

Accounting for Peace and Environmental Justice: Toward a Multi-Dimensional Sustainability Model

AKINLADE Olayinka Odunayo^{1*}, ODEWOLE Olabisi Bolarinwa², AKINADE Simeon Adebisi², NURUDEEN Abdulfatai Olarenwaju³

¹Yaba College of Technology, Yaba, Lagos.

²College of Medicine, University of Lagos, Idi-araba.

³Crescent University, Lafenwa, Abeokuta, Ogun State.

Received: 03/06/2025

Accepted: 28/07/2025

Published: 21/08/2025

Abstract: This study investigates how peace and environmental justice can be integrated into sustainability accounting to create a multi-dimensional reporting model. Using a quantitative survey of 120 professionals across corporate, governmental, and non-profit sectors in sub-Saharan Africa, data were analyzed with SPSS to examine patterns in sustainability disclosure. Results show that only 47.5% of organizations include environmental justice indicators, and just 25.8% track impacts on marginalized groups. Strong correlations were found between justice-oriented reporting and stakeholder inclusion ($r = 0.61$), as well as with conflict sensitivity ($r = 0.58$). Additionally, sustainability reporting was positively correlated with community trust ($r = 0.63$) and negatively with conflict frequency ($r = 0.56$). These findings support the need for a new sustainability accounting model that includes peacebuilding and equity metrics. The study recommends expanding reporting frameworks, training accounting professionals, and mandating justice-focused disclosures to enhance corporate accountability and social stability.

Keywords: Sustainability Accounting, Environmental Justice, Peacebuilding, Stakeholder Inclusion, Corporate Accountability, Conflict Sensitivity.

Cite This Article:

AKINLADE, O.O., ODEWOLE, O.B., AKINADE, S.A., NURUDEEN, A.O., (2025). Accounting for Peace and Environmental Justice: Toward a Multi-Dimensional Sustainability Model. *World Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, 2(8), 19-27.

Introduction

The evolving discourse on sustainability has extended beyond environmental protection to incorporate social dimensions such as equity, justice, and peace. In recent years, there has been a growing recognition that accounting systems, especially those used in corporate sustainability and government financial reporting, must evolve to reflect these broader imperatives (Bebbington et al., 2019). Traditional environmental accounting frameworks have focused largely on resource depletion, pollution control, and corporate environmental performance. However, such models often overlook the embedded structural inequalities, conflicts, and justice-related implications of environmental decisions, especially in fragile and conflict-prone settings (Mertens, 2020).

Peace and environmental justice are inherently interconnected. Environmental degradation often exacerbates socio-political tensions, while equitable access to natural resources can promote stability and cohesion (Ide, 2019). This interrelationship suggests a pressing need to develop a sustainability accounting framework that does not merely track emissions or resource use but also integrates metrics for peacebuilding, justice, and inclusivity. Scholars have begun to argue for the incorporation of peace indicators and distributive justice parameters into corporate

sustainability reports and national sustainability plans (UNRISD, 2020; Antonaras & Constantinou, 2021). However, there remains a conceptual and practical gap in operationalizing such models within accounting systems.

A multi-dimensional sustainability model must bridge environmental stewardship with social harmony and justice, thereby creating a robust platform for equitable development. This approach aligns with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly SDG 16 (Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions) and SDG 13 (Climate Action), encouraging integrated accountability across sectors (UN, 2019). Despite increasing academic interest in sustainability and peacebuilding, few frameworks actively align the tools of accounting with broader goals of peace and justice.

This paper proposes a transformative accounting framework that accounts for environmental justice and peace as critical dimensions of sustainability. It explores how organizations and governments can embed peacebuilding indicators within environmental and financial disclosures. By integrating environmental justice and peace into accounting systems, this study aims to contribute to a more holistic sustainability paradigm suitable for complex, real-world challenges.

*Corresponding Author

AKINLADE Olayinka Odunayo*

Email: akinladeolayinka2020@gmail.com.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-NC](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) license



Statement of the Problem

Despite the increasing adoption of sustainability reporting and environmental accounting standards, many existing frameworks remain largely technocratic and quantitative, often failing to account for complex socio-political realities such as structural injustice, conflict, and peace. Environmental degradation is not merely a technical issue, it often intersects with land dispossession, marginalization of indigenous communities, and intergenerational injustice (Agyeman et al., 2019). These intersections call into question the adequacy of current accounting tools in addressing the deeper dimensions of sustainability.

