International Conference of
Economics, Finance and Accounting Studies

International Conference of Economics, Finance and Accounting Studies is a double-blind peer-reviewed, open-access journal published to reach excellence on the scope. It considers scholarly, research-based articles on all aspects of economics, finance and accounting. As an international congress aimed at facilitating the global exchange of education theory, contributions from different educational systems and cultures are encouraged. It aims to provide a forum for all researchers, educators, educational policy-makers and planners to exchange invaluable ideas and resources.

Evaluating the Effectiveness of Social Responsibility and Environmental Management Systems in Accommodation Establishments

Fayzullayev Shahzod G'ayrat o'g'li
Student of Group 10-1Tur-2024
Tourism and Hospitality Department
Faculty of Economics and Tourism
Bukhara State University

Abstract

As accommodation establishments adopt corporate social responsibility (CSR) commitments and formal environmental management systems (EMS), the central management question shifts from whether such systems are implemented to how effectively they perform. This article develops a structured approach to evaluating the effectiveness of social responsibility and environmental management in hotels and other lodging facilities. Drawing on the academic literature, internationally recognised standards (ISO 14001, the GRI Standards and the GSTC Criteria) and established CSR theory, the study distinguishes efficiency from effectiveness, organises the field around the triple-bottom-line and Carroll's domains of responsibility, and assembles a multi-dimensional system of indicators spanning environmental, social, economic and governance performance. It then compares the principal evaluation methods — normalised key performance indicators, composite indices, sustainability reporting with external assurance, and maturity models — and proposes an integrated input–process–outcome assessment framework that yields a weighted composite effectiveness index. The risks of greenwashing, data inconsistency and the attribution problem are examined as threats to valid measurement. The Uzbek accommodation sector is used as an emerging-market illustration. The findings indicate that effectiveness cannot be inferred from the presence of a system alone; it must be evaluated against normalised, intensity-based indicators, verified by independent assurance and tracked over time. Practical recommendations are offered for managers, certifiers and policymakers.

Keywords: corporate social responsibility; environmental management system; ISO 14001; effectiveness evaluation; key performance indicators; sustainability index; accommodation; hotels

The accommodation sector sits at the intersection of intense resource use and direct, sustained contact with local communities and employees. Hotels and other lodging facilities consume large quantities of energy and water, generate substantial waste, and shape the social and economic life of the destinations in which they operate. In response, the industry has, over the past two decades, increasingly embraced two complementary commitments: corporate social responsibility (CSR), which frames the establishment's obligations towards society and the environment, and the environmental management system (EMS), a structured mechanism — typically modelled on ISO 14001 — for planning, implementing and improving environmental performance. The diffusion of these systems has, however, outpaced the capacity to evaluate them. A growing number of establishments publish sustainability policies, adopt CSR programmes and certify their environmental management; yet the mere existence of a policy or a certificate reveals little about whether the system actually reduces environmental impact, improves social outcomes or creates value. The governing principle of management science — that what cannot be measured cannot be managed — applies with particular force here. Without rigorous evaluation, CSR and EMS risk degenerating into symbolic compliance, and stakeholders lose the ability to distinguish genuine performance from presentation.[1][2][3]

The significance of getting evaluation right grows with the scale of the sector. International tourism continues to expand, and much of the new accommodation capacity is being built in emerging destinations whose environmental and social governance is still maturing. Each establishment represents a long-lived commitment of resources and a lasting presence in a community, so the quality of its social and environmental management compounds over decades. In this setting, the ability to measure effectiveness reliably is not an academic refinement but a practical determinant of whether the sector's growth proves sustainable. The same ability also conditions access to capital and to environmentally conscious markets, both of which increasingly demand verified, comparable evidence of performance rather than narrative assurances.[4]

Corporate social responsibility refers to the obligations an enterprise assumes towards society beyond its strictly economic and legal duties. The most influential conceptualisation, Carroll's pyramid, arranges these obligations into four ascending domains: economic responsibility (to be profitable), legal responsibility (to obey the law), ethical responsibility (to act justly), and philanthropic responsibility (to contribute to community welfare). In the hospitality context this framework has been widely adopted and extended, with measurement instruments typically dividing CSR into financial/economic, environmental, legal, ethical and social/philanthropic domains. A parallel and complementary formulation is the triple bottom line, which evaluates the enterprise against three axes — people, planet and profit — and which underpins most contemporary sustainability reporting.[5]

