
THE EFFECT OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY PRACTICES ON THE EGYPTIAN HOTELS' PERFORMANCE

MUSTAFA MAHMOUD MOHAMED

RESEARCHER, FACULTY OF TOURISM AND HOTELS, LUXOR UNIVERSITY, EGYPT

SABREEN GABER ABD EL-JALIL

FACULTY OF TOURISM AND HOTELS, LUXOR UNIVERSITY, EGYPT

AHMED RADY

FACULTY OF TOURISM AND HOTELS, MINIA UNIVERSITY, EGYPT

ABSTRACT

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) can be defined as context-specific organizational actions and policies that consider stakeholders' expectations and the triple bottom line of economic, social, and environmental performance. Therefore, this research will focus on exploring the effect of social responsibility practices on the Egyptian hotels' performance. A five-point Likert scale was used to test the attitude of the participators toward research variables. Participators shared in this survey are hotel managers in the governorates of Luxor and Aswan (38 managers). The research found that hotels in Luxor and Aswan exploit renewable energy in a productive process compatible with the environment; hotels in Luxor and Aswan reduce their consumption of natural resources and communicate with their customers about their environmental practices. The research also recommended to rely on renewable energy that are not harmful to the environment and society and to reduce hotel consumption of green resources.

KEYWORDS: Social responsibility, Egyptian hotels, performance, Luxor, Aswan.

INTRODUCTION

From a theoretical perspective, the stakeholder theory sets the framework for the CSR-performance relationship; interest groups claim company resources and, in so doing implicitly require proper company behavior, such as consideration for the environment and concern for fair and just labor relations. Failure of a company to act socially responsible way will probably entail significant costs and a financial burden which is bound to reduce profits, making the company less socially aware. On the contrary, if

companies that adopt socially responsible policies turn out to be more profitable, then socially responsible investments will provide an incentive for companies to increase investments in CSR programs (Úbeda-García et al., 2021). In recent decades, however, social responsibility has come to be acknowledged as particularly relevant in relation to corporate behavior, that is, in relation to the way in which businesses and managers behave and conduct themselves in societal relationships, and the extent to which these actors commit themselves to socially oriented initiatives aimed at improving the quality of life in and overall well-being of society. Ideally, for a business to be regarded as socially responsible, it should acknowledge responsibility for its impact on the environment, consumers, employees, communities, stakeholders, and all other members that make up the public sphere (Dyer, 2018).the research aims to identify the impact of social responsibility on hotel performance and measuring the impact of demographic factors on research aspects(Economic- environmental-social).

LITERATURE REVIEW

BUSINESS AND SOCIETY

Business and society are correlated with each other. As business fulfills the needs of society and society gives business the resources required to it. The different businesses operating in society play our important role in functioning of society in different ways like business provide employment to various people of society (Carroll& Buchholt, 2014). The basic objective of business enterprise is to develop, produce and supply goods and service to customer, this need to be done in such a way which allowed companies to make profit, that in turn demands far more than just skills in companies on fields and processes (Bapuji et al., 2020). The social skills of owners of companies, together with maintaining relationship with customers, suppliers, and businesspeople, are always important if companies want to be run well and developed with view to future (González-Rodríguez et al., 2019).

CONCEPT OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

The evolution of the concept of social responsibility of business has passed through different stages of struggle. Business began merely as an institution for the purpose of making money, as long as a man-made money and kept out of jail, he was considered successful (Chakraborty & Jha, 2019). He felt no particular obligation and acknowledged no responsibility to the public. As an owner of his business, he thought that he had a perfect right to do with it what he pleased. Social norms and attitudes had very little influence on the practice of business (Montag et al., 2021).

IMPORTANCE AND BENEFITS OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

The importance of social responsibility has been increasing, making it a must for companies to have social responsibility activities to sustain their business. Social responsibility can be of strategic importance as well, a company can use CSR as a strategy to build brand image and raise its profile in the customers' mind. To do this effectively, the activity done should work closely with the company's core competencies and core values. Environmental policies are also included as part of the CSR activity as well (Apaydin et al., 2020). This means that these firms contribute in saving and preserving the environment by performing green operations in their firms. Another importance of CSR will be its relationship with customers, there are positive relationships between a firm's CSR actions and the consumers' attitudes towards the particular company and its products, CSR activities can bring numerous benefits to the firms (Brin et al., 2020). These benefits can go beyond the reputation-building stage where the CSR activities can allow the development of valuable organizational capabilities in the firms. Firstly, CSR created the benefit by increasing customers' identification relationship with the corporation, which is also known as customer-corporate (C-C) identification, C-C identification is a degree of overlapping in a consumer's self-concept and his perception of the company. Cause-related efforts can also be another CSR effort that can allow firms to make profits, while doing well to the society (Sroka & Szántó, 2018). This can be achieved by creating cause-related projects frequently, which will then build long term customer relationships such as customer loyalty, brand equity and trust from the customers (Fallah Shayan et al., 2022).

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND PERFORMANCE

the growth in socially responsible investments and in CSR awareness among the public may lead to successful firms proactively balancing short-term financial goals with long term sustainable corporate brand building. In addition to shedding light on the association between CSR and firm performance, where many studies controlled for three variables (firm size, industry sector and firm age), which have a significant impact on the effects of market orientation and CSR on business performance (Goffi et al., 2021). Many researchers provide evidence that stakeholders expect more social initiatives from large corporations than from small ones. For example, large multinationals and publicly traded companies are pressured to demonstrate commitment to CSR. Additionally, larger firms recognize the need to be leaders in their commitment to corporate social performance (Kong et al., 2020). The leadership role may be due not only to the firm's access to additional resources used to implement corporate social

performance programs, but also to the increased influence of additional stakeholders (environmental groups, government regulations) rather than a primary focus on shareholders. Furthermore, small firms are less able than their large counterparts to adopt CSR principles and communicate their CSR activities to external stakeholders (Hammam, 2020).