The separation between environmental metrics and peace or justice considerations creates a blind spot in sustainability assessments. While many organizations report on carbon emissions and energy consumption, very few disclose their role in exacerbating or mitigating social tensions in vulnerable communities. This problem is compounded by the fact that corporate social responsibility (CSR) and environmental, social, and governance (ESG) frameworks often isolate peacebuilding from environmental stewardship, despite the fact that these issues are tightly intertwined (Daher & Grolleau, 2022).

Accounting mechanisms that fail to integrate peace and justice inadvertently reinforce status quo models that are environmentally extractive and socially unjust. For instance, a mining company may appear environmentally compliant through carbon offsetting while displacing local communities, an act that generates social unrest and long-term instability. Without a multi-dimensional accounting model that considers peace, equity, and justice alongside environmental and financial performance, sustainability efforts remain incomplete and potentially harmful.

This study addresses this critical gap by proposing a holistic accounting framework that brings together environmental justice and peacebuilding principles. The aim is to move from surface-level compliance toward transformational accounting, one that actively supports a more just, peaceful, and ecologically balanced society.

Research Questions

1. How can accounting frameworks be redesigned to incorporate peacebuilding and environmental justice indicators?
2. What are the limitations of current sustainability reporting standards in reflecting multi-dimensional sustainability?
3. How do environmental accounting practices influence social equity and conflict in environmentally vulnerable regions?
4. To what extent are organizations currently integrating environmental justice and peace considerations into their sustainability reports?
5. What role can multi-dimensional sustainability accounting play in advancing the Sustainable Development Goals, especially SDG 13 and SDG 16?

Research Hypotheses

Ho1: There is no significant relationship between peace-oriented indicators and corporate sustainability reporting.

Ho2: Environmental justice metrics do not significantly influence stakeholder perceptions of corporate accountability.

Ho3: Current environmental accounting standards are sufficient for promoting multi-dimensional sustainability.

Ho4: Integrating peace and justice indicators into sustainability reporting has no effect on conflict mitigation in host communities.

Ho5: Multi-dimensional sustainability models do not significantly contribute to the achievement of SDGs.

Scope and Limitation of the Study

This study focuses on the development of a conceptual and theoretical framework for integrating peace and environmental justice into sustainability accounting systems. The analysis emphasizes the roles of both corporate and governmental institutions in fragile and environmentally sensitive contexts. Geographically, the study may draw examples from both developed and developing countries, but its main theoretical contribution is universal in scope.

The key limitation of this study lies in its conceptual orientation, it does not include empirical fieldwork or case studies due to scope constraints. Additionally, the implementation of multi-dimensional sustainability models is context-specific, and the recommendations may require further adaptation in sectoral applications (e.g., energy, agriculture, mining). Nevertheless, the insights offered here lay the groundwork for empirical follow-up studies and policy development.

Literature Review

Conceptual Review

Accounting and the Evolution of Sustainability Thinking

The concept of sustainability in accounting has evolved from focusing solely on environmental performance to encompassing broader socio-economic dimensions, including justice, inclusivity, and peace. Initially, sustainability accounting emphasized the measurement of environmental externalities, such as carbon emissions and waste (Bebbington et al., 2019). However, recent academic discourse critiques the reductionist nature of these approaches, arguing that they often ignore underlying structural inequalities and conflict dynamics that shape environmental outcomes (Cho et al., 2020). This has led to a call for reimagining accounting as a socially embedded practice that contributes to sustainable and peaceful societies.

Environmental Justice and the Role of Accounting

Environmental justice involves the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people in environmental decision-making, regardless of race, class, or geography (Agyeman et al., 2019). In this context, accounting can play a transformative role by uncovering the distributional impacts of corporate and state activities on marginalized communities. However, mainstream sustainability reporting frameworks such as the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) often lack the tools to capture distributive injustices and environmental harm experienced by vulnerable populations (Daher & Grolleau, 2022). Consequently, the integration of environmental justice metrics into accounting

systems is gaining traction as a way to promote greater transparency and equity.

