INTEGRATING GREEN ECONOMY PRINCIPLES INTO INTERNATIONAL TRADE: LESSONS FOR EXPORT-ORIENTED MARKETING

Abdullayev Aziz Kurbanovich
Associate Professor at the Department of International Finance and Investments,
University of World Economy and Diplomacy
Email: *aabdullayev@uwed.uz*
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4888-1068
Xusanova Dilafruz Mamurjon qizi
Master's student, University of World Economy and Diplomacy.
Email: *umdilafruzacca@gmail.com*
ORCID: 0009-0009-8440-8612

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19768496

Abstract*. The transition toward a global green economy has reshaped the conditions for export competitiveness, yet the integration of environmental principles into international marketing strategy remains theoretically underdeveloped and empirically contested. This article is looking at how the principles of the green economy that include low-carbon production, resource efficiency and environmental certification could be incorporated in the export-oriented marketing strategy to improve the competitive performance in the international markets. The study will provide a response to the following research question: To which extent green economy practices, namely, environmental certification, carbon intensity reduction, and sustainability-oriented marketing, affect the performance of exports to international markets, and what are the strategic marketing implications of export-oriented firms in various regulatory and cultural environments? The study will be conducted using a Comparative Country Analysis design and a secondary data analysis using the WTO, UNCTAD, the World Bank, and peer-reviewed literature (2015-2025). Important discoveries are that in 2022, global green goods trade had increased significantly by 243% since 2000, sustainability-marketed products offered a 27.6% higher price than conventional products, and in European panel data, ISO 14001 certification was positively linked to excellent export performance. The Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM) of the EU which goes into full effect in 2026 is considered as a structural inflection point that is redefining the competitive floor of carbon-intensive exporters. The findings of the panel quantile regression (1561-1562) of 30 European countries (2012-2022) indicate that the relationship between green-export performance and institutional quality and R&D expenditure is moderate, and hence the significant consequences of the study are that the firm in various regulatory and cultural settings must adjust the investment in green marketing accordingly. The article ends with policy suggestions to governments and companies who are aiming at making environmental compliance a lasting export competitive advantage.*

Keywords: *green economy, export-oriented marketing, international trade, eco-labelling, Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism, green competitiveness, ISO 14001, sustainable marketing, comparative country analysis.*

INTRODUCTION

The history of international marketing strategy has been established on the optimization of the market entry, segmentation, positioning and management of cultural and institutional distance among national markets. Environmental performance has hardly been considered as a strategic variable in the criteria on which firms compete in export markets price, quality, brand

equity, distribution efficiency. This is rapidly changing. An amalgamation of regulatory change, changes in consumer preference and realignment of geopolitics is transforming environmental performance into a core axis of export competitiveness with far-reaching consequences on the way international marketers construct product positioning, modes of targeting and brand communication practices across borders.

In 2023, the exports of global merchandise were as high as 22 trillion (WTO, 2023), despite the fact that the governments of European Union, the United States, and China announced comprehensive green industrial policies, the conditions under which the foreign goods are offered to the markets directly depend on them. The Green Deal of the EU, which is being implemented with the help of the Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM), makes it a prerequisite of access to the largest import market in the world, the carbon intensity of the exported goods. The U.S. Inflation Reduction Act subsidizes locally born green products, which generates competitive unbalances in the international markets of clean technology. The dual-carbon goals of China have reshaped its manufacturing export foundation to photovoltaics, electric vehicles, and green chemicals at the rate that is redefining the global supply chains.

These do not happen to be peripheral developments. They are a structural change in the competitive environment in which export-oriented firms are involved in a change that has thus far, been only to some degree mapped by the international marketing scholarship.

The issue that this article has responded to is the mismatch between the size and rate of green economy change and incorporation of green values into global marketing plan. The export-oriented companies especially those in developing and emerging economies are still structuring their competitive strategies on the traditional trade variables cost, quality, and market access.

This is a strategy that is growing to be insufficient. Companies that fail to internalize the concepts of the green economy have to deal with increasing regulatory risks in their most significant export markets, diminishing price premiums facing the consumer and inability to be part of sustainability-oriented global value chains. However, the academic literature on international marketing has failed to theorize and empirically establish how the principles of green economy should be applied in export marketing strategy which practices are important in what market situations, and by what processes.

The three gaps in existing knowledge are what motivate this study. To begin with, the trade-environment literature has concentrated more on the macro-level concentration between trade openness and environmental, which has not examined the firm-level and marketing-strategy implications effectively. Second, the treatment of the environmental variables in the export marketing literature has been more of anecdotal rather than systematic based on cross countries empirical evidence on the relationship between the green and the export performance.

Third, the new body of research based on green branding and eco-labelling has been largely based on domestic markets and little attention has been paid to the particular issues of communicating environmental credentials across cultural and regulatory borders in the international markets.

It is on this basis that this article is structured under the following Research Question (RQ):

To what extent, does green economy practices namely in terms of environmental certification, carbon reduction and sustainability oriented marketing practices impact export performance in the international market and what are the strategic marketing implication of such practices in export oriented firms within various regulatory and cultural environments?

The research aim is to define and generalize empirical findings on the relationship between green-export performance, define regulatory and consumer demand climate that determines green trade, and draw practical implications of the marketing strategy on the export based firms that conduct their operations in various national settings.

