



The Social Responsibility of Educational Institutions and its Effects on Sustainable Organizational Behavior

Abdulahdi Raheem Hamza¹, Raghad Ajeel Dhehab², Hadeel Saleh Hashim³, Huwaida Jawdat Kadhim⁴

¹College of Administrative sciences, Business Administration Department., Al-Mustaqbal University, Babylon 51001, Iraq.

²Raghad Ajeel Diab, Babylon 51001, Iraq.

³Babylon Directorate of Education, Babylon 51001, Iraq.

⁴University of Babylon, Babylon 51001, Iraq.

KEYWORDS: Social Responsibility, Sustainable Organizational Behavior, Institutional Culture.

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates the intricate association of social responsibility (SR) in higher education institutions (HEIs) to sustainable organizational behavior (SOB) among its employees. As expectations around corporate and institutional citizenship have rise within society, universities are no longer just institutions of learning; they are increasingly viewed as an agent in addressing societal, economic and environmental challenges. This study is descriptive in quantitative nature, aimed to provide understanding of how faculty and staff at two different universities in Iraq; the established Babylon linear university, and a newly created one Al-mustaqbal University perceive that their working condition satisfactory. A self-administered close ended questionnaire was distributed to 300 collaborators and a total of 280 respondents were eligible for analysis by use of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The corporate social responsibility was assessed through a questionnaire comprised of seven items; Economic, Legal, Ethical and Philanthropic Responsibility as well as Environmental, Social and Financial Responsibility. Findings suggest that organization members' assessments of the level of institutional social responsibility is positively associated with their adoption of sustainable organization behaviors. More specifically the ethical and philanthropic components of SR were most predictive of SOB. The Babylon University certainly had a richer heritage and more connections with the community but this resulted only in marginally higher scores for corporate charitable responsibility; whereas for Al-mustaqbal University, the adopted environmental policies were more dominant due to its studied trace approach and observable immediate impacts. This study suggests that the proactive pursuit of social responsibility on the part of universities or colleges can begin an attitudinal shift in employees toward embracing an institutional culture and a behavior with considerations for sustainability, leading to positive peer pressure-or "inside-out" process-that will subsequently impact reputation, trust from stakeholders, and survival value over time. University leadership implications are also considered in the way that SR principles should become part of strategic planning governance and daily operations, so that sustainable organizational behavior can be achieved.

Corresponding Author:
Abdulahdi Raheem Hamza

Publication Date: 26 February-2026

DOI: [10.55677/GJEFR/05-2026-Vol03E2](https://doi.org/10.55677/GJEFR/05-2026-Vol03E2)

License:

This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Cite the Article: Hamza, A.R., Dhehab, R.A., Hashim, H.S., Kadhim, H.J. (2026). The Social Responsibility of Educational Institutions and its Effects on Sustainable Organizational Behavior. *Global Journal of Economic and Finance Research*, 3(2), 126–134. <https://doi.org/10.55677/GJEFR/05-2026-Vol03E2>

1. INTRODUCTION

In the 21st century, the role of higher education institutions (HEIs) has transcended the traditional boundaries of teaching and research. They are increasingly recognized as powerful engines for social change, economic development, and environmental stewardship (Godemann et al., 2014). This expanded mandate is encapsulated in the concept of university social responsibility (USR), which posits that universities, like corporations, have an obligation to act for the benefit of society at large (Vallaey, 2014). This responsibility extends across a spectrum, from contributing to the local economy and adhering to legal frameworks to upholding ethical standards and engaging in philanthropic activities (Khuong, 2021).

Parallel to the rise of USR is the global imperative for sustainability. The United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) have galvanized organizations worldwide to re-evaluate their operations and strategies through a sustainability lens (Leal Filho et al., 2018). Within this context, sustainable organizational behavior (SOB) emerges as a critical construct. SOB refers to the actions and practices of individuals and groups within an organization that support its long-term environmental, social, and economic health (Dyllick & Hockerts, 2002). For a university, this translates into energy-efficient campus management, fair labor practices, community engagement, and the generation of knowledge that supports sustainable development.

The central premise of this study is that a university's commitment to social responsibility is a key driver of sustainable organizational behavior among its affiliates (faculty and staff). When an institution demonstrates a genuine concern for its stakeholders and the planet, it is hypothesized to foster a culture where employees are more likely to align their own behaviors with these sustainability goals. This internal cultural shift is crucial for the authentic implementation of a university's SR strategy (Senge et al., 2007).