Peace Accounting and Conflict-Sensitive Reporting

Peace accounting is an emerging area that seeks to integrate conflict sensitivity and peacebuilding principles into financial and sustainability reporting. This approach is grounded in the recognition that environmental harm can act as a driver of conflict, especially in regions facing resource scarcity or socio-political instability (Ide, 2019). Peace-oriented accounting frameworks advocate for disclosures that assess not only the environmental footprint of organizations but also their potential role in either exacerbating or resolving conflict (Antonaras & Constantinou, 2021). These frameworks propose indicators such as land-use conflicts, displacement, access to clean water, and corporate-community relations as part of the sustainability reporting matrix.

Toward a Multi-Dimensional Sustainability Model

There is growing consensus that sustainability must be understood as a multidimensional concept, encompassing environmental, social, and peace-related dimensions. Traditional accounting tools are insufficient to address the complexities of this integrated view (Mertens, 2020). The proposed multi-dimensional sustainability model emphasizes the interdependence between ecological balance, social justice, and peaceful coexistence. It encourages organizations to move beyond compliance-based disclosures toward proactive accountability that contributes to inclusive and conflict-sensitive development.

Theoretical Review

Stakeholder Theory

Stakeholder theory, originally advanced by Freeman, has become central to discussions on sustainability accounting. The theory emphasizes that organizations are accountable not just to shareholders but to all stakeholders, employees, communities, governments, and the environment (Freeman et al., 2020). In the context of peace and environmental justice, stakeholder theory provides a useful lens for expanding accountability beyond economic outcomes to include the social and ecological impacts of organizational decisions. When organizations ignore the interests of vulnerable or marginalized stakeholders, they may contribute to environmental injustice and conflict. Thus, stakeholder theory supports the argument that accounting frameworks must be inclusive and reflective of all stakeholder groups, particularly those affected by environmental degradation or social unrest (de Villiers & Sharma, 2020).

Legitimacy Theory

Legitimacy theory suggests that organizations seek to operate within the bounds and norms of their societies to maintain their legitimacy. This theory explains the rise of corporate sustainability reporting as a response to public pressure for transparency and accountability (Schoeneborn et al., 2020). When organizations disclose information about their environmental or peacebuilding efforts, they are often aiming to gain or maintain legitimacy in the eyes of stakeholders. However, the theory also cautions that disclosures may be symbolic rather than substantive. In the context of peace and environmental justice, legitimacy theory can explain why some corporations engage in "greenwashing" or "peace-washing", appearing responsible without making meaningful changes (Talbot & Boiral, 2021). Therefore, this theory supports

the need for robust, verifiable, and justice-oriented accounting systems.

Triple Bottom Line Theory

The Triple Bottom Line (TBL) theory expands the focus of corporate performance from financial outcomes (profit) to include environmental (planet) and social (people) dimensions. While widely used in sustainability reporting, TBL has often been criticized for its vague treatment of justice and peace (Elkington, 2019). A multi-dimensional sustainability model seeks to build on TBL by incorporating conflict sensitivity, equity, and peace indicators directly into accounting frameworks. This expansion makes TBL more responsive to the real-world challenges of sustainability in fragile or conflict-prone environments (Rogers & Milne, 2020). By integrating peace and environmental justice, TBL evolves from a static measurement framework to a dynamic tool for societal transformation.

Environmental Justice Theory

Environmental justice theory emphasizes the fair distribution of environmental benefits and burdens across all populations, regardless of race, class, or geography. It critiques policies and systems that disproportionately expose marginalized communities to environmental harm (Agyeman et al., 2019). Applied to accounting, this theory argues for the development of reporting frameworks that explicitly address issues of equity, access, and community well-being. It also supports participatory accounting models that involve affected communities in decision-making processes. In advancing a multi-dimensional model, environmental justice theory helps anchor accounting practices in fairness and inclusivity.

Empirical Review

Empirical Studies on Sustainability Accounting and Reporting

Recent empirical studies have examined how organizations disclose sustainability practices, yet findings reveal a consistent gap in addressing peace and environmental justice. For example, Bini and Bellucci (2020) analyzed sustainability reports of multinational corporations and found that while environmental and social disclosures were common, few organizations reported on community displacement, land conflict, or distributive justice. Their content analysis highlighted that most disclosures were compliance-driven and lacked depth in addressing systemic environmental inequalities.

Similarly, Boiral et al. (2021) conducted a qualitative assessment of sustainability reports in the extractive sector and observed that disclosures related to environmental impact often failed to mention affected communities or local conflict dynamics. The study revealed that organizations tended to adopt symbolic reporting strategies, emphasizing policies and certifications while avoiding concrete indicators of environmental justice or peace. This reinforces concerns raised in theoretical literature that current frameworks allow for superficial legitimacy-seeking rather than transformative accountability.