Literature review

Theoretical underpinnings of this article cut across three areas of studies. The former is the green economy theory. Based on three pillars including; low-carbon energy systems, resource efficiency, and social inclusivity, UNEP (2011) defines the green economy as one that creates growth and minimizes the threat to the environment. Bowen and Fankhauser (2011) opine that the policies of green economy do not necessarily have to contradict with the growth of the economy; it shows that in the example of early-movers, the environmental leadership in the renewable energy sector can earn considerable export revenues. These pillars in trade terms would be converted to the category of environmental good and services (EGS), sustainable value chains and eco-innovation as a source of comparative advantage (OECD, 2010).

The second academic school deals with the trade-environment relationship. This debate is organized by the competing Pollution Haven Hypothesis (PHH) and Porter Hypothesis. The PHH assumes that trade liberalization stimulates firms to outsource polluting operations to those jurisdictions that have weaker environmental regulations and drives the other firms out of the market instead of reducing the emissions (Copeland and Taylor, 1994). The PHH is empirically supported or not based on circumstances. The Porter Hypothesis, in its turn, states that strict environmental controls trigger eco-innovation that eventually enhances the performance in terms of competitiveness (Porter and van der Linde, 1995). The most rigorous approach to the Porter Hypothesis in the export environment is presented by Ramirez et al. (2025), which relies on panel quantile regression of 30 European countries (2012-2022). Results show that the ISO 14001 certification and environmental technology patents have a positive relationship with export performance with moderating effects of institutional quality and R&D expenditure.

The third theory is export marketing theory. Zou and Cavusgil (2002) create the framework Global Marketing Strategy (GMS) according to which the adaptation-standardization dilemma is the key issue of the international marketing. The additional element of this dilemma is the emergence of environmental consumer tastes: the green product characteristics can be both the basis of premium pricing and the market entry criterion in the high-income segments, and at the same time, their value can differ significantly in different national consumer cultures. The eco-labelling as a marketing tool is a solution to the information asymmetry issue of the foreign market: foreign consumers are not able to check the environmental credentials of imported goods directly, and established certification systems are credible signals of the compliance (Auriol and Schilizzi, 2003). The NYU Stern Center for Sustainable Business (2024) has documented research that products marketed with sustainability have recorded a five-year compound annual growth of 9.48 percent as compared to conventional products, with an average price premium of 27.6 percent which proves that eco-labelling is not a reputational service to a product but a commercial investment.

There is one common finding in the literature: green competitiveness is a systemic and context-specific result. This is not generated by the mere investment in certification by the firm level but as the relationship between the investment and the national institutions, infrastructures of innovation and the particular regulatory and cultural need of the target markets.

This systemic nature is precisely why green economy principles require integration into international marketing strategy at the strategic, not operational, level and why a comparative, cross-country analytical approach is needed to generate generalizable insights.

METHODS

The proposed research design is a Comparative Country Analysis, which is a systematic comparison of the implication of the green trade performance and marketing strategy in a panel of countries representing various levels of environmental policy stringency, economic development and cultural orientation towards sustainability. The RQ uses the Comparative Country Analysis methodology since the main marketing problem to be solved was how to structure or harmonize green export strategies in different national settings, is comparative in nature. Individual-country or individual-firm case studies cannot produce the cross-national difference that would allow to determine what contextual factors mediate the relationship between green-export performance.

The research is based purely on secondary data, which involves the synthesis of quantitative evidence in the form of international databases, as well as a comprehensive inspection of peer-reviewed sources published since 2015 and up to 2025. This method does not contradict evidence synthesis methodologies in international economics (Hausmann et al., 2014).

Table 1 below is a table where the data sources are recorded, the indicators from each source identified, and their direct references. Institutional authority, methodological transparency and cross-national comparability were prioritized in terms of source selection. Where primary regression evidence is referred to, the findings are based on the peer reviewed panel studies that use established econometric techniques on samples of countries. The analysis model compiles evidence on three types of variables. Export performance is the dependent variable, which is operationalized in three forms, (1) the total export volume of environmental goods (current USD value); (2) the compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of products marketed on sustainability (consumer markets); (3) Revealed Comparative Advantage (RCA) index of green goods (RCA > 1 is an indicator of competitive specialization). Triangulation is made possible by the selection of various operationalization implementation in trade and marketing situations.

The most important independent variables are green economy practices as (a) the rate of adoption of environmental certifications measured using the rates of ISO 14001 certification per country; (b) the rate of carbon intensity of production measured using the rates of CO2 emissions per unit GDP; (c) the rate of technological innovation of environmental technologies measured using the rates of OECD green patents; (d) the rate of sustainability marketing investment measured using the rates of share of sustainability-marketed products on overall retail sales taken using the NYU Stern Sustainable Market Share Index (2024

The control variables deal with rival explanations of the cross-national difference in export performance: GDP per capita (controlling overall economic development); trade openness, which is a sum of exports and imports (percentage of GDP); manufacturing value added (percentage of GDP), which controls industrial structure; R&D expenditure (percentage of GDP), which controls the quality of institutional institutions; the World Bank Regulatory Quality Index (controlling institutional quality); and Cultural Orientation toward Sustainability, a composite variable that is based on long-term orientation scores of Hofstede and the Ed

Two integrated case studies the EU Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism and the photovoltaic export growth in China are integrated as systematic comparisons that bring the cross-country statistical evidence into the context of a given policy and market setting.