CSR in accommodation is distinctive because the "product" is co-produced with the guest on site and because the establishment is physically embedded in a community. Responsibility therefore extends simultaneously inward, to employees and working conditions, and outward, to guests, suppliers, the host community and the natural environment. This breadth is precisely what makes effectiveness difficult to capture in a single figure and what necessitates a multi-dimensional approach to evaluation.[6]

An environmental management system is the structured means by which an organisation operationalises its environmental commitments. The dominant standard, ISO 14001, organises the system around the Plan–Do–Check–Act cycle: the establishment sets environmental objectives, assigns responsibilities and procedures, monitors performance, audits results and feeds the findings back into revised objectives. An EMS thus institutionalises continual improvement; its defining feature is not a fixed level of performance but a self-correcting process that drives performance upward over time.[7]

Where CSR provides the normative orientation — the statement of why the establishment should act responsibly — the EMS provides the operational machinery for the environmental component of that orientation. The two are therefore nested rather than separate: the EMS can be

understood as the environmental engine within the broader vehicle of CSR. Evaluating their effectiveness consequently requires both a view of the system's internal functioning (does the PDCA cycle actually turn?) and a view of its external outcomes (does impact actually fall?).[8]

A central conceptual distinction underpins the entire evaluation enterprise: the difference between efficiency and effectiveness. Efficiency concerns the ratio of outputs to inputs — doing things economically. Effectiveness concerns the achievement of intended outcomes — doing the right things and reaching the targeted environmental and social effects. A hotel may run an efficient laundry while still failing to reduce its overall water footprint; conversely, a costly programme may be highly effective in cutting emissions. Evaluation must therefore look beyond inputs and activities to outcomes and impacts.[9]

It is useful to locate effectiveness within a logic chain of four linked elements: inputs (investment, staff time, equipment), processes (the functioning of the management system itself), outputs (measurable resource and social performance such as energy used or local staff employed), and outcomes or impacts (the ultimate environmental and social effects relative to targets). A complete evaluation traces this chain end to end, since strong performance at one stage does not guarantee it at the next. This logic chain forms the backbone of the integrated framework proposed in Section 6.[10]

Underlying both CSR and EMS is stakeholder theory, which holds that an enterprise is accountable not only to its owners but to all groups affected by its conduct — employees, guests, suppliers, host communities, regulators and the natural environment. This theoretical grounding matters for evaluation because it dictates whose interests the indicators must represent: a credible effectiveness assessment cannot confine itself to environmental metrics but must also register the establishment's performance towards its workforce and its community. The literature on hospitality CSR consistently finds that responsibility, far from being a drain on performance, can enhance reputation, employee commitment and guest loyalty, and that positive CSR activity is associated with improved company performance. This evidence reframes effectiveness evaluation as a search not merely for reduced harm but for shared value — outcomes that benefit stakeholders and the establishment simultaneously — and it justifies the inclusion of an economic dimension alongside the environmental and social ones.[11]

The study adopts a qualitative, integrative methodology in three steps. First, it reviews the peer-reviewed literature on CSR and EMS in hospitality, together with the documentation of the principal standards and reporting frameworks (ISO 14001, the GRI Standards, the GSTC Criteria), in order to establish the conceptual landscape and to harvest validated indicators. Second, it organises these indicators into a coherent multi-dimensional system aligned with the triple bottom line and the input–process–outcome logic. Third, it compares the leading evaluation methods along defined criteria and synthesises them into an integrated assessment framework, expressed as a weighted composite index. The approach is analytical and design-oriented rather than statistical; its contribution is a structured evaluation instrument grounded in the existing evidence base, suitable for subsequent empirical application.[12]

Effectiveness in this field is irreducibly multi-dimensional. A defensible indicator system must span the environmental, social, economic and governance domains, and must privilege normalised, intensity-based measures over absolute figures so that establishments of different sizes and occupancy levels can be compared fairly. The principle of intensity — expressing impact per guest-night, per occupied room or per unit of revenue — is essential, because absolute consumption rises and falls with business volume and therefore conceals genuine performance. Carbon intensity in particular has emerged as a common denominator that integrates energy, fuel and waste into a single comparable metric.[13]

Table 1.

