

## Research Article

**Cite this article:** Kimbanda, F., Leonido, L., Gouveia, L, & Morgado, E. (2025). Assessing Quality and Social Responsibility in Higher Education Institutions in Angola. *Educational Process: International Journal*, 14, e2025052. <https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2025.14.52>

**Received** December 03, 2024

**Accepted** January 13, 2025

**Published Online** February 12, 2025


**Keywords:**

Education, higher education, educational system, quality systems social responsibility

**Author for correspondence:**

Elsa Morgado

 [elsasmorgado@gmail.com](mailto:elsasmorgado@gmail.com)

 Instituto Politécnico De Bragança  
Escola Superior De Educação, Portugal.



**OPEN ACCESS**

© The Author(s), 2025. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction, provided the original article is properly cited.

## Assessing Quality and Social Responsibility in Higher Education Institutions in Angola

Francisco Kimbanda , Levi Leonido , Luís Gouveia ,  
Elsa Morgado 

**Abstract**

**Background/purpose.** Education is a complex process, so higher education institutions (HEIs) must be increasingly aware of the importance of improving the quality of their various activities. Higher education is one of the crucial elements of the global education system, which must be flexible, diverse, effective, and in tune with the needs of the economy and knowledge. The study was developed in the IV Academic Region of Angola and attempted to assess the Quality and Social Responsibility of public higher education institutions.

**Materials/methods.** Quantitative research methodology. Case Study using a questionnaire survey with closed questions. Population: students, employees and teachers of the HEIs of the IV Academic Region of Angola. Sample: Students (n=447), employees (n=131) and teachers (n=62) participated in the study, totaling 640 individuals.

**Results.** The results determined that the dimension of Social Responsibility of Higher Education Institutions, best evaluated was the “Research” (média = 2,93) dimension and the least considered was “Structures” (média = 2,72), and that teachers significantly identify this dimension more in the educational institutions where they work, than staff or students. These results emphasize the need for strategic reforms to improve infrastructure and promote civic responsibility in Angola's HEIs.

**Conclusion.** Higher Education reforms in Angola should prioritize quality promotion through strategic intervention in four key areas: 1. Strengthening vision and legal frameworks; 2. Improving resources; 3. Fostering academic activities; 4. Expanding access. These reforms align with promoting civic values and ethical professional practices, which are vital for societal and institutional management.

## 1. Introduction

Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) have a fundamental responsibility for societies' economic and social progress, contributing to the promotion of active citizenship and the development of values, encouraging social awareness, environmental responsibility, civic participation and respect for diversity. Therefore, they must demonstrate levels of quality in terms of leadership, curriculum development, pedagogical performance, financial viability and ability to guarantee access to existing resources. In this way, the staff trained by the HEIs will have to be highly qualified and have skills adjusted to the needs of the country to perform active citizenship, responding to the needs and challenges of the community, as well as promoting social inclusion, thus contributing to the economic and social development of the country (Bezerra et al., 2024; Morgado et al., 2024a).

On the other hand, given the complexity of global challenges, present and future, HEIs have an implicit social responsibility with regard to understanding and resolving the multifaceted problems that arise, which have social, economic, scientific, and cultural dimensions. (Morgan and White, 2013; Guiffre and Ratto, 2014; Elfert, 2015; UNESCO, 2016; Burmistrova et al., 2017, 2018; Dias Sobrinho, 2019; Morgado et al., 2024b; Bezerra et al., 2024; Morgado et al., 2024c).

According to the World Declaration on Higher Education (UNESCO, 1998), the realization of the social responsibility of HEIs in the 21st century will depend, on the one hand, on how their mission is defined and on the other, on the increasingly complex problems that face the current society in which they operate. It is this commitment that an organization must have towards society, expressed through acts and attitudes that can positively and broadly affect a better quality of life for society.

We intend, from the outset, to assess and address the universe related to the levels (and indices) of Quality and Social Responsibility of public Higher Education Institutions allocated to the IV Academic Region of Angola, as well as intending, at the same time, to present solutions and/ or recommendation for its implementation, based on the dispersed Quality and Social Responsibility of Organizations (RSO) policies already existing and practiced in the various Organic Units (OU) of Lueji A'Nkonde University (ULAN).

