

This is a repository copy of *How legitimate are the environmental sustainability claims of luxury conglomerates?*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/170679/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Wells, Victoria orcid.org/0000-0003-1253-7297, Athwal, Navdeep, Nervino, Esterina et al. (1 more author) (2021) How legitimate are the environmental sustainability claims of luxury conglomerates? *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*. pp. 697-722. ISSN 1361-2026

<https://doi.org/10.1108/JFMM-09-2020-0214>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



How legitimate are the environmental sustainability claims of luxury conglomerates?

Journal:	<i>Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management</i>
Manuscript ID	JFMM-09-2020-0214
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Sustainability, Luxury, Reporting, Discourse Analysis, Legitimacy Theory

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

How legitimate are the environmental sustainability claims of luxury conglomerates?

Note: there is no conflict of interest

Highlights

- Legitimacy theory is used to ascertain the credibility of the conglomerates'; LVMH and Kering commitment to environmental sustainability.
- A corpus-assisted discourse analysis centred upon Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) guidelines to examine the environmental disclosures.
- Both conglomerates use reporting to communicate their core values.
- Inconsistencies exist due to the lack of brand-level environmental sustainability disclosures.

Abstract

Purpose: By responding to scholarly calls, this study examines the environmental reports of LVMH and Kering. The study extends legitimacy theory to ascertain the credibility of the aforementioned luxury conglomerates' commitment to environmental sustainability.

Approach: A corpus-assisted discourse analysis centred upon the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) guidelines is used to examine the environmental disclosures of LVMH and Kering.

Findings: The findings show inconsistencies due to the lack of brand level reporting and reporting quality falls short of comparable sustainability reporting within each conglomerate and with one another. Selective and unbalanced reporting along with symbolic management and undermine the legitimacy of sustainability efforts by LVMH and Kering.

Originality: Despite the increased attention paid to sustainable luxury, few studies critically analyse how luxury brands formally report on sustainability.

Keywords: sustainability, reporting, luxury, discourse analysis, legitimacy theory

Declarations of interest: none

How legitimate are the environmental sustainability claims of luxury conglomerates?

1. Introduction

The global luxury industry; valued over £700 billion worldwide (Kollewe 2015), markets products and services primarily valued for their indulgence, lavishness and symbolic meanings (Atwal and Williams 2009). The luxury sector has not prioritised issues of sustainability (Athwal et al. 2019) but now must do so as luxury organisations face growing tensions driven by consumer activists critiquing brands for their lack of supply-chain transparency, including accusations of animal and worker exploitation (Dekhili and Achabou 2016; Kapferer and Michaut-Denizeau 2014). Brands such as Hermès, Prada, Louis Vuitton and Gucci experience criticism for the unethical treatment of animals for exotic-skin handbags and shoes (PETA 2017), while Dior, Chanel and Dolce & Gabbana face censure regarding their supply chains and their unprincipled and ineffective processes (Torrance 2018). Data released after the Rana Plaza disaster further accuses luxury supply chains of being opaque (Kozlowski et al. 2015; Hall 2018). Growing stakeholder awareness of socially irresponsible and unethical organizational practices (Sharma et al. 2020), coupled with significant media and public attention means stakeholders are demanding organizations behave responsibly (Othman and Ameer, 2009; Winston 2016). Thus, sustainability is transforming from niche to necessity (Kozlowski et al. 2015). Additionally, publications such as the 'Deeper Luxury' report (Bendell and Kleanthous 2007) highlight the longstanding pressures on the luxury industry to acknowledge their responsibilities and opportunities for sustainable sourcing, manufacturing, and marketing of luxury goods. In response, alongside other luxury brands, both of the world's largest luxury conglomerates, LVMH and Kering, have developed sustainability initiatives.

1
2
3 Beyond the luxury sector, as attention towards sustainable behaviours has intensified, the
4
5 response has been an evolution in sustainability reporting (Isenmann et al. 2007), with
6
7 organisations increasingly publishing sustainability reports as formal tools for communicating
8
9 strategic corporate social responsibility (CSR) (Landrum and Ohsowski 2018). Used to
10
11 positively position a brand or organisation, curate an image and shape reputation, sustainability
12
13 reports provide a window for researchers to understand corporate policy and sustainability
14
15 priorities (Landrum and Ohsowski 2018). There are many reasons that organisations report on
16
17 their social, environmental and sustainability initiatives. These include compliance with legal
18
19 regulations, to meet community expectations, manage particular stakeholder groups and to
20
21 attract investment (Deegan 2002). Reporting may also be a response to negative media attention
22
23 and/or environmental or social incidents, which is often the case for luxury brands. When this
24
25 occurs, reporting may be used to legitimise the organisation by responding to events which may
26
27 be detrimental to the organisations' reputation and survival (Deegan 2002).
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 Despite increasing attention being paid to sustainable luxury (Athwal et al. 2019) few studies
36
37 critically analyse how luxury organisations report and formally communicate sustainability to
38
39 their stakeholders. Thus, this study examines the legitimacy of those sustainability
40
41 communications. More specifically, how much are they in accordance with established
42
43 sustainability principles or standards? Is the content valid, justifiable and reasonable? Here we
44
45 examine these reporting behaviours via the lens of legitimacy theory by analysing the
46
47 sustainability communicative style of the world's largest luxury conglomerates, LVMH and
48
49 Kering. Legitimacy theory states that organisations will seek to ensure they are acting in line
50
51 with the values and norms of society and their stakeholders (Suchman 1995). Where there are
52
53 threats to legitimacy, through for example negative reports in the media, organisations will
54
55 respond through information disclosure to protect their brand. One approach to manage this
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 information disclosure is through corporate reports. However, these reports may be little more
4
5 than impression management, rather than reporting on actual changes to behaviours, values and
6
7 norms at the organisation, and potentially exacerbate further damaging perceptions of the
8
9 organisation (Elsbach 2003). Increasingly, legitimacy theory has also been applied to
10
11 sustainability reporting but there are scholarly calls for it to be integrated and utilised further
12
13 (Ching and Gerab 2017).
14
15
16
17
18

19 This study makes the following contributions. First, it addresses the aforementioned research
20
21 gap by furthering our understanding of the environmental impact of the luxury industry in the
22
23 context of sustainability reporting. Second, the study extends legitimacy theory by applying it
24
25 in the context of luxury sustainability reporting to ascertain how legitimate the luxury industry's
26
27 commitment to sustainability is. This responds to calls for research on effective
28
29 communications and detailed descriptions regarding luxury (Athwal et al. 2019), and more
30
31 comprehensive reporting of environmental, monitoring and enforcement practices (Mann et al.
32
33 2013). In doing so, the study expands prior sustainability reporting research into the luxury
34
35 sector (Cormier and Magnan 1999; Cormier and Gordon 2001; Hedberg and von Malmborg
36
37 2003; Milne and Gray 2013). Finally, a novel methodological contribution is made by using a
38
39 corpus-assisted discourse analysis alongside a discourse analysis to examine the sustainability
40
41 reports (Bondi 2016; Malavasi 2017; Poppi 2018). Such methods are innovative and useful
42
43 approaches, which offer richer and deeper meanings to large text-based data sets (Humphreys
44
45 and Wang 2018). Additionally, as legitimacy is partly based on whether communications are
46
47 grounded in established rules, principles and standards we use the Global Reporting Initiative
48
49 (GRI) guidelines, the most utilised sustainability reporting principles to frame our discussion.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The study opens with an overview of the extant literature pertaining to luxury and sustainability.
4
5 Sustainability reporting is discussed, followed by an examination of legitimacy theory. Next,
6
7 the methodology is outlined, leading to an analysis and discussion. The study concludes with
8
9 limitations and recommendations for future research and sustainable luxury reporting.
10
11

12 **2. Literature Review**

13 ***2.1 Luxury and sustainability***

14 There is no widely accepted definition of luxury; but 'luxus' - originally derived from Latin –
15
16 means excess, extravagance, and vicious indulgence (Oxford English Dictionary 2016). It is
17
18 synonymous with exclusivity, often inessential and indulgent (Berry 1994), difficult to obtain
19
20 (Phau and Prendergast 2000), conspicuous (Wilcox et al. 2009), exhibits craftsmanship (Atwal
21
22 and Williams 2009), and perfection (Berthon et al. 2009). The longstanding associations of
23
24 luxury with ostentation and overconsumption (Veblen 1889), demonstrates a potential
25
26 incompatibility with sustainability (Dean 2018). Luxury values are coupled with personal
27
28 pleasure, while sustainable consumption is linked to moderation and ethics (Naderi and Strutton
29
30 2015).
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 However, there are some potential compatibilities between luxury and sustainability. Scarcity
38
39 of luxury brands is often reflected via selective retailing channels, and production of limited
40
41 editions (Han et al. 2016) and where luxury products are seen as both scarce and enduring.
42
43 Thus, they are considered more socially responsible by consumers (Janssen et al. 2014).
44
45 Additionally, Kapferer and Michaut-Denizeau (2014) contend luxury promotes the
46
47 conservation of natural resources with its close association with durability. Arguably, unlike
48
49 more mainstream products, this contributes to responsible consumption that would indirectly
50
51 protect natural resources and places less strain on supply chains, in turn, assisting with
52
53 sustainable consumption. Luxury brands also communicate their products as timeless (Kessous
54
55 et al. 2017). This also suggests synergies with sustainability as luxury is not dictated to by
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 trends, but rather is considered enduring. Debates around the perceptions of luxury as both
4
5 compatible and incompatible with sustainability highlight the complex nature of luxury
6
7 communications.
8
9

