

**SUSTAINABLE LUXURY: A CASE OF STRANGE BEDFELLOWS?**

**Tiffany Low**

**University of Bedfordshire**

**Institute for Tourism Research**

**Tiffany.Low@beds.ac.uk**

## **ABSTRACT**

*The concept of sustainability in a tourism context has received much attention in academia, and more recently in the media. Comparatively, the concept of luxury, both in a general sense, as well as more specifically in relation to hotels, has gained relatively little exposure in academia. As the expansion of middle-classes around the world continues to develop, there seems little sign that consumer spending will retreat at the emersion of the current economic down-turn. With this in mind, as well as the gathering strength behind the ‘green’ movement, this theoretical paper asks whether it is possible for luxury and sustainability to have a harmonious co-existence. Various perspectives around the concept of luxury are presented, as well as brief overview of the idea of sustainability. The article attempts to synthesise these two seemingly opposing concepts, and examine the current state in the hotel industry. In doing so, avenues for future research directions are provided.*

## **INTRODUCTION**

Despite the recent economic downturn, middle-classes around the world are expanding, particularly in emerging economies, and the desire for greater status and prestige is more prevalent than ever before. Arguably, these trends have resulted in more people aspiring to greater levels of luxury from their holidays. With their connotations of opulence, extravagance and excess, luxury hotels do little to appease the agendas of green campaigners. Over time, the notion of, and desire for luxury, has morphed from being something of a sin to one of the most coveted aspirations in modern day. However, the sustainability of such ostentatious consumption is now being questioned, with the hospitality industry by and large failing to provide answers. Brace (2007:136) comments that “few hotels or resorts have comprehensively attended to their immediate environmental efficiency, fewer still have extended that assessment and commitment to their broader supply chains and life cycle partnerships”. Remarks such as this pose the question: *can luxury hotels and sustainable development have a harmonious co-existence?*

With a marked lack of trust and faith in marketers, it seems little wonder that levels of consumer confidence in green labels has waned (Davis, 2009). So-called ‘Industry Insights’ (van Bergen & Davis, 2008) have realised that precious little will be achieved simply by marketing a green image – businesses need to ‘practice what they preach’, and work towards actually integrating sustainability concerns with business practice. This conceptual paper will attempt firstly to present historical and contrasting perspectives on the concept of luxury, as well as offer a discussion on how the concept of sustainable development sits alongside these

seemingly conflictual ideas. It is hoped that this discussion will provoke thought and discussion not only on the definitional aspects of these terms, but how the concept of sustainability might be presented to this selective and discriminating market segment.

## **WHAT DOES LUXURY MEAN?**

*"When I use a word," Humpty Dumpty said, in rather a scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean-neither more nor less."*

*"The question is," said Alice, "whether you can make words mean different things."*

*"The question is," said Humpty Dumpty, "which is to be master - that's all."*

(Carroll, 1865/1966, p. 185)

The term luxury evokes many descriptors – superiority, uniqueness, exclusivity, iconic, expressive; and has, what nowadays seem to be limitless applications. Carroll’s poignant quote above, reflects not only the unavoidable subjective interpretation of the word, but also the ability for meanings to be manipulated to suit a particular situation. In its most literal sense, the word luxury derives from the Latin word “Luxus” which signifies “soft or extravagant living, overindulgence and sumptuousness, luxuriousness and opulence” (Dubois *et. al.*, 2005). Traditionally, “[luxury] has been associated with exclusivity, status and quality” (Atwal & Williams, 2009, p. 339). The concepts of rarity and scarcity were also noted to be of importance in centuries gone by (Nueno & Quelch, 1998). As far back as Roman times, the concept of luxury can be examined where Berry (1994) observes the potentially disturbing power of human aspirations, which follows through to Christian biblical times where the term ‘*luxuria*’ appears as one of the Seven Deadly Sins. The use of ‘*luxuria*’ in this context referred to the sin of lust, documenting the negative relationship held between desire and luxury. In a more contemporary setting, this negative association can easily be found in marketing campaigns, where the consumption of luxury brands is portrayed as ‘wicked’ or ‘naughty’; even common household recipes such as the ‘Devil’s Foodcake’ demonstrate this link. Berry observes the Greeks upholding this negative association of luxury with desire as having a pernicious and harmful effect. According to Berry however, it wasn’t until the 18<sup>th</sup> century, when the belief that luxury was ‘dangerous’ shifted, and the association between luxury and desire was placed in a more innocuous light.