In order to fulfill the main objective of our research (to assess the Quality and Social Responsibility of public Higher Education Institutions), we have structured this research based on the following 17 research questions, which are embodied in the questionnaire survey used: 1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are teachers in higher education with teaching, infrastructure, equipment, services, connection with the outside world, experience and personal development?; 2. How do teachers rate the different aspects of teaching in their courses?; 3. How satisfied are teachers with the infrastructure of higher education institutions?; 4. How do teachers perceive the services provided by higher education institutions?; 5. How do teachers evaluate their experience and personal development in the higher education institutions where they work?; 6. To what extent do higher education institutions fulfil teachers' expectations before they join them?; 7. What are the teachers' intentions with regard to continuing their studies at postgraduate, master's or doctoral level?; 8. How likely are teachers to recommend the higher education institutions where they teach to other people?; 9. What is the frequency of classroom attendance among lecturers in higher education?; 10. What is the opinion of teachers about the relevance of the learning offered in the courses?; 11. How do teachers rate their commitment to their classes?; 12. What is the teachers' perception of the organization and clarity of the classes they teach?; 13. How do teachers rate the interaction between teachers and students during lessons?; 14. What do teachers think of the teacher-student relationship?; 15. How do teachers rate the depth with which topics are covered in the courses?; 16. How do lecturers feel about assessment methods and grades?; 17. What is the teachers' opinion of the recommended work and reading?

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1. Concept of quality in Higher Education

The complexity attached to education, teaching and learning at this level (higher education) determines that issues related to precepts and quality indices will have to be overcome, in each cycle, and in each context, since institutions are increasingly aware of the importance of improving the quality of their services and the impact they have on an endogenous and exogenous level to the academy.

The term quality has been used in the most diverse fields of knowledge, including education, although there are substantial differences in its conceptualization and there is no universal definition. In the educational context, the definition of this term falls on varied aspects such as: customer satisfaction and social expectations, the management and administration of educational institutions, the availability of human, financial and infrastructural resources, among others, which contribute to carrying out the functions of HEIs (Mendes, 2014). Authors such as Taylor and Pearson (1994), Baird (2006), and Khan (2015) describe that the definition of quality refers to the totality of characteristics of a product or service that affect its ability to satisfy a given need.

This perspective of what is understood as Quality (in higher education) is clearly part of the mission and purpose of the academy, which, among others, formulates goals that meet the needs of the community in which it operates. Teaching and research programs are developed and implemented with the aim of achieving these goals. An essential characteristic of quality is the ability to achieve these objectives. Therefore, it is essential that universities clearly define their goals and create teaching and learning programs that serve as reference criteria to evaluate the quality of the activities carried out (Raposo, 2011; González-Chordá and Maciá-Soler, 2015; Savelyeva and Douglas, 2017; Bizarria et al., 2018).

The quality of higher education and training should certainly be one of the main objectives of any country and not just a mere formal and mandatory response to institutional assessments (Burmistrova et al., 2017, 2018; Capaldi & Brown, 2019; Ong & Lee, 2019; Chen et al., 2020; Lee & Liu, 2020; Le & Hoang, 2022). However, the concept of quality in higher education is not a univocal and fixed concept. Therefore, it must be built through consensus and negotiation between the various parties involved. Social construction varies according to the interests of the groups involved, which reflect the characteristics of the society desired for today and projected for the future (Bhattacharyya & Chakraborty, 2019; Chen et al., 2020; Sánchez-Gómez et al., 2021; Raja et al., 2021; Gomes & Cruz, 2022; Chukwu & Nwachukwu, 2023).

### 2.2. Social responsibility of Higher Education: quality factor

The term social responsibility was coined to address the moral obligation of companies to behave socially responsible in order, together with States and civil society, to build a better world. The desire for a better world, made possible by social inclusion and defended by companies, was already a rhetoric of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) which, imbued with this spirit, deepened discussions on social responsibility, as they are responsible for the training process and professionalization of people through critical reaction and reflection with technical, theoretical, ethical and moral aspects involved in life in society – therefore a natural space for social responsibility, due to the very nature of HEIs (Vallaey, 2006; Vallaey et al., 2009; Pompeu, 2011; Savelyeva & Douglas, 2017; Dias Sobrinho, 2019; Sepetis et al., 2020; Kimbanda, 2021; Bezerra et al., 2024; Kimbanda et al., 2024).