10 **2.2 Sustainability reporting**

11 CSR strategies can signal brand quality and value, performance and sustainability to
12
13 stakeholders, and reduce and mitigate business risk (Hoejmose et al. 2014). The competitive
14
15 and reputation advantages that can result from positive signals about an organisation's
16
17 sustainability are well rehearsed (Porter and Kramer 2002; Roberts and Dowling 2002).
18
19 However, as noted above, the luxury industry is grappling with the cynicism that emerges when
20
21 information about their sustainability is uncertain, unreliable or asymmetrically distributed,
22
23 either because of reports of unethical behaviour or a perceived incompatibility with
24
25 sustainability.
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Signalling an organisation's position, through numerous channels, such as branding, social
33
34 media marketing and CSR reports (Karasek and Bryant 2012) allows the organisation to
35
36 communicate their core values to stakeholders. One way to reduce the information asymmetry
37
38 is to make a clear signal to stakeholders regarding sustainability (Ching and Gerab 2017). In
39
40 situations where it is challenging for stakeholders to ascertain reliable, credible information
41
42 about an organisation's sustainability, signals must communicate legitimacy (Hahn and Kühnen
43
44 2013). Moreover, these signals will only be effective if they are perceived as plausible and
45
46 trustworthy (Scott-Philips 2008). Sustainability reporting has become a popular way to signal
47
48 sustainability, secure legitimacy and protect an organisation's brand (Pérez 2015).
49
50 Sustainability reports are expected to contain qualitative and quantitative information
51
52 concerning how the organisation has improved its environmental and social effectiveness in the
53
54 reporting period (Roca and Searcy 2012).
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Sustainability reports should provide a “complete and balanced picture of corporate
4 sustainability performance” (Hahn and Lülfs 2014, p. 401), yet seldom do. Due to the voluntary
5 nature of most reporting the information presented is inevitably selective, inevitably raising
6 questions about the completeness and accuracy of claims (Evangelinos and Skouloudis, 2014;
7 Michael and Dixon, 2019). Regarded as the “de facto global standard” (KPMG 2011, p. 20)
8 the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) is a multi-stakeholder forum that aims to overcome
9 information gaps in sustainability reporting by providing guidance for voluntary sustainability
10 disclosure, hence improving their legitimacy. Considered the most comprehensive reporting
11 framework (Yeop 2013), the GRI provides a common language for stakeholders and
12 organizations. The GRI objective is for organisations to report positive and negative
13 contributions to sustainability and ensure transparency and completeness (Hahn and Lülfs
14 2014). Within its categories the framework has two main principles – reporting content and
15 reporting quality. Reporting content is based on stakeholder inclusiveness, context, materiality
16 and completeness. Reporting quality is based on, for example, balance, comparability,
17 accuracy, timeliness, clarity and reliability (see Table One and www.globalreporting.org).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 [Insert Table One]
38

39
40 However, the GRI reporting framework is contested. In particular, the framework has been
41 criticized for not taking into account distinctive characteristics of different industries and
42 research is needed to deepen our assessment of sustainability reporting in diverse industries and
43 across time (Fernandez-Feijoo et al. 2014). A key challenge is that such documents often lack
44 specific and measurable evidence, and therefore legitimacy, regarding sustainable practice. Of
45 concern is that if detail and evidence is limited in sustainability reporting, this might lead to
46 greenwashing with the potential to inflate unsubstantiated ethical claims (Delmas and Burbano
47 2011), further compounded by consumer cynicism, scepticism and scrutiny (Jahdi and Acikdilli
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2009). This could be detrimental to corporate reputation and brand equity (Pérez 2015). Despite these shortcomings, the GRI remains a helpful tool in capturing aspects of sustainable activity.

2.3 Legitimacy theory

Legitimacy theory embraces the idea that corporate social and environmental disclosures are motivated by a desire to legitimise an organisation's operations and to influence external perceptions about their organisation (Deegan 2002). Monfardini et al. (2013) emphasise that this type of information disclosure can be a positive strategy for organisations. Through the use of legitimacy theory, Michelon (2011) highlights that organisations which are exposed to significant public pressure are more likely to use sustainability disclosures to communicate their legitimacy to stakeholders. Legitimacy theory is described as a systems-oriented theory which focuses on the role of communications and disclosures in the relationships between organisations, individuals and groups (Gray et al. 1996). These types of disclosures can construct, sustain and legitimise the activities of an organisation and can be directed at a range of stakeholders (Guthrie and Parker 1990). Moreover, legitimacy theory argues that legitimacy is something upon which the organisation is dependent for survival; if the values and norms of the organisation do not mirror those of stakeholders, it will result in threats to legitimacy (Suchman 1995), in other words, the organisation will not be seen as operating in a legitimate manner. In response to the perception that an organisation is not working legitimately, consumers may reduce or eliminate demand for the products of the business (Lindblom 1994) and the organisation's brand can suffer damage through breaking a social contract (Shocker and Sethi 1973).

Thus, within the context of sustainability reporting, it can be viewed as part of a corporation's overall strategy to build and maintain its legitimacy (Roca and Searcy 2012) providing information to counter or offset negative news that may be publicly available (Deegan and Rankin 1997). Organisations may not be perceived as legitimate if major adverse events have

1
2
3 occurred linked to supply chains such as the poor treatment of animals or unethical working
4
5 conditions. Unscrupulous practices possibly deemed acceptable or ignored in the past, are now
6
7 more widely considered as intolerable. Stakeholder expectations are increasingly that
8
9 organisations are sustainable, with increased environmental concern emanating from
10
11 stakeholders. Indeed, values and norms are dynamic and organisations must be flexible and
12
13 responsive themselves (Perks et al. 2013). Where the norms and values of the organisation do
14
15 not meet society's expectations this may lead stakeholders to perceive a legitimacy gap (Deegan
16
17 2002). In response to legitimacy gap organisations will take remedial action, through selected
18
19 disclosure of information. The organisation may change its operations to conform to perceived
20
21 legitimacy and educate relevant stakeholders about these changes, building brand perception of
22
23 the organisation – an act of substantive management (Ashforth and Gibbs 1990). Alternatively,
24
25 Lindblom (1994) notes that organisations may seek to change the perceptions of stakeholders,
26
27 without actually changing behaviour, or manipulate perceptions by deflecting attention from
28
29 the issue – an act of symbolic management (Ashforth and Gibbs 1990). This raises questions
30
31 regarding whether organisations have genuinely implemented the initiatives that they have
32
33 reported and whether their words reflect their deeds (Kolk 2004). In these selective disclosures,
34
35 reporting relatively benign impact under the impression of transparency, could be perceived as
36
37 greenwashing (Marquis et al. 2016) and may damage the brand, or if uncovered may not fill the
38
39 legitimacy gap. As Deegan (2002) notes, disclosure may not lead to the provision of unbiased
40
41 information, rather it may be self-laudatory. Further an organisation may opt to disclose
42
43 minimal negative environmental information (Deegan and Rankin 1997).
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Overall, this study argues that in order for the discourses within sustainability reports to be seen
55
56 as legitimate by stakeholders they must comply with guidelines of good practice in
57
58 sustainability reporting and be open, transparent and valid. The study examines whether luxury
59
60

1
2
3 organisations follow key tenets of sustainability reporting from the GRI framework, whether
4 they provide sufficient detail, specifics, clarity and evidence to support sustainability claims
5 and what (if any) potential greenwashing or over-attribution occurs.
6
7
8
9

10 **3. Methodology**

11 By drawing upon the GRI sustainability guidelines, this study conducts a corpus-assisted
12 discourse analysis of the sustainability reports produced by LVMH and Kering, to understand
13 their sustainability claims and legitimacy. The corpus-assisted discourse analysis technique has
14 previously been used to analyse oil and gas companies (Yeop 2013). Further, as noted above,
15 the GRI guidelines are the most recognised sustainability principles (GRI 2018) and will
16 support our understanding of how these two luxury organisations enact environmental
17 sustainability reporting. LVMH, for some of its reporting does state alignment to the GRI
18 principles, while Kering does not.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Collectively LVMH and Kering control a significant share of luxury brands across sectors.
33 LVMH owns approximately 70 brands across a range of sectors and is considered as the world's
34 leading luxury conglomerate, generating approximately 46.8 billion euros in 2018 (O'Connell
35 2019). Kering; a key competitor of LVMH, owns approximately 18 brands, mainly operating
36 in the fashion industry and reported approximately 15.9 billion euros in 2019 (O'Connell 2020).
37 These two conglomerates were also chosen as they have been negatively portrayed in the media,
38 due to specific events or ongoing criticism; this study will allow for an assessment of whether
39 these negatives were disclosed. Evidenced in Table Two, LVMH sustainability reporting
40 practice began in 2000 and has since been conducted annually. The latest sustainability report
41 available on the official website is dated 2018 (released in 2019).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 For Kering, sustainability reporting is available on the official website from 2012, the year in
58 which the group underwent a process of rebranding, changing its brand name from Pinault-
59
60

1
2
3 Printemps-Redoute (PPR) to Kering. The documentation available on the official website is
4
5 wide ranging, consisting of sustainability reports, environmental indicators, statements relating
6
7 to various acts, and environmental profit and loss methodology and group results. Desk research
8
9 suggests that the motivation for the rebranding was related to the subtle wordplay defining its
10
11 own luxury concept as sustainable and *caring for the world* (Kansara 2013; Passariello 2013).
12
13

14
15
16 Drawing upon the GRI principle of timeliness, both conglomerates show a degree of
17
18 commitment to regular reporting. For LVMH this regularity has been with the same annual
19
20 report and fulfils this criterion, while Kering partially fulfills this criterion as while reporting
21
22 began in 2012 there have been different styles of reports since. The researchers sought to find
23
24 Kering's sustainability documentation prior to the rebranding in 2012; no such reports were
25
26 publicly available.
27
28
29

30 [Insert Table Two]

31 This study contributes to a growing body of environmental and sustainability work that employs
32
33 various forms of discourse analysis (Buhr and Reiter 2006; Tregidga and Milne 2006; Onn and
34
35 Woodley 2014). de Graaf (2006) has employed both discourse and descriptive techniques and
36
37 states that *'the analysis focuses on the effects of the texts on other texts'* (p 251). For
38
39 completeness of information, the researchers further enrich the linguistic analysis with a genre
40
41 and visual analysis and well as a discourse analysis (Krippendorff 2019).
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **3.1 Data Analysis Strategy**

49 Corpus-assisted discourse is the *'form and/or function of language as communicative discourse*
50
51 *which incorporates the use of computerized corpora in their analyses'* (Partington et al. 2013,
52
53 p 10). It seeks to analyze language in its context, thus it does not treat the corpus in isolation.
54
55 Further, it is designed to uncover the meaning in texts and adopts a quantitative (statistical
56
57 corpus analysis) and qualitative (discourse analysis) approach (Partington et al. 2013). Corpus
58
59
60

1
2
3 linguistic analysis has been previously applied to CSR reports (Bondi 2016; Malavasi 2017;
4 Poppi 2018), by drawing on this analytical approach to understand sustainability reports, this
5 study also makes a novel methodological contribution.
6
7
8

9
10 A three-stage discourse data analysis strategy was employed for the corpus-assisted discourse
11 analysis with each stage building upon the previous step (see Table Three). The first stage
12 involved a genre analysis to understand the organizational structure of the information
13 (Malavasi 2011). The second stage involved the generation of semantic and word clouds to
14 unpack language style and the intention of the text (Bondi 2016; Poppi 2018). The third stage
15 examined word frequencies and concordances. An analysis of the text through linguistic
16 software provides a systematic detection of patterns in language that researchers might
17 otherwise not notice (Humphreys and Wang 2018). The discourse analysis examined the
18 content in line with the various GRI principles.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 [Insert Table Three]

33 The corpus-assisted discourse data analysis was completed using Wmatrix 3.0, a linguistic
34 software that produces statistical data regarding key semantic domains and main discourse
35 themes in data (Rayson 2003). This analysis involved identifying major semantic themes, which
36 allowed the researchers to study communication style and linguistic features related to
37 sustainability in the data. This form of computer-assisted discourse analysis provided a
38 systematic identification of the *'finer shades of meaning'* (Humphreys and Wang 2018, p. 1277)
39 within texts. Using Wmatrix 3.0 software, the two sets of reports were compared with the sub-
40 corpus British National Corpus (BNC) Sampler CG (Spoken) Business¹. This chosen reference
41 corpus includes instances of specialized business discourse appropriate for this study on
42 sustainability as it includes 141,143 words collected from the BNC Sampler Context Governed
43 Business. The analysis of the semantic fields generated by Wmatrix follows the USAS (UCREL
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58
59
60 ¹ A 100 million-word collection of written and spoken British English language designed to represent a wide cross-
section from the later part of the 20th century.