Environmental Justice Indicators in Corporate Reporting

Several empirical studies have attempted to quantify environmental justice within corporate and public-sector reporting. For instance, Pucker (2021) evaluated sustainability practices in the fashion industry and found that most environmental disclosures overlooked labor exploitation and pollution burdens borne by low-income

communities. The study recommended the inclusion of justice-oriented metrics, such as health outcomes, pollution exposure levels, and access to grievance mechanisms. These findings underscore the empirical need for multi-dimensional sustainability models that go beyond environmental impact to include social vulnerability and conflict indicators.

In another study, Yekini et al. (2022) explored corporate social responsibility disclosures in African economies. Using regression analysis, the researchers found a weak correlation between the volume of sustainability disclosures and actual improvements in community well-being. The study concluded that while companies may disclose environmental information, the absence of peace or justice-related data renders such reports incomplete. This highlights a structural flaw in how accounting systems capture stakeholder realities, particularly in regions affected by socio-environmental tension.

Integrating Peace into Sustainability Frameworks

Empirical work on peace-related disclosures remains sparse but growing. Daher and Grolleau (2022) examined peace reporting in the context of post-conflict nations and identified significant inconsistencies in how organizations report on their roles in rebuilding trust and cohesion. The study suggested integrating conflict-sensitive indicators such as community engagement, local employment, and cultural preservation into sustainability accounting frameworks. These findings reinforce the call for a restructured model that explicitly incorporates peace metrics as a component of sustainability.

Methodology

Research Design

This study adopted a quantitative, descriptive survey design, allowing for the collection of primary data from a wide range of stakeholders to assess the integration of peace and environmental justice in sustainability accounting practices. The design is appropriate for understanding relationships between variables such as corporate sustainability practices, stakeholder inclusion, environmental justice indicators, and peacebuilding disclosures.

Population and Sampling Technique

The target population consisted of accounting and sustainability officers, environmental managers, and CSR professionals working in corporations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and public regulatory bodies in environmentally sensitive or conflict-prone regions. A purposive sampling technique was used to select 150 respondents across Nigeria, Kenya, Ghana, and South Africa, regions where issues of environmental justice and socio-political tensions intersect with sustainability challenges.

Out of the 150 distributed questionnaires, 120 were returned and deemed usable, reflecting an 80% response rate, which is statistically adequate for correlation and frequency analysis.

Instrument for Data Collection

Data were collected through a structured questionnaire consisting of five sections:

1. Demographic information;
2. Organizational sustainability practices;
3. Peace and conflict sensitivity in reporting;
4. Environmental justice metrics;
5. Stakeholder engagement and disclosure accountability.

The instrument included both closed-ended Likert-scale items (ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree) and factual questions designed to generate data for frequency analysis.

Validity and Reliability

To ensure content validity, the questionnaire was reviewed by three experts in sustainability accounting, environmental policy, and conflict resolution. A pilot test was conducted with 15 respondents, and the instrument achieved a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of 0.87, indicating high internal consistency.

Method of Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 25. Descriptive statistics were used to generate frequency tables capturing respondent demographics and organizational practices related to environmental justice and peace disclosure.

To test relationships between key variables, Pearson's correlation analysis was conducted. The results are presented in four tables as follows:

- Table 1: Frequency distribution of respondent demographics and organizational sector.
- Table 2: Frequency distribution of responses on peace and environmental justice disclosures.
- Table 3: Pearson correlation matrix between environmental justice practices, stakeholder engagement, and peace indicators.
- Table 4: Pearson correlation matrix between sustainability reporting practices and community conflict outcomes.

A 5% significance level ($p < 0.05$) was used to determine statistical significance. The correlation tables were particularly used to assess the strength and direction of association between peace-related disclosures, environmental justice practices, and sustainability reporting effectiveness.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval was obtained from relevant institutional review boards in each country where data collection took place. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were assured of anonymity and confidentiality. No identifying information was collected, and all data were used solely for academic purposes.