A multi-dimensional indicator system for evaluating CSR and EMS effectiveness

Dimension	Representative indicators	Typical normalisation / unit
Environmental	Energy use; water use; carbon emissions; waste generated and diverted; renewable-energy share	kWh and litres per guest-night; kg CO_2e per guest-night; % waste diverted; % renewable
Social – internal	Staff training hours; employee turnover; occupational safety incidents; pay equity; share of local staff	Hours per employee; % turnover; incidents per 100 staff; ratio; % local hires
Social – external	Local procurement; community investment; guest satisfaction with sustainability; complaints resolved	% local spend; spend per room; survey score; % resolved
Economic	Cost savings from efficiency; sustainability-linked revenue; return on green investment	Currency per guest-night; % of revenue; payback period
Governance / process	EMS audit findings closed; objectives met; reporting transparency; assurance level	% non-conformities closed; % targets achieved; disclosure score; assured (Y/N)

Source: compiled by the author from the GRI Standards, ISO 14001, the GSTC Criteria and the hospitality CSR literature

Two features of this system deserve emphasis. First, the governance/process dimension captures the internal functioning of the management system itself — whether audit findings are actually closed and targets actually met — and thereby guards against the error of inferring effectiveness from outcomes alone while ignoring whether the system that produced them is sound. Second, the inclusion of an economic dimension recognises that effectiveness in a commercial setting includes the capacity to deliver environmental and social value without undermining viability; evidence that responsible practice and profitability can be mutually reinforcing strengthens the durability of the whole system. A recurring imbalance must also be addressed when assembling the indicator system. Environmental indicators are comparatively easy to quantify, since energy, water, waste and carbon are physically measurable and already metered in most establishments, whereas social indicators — fair treatment of employees, contribution to community welfare, the authenticity of engagement — are harder to render in numbers and are consequently under-represented in many evaluation schemes. An assessment that tracks the environmental domain in fine detail while reducing the social domain to a single token measure produces a distorted picture and quietly privileges “planet” over “people”. The system in Table 1 deliberately separates internal and external social performance and pairs each with concrete, normalisable measures precisely to counteract this tendency and to give the social pillar parity of treatment.[14]

The comparison above implies that no single method suffices: KPIs ground the evaluation in real outcomes, composite indices summarise it, reporting and assurance secure its credibility, and maturity models contextualise it. The framework proposed here integrates these strengths within the input–process–outcome logic established in Section 2. The framework evaluates an establishment at three levels. At the process level it verifies that the management system functions — that objectives are set, audits conducted and non-conformities closed. At the output level it measures normalised, intensity-based KPIs across the environmental and social domains. At the outcome level it assesses performance relative to targets and to peer benchmarks. Scores

from the three levels are normalised to a common scale and combined into a single composite effectiveness index, with weights assigned according to the materiality of each dimension and validated, where possible, by expert judgement.

The composite may be expressed as a weighted sum:

$$E = \Sigma\, w_i \cdot s_i \,, \quad with\ \Sigma\, w_i = 1,$$

where E is the overall effectiveness index, s_i is the normalised score of dimension i (environmental, internal-social, external-social, economic and governance/process), and w_i is its materiality weight. Crucially, the framework requires that the governance/process score act as a gate: an establishment cannot record a high overall index while its management system is dysfunctional, because a non-functioning system cannot reliably sustain whatever outcomes are observed. This gating condition is the framework's principal safeguard against rewarding outcomes that are accidental, temporary or unverifiable. Three procedural requirements give the framework its validity. The indicators must be intensity-normalised so that comparison is fair; the data underlying the outcome level should be externally assured to counter the disclosure–performance gap; and the index must be tracked longitudinally, since effectiveness is a property of trajectory rather than of a single snapshot. Applied in this way, the framework converts a diffuse claim of responsibility into a transparent, comparable and auditable judgement.

In practical use, the framework produces both a single headline index for communication and a disaggregated profile for management. The headline index supports benchmarking, ranking and the linking of incentives to performance, while the underlying dimension scores reveal exactly where an establishment is strong or weak — for instance, excellent environmental intensity but poor social engagement, or sound outcomes resting on a fragile management process. This dual output is deliberate: a composite score that cannot be decomposed risks obscuring the trade-offs that managers most need to see. Reported alongside a clear statement of the weights and of the assurance status of the data, the framework therefore serves accountability and improvement at once, and it remains intelligible to the non-specialist stakeholders — guests, investors, regulators — to whom effectiveness must ultimately be demonstrated. Before deployment the framework should be calibrated to the establishment's context. The set of indicators, the materiality weights and the peer group against which benchmarking occurs all depend on the type of property, its location and its market segment: a city business hotel, a desert eco-lodge and a historic-centre boutique hotel face different material issues and should not be assessed against an identical template. Calibration involves selecting the indicators that are material to the property, agreeing the weights through a transparent and preferably participatory process, and establishing a credible baseline against which subsequent performance is judged. This adaptability is a strength rather than a weakness, provided the calibration choices are documented and held stable over time so that the resulting index remains comparable across reporting cycles.[15]