Semantic Analysis System) based on a semantic classification developed in 1981 by Tom McArthur for the Longman Lexicon of Contemporary English. This semantic classification includes 21 categories; these categories are further divided into a number of sub-categories. This accurate process of identification of the semantic domains allowed the researchers to investigate sustainability discourse and its different linguistic features based on the co-text and context of specific words (POS: Part-Of-Speech tagging) (Rayson 2003). It is noteworthy that although the analysis for each conglomerate was conducted individually, the interpretation involved comparisons.

In sum, this study employs a detailed discourse approach to examine the use of language in a micro context. This analytical strategy allowed for an in-depth understanding of sustainability disclosures, thus addressing calls for research that offers specific and detailed insights into environmental practices (Mann et al. 2013). Further, it responds to calls for research on effective communications and detailed descriptions regarding luxury (Athwal et al. 2019).

4. Analysis

The GRI has 2 universal standards which are applicable to all organisations (Foundation, General Disclosures) and 33 topic-specific standards which come under Management Approach (Economic, Environmental and Social) of which 8 are environmental and will be the focus of analysis here (See Figure 1). The analysis will be structured around this section with each section drawing on the discourse and three-stage corpus-assisted discourse analysis. During each section reporting content and reporting quality will also be noted and discussed. It is worth remarking that many of the environmental aspects are interrelated and crossovers will be noted where appropriate.

4.1 Universal Standards: Foundation, General Disclosures, Management Approach and Reporting Approach

For both LVMH and Kering, general standard disclosures are reflected when outlining their overall vision for sustainability and are updated for each report, suggesting a level of timeliness.

Both LVMH and Kering report at the group level, but also discuss, and sometimes report at the brand level (also referred to as houses or “maisons”).

The LVMH reports have evolved significantly since their first 2000-01 report becoming more detailed and sophisticated, covering a wider range of subjects. From 2003 to 2016 the reports state that they were prepared by incorporating GRI guidelines, and this will be discussed further below. From 2010 the LVMH reports also include a statement relating to the French New Economic Regulations (NRE) on extra-financial reporting. Up to 2012 each report stated short-term objectives for the next year based on achievements in that year. From 2012 The LIFE programme, with 9 strategic environmental challenges, was introduced, and in 2016 LIFE 2020 was launched noting objectives for 2020 (but using 2013 as a baseline) presenting a longer-term perspective. Although not in earlier reports, later reports note a number of stakeholders with increasing clarity. In 2011 lists of stakeholders begin to appear (for example: planet, employees, partners and suppliers, society, customers, consumer associations, NGOs, Trade Unions, Press, Governments, Professional federations, multinational organisations) and later reports include communication strategies with stakeholders based on comprehensiveness of information and transparency. The sustainability context is outlined in all LVMH reports, noting their environmental charter and management of initiatives through their environmental department. The GRI guideline (materiality) notes that the report should cover topics that reflect the reporting organisations’ significant impacts and LVMH claims to fulfil this by including details on its primary environmental challenges. Each year LVMH includes details on the scope of its reporting and from 2008 this was included in a separate methodology section.

1
2
3 The scope changes regularly across the reporting periods due to acquisitions and sales of brands
4 and improvements in and availability of measurements. However, even in latest report, the
5 reporting scope only covers 58% of production, warehouse and administrative sites and 70% of
6 sales floor areas for energy consumption and greenhouse gases and 19% of sales floor areas for
7 water consumption suggesting that the reports are not complete in their reporting. Year 2008
8 sees an introduction of a separate methodology section, which has improved accuracy and
9 reliability. However, a number of the reports state estimated figures, making it difficult to see
10 the general trend of improvements. GRI principles note the importance of including positive
11 and negative aspects but the LVMH reports contain predominantly positive aspects suggesting
12 a lack of balance. Where negative aspects (such as an increase in water consumption) are
13 reported this is often attributed to changes in scope. While the reports are well written and
14 presented, there are issues with clarity of reporting. The overall structure of initiatives are often
15 overlapping and difficult to follow. For example, in the 2015 report there is one charter, 5
16 goals, LIFE issues and group wide objectives some of which are at group level, some at brand
17 level. Additional objectives and performance are often buried in text making them difficult to
18 extract and measurements are sometimes different within and across reporting periods (for
19 example for the LED lights target store numbers and square metres of stores are both used).
20 Due to changing objectives it is quite difficult to compare across years and where the same
21 graphs/charts are used across years these subtly change. For example, a graph related to waste
22 is included as Percentage of Waste recovered (2007), Change in percentage of waste recovery
23 (2008), Percentage of waste recycled (2009), Percentage of waste recovery (2010), Percentage
24 of waste value (2016) and Percentage of waste converted (2018) making longitudinal
25 comparison problematic.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Overall the LVMH reports have a promotional tone, highlight work by individual brands as
4 snap shots, rather than reporting fully on the group as a whole. Early pages in the reports are
5 dominated by statements from various senior figures, while analysis and reporting comes later.
6
7
8
9
10 The reports exhibit a magazine feel and tone, containing multiple photographs of products and
11 employees, interviews with and profiles of managers, which do not add value or substance to
12 the purpose of a sustainability report. This could signal window-dressing of sustainability
13 disclosures and inevitably creates a negative perception regarding legitimacy (Hrasky 2012)
14 and asymmetry between messages.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 In contrast, Kering reporting is much more fragmented using a range of different documentation
25 from 2012, rather than one consistent annual report. The main reporting mechanism is the
26 Environmental Profit and Loss (EP&L) methodology which is used in a number of reports, but
27 particularly in their group results, a document released from 2013-2017. This methodology is
28 open and transparent, has been assessed by external stakeholders, is available for use by any
29 organisation and represents a relatively novel concept in the luxury sector, predominately
30 characterized by its secrecy (Carrigan et al. 2015). This transparency is extremely useful but
31 does not align with the GRI principles which makes comparing between Kering and any other
32 organisation problematic, resulting in a lack of external comparability. Additionally, all
33 environmental impacts are reported in euros rather than amounts of waste, energy etc again
34 causing issues for external comparability. Kering admits this comparability problem stating
35 that “There are no other published analysis by organisations that can be used for can be used as
36 a comparator for our results which can make it difficult to put them into context.” As well as
37 their EP&L methodology Kering also works to a three-pillar roadmap for 2025 – Care,
38 Collaborate, Create – with all objectives working towards this goal. The Kering reports are
39 much shorter than LVMH and are focused heavily on reporting at the overall group level rather
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 than individual brands. The GRI guideline (materiality) notes that the report should cover topics
4 that reflect the reporting organisations significant impacts. Kering fulfils this by its focus on
5 raw materials and they state that “much of our sustainability efforts focus on reducing the
6 impacts of the raw materials we use in our products..... our most significant impacts are
7 generated in the supply chain (93%) and in particular by the production and processing of raw
8 materials (49% and 25% respectively)”. As well as the EP&L reporting Kering has released a
9 range of other reports including a Sustainability report, Environmental indicators, Python
10 Conservation Partnership Report, a Code of Ethics etc although these are sometimes one-off
11 documents or are available for only a few years. In their methodology memos, Kering also
12 reports the scope of it’s reporting with the last memo in 2015 noting that 88% of the 1673 sites
13 open in 2015 were included in the reporting.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 GRI principles note the importance of including positive and negative aspects and while, like
32 LVMH, Kering reports contain largely positive reports Kering retrospectively corrects earlier
33 reports (often due to improvements in methodology) and highlights issues suggesting a more
34 balanced reporting strategy. Additionally, an expert review of the EP&L methodology is
35 available.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Comparatively, the genre analysis of the whole data set is smaller for Kering, in comparison to
46 LVMH as the reporting period is much shorter. The genre analysis reveals that Kering utilises
47 a consistent layout with the same set of performance indicators, which allows some longitudinal
48 assessment and comparability, a key GRI expectation. Kerings’ performance indicators are split
49 into 10 themes such as energy, water, waste production and packaging consumption. There is a
50 clear crossover between these performance indicators presented in the Kering reports and the
51 GRI environmental categories even if Kering does not state alignment with the principles.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

4.2 *Specific disclosures within the environmental category*

The aspects found within the environmental category in the reports are discussed through a series of semantic fields identified by Wmatrix and mapped into key domain clouds for LVMH and Kering (see Figure Two and Three respectively).

[Insert Figures Two & Three]

Broadly, the key domain clouds for both LVMH and Kering report on their sustainable practices by explaining in which areas of the business they are working to reduce their impact on the environment. As shown in the figures the main categories of discourse evidenced relate to materials, energy consumption, other green issues, logistics, and cause and effect sentence constructions. Interestingly, when compared to LVMH, the Kering cloud presents semantic categories that reflect a more scientific, numeric discourse, evidenced by the emergence of categories such as ‘mathematics and numbers’.

When analysing the key words emerging from the linguistic analysis, the analysis frames how both conglomerates signal the environmental dimension of sustainability, relating it to inputs such as energy and water, outputs such as emissions, effluents and waste, and covers biodiversity, transport and product and service-related impacts. The key word cloud (see Figure Four) shows the most frequent key words occurring in the LVMH corpus.