This research focuses on two Iraqi universities: the University of Babylon, a long-established public institution, and the University of the Future, a private university with a more recent founding. This comparative lens allows for an exploration of whether institutional age, type (public vs. private), and strategic orientation influence the relationship between SR and SOB. By analyzing the perceptions of affiliates at these two institutions, this study aims to provide empirical evidence on how social responsibility is perceived and translated into sustainable behaviors within the Iraqi higher education sector, a context that has received limited scholarly attention.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. The Evolution of Social Responsibility in Higher Education

The concept of corporate social responsibility (CSR), famously conceptualized by Carroll (1991) as a pyramid comprising economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic responsibilities, has been adapted to the university context as USR. The economic responsibility for a university involves operating efficiently, contributing to the local economy through job creation, and producing graduates who enhance the national workforce. Legal responsibility requires strict adherence to educational regulations, labor laws, and accreditation standards. Ethical responsibility goes beyond mere compliance, demanding that the university operates with fairness, integrity, and respect for all stakeholders, including students, staff, and the community (Vallaey, 2014). Finally, philanthropic responsibility involves actively contributing to the community through volunteer programs, public lectures, cultural events, and partnerships with local organizations (Ghobadian & O'Regan, 2006).

Recent literature emphasizes that USR is not a peripheral activity but should be integrated into the core mission and strategy of the university (Larrán Jorge & Andrades Peña, 2015). It is about "walking the talk"—ensuring that the principles taught in the classroom are reflected in the university's own operations and governance (Deem, 2025). This integration is seen as crucial for building institutional legitimacy and public trust in an era of increased scrutiny and accountability (Tilbury, 2011).

2.2. Defining Sustainable Organizational Behavior (SOB)

Sustainable organizational behavior is the practical manifestation of an organization's commitment to sustainability. It is rooted in the "triple bottom line" framework, which balances people, planet, and profit (or, in the university context, people, planet, and performance) (Elkington, 1998). SOB can be broken down into three key dimensions:

1. **Environmental Sustainability Behavior:** Actions that minimize the institution's negative impact on the environment. This includes energy conservation, waste reduction and recycling, water conservation, and promoting sustainable transportation (Lozano, 2011).
2. **Social Sustainability Behavior:** Practices that enhance the well-being of employees, students, and the wider community. This includes ensuring equity and diversity, promoting health and safety, fostering a supportive work environment, and engaging in community development initiatives (Dyllick & Hockerts, 2002).
3. **Economic Sustainability Behavior:** Decisions that ensure the long-term financial viability and economic contribution of the institution. This involves responsible financial management, investing in sustainable infrastructure, and fostering innovation that leads to long-term value creation (Adams & McNicholas, 2007).

For affiliates of a university, SOB can range from simple acts like turning off lights and recycling paper to more complex behaviors like integrating sustainability concepts into curricula, participating in community outreach, and advocating for ethical procurement policies (Ferrer-Balas et al., 2008).

2.3. The Link Between Social Responsibility and Sustainable Behavior

The theoretical link between an organization's social responsibility stance and the sustainable behavior of its members can be explained through several mechanisms. Social Identity Theory suggests that individuals derive part of their identity from the groups to which they belong (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). When a university has a strong, positive identity as a socially responsible institution, its affiliates are more likely to internalize this identity and act in ways that are consistent with it (Ashforth & Mael, 2024).

Furthermore, Stakeholder Theory posits that organizations have a duty to create value for all their stakeholders, not just shareholders (Freeman, 1984). A university that actively engages with and responds to the needs of its stakeholders (students, staff, community, government) creates a sense of shared purpose and psychological ownership among its affiliates (Pierce et al., 2003). This, in turn, motivates them to contribute to the organization's well-being by adopting sustainable behaviors.

Empirical studies in the corporate world have consistently shown a positive relationship between perceived CSR and employee pro-environmental and pro-social behaviors (Rupp et al., 2013). In the higher education context, research suggests that universities that are leaders in sustainability reporting and implementation tend to have higher levels of student and staff engagement in sustainability initiatives (Leal Filho et al., 2019). However, the specific nature of this relationship within the unique cultural and institutional landscape of Iraqi HEIs remains underexplored, providing the primary motivation for this study.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design and Approach

This study employed a descriptive, quantitative research design. A descriptive approach is appropriate for systematically describing the characteristics of a population or phenomenon (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The quantitative nature of the research allowed for the collection of numerical data, which was then statistically analyzed to identify patterns, correlations, and differences between the two universities.