Results

Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Sector and Role

Variable	Frequency (n=120)	Percentage (%)
Sector		
Corporate (Private Sector)	48	40.0
Government/Public Agencies	32	26.7
NGOs/Civil Society Organizations	40	33.3
Respondent Role		
Sustainability/CSR Officer	56	46.7
Environmental Compliance Manager	38	31.7
Finance/Accounting Professional	26	21.6

Interpretation of Findings

This table provides a breakdown of the sectors and roles of respondents. A notable insight is the dominance of corporate sector participants (40%), closely followed by NGOs (33.3%). This indicates an increasing engagement of non-governmental actors in sustainability discourse, especially around peace and environmental justice. Notably, CSR and sustainability officers comprised the largest professional category at 46.7%, suggesting that sustainability practices are becoming an integral part of

corporate strategy. The strong presence of government officials (26.7%) and environmental compliance managers also reflects the regulatory importance of sustainability reporting. Interestingly, the lower proportion of finance/accounting professionals (21.6%) might point to a gap in integrating peace and environmental justice concerns into traditional financial accounting practices, supporting the study's core argument that multi-dimensional models are needed.

Frequency Distribution of Responses on Peace and Environmental Justice Disclosures

Statement	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Neutral (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
My organization includes indicators of environmental justice in its sustainability reports.	10.0	21.7	20.8	35.8	11.7
We consider community conflict or peace impact when planning projects.	9.2	16.7	22.5	38.3	13.3
Sustainability reports include voices or concerns of affected communities.	15.8	27.5	25.0	24.2	7.5
Our accounting/reporting systems measure impacts on marginalized or vulnerable groups.	18.3	26.7	29.2	20.8	5.0

Interpretation of Findings

This table reflects the extent to which organizations include peace and environmental justice elements in their reporting systems. A majority of respondents (47.5%) agree or strongly agree that their organizations consider environmental justice indicators in reporting, yet 31.7% disagree, suggesting uneven practices. Moreover, while 51.6% agree their projects consider community conflict or peace implications, only 31.7% report that sustainability disclosures reflect the voices of affected communities, and an even lower 25.8% affirm that accounting systems measure impacts on marginalized populations.

These disparities point to a serious shortcoming in mainstream sustainability frameworks: organizations may acknowledge broad peace or justice goals, but they often fail to operationalize them within reporting mechanisms. This supports the conceptual and theoretical arguments in the study that existing models tend to be performative rather than transformative. The weak inclusion of community voices and vulnerable populations underscores the need for an enhanced accounting framework that addresses equity and conflict sensitivity.

Correlation Matrix of Environmental Justice Practices and Stakeholder Engagement

Variables	EJ Reporting	Stakeholder Inclusion	Conflict Sensitivity
Environmental Justice Reporting (EJ Reporting)	1.00		
Stakeholder Inclusion	0.61**	1.00	
Conflict Sensitivity in Project Design	0.58**	0.55**	1.00

Note: $p < 0.01$

Interpretation of Findings

The correlation matrix shows statistically significant relationships between environmental justice reporting, stakeholder inclusion, and conflict sensitivity. The positive correlation ($r = 0.61$) between environmental justice reporting and stakeholder inclusion suggests that organizations that emphasize justice in their reporting also tend to involve diverse stakeholders in decision-making. Similarly, the correlation of 0.58 between environmental justice practices and conflict sensitivity highlights the interconnectedness between justice reporting and peace-oriented planning.

These findings empirically reinforce the theoretical argument that peace and justice cannot be separated from sustainability practices. Organizations that embed equity metrics are more likely to anticipate or prevent community conflicts. The significant relationships across these variables support the proposed multi-dimensional model of sustainability accounting, which views peace, justice, and environmental stewardship as interdependent components of accountability.

Correlation Matrix of Sustainability Reporting and Conflict-Related Outcomes

Variables	Sustainability Reporting Score	Community Trust	Reported Conflicts
Sustainability Reporting Score	1.00		
Level of Community Trust	0.63**	1.00	
Frequency of Local Conflicts (inverse coded)	0.56**	0.59**	1.00

Note: $p < 0.01$

Interpretation of Findings

This table reveals strong positive correlations between robust sustainability reporting and improved social outcomes. A correlation of 0.63 between sustainability reporting and community trust suggests that transparent, justice-oriented reporting fosters stronger stakeholder confidence. Additionally, the inverse relationship with conflict frequency ($r = 0.56$) implies that better reporting practices are associated with fewer instances of local unrest or disputes.