[Insert Figures Four & Five]

The largest words appearing in the word cloud reflect the foreground elements of the discourse, signposting words that are key in the sustainability discourse. Although the size of the data corpus is much smaller for Kering, the analysis shows that Kering frequently uses a wider variety of terms in their sustainability reports as reflected in the word cloud (see Figure Five). In each case, terms linked to waste and energy/carbon emissions are predominant. These relate to performance indicators within the sustainability debate and GRI criteria that signal measurement and comparison for longitudinal improvement, which may explain their narrative prevalence.

1
2
3
4
5 The proceeding analysis focuses on discourse and linguistic features from the reporting
6 discourses by drawing upon examples of environmental sustainability in each of the GRI
7 categories.
8
9

10 11 12 4.2.1 Materials

13 The GRI principles for materials state that the total weight/volume of materials used to produce
14 and package the organisation's primary products and services should be reported and broken
15 down into non-renewable and renewable materials, the percentage of recycled input should be
16 reported along with the percentage of reclaimed products.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 For LVMH the first thing to note is that packaging is treated separately in their reporting and
26 hence overall materials figures are difficult to pin down. Packaging receives a lot of attention
27 in LVMH reports overall and there is more frequent reference to packaging than there is to
28 materials generally. LVMH reports on packaging activities from specific brands as evidenced
29 in the two semantic category examples relating to packaging:
30
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 *For Parfums Givenchy, 2005 was the year to reduce packaging.....The plastic*
38 *"shrink wrap" film was reduced, even eliminated, along with the polystyrene*
39 *blocks.*
40

41
42 *This year, Louis Vuitton plans to save another 100 tons of paper and*
43 *cardboard by eliminating double packaging.... Until now, the leather goods*
44 *were shipped to the stores in rough "packaging" to protect them, which was*
45 *then thrown out.*
46

47 Both examples reflect a reasonable, albeit relatively superficial representation of overall
48 performance by acknowledging unsustainable behaviours (negatives), and reporting on
49 improvements (positives), in line with the GRI principle of balance. However, because these
50 examples are brand, not group level it is clear that there is no overall group strategy and it is
51 not certain how widespread these examples are.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 With regards to other materials LVMH reports a range of rare or natural raw materials it uses
4 such as flowers, precious stones etc. LVMH has been subject to significant attention for its use
5 of exotic leathers, poor animal welfare and conditions in their crocodile farms so this reporting
6 may be a reaction to this. From 2011 LVMH starts reporting their strategies for sourcing these
7 types of products noting, for example, it's links to Convention on International Trade in
8 Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) suggesting that this reports in
9 substantive rather than symbolic management. Traceability of these types of materials is then
10 included in the LIFE initiatives with stricter monitoring of suppliers (for example tanneries) by
11 2020. However, the majority of the reporting of materials, is done at brand level with specific
12 case studies of initiatives included. For packing there is reporting at group level but the majority
13 of example cases are included at brand level.

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30 Kering, unlike LVMH, includes the whole supply chain in it's reporting and in it's EP&L
31 methodology. As it does this there is a significant focus on raw materials (including processing
32 and production) in all of their reports and these are a central focus of many of their initiatives.
33 The evolution of the reports shows a move from understanding supply chains and measuring
34 their impact and EP&L and then using this information to develop strategies to minimise their
35 impact. This is a process that is mirrored in many areas of the reports. Initiatives in the areas
36 of materials include their Materials Innovation Lab (est. 2013), smart sourcing strategies,
37 replacing materials with recycled alternatives, examining and comparing the location of
38 production (esp. for leather and cotton). However, while Kering shows in detail it's analysis of
39 supply chains and the improvements it has made in sourcing and processing raw materials (esp.
40 leather) it does not meet the GRI guidelines fully. In a number of reports the amount (in tonnes)
41 of packaging and raw materials is reported but this is secondary to their communication as euros
42 as part of the EP&L. Additionally, the amount of recycled and reclaimed materials is not
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 detailed in quantity (although this process is reported as taking place). Comparing with LVMH,
4
5 packaging is less of a central concern for Kering. This however is because they focus on and
6
7 include their supply chain, which as they detail has greater environmental impact. For LVMH
8
9 which does not include this element, packaging is a much more significant part of their impact.

12 4.2.2 Energy

14 The GRI principles for energy state that energy consumption reporting should be of inside and
15
16 outside the organisation, energy intensity, reduction of energy consumption and reduction in
17
18 energy requirements of products and services.
19

21
22
23 LVMH acknowledges the global energy challenges and states that it is taking significant steps
24
25 to reduce fossil fuel consumption and increase the consumption of renewable energies, reflected
26
27 in a semantic category relating to energy:
28
29

31 *Burning fossil fuels in boilers, engines, for heating, light or transport entails*
32 *extracting resources that are becoming rarer, causes local pollution, and*
33 *emits greenhouse gases that threaten the climate balance of the planet.*
34 *LVMH group has integrated these challenges into a total program to*
35 *streamline energy use on its production sites.*
36
37

38 LVMH actively reports energy consumption and reduction but does not report on energy
39
40 intensity and the energy requirements of its products and services. Energy consumption is
41
42 reported by group, by business group and by source in most of the reports. Although as the
43
44 scope of reporting changes year by year it is not straightforward to compare these, falling short
45
46 of the principle of comparability.
47
48
49
50

51 The reduction of energy consumption is detailed for specific initiatives, rather than at group
52
53 level making it difficult to compare year to year and between parts of the conglomerate. For
54
55 example, initiatives about LED lighting and solar panels differ by business group and by
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 individual brand, as do increases in the use of renewable energy broadly. Renewable energy is
4
5 regularly reported increasing from 1% in 2000 to 27% in 2018 with an aim of 30% by 2020.
6
7
8
9

10 Energy is included in the Kering EP&L Methodology but again, not meeting the GRI principles
11
12 is reported in euros rather than in MWh, although this is reported in one environmental indicator
13
14 report. As with materials one of the main foci for Kering is raw materials and it states, quite
15
16 vaguely how it aims to improve water and energy efficiency in the processing of these. In stores
17
18 there is an introduction of smart metering technology, LED lighting and a sustainable store
19
20 guide. Electricity from renewable sources is also discussed in a 2014 report but overall there
21
22 is very little focus or specifics (except inclusion in EP&L calculations) in reporting. This does
23
24 not there meet the GRI principles for energy or more broadly in terms of completeness.
25
26
27

28 4.2.3 Water and effluents

29
30 The GRI principles for water and effluents state that organisations should report on interactions
31
32 with water as a shared resource, management of water related discharge impact, water
33
34 withdrawal, water discharge and water consumption.
35
36
37

38
39 LVMH acknowledges that it faces a water conservation challenge given how fundamental it is
40
41 to the wine and spirits production process, which are additionally often situated in areas of high
42
43 water stress. The report acknowledges the need for safeguarding but cite the ‘purity’ and
44
45 ‘quality’ demanded in producing ‘perfection’ to mitigate their weaker sustainability actions:
46
47
48

49
50 *Indeed, to obtain optimum quality for champagne or cognac, the presses and*
51 *vats must be regularly cleaned thoroughly. A perfect product must be pure.*
52
53
54

55 Additionally, they discuss this in very strong terms such conflict, survival and solidarity
56
57 signalling the challenge aspects of this process and suggesting they are ‘fighting hard’, but
58
59 offering scant progress.
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 The majority of reporting in this area relates to water consumption and figures are given in most
7 reports of amount of water used for agricultural purposes (e.g. vineyard irrigation) and process
8 needs (as with other aspects this is difficult to compare year on year due to the changing scope
9 of reporting and the use of estimates in figures – meaning that the principles of comparability
10 and accuracy are not met). In 2014 protecting water resources was included as one of the LIFE
11 objectives. LVMH does acknowledge that discharges of water may promote eutrophication,
12 and it measures these substances by Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) a measurement that is
13 included regularly in reporting. LVMH focuses their attention on a few of its brands for water
14 conservation examples and while it provides overall figures for the conglomerate it is not clear
15 if these practices are widespread.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 As with all other aspects Kering include water in its EP&L methodology and includes its supply
32 chain within this. In the example below of a semantic category on suppliers, Kering briefly sets
33 out recommendations for suppliers and their environmental impact with regards water:
34
35
36

37
38
39 *As the first step to reducing environmental impacts is identifying and*
40 *understanding them, suppliers and sub-suppliers should measure their*
41 *environmental impactsenergy use, water use and water discharge.*
42

43 Throughout Kering's reporting they provide example supply chains for a range of products, for
44 instance a leather handbag, gold watch etc, and through this examine the water impact during
45 processing. In some environmental indicator reports, Kering communicates water consumption
46 as m³ but largely, as with other aspects it is given a financial value as part of the EP&L.
47 Objectives for reducing water consumption (and also for energy and materials) are often given
48 as percentages. Like materials and energy, water does not meet the GRI principles for
49 completeness or clarity.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 4.2.4 Biodiversity

59
60

1
2
3 The GRI principles for biodiversity state that organisations should report operational sites
4 which are protected or of high biodiversity, significant impacts on biodiversity, habitats
5 protected or restored and any conservation list species which are affected.
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 LVMH's reporting concentrates on the Perfumes & Cosmetics and Wines & Spirits business
13 groups. In Perfumes it highlights that protected, rare and threatened plants are not harvested
14 and notes that it has set up ethnobotanical networks in different countries for protection and
15 research. In Wines, viticulture is the focus, highlighting integrated grape growing practices and
16 a reduction in pesticides. Biodiversity is included as one of the LIFE principles and from here
17 bees, python skins and animal welfare are more central in reporting (perhaps due to media
18 attention in this area). In earlier reports LVMH also note the restoration of biodiversity. For
19 example, they note the work of Domaine Chandon Australia and their restoration of flora in the
20 marshy zone of the Yarra River.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Using an example from the semantic category of biodiversity, LVMH outlines the external
36 organisations it is working with to ensure that it is sustainable across the supply chain with
37 regards biodiversity:
38
39
40
41
42

43 *LVMH adheres to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered*
44 *Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) and the EU Timber Regulation*
45 *(EUTR). Under the international regulations stemming from the 1992*
46 *Convention on Biological Diversity, a number of projects are being discussed*
47 *or examined in further depth for the Perfumes & Cosmetics, Fashion &*
48 *Leather Goods, and Watches & Jewelry business groups. These include*
49 *conducting audits of supply chains aimed at assessing compliance of our*
50 *practices with the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the*
51 *Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization (ABS),*
52 *and developing new fair and responsible supply chains in categories such as*
53 *gold and cashmere.*
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 This signals a certain level of credibility as LVMH is working with accreditation organisations
4 and experts on specific aspects of sustainability. Further, this contributes to the transparency of
5 LVMH and it signals that substantive management is being adopted across the business.
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 Kering acknowledges the impact of its operations on biodiversity, with land use representing
13 almost a quarter of the groups total environmental impacts, and as for other elements includes
14 this within it's EP&L methodology. A number of reports highlight the use of global experts to
15 better track and understand impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems. This fulfils the criteria of
16 balance as Kering highlights the negative impacts it is having alongside initiatives to be more
17 environmentally positive. Specifically, when analysing the semantic category of farming and
18 horticulture, Kering refers to overall initiatives that concern biodiversity risks such as the use
19 of exotic leathers:
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31
32 *The "Assessment of Python Breeding Farms Supplying the International*
33 *High-end Leather" is a study evaluating the economic feasibility and*
34 *viability of captive breeding of pythons as a part of an approach to*
35 *sustainable use and conservation of the species.*
36