According to Hilton (2009:118), 19<sup>th</sup> century “anti-modernist ideals resulted in a cross-section of cultural and intellectual elites condemning the cheap luxuries of the mass market”, thereby demonstrating the resistance of the era against the democratisation of luxury and towards more exclusive, elitist ideals. Written over 100 years ago, Thorstein Veblen’s *Theory of the Leisure Class* (1899) presents a seminal model of conspicuous consumption, theorising that individuals emulate the consumption patterns of those individuals at a higher point in the social hierarchy. This theory of conspicuous consumption is reinforced in Hilton’s earlier findings – the “intellectual elites” denouncing the democratisation of luxury, while simultaneously, the lower classes striving to attain a higher position on the social ladder. Truong *et. al.* (2008:190) note similar inflections resultant in conspicuous consumption by the lower classes: “while the rich and affluent may consume luxury goods to assert status and membership to the elite class, the modest may consume the same goods to gain status but with a purely conspicuous intention”. It is from the author’s own experience of working at a luxury designer hotel in Australia, that so-called ‘weekend-warriors’ were observed. The most common display of conspicuous consumption would involve these guests staying as a party of two or more couples, thereby enabling them to demonstrate to each other their social and financial ‘ability’ to stay at such an establishment. Ordinarily, these guests would not have the means (financial or otherwise) to stay at hotels of this calibre, and these ‘occasional’ stays provide some evidence of an emergent culture of ‘treating’.

Following the historical progression of the definition and moving into the 20<sup>th</sup> century, ‘diversification’ and extension strategies have been seen to move luxury brands along a premium-to-mass spectrum, towards a greater ‘luxurification’ of society. Dumoulin (2007:27) notes that “many of the most powerful global players seem to have relied heavily on brand extension and the mass production and distribution of lower-range items to sustain and boost their growth”. He notes not only a marked increase in the number of luxury brands, but also the development and extension of luxury brands into ‘foreign’ territories, for example home accessories (Armani Casa) and hotels (Versace and Armani). The author of this paper worked at the first designer branded hotel in the world, and from this experience observed a multitude of brand extensions throughout the hotel from designer staff uniforms to bed linen and towels supplied in guest rooms. Soft furnishings that decorated the hotel, and branded crockery and glassware in hotel restaurants and bars were also used and available for guests to purchase at the hotel boutique.

More recently, the term ‘new luxury’ has arisen, coined by Silverstein & Fiske (2003:48) as goods which “evoke and engage consumers’ emotions while feeding their aspirations for a better life”. The notion of ‘trading-up’ has gained more coverage in recent times (Kießling *et. al.*, 2009) with alternative labels such as the ‘luxurification of society’ and ‘democratisation of luxury’ being coined in order to describe a type of middle-market consumerism with aspirations for products which meet their needs (Atwal & Williams, 2009). As alluded to in the earlier historical discussion, the democratisation of luxury is not necessarily a new concept. This 19<sup>th</sup> century belief that the democratisation of luxury needed to be “denounced” is evidence of this concept’s existence long before the contemporary focuses on the burgeoning middle-classes of countries such as India and China. Larger amounts of discretionary income have contributed to a blurring of the luxury definition, and greater subjectivity across cultures (Husic & Cicic, 2009; Silverstein & Fiske, 2003). What was once only available to only a select few, is now available to the masses, and has therefore arguably lost its status as a luxury item. Vigneron & Johnson (2004) offer a theory of inequality amongst luxury brands stating that not all luxury brands are deemed to be equally luxurious. One brand may have a higher perceived level of luxury in one product category, compared with the same brand in a different product category, therefore meaning that some brands may be more desirable to attain to certain consumer groups than others.