TYPES OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

There are several types of social responsibility programs; (Drobayzko et al., 2020):

1. **EMPLOYEE HEALTH AND WELLNESS:** Organizations must be socially responsible to their employees. The employees are an organization's greatest assets. Since the longevity of employees is influenced by the lifestyle choices they make, organizations must offer tools and incentives that encourage employees to adopt or maintain healthy lifestyles. There is also the need to offer a variety of benefits aimed at protecting employees' physical and emotional health (McDonald et al., 2020).
2. **ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY:** Corporate social responsibility also covers commitment to protect and even improve the environment for the benefit of current and future generations. Environmental protection and preservation make sound business sense. It not only enriches the lives of our employees, our clients, and their loved ones, it can also reduce our expenses and improve our bottom line. Through actions such as, but not limited to, using energy-efficient properties, reducing our reliance on paper, and investing in alternative energy and clean air technology. Environmental responsibility covers precautionary approaches to prevent or minimize adverse impacts, support for initiatives, promoting greater environmental responsibility, developing, and diffusing environmentally friendly technologies, and similar areas (Asemah et al., 2013).

Environmental responsibility refers to the belief that organizations should behave in as environmentally friendly a way as possible. It's one of the most common forms of corporate social responsibility. Some companies use the term "environmental stewardship" to refer to such initiatives. Companies that seek to embrace environmental responsibility can do so in several ways:

- Reducing pollution, greenhouse gas emissions, the use of single-use plastics, water consumption, and general waste
- Increasing reliance on renewable energy, sustainable resources, and recycled or partially recycled materials.
- Offsetting negative environmental impact; for example, by planting trees, funding research, and donating to related causes

3. **ETHICAL RESPONSIBILITIES:** Ethical responsibilities are responsibilities that a company puts on itself because its owners believe it is the right thing to do; not because they have an obligation to do so. Ethical responsibilities could include being environmentally friendly, paying fair wages or refusing to do business with oppressive countries, for example (Smith, 2013). Ethical CSR entails incorporating responsible practices that minimize the societal harms of business operations (Asemah et al, 2013) agreed with (Belu and Manescu, 2013). There are many ways organizations to implement ethical business practices; these include minimizing environmental pollution in manufacturing facilities and providing healthcare benefits to employees.
4. **LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES:** A company's legal responsibilities are the requirements that are placed on it by the law. Next to ensuring that an organization is profitable, ensuring that it obeys all laws is the most important responsibility according to the theory of corporate social responsibility. Legal responsibilities can range from securities regulations to labor law, environmental law, and even criminal law (Asemah, et al, 2013).
5. **PHILANTHROPIC RESPONSIBILITIES:** Philanthropic responsibilities are responsibilities that go above and beyond what is simply required or what the company believes is right. They involve trying to benefit society; for example, by donating services to host communities, engaging in projects to aid the environment, or donating money to charitable causes. Philanthropic corporate social responsibility involves giving funds, goods, or services, sometimes serving as advertising. For example, the local branch of a bank might donate money to fund uniforms for a school sport team, or a health care company might donate to the city opera. Philanthropic CSR describes a company's support for a cause or activity that occurs outside of their business operations, but provides benefit to society (Asemah, et al, 2013).
6. **ECONOMIC RESPONSIBILITIES:** An organization's first responsibility is its economic responsibility; that is to say, an organization needs to be primarily concerned with turning a profit. This is because if a company does not make money, it will not last, employees will lose jobs, and the company will not even be able to think about taking care of its social responsibilities. Before a company thinks about being a good corporate citizen, it first needs to make sure that it can be profitable. This implies that economic responsibility covers areas like integrity, corporate governance, economic development of the community, transparency, prevention of bribery and corruption, payments to national and local authorities, use of local suppliers, hiring local labor and similar areas (Asemah, et al, 2013).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study population consisted of managers of four- and five-star hotels in Luxor and Aswan, a comprehensive survey of the study population was carried out. The study sample consisted of 38 hotel managers.

The manager's questionnaire form included a set of questions related to the subject of the study and they constituted:

1. Personal information.
2. Environmental Practices
3. Social Practices
4. Economic Practices
5. Hotel performance.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

H₁: There were statistically significant differences between the demographic data of the sample (age categories, hotel departments, levels of education, sex and the regions) with regard to environmental practices.

H₂: There were statistically significant differences between the demographic data of the sample (age categories, hotel departments, levels of education, sex and the regions) with regard to social practices.

H₃: There were statistically significant differences between the demographic data of the sample (age categories, hotel departments, levels of education, sex and the regions) with regard to economic practices.

H₄: There were statistically significant differences between the demographic data of the sample (age categories, hotel departments, levels of education, sex and the regions) with regard to hotel performance.

H₅: There is a statistically significant effect of social responsibility on the hotel performance.

RESULTS

RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY

Reliability is the used measuring instrument stability and its consistency. Cronbach's α reliability coefficient greater than 0.6 was acceptable (Gliem and Gliem 2003), the reliability of current research variables was tested by Cronbach's alpha coefficient; the four variables were acceptable. The Overall Cronbach's Alpha exceeded 0.6 for the 26 variables; this means that all variables were acceptable and reliable (see table 1).

RELIABILITY

Table (1): Manager's Questionnaire Reliability Analysis of the Study Variables

The Axes	No. of statements	Alpha Coefficient
Environmental practices	6	0.73
Social practices	9	0.757
Economic practices	7	0.97
Hotel performance	4	0.61
The Overall Cronbach's Alpha	26	0.607

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Table (2): The Sample Characteristics Statistics

Variable	Response	Frequency	Percent	Rank
Gender	Male	25	65.8	1
	Female	13	34.2	2
	Total	38	100.0	-
Region	Luxor	22	57.9	1
	Aswan	16	42.1	2
	Total	38	100	
Age	From 20 to 35 years	5	13.1	3
	More than 35 to 45 years	18	47.4	1
	More than 45 years	15	39.5	2
	Total	38	100.0	-
Categories of participants	general manager	10	26.3	1
	front office manager	10	26.3	1
	human resources manager	9	23.6	2
	food and beverage manager	9	23.6	2
	Total	38	100.0	-
Level of education	Less than secondary school	0	0	4
	Secondary or technical education	0	0	4
	intermediate qualification	1	2.6	3

	University education or high institute	25	65.8	1
	Postgraduate studies	12	31.6	2
	Total	38	100.0	-

According to Sector, the results in Table (2) showed that the percent of male (65.8%) was more than female (34.2%). According to the region, 56.42% of the sample respondents were in Luxor city and 43.58% of them were at Aswan. According to most of the respondents belong to More than 35 to 45 years (47.4%), followed by more than 45 years (39.5%) and from 20 to 35 years (13.1%). According to the Categories of participants, most of the respondents were general managers (26.3%) and front office (26.3%). followed by human resources (23.6%), and food and beverage (23.6%). According to respondents' Level of education, most of the respondents had University education or high institute (65.8%), followed by Postgraduate studies (31.6%), followed by intermediate qualification (23.2%), and followed by intermediate qualification (2.6%).