These results lend empirical support to the theoretical proposition that peace can be embedded within sustainability frameworks. By disclosing information that is fair, inclusive, and conflict-sensitive, organizations appear to build stronger social contracts with host communities. This demonstrates that sustainability accounting is not merely a technical tool but a mechanism for conflict prevention and peacebuilding. The findings validate the study's call for an integrated model that accounts for these broader social dimensions.

Discussion of the Findings

Integration of Peace and Environmental Justice in Reporting is Partial and Uneven

The analysis of frequency data shows that while many organizations claim to consider peace and environmental justice in their sustainability efforts, the degree of actual integration remains limited. Although 47.5% of respondents acknowledged including

environmental justice indicators in reports, a significant proportion either disagreed or remained neutral. Similarly, only 31.7% of respondents agreed that their reporting includes the voices of affected communities, and just 25.8% reported measuring impacts on marginalized groups. This inconsistency demonstrates a gap between sustainability rhetoric and genuine commitment to multi-dimensional accountability. The findings support prior literature that highlights how current reporting standards often overlook justice-related metrics (Boiral et al., 2021; Pucker, 2021).

Strong Link Between Environmental Justice and Stakeholder Engagement

The correlation between environmental justice reporting and stakeholder inclusion ($r = 0.61$) suggests a strong relationship between equity-centered disclosures and participatory practices. Organizations that take justice seriously tend to involve community stakeholders in sustainability planning and reporting. This reinforces stakeholder theory, which posits that organizations are more effective when they attend to the interests of all groups affected by their actions (Freeman et al., 2020). The data also aligns with theoretical assertions that environmental justice and peace are not standalone goals but interwoven components of a broader sustainability framework.

Conflict-Sensitive Reporting Promotes Social Stability

Perhaps one of the most compelling findings is the positive correlation between robust sustainability reporting and community

trust ($r = 0.63$), alongside a negative correlation with conflict frequency ($r = 0.56$). These results empirically validate the idea that comprehensive, transparent reporting fosters peace and reduces tension in communities affected by corporate or state activities. Organizations that report on environmental and social justice appear to experience fewer conflicts, likely because they engage more respectfully and responsibly with local populations. This observation aligns with peace accounting frameworks that advocate for disclosure systems sensitive to local dynamics (Daher & Grolleau, 2022).

Need for Multi-Dimensional Models in Accounting

Taken together, these findings highlight the inadequacy of traditional accounting models that focus solely on environmental or financial outcomes. The interconnected nature of justice, peace, and sustainability demands a new approach, one that embeds equity, stakeholder voice, and conflict sensitivity at its core. This supports the study's thesis that sustainability accounting must move from a compliance-based to a transformation-based model.

Implication of the Findings

Redefining the Purpose of Sustainability Accounting

The findings imply a critical shift in how sustainability accounting should be understood and practiced. Rather than serving as a compliance checklist or marketing tool, sustainability accounting must evolve into a transformative mechanism that addresses real-world issues of inequality and conflict. The inclusion of environmental justice and peace metrics is no longer optional, it is essential for meaningful corporate accountability and long-term stability in high-risk environments.

Policy and Regulatory Reforms are urgently needed

Given that many organizations lack standardized tools for reporting on justice and peace indicators, there is a strong need for policymakers and regulatory bodies to update sustainability reporting guidelines. Current frameworks such as GRI or SASB should expand to include equity-focused and conflict-sensitive indicators. These additions will make reporting more responsive to local realities and encourage organizations to consider broader social impacts in their decision-making.

Need for Capacity Building in Accounting and CSR Functions

The relatively low participation of finance and accounting professionals in justice-related sustainability efforts, as observed in the demographic data, reveals a gap in training and awareness. Accounting practitioners must be trained to understand and measure social indicators such as community displacement, access to natural resources, and inter-group trust. Professional development programs should incorporate modules on environmental justice, peace economics, and stakeholder engagement to prepare accountants for this new multi-dimensional role.

Improved Community Relations and Risk Reduction

Another important implication is that organizations that report transparently on peace and justice tend to enjoy higher levels of community trust and experience fewer conflicts. This suggests that embracing multi-dimensional sustainability accounting is not only ethically sound but strategically beneficial. It helps organizations build legitimacy, reduce reputational risk, and avoid costly community conflicts. These outcomes support the adoption of

peace accounting as a value-adding practice in sustainability strategy.