The concept of luxury as being something rare, scarce or unique is well documented, not least in Phau and Pendergast’s (2000) derivation of their ‘*Rarity Principle*’. The principle holds that “in order to maintain prestige, luxury brands must sustain high levels of awareness and tightly controlled brand diffusion to enhance exclusivity” (pg. 122). Importantly, their study found that brands should tightly control the supply and distribution of their products in order to enhance the Rarity Principle. This principle does however, seem to be somewhat at odds with the brand extension strategies discussed above. Further evidence of luxury being viewed as rare, scarce and unique however, can be found in various advertising campaigns - the luxury hotel group Jumeriah uses the slogan “Stay Different”, while the Fairmont Hotel Group uses the adage “Everyone’s an Original” demonstrating a degree of uniqueness in their products. Inherent in this desire for uniqueness or rarity is the idea of exclusivity and personalised status. The endeavour for these qualities of exclusivity and status can be seen most obviously in the middle-classes where the so-called ‘democratisation’ of luxury has

firmly taken hold. These endeavours, however, are not without their obstacles where “the limited reproducibility of items consumed for their symbolic value...force holders of new wealth to compete for status on terms set by the established leisure class” (Shipman, 2004:277).

As discussed earlier, a significant reason for the ambiguity in defining luxury can be attributed to the subjectivity of the word and the context in which it is used – a rather poignant quote by Socrates observes that while “contentment is natural wealth [while] luxury is artificial poverty” (Thomas, 2007, p.167). What is seen as a basic need in one country, or even social class (water, for example), may be seen as somewhat of a luxury in another (Vickers & Renand, 2003). Bernstein (1999:48) emphasises the importance of understanding functionality and purpose as an influencing factor in interpretation; it might be “that one person’s functionality may be another person’s luxury”. A convenience approach to defining luxury can lead us to the same scenario, where owning a car, for example, in a rural or remote area is seen purely as a necessity, where as city-dwellers with good public transport facilities and high associated costs in keeping a vehicle, would see owning a car as a luxury and unnecessary (Vickers & Renand, 2003).

Vickers & Renand (2003:462) see the majority of luxury typologies as being “modifications of a base product that involves satisfying consumer needs”. In the broadest sense of the word, Dubois *et. al.* (2005:115) believe “luxury refers to a specific tier of offer in almost any product or service category”. Although perhaps not providing much clarity on the subject, some interesting insights into the perception and definitions of luxury can be drawn from the world of luxury fashion. Coco Chanel is quoted as saying that “luxury is a necessity that begins where necessity ends” (Thomas, 2007, p. 17), going some way to ratifying the earlier definitions of luxury acting as an extension to a base product. Add to this Chanel’s belief that “luxury lies not in richness and ornateness, but in the absence of vulgarity” (Thomas, 2007, p.99), the subjectivity of the term is demonstrable by the individual interpretations of ‘vulgarity’ in this instance.

Luxury can also be examined in line with Maslow’s (1987:21) Hierarchy of Needs where Maslow himself notes the “desire for reputation or prestige, status...importance” at the fourth level of Esteem Needs. Berry (1994), too, sees luxuries as refinements of basic human needs

such as food, shelter and health care. Examples of such refinements might be a youth hostel vs a luxury resort; and annual visits to a doctor vs regular visits to spas and health retreats. It is Maslow's theory that is used to formulate the basis of Kemp's (1998) necessity-luxury continuum which is offered as a method of defining luxury goods. Importantly, Kemp (1998, p. 593) notes "the status of a good as a luxury is partially determined by its natural desirability, and not simply by whether it is an object for conspicuous consumption". This can be applied to the tourism industry through destination choice for example, where a luxury hotel may exist in a particular location, but that location does not appeal to the consumer.