ENVIRONMENTAL PRACTICES

Table (3): Factor Analysis of the environmental practices

Environmental Practices	Loading
The hotel under study protects the environment.	.625
The hotel under study reduces its consumption of natural resources.	.827
The hotel gives importance to recycles.	.622
The hotel under study communicates to their customer about their environmental practices.	.689
The hotel under study under study exploits renewable energy in a productive process compatible with the environment.	.783
The hotel under study has a high environmental awareness level	.797
Sums of Squared Loadings	.922

The factor analysis shown in Table (3) stated that all the statements (6 statements) were responsible for the Environmental Practices with a percentage of (92.2%).

Table (4): the environmental practices

Environmental practices	Response	Freq.	%	Mean	SD	Sig.	Rank
Hotels under study in luxor and Aswan	Strongly Disagree	0	0	4.60	.495	.000	2

protect the environment.	Disagree	0	0				
	Neutral	0	0				
	Agree	15	39.5				
	Strongly Agree	23	60.5				
	Total	38	100.0				
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan reduce its consumption of natural resources.	Strongly Disagree	0	0	4.60	.495	.000	2
	Disagree	0	0				
	Neutral	0	0				
	Agree	15	39.5				
	Strongly Agree	23	60.5				
	Total	38	100.0				
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan give importance to recycles.	Strongly Disagree	0	0	4.44	.601	.000	4
	Disagree	0	0				
	Neutral	2	5.3				
	Agree	17	44.7				
	Strongly Agree	19	50.0				
	Total	38	100.0				
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan communicate to their customer about their environmental practices.	Strongly Disagree	0	0	4.52	.506	.000	3
	Disagree	0	0				
	Neutral	0	0				
	Agree	18	47.4				
	Strongly Agree	20	52.6				
	Total	38	100.0				
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan exploit renewable energy in a productive process compatible with the environment.	Strongly Disagree	0	0	4.73	.446	.000	1
	Disagree	0	0				
	Neutral	0	0				
	Agree	10	26.3				
	Strongly Agree	28	73.7				
	Total	38	100.0				
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan have a high environmental	Strongly Disagree	0	0	4.26	.601	.010	5
	Disagree	0	0				
	Neutral	3	7.9				

awareness level	Agree	22	57.9				
	Strongly Agree	13	34.2				
	Total	38	100.0				
Overall				4.53	.193		-

Table(4) viewed that with respect to “environmental practices”, the first variable was “Hotels in Luxor and Aswan exploit renewable energy in a productive process compatible with the environment”, where the mean value was (4.73) and the standard deviation was (0.446). On the other hand, the least variable was “Hotels in Luxor and Aswan have a high environmental awareness level”, where the mean value was (4.26) and the standard deviation was (.601). The overall mean of the variables was (4.53), the standard deviation of means values was (.193).

Table (5): Factor Analysis of the social practices

Social Practices	Loading
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan are committed to improving the welfare of the communities in which it operates	.727
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan actively participate in social and cultural events (music, sports, etc.).	.758
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan play a role in society that goes beyond mere profit generation	.547
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan provide a fair treatment of employees (without discrimination and abuse, regardless of gender, race, origin, or religion)	.689
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan provide training and promotion opportunities for employees	.633
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan provide training and promotion opportunities for employees	.780
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan work in partnership with non-governmental organizations in the region By authors	.674
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan work in partnership with non-governmental organizations in the region By authors	.598
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan contribute to the protection of the local culture	.872
Sums of Squared Loadings	.991

The factor analysis shown in Table (5) stated that all the statements (9 statements) were responsible for the social practices with a percentage of(91.1%).

Table (6): the social practices

Social Practices	Response	Freq.	%	Mean*	SD	Sig.	Rank
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan are committed to improving the welfare of the communities in which it operates	Strongly Disagree	0	0	4.39	.638	.001	3
	Disagree	0	0				
	Neutral	3	7.9				
	Agree	17	44.7				
	Strongly Agree	18	47.4				
	Total	38	100.0				
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan actively participate in social and cultural events (music, sports, etc.).	Strongly Disagree	0	0	4.23	.786	.071	5
	Disagree	0	0				
	Neutral	8	21.1				
	Agree	13	34.2				
	Strongly Agree	17	44.7				
	Total	38	100.0				
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan play a role in society that goes beyond mere profit generation	Strongly Disagree	0	0	4.00	.697	1.00	6
	Disagree	1	2.6				
	Neutral	6	15.8				
	Agree	23	60.5				
	Strongly Agree	8	21.1				
	Total	38	100.0				
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan provide a fair treatment of employees (without discrimination and abuse, regardless of gender, race, origin, or religion)	Strongly Disagree	0	0	3.92	.881	.584	7
	Disagree	0	0				
	Neutral	16	42.1				
	Agree	9	23.7				
	Strongly Agree	13	34.2				
	Total	38	100.0				
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan provide training and promotion opportunities for employees	Strongly Disagree	0	0	3.92	.673	.474	7
	Disagree	0	0				
	Neutral	10	26.3				
	Agree	21	55.3				
	Strongly Agree	7	18.4				
	Total	38	100.0				
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan provide training and promotion opportunities for	Strongly Disagree	0	0	4.34	.745	.007	4
	Disagree	0	0				
	Neutral	6	15.8				
	Agree	13	34.2				