37 Kering's strategy is also highlighted within the semantic category of "living creatures; animals,
38 birds" with links to, for example the Madagascar Crocodile Conservation & Sustainable Use
39 Programme (MCCSUP). Kering also forbids the use of leather from farms involved in any
40 form of deforestation in the Amazon biome since July 2006, or farms included in IBAMAs
41 embargo list. This example shows how Kering uses a natural, rare and (sometimes) endangered
42 resource, while attempting to present a sustainable strategy. In doing so Kering reports on both
43 positive and negative sustainability practices again complying with GRI principles of balance,
44 and showing substantive management.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55
56
57 Kering's focus on the supply chain is again evident with suppliers being required to provide
58 documentation of traceability including stakeholders in this journey and meeting the GRI
59
60

1
2
3 criteria of stakeholder inclusiveness. As with other categories Kering does not report actual
4
5 amounts but reports in financial value.
6

7 8 *4.2.5 Emissions*

9 The GRI principles state that direct and indirect emissions (Scopes 1-3), GHG (greenhouse gas)
10
11 emissions intensity, reduction of GHG emissions and other significant emissions should be
12
13 reported.
14

15
16
17
18 Direct and indirect emissions are reported in the majority of LVMH reports. While overall
19
20 figures are given the level of detail required to fully meet GRI guidelines, it is not always
21
22 available. In earlier reports the focus is often on transport of goods which a shift to shipping
23
24 rather than air a key principle. Carbon footprints of stores, and initiatives to reduce local
25
26 transport impacts etc are included in later reports but the scope of reporting constantly changes
27
28 between reports and estimates are again used. Reducing CO₂ emission is also included as one
29
30 of the LIFE principles. GHG intensity is not reported and reduction of GHG was internally
31
32 motivated by introducing an internal carbon price in 2015.
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 The LVMH reports provide good examples of the 'cause and effect' semantic category,
40
41 especially in the area of emissions. LVMH signal sustainable practices by starting from a
42
43 particular business activity, and then show the problem and its impact. This example shows
44
45 how LVMH are working to solve or reduce environmental impact.
46
47

48
49 *Problem/impact – 'Only with this type of proactive attitude will businesses*
50 *be able to reduce environmental impacts, anticipate changes, and solve*
51 *any ecological problems.'*
52

53
54
55 *LVMH solution – 'In addition to CO₂ emissions, LVMH actively monitors*
56 *and seeks to reduce another kind of emission relating to its business activities*
57 *that has an impact on air quality, namely volatile organic compounds*
58 *(VOCs).'*
59
60

1
2
3 By studying the co-text and contextualized instances where cause and effect appeared in the
4 reports, the GRI category of stakeholder inclusiveness is signalled since it would be an
5 expectation of stakeholders such as governmental organizations that organizations to monitor
6 and reduce CO2 emissions. The contextualization of 'cause and effect' uncovered a broader
7 picture of LVMH sustainability reporting, contributing to the principle of sustainability context.
8 However, as above the problem /impact is often only described in vague turns ("solve any
9 ecological problems") it fails to live up to GRI completeness expectations.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 Kering, as with other elements, reports emissions as part of it's EP&L methodology. However,
22 exact amounts are rarely discussed, with financial values given most of the time. Exceptions
23 are in the Environmental Indicators reports, the 2014 EP&L group results and Clean by Design
24 report where GHG emissions are reported in tonnes. For example, GHG from mills are
25 discussed alongside reductions achieved by percentage. As in other areas, Kering's focus in on
26 the supply chain noting the heavy impact of materials, in particular leather, on it's GHG
27 emissions. As with LVMH, transport is also discussed, especially relating to optimisation of
28 deliveries to stores. Although Kering does note that although it reports transport it does not
29 always have control over these emissions:

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43 '...include CO2 emissions originating from the upstream fuel phase (i.e.
44 during production and transport of fuels), even if the Group doesn't have
45 direct control over such emissions...'

46
47 Overall for Kering it is clear that they measure and seek reductions in emissions. However,
48 they do not fulfil GRI requirements as they do not regularly report detailed amounts or intensity.

4.2.6 *Effluents and waste*

49
50
51
52
53 The GRI principles note that water discharge (and water bodies affected by these), waste,
54 significant spills and hazardous waste should be reported. Overall LVMH shows that it
55 recognises the importance of waste management:
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The principle of reducing waste at the source has since been extended to
4 many other products, with priority given to three elements: making lighter
5 packages, using recycled materials, and designing refillable bottles.
6

7 In every report LVMH reports waste by type and disposal method. These figures are given
8 across the group with examples from its brands. LVMH does not report significant spills, but
9 from 2008 amounts of hazardous waste are included. LVMH does acknowledge that certain
10 business practices in their sector continue to produce high levels of waste. For example:
11
12
13
14

15
16
17 In cognac distillation, the equivalent of 90% of the volume of the distilled
18 wine is thrown out in the form of vinasses, an organically rich substance that
19 represents a significant pollution risk.
20

21 Reporting this complies with the balance principle, as the report reflects positive and negative
22 aspects of sustainability performance. LVMH carefully applies this principle and highlights
23 how its specific products are the results of this inevitable waste, but as yet there is little
24 signalling of how they tackle the challenges, nor measurement of success, improvement or
25 failure.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33
34
35 As with other elements of Kering's reporting exact amounts for each of these elements are often
36 lacking as they report using financial value through the EP&L methodology. Waste amounts
37 are reported in the Environmental Indicators reports, but these are separated only into hazardous
38 and non-hazardous waste and not categorized by type. However, Kering does acknowledge the
39 importance of waste reduction:
40
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 Actions including material efficiency, recycling and waste minimisation are
48 just some examples that will reduce negative impacts throughout the supply
49 chain.
50

51 In their earliest Sustainability report Kering also highlights the importance of chemical
52 management and are:
53
54
55

56
57taking proactive action to meet our 2020 Target with the Kering Group
58 recently joining the Zero Discharge of Hazardous Chemicals Group
59 (ZDHC)....
60

1
2
3 As with other categories, it is clear that Kering is doing work in the area of waste but it is hard
4
5 to extract detailed amounts and targets from their reporting suggesting that they do not meet the
6
7 GRI principles.
8
9

10 *4.2.7 Environmental compliance*

11 The GRI guidelines note that the reporting organisation should show how they are
12
13 environmentally compliant and disclose significant fines and sanctions for non-compliance
14
15 with environmental laws or regulations.
16
17

18 The LVMH reports increasingly include details of environmental compliance. Key
19
20 certifications success such as ISO14001 (Effective environmental management system), ISO
21
22 22000 (food safety management), the HEQ initiative in France, LEED in the United States,
23
24 Bream in the United Kingdom, France's National Strategy for Biodiversity amongst many
25
26 others are reported. In some cases, they state that they are making progress towards these
27
28 accreditations but fines and sanctions are not included. This may be because LVMH has not
29
30 been sanctioned or because many of these accreditations are optional.
31
32
33
34
35

36 Kering's reports do not consistently report environmental compliance but in their first
37
38 sustainability report they do note compliance with a range of initiatives including the
39
40 Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)
41
42 diamond sourcing and certification by the Kimberley Process (KPCS) and it appears that these
43
44 are included within their EP&L methodology and in their supplier expectations. Details of fines
45
46 or sanctions are not included but, as with LVMH these may be because they have not been
47
48 sanctioned or because many of these accreditations are optional.
49
50
51

52 *4.2.8 Supplier environmental assessment*

53 The GRI guidelines state that details of supplier screening and negative environmental impacts
54
55 in the supply chain and actions taken should be reported.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In 2002 LVMH released a supplier tool to screen suppliers, in 2008 adopted a Supplier Code
4 of Conduct and in 2014 highlighted increasing responsibility of suppliers as part of the LIFE
5 programme. LVMH asks its suppliers to comply with their recommendations and audits them
6 to ensure compliance. However, much of the responsibility appears to be cascaded down to
7 suppliers who are asked to comply. In 2018, 877 suppliers were the subject of 1092 audits by
8 LVMH. LVMH notes that through these processes it identifies non-conformity, highlights
9 areas for improvement and can launch corrective action but few examples are given of when
10 this has taken place. In 2018, 20% of suppliers audited did not meet requirements but further
11 details or actions taken are not discussed. Thus, the spirit of GRI is met, but not the substance,
12 as there is no mention of any sanctions or compliance failures to ensure balance.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Throughout its environmental strategy and reporting suppliers are a key focus for Kering and
29 they note a need for a collaborative relationship with its suppliers. By including the full supply
30 chain in their EP&L methodology there is significant motivation for them to work with
31 suppliers to improve their overall environmental impact. Impacts from the supply chain are
32 recognised in almost all their reports and their supplier expectations culminate in a 145 suppliers
33 document on standards for raw materials and manufacturing processes. Designed for use by
34 suppliers, although not a contractual document, it outlines the minimum requirements for
35 suppliers, notes the role of announced/unannounced audits, and that suppliers are expected to
36 develop sustainable management, reporting and tracking systems to ensure compliance.
37 Actions resulting from non-compliance are also detailed including termination of contract for
38 a number of zero tolerance elements. Although no actions taken with specific suppliers are
39 noted arguably Kering meets the GRI guidelines in this area.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 **5. Discussion**

57 Overall for LVMH, reporting has increased in sophistication and detail with a turning point in
58 2012 to more comprehensive reporting. However, it is often very challenging to extract key
59
60