Theoretical Advancement in Sustainability Discourse

Lastly, the findings contribute to the theoretical advancement of sustainability accounting by validating the integration of stakeholder theory, legitimacy theory, environmental justice theory, and the triple bottom line. These frameworks, when combined empirically, form the backbone of a robust model that captures the complexity of real-world environmental and social challenges.

Conclusion

This study explored the integration of peace and environmental justice into sustainability accounting frameworks and proposed the development of a multi-dimensional model that addresses the complex interrelations between environmental stewardship, equity, and social cohesion. The findings demonstrate that while sustainability reporting has become more prevalent, its current design often fails to account for the realities of conflict, community displacement, and marginalization. A significant portion of organizations continues to engage in surface-level environmental disclosures that lack depth, participation, or sensitivity to local contexts.

The analysis further revealed that organizations incorporating environmental justice indicators tend to foster higher levels of community trust and experience fewer conflict incidents. Positive correlations between stakeholder inclusion, justice-oriented metrics, and peace-related outcomes underscore the need for accounting systems that move beyond traditional financial and environmental metrics.

By aligning the empirical findings with theoretical foundations such as stakeholder theory, legitimacy theory, and environmental justice theory, this paper validates the need for an expanded accounting model that supports social sustainability, peacebuilding, and inclusive development. Such a model has the potential to reshape the accountability landscape in fragile contexts and environmentally sensitive regions. Ultimately, accounting for peace and justice is not just an ethical necessity, it is a strategic imperative for sustainable growth and societal well-being.

Recommendations

- i. International reporting standards such as the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) and the Sustainability Accounting Standards Board (SASB) should integrate indicators that measure social conflict, access to resources, equitable benefit distribution, and peacebuilding initiatives. These metrics should be standardized and applicable across sectors.
- ii. Organizations, particularly those in extractive industries, agriculture, and infrastructure development, should adopt specialized toolkits that help them assess and disclose their impact on vulnerable communities and local ecosystems. These toolkits should include stakeholder mapping, peace/conflict risk analysis, and environmental equity assessments.
- iii. Professional bodies, universities, and training institutions should revise accounting and corporate social responsibility (CSR) curricula to include environmental justice, conflict-sensitive development, and stakeholder engagement. Accountants must be equipped to measure,

interpret, and disclose social outcomes as part of sustainability reports.

- iv. Governments and regulatory agencies should enact policies that mandate the inclusion of community consultation outcomes, grievance mechanisms, and socio-environmental impact metrics in corporate sustainability disclosures. These should be linked to licensing, tax incentives, or public procurement eligibility.
- v. Future research should explore how peacebuilding can be further operationalized within financial systems. Longitudinal case studies, cross-sectoral analyses, and comparative models across countries can offer deeper insights into how multi-dimensional accounting influences long-term community resilience and corporate legitimacy.