These examples were chosen due to the policy implications and their opposite dynamics: the CBAM is a demand-side driver of green trade compliance, and the PV export growth of China is a supply-side green industrial policy dynamic. They all depict the opportunity dimension and the asymmetric challenge dimension of integrating green economy to export-oriented firms.

An econometric reference model drawing on the gravity model of trade literature provides the theoretical scaffolding for interpreting the cross-country evidence. In the standard gravity framework, bilateral trade flows (T_ij) between exporting country i and importing country j are modeled as:

$$ln(T\_ij) = \alpha + \beta_1 ln(GDP\_i) + \beta_2 ln(GDP\_j) + \beta_3 ln(Dist\_ij) + \beta_4 GreenPractice\_i + \beta_5 RegQuality\_i + \beta_6 CulturalDist\_ij + \beta_7 CBAM\_exposure\_i + \varepsilon\_ij$$

Equation 1. Augmented Gravity Model with Green Economy Variables

The coefficients of interest in this specification include; b4 (the direct impact of green practices on trade flows), b6 (the influenced effect of cultural distance on acceptance of green products) and b7 (the effect of competition exposure of the CBAM). This model goes hand in hand with Chen et al. (2023), who use a stochastic frontier gravity model to estimate China-RCEP green trade efficiency, and with Ramirez et al. (2025), whose panel quantile regression can, subject of the conditional distribution of export performance, be interpreted as estimating b4. Although the primary estimation of Equation 1 is out of scope of the current secondary-data research, the framework gives the analytical prism according to which the available empirical findings are viewed and the variables according to which findings are structured.

TABLE 1.

DATA SOURCES, VARIABLES, AND REFERENCES USED IN THE ANALYSIS

Data Source	Indicators / Variables Used
WTO Trade Statistics (2023–2024)	Green goods trade flows; EGA status; tariff rates on environmental goods
UNCTAD Global Trade Update, March 2024	Sectoral trade values by product; green goods growth rates
World Bank – CBAM Exposure Index (2024)	Carbon intensity per country; CBAM competitive exposure score
OECD Green Patent Database	Environmental technology patent counts by country and year
NYU Stern Sustainable Market Share Index (2024)	CAGR of sustainability-marketed goods; price premium data; U.S. market share trends
Council on Foreign Relations (2024)	Global green goods trade volumes; U.S. env. tech. export values
Ramirez et al. (2025) – MDPI Sustainability	Panel regression results: ISO 14001 × export performance; 30 EU countries, 2012–2022
Chen et al. (2023) – Frontiers Env. Science	RCA indices; gravity model; China-RCEP green trade efficiency scores
Centre for Global Development (2023)	CBAM macroeconomic impact scenarios; African and Asian GDP effects
Scientific Reports / Nature (2025)	Consumer WTP premium for eco-labelled products; China consumer survey

Emam et al. (2023) – MDPI Agriculture	Local projection analysis: Ecuador green export review and market share

RESULTS

The findings are arranged in a way that they answer the three dimensions of the research question in clearly in the following order: the extent and the development of the green goods trade, empirical relationship between green practices and export performance and regulatory and consumer demand climate that influences green marketing strategy in various country settings.

Green Goods Trade: Scale, Growth, and Sectoral Distribution

By 2022, global trade in environmental goods had reached about $1.9 trillion, which is 100 billion higher than 2021 (CFR, 2024). In the long-term, the WTO predicts that the trade of individual environmental products has increased by 243 percent between 2000 and 2020. In the construction and manufacturing industries, green exports grew by 71 percent between 2013 and 2022 up to 4.1 trillion dollars more than the growth rate of the traditional classes of merchandise trade (Tang et al., 2025). UNCTAD (2024) also confirms that even as the global trade declined by about 3% in 2023 due to post-pandemic normalized conditions, electric vehicles and renewable energy equipment still grew, as a structural cushion to nations and companies that are well-developed in green areas.

TABLE 2.

SUMMARY OF KEY GREEN TRADE AND MARKET PERFORMANCE INDICATORS.

Indicator	Value / Finding	Source
Global green goods trade (2022)	~$1.9 trillion (+$100B from 2021)	CFR, 2024
WTO environmental goods growth (2000–2020)	+243%	CFR, 2024
Green exports: construction/manufacturing (2013→2022)	$2.4T → $4.1T (+71%)	Tang et al., 2025
China PV exports (2022)	>$50B (↑80.3% year-on-year)	Chen et al., 2023
U.S. environmental technology exports (2023)	>$38B	CFR, 2024
Sustainable consumer goods market CAGR (to 2030)	10.7% (→$574.7B)	Future Data Stats, 2023
Price premium: sustainability-marketed goods	+27.6% vs. conventional	NYU Stern, 2024
5-yr CAGR: sustainable vs. conventional goods	9.48% vs. 4.98%	Retail Dive, 2023
Sustainable goods: U.S. market share (2022)	17.3% (up from 14.3% in 2018)	Retail Dive, 2023
Mozambique CBAM excess cost (aluminum exports)	~6% of export value to the world	World Bank, 2024
African GDP loss under broad CBAM (€87/t scenario)	−1.12% GDP; −5.72% EU exports	CGD, 2023

Global carbon pricing initiatives (2019 → May 2024)	57 → 75 initiatives (+32%)	RFF, 2024

Source: CFR, 2024; Tang et al., 2025; Future Data Stats, 2023; NYU Stern, 2024; Retail Dive, 2023; World Bank, 2024; CGD, 2023; RFF, 2024