1
2
3 figures as the reports are often crowded with examples from brands rather than for the group as
4
5 a whole. Additionally, the scope changes between reports making comparability very difficult
6
7 and estimates are often used rather than accurate figures. Interviews and quotations from staff
8
9
10 are a distraction and make the results present more like a magazine than a serious business
11
12 report. Due perhaps to the nature of the luxury industry there is a significant focus on packaging
13
14 and eco design and these are dealt with separately from other aspects, and for this industry GRI
15
16 guidelines could be adapted to allow detailed reporting for these specific areas. LVMH reports
17
18 in most years it's environmental expenditure and awareness and training of employees.
19
20 However, these are reported as inputs (e.g. hours provided in training) not the positive (or
21
22 negative) outcomes of these initiatives and whether they have actually made an environmental
23
24 difference. While in later reports objectives further than one year ahead are included there is no
25
26 detail over how these targets were decided.
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 Overall for Kering, the reporting is quite sporadic with different reports being used at different
34
35 times consisting of different styles, meaning it is difficult to compare between and across years
36
37 in some cases (not meeting the GRI principle of timeliness). As the EP&L methodology and
38
39 reporting dominates their documentation it is often hard to extract details for some areas
40
41 (especially actual amounts) and this means that it often does not meet the GRI principles. This
42
43 is not to say that the methodology lacks comprehensiveness and detail. The reports are
44
45 straightforward and show the many areas in which Kering is involved, but nonetheless it is not
46
47 possible for it to be compared to reporting from other organisations (not meeting the GRI
48
49 principles of comparability), although it is possible to compare with other Kering
50
51 documentation. The detail and methodology discussion do however show a good level of
52
53 completeness, accuracy and clarity meeting a number of the report quality elements of the GRI
54
55 principles. Unlike LVMH there is a great deal of focus on the supply chain, which is fully
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 integrated into reporting and initiatives take place at the group, not brand level. Kering reports
4
5 also show a lack of detail on stakeholders. While some are mentioned in passing these are not
6
7 systematically reported, and so not meeting GRI principles.
8
9

10 **6. Conclusions**

11 The key aim of this study was to examine whether the reporting practices of LVMH and Kering
12
13 were legitimate. That is, were they in accordance with established rules, principles or standards.
14
15 In this case, the study compared their reporting against the widely accepted GRI standards.
16
17 Reporting styles were inconsistent, with LVMH loosely following the GRI principles, and
18
19 Kering developing its own approach (the EP&L methodology). As the conglomerates have
20
21 considerable discretion on what to report it was very difficult to conclude which was in fact
22
23 performing better in terms of sustainability, as has been noted in other industries (Sherman
24
25 2009).
26
27
28
29

30
31 The analysis shows that the two conglomerates are in some cases working well within the GRI
32
33 guidelines and in other cases are not. Examining the two reports side by side highlights the
34
35 failings and good practice in each reporting style. For example, Kering's complete inclusion
36
37 of all supply chain elements highlights that LVMH does not include this, and hence may be
38
39 considerably underreporting its impacts. This suggests elements of selective reporting and
40
41 symbolic management which is likely to undermine the legitimacy of the organisation in the
42
43 eyes of stakeholders (Ashforth and Gibbs 1990). These could also be perceived as calculated
44
45 greenwashing (Okereke 2007), especially given that the reports are often unbalanced,
46
47 selectively reporting positive impacts rather than negative ones. Reporting potentially benign
48
49 impacts damages the legitimacy of the sustainability initiatives and the conglomerates as a
50
51 whole. Supply chains are a key element of the luxury industry that has received substantial,
52
53 often negative, media reporting. By including the supply chain, Kering acknowledges supply
54
55 chains by tackling it head on and appear to be responding through substantive management.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 This is likely to increase legitimacy in the eyes of stakeholders. However, as Kering's approach
4
5 does not allow comparability, legitimacy may be damaged from this perspective.
6
7

8 Both conglomerates use the reporting to communicate their core values. As noted, values and
9
10 norms are themselves flexible and the development of reporting over the review period shows
11
12 how these organisations have responded to the changing interests, and expectations of
13
14 stakeholders. One example of this is the use of rare and sometimes endangered leather, for
15
16 example python, which both conglomerate focus on more in recent reporting. The reporting
17
18 styles certainly suggest that reputational gains and response to media attention are one reason
19
20 for sustainability reporting in the luxury setting (Tang and Demeritt 2017).
21
22
23
24

25 The sustainability discourse and linguistic styles within the reports demonstrate weak specifics
26
27 on GRI criteria; largely they do not provide measurable, tangible evidence regarding the
28
29 claimed sustainability success or failures of LVMH and Kering. Unsurprisingly the analysis
30
31 reveals imagery that pervades luxury reporting rather than critical analysis of the Groups'
32
33 sustainability performance. This is especially the case for LVMH whose reporting has a more
34
35 decorative approach, and magazine feel. The evidenced 'gliding over' of both the positive and
36
37 negative attributes of sustainable performance is concerning, since with limited detail, depth
38
39 and evidence being provided in luxury sustainability reporting, the opportunities for
40
41 greenwashing, and the potential to inflate or obscure unsubstantiated ethical claims (Delmas
42
43 and Burbano 2011) remains unfettered. Nor will such lack of transparency and elided evidence
44
45 defuse stakeholder cynicism and scrutiny (Jahdi and Acikdilli 2009).
46
47
48
49
50

51 Overall, whether the reports meet the GRI principles of report quality is questionable in places.
52
53 Balance is sometimes met, but often negative figures are glossed over or blamed on scope
54
55 changes. Comparability is not possible between conglomerates, although comparability is
56
57 occasionally met within each conglomerate. Timeliness is largely met as a GRI principle due
58
59
60

1
2
3 to the broadly regular reporting schedule from the two conglomerates, although the more
4
5 haphazard reporting schedule of Kering is problematic. Accessibility is questionable, as not all
6
7 stakeholders would have the relevant background knowledge to read the environmental signals
8
9 and technical details being sent. Finally, it is uncertain as to whether the reliability GRI criteria
10
11 is met as it is often impossible to follow the evidence trail of the reports and to verify the
12
13 statements made. Overall by not meeting these principles the conglomerates risk damage to
14
15 their legitimacy and stakeholders cast doubt over their claims.
16
17
18
19

20 In conclusion, the study has made the following contributions. Firstly, it addresses the
21
22 aforementioned research gap by furthering our understanding of sustainability and the luxury
23
24 industry in the context of environmental sustainability reporting. Secondly, the study has
25
26 applied legitimacy theory to the context of luxury reporting to ascertain to what extent the
27
28 reporting can be seen as legitimate and indicative of substantive management practice. Finally,
29
30 the study makes a novel methodological contribution, utilising a mixture of discourse and
31
32 corpus-assisted discourse analysis to draw upon linguistics to examine the sustainability
33
34 reports.
35
36
37
38

39 **6.1 Implications**

40 The study is of interest to both of the conglomerates under investigation, competitors and
41
42 practitioners working in the luxury sector, but also policy makers to facilitate the incorporation
43
44 of robust sustainability reporting practices. First, the luxury industry needs to ensure
45
46 consistency regardless of reporting style, which will enable comparisons (including
47
48 longitudinal) to be made within the organisations and with competitors. While following
49
50 guidelines such as the GRI standards can help this, there is no reason why an alternative
51
52 approach cannot be taken, but it must allow comparability. If it is impossible to compare and
53
54 contrast, there is a significant risk of organisations damaging their legitimacy in the eyes of
55
56 stakeholders.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Second, where conglomerates are reporting it is key that there is clarity regarding group and
4 brand level reporting. Only clear differentiation and transparency can protect organisational
5 legitimacy. Third, as noted above the supply chain is a key element of the luxury industry that
6
7
8
9
10 has faced significant scrutiny in recent times. Without tackling the substantial impacts here
11
12 sustainability reporting feels superficial and could be construed as greenwashing. Openness
13
14 and balance are key GRI principles and organisations must embrace these to ensure
15
16 stakeholders perceived them rightly to be legitimate.
17
18
19

20 ***6.2 Limitations and directions for future research***

21 A key limitation is that the data set only analyses the two luxury conglomerates, albeit the main
22
23 industry players, and does not consider the sustainability reporting practices of other luxury
24
25 conglomerates or independent luxury brands which might reveal different practices. Future
26
27 research could examine the online sustainability reports of other conglomerates and smaller
28
29 brands in order to gain a broader perspective such as Starwood Preferred Group and Cie
30
31 Financière Richemont.
32
33
34
35

36 Further research could also study the sustainability reports of luxury brands individually, rather
37
38 than at the group level. However, in the case of LVMH and Kering, brand level reports, to the
39
40 knowledge of the researchers are unavailable online. There is also scepticism as to whether
41
42 small, independent luxury organisations are willing to share their sustainability reports.
43
44
45

46 Another limitation of the study is associated with the analysis and the criticisms surrounding
47
48 the GRI reporting framework. In particular the framework has been criticized for not
49
50 considering distinctive characteristics of different industries (Fernandez-Feijoo et al. 2014).
51
52 Furthermore, the vast majority of brands owned by LVMH operate in the fashion sector, with
53
54 Kering solely focusing on fashion. However, the luxury industry is widespread, comprising
55
56 of automobiles, hospitality, gastronomy, alcohol, and fine art (D'Arpizio et al. 2017; Wiedmann
57
58 and Hennigs 2013). Additionally, while this study focused on the environmental elements of
59
60

the GRI principles, future research should also examine the economic and social aspects, such as modern slavery (Gold et al. 2015).

References

Ashforth, B.E. and Gibbs, B.W. (1990). The double-edge of organizational legitimation, *Organization Science*, 1(2), 177-194.

Athwal, N., Wells, V. K., Carrigan, M., & Henninger, C. E. (2019). Sustainable luxury marketing: A synthesis and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*.

Atwal, G., & Williams, A. (2009). Luxury brand marketing - The experience is everything! *Journal of Brand Management*, 16 (5–6), 338-346.

Bendell, J., & Kleanthous, A. (2007). *Deeper Luxury*. Retrieved from http://assets.wwf.org.uk/downloads/luxury_report.pdf.

Berthon, P., Pitt, L., Parent, M., & Berthon, J-P. (2009). Aesthetics and ephemerality: observing and preserving the luxury brand. *California Management Review*, 52 (1), 45-66.

Bondi, M. (2016). CSR reports in English and Italian: Focus on generic structure and importance markers. In G. E. Garzone, D. Heaney, & G. Riboni (Eds.), *Language for Specific Purposes. Research and Translation across Cultures and Media*. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Buhr, N., & Reiter, S. (2006). Ideology, the environment and one world view: A discourse analysis of Noranda's environmental and sustainable development reports. *Advances in Environmental Accounting*, 3, 1-48.

Carrigan, M., Bosangit, C., Moreas, C., & Mceachern, M. (2015). Less shine, more substance: Corporate social responsibility, SMEs And the jewellery industry. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 35 (1), 136-136.