employees	Strongly Agree	19	50.0				
	Total	38	100.0				
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan work in partnership with non-governmental organizations in the region By authors	Strongly Disagree	00	0	4.68	.525	.000	1
	Disagree	0	0				
	Neutral	1	2.6				
	Agree	10	26.3				
	Strongly Agree	27	71.1				
	Total	38	100.0				
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan provide financial support in the construction of schools, hospitals etc.	Strongly Disagree	0	0	4.23	.786	.071	5
	Disagree	2	5.3				
	Neutral	2	5.3				
	Agree	19	50.0				
	Strongly Agree	15	39.5				
	Total	38	100.0				
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan contribute to the protection of the local culture	Strongly Disagree	0	0	4.42	.642	.000	2
	Disagree	0	0				
	Neutral	3	7.9				
	Agree	16	42.1				
	Strongly Agree	19	50.0				
	Total	38	100.0				
Overall				4.18	.459	.000	-

Table (6) looked at what the first variable was “Hotels in Luxor and Aswan work in partnership with non-governmental organizations in the region By authors”, where the mean value was (4.68) and the standard deviation was (0.525). On the other hand, the least variable was “Hotels in Luxor and Aswan provide training and promotion opportunities for employees”, where the mean value was (3.92) and the standard deviation was (.673). The overall mean of the variables was (4.18), the standard deviation of means values was (.459).

Table (7): Factor Analysis of the Economic Practices

Economic practices	Loading
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan obtain the greatest possible profits	.761
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan try to achieve long-term success	.798
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan improve their economic performance	.830
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan are admired establishments.	.773

Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan improve their results	.603
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan provide employment to locals	.389
Sums of Squared Loadings	.919

The factor analysis shown in table (7) stated that all the statements (6 statements) were responsible for the social practices with a percentage of (91.9%).

Table (8) economic practices

Economic practices	Response	Freq.	%	Mean*	SD	Sig.	Rank
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan obtain the greatest possible profits	Strongly Disagree	0	0	4.52	.603	.000	1
	Disagree	0	0				
	Neutral	2	5.3				
	Agree	14	36.8				
	Strongly Agree	22	57.9				
	Total	38	100.0				
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan try to achieve long-term success	Strongly Disagree	0	0	4.21	.741	.088	4
	Disagree	0	0				
	Neutral	7	18.4				
	Agree	16	42.1				
	Strongly Agree	15	39.5				
	Total	38	100.0				
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan improve their economic performance	Strongly Disagree	0	0	4.44	.554	.000	2
	Disagree	0	0				
	Neutral	1	2.6				
	Agree	19	50.0				
	Strongly Agree	18	47.4				
	Total	38	100.0				
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan are admired establishments.	Strongly Disagree	0	0	4.18	1.00	.268	5
	Disagree	2	5.3				
	Neutral	10	26.3				
	Agree	5	13.2				
	Strongly Agree	21	55.3				
	Total	38	100.0				
Hotels under study in Luxor and Aswan improve their results	Strongly Disagree	0	0	4.31	.574	.002	3
	Disagree	0	0				
	Neutral	2	5.3				
	Agree	22	57.9				
	Strongly Agree	14	36.8				
	Total	38	100.0				
Hotels under study in	Strongly Disagree			4.18	.691	.109	5

Luxor and Aswan provide employment to locals	Disagree	1	2.6				
	Neutral	3	7.9				
	Agree	22	57.9				
	Strongly Agree	12	31.6				
	Total	38	100.0				
Overall				4.31	.251	.000	-

Table (8) viewed that concerning “economic practices”, the first variable was “Hotels in Luxor and Aswan obtain the greatest possible profits”, where the mean value was (4.52) and the standard deviation was (0.603). On the other hand, the least variable was “Hotels in Luxor and Aswan provide employment to locals”, where the mean value was (4.18) and the standard deviation was (.691). The overall mean of the variables was (4.31), the standard deviation of means values was (.251).

Table (9): Factor Analysis of Hotel Performance

Hotel performance	Loading
Our hotel has improved regarding Profits	.831
Our Hotel has improved regarding Return on assets	.889
Our hotel has introduced improvements relative to Customer service	.848
Our hotel has introduced improvements relative to Relations with customers	.804
Our hotel has introduced improvements relative to Customer loyalty	.758
Our hotel has improved with regard to Staff absenteeism	.873
Our hotel has improved with regard to The working environment	.830
Our hotel has improved with regard to Employees' loyalty and morale	.914
Sums of Squared Loadings	.991

The factor analysis shown in Table (9) stated that all statements (8 statements) were responsible for hotel performance with a percentage of (91.1%).

Table (10): The hotel performance

Hotel Reputation	Response	Freq.	%	Mean	SD	Sig.	Rank
The hotel has improved regarding Profits	Strongly Disagree			4.31	.661	.006	1
	Disagree						
	Neutral	4	10.5				
	Agree	18	47.4				
	Strongly Agree	16	42.1				
	Total	38	100.0				

The hotel has improved regarding Return on assets	Strongly Disagree			4.21	.810	.118	3
	Disagree	2	5.3				
	Neutral	3	7.9				
	Agree	18	47.4				
	Strongly Agree	15	39.5				
	Total	38	100.0				
The hotel has introduced improvements relative to Customer service	Strongly Disagree	3	7.9	4.05	1.01	.750	5
	Disagree	24	63.2				
	Neutral	11	28.9				
	Agree	38	100.0				
	Strongly Agree	3	7.9				
	Total	24	63.2				
The Hotel has introduced improvements relative to Relations with customers	Strongly Disagree			4.13	.741	.281	4
	Disagree	1	2.6				
	Neutral	5	13.2				
	Agree	20	52.6				
	Strongly Agree	12	31.6				
	Total	38	100.0				
The hotel under study has introduced improvements relative to Customer loyalty	Strongly Disagree			4.13	.777	.303	4
	Disagree	1	2.6				
	Neutral	6	15.8				
	Agree	18	47.4				
	Strongly Agree	13	34.2				
	Total	38	100.0				
Our hotel has improved with regard to Staff absenteeism	Strongly Disagree			4.28	.767	.026	2
	Disagree	2	5.3				
	Neutral	1	2.6				
	Agree	19	50.0				
	Strongly Agree	16	42.1				
	Total	38	100.0				
Our Hotel has improved with regard to The working environment	Strongly Disagree			4.21	.664	.058	3
	Disagree						
	Neutral	5	13.2				
	Agree	20	52.6				
	Strongly Agree	13	34.2				
	Total	38	100.0				
Our hotel has	Strongly Disagree			3.97	.752	.831	6

improved with regard to Employees' loyalty and morale	Disagree	1	2.6				
	Neutral	8	21.1				
	Agree	20	52.6				
	Strongly Agree	9	23.7				
	Total	38	100.0				
Overall				4.16	.322	.000	