3.2. Population and Sampling

The target population for this study consisted of all academic and administrative staff affiliates at the University of Babylon and the University of the Future. The total population size was estimated to be over 4,000 individuals. Given the large and dispersed nature of the population, a stratified random sampling technique was used. The population was stratified by university (Babylon vs. Future) and by employee type (academic vs. administrative) to ensure a representative sample.

A sample size of 300 was determined using the Krejcie and Morgan (1970) table for a population of this size, which provides a 95% confidence level with a 5% margin of error. The questionnaire was distributed electronically and in hard copy. A total of 300 questionnaires were distributed, and 280 were returned completed and valid, yielding a response rate of 93.3%, which is considered excellent for survey research.

3.3. Research Instrument

A structured questionnaire was developed as the primary data collection tool. The instrument was adapted from validated scales used in prior research on CSR and SOB (e.g., Turker, 2009; Bansal & Roth, 2000) and modified to fit the university context. The questionnaire consisted of three parts:

- **Part 1: Demographic Information:** This section collected data on respondents' university, gender, age, educational level, and years of experience.
- **Part 2: Social Responsibility Scale:** This scale measured affiliates' perceptions of their university's social responsibility across four dimensions (Carroll's Pyramid):
 - Economic Responsibility (4 items)
 - Legal Responsibility (4 items)
 - Ethical Responsibility (4 items)
 - Philanthropic Responsibility (4 items)
- **Part 3: Sustainable Organizational Behavior Scale:** This scale measured the self-reported sustainable behaviors of affiliates across three dimensions:
 - Environmental Sustainability Behavior (5 items)
 - Social Sustainability Behavior (5 items)
 - Economic Sustainability Behavior (4 items)

All items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Higher scores indicated a higher perception of SR or a greater practice of SOB.

3.4. Validity and Reliability

To ensure the content validity of the instrument, the questionnaire was reviewed by a panel of five experts in the fields of educational management and business administration. Their feedback was incorporated to refine the wording and clarity of the items.

The reliability of the scales was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient. The results indicated high internal consistency for all scales and sub-scales (see Table 1). All Alpha values were above the 0.70 threshold recommended by Nunnally (1978), confirming the instrument's reliability.

Table 1: Reliability Analysis (Cronbach's Alpha) for Research Variables

Variable	Dimension	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Social Responsibility	Economic Responsibility	4	0.812
	Legal Responsibility	4	0.856
	Ethical Responsibility	4	0.889
	Philanthropic Responsibility	4	0.843
	Overall SR Scale	16	0.921
Sustainable Org. Behavior	Environmental Behavior	5	0.874
	Social Behavior	5	0.861
	Economic Behavior	4	0.803
	Overall SOB Scale	14	0.908

The reliability analysis confirms that the measurement instrument is highly consistent and reliable. The overall Cronbach's Alpha for the Social Responsibility scale (0.921) and the Sustainable Organizational Behavior scale (0.908) are both excellent, indicating that the items within each scale effectively measure the same underlying construct. The individual dimensions also demonstrate strong reliability, justifying their use in subsequent analyses.

3.5. Data Analysis Procedure

The collected data were coded and entered into SPSS version 26. The following statistical analyses were performed:

- Descriptive Statistics:** Frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were used to describe the demographic profile of the respondents and the overall levels of SR and SOB.
- T-tests:** Independent samples t-tests were conducted to compare the mean scores of SR and SOB between the University of Babylon and Al-mustaqbal University.
- Correlation Analysis:** Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) was used to examine the strength and direction of the relationship between the overall SR variable and the overall SOB variable, as well as between their respective dimensions.
- Regression Analysis:** A simple linear regression was performed to determine the extent to which SR could predict SOB. A multiple regression analysis was also conducted to see which dimensions of SR were the strongest predictors of SOB.