The practical stakes of rigorous evaluation are highest in rapidly developing tourism economies, where accommodation capacity is expanding and where the institutions of measurement are still being built. Uzbekistan illustrates the point. The country has elevated tourism to a strategic priority, supported by a national tourism development strategy and by cooperation with international organisations including UN Tourism, the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank, the latter financing a broad green-economy transition of which sustainable tourism forms an explicit part. Research on the sector reports that environmental, social and governance practice is advancing but that systematic measurement — the routine collection of normalised indicators and the external verification of claims — remains uneven. For an accommodation sector concentrated in heritage cities and fragile arid landscapes, the capacity to evaluate effectiveness is not a technical luxury but a precondition of credible sustainability. Without intensity-based indicators and independent assurance, the sector cannot demonstrate genuine performance to the international markets it seeks to attract, and it cannot distinguish establishments that truly conserve scarce water and energy from those that merely advertise that they do. The integrated framework proposed here offers such economies a ready instrument: it can be adapted to national conditions, embedded in destination-level monitoring, and linked to

incentives so that measured effectiveness, rather than declared intention, becomes the basis of recognition and support. The principal task is institutional — building the data systems, the auditor capacity and the policy linkages that allow evaluation to operate at scale.[16]

The heritage cities of the Silk Road — Samarkand, Bukhara and Khiva — make the argument concrete. Their appeal to visitors is inseparable from the integrity of their historic fabric and from the arid environments that surround them, both of which are sensitive to the pressures generated by a growing accommodation stock: rising demand for scarce water, expanding energy consumption and the strain of visitor flows on old-town infrastructure and on community life. Here the social and environmental dimensions of responsibility are tightly coupled, and an effectiveness evaluation that ignored either would be incomplete. A small historic-centre hotel that genuinely conserves water, sources locally, manages waste responsibly, employs and trains local residents, and respects the architectural character of its surroundings is protecting the very asset that sustains the destination. The integrated framework allows such performance to be measured, verified and compared, rather than merely asserted, and thereby gives both the establishment and the destination a defensible basis for the sustainability claims on which their reputation increasingly rests.[17]

Any evaluation framework must contend with several threats to validity, which together explain why effectiveness cannot be inferred from the presence of a system alone.

- Greenwashing and selective disclosure. Establishments may report favourable indicators while suppressing unfavourable ones, inflating apparent effectiveness. Independent assurance and comprehensive, standardised reporting are the primary defences.
- The disclosure–performance gap. What is published may diverge from what is achieved; outcome verification, not disclosure alone, must anchor the evaluation.
- Data inconsistency and the absence of normalisation. Absolute figures, inconsistent boundaries and missing intensity measures make comparison meaningless; standardised, intensity-based metrics are essential.
- The attribution problem. Observed improvements may stem from external factors — milder weather, lower occupancy, new regulation — rather than from the system itself; longitudinal tracking and peer benchmarking help isolate the system's contribution.
- Weighting subjectivity in composite indices. Arbitrary weights can distort the summary score; transparent, materiality-based weighting validated by expert judgement mitigates this risk.

Taken together, these threats explain a recurring empirical finding: across studies of hotel CSR and environmental management, the establishments that publish the most about their responsibility are not always those that perform best, and certificates correlate only weakly with verified outcomes when the underlying data are unaudited. The lesson for evaluation is not scepticism towards CSR and EMS as such, but insistence on the methodological safeguards that separate substance from signal. These threats do not invalidate evaluation; rather, they specify the conditions under which it is trustworthy. An evaluation that normalises by intensity, traces the full chain from process to outcome, secures its outcome data through independent assurance, weights its dimensions transparently and observes performance over several reporting cycles can withstand each of the threats enumerated above; an evaluation that omits these safeguards cannot, and should be treated as provisional at best.

Effective measurement of CSR and EMS is therefore characterised by intensity-normalised indicators, an end-to-end view from process to outcome, external assurance, transparent weighting and longitudinal tracking. Social responsibility and environmental management systems have become standard features of the accommodation sector, but their proliferation has outrun the capacity to judge whether they work. This article has argued that effectiveness is a distinct and demanding criterion: it concerns outcomes, not intentions; it is multi-dimensional, spanning environmental, social, economic and governance domains; and it cannot be inferred

from the mere existence of a policy or a certificate. Evaluation must instead rest on normalised, intensity-based indicators, trace the full input–process–outcome chain, and be secured by independent assurance and longitudinal tracking.