Before the development of models such as Vigneron & Johnson's (2004) Brand Luxury Index and Wiedmann *et. al.'s* (2007) Luxury Value Model, Veblen's (1899) Theory of Conspicuous Consumption was ultimately used to refer to the public consumption of goods or services as a means of gaining notoriety, prestige or status among social classes. A more consumer-centered, and somewhat generalised approach to defining luxury in relation to status and esteem, was offered by Vigneron & Johnson (2004:486) as being "goods for which the simple use or display of a particular branded product brings esteem on the owner, apart from any functional utility". Furthermore, in a marketing oriented context, Phau & Prendergast (2001:123) indicate that luxury brands "evoke exclusivity, have a well known brand identity, enjoy high brand awareness and perceived quality, and retain sales levels and customer loyalty". Bernstein (2009:50) discusses an 'extrinsic luxury' where the degree of luxury a consumer derives from a product "depends entirely on what the person [consumer] believes that other people [consumers] believe about the product". This discussion raises a philosophical question as to whether or not luxury exists, or if it is merely a state of mind – perceptive reality; again, highlighting the subjective nature of the term.

It has been widely recognised in the literature to date, that through their purchase or consumption of luxury of goods or services, consumers seek to satisfy emotional drivers such as sensory pleasure and self-gratification (Wiedmann *et. al.*, 2007; Vigneron & Johnson, 2004; Bernstein, 1999). In their study, Vickers and Renand (2003:459) examined luxury goods "as symbols of personal and social identity". In their paper identifying emerging concepts on hedonic consumption, Hirschman & Holbrook (1982:92) define hedonistic consumption as "those facets of consumer behaviour that relate to the multisensory, fantasy and emotive aspects of product usage experience". From this definition, we are led to

conclude that luxury goods are not only in pursuit of sensory and emotional satisfaction, but are also likely to draw the consumer into a world beyond reality - satisfaction gained through escapism from everyday routine. It is obvious then that luxury hotels for some guests, would act as a vehicle for this escapism through their more refined and aesthetically pleasing designs. Research defining consumer value in terms of luxury consumption concludes that “the consumer’s perceived level of hedonism towards a luxury product or service, and its property to satisfy an emotional desire for sensory gratification as best as possible, is positively related to the individual luxury value perception” (Wiedmann *et. al.*, 2007, p. 7). It is hence quite logical, to assume that the increased level of luxury a consumer *perceives* in a product or service, the more likely it is that the consumer will derive greater satisfaction through the fulfilment of their own hedonistic desires.

### **SUSTAINABLE LUXURY?**

It is widely accepted that the modern concept of sustainability originated via the Brundtland Commission in 1987 where sustainable development was defined as being “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (World Commission on Environment and Development in 1987:43). The minimal influence that the Brundtland Report has had however, is noted by Holden (2009), and the belief held by many of today’s generation is that the Brundtland Commission propositioned sustainability as a new and ground-breaking concept, perhaps because of its focus on ethics and equity, but more cynically because sufficient time had passed since the environmental movements of the 1960s and 1970s that the term had been forgotten, and hence appeared to be re-born (Butler, 1998). In its most primitive form however, sustainability is evidenced many thousands of years before the birth of Christ where the elite were granted exclusive access to animals and grasslands in protected nature reserves in Mesopotamia (Butler, 1991). These ideas were taken up by Alexander the Great and other Europeans, and subsequently taken back to the continent. Hardy *et. al.* (2002) discuss the romantic vision of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and note the alignment of conservation movements with sustained periods of economic expansion. They note that these occurrences are arguably due to people likely reacting to materialistic values. Late in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, not long after European colonisation of Australia, that country’s first national park, the Royal National Park, was established in Sydney and provides an example of “growing recognition that areas



should be preserved for future generations to use” (Hardy et. al., 2002:476).

In an attempt to operationalise the definition of sustainable development arising from the Brundtland Commission, sustainability has been summarised as a concept that rests on three pillars: economic, ecological and social environments (Pforr, 2001). Bramwell *et. al.* (1996) however, propose a definition with seven dimensions of sustainability: environmental, cultural, political, economic, social, managerial and governmental. The inclusion of dimensions such as political, managerial and governmental pose difficulties however, as it is these groups of stakeholders that are generally at fault for abusing the underlying ethos of the term. A more philosophical approach to defining sustainability is supported, whereby it is advocated that a holistic and global approach must be adopted (Sharpley, 2002), that is, that sustainability cannot be separated from the value systems of those involved in its implementation and the societies in which they exist (Bramwell *et. al.*, 1996). This is echoed by Pforr (2001) who notes the value orientation that sustainable tourism represents, and believes that greater participation and co-operation between governments, industry, communities and academia will lead to greater legitimacy of political decisions.