Adopting more sustainable development models requires the participation and cooperation of all socioeconomic sectors: business organizations, public administrations, social organizations, consumers, investors, media outlets, Higher Education Institutions, among others.

An organization that intends to be competitive in the future will have to have strategies that act in favor of the environment in which they operate and with respect for the environment, human rights and improving relations with their employees and society in general, so the adoption of Social Responsibility (SR) criteria implies the formalization of policies and management systems, in the economic, social and environmental spheres; also, the informative transparency of the results achieved in such areas, and, finally, the external feedback of those (Arli et al., 2019; Tumajan et al., 2020; Husted and Allen, 2020; Kim and Park, 2021; Pansari and Kumar, 2022; Ormazabal and Arrayave, 2023).

In this sense, HEIs should aim to improve the quality of the higher education system as a whole and greater efficiency in the use of available resources. Therefore, HEIs must promote RS as a social commitment to quality and excellence in management and provision of services to society, aware that training and knowledge are key factors in the economic, cultural and social development of a country, and hence the need for a well-coordinated, competitive higher education system with quality criteria that allow reorienting the activities of HEIs, to ensure greater social and environmental commitment (Ashley, 2005; Caixeta and Sousa, 2013; Ribeiro and Magalhães, 2014; Baca Neglia, 2016; Seroao et al., 2017; Vieira et al., 2018; Sepetis et al., 2020). Therefore, HEIs, as trainers of current and future generations, as consumers of resources and as references in the generation of knowledge, must respond to the needs and expectations of different interested parties.

More recently, the importance of university social responsibility has grown significantly, that is, the university's ability to define and put into practice a set of principles and values, through four essential processes: management, teaching; research, and extension (understood as a service to the community), thus committing, from a social point of view, to the university community and the country in which it operates (Calderón et al., 2011; Bizarría et al., 2018; Eidt & Calgaro, 2021). Society itself increasingly demands that universities be accountable for the way they train their students for professional practice (Fernandes & Ferreira, 2019; Costas and del Mar Fuentes-Fuentes, 2019; Meléndez & García, 2019; Zhu & Hu, 2020; Eidt & Calgaro, 2021; Castro & Costa, 2022). Therefore, discussing university social responsibility is to emphasize the commitment of HEIs to fulfilling their mission, guaranteeing the quality of education for citizens who use the educational services they provide. they offer (Morosini, 2008; Milana et al. 2016; Popescu and Ardelean, 2020; König et al., 2020; Zhu and Hu, 2020; García-Peñalvo and Lytras, 2021; Peng et al., 2021; Kimbanda, 2021; Castro and Costa, 2022; Ouyang et al., 2023).

### 3. Methodology

This quantitative study employs a case study approach and utilizes a questionnaire for data collection. It was developed in the IVth Academic Region of the Lueji A'Nkonde University (ULAN) of Angola, in the HEIs (Faculty of Medicine of Malanje, Escola Superior Politécnica de Malanje, Instituto Superior Politécnico de Malanje, Instituto Superior Agroalimentar de Malanje; Escola Superior Politécnica da Lunda Sul, Escola Superior Pedagógica da Lunda Norte, Faculty of Law of Lunda Norte, Faculty of Economics of Lunda Norte, and Escola Superior Pedagógica do Cuango) whose selection was intentional. The intentionality in the selection was due to the fact that evaluation constitutes an emerging element in the IVth Academic Region of ULAN and, consequently, in its organic units (OU).

The non-probabilistic convenience sample collection technique was adopted (Skinner et al., 2014), with respondents chosen according to availability or because they were more accessible to respond. 640 individuals participated in the study (n=447 students, n=131 employees, and n=62 teachers). Prior contact was made for data collection, through an 'official introductory letter', addressed to those responsible for each of the institutions, to obtain consent for data collection.

When processing data, we used descriptive statistical analysis (absolute and relative frequencies, means and respective standard deviations) and inferential statistics. The significance level to reject

the null hypothesis was set at  $\alpha \leq .05$ . Exploratory factor analysis, Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient, Pearson's correlation coefficient, Student's t-test for one sample, Student's t-test for independent samples, Anova repeated measures and Manova were used. The normal distribution of values in samples larger than 30 was accepted, in accordance with the central limit theorem. Homogeneity of variances was analyzed using Levene's test. The SPSS software (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) version 25.0 for Windows was used for statistical analysis.