Table (10) looked at how hotel performance ", the first variable was 'Our hotel has improved regarding Profits', where the mean value was (4.31) and the standard deviation was (0.661). On the other hand, the least variable was "Our Hotel has improved with regard to Employee loyalty and morale", where the mean value was (3.97) and the standard deviation was (.752). The overall mean of the variables was (4.16), and the standard deviation of the mean values was (.322).

TEST OF THE FIRST RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

H₁: *There were statistically significant differences between the demographic data of the sample (age categories, hotel departments, levels of education, sex and the regions) with regard to environmental practices.*

Table (11): Differences between age categories concerning the Environmental Practices

Variable		Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	Age categories	
					F	Sig.
Environmental Practices	Between Groups	.094	2	.047	1.285	.289
	Within Groups	1.286	35	.037		
	Total	1.381	37			

Table (11) illustrated the one-way ANOVA to analyze the differences between age categories regarding environmental practices. The results showed that the significance level of age categories was more than (0.05), This means that there were no statistically significant differences between age categories with respect to Environmental practices. This result indicated that the first hypothesis of the study was not accepted with respect to the age factor.

Table (12): Differences between hotel departments concerning Environmental Practices

Variable		Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	Hotel departments	
					F	Sig.
Environmental Practices	Between Groups	.301	3	.100	3.154	.037
	Within Groups	1.080	34	.032		
	Total	1.381	37			

Table (12) illustrated the one-way ANOVA to analyze the differences between hotel departments concerning the Environmental Practices. The results showed that the significance level for age categories was less than (0.05), This means that there were statistically significant differences between Hotel departments with respect to Environmental practices. This result indicated that the first hypothesis of the study was accepted.

Table (13): LSD between hotel departments concerning Environmental Practices

Variable		(I) Department	(J) department	Sig.
Environmental Practices	LSD	general manager	front office	.210
			Human resources	.630
			food and beverage	.036

According to the variable of ‘hotel departments concerning the Environmental Practices’, the LSD (Least Significant Difference) test was calculated to determine the sources of the differences. Table (13) showed that there was no statistically significant difference between the hotel department ‘general manager’ and the front office (Sig. = 0.210), and there was no statistically significant difference between the hotel department ‘general manager’ and human resources (Sig. =0.630)”, while there was statistically significant difference between hotel department “general manager and food and beverage(Sig. =0.036)”. These differences were in favor of hotel department of “food and beverage (Mean = 4.66)” and hotel department of “human resources (Mean = 4.53)” and against hotel

department of “general manager(Mean= 4.50)” and hotel department of “front office (Mean = 4.38)”.

Table (14): Means of hotel departments concerning the Environmental Practices

Variable	General Manager	Front Office	Human Resources	Food and Beverage
Environmental Practices	4.50	4.38	4.53	4.66

Table (15): Differences between levels of education concerning the environmental practices

Variable		Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	Level of education	
					F	Sig.
Environmental Practices	Between Groups	1.946	3	.649	10.591	.000
	Within Groups	24.076	393	.061		
	Total	26.023	396			

Table (16) illustrated the one-way ANOVA to analyze the differences between the level of education in relation to the environmental practices. The results showed that the significance level was less than 0.05, which means that there were statistically significant differences between all education levels with respect to environmental practices. This result indicated that the first hypothesis of the study was not accepted with respect to the education factor.

Table (17): Differences between men and females concerning the environmental practices

The Variable	Group	Mean	SD	T-Test	
				T	Sig.
Environmental Practices	Males	4.5533	.133	1.001	.323
	Females	4.4872	.276		

From the results shown in Table (17), independent samples T test used to determine the differences between the two groups, it was noticeable that the variable was more than (0.05), which means that there were no

statistically significant differences between men and females with respect to environmental practices. This result indicated that the first hypothesis of the study was not accepted concerning the gender factor.

Table (18): Differences between regions in regard to environmental practices

The Variable	Group	Mean	SD	T-Test	
				T	Sig.
Environmental Practices	Luxor	4.130	.281	1.73	.825
	Aswan	4.021	.220		

From the results shown in Table (18), independent samples T test used to determine the differences between the two groups, it was noticeable that the variable was more than (0.05), which means that there were no statistically significant differences between Luxor and Aswan with respect to environmental practices. This result indicated that the first hypothesis of the study was not accepted concerning the region factor.

TEST OF THE SECOND STUDY HYPOTHESIS

H₂: *There were statistically significant differences between the demographic data of the sample (age categories, hotel departments, levels of education, sex and the regions) with regard to social practices.*

Table (19): Differences between age categories concerning the social practices

Variable		Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	Age Categories	
					F	Sig.
Social Practices	Between Groups	2.771	2	1.386	9.637	.000
	Within Groups	5.033	35	.144		
	Total	7.804	37			

Table (19) illustrated the one-way ANOVA to analyze the differences between Age categories concerning the Social Practices. The results showed that the significance level for Age categories was less than (0.05), This means that there were statistically significant differences between Age categories with respect to Social practices. This result indicated that the second hypothesis of the study was accepted.