References

1. Agyeman, J., Schlosberg, D., Craven, L., & Matthews, C. (2019). Trends and directions in environmental justice: From inequity to everyday life and just sustainabilities. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 44, 321–340. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-101718-033120>
2. Antonaras, A., & Constantinou, C. (2021). Sustainability reporting and peacebuilding: Emerging pathways for corporate accountability. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 171(2), 347–364. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04487-5>
3. Bebbington, J., Russell, S., & Thomson, I. (2019). Accounting and sustainable development: Reflections and propositions. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 60, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2018.09.003>
4. Bini, L., & Bellucci, M. (2020). Integrated sustainability reporting in practice: Evidence from emerging economies. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, 11(4), 677–703. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SAMPJ-05-2019-0190>
5. Boiral, O., Heras-Saizarbitoria, I., & Brotherton, M. C. (2021). Improving sustainability reporting: A critical review of content analysis techniques. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 314, 128035. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.128035>
6. Cho, C. H., Laine, M., Roberts, R. W., & Rodrigue, M. (2020). The frontstage and backstage of corporate sustainability reporting: Exploring the roles of stakeholders and accounting in corporate social performance. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 81, 101074. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2019.101074>
7. Daher, M., & Grolleau, G. (2022). Accounting for peace in sustainability reports: An emerging research agenda. *Journal of Environmental Accounting and Management*, 10(1), 43–56. <https://doi.org/10.5890/JEAM.2022.01.003>
8. de Villiers, C., & Sharma, U. (2020). A critical reflection on the future of financial, intellectual capital, sustainability and integrated reporting. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 70, 101999. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2019.101999>
9. Elkington, J. (2019). 25 years ago I coined the phrase “Triple Bottom Line.” Here’s why it’s time to rethink it. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2018/06/25-years-ago-i-coined-the-phrase-triple-bottom-line-heres-why-im-giving-up-on-it>
10. Freeman, R. E., Harrison, J. S., & Zyglidopoulos, S. (2020). *Stakeholder theory: Concepts and strategies*. Cambridge University Press.
11. Gonzalez-Perez, M. A., & Leonard, L. (2020). Sustainable business and development in Africa: Promoting peace and environmental justice through CSR. *Journal of Business Research*, 119, 738–747. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.02.053>
12. Gray, R. (2019). Accountability, social responsibility and sustainability: Accounting for society and the environment. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 32(3), 676–698. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-02-2018-3363>
13. Ide, T. (2019). The impact of environmental cooperation on peacemaking: Definitions, mechanisms, and empirical evidence. *International Studies Review*, 21(3), 327–346. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/viy014>
14. Ihlen, Ø., Bartlett, J. L., & May, S. (2021). CSR and environmental communication: The rise of justice narratives. *Business and Society Review*, 126(2), 163–180. <https://doi.org/10.1111/basr.12213>
15. Islam, M. A., & Deegan, C. (2020). Media pressures and corporate disclosure of social responsibility performance information: A study of the global garment industry. *Accounting & Business Research*, 50(5), 456–487. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00014788.2020.1728529>
16. Jamali, D., & Karam, C. (2019). Corporate social responsibility in developing countries as an emerging field of study. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 21(1), 2–28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12112>
17. Jones, M. J. (2020). Accounting for biodiversity: A review of the recent literature. *Accounting Forum*, 44(1), 23–45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01559982.2019.1593574>
18. Kolk, A., & Rivera-Santos, M. (2021). The state of research on Africa in business and management: Insights from a systematic review of key international journals. *Business & Society*, 60(2), 415–448. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650319845094>
19. Mertens, F. (2020). Accounting for sustainability in the Anthropocene: Advancing environmental justice. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, 11(6), 1201–1223. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SAMPJ-02-2020-0033>
20. Nyeadi, J. D., & Atiga, O. (2022). Environmental accounting and peace building: Evidence from Ghana's oil and gas sector. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 18(3), 412–429. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-05-2020-0203>
21. Pucker, K. P. (2021). Rethinking corporate sustainability in the fashion industry. *Harvard Business Review*, 99(3), 124–132. <https://hbr.org/2021/05/rethinking-sustainability-in-the-fashion-industry>
22. Rogers, R. K., & Milne, M. J. (2020). Accounting for sustainability and the triple bottom line: A review and agenda for future research. *Accounting & Finance*, 60(S1), 337–365. <https://doi.org/10.1111/acfi.12517>
23. Schoeneborn, D., Morsing, M., & Crane, A. (2020). Formative perspectives on the relation between corporate social responsibility communication and legitimacy: A literature review. *Business & Society*, 59(5), 798–839. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650318758321>
24. Spence, C., & Rinaldi, L. (2019). Governmentality in accounting and accountability: A case study of peace

- accounting. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 74, 29–45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2018.07.002>
25. Talbot, D., & Boiral, O. (2021). Genuinely green or greenwashed? Assessing the quality of sustainability reporting in the mining sector. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 170(1), 79–98. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04334-2>
26. Tilt, C. A. (2019). Making social and environmental accounting research relevant in developing countries: A matter of context? *Social and Environmental Accountability Journal*, 39(2), 87–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969160X.2019.1615011>
27. Unerman, J., Bebbington, J., & O'Dwyer, B. (2020). Corporate reporting and accounting for externalities. *Accounting and Business Research*, 50(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00014788.2019.1651263>
28. Wilmshurst, T. D., & Frost, G. R. (2019). Corporate environmental reporting: A test of legitimacy theory. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 32(2), 200–222. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-05-2017-2929>
29. Yekini, K. C., Adelopo, I., & Adegbite, E. (2022). Corporate social responsibility disclosures and community development in African economies: Evidence from Nigeria and Ghana. *Accounting Forum*, 46(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01559982.2021.1917932>
30. Zadek, S., & Merme, V. (2020). Accounting for sustainable development performance: Emerging lessons from practice. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, 11(3), 577–596. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SAMPJ-03-2020-0071>