The concentration of the green trade growth is shown through sector level evidence. By 2022, the value of China's exports in photovoltaic products reached above 50 billion dollars, increasing by 80.3 percent on an annual basis due to the resulting combination of calculated industrial policy assistance and the decrease in cost of production, which made Chinese PV modules cost-competitive on a global scale. Chinese PV exports have already reached over 29.2 billion in 2023, an 11.7 percent more than the similar figures of 2022 (Chen et al., 2023). In 2023, the U.S. environmental technology exports, which are topped by water and wastewater management equipment, were over 38 billion (CFR, 2024). The sustainable consumer goods market is expected to increase by 10.7% in CAGR between 2023 and 2030 to reach a projected amount of 293.8 billion to 574.7 billion (Future Data Stats, 2023). These figures make it clear that the international trading system is a structural feature and not a niche segment and that organizations that position themselves at the first position in exporters of green goods regardless of whether the country or company is a country or firm are being matched to the mainstream growth trend of the world demand.

Green Practices and Export Performance: Panel Evidence

The best methodologically rigorous evidence that exists on the relationship between green-export performance is that provided by Ramirez et al. (2025), which rail panel quantile regression of 30 European countries in the years 2012-2022 concludes that the adoption of ISO 14001 certification and the number of environmental technology patents were both positively and significantly related with export performance with respect to most quantiles of the export distributions. It is heterogeneous in effect: green practices only have a positive correlation with competitive advantages of countries in the upper quartile of the export distribution, implying that green practices do not create competitive advantages but only enhance them. Importantly, both quality of regulatory ($b = 0.41$, $p < 0.01$) and investment in R&D ($b = 0.38$, $p < 0.01$) as a share of GDP moderate the positive effects of green practices by an essentially similar degree meaning that the same certification investment generates much higher export returns in a strong institutional environment as compared to a weak institutional one.

Using the stochastic frontier gravity model based on the 20012020 China-RCEP green trade data, Chen et al. (2023) affirm that GDP per capita and population of the importing countries facilitate bilateral green trade volumes, whereas governance quality and economic freedom in the exporting countries enhance the efficiency of green trade. Their Revealed Comparative Advantage analysis reveals that the Chinese competitive edge in green goods has steadily increased throughout the study period by photovoltaic products, wind technology, and electric vehicles having the biggest RCA increases. The efficiency scores generated by the frontier model show that Japan and South Korea are closest to their green trade potential frontier, and that most members of the ASEAN and the RCEP partners of developing countries are well below their frontier efficiency, indicating that there is massive potential of unrealized green exports in these countries should they upgrade and modernize their institutions.

The Emam et al. (2023) study is a warning study as it reviews the National Green Export Review (NGER) in Ecuador through the local projection analysis of Ecuadorian share of the

global fish export markets. The fact that they found that the NGER had no positive impact on the competitive situation in Ecuador marks a glaring hole between the supply-side green compliance and the demand-side marketing efficiency. They had a program on environmental and regulatory compliance, but have not properly mapped the particular certification expectations, eco-label recognition and quality signal preferences of European and North American seafood consumers.

It is this inability to convert the green credentials into marketing value which can be seen by the consumer that is exactly the lapse that is being covered by this article; the green export strategy needs to be on the basis of the demand rather than the supply alone.

The Regulatory Environment: CBAM as Structural Inflection Point.

The Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM) is the most important regulatory innovation in the interface between trade and the environment, which was formally adopted in May 2023 and will become fully operational in January 2026. The CBAM levies a tariff on imports in six carbon intensive industries aluminum, cement, electricity, fertilizers, hydrogen, and iron and steel calculated to the difference in the cost of carbon by the EU producers and importers. The mechanism converts the carbon based competitive advantage (lower input costs due to lax environmental regulation) into a structural liability: the high-carbon exporters to the EU are subjected by the mechanism to increased costs of imports, and the exporters of low carbon are not subject to the mechanism to extra costs, or relative gain.

The CBAM Exposure Index (2024) by the World Bank shows drastic inequality in vulnerability on the country level. With Mozambique exporting 97 percent of total alumnium to the EU, the additional cost in compliance with carbon levels amounts to about 6 percent of the total value of the alumnium export the highest in the sample of the study. At the aggregate, CGD (2023) concludes that an expansion of the CBAM based on the average carbon price of EUR87 per tonne, abundantly extended to Africa, would cut exports to EU by 5.72% and African GDP by 1.12% (without plastic products). Conversely, nations that are already at a lower level of carbon intensity such as Ghana, Uzbekistan and Jordan are already at a negative exposure, meaning that they are likely to gain competitively as other high-carbon countries are forced to pay increased costs. This imbalance is a significant geopolitical complication of the green trade integration, which will be further addressed in Section.

Spillover effects of the CBAM are not limited to the EU. According to the resources of the future (2024) records, globally, the initiative of carbon pricing has increased to 75 in May 2024, which is a 32 percent increase, in reference to the role of the mechanism as an external discipline on climate policy in the world. In the case of export-oriented companies, the CBAM establishes a strategic emergency: determining which production activities and export products are most at risk due to carbon costs and building decarbonization roadmaps in accordance with the stages of the CBAM implementation.