Table (20): LSD between age categories concerning the social practices

Variable		(I) Age	(J) Age	Sig.
Social Practices	LSD	From 20 to 35 years	More than 35 to 45 years	.880
			More than 45 years	.006

According to the variable of “age categories concerning the social practices”, the LSD (Least Significant Difference) test was calculated to determine the sources of differences. Table (20) showed that there were no statistically significant differences between the age category ‘From 20 to 35 years and age category More than 35 to 45 years (Sig. = 0.888)’, while there was no statistically significant difference between the age category ‘From 20 to 35 years and the age category More than 45 years (Sig. = 0.006)’. These differences were in favor of the age category ‘From 20 to 35 years (Mean = 4.425)” and against the age category ‘More than 35 to 45 years (Mean = 4.395)” and age category “More than 45 years (mean = 3.850)”.

Table (21): Means of age categories concerning the social practices

Variable	From 20 to 35 years	More than 35 to 45 years	More than 45 years
Social Practices	4.4250	4.3958	3.8500

Table (22): Differences between hotel departments concerning the Social Practices

Variable		Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	department	
					F	Sig.
Social Practices	Between Groups	2.089	3	.696	4.143	.013
	Within Groups	5.715	34	.168		
	Total	7.804	37			

Table (22) illustrated the one-way ANOVA to analyze the differences between levels of education with respect to social practices. The results showed that the significance level was less than 0.05, which means that there were statistically significant differences between all levels of

education with respect to social practices. This result indicated that the second hypothesis of the study was accepted.

Table (23): LSD between hotel departments concerning the social practices

Variable		(I) Department	(J) department	Sig.
Social Practices	LSD	general manager	front office	.004
			Human resources	.774
			food and beverage	.035

According to the variable of “hotel department concerning the Social Practices”, the LSD (Least Significant Difference) test was calculated to determine the sources of differences. Table (23) showed that there was a statistically significant difference between the ‘general manager’ and department front office (Sig.=0.004)”, also there was no statistically significant difference between department “general manager and department food and beverage(Sig. =0.035)”, while there was no statistically significant difference between department and department human resources (Sig. = 0.774)’. These differences were in favor of the department ‘general manager (mean = 4.38)’ and department “human resources (mean = 4.33)” and against department “food and beverage (Mean= 4.00)” and department “front office (Mean = 3.77)”.

Table (24): Means of hotel departments concerning the social practices

Variable	General Manager	Front Office	Human Resources	Food And Beverage
Social Practices	4.38	3.77	4.33	4.0

Table (25): Differences between Levels of Education Concerning Social Practices

Variable		Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	Level of education	
					F	Sig.
Social Practices	Between Groups	.037	2	.019	.084	.919
	Within Groups	7.767	35	.222		
	Total	7.804	37			

Table (25) illustrated the one-way ANOVA to analyze the differences between departments in relation to social practices. The results showed that the significance level for Levels of education was more than (0.05), This means that there were no statistically significant differences between Levels of education with respect to social practices. This result indicated that the second hypothesis of the study was not accepted with respect to the educational level factor.

Table (26): Differences between men and females concerning the Social Practices

The Variable	Group	Mean	SD	T-Test	
				T	Sig.
Social Practices	Males	4.2600	.520	1.431	.161
	Females	4.0385	.271		

From the results shown in Table (26), the independent sample T test used to determine the differences between the two groups, it was noticed that variable was more than (0.05), which means that there were no statistically significant differences between men and females with respect to social practices. This result indicated that the second hypothesis of the study was not accepted concerning the gender factor.

Table (27): Differences between regions concerning the social practices

The Variable	Group	Mean	SD	T-Test	
				T	Sig.
Social Practices	Luxor	4.320	.190	1.90	.281
	Aswan	4.338	.204		

From the results shown in Table (27), the independent sample T test used to determine the differences between the two groups, it was noticed that variable was more than(0.05), this means that there were no statistically significant differences between Luxor and Aswan with respect to social practices. This result indicated that the second hypothesis of the study was not accepted concerning the region factor.

TEST OF THE THIRD STUDY HYPOTHESIS

H₃: *There were statistically significant differences between the demographic data of the sample (age categories, hotel departments, levels of education, sex and the regions) with regard to economic practices.*

Table (28): Differences between age categories concerning the Economic Practices

Variable		Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	Age	
					F	Sig.
Economic Practices	Between Groups	.117	2	.058	.919	.408
	Within Groups	2.226	35	.064		
	Total	2.343	37			

Table (28) illustrated the one-way ANOVA to analyze the differences between age categories concerning the Economic Practices. The results showed that the significance level for age categories was more than (0.05), This means that there were no statistically significant differences between age categories with respect to Economic practices. This result indicated that the third hypothesis of the study was not accepted concerning the age factor.

Table (29): Differences between Hotel Departments concerning the Economic Practices

Variable		Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	department	
					F	Sig.
Economic Practices	Between Groups	.717	3	.239	4.993	.006
	Within Groups	1.626	34	.048		
	Total	2.343	37			

Table (29) illustrated the one-way ANOVA to analyze the differences between departments concerning the Economic Practices. The results showed that the significance level for variable of departments was less than (0.05), This means that there were statistically significant differences between departments with respect to Economic practices. This result indicated that the third hypothesis of the study was accepted.

Table (30): LSD between hotel departments concerning the economic practices

Variable		(I) Department	(J) department	Sig.
Economic Practices	LSD	general manager	front office	.292
			Human resources	1.000
			food and beverage	.036

According to the variable of “hotel departments concerning the Economic Practices”, the LSD (Least Significant Difference) test was calculated to determine the sources of differences. Table (30) showed that there was no statistically significant difference between department “general manager and department front office (Sig.=0.292)”, also there was no statistically significant difference between department “general manager and department human resources (Sig. =1.00)”, while there was statistically significant difference between department “general manager and food and department beverage (Sig. =0.036)”. These differences were in favor of department “food and beverage (Mean = 4.50)” and department “front office (Mean = 4.44)” and against department “general manager (Mean= 4.22)” and department “human resources (Mean = 4.16)”.