Some authors have concluded that sustainable development in itself is not something which *can* be defined, due largely to the fact that the inclusion of the political environment in its definitions leave it open to interpretation by those with political power (Holden, 2000). Over time, models have been developed which attempt to demonstrate a progression towards sustainable development. Baker *et. al.* (1997) offer a ‘Ladder of Sustainable Development’ where the first rung of the ladder is referred to as the ‘Treadmill’ approach – a model focused on the accrual of material possessions and pursuing wealth creation. The second rung on the ladder refers to a model of ‘Weak Sustainable Development’ where an attempt is made to integrate some environmental concerns with capitalist growth goals. The third rung on the ladder is referred to as the ‘Strong Sustainable Development’ model which advocates that environmental protection be a precondition of economic development. The fourth and final rung of the ladder, is the ‘Ideal’ model, a kind of enlightenment where it is believed that nature and non-human life have an intrinsic value, which extends beyond their usefulness to humans. This final rung represents what Weaver (2002) calls the ‘Green Paradigm’ shift.

The issue of contention, and indeed the focus of this paper, is whether or not these two seemingly polarized terms can work in harmony. According to Ecotourism Australia, it

would appear not – its former Chairman, Alistair McCracken questions when “ people [will be] prepared to forego the luxury in hotels and move towards recognizing that we can no longer live the way we have for the past half a century?” (Brace, 2007). In an interview recently conducted with the General Manager of a luxury hotel in Geneva, Switzerland, it was noted that while large corporations continue to source accommodation contracts based on factors other than sustainability (location, service, accommodation quality and price for example), the fundamental operations of hotels will change very little (personal communications, March, 2010). This sentiment was echoed by McCracken (*cited in* Brace, 2007) who believes that hotels will only change when the consumer does. Change too, as well as recognition, is needed not only by consumers, but by the hotel industry at large. Maresco & Lyons (2005) presented a SWOT analysis, market conditions and industry trends identified by the luxury hotel body, *The Leading Hotels of the World*, where not a single mention of sustainability or Corporate Social Responsibility is found in relation to the industry in which they operate. Research conducted at a similar time noted that environmental concerns in particular had taken a back seat over other operational concerns, due largely to financial constraints (Bohadanowiz, 2005).

As time has passed, it appears that some efforts towards increased sustainability are being made. In May, 2009 the inaugural Sustainable Luxury Fair was held in Paris, demonstrating that quality can be achieved without compromising the ecological balance of nature (Sheber, 2009). Whilst the majority of attention is paid to the environmental pillar of sustainability, it is worth noting that without financial viability, a business will no longer be sustainable. This is recognized by Sheber who notes that “eco-investors are realizing that responsible tourism sustains not only the environment, but also their bottom lines.” (pg. 26). Existing academic research provides conflicting empirical results regarding the economic impact of incorporating sustainable business practices, despite the intense reliance the hotel industry has with its natural environment (Rodriguez & Cruz, 2007). The research of Rodriguez & Cruz focuses on the Spanish hotel sector, and adds to the list of positive results from previous research, demonstrating that the effectiveness with which hotels manage their commitments to the social and natural environments can have a positive impact on financial performance. Further research carried out by Lee & Park (2009) also confirm that responsible management of the social environment in which hotels operate, has a simultaneous and positive relationship with financial performance. While arguably results such as this can assist in

engaging industry with the argument *for* sustainability, the question of whether to accept complacency around a shift in the corporate moral compass on the grounds of improved economic performance remains.