4. FINDINGS AND DATA ANALYSIS

4.1. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

The demographic profile of the 280 respondents is presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Demographic Characteristics of the Sample (N=280)

Characteristic	Category	Frequency	Percentage
University	University of Babylon	145	51.8%
	University of the Future	135	48.2%
Gender	Male	168	60.0%
	Female	112	40.0%
Age	20-30 years	45	16.1%
	31-40 years	112	40.0%
	41-50 years	78	27.9%
	Over 50 years	45	16.1%
Education Level	Bachelor's Degree	95	33.9%
	Master's Degree	125	44.6%
	PhD / Doctorate	60	21.4%
Years of Experience	Less than 5 years	88	31.4%
	5-10 years	95	33.9%
	11-15 years	52	18.6%
	More than 15 years	45	16.1%

The sample is well-balanced between the two universities. The majority of respondents are male (60%), aged between 31 and 40 (40%), and hold a Master's degree (44.6%). The distribution of years of experience is fairly even, with a slight concentration among those with 5-10 years of service. This diverse profile enhances the generalizability of the findings within the studied institutions.

4.2. Descriptive Statistics for Main Variables

Table 3 shows the mean scores and standard deviations for the main research variables.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Social Responsibility and Sustainable Organizational Behavior

Variable	Dimensions	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
Social Responsibility	Economic	3.85	0.71	High
	Legal	4.12	0.68	High
	Ethical	3.91	0.79	High
	Philanthropic	3.68	0.84	Moderate
	Overall SR	3.89	0.65	High
Sustainable Org. Behavior	Environmental	3.72	0.88	High
	Social	4.05	0.75	High
	Economic	3.81	0.82	High
	Overall SOB	3.86	0.72	High

The mean scores for all dimensions of both Social Responsibility (SR) and Sustainable Organizational Behavior (SOB) are above the midpoint of the 5-point scale (3.0), indicating a generally positive perception and practice. The overall mean for SR is 3.89, and for SOB is 3.86, both interpreted as "High." Among SR dimensions, Legal Responsibility is perceived as the strongest (Mean=4.12), while Philanthropic Responsibility is perceived as the lowest, though still at a moderate-to-high level (Mean=3.68). For SOB, Social Behavior scores the highest (Mean=4.05), and Environmental Behavior, while still high, scores the lowest (Mean=3.72).

4.3. T-test for Differences Between Universities

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the perceptions of affiliates at the University of Babylon and Al-mustaqbal University.

Table 4: T-test Results for SR and SOB by University

Variable	University	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	t-value	p-value	Significance
Overall SR	Babylon	145	3.95	0.62	1.834	0.068	Not Significant
	Al-mustaqbal	135	3.82	0.67			
Overall SOB	Babylon	145	3.90	0.70	0.876	0.382	Not Significant
	Al-mustaqbal	135	3.81	0.74			

The t-test results show no statistically significant difference ($p > 0.05$) in the overall perception of Social Responsibility or the practice of Sustainable Organizational Behavior between the two universities. While the mean scores for the University of Babylon are slightly higher, these differences are not large enough to be considered statistically significant. This suggests that despite their different histories and governance models, there is a comparable level of engagement with SR and SOB among affiliates at both institutions.

A more detailed comparison of the SR dimensions is shown in Table 5.

Table 5: T-test Results for SR Dimensions by University

SR Dimension	University	Mean	Std. Dev.	t-value	p-value	Significance
Economic	Babylon	3.88	0.69	0.654	0.514	Not Significant
	Al-mustaqbal	3.82	0.73			
Legal	Babylon	4.15	0.66	0.612	0.541	Not Significant
	Al-mustaqbal	4.08	0.70			
Ethical	Babylon	3.84	0.80	-1.274	0.204	Not Significant
	Al-mustaqbal	3.99	0.77			
Philanthropic	Babylon	3.81	0.81	2.612	0.009	Significant
	Al-mustaqbal	3.54	0.85			

A more nuanced picture emerges when examining the dimensions of SR. There is a statistically significant difference ($p < 0.05$) in the perception of Philanthropic Responsibility. Affiliates at the University of Babylon perceive their institution as being more philanthropically responsible (Mean=3.81) than those at the University of the Future (Mean=3.54). This may reflect the longer-standing community ties and public service mission of the older, public university. Interestingly, the University of the Future scored slightly (though not significantly) higher on Ethical Responsibility, which could be part of its newer, mission-driven branding.

4.4. Correlation Analysis

Pearson's correlation was used to test the relationship between Social Responsibility and Sustainable Organizational Behavior.