Ching, H.Y. and Gerab, F. (2017). Sustainability reports in Brazil through the lens of signaling, legitimacy and stakeholder theories. *Social Responsibility Journal*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 95-110.

Cormier, D., & Gordon, I. M. (2001). An examination of social and environmental reporting strategies. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 14 (5), 587-617.

Cormier, D., & Magnan, M. (1999). Corporate environmental disclosure strategies: Determinants, costs and benefits. *Journal of Accounting, Auditing & Finance*, 14 (4), 429-451.

D'Arpizio, C., Levato, F., Kamel, M. A., & de Montgolfier, J. (2017). *Luxury goods worldwide market study*, Fall-Winter 2017 Bain Report. Retrieved from http://www.bain.de/Images/BAIN_REPORT_Global_Luxury_Report_2017.pdf

de Graaf, G. (2006). Discourse and descriptive business ethics. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 15 (3), 246-258.

1
2
3 Dean, A. (2018). *Everything is wrong: a search for order in the ethnometaphysical chaos of*
4 *sustainable luxury fashion*. The Fashion Studies Journal. Retrieved from
5 [http://www.fashionstudiesjournal.org/5-essays/2018/2/25/everything-is-wrong-](http://www.fashionstudiesjournal.org/5-essays/2018/2/25/everything-is-wrong-a-search-for-order-in-the-ethnometaphysical-chaos-of-sustainable-luxury-fashion)
6 [a-search-](http://www.fashionstudiesjournal.org/5-essays/2018/2/25/everything-is-wrong-a-search-for-order-in-the-ethnometaphysical-chaos-of-sustainable-luxury-fashion)
7 [for-order-in-the-ethnometaphysical-chaos-of-sustainable-luxury-fashion](http://www.fashionstudiesjournal.org/5-essays/2018/2/25/everything-is-wrong-a-search-for-order-in-the-ethnometaphysical-chaos-of-sustainable-luxury-fashion)

8
9 Deegan, C. (2002). The legitimising effect of social and environmental disclosures – a
10 theoretical foundation. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 15(3), 282-311.

11
12 Deegan, C. & Rankin, M. (1997). The materiality of environmental information to users of
13 annual reports. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 10(4), 562-583

14
15 Dekhili, S., & Achabou, M. A. (2016) Is It Beneficial for Luxury Brands to Embrace CSR
16 Practices? Celebrating America's Pastimes: Baseball, Hot Dogs, Apple Pie and Marketing?,
17 Proceedings of the Academy of Marketing Science, Florida, 18 – 21 May.

18
19 Delmas, M. A., & Burbano, V. C. (2011). The drivers of greenwashing. *California Management*
20 *Review*, 54 (1), 64-87.

21
22 Elsbach, K.D. (2003). Organizational perception management. *Research in Organizational*
23 *Behavior*, 25, 297-332.

24
25 Evangelinos, K., & Skouloudis, A. (2014). European perspectives on corporate non-financial
26 disclosure: Evidence from the Southeast. *International Journal of Disclosure and Governance*,
27 11, 33-53.

28
29 Fernandez-Feijoo, B., Romero, S., & Ruiz, S. (2014). Effect of stakeholders' pressure on
30 transparency of sustainability reports within the GRI framework. *Journal of Business Ethics*,
31 122, 122-163.

32
33 Gold, S., Trautrim, A., & Trodd, Z. (2015). Modern slavery challenges to supply chain
34 management. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, 20 (5), 485-494.

35
36 Gray, R., Owwn, D. & Adams, C. (1996). *Accounting and Accountability: Changes and*
37 *Challenges in Corporate Social Reporting*, Prentice Hall, London.

38
39 Guthrie, J., & Parker, L. D. (1990). Corporate social disclosure practice: a comparative
40 international analysis. *Advances in Public Interested Accounting*, 3, 159-176.

41
42 Hahn, R., & Kühnen, M. (2013). Determinants of sustainability reporting: a review of results,
43 trends, theory, and opportunities in an expanding field of research. *Journal of Cleaner*
44 *Production*, 59, 5-21.

45
46 Hahn, R. & Lülfs, R., (2014). Legitimizing negative aspects in GRI-oriented sustainability
47 reporting: A qualitative analysis of corporate disclosure strategies. *Journal of Business Ethics*,
48 123 (3), 401-420.

49
50 Hall, J. (2018). 5 Years On From The Rana Plaza Collapse, How Much Has Actually Changed?
51 Vogue – 23 April. Retrieved from [https://www.vogue.co.uk/article/rana-plaza-fifth-](https://www.vogue.co.uk/article/rana-plaza-fifth-anniversary-how-has-fashion-industry-changed)
52 [anniversary-how-has-fashion-industry-changed](https://www.vogue.co.uk/article/rana-plaza-fifth-anniversary-how-has-fashion-industry-changed)

- 1
2
3 Han, J., Seo, Y., & Ko, E. (2016). Staging luxury experiences for understanding sustainable
4 fashion consumption: A balance theory application. *Journal of Business Research*, 74, 162-167.
5
6 Hedberg, C J., & von Malmberg, F. (2003). The Global Reporting Initiative and corporate
7 sustainability reporting in Swedish companies. *Corporate Social Responsibility and*
8 *Environmental Management*, 10 (3), 153-164.
9
10
11 Hoejmose, S. U., Roehrich, J. K. & Grosvold, J. (2014). Is doing more, doing better? The
12 relationship between responsible supply chain management and corporate reputation. *Industrial*
13 *Marketing Management*, 43 (1), 77-90.
14
15
16 Hrasky, S. (2012). Visual disclosure strategies adopted by more and less sustainability-driven
17 companies. *Accounting Forum*, 36, 154-165.
18
19
20 Humphreys, A., & Wang, R., J-H. (2018). Automated text analysis for consumer research.
21 *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (6), 1274–1306.
22
23
24 Isenmann, R., Bey, C., & Welter, M. (2007). Online reporting for sustainability issues. *Business*
25 *Strategy and the Environment*, 16, 487-501.
26
27
28 Jahdi. K. S., & Acikdilli, G. (2009). Marketing communications and corporate social
29 responsibility (CSR): Marriage of convenience or shotgun wedding? *Journal of Business*
30 *Ethics*, 88 (1), 103-113.
31
32
33 Janssen, C., Vanhamme, J., Lindgreen, A., & Lefebvre, C. (2014). The Catch-22 of responsible
34 luxury: effects of luxury product characteristics on consumers' perception of fit with
35 corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 119 (1), 45-57.
36
37
38 Kansara, V. A. (2013). Why did PPR change its name to Kering? *Business of Fashion*.
39 Retrieved from <https://www.businessoffashion.com/articles/intelligence/why-did-ppr-change-its-name-to-kering>
40
41
42 Kapferer, J. N., & Michaut-Denizeau, A. (2014). Is luxury compatible with sustainability?
43 Luxury consumers' viewpoint. *Journal of Brand Management*, 21 (1), 1-22.
44
45
46 Karasek, R., & Bryant, P. (2012). Signaling theory: Past, present, and future. *Academy of*
47 *Strategic Management Journal*, 11 (1), 91-100.
48
49
50 Kessous, A., Valette-Florence, P. & De Barnier, V. (2016). Luxury watch possession and
51 dispossession from father to son: A poisoned gift? *Journal of Business Research*. 77.
52
53
54 Kollewe, J. (2015). *Global Luxury Goods Market Exceeds €1tn*. The Guardian - 29 October.
55 Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/business/2015/oct/29/global-luxury-goods-market-exceeds-1tn-euro>
56
57
58 Kozlowski. A., Searcy, C. & Bardecki, M. (2015). Corporate sustainability reporting in the
59 apparel industry: An analysis of indicators disclosed. *International Journal of Productivity and*
60 *Performance Management*, 64 (3), 377-397.

- 1
2
3 KPMG. (2011). *KPMG International Survey of Corporate Responsibility Reporting 2011*.
4 Retrieved from <https://www.kpmg.de/docs/survey-corporate-responsibility-reporting-2011.pdf>
5
6 Krippendorff, K. (2019). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to its methodology* (4th Edition),
7 Sage Publications.
8
9
10 Landrum, N. E., & Ohsowski, B. (2018). Identifying worldviews on corporate sustainability: A
11 content analysis of corporate sustainability reports. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 27,
12 128-151.
13
14 Lindblom, C.K. (1994). The implications of organizational legitimacy for corporate social
15 performance and disclosure, Critical Perspectives on Accounting Conference, New York.
16
17
18 Malavasi, D. (2011). Doing well by doing good: A comparative analysis of Nokia's and
19 Ericsson's corporate social responsibility reports. In G. E. Garzone & M. Gotti (Eds.),
20 *Discourse, Communication and the Enterprise. Genres and Trends*. Bern: Peter Lang, 193-
21 212.
22
23 _____ (2017). *Building Trust through Corporate Identity: An Analysis of CSR Reports*
24 *and Webpages*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
25
26 Mann, M., Byun, S E., Kim, H., & Hoggle, K. (2013). Assessment of leading apparel specialty
27 retailers' CSR practices as communicated on corporate websites: problems and opportunities.
28 *Journal of Business Ethics*, 122 (4), 599-622.
29
30
31 Marquis, C., Toffel, M.W., and Zhou, Y. (2016). Scrutiny, Norms, and Selective Disclosure: A
32 Global Study of Greenwashing. *Organization Science*, 27 (2), 233-504.
33
34 Michael, A., & Dixon, R. (2019). Audit data analytics of unregulated voluntary disclosures
35 and auditing expectations gap. *International Journal of Disclosure and Governance*, 16, 188-
36 205.
37
38
39 Michelon, G. (2011). Sustainability Disclosure and Reputation: A Comparative Study.
40 *Corporate Reputation Review*, 14 (2), 79-96.
41
42 Milne, M. J., & Gray, R. (2013). W(h)ither ecology? The triple bottom line, the Global
43 Reporting Initiative, and corporate sustainability reporting. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 118 (1),
44 13-29.
45
46
47 Monfardini, P., Barretta, A.D., and Ruggiero, P. (2013). Seeking legitimacy: Social reporting
48 in the healthcare sector, *Accounting Forum*, 37 (1), 54-66.
49
50
51 Naderi, I., & Strutton, D. (2015). I support sustainability but only when doing so reflects
52 fabulously on me: Can green narcissists be cultivated? *Journal of Macromarketing*, 35 (1), 70-
53 83.
54
55 O'Connell, L. (2019). Sales of the leading luxury companies worldwide 2012-2021. Retrieved
56 from: [https://www.statista.com/statistics/245697/sales-of-the-leading-luxury-companies-](https://www.statista.com/statistics/245697/sales-of-the-leading-luxury-companies-worldwide/)
57 [worldwide/](https://www.statista.com/statistics/245697/sales-of-the-leading-luxury-companies-worldwide/)
58
59
60

1
2
3 _____ (2020). Revenue share of the Kering Group worldwide 2019, by region.
4 Retrieved from: [https://www.statista.com/statistics/308257/revenue-share-of-the-kering-](https://www.statista.com/statistics/308257/revenue-share-of-the-kering-group-worldwide-by-region/)
5 [group-worldwide-by-region/](https://www.statista.com/statistics/308257/revenue-share-of-the-kering-group-worldwide-by-region/)
6

7
8 Okereke, C. (2007). An exploration of motivations, drivers and barriers to carbon management:
9 The UK FTSE 100. *European Management Journal*, 25 (6), 475-486.