## 4. Results

The structure of the presentation is based on the research points and questions, articulated with the issues addressed in the validated questionnaire survey, according to the terms and parameters outlined within the international framework, in the Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) of the academic region under study. Overall, we focus the research on the framework of the relationship and interaction between teachers and students. Whenever applicable and significant, we expand the discussion to include staff members who are part of the population and sample of the present study. Characteristics of the participants in the present study: Individuals participated (n=640), 69.8% (n=447) students, 20.5% (n=131) employees and 9.7% (n=62) teachers. The majority of students were male (70.9%, n=317), aged between 20-25 years old (50.7%, n=226), from the IV Academic Region (96.2%, n=430), were attending the 2nd year (38.7%, n=173) of the Pedagogy Teaching (23%, n=103) or Psychology Teaching (21.3%, n=95) course, being a student worker (50.9%, n=228). The employees were male (58%, n=76), aged 26-30 years (41.2%, n=54), from the IV Academic Region (91.6%, n=120), with higher education (73.3%, n=96), and performed the role of Technician (22.1%, n=29). As for teachers, the majority were male (67.7, n=42), over 50 years old (33.9%, n=21), from the IV Academic Region (69.4%, n=43), with a master's degree (59.7%, n=37) with more than 20 years of teaching experience (30.6%, n=19), with a Social Science course (38.7%, n=24), in the Assistant Professor category (38.7%, n=24).

### 4.1. Perceptions about Higher Education Institutions

#### Overall satisfaction (students and teachers)

Q1: Considering your experience in Higher Education, particularly in terms of teaching, facilities, equipment, services, connection to the outside world, experience and personal development, indicate your degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. We found that 41.9% (n=26) of teachers are satisfied, while the majority of students, 30% (n=134), are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

**Table 1.** Overall satisfaction (students and teachers)

	Students (n=447)		Teachers (n=62)	
	n	%	N	%
Very Dissatisfied	41	9,2%	0	0,0%
Dissatisfied	103	23,0%	6	9,7%
Neither satisfied/nor dissatisfied	134	30,0%	14	22,6%
Satisfied	114	25,5%	26	41,9%
Very satisfied	55	12,3%	16	25,8%

Q2: Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following aspects related to teaching on your course.

The best-rated item was the Ability to transmit knowledge (3.29), while the least-rated item was Class size (2.93). Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) of the relational structure of the 9 items of the teaching satisfaction scale revealed a unidimensional structure that explains 63.7% of the total variance. The validity of the factor analysis was carried out using the KMO (0.939, excellent) and Bartlett's test (significant,  $p < .001$ ). Internal consistency, assessed with Cronbach's Alpha, is .928 (excellent).

**Table 2.** Teaching - students and teachers (Synthesis Table)

	Students (n=447)						NR/O	Teachers (n=62)						NR/O
	VD	D	NS/ND	S	VS	Total		VD	D	NS/ND	S	VS	Total	
Teaching quality	52	104	105	138	36	435	12	1	9	15	32	5	62	0
	12,0%	23,9%	24,1%	31,7%	8,3%		1,6%	14,5%	24,2%	51,6%	8,1%			
Interaction with teacher-students and teacher-teachers	50	85	103	139	55	432	15	0	6	8	40	8	62	0
	11,6%	19,7%	23,8%	32,2%	12,7%		0,0%	9,7%	12,9%	64,5%	12,9%			
Communication of progress by teachers	48	100	113	131	33	425	22	0	8	16	34	3	61	1
	11,3%	23,5%	26,6%	30,8%	7,8%		0,0%	13,1%	26,2%	55,7%	4,9%			
Ability to transmit knowledge	47	75	99	169	45	435	12	0	2	9	43	7	61	1
	10,8%	17,2%	22,8%	38,9%	10,3%		0,0%	3,3%	14,8%	70,5%	11,5%			
Volume of work required	48	87	119	144	35	433	14	1	7	13	37	4	62	0
	11,1%	20,1%	27,5%	33,3%	8,1%		1,6%	11,3%	21,0%	59,7%	6,5%			
Existing study plan(s)	53	94	123	128	37	435	12	1	9	13	34	5	62	0
	12,2%	21,6%	28,3%	29,4%	8,5%		1,6%	14,5%	21,0%	54,8%	8,1%			
Relevance of subjects?	47	86	113	136	45	427	20	0	6	10	39	7	62	0
	11,0%	20,1%	26,5%	31,9%	10,5%		0,0%	9,7%	16,1%	62,9%	11,3%			
Offer of optional subjects	57	90	123	119	39	428	19	2	13	9	31	5	60	2
	13,3%	21,0%	28,7%	27,8%	9,1%		3,3%	21,7%	15,0%	51,7%	8,3%			
Class size	68	112	101	114	42	437	10	5	9	13	31	4	62	0
	15,6%	25,6%	23,1%	26,1%	9,6%		8,1%	14,5%	21,0%	50,0%	6,5%			
Overall Satisfaction with Teaching	46	104	123	127	41	441	6	0	9	12	37	4	62	0
	10,4%	23,6%	27,9%	28,8%	9,3%		0,0%	14,5%	19,4%	59,7%	6,5%			