Consumer Demand, Eco-Labelling, and Cross-Cultural Variation

The demand side of the consumer market records a consistent sustainability premium, however, with considerable cross-national differences in the way the premium is manifested, and the way the environmental credentials are measured. According to the NYU Stern Sustainable Market Share Index (2024), sustainability-marketed commodities in the United States have increased at an annual CAGR of 9.48% in five years (compared to 4.98% in traditional goods), fetched an average price premium of 27.6 percent, and have become a proportion of total U.S. consumer buying of 17.3 percent in 2022, as opposed to 14.3 percent in 2018.

A study of Chinese consumer data released in Scientific Reports (2025) shows that recognition of carbon labels leads to a significant change in willingness to pay a premium and is linked to a higher perceived quality a result that is in line with the signaling theory (Spence, 1973).

Eco-label recognition and trust cross-nationally is a key marketing variable. The most familiar and trusted upon eco-label are European consumers who have a regulatory environment that has formalised the eco-label, including EU Ecolabel scheme, the Organic certification framework, and the FSC and MSC on forest and fisheries products. Gorton et al. (2021) show that trust in eco-labels by consumers is significantly and positively related to purchase intent in all markets in Europe, although this connection is less significant in markets with minimal eco-label exposure and weaker consumer protection laws. Indian research (ResearchGate, 2023) concludes that eco-labels arouse green purchase intention among consumers in the emerging market, which is mostly due to environmental concern, self-motivation, and food safety concerns instead of to the presence of the broader environmental awareness as a motivational structure that suggests the marketing communication approach to the South Asian market should be different than to European markets.

TABLE 3.

COMPARATIVE COUNTRY ANALYSIS: GREEN TRADE POSITION, CBAM EXPOSURE, AND CONSUMER DEMAND CONTEXT.

Country/Region	Green Export Strength	CBAM Exposure	Consumer Green Demand	Key Marketing Implication
EU (Germany, France)	High – RCA > 1 in clean tech, organic food	Low (already low-carbon)	Very high; eco-label literacy high	Standardized green positioning; leverage EU Ecolabel
China	Very high – PV, EVs, wind; RCA rising	Moderate; transitioning	Rising; carbon labels gaining traction	Scale-driven green branding; target EU and RCEP markets
Sub-Saharan Africa (e.g., Mozambique)	Low – primary commodities dominate	Very high (aluminum, steel)	Low – price sensitivity dominant	Urgent decarbonization of export sectors; seek green finance
South/SE Asia (India, Vietnam, Thailand)	Mixed – growing in EVs and textiles	High for plastics, steel	Moderate; health/safety-driven green demand	Adapt eco-claims to safety/quality messaging; invest in ISO
Central Asia (Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan)	Emerging – energy, metals, cotton	Low to negative (relatively low carbon intensity in some sectors)	Low-moderate; developing consumer class	Opportunity to leverage competitive advantage over high-carbon peers; build certification capacity now

Source: European Commission, OECD, IEA, World Bank, UNCTAD, ADB, WTO, UN Comtrade Database

This cross-cultural difference is directly applicable in the debate of adaptation-standardization in the export marketing. A universal international green positioning programme that reflects the same eco-credential under the same certified marks with the same language of communication might be the best in the EU markets where eco-labels are aligned and the consumer literacy is very high. The same practice can be ineffective or counterproductive in Middle Eastern, South Asian or Southeast Asian markets where consumers will interpret environmental claims differently, weigh different certification programs as legitimate and react to various health and safety value drivers, and not environmental stewardship itself. Table 3 will list the cross-country comparative findings on green trade performance, regulatory exposure, and consumer demand context.

DISCUSSION

From Green Compliance to Green Competitiveness

The findings confirm the main thesis of the article, that green economy principles in the export marketing strategy are not a compliance process but commercial consequence strategic decisions. The evidence shows that there are three different channels by which the green practices translate into export performance improvements. The regulatory compliance channel is achieved through market access: after 2026, EU importers in covered CBAM sectors will have to pay direct costs on high-carbon products, which will create a structural competitive advantage to low-carbon exporters that accumulates over time as the EU carbon price goes up. The channel of consumer preference works based on the pricing power: the 27.6% premium and the almost double growth rate of sustainability-marketed products records the monetizable value of environmental differentiation in consumer market with high income levels. The channel of innovation also works in terms of productivity: The Porter Hypothesis mechanism according to which restrictive regulation leads to eco-innovation enhancing environmental and commercial results is proven with the help of the Ramirez et al. (2025) panel data correlating environmental patents and export revenues.

These three channels lead to the same strategic conclusion that environmental investment, however, in the strategic planning of firms, should be redesigned as a cost center to a competitive asset that has to be actively developed, communicated and exploited in market segments. The prevailing way of framing in most of the literature in the business environment is that compliance with the environment is a handicap to competitiveness, and it is costly without any revenue. The reviewed empirical evidence logically refutes this framing. The most apparent example of firms that have integrated environmental credentials into their brand identity is the case of Patagonia, IKEA and Natura, which rely on the credentials to justify premium prices, create brand loyalty and preferred-supplier positions in value chains of sustainability (Berns et al., 2009). This does not mean that every company should go the same way to green positioning but the question of whether or how much investment in green credentials is going to be made was a strategic marketing issue, not a fringe corporate social responsibility matters any more.

Global vs. Local Tensions Green Export Marketing.