Table (31): Means of hotel department concerning the Economic Practices

Variable	General Manager	Front Office	Human Resources	Food And Beverage
Economic Practices	4.22	4.44	4.16	4.50

Table (32): Differences between Levels of Education Concerning Social Practices

Variable		Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	Level of education	
					F	Sig.
Economic Practices	Between Groups	.273	2	.137	2.310	.114
	Within Groups	2.070	35	.059		
	Total	2.343	37			

Table (32) illustrated the one-way ANOVA to analyze the differences between levels of education concerning the Economic Practices. The results showed that the significance level for variable of Level of education

was more than (0.05), This means that there were no statistically significant differences between departments with respect to Economic practices. This result indicated that the third hypothesis of the study was accepted.

Table (33): Differences between men and females concerning the ECONOMIC PRACTICES

The Variable	Group	Mean	SD	T-Test	
				T	Sig.
Economic Practices	Males	4.3400	.269	.971	.338
	Females	4.2564	.210		

From the results shown in Table (33), the independent sample T test used to determine the differences between the two groups, it was noticed that variable was more than(0.05), this means that there were no statistically significant differences between men and females with respect to economic practices. This result indicated that the third hypothesis of the study was not accepted concerning the gender factor.

Table (34): Differences between regions concerning the Economic Practices

The Variable	Group	Mean	SD	T-Test	
				T	Sig.
Economic Practices	Luxor	4.002	.135	1.84	.180
	Aswan	4.015	.189		

From the results shown in Table (34), independent samples T test used to determine the differences between the two groups, it was noticeable that variable was more than (0.05), this means that there were no statistically significant differences between Luxor and Aswan with respect to the economic practices This result indicated that the third hypothesis of the study was not accepted concerning the region factor.

Test of the fifth study hypothesis

H₅: There were statistically significant differences between the demographic data of the sample (age categories, hotel departments,

levels of education, sex and the regions) with regard to hotel performance.

Table (35): Differences between age categories concerning the hotel Performance

Variable		Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	Age	
					F	Sig.
Hotel Performance	Between Groups	.326	2	.163	1.618	.213
	Within Groups	3.522	35	.101		
	Total	3.847	37			

Table (35) illustrated the one-way ANOVA to analyze the differences between departments in relation to hotel performance. The results showed that the significance level for variable of Hotel Performance was more than (0.05), this means that there were no statistically significant differences between variable of age categories with respect to Hotel Performance. This result indicated that the fourth hypothesis of the study was not accepted concerning the age factor.

Table (36): Differences between hotel departments concerning the Hotel Performance

Variable		Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	department	
					F	Sig.
Hotel Performance	Between Groups	.785	3	.262	2.907	.049
	Within Groups	3.062	34	.090		
	Total	3.847	37			

Table (36) illustrated the one-way ANOVA to analyze the differences between departments in relation to hotel performance. The results showed that the significance levels for variable of Hotel Performance was less than (0.05), this means that there were statistically significant differences between variable of department with respect to Hotel Performance. This result indicated that the fourth hypothesis of the study was accepted.

Table (37): LSD between hotel departments concerning the Hotel Performance

Variable		(I) Department	(J) department	Sig.
Hotel Performance	LSD	front office	general manager	.127
			Human resources	.047
			food and beverage	.007

According to the variables of “hotel departments concerning the Hotel Performance”, the LSD (Least Significant Difference) test was calculated to determine the sources of differences. Table (37) showed that there was no statistically significant difference between department front office and department general manager (Sig. = 0.127)’, while there was a statistically significant difference between “department front office’ and department human resources (Sig. =0.47)”, also there was statistically significant difference between “department front office and department food and beverage (Sig. =0.007)”. These differences were in favor of department “food and beverage (Mean = 4.34)” and department “human resources (Mean = 4.22)” and department “general manager (Mean= 4.12)” and department “front office (Mean = 3.89)”.

Table (38): Means of hotel departments concerning the hotel performance

Variable	General Manager	Front Office	Human Resources	Food And Beverage
Hotel Performance	4.12	3.89	4.22	4.34

Table (39): Differences between Levels of Education Concerning the Hotel Performance

Variable		Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	Level of education	
					F	Sig.
Hotel Performance	Between Groups	.102	2	.051	.478	.624
	Within Groups	3.745	35	.107		
	Total	3.847	37			

Tables (4-78) illustrated the one-way ANOVA to analyze the differences between levels of education concerning the hotel performance. The results

showed that the significance level for variable of Hotel Performance was more than (0.05), this means that there were no statistically significant differences between variables of Level of education with respect to Hotel Performance. This result indicated that the fourth hypothesis of the study was not accepted concerning the Level of education factor.

Table (40): Differences between males and females concerning the hotel Performance

The Variable	Group	Mean	SD	T-Test	
				T	Sig.
Hotel Performance	Males	4.2250	.336	1.641	.110
	Females	4.0481	.267		

From the results shown in Table (40), independent samples T test used to determine the differences between the two groups, it was noticeable that variable was more than(0.05), this means that there were no statistically significant differences between males and females with respect to the Hotel Performance. This result indicated that the fourth hypothesis of the study was not accepted concerning the gender factor.

Table (41): Differences between regions concerning the hotel Performance

The Variable	Group	Mean	SD	T-Test	
				T	Sig.
Hotel Performance	Luxor	3.73	.210	1.70	.289
	Aswan	3.92	.241		

From the results shown in Table (41), the independent sample T test used to determine the differences between the two groups, it was noticed that variable was more than(0.05), this means that there were no statistically significant differences between Luxor and Aswan with respect to the hotel performance. This result indicated that the fourth hypothesis of the study was not accepted concerning the region factor.

TEST OF THE FIFTH STUDY HYPOTHESIS

H₆: There is a statistically significant effect of social responsibility on the hotel performance.

Table (42): The Effect of Social Responsibility on the hotel performance

Dependent Variable		Independent Variable
		Social responsibility
Hotel performance	R	0.258
	R ²	0.066
	Sig.	0.118
	Constant	1.793
	B.	0.546

Table (42) showed that there was no significant correlation between social responsibility and hotel performance (R=0.258). Moreover, the sig. was (0.118) more than (0.05) suggested that there was not a significant effect of the independent variable (social responsibility) on the dependent variable (hotel performance). This result indicated that the sixth hypothesis of the study was not accepted, hotel awareness for managements is weak, and therefore there is no link between social responsibility and hotel performance.