VD – Very Dissatisfied, D – Dissatisfied, NS/ND – Neither Satisfied/Nor dissatisfied, S – Satisfied, VS – Very Satisfied. NR/O – No Response or Opinion

**Table 3.** Satisfaction with teaching: teachers vs students (Synthesis Table)

	Students		Teachers		Sig.
	M	DP	M	DP	
Teaching satisfaction	3.05	.94	3.58	.61	.001***

Overall satisfaction with teaching, considering the joint appreciation of students and teachers, obtained a mean of 3.13 (SD = 0.92), which is significantly higher than the midpoint of the scale (3),  $t(407) = 2.938$ ,  $p = .003$ . If we consider that the midpoint of the scale means neither satisfied/nor dissatisfied, we can therefore consider that the degree of satisfaction of students and teachers is medium high. When we compare the degree of satisfaction of students and teachers, we find that the differences are statistically significant  $t(405) = -4.060$ ,  $p = .001$ , with teachers reporting higher levels of satisfaction with teaching than students (3.58 vs. 3.05).

### *Satisfaction with facilities and equipment*

Q3: Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following aspects related to the facilities.

The highest-rated item was General cleaning (3.23), and the lowest-rated was Library Spaces (2.51).

**Table 4.** Facilities and Equipment (Summary Table)

	Students (n=447)						NR/O	Teachers (n=62)						NR/O
	VD	D	NS/ND	S	VS	Total		VD	D	NS/ND	S	VS	Total	
Library spaces	122	142	69	53	28	414	33	4	22	13	17	6	62	0
	27,3%	31,8%	15,4%	11,9%	6,3%			6,5%	35,5%	21,0%	27,4%	9,7%		
Study spaces	111	131	86	62	24	414	33	6	21	11	18	6	62	0
	24,8%	29,3%	19,2%	13,9%	5,4%			9,7%	33,9%	17,7%	29,0%	9,7%		
Surrounding spaces	75	127	103	75	22	402	45	3	23	9	20	5	60	2
	16,8%	28,4%	23,0%	16,8%	4,9%			4,8%	37,1%	14,5%	32,3%	8,1%		
Sport facilities	90	95	92	100	34	411	36	10	19	11	15	7	62	0
	20,1%	21,3%	20,6%	22,4%	7,6%			16,1%	30,6%	17,7%	24,2%	11,3%		
Overall Satisfaction with Facilities and Equipment	84	121	97	81	25	408	39	3	18	15	21	5	62	0
	18,8%	27,1%	21,7%	18,1%	5,6%			4,8%	29,0%	24,2%	33,9%	8,1%		
Cantine/bar	75	108	89	108	26	406	41	6	16	17	16	7	62	0
	16,8%	24,2%	19,9%	24,2%	5,8%			9,7%	25,8%	27,4%	25,8%	11,3%		
Buildings	85	142	86	69	16	398	49	6	14	8	24	8	60	2
	19,0%	31,8%	19,2%	15,4%	3,6%			9,7%	22,6%	12,9%	38,7%	12,9%		
Classrooms	61	123	90	105	28	407	40	5	12	10	27	8	62	0
	13,6%	27,5%	20,1%	23,5%	6,3%			8,1%	19,4%	16,1%	43,5%	12,9%		
Sanitary facilities / Bathrooms	85	110	90	91	33	409	38	6	9	13	24	9	61	1
	19,0%	24,6%	20,1%	20,4%	7,4%			9,7%	14,5%	21,0%	38,7%	14,5%		
Building access	60	117	93	104	21	395	52	7	10	6	29	10	62	0
	13,4%	26,2%	20,8%	23,3%	4,7%			11,3%	16,1%	9,7%	46,8%	16,1%		
Educational institution location	78	132	84	94	26	414	33	3	10	7	27	13	60	2
	17,4%	29,5%	18,8%	21,0%	5,8%			4,8%	16,1%	11,3%	43,5%	21,0%		
Parking lot	108	145	67	62	24	406	41	3	11	8	26	14	62	0
	24,2%	32,4%	15,0%	13,9%	5,4%			4,8%	17,7%	12,9%	41,9%	22,6%		
General cleaning	53	96	83	133	39	404	43	1	5	13	34	8	61	1
	11,9%	21,5%	18,6%	29,8%	8,7%			1,6%	8,1%	21,0%	54,8%	12,9%		
IT resources	82	111	98	97	24	412	35	6	18	13	16	8	61	1
Library spaces	18,3%	24,8%	21,9%	21,7%	5,4%			9,7%	29,0%	21,0%	25,8%	12,9%		