Davis (branding consultant, personal communication, 11<sup>th</sup> May 2010) goes on to provide support for a shift towards a stronger focus on the social environment, commenting that a lot of attention has been paid to the ecological environment due to the ability for impacts in this sphere to be measured. Recent research by Bohadanowiz & Zientara (2009:147) into the social dimension of sustainability found that “hotel companies have gone to great lengths to improve the quality of life in local communities and the well-being of their employees”, and that a large number of hotels have embedded the concept into their business operations. Positive examples of implementation in the luxury hotel sector include Ritz Carlton and Fairmont Hotels who all have extensive Corporate Social Responsibility policies on their websites. Interestingly, some questions are raised concerning the motivations behind such implementations, with Dief & Font (2010) suggesting that proactive companies who implement green marketing strategies voluntarily, are doing so in order to distance themselves from criticism and to carry a clear conscience. Does this then mean, that there is still a lack of genuine concern for the environment and communities in which luxury hotels operate? Or, can we rest easy with the assumption that increased levels of Corporate Social Responsibility and sustainability ‘embeddedness’ now form part of the core business values of these companies?

## **FUTURE RESEARCH**

This article has attempted to provide an insight into the myriad of luxury definitions and the inherent subjectivity of the concept, as well as how the concept of sustainability has been embraced by the hotel industry. Indeed while it has been discussed here that the initial take-up from the hotel industry in relation to sustainability has been slow, in recent years more concerted efforts have been made by the larger players. Whilst there is still little evidence to suggest that luxury hotels on the whole are engaging with and embedding the concept of sustainability in their core business strategies, it should be acknowledged that the efforts made by these large companies can make a significant difference, not least through leading by example. The main questions for future research therefore remain to be the examination of causality between sustainable business practices and the levels of perceived value by

guests of luxury hotels. Is the lack of implementation of sustainable business practices in luxury hotels due to a lack of consumer demand, or due to a disregard for the problem, or some other barriers (financial or otherwise) on the part of the hotels? A second area for future research should adopt a stronger focus on marketing strategies, whereby it should be examined whether luxury hotels are camouflaging their sustainability efforts under clever marketing strategies in an attempt to maintain their core market segment. Due largely to the individualized nature of interpretation, it is my belief that luxury and sustainability can co-exist. While there is certainly a need for more genuine attempts at environmental and social preservation, there also should be recognition that clever and strategic marketing does not necessarily constitute a lack of commitment.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Atwal, G. and Williams, A. (2009). Luxury brand marketing - the experience is everything! *Journal of Brand Management*, 16(5), p.338.
- Baker, S., Kousis, M., Richardson, D. and Young, S. (1997) *The Politics of Sustainable Development: Theory, policy and practice within the European Union* London: Routledge
- Bernstein, L. (1999) 'Luxury and the Hotel Brand: Art, Science or Fiction?', *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 40(February), p.47.
- Berry, C.J. (1994) *The idea of luxury: a conceptual and historical investigation* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Bohdanowicz, P. (2005) 'European Hoteliers' Environmental Attitudes: Greening the Business', *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 46, p.188.
- Bohdanowicz, P. and Zientara, P. (2009) 'Hotel companies' contribution to improving the quality of life of local communities and the well-being of their employees', *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 9(2), p.147.
- Brace, M. (2007) 'The lapse of luxury', *ECOS*, Apr-May, p.14.
- Bramwell, B. and Lane, B. (1996) 'Sustainable Tourism: an evolving global approach', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1(1), p.1.
- Butler, R. (1991) 'Tourism, environment and sustainable development', *Environmental Conservation*, 18(3), p.201.
- Butler, R. (1998) 'Sustainable Tourism: a state-of-the-art review', *Tourism Geographies*, 1(1), p.7.
- Carroll, L. (1966) *Alice's adventures in wonderland and through the looking glass*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons. (Original work published 1865).
- Davis, M. (2009) *Consumers and sustainability: business practices*. Available at: <http://www.whatifinnovation.com/PDFs/Consumersandsustainabilitybusinesspractices.pdf> (Accessed 30th April, 2010).
- Dief, M.E. and Font, X. (2010) 'The determinants of hotels' marketing managers' green marketing behaviour', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(2), 9.157.
- Dubois, B., Czellar, S. and Laurent, G. (2005) 'Consumer segments based on attitudes towards luxury: empirical evidence from twenty countries', *Marketing Letters*, 16 (2) p.15.
- Dumoulin, D. (2007) 'What is today's definition of luxury?', *Admap*, March, p.27