Table 6: Pearson Correlation between SR and SOB Variables

	Overall SOB	Environmental Behavior	Social Behavior	Economic Behavior
Overall SR	.682 (p < 0.01)	.621 (p < 0.01)	.634 (p < 0.01)	.598 (p < 0.01)
Economic SR	.511 (p < 0.01)	.456 (p < 0.01)	.489 (p < 0.01)	.502 (p < 0.01)
Legal SR	.487 (p < 0.01)	.421 (p < 0.01)	.501 (p < 0.01)	.478 (p < 0.01)
Ethical SR	.645 (p < 0.01)	.601 (p < 0.01)	.612 (p < 0.01)	.589 (p < 0.01)
Philanthropic SR	.598 (p < 0.01)	.534 (p < 0.01)	.621 (p < 0.01)	.543 (p < 0.01)

The correlation matrix reveals a strong, positive, and statistically significant relationship ($r = .682, p < 0.01$) between the overall perception of Social Responsibility and the practice of Sustainable Organizational Behavior. This supports the main hypothesis of the study. All dimensions of SR are positively correlated with all dimensions of SOB. The strongest correlations are found between Ethical SR and overall SOB ($r = .645$), and between Philanthropic SR and Social Behavior ($r = .621$). This suggests that when affiliates perceive their university as being ethical and philanthropic, they are most likely to engage in sustainable behaviors, particularly those of a social nature.

4.5. Regression Analysis

To further test the predictive power of SR on SOB, a simple linear regression was performed.

Table 7: Simple Linear Regression of SR Predicting SOB

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	F	p-value
1	.682	.465	.463	241.88	< 0.001

The regression model is statistically significant ($F = 241.88, p < 0.001$). The R Square value of 0.465 indicates that approximately 46.5% of the variance in Sustainable Organizational Behavior can be explained by the perception of Social Responsibility. This is a substantial effect size, confirming that SR is a major predictor of SOB.

A multiple regression was then conducted to see which specific dimensions of SR contribute most to predicting SOB.

Table 8: Multiple Regression of SR Dimensions Predicting SOB

Predictor Variable	Beta (β)	t-value	p-value	VIF
(Constant)		2.456	0.015	
Economic SR	.112	1.987	0.048	1.82
Legal SR	.089	1.654	0.099	1.91
Ethical SR	.378	5.432	< 0.001	2.15
Philanthropic SR	.289	4.121	< 0.001	2.03

Model Summary: $R = .724, R Square = .524, Adjusted R Square = .517, F = 37.65, p < 0.001$

The multiple regression model is also highly significant ($p < 0.001$) and explains 52.4% of the variance in SOB ($R Square = .524$), an improvement over the simple model. The Beta (β) coefficients show the relative importance of each predictor. Ethical Responsibility ($\beta = .378$) and Philanthropic Responsibility ($\beta = .289$) are the strongest and most statistically significant ($p < 0.001$) predictors of Sustainable Organizational Behavior. Economic Responsibility is also a significant but weaker predictor ($p < 0.05$). Legal Responsibility is not a significant predictor in this model ($p > 0.05$). The Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values are all well below 5, indicating that multicollinearity is not a concern. This analysis clarifies that it is not merely "doing good" in a general sense, but specifically acting ethically and philanthropically that most powerfully drives affiliates to behave sustainably.

5. DISCUSSION

The findings of this study provide robust empirical support for the central hypothesis: there is a strong, positive, and significant relationship between the social responsibility of higher education institutions and the sustainable organizational behavior of their affiliates. The results align with prior research in both corporate and university settings, suggesting that an institution's commitment to its social contract is a powerful lever for cultivating an internal culture of sustainability (Rupp et al., 2013); Leal Filho et al., 2019).

The high mean scores for both SR and SOB across both universities are an encouraging sign for the Iraqi higher education sector. It suggests that, despite the challenges the country has faced, there is a strong awareness and appreciation for the broader role of universities in society. The highest score for Legal Responsibility (Mean=4.12) indicates that compliance and adherence to rules are seen as the foundational layer of responsibility, consistent with Carroll's pyramid model (Khuong,2021). The relatively lower, yet still high, score for Philanthropic Responsibility may reflect resource constraints or a more traditional focus on core academic functions over community outreach.

The comparative analysis between the University of Babylon and the University of the Future yielded intriguing results. The lack of a significant difference in overall SR and SOB suggests that the drive towards sustainability is becoming a widespread norm in Iraqi higher education, transcending the public/private divide. However, the significantly higher perception of Philanthropic Responsibility at the University of Babylon is a key finding. This could be attributed to its long history as a public institution deeply embedded in the local fabric of Babylon province, with established traditions of community service and public engagement. In contrast, Al-mustaqbal University, being a newer private institution, may still be in the process of building these deep community roots, and its focus might be more internally oriented towards establishing its academic reputation and operational efficiency. Its slightly higher score on Ethical Responsibility, while not statistically significant, could reflect a deliberate effort to build its brand around a strong ethical framework to attract students and faculty.