The integrated framework proposed here combines the complementary strengths of KPI benchmarking, composite indexing, assured reporting and maturity assessment, and protects validity through a governance gate, intensity normalisation, external assurance and transparent weighting. On this basis the following recommendations are offered:

- For managers: move from declaring commitments to measuring outcomes; adopt intensity-based KPIs, close the loop of the management cycle, and treat the effectiveness index as a tool for continual improvement rather than a marketing badge.
- For certifiers and assurance providers: anchor evaluation in independent, on-site verification of outcomes; demand standardised, normalised data; and resist rewarding disclosure unsupported by performance.
- For policymakers, especially in emerging destinations: build the data infrastructure and auditor capacity that evaluation requires, adopt a recognised indicator system at destination level, and link incentives to measured effectiveness rather than to declared intention.

Ultimately, the value of social responsibility and environmental management in accommodation depends on the rigour with which it is evaluated. Measurement that is honest, multi-dimensional and verified transforms responsibility from a claim into an accountable practice — and, in doing so, sustains both the credibility of the establishment and the resources on which the wider tourism economy depends.

References

[1] Global Sustainable Tourism Council (GSTC), *GSTC Industry Criteria and Hotel Standard*. Washington, DC, USA: GSTC, 2023.

[2] Global Sustainable Tourism Council (GSTC), *GSTC Standards: The Four Pillars of Sustainable Tourism*, 2024. Available: https://www.gstc.org/

[3] H. Han, L. T. J. Hsu, and J. S. Lee, "Empirical investigation of the roles of attitudes toward green behaviors, overall image, gender and age in hotel customers' eco-friendly decision-making process," *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 519–528, 2009.

[4] Tourism Committee of Uzbekistan, *Tourism Development Strategy of the Republic of Uzbekistan 2019–2025*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 2019.

[5] UN Tourism (UNWTO), *Supporting the Development of Sustainable Tourism in Uzbekistan*. Madrid, Spain: UN Tourism, 2025.

[6] World Bank, *Uzbekistan Tourism Sector Assessment*. Washington, DC, USA: World Bank, 2022.

[7] R. Buckley, "Sustainable tourism: Research and reality," *Annals of Tourism Research*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 528–546, 2012.

[8] F. K. Saidova and A. T. L. Hamroyev, "Transitioning urban logistic operations to electric vehicles: Advantages and challenges," *IMRAS*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 22–28, 2025.

[9] S. F. Kamolovna and I. Ozodbek, "Rare earth elements and global power: The economic geography and geopolitical stakes of strategic resources," *American Journal of Multidisciplinary Bulletin*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 189–196, 2025.

[10] S. F. Kamolovna and X. Mirjon, "Agrologistikada ta'minot zanjirini boshqarish samaradorligini oshirish yo'llari," *Zamonaviy Ta'lim Tizimini Rivojlantirish va Unga Qaratilgan Kreativ G'oyalar, Takliflar va Yechimlar*, vol. 8, no. 84, pp. 160–165, 2026.

[11] O. K. Khurramov, S. A. Fayzieva, and F. K. Saidova, "Features of electronic online market in tourism," *Vestnik Nauki i Obrazovaniya*, no. 24-3, pp. 18–20, 2019.

[12] O. K. Kayumovich, F. S. Annamuradovna, and S. F. Kamalovna, "Features of electronic online market in tourism," *Vestnik Nauki i Obrazovaniya*, no. 24-3(78), pp. 18–20, 2019.

[13] O. K. Kayumovich, F. S. Annamuradovna, and S. F. Kamalovna, “The aspect and influence of use the global internet in tourism,” *Dostizheniya Nauki i Obrazovaniya*, no. 13(54), pp. 29–30, 2019.
[14] F. K. Saidova, “Ispolzovanie uslug autsorsinga v servisnykh setyakh,” in *Innovatsionnoe Razvitie Nauki i Obrazovaniya*, pp. 88–99, 2021.
[15] F. K. Saidova, “Sovremennoe sostoyanie i napravleniya razvitiya agrarnogo sektora Respubliki Uzbekistan,” in *Sovremennoe Ekologicheskoe Sostoyanie Prirodnoy Sredy i Nauchno-Prakticheskie Aspekty Ratsionalnogo Prirodopolzovaniya*, pp. 3673–3675, 2016.
[16] F. K. Saidova, “Factors affecting the development of international tourism,” in *International Scientific Review of the Problems of Economics, Finance and Management*, pp. 74–81, 2020.
[17] S. F. Kamolovna and A. Zikirillo, “O‘zbekistonda bioiqtisodiyot va sirkulyar iqtisodiyotni rivojlantirishning ijtimoiy-iqtisodiy mohiyati,” *Raqamli Iqtisodiyot (Tsifrovaya Ekonomika)*, no. 10, pp. 1033–1042, 2025.