VD – Very Dissatisfied, D – Dissatisfied, NS/ND – Neither Satisfied/Nor dissatisfied, S – Satisfied, VS – Very Satisfied. NR/O – No Response or Opinion

**Table 5.** (FE): teachers vs students

	Students		Teachers		Sig.
	M	DP	M	DP	
Facilities and equipment	2.75	.95	3.21	.82	.001***

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) of the relational structure of the 13 items of the facilities and equipment scale revealed a unidimensional structure that explains 55.2% of the total variance. The validity of the factor analysis was carried out using the KMO (0.936, excellent) and Bartlett's test (significant,  $p < .001$ ). Internal consistency was .928 (excellent).

The overall satisfaction with the facilities and equipment, considering the joint appreciation of students and teachers, was 2.82 (SD = 0.95), which is significantly lower than the midpoint of the scale (3),  $t(392) = -3.746$ ,  $p = .001$ . If we consider that the midpoint of the scale means neither satisfied/nor dissatisfied, we can therefore consider that the degree of satisfaction of students and teachers is medium low. When we compare the degree of satisfaction with the facilities and equipment of students and teachers, we find that the differences are statistically significant  $t(391) = -3.456$ ,  $p = .001$ , with teachers reporting higher levels of satisfaction with the facilities and equipment while students report low levels of satisfaction with facilities and equipment (3.21 vs 2.75).

#### ***Satisfaction with Services***

Q4: Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following aspects related to the services provided.

The item on the satisfaction scale relating to services with the highest value was Management Bodies (Direction, Scientific and Pedagogical C.) (3.12); the least well-rated item was Libraries (2.70).



Table 6. Services (Summary table)