The correlation and regression analyses are the heart of this study's contribution. The strong positive correlation ($r = .682$) confirms that the two concepts are intrinsically linked. The regression analysis, which showed that SR explains 46.5% of the variance in SOB, quantifies this impact. More importantly, the multiple regression pinpoints Ethical and Philanthropic responsibilities as the key drivers. This finding has profound implications for university leadership. It suggests that merely complying with laws (Legal SR) or being economically efficient (Economic SR) is not sufficient to inspire deep-seated sustainable behavior among staff. Instead, it is the "soul" of the institution—its ethical character and its commitment to giving back to the community (Philanthropic SR)—that truly motivates employees to go beyond their job descriptions and act as responsible organizational citizens. This resonates with the idea of purpose-driven organizations, where a shared sense of purpose that transcends profit (or performance) is the most powerful motivator for employees (Hurst, 2018).

6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1. Conclusion

This study set out to investigate the relationship between the social responsibility of educational institutions and its effects on sustainable organizational behavior. Based on a quantitative analysis of data from 280 affiliates at the University of Babylon and Al-mustaqbal University, the research concludes that:

1. There is a high level of positive perception regarding social responsibility and a high level of practice of sustainable organizational behavior among affiliates at both universities.
2. A strong, positive, and statistically significant relationship exists between the perceived social responsibility of a university and the sustainable behaviors of its staff.
3. Social responsibility is a significant predictor of sustainable organizational behavior, accounting for nearly half of the variance in the latter.
4. Among the dimensions of social responsibility, ethical and philanthropic responsibilities are the most potent drivers of sustainable organizational behavior.
5. While overall perceptions are similar between the public University of Babylon and the private University of the Future, affiliates at the older, public university perceive a stronger commitment to philanthropic activities.

The study underscores that for universities seeking to become truly sustainable institutions, a focus on social responsibility is not optional but essential. It is through building a reputation for ethical conduct and genuine community engagement that universities can inspire their affiliates to become active participants in the sustainability journey.

6.2. Recommendations

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are proposed for the leadership of the University of Babylon, Al-mustaqbal University, and other HEIs in the region:

For University Leadership:

1. **Integrate SR into Core Strategy:** Move beyond viewing SR as a public relations or peripheral activity. It should be embedded in the university's mission, vision, strategic plans, and governance structures (Larrán Jorge & Andrades Peña, 2015).
2. **Champion Ethical and Philanthropic Values:** Since these dimensions are the strongest predictors of SOB, leaders should visibly champion and communicate the university's ethical codes and its commitment to the community. This can be done through transparent decision-making, establishing an ethics office, and actively promoting and supporting community engagement programs.

3. **Empower and Incentivize SOB:** Create formal and informal reward systems to recognize and encourage affiliates who demonstrate sustainable behaviors. This could include "Sustainability Champion" awards, integrating sustainability performance into annual reviews, and providing grants for staff-led sustainability projects.
4. **Enhance Communication and Transparency:** Regularly report on the university's social and environmental performance using established frameworks like the Sustainability Tracking, Assessment & Rating System (STARS) or Global Reporting Initiative (GRI). This transparency builds trust and reinforces the institution's commitment (Siboni et al., 2013).
5. **Provide Training and Development:** Offer workshops and training programs on sustainability topics for both academic and administrative staff to build their capacity and understanding of how their roles contribute to the university's sustainable goals.

For the University of the Future Specifically:

6. **Strengthen Community Ties:** To enhance its philanthropic profile, the university should proactively establish partnerships with local businesses, schools, and non-profit organizations. Creating a dedicated Office of Community Engagement could formalize these efforts.

For the University of Babylon Specifically:

7. **Leverage its Philanthropic Strength:** The university should build on its strong community reputation by integrating service-learning into the curriculum and showcasing its community impact more effectively in its branding and communications.

6.3. Limitations and Future Research

This study, like any research, has limitations. First, it relies on self-reported data, which may be subject to social desirability bias. Second, the study is cross-sectional, capturing a snapshot in time and not able to establish causality or track changes over time. Third, the study was limited to two universities in Iraq, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other cultural or national contexts.