The findings indicate a basic conflict between the pressures of global harmonization in the green standards and the local diversity in the valuation and communication of environmental credentials. At the harmonization level, the CBAM will provide a powerful regulatory force to converge on EU-compliant carbon accounting standards, and the environmental needs of the supply chain by multinational buyers (Berns et al., 2009) will extend EU-level green requirements to suppliers across the entire global value chain irrespective of their home market

environment. The ISO 14001 being a globally known framework is a de facto international standard that regardless of various regulatory settings has credibility. These drivers are driving towards the direction of a standardized global green positioning strategy.

It is against this that the consumer demand evidence manifests to exhibit an incessant local difference that does not lend itself to standardization. The European consumers are highly trustful and full of intention to buy already established eco-label schemes (EU Ecolabel, FSC, Fairtrade). Indian consumers are more sensitive to eco-labels that are related in health, safety, and food safety as opposed to abstract environmental protection (ResearchGate, 2023). The eco-label literacy among Chinese consumers is emerging and increasing, and carbon labeling is becoming more accepted in addition to the general quality association (Scientific Reports, 2025).

The presence of these consumer motivational structures suggests that a sustainability statement made in the same label, using the same language, will have varied purchase reactions in different markets.

The answer to this international-domestic tension is the multi-layered approach to marketing: maintain uniformity in the certification model (ISO 14001, accepted eco-labels) to ensure regulatory conformity and supply chain credibility internationally, but flex the marketing message to fit the particular values and motivational schemes prevailing in each target market. In European markets, focus on the impact of climate and the contributions of the circular economy.

In South and Southeast Asian markets, stress food safety, health and product quality as the consumer facing benefits of environmental certification. In the markets of the emerging economies where the level of environmental awareness is less and price sensitivity is high, incorporate green credentials into longer value propositions durability, efficiency, quality not in the first place with environmental claims that might be less effective. This is an adaptation of green marketing communication into a standardized certification equation which replicates the standardization-adaptation standardization decision in the global marketing: standardize the product, adapt the communication (Zou and Cavusgil, 2002).

Cross-Cultural, Legal and Geopolitical Complexity

The CBAM analysis shows that the green trade transition has extremely asymmetric geopolitical implications. The least-contributing countries of global carbon accretion that comprise a majority of sub-Saharan Africa, Central Asia and some parts of Southeast Asia bear the greatest proportional adjustment costs of border carbon schemes adjusted to EU carbon prices. This does not simply raise an economic efficiency issue but it is a distributional justice issue with actual trade policy implications. The governments of developing countries are becoming more assertive in the global arena over the validity of the application of trade policy to impose environmental standards that their economies cannot adhere to in terms of technology and capital within a time frame imposed by the EU. To export-oriented companies in these economies, the geopolitical situation is thus not a background factor but a decisive influence of the market access: the companies that outrun their national policy course on decarburization can acquire a competitive edge over the local counterparts and be credible to the EU buyers who are pressured to prove their supply chain decarburization declarations.

The regulatory problem is complicated by legal complexity. The WTO consistency of the CBAM is a subject of debate: although the mechanism is meant to ensure that there is no discrimination between home and foreign goods, WTO members of the developing countries have opposed it as a veiled trade barrier that is contrary to the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities of the UNFCCC.

To the export marketers, this legal ambivalence provides a planning environment where the timelines of implementation of CBAM and the coverage of the sector can change in a manner that cannot be certain and predictable. Such a lack of a WTO Environmental Goods Agreement is another fracturing of the market access landscape: India imposes an average tariff of 14.7 on environmental goods (CFR, 2024), and this provides a barrier to the exporter of green products in a market simultaneously facing a high growth of green demand at home. To sail through this broken law field, export marketers need to consider regulatory risk analysis as a component of the green market entry strategy.

The effectiveness of the green marketing strategies is also influenced by cultural distance measured in the analytical framework in terms of the Hofstede long-term orientation index and the Edelman Trust Barometer that interplay in the global-local tension outlined above. Societies with lower long-term orientation (many African and Middle Eastern markets) may respond better to green credentials framed as immediate, tangible product benefits. Green export marketers who fail to account for cultural distance risk the kind of marketing-market misalignment documented in Ecuador's fisheries case regulatory compliance without consumer-facing value creation.

Barriers to Green Export Integration

Although this has proven the advantages of green export strategies, the outcomes show that there are still systematic obstacles limiting its implementation. Small and medium-sized businesses (SMEs) in the developing world continue to be cost and technology constrained. The administration and financial cost of the implementation of green certification processes, CBAM documentation systems, and environmental management system are burdensome and prohibitive to administer without external assistance. According to the World Bank (2024), the requirements of documentation of CBAM compliance often outweigh the ability of organizations of the developing countries to manage compliance with these requirements, especially in the aluminum and steel industries where small enterprises prevail. This institutional obstacle threatens to consolidate the gains of green trade integration between large, well endowed exporters and the SMEs of the market a market fragmentation process with significant distributional implications.

Greenwashing is a threat to marketing integrity. In the markets where there is suspicion that the environmental claims made cannot be proved, the buyer and consumers might reduce the green positioning as unsupported by the well-publicized cases of greenwashing in the fashion industry and food industry. According to the survey of the largest markets, a considerable proportion of consumers express their distrust to the corporate claims on sustainability, especially when they are not verified by third parties (Statista, 2022).

This credibility challenge states that it is credible to invest in internationally accepted certification over self-certification and consistency of green claims with verifiable metrics of environmental performance in all buyer facing communications.