10
11 Onn, H A., & Woodley, A. (2014). A discourse analysis on how the sustainability agenda is
12 defined within the mining industry. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 84 (1), 116-127.

13
14 Othman, R., & Ameer, R. (2009). Corporate social and environmental reporting: Where are we
15 heading? A survey of the literature. *International Journal of Disclosure and Governance*, 6,
16 298-320.
17

18
19 Oxford English Dictionary. (2016). *Oxford English Dictionary Addition Series*. Oxford, UK:
20 Oxford University Press.
21

22
23 Partington, A., Duguid, A., & Taylor, C. (2013). *Patterns and Meanings in Discourse: Theory*
24 *and practice in Corpus-Assisted Discourse Studies (CADS)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins
25 Publishing Company.
26

27
28 Passariello, C. (2013). PPR to Change Name to Kering. Retrieved from:
29 <https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424127887324103504578375903938246098>
30

31
32 Patten, D. (2019). Seeking legitimacy, Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy
33 Journal, epub ahead of print.

34
35 Pérez, A. (2015). Corporate reputation and CSR reporting to stakeholders: Gaps in the literature
36 and future lines of research. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 20 (1), 11-
37 29.
38

39
40 Perks, K.J., Farache, F., Shukla, P., and Berry, A. (2013). Communicating responsibility-
41 practicing irresponsibility in CSR advertisements. *Journal of Business Research*, 66 (10), 1881-
42 1888.

43
44 PETA. (2017). Crocodiles Cut Open, Skinned in Vietnam for Leather Bags. Retrieved from:
45 <http://investigations.peta.org/vietnam-crocodile-skin-farm/>
46

47
48 Phau, I., & Prendergast, G. (2000). Consuming luxury brands: The relevance of the ‘Rarity
49 Principle’. *Journal of Brand Management*, 8 (2), 122-138.

50
51 Poppi, F. (2018). CSR Reports in Our Globalized Era: Balancing National Culture and Global
52 Language. In W. Giordano & G. Garzone (Eds). *Discourse, Communication and the Enterprise:*
53 *When Economics meets Language*: Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing,
54 249-270.
55

56
57 Porter, M. E. & Kramer, M. R. (2002). *The Competitive Advantage of Corporate Philanthropy*.
58 Harvard Business Review – December. Retrieved from [https://hbr.org/2002/12/the-](https://hbr.org/2002/12/the-competitive-advantage-of-corporate-philanthropy)
59 [competitive-advantage-of-corporate-philanthropy](https://hbr.org/2002/12/the-competitive-advantage-of-corporate-philanthropy)
60

- 1
2
3 Rayson, P. (2003). Matrix: A statistical method and software tool for linguistic analysis through
4 corpus comparison. Ph.D. thesis, Lancaster University, UK. Retrieved from
5 <http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/wmatrix/>
6
7
8 Roberts, P. W. & Dowling, G. R. (2002). Corporate reputation and sustained superior financial
9 performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23 (12), 1077-1093.
10
11 Roca, L.C., and Searcy, C. (2012). An analysis of indicators disclosed in corporate
12 sustainability reports, *Journal of Cleaner Production*. 20, 103-118.
13
14 Scott-Philips, T. C. (2008). On the correct application of animal signalling theory to human
15 communication. In A. D. M. Smith., K. Smith., & R. Ferrer (Eds.), *The Evolution of Language*.
16 Singapore: World Scientific Publishing.
17
18
19 Sharma, P., Panday, P., & Dangwal, R. C. (2020). Determinants of environmental, social and
20 corporate governance (ESG) disclosure: a study of Indian companies. *International Journal of*
21 *Disclosure and Governance*
22
23
24 Shocker, A.D and Sethi, S.P. (1973). An approach to incorporating societal preferences in
25 developing corporate action strategies, *California Management Review*, Summer, 97-105.
26
27
28 Suchmann, M.C. (1995). Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches.
29 *Academy of Management Journal*, 20 (3), 571-610.
30
31 Torrance, J. (2018). Luxury fashion brands under fire for hidden supply chains. The Telegraphy
32 – 23 April. Retrieved from [https://www.telegraph.co.uk/business/2018/04/22/luxury-fashion-](https://www.telegraph.co.uk/business/2018/04/22/luxury-fashion-brands-fire-hidden-supply-chains/)
33 [brands-fire-hidden-supply-chains/](https://www.telegraph.co.uk/business/2018/04/22/luxury-fashion-brands-fire-hidden-supply-chains/)
34
35
36 Tregidga, H., and Milne, M J. (2006). From sustainable management to sustainable
37 development: a longitudinal analysis of a leading New Zealand environmental reporter.
38 *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 15, 219-241.
39
40
41 Veblen, T. (1889). *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
42
43
44 Wiedmann, K P., & Hennigs, N. (2013). *Luxury Marketing: A Challenge for Theory and*
45 *Practice*. Germany: Springer Gabler.
46
47
48 Wilcox, K., Kim, H. M., & Sen, S. (2009). Why do consumers buy counterfeit luxury brands?
49 *Journal of Marketing Research*, 46, 247-259.
50
51
52 Winston, A. (2016). Luxury brands can no longer ignore sustainability. *Harvard Business*
53 *Review*, 2-4.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 Yeop, O. (2013) Global Reporting Initiative's environmental reporting: A study of oil and gas
companies, *Ecological Indicators*, 32, 19-24.

Table One. Principles of Global Reporting Initiative (Source: GRI, www.globalreporting.org)

Principles for defining report content	
<i>Principle</i>	<i>Description</i>
Stakeholder inclusiveness	The organization should identify its stakeholders, and explain how it has responded to their reasonable expectations and interests.
Sustainability Context	The report should present the organization's performance in the wider context of sustainability.
Materiality	The report should cover aspects that: 1- reflect the organization's significant economic, environmental and social impacts; or 2- substantively influence the assessments and decision of stakeholders.
Completeness	The report should include coverage of material aspects and their boundaries, sufficient to reflect significant economic, environmental and social impacts, and to enable stakeholders to access the organization's performance in the report period.
Principles for defining report quality	
<i>Principle</i>	<i>Details</i>
Balance	The report should reflect positive and negative aspects of the organization's performance to enable a reasoned assessment of overall performance.
Comparability	The organization should select, compile and report information consistently. The reported information should be presented in a manner that enables stakeholders to analyse changes in the organization's performance over time, and that could support analysis relative to other organizations.
Accuracy	The reported information should be sufficiently accurate and detailed for stakeholders to assess the organization's performance.
Timeliness	The organization should report on a regular schedule so that information is available in time for stakeholders to make informed decisions.
Clarity	The organization should make information available in a manner that is understandable and accessible to stakeholders using the report.
Reliability	The organization should gather, record, compile, analyze and disclose information and processes used in the preparation of a report in a way that they can be subject to examination and that establishes the quality and materiality of the information.

Table Two. Data Source Details*

Organisation	Document	Year of Publication
LVMH	Environmental Data Report	2000 - 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018
	Annual Shareholder Meeting	2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017
	Social Responsibility Report	2014, 2015, 2016, 2017
Kering	Sustainability Report	2012 - 2016, 2018
	Environmental Indicators	2012, 2013, 2015
	Statement on Transparency in Supply Chains Act	2017
	Integrated Report	2017
	Environmental Profit and Loss (EP & L) Group Results	2014, 2015, 2016, 2017

Environmental Profit and Loss (EP & L) Methodology and Group Results	2013
An Expert Review of the Environmental Profit and Loss (EP & L) Account	2012
Python Conservation Partnership	2014
Clean by Design in Italia	2016
Code of Ethics	2019
Standards for raw materials and manufacturing processes	2019

* Please note that reports often reports on the previous year's achievements and are therefore not published until the year afterwards. For example, the 2018 LVMH reports were not published until September 2019.

Table Three. Data Analysis Strategy

Discourse Analysis Stage		Description	Outcome
1	Genre	Layout of the sustainability reports, and organization of the text and images	Aims to identify patterns and layout relating to the generic report structure Aims to understand the contribution of photographs and graphs in the creation of meanings
2	Semantic Fields	Grouping words by specific categories set by the Wmatrix 3.0.	Examines the meanings of sentences by studying importance of and emphasis of words.
3	Word Frequency List and Concordances ²	Frequency of the words and context and co-text (surrounding words) of the words	Examines how frequently words acts as indicators of language style and the intention of the text extracts in relation to subject matter.

Figure One. GRI Specific Disclosures: Categories and Aspects (source:

<https://www.globalreporting.org/resource/library/>)

² A concordance line is a unit of meaning. Corpus linguistics software generates a series of concordance lines to show the use of a specific word within a text to understand its collocation, in other words the co-text and context (Sinclair, 1991).

Category: Economic	Category: Environmental	Category: Social
Economic Performance	Materials	Employment
Market Presence	Energy	Labour/Management Relations
Indirect Economic Impacts	Water and Effluents	Occupational Health and Safety
Procurement Practices	Biodiversity	Training and Education
Anti-corruption	Emissions	Diversity and Equal Opportunity
Anti-competitive Behaviour	Effluents and Waste	Non-discrimination
Tax	Environmental Compliance	Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining
	Supplier Environmental Assessment	Child Labour
		Forced or Compulsory Labour
		Security Practices
		Rights of Indigenous Peoples
		Human Rights Assessment
		Local Communities
		Supplier Social Assessment
		Public Policy
		Customer Health and Safety
		Marketing and Labelling
		Customer Privacy
		Socioeconomic Compliance

Figure Two. Key Domain Cloud for LVMH



Figure Three. Key Domain Cloud for Kering




Figure Four. Key Word Cloud for LVMH




Figure Five. Key Word Cloud for Kering