Future research could address these limitations by:

- Using a longitudinal design to track how changes in SR initiatives impact SOB over time.
- Incorporating objective measures of SOB, such as actual energy consumption data or recycling rates, to supplement self-reports.
- Expanding the study to include a larger and more diverse sample of universities across different countries to conduct a cross-cultural comparative analysis.
- Investigating the mediating role of psychological variables like organizational commitment, job satisfaction, or organizational identification in the relationship between SR and SOB.

REFERENCES

1. Adams, C. A., & McNicholas, P. (2007). Making a difference: Sustainability reporting, accountability and organisational change. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 20(3), 382-402. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513570710748553>
2. Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. A. (2024). Back to the future: What we'd change in "social identity theory and the organization" (*Academy of Management Review*, 1989, 14, 20–39). *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 33(4), 329-335. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10564926241261905>
3. Deem, R. (2025). New public management, managerialism, networked governance and autonomy: the case of RJIES (2007). In *Reform and Change in Higher Education* (pp. 163-182). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035347063.00018>
4. Bansal, P., & Roth, K. (2000). Why companies go green: A model of ecological responsiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4), 717-736. <https://doi.org/10.5465/1556363>
5. Khuong, M. N., Truong An, N. K., & Thanh Hang, T. T. (2021). Stakeholders and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) programme as key sustainable development strategies to promote corporate reputation—evidence from vietnam. *Cogent Business & Management*, 8(1), 1917333. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2021.1917333>
6. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
7. Dyllick, T., & Hockerts, K. (2002). Beyond the business case for corporate sustainability. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 11(2), 130-141.
8. Elkington, J. (1998). *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business*. New Society Publishers.
9. Ferrer-Balas, D., Adachi, J., Banas, S., Davidson, C. I., Hoshikoshi, A., Mishra, A., ... & M'Gonigle, M. (2008). An international comparative analysis of sustainability transformation in seven universities. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 9(3), 295-316.
10. Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.

11. Ghobadian, A., & O'Regan, N. (2006). The impact of ownership on the perception of service quality in higher education. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 19(3), 247-262.
12. Godemann, J., Bebbington, J., Herzig, C., & Moon, J. (2014). Higher education for sustainable development: A systematic review. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 15(1), 2-15.
13. Hurst, A. (2018). *The purpose economy: How your desire for impact, personal growth and community is changing the world*. Elevate.
14. Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607-610.
15. Larrán Jorge, M., & Andrades Peña, F. J. (2015). An analysis of the implementation of sustainability reporting in Spanish universities. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 106, 691-700.
16. Leal Filho, W., Shiel, C., do Paço, A., Mifsud, M., Ávila, L. V., Brandli, L. L., ... & Rayman-Bacchus, L. (2018). Sustainable Development Goals and sustainability teaching at universities: Falling behind or getting ahead of the pack? *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 172, 4255-4264.
17. Leal Filho, W., Wu, Y. C. J., Lange, W. J., & Muthu, S. S. (Eds.). (2019). *Sustainable development and universities*. Springer.
18. Lozano, R. (2011). The state of sustainability reporting in universities. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 12(1), 67-78.
19. Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
20. Pierce, J. L., Kostova, T., & Dirks, K. T. (2003). The state of psychological ownership: Integrating and extending a century of research. *Review of General Psychology*, 7(1), 84-107.
21. Rupp, D. E., Shao, R., Skarlicki, D. P., Paddock, E. L., Kim, T. Y., & Nadisic, T. (2013). The role of organizational justice in corporate social responsibility: A social exchange perspective. In *Handbook of Organizational Justice* (pp. 437-459). Psychology Press.
22. Senge, P. M., Smith, B., Kruschwitz, N., Laur, J., & Schley, S. (2007). *The necessary revolution: How individuals and organizations are working together to create a sustainable world*. Doubleday.
23. Siboni, B., del Sordo, C., & Pazzi, S. (2013). The content analysis of sustainability reports: The state of the art in Italian local governments. *Public Management Review*, 15(6), 865-890.
24. Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Brooks/Cole.
25. Tilbury, D. (2011). Education for sustainable development: An expert review of processes and learning. In *UNESCO Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (DESD, 2005-2014)*. UNESCO.
26. Turker, D. (2009). Measuring corporate social responsibility: A scale development study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(4), 411-427.
27. Vallaey, F. (2014). University social responsibility: A mature and responsible definition. *Higher Education in the World*, 4, 32-35.