Fragmegration of regulations in key markets poses complexity to compliance to any exporter who has more than one destination. The eco-labelling standards of the EU, the U.S. FTC Green Guides and those of emerging regulatory systems in China, Japan and the ASEAN vary in their technical standards as well as their institutions to enforce.

A company willing to export its goods in several markets at the same time has to negotiate a mosaic of overlapping and even contradictory environmental disclosure policies a transaction cost that is least bearable by smaller exporters and which can serve as a de facto non-tariff barrier to green market entry.

Limitations

There are a number of significant limitations that qualify this study. To begin with, the secondary data analysis design implies that the results will be limited to the coverage and the quality of the available datasets. The evidence of the cross-country panel is mostly European-based (Ramirez et al., 2025), which might not be applicable to the exporters of developing economies in other institutional and regulatory settings. It is not directly estimated in the present paper, as the gravity model specification expressed in Equation 1 is merely used to provide an analytical framework in the analysis, with primary estimation based on internationally harmonized panel data supporting the causal inference.

Secondly, the cultural distance measure, operationalized based on Hofstede scores and the Edelman Trust Barometer, is a composite measure that might not reflect the dimensions of cultural orientation that are of the greatest interest in the context of eco-label acceptance and green purchase intentions. Additional cross-cultural consumer study in a more granular form through conjoint analysis or incentivized choice experiments would give more accurate estimates of desired willingness to pay on environmental features among target markets.

Third, the CBAM is a relatively new mechanism that has little implementation information. The mentioned estimates of the model-based projections of the CGD (2023) and the world bank (2024) are not the actual effects of the measure on competition, but the projections of the model type that use the carbon pricing policy of other exporting countries, and the effectiveness of the CBAM in reality is heavily reliant on the development of the carbon pricing policy of other countries and the utility of such a mechanism in exercising its flexibility provisions. The effect of these estimates should be revised in future studies because the data on the implementation of CBAM will be increasing after the year 2026.

Fourth, the emphasis of the article on environmental certification (ISO 14001) and carbon intensity as the main variables of green practices might undermine other aspects of the green economy integration that are commercially relevant such as the principles of the circular economy, certifications of biodiversity and water stewardship. As these spheres become more regulatory and consumer-facing, it would be worth developing a larger framework of measurement of green practices to underpin empirical studies in the future.

Future Research Directions

This analysis results in a number of promising opportunities to conduct further research.

The first is the immediate empirical measure of the augmented version of the gravity model in Equation 1 with the addition of the CBAM exposure, cultural distance, and variable of green practice to ensure that the regulatory, cultural, and firm-level factors influence the frequency of green export flows are determined simultaneously. It would involve creating a panel dataset that encompasses developed and developing economies in various green products categories an action research project that would be methodologically impossible within this study but practically easy through the existing international databases.

The second priority is the longitudinal studies that will follow how companies in CBAM-exposed industries respond to the mechanism by changing their export-marketing strategies. A case study study based on a matched sample of high-carbon and low-carbon exporters in the aluminum, steel, or fertilizer industry as CBAM comes into full force since 2026 would yield especially useful marketing strategy information concerning the interaction of regulatory-motivated green transitions with brand positioning, customer relationships management, and pricing strategy in overseas B2B markets.

Third, the cross-cultural consumer research gap on the effectiveness of eco-labels in the emerging markets is very high. The vast majority of the existing eco-label studies have been done within European or North American settings; empirical data that is comparative in terms of the consumer research across South Asian, Southeast Asian, African, and Middle Eastern markets would be the basis of the empirical research of the locally adjusted green communication strategies, which this article supports.

CONCLUSION

This paper has discussed the implementation of the concept of green economy in the export-oriented marketing strategy trying to respond to the research question by assessing whether and by what means green practices environmental certification, carbon intensity reduction, and sustainability based marketing performance have an impact on the export performance in the international markets. Three major conclusions are reached.

To begin with, the international shift to the green trade is a structural fact which determines the competitive nature of the export-oriented companies. The global trade in green goods has already reached 1.9 trillion in 2022 and increased 243 percent since 2000 and the sustainable consumer goods market is growing at an average of 10.7 percent CAGR and the EU CBAM, which will be fully implemented in 2026, is making decarbonization a pre-requisite to continuing access to the EU market in the covered sectors. These are not the trends to observe but requirements that they are to act.

Second, the empirical evidence discusses that green practices help to enhance export performance; however, the extent of such impact is strongly mediated by the quality of institutions, R&D, and the correspondence between green credentials and the target market consumer expectations regarding the particular certification system and cultural orientations.

Green competitiveness is localized and systematic: it can only be calibrated, market-specific marketing strategy but not a template of a globally uniform positioning.

Third, the global-local conflict in green export marketing can be resolved using a layered approach standardize on international recognized certification systems to attain regulatory and supply chain legitimacy in the global market, and customize marketing messages to suit the motivational systems, eco-label literacy, and cultural orientations of individual target markets.

This strategy reflects the established adaptation-standardization resolution of the international marketing theory and translates it to the new sphere of the green trade strategy.

On the government side, the implication is investment in green institutional infrastructure environmental control, available green finance and certification support to SMEs as a requirement to ensure the transfer of the firm-level green investments to macroeconomic export benefits. In the case of export-oriented companies, the strategic importance of environmental credentials lies in the need to view them as commercially viable assets that will require investment in their active marketing. Within the case of international organizations, it is necessary that the revenues of CBAM fund green industrialization of the developing economies to create a sustainable global green trade order as opposed to extractive global green trade order.