	Students (n=447)							Teachers (n=62)							NR/O
	VD	D	NS/ND	S	VS	Total	NR/O	VD	D	NS/ND	S	VS	Total	NR/O	
International relations	93	107	89	55	17	361	86	4	12	19	15	12	62	0	
	20,8%	23,9%	19,9%	12,3%	3,8%			6,5%	19,4%	30,6%	24,2%	19,4%			
Professional insertion	63	106	116	70	20	375	72	1	16	15	17	11	60	2	
	14,1%	23,7%	26,0%	15,7%	4,5%			1,6%	25,8%	24,2%	27,4%	17,7%			
New students orientation	58	104	115	83	21	381	66	1	11	17	21	11	61	1	
	13,0%	23,3%	25,7%	18,6%	4,7%			1,6%	17,7%	27,4%	33,9%	17,7%			
Accounting/Treasury	65	96	117	87	19	384	63	4	7	14	24	11	60	2	
	14,5%	21,5%	26,2%	19,5%	4,3%			6,5%	11,3%	22,6%	38,7%	17,7%			
Kantine/Bars	74	112	107	81	16	390	57	3	18	14	16	9	60	2	
	16,6%	25,1%	23,9%	18,1%	3,6%			4,8%	29,0%	22,6%	25,8%	14,5%			
IT resources	86	120	86	80	16	388	59	1	18	18	16	8	61	1	
	19,2%	26,8%	19,2%	17,9%	3,6%			1,6%	29,0%	29,0%	25,8%	12,9%			
Students association	114	114	83	65	18	394	53	2	13	15	19	13	62	0	
	25,5%	25,5%	18,6%	14,5%	4,0%			3,2%	21,0%	24,2%	30,6%	21,0%			
Library	108	116	89	62	20	395	52	1	21	18	15	7	62	0	
	24,2%	26,0%	19,9%	13,9%	4,5%			1,6%	33,9%	29,0%	24,2%	11,3%			
Academic services /DAC	67	97	91	105	27	387	60	1	13	18	18	11	61	1	
	15,0%	21,7%	20,4%	23,5%	6,0%			1,6%	21,0%	29,0%	29,0%	17,7%			
Management bodies (Direction, Scientific and Pedagogical)	69	85	118	88	27	387	60	0	7	13	26	15	61	1	
	15,4%	19,0%	26,4%	19,7%	6,0%			0,0%	11,3%	21,0%	41,9%	24,2%			
Social Action Services	90	96	110	69	21	386	61	4	21	13	14	10	62	0	
	20,1%	21,5%	24,6%	15,4%	4,7%			6,5%	33,9%	21,0%	22,6%	16,1%			
Extracurricular activities	86	107	114	60	21	388	59	3	16	18	16	8	61	1	
	19,2%	23,9%	25,5%	13,4%	4,7%			4,8%	25,8%	29,0%	25,8%	12,9%			
Site/Page/Web	86	113	101	65	20	385	62	8	16	19	10	8	61	1	
	19,2%	25,3%	22,6%	14,5%	4,5%			12,9%	25,8%	30,6%	16,1%	12,9%			
Overall Satisfaction with Services	83	97	109	74	28	391	56	2	17	19	17	7	62	0	
	18,6%	21,7%	24,4%	16,6%	6,3%			3,2%	27,4%	30,6%	27,4%	11,3%			

VD – Very Dissatisfied, D – Dissatisfied, NS/ND – Neither Satisfied/Nor dissatisfied, S – Satisfied, VS – Very Satisfied. NR/O – No Response or Opinion

Table 7. (SS): teachers vs students

	Students		Teachers		Sig.
	M	DP	M	DP	
Services satisfaction	2.86	1.05	3.32	.85	.002**

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) of the relational structure of the 13 items of the academic services satisfaction scale revealed a unidimensional structure that explains 64.4% of the total variance. The validity of the factor analysis was carried out using the KMO (0.946, excellent) and Bartlett's test (significant,  $p < .001$ ). The internal consistency of the satisfaction with academic services scale was .954 (excellent).

The overall satisfaction with academic services, considering the joint appreciation of students and teachers, was 2.92 (SD = 1.0), which is similar to the midpoint of the scale (3),  $t(399) = -1.391$ ,  $p = .165$ . When we compare the degree of satisfaction with academic services satisfaction of students and teachers, we find that the differences are statistically significant  $t(398) = -3.084$ ,  $p = .002$ , with teachers reporting higher levels of satisfaction with services while students report low levels of satisfaction with academic services (3.32 vs 2.86).

### *Satisfaction with the connection abroad*

Q5: How satisfied are you with the following aspects related to your experience and personal development at the HEI Institution(s) where you teach?

The best rated item was Sense of belonging (feeling welcome) (3.18), while the least rated item was Employability and Entrepreneurship (2.74).