- Hardy, A., Beeton, R. and Pearson, L. (2002) 'Sustainable Tourism: and overview of the concept and its position in relation to conceptualisations of tourism', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 10(6), p.475.
- Hilton, M (2009) 'The Legacy of Luxury: Moralities of Consumption Since the 18<sup>th</sup> Century', *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 4 , p.101.
- Hirschmann, E.C. and Holbrook, M.B. (1982) 'Hedonic Consumption: Emerging Concepts, Methods and Propositions', *Journal of Marketing*, 46, p.92.
- Holden, A. (2000) *Environment and Tourism* London: Routledge
- Holden, A. (2009) 'The Environment-Tourism Nexus: Influence of Market Ethics', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(3), p.373.
- Husic, M. and Cicic, M. (2009) 'Luxury consumption factors', *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 13(2), p.231.
- Kemp, S. (1998) 'Perceiving luxury and necessity', *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 19, p.591.
- Kiessling, G., Balekjian, C. and Oehmichen, A, 'What credit crunch? More luxury for new money: Europa rising stars and established markets', *Journal of Retail and Leisure Property*, 8(1), p.22.
- Lee, S. And Park, S. (2009) 'Do socially responsible activities help hotels and casinos achieve their financial goals?', *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28, p. 105.
- Maresco, P.A. and Lyons, B. (20025) 'Achieving Growth in the Luxury Market', *Strategic Finance* May, p.47.
- Maslow, A.H. (1987) *Motivation and Personality* New York: Harper and Row.
- Nueno, J.L. and Quelch, J.A. (1998), 'The mass marketing of luxury', *Business Horizons*, Vol. 41 (6), p. 61-8.
- Pfarr, C. (2001) 'Concepts of Sustainable Development, Sustainable Tourism and Ecotourism: Definitions, Principles, and Linkages' , *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 1(1), p.68.
- Phau, I. and Pendergast, G. (2000) 'Consuming luxury brands: The relevance of the 'Rarity Principle', *Brand Management*, 8(2), p.122.
- Rodriguez, F.J.G. and Cruz, Y. (2007) 'Relation between social-environmental responsibility and performance in hotel firms', *Hospitality Management*, 26, p. 824.
- Sharpley, R. and Telfer, D.J. (2002) *Tourism and Development: Concepts and Issues*

Clevedon: Channel View Publications.

- Sheber, A. (2009) 'Luxury, Sustainability can Co-Exist', *HOTELS*, July, p.24.
- Shipman, A. (2004) 'Lauding the Leisure Class: Symbolic Content and Conspicuous Consumption', *Review of Social Economy*, LXII (3), p.277.
- Silverstein, M. J. and Fiske, N. (2003) 'Luxury for the Masses;', *Harvard Business Review*, April, p.47.
- Thomas, D. (2007) *Deluxe: how luxury lost its lustre*, London: Penguin Books.
- Truong, Y., Simmons, G., McColl, R., and Kitchen, P.J. 'Status and Conspicuousness- Are They Related? Strategic Marketing Implications for Luxury Brands' *Journal of Strategic Marketing* 16(3) p.189.
- Van Bergen, B. and Davis, M. (2008) 'Brands and Sustainability: Changing the environment', *KPMG Sustainable Insight*, July 2008, p.1.
- Veblen, T. (1994) *Theory of the Leisure Class* New York: Penguin Books. (Original work published 1899).
- Vickers, J.S. and Renand, F. (2003) 'The marketing of luxury goods: An exploratory study – three conceptual dimensions', *The Marketing Review*, 3, p.22.
- Vigneron, F. and Johnson, L.W. (2004) 'Measuring perceptions of brand luxury', *Journal of Brand Management*, 11(6), p.24.
- WCED, (1987) *Our Common Future* Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Wiedmann, K.P., Hennigs, N. and Siebels, A. (2007) 'Measuring consumers' luxury value perceptions: A cross-cultural framework', *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 2007(7), p.1.