REFERENCES

1. Auriol, E., & Schilizzi, S. G. M. (2003). Quality signaling through certification: Theory and application to agricultural seed markets. IDEI Working Paper, Toulouse School of Economics.

2. Berns, M., Townend, A., Khayat, Z., Balagopal, B., Reeves, M., Hopkins, M. S., & Kruschwitz, N. (2009). Sustainability and competitive advantage. MIT Sloan Management Review, 51(1), 18–26.
3. Bowen, A., & Fankhauser, S. (2011). The green growth narrative: Paradigm as political strategy. Global Environmental Change, 21(4), 1157–1159. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2011.07.009
4. Centre for Global Development [CGD] (2023). The EU's carbon border tax: How can developing countries respond? Retrieved from https://www.cgdev.org/blog/eus-carbon-border-tax-how-can-developing-countries-respond
5. Chen, X., Liu, X., & Wang, J. (2023). The characteristic and potential of green trade between China and RCEP countries. Frontiers in Environmental Science, 11, 1267413. https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2023.1267413
6. Copeland, B. R., & Taylor, M. S. (1994). North–South trade and the environment. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 109(3), 755–787. https://doi.org/10.2307/2118421
7. Council on Foreign Relations [CFR] (2024). Trade tools for climate action: Green goods. Retrieved from https://www.cfr.org/articles/trade-tools-climate-action-green-goods
8. Emam, M. A., Leibrecht, M., & Chen, T. (2023). The impact of a 'National Green Export Review' on competitiveness: Empirical evidence for Ecuador's fish exports. Agriculture, 13(1), 62. https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture13010062
9. Future Data Stats (2023). Ethical and sustainable consumer goods market size & industry growth 2030. Retrieved from https://www.futuredatastats.com/ethical-and-sustainable-consumer-goods-market
10. Gorton, M., Tocco, B., Yeh, C.-H., & Hartmann, M. (2021). What determines consumers' use of eco-labels? Taking a close look at label trust. Ecological Economics, 189, 107173. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2021.107173
11. Hausmann, R., Hidalgo, C. A., Bustos, S., Coscia, M., Chung, S., Jimenez, J., & Yildirim, M. A. (2014). The atlas of economic complexity. MIT Press.
12. Lall, S. (2001). Competitiveness, technology and skills. Edward Elgar Publishing.
13. NYU Stern Center for Sustainable Business (2024). Sustainable Market Share Index 2024™. New York University. Retrieved from https://www.stern.nyu.edu/sites/default/files/2024-05/2024%20CSB%20Report%20for%20website.pdf
14. OECD (2010). Interim report of the green growth strategy: Implementing our commitment for a sustainable future. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264083554-en
15. Porter, M. E., & van der Linde, C. (1995). Toward a new conception of the environment-competitiveness relationship. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 9(4), 97–118. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.9.4.97
16. Ramirez, J., Garcia, A., & Torres, M. (2025). The role of institutional and innovation ecosystem in moderating the impact of green practices on export performance: Evidence from European countries. Sustainability, 17(20), 9146. https://doi.org/10.3390/su17209146
17. Resources for the Future [RFF] (2024). How carbon border adjustments might drive global climate policy momentum. Retrieved from

https://www.rff.org/publications/reports/how-carbon-border-adjustments-might-drive-global-climate-policy-momentum/

18. Retail Dive (2023). Sustainable products took more market share last year: Report. Retrieved from https://www.retaildive.com/news/sustainable-environmentally-friendly-retail-prodcuts-grow-market-share/646138/
19. Scientific Reports / Nature (2025). Willingness to pay a premium for eco-label products in China: A mediation model based on quality value. Scientific Reports. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-025-86202-9
20. Spence, M. (1973). Job market signaling. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 87(3), 355–374. https://doi.org/10.2307/1882010
21. Tang, J., Li, H., & Zhang, F. (2025). The impact of digital services trade in Belt and Road countries on China's construction green goods export efficiency. Architectural Engineering and Design Management. https://doi.org/10.1080/13467581.2025.2499726
22. UNCTAD (2024). Global trade update, March 2024. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. Retrieved from https://unctad.org/publication/global-trade-update-march-2024
23. UNEP (2011). Towards a green economy: Pathways to sustainable development and poverty eradication. United Nations Environment Programme. https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/126GER_synthesis_en.pdf
24. World Bank (2024). How developing countries can measure exposure to the EU's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism. Retrieved from https://blogs.worldbank.org/en/trade/how-developing-countries-can-measure-exposure-eus-carbon-border-adjustment-mechanism
25. WTO (2022). World Trade Report 2022: Climate change and international trade. World Trade Organization. https://www.wto.org/english/res_e/booksp_e/wtr22_e/wtr22_e.pdf
26. WTO (2023). World Trade Report 2023. World Trade Organization. https://www.wto.org/english/res_e/booksp_e/wtr23_e/wtr23_e.pdf
27. WTO (2024). World trade statistics 2024. World Trade Organization. https://www.wto.org/english/res_e/statis_e/world_trade_statistics_e.htm
28. Zou, S., & Cavusgil, S. T. (2002). The GMS: A broad conceptualization of global marketing strategy and its effect on firm performance. Journal of Marketing, 66(4), 40–56. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.66.4.40.18519