RESULTS

1. Hotels in Luxor and Aswan exploit renewable energy in a productive process compatible with the environment.
2. Hotels in Luxor and Aswan reduce their consumption of natural resources.
3. Hotels in Luxor and Aswan communicate to their customer about their environmental practices.
4. Hotels in Luxor and Aswan give importance to recycles.
5. Hotels in Luxor and Aswan have a high environmental awareness level.
6. Hotels in Luxor and Aswan work in partnership with non-governmental organizations in the region By authors
7. Hotels in Luxor and Aswan contribute to the protection of the local culture.
8. The Luxor and Aswan are committed to improving the welfare of the communities in which they operate.

9. Hotels in Luxor and Aswan actively participate in social and cultural events (music, sports, etc.).
10. Hotels in Luxor and Aswan provide a fair treatment of employees (without discrimination and abuse, regardless of gender, race, origin, or religion)
11. Hotels in Luxor and Aswan improve their economic performance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS TO HOTELS IN LUXOR AND ASWAN

1. The necessity of relying on renewable energy that is not harmful to the environment and society.
2. Educating customers about green practices that preserve the environment.
3. Reducing hotel consumption of green resources.
4. Hotels need to take care of recycling.
5. The need for hotels to pay attention to raising environmental awareness.
6. The necessity for hotels to provide appropriate benefits to employees without discrimination.
7. Pay attention to training and supporting hotel workers and providing their needs.
8. The necessity for hotels to take care in cooperation with non-governmental institutions to support social responsibility.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE EGYPTIAN MINISTRY OF TOURISM

- 1- Directing hotels to care about supporting the community so that the interest is not limited to making profits.
- 2- Directing hotels to carry out their responsibilities towards community institutions such as hospitals and schools.
- 3- Opening ways of cooperation between hotels and government institutions to support social responsibility.
- 4- Putting attention to social responsibility as one of the conditions for upgrading the hotel to a higher category.
- 5- Providing the necessary support and awareness to hotels to help them implement social responsibility.

REFERENCES

- Apaydin, M., Jiang, G. F., Demirbag, M., & Jamali, D. (2021). The importance of corporate social responsibility strategic fit and times of economic hardship. *British Journal of Management*, 32(2), 399-415.
- Asemah, E. S., Okpanachi, R. A., & Edegoh, L. O. (2013). Business advantages of corporate social responsibility practice: A critical review. *New Media and Mass Communication*, 18(1), 45-54.
- Bapuji, H., de Bakker, F. G., Brown, J. A., Higgins, C., Rehbein, K., & Spicer, A. (2020). Business and society research in times of the corona crisis. *Business & Society*, 59(6), 1067-1078.
- Belu, C., & Manescu, C. (2013). Strategic corporate social responsibility and economic performance. *Applied Economics*, 45(19), 2751-2764.
- Brin, P., Nehme, M., & Polančič, G. (2020). Corporate social responsibility as an instrument of increasing country competitiveness. *Torun International Studies*, (13), 131-150.
- Carroll, A. B. (2015). Corporate social responsibility: The centerpiece of competing and complementary frameworks. *Organizational Dynamics*, 44(2), 87-96.
- Carroll, A. B., & Buchholtz, A. K. (2014). *Business and society: Ethics, sustainability, and stakeholder management*. Cengage Learning.
- Chakraborty, A., & Jha, A. (2019). Corporate social responsibility in marketing: a review of the state-of-the-art literature. *Journal of social marketing*.
- Drobnyazko, S., Hilorme, T., Solokha, D., & Bieliakova, O. (2020). Strategic policy of companies in the area of social responsibility: Covid-19 challenges. In *E3S Web of Conferences* (Vol. 211, p. 04011). EDP Sciences.
- Dyer, C. (2018). *The Power of Company Culture: How any business can build a culture that improves productivity, performance and profits*. Kogan Page Publishers.
- Fallah Shayan, N., Mohabbati-Kalejahi, N., Alavi, S., & Zahed, M. A. (2022). Sustainable development goals (SDGs) as a framework for corporate social responsibility (CSR). *Sustainability*, 14(3), 1222.
- Goffi, G., Masiero, L., & Pencarelli, T. (2021). Corporate social responsibility and performances of firms operating in the tourism and hospitality industry. *The TQM Journal*.

- González-Rodríguez, M. R., Martín-Samper, R. C., Köseoglu, M. A., & Okumus, F. (2019). Hotels' corporate social responsibility practices, organizational culture, firm reputation, and performance. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 27(3), 398-419.
- Hammam, K. H. A. (2020). The Relationship between Social Responsibility and the Performance of the Organization. *Journal of the Future of Social Sciences*, Volume 3, Volume 3, 249 - 269.
- Kerlin, J. A. (2017). Defining social enterprise across different contexts: A conceptual framework based on institutional factors. In *Social enterprises* (pp. 91-117). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Kong, Y., Antwi-Adjei, A., & Bawuah, J. (2020). A systematic review of the business case for corporate social responsibility and firm performance. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 27(2), 444-454.
- McDonald, W. S., Wagner, J. K., Deverka, P. A., Woods, L. A., Peterson, J. F., & Williams, M. S. (2020). Genetic testing and employer-sponsored wellness programs: An overview of current vendors, products, and practices. *Molecular genetics & genomic medicine*, 8(10), e1414.
- Montag, C., Hegelich, S., Sindermann, C., Rozgonjuk, D., Marengo, D., & Elhai, J. D. (2021). On corporate responsibility when studying social media use and well-being. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 25(4), 268-270.
- Smith, NC. (2013). *Corporate Social Responsibility: Not Whether, But How*. Center for Marketing Working Paper.
- Sroka, W., & Szántó, R. (2018). Corporate social responsibility and business ethics in controversial sectors: Analysis of research results. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Innovation*, 14(3), 111-126.
- Úbeda-García, M., Claver-Cortés, E., Marco-Lajara, B., & Zaragoza-Sáez, P. (2021). Corporate social responsibility and firm performance in the hotel industry. The mediating role of green human resource management and environmental outcomes. *Journal of Business Research*, 123, p57-69.