**Table 8.** Connection abroad, experience and personal development (Summary Table)

	Students (n=447)						NR/O	Teachers (n=62)						NR/O
	VD	D	NS/ND	S	VS	Total		VD	D	NS/ND	S	VS	Total	
Employability and Entrepreneurship	86	116	127	58	47	434	13	3	17	18	17	7	62	0
	19,2%	26,0%	28,4%	13,0%	10,5%			4,8%	27,4%	29,0%	27,4%	11,3%		
Image and reputation of the institution	58	106	132	88	47	431	16	4	9	20	22	7	62	0
	13,0%	23,7%	29,5%	19,7%	10,5%			6,5%	14,5%	32,3%	35,5%	11,3%		
Connection to the Outside of the Institution(s)	65	91	161	75	40	432	15	2	11	24	19	6	62	0
	14,5%	20,4%	36,0%	16,8%	8,9%			3,2%	17,7%	38,7%	30,6%	9,7%		
Overall Satisfaction with the Connection Abroad of the Institution(s)	67	84	153	79	42	425	22	1	18	19	19	5	62	0
	15,0%	18,8%	34,2%	17,7%	9,4%			1,6%	29,0%	30,6%	30,6%	8,1%		
Improving teamwork ability	56	94	135	106	45	436	11	3	12	21	20	6	62	0
	12,5%	21,0%	30,2%	23,7%	10,1%			4,8%	19,4%	33,9%	32,3%	9,7%		
Feeling of security	52	108	126	108	43	437	10	4	8	16	25	9	62	0
	11,6%	24,2%	28,2%	24,2%	9,6%			6,5%	12,9%	25,8%	40,3%	14,5%		
Sense of belonging (feels welcome)	52	83	118	128	54	435	12	2	7	17	24	12	62	0
	11,6%	18,6%	26,4%	28,6%	12,1%			3,2%	11,3%	27,4%	38,7%	19,4%		
Overall Satisfaction with Experience and Personal Development	58	68	133	128	53	440	7	2	7	18	24	11	62	0
	13,0%	15,2%	29,8%	28,6%	11,9%			3,2%	11,3%	29,0%	38,7%	17,7%		

VD – Very Dissatisfied, D – Dissatisfied, NS/ND – Neither Satisfied/Nor dissatisfied, S – Satisfied, VS – Very Satisfied. NR/O – No Response or Opinion

**Table 9.** Connection abroad: teachers vs students

	Students		Teachers		Sig.
	M	DP	M	DP	
Exterior access	2.94	1.02	3.29	.87	.009**

The exploratory factor analysis of the relational structure of the 7 items of the satisfaction with Foreign Connection scale revealed a unidimensional structure that explains 73.2% of the total variance. The validity of the factor analysis was carried out using the KMO (0.913, excellent) and Bartlett's test (significant,  $p < .001$ ). The internal consistency of the satisfaction with Foreign Connection scale was .939 (excellent). The overall satisfaction with Connection Abroad, considering the joint appreciation of students and teachers, was 2.99 (SD = 1.0), which is similar to the midpoint of the scale (3),  $t(443) = -0.235$ ,  $p = .814$ . When we compare the degree of satisfaction with satisfaction with the Connection Abroad of students and teachers, we find that the differences are statistically significant  $t(442) = -2.630$ ,  $p = .009$ , with teachers reporting higher levels of satisfaction with the Connection abroad while students report low levels of satisfaction with Connection Abroad (2.94 vs 3.29).

### *Global insights*

Q6: How does the institution you study at compare to your expectations before attending higher education?

Q7: If possible, do you intend to continue your studies in higher education through a postgraduate, master's or doctorate degree?

Q8: Tell us how likely you are to recommend the HEI(s) you teach at to other people?

When students were asked about how they see the institution they study at in relation to their expectations before attending higher education (Q6), the majority indicated that their expectations were met (42.3%, [n=189]), 31, 1% ([n=139]) consider that they are below and 3.6% ([n=16]) that they are well above their expectations.

In Q7, a high percentage (60.5%, [n=263]) states that they intend to continue their studies in higher education through a postgraduate degree, master's degree or doctorate.

In turn, the intention to recommend the educational institution (Q8) is high, standing at 62.8% ([n=320]), and the intention to recommend the course is around 75.9% ([n=386]). A little more than half consider that they would reapply to the institution they attend (52.3% [n=266]).

**Table 10.** Recommendation (Summary Table)

	Extremely below expectation	Below expectation	Expectations met	Above expectations	Extremely above expectations	Total of answers	NR/O
Students (n= 447)	58 13,0%	139 31,1%	189 42,3%	45 10,1%	16 3,6%	443	4
Teachers (n=62)	1 1,6%	22 35,5%	34 54,8%	3 4,8%	2 3,2%	62	0

### *Perception of Teaching Quality*

Q9: What is your level of class attendance?

We found that half of the respondents (48.5%, [n=217]) indicate that they attend more than 75% of classes.

**Table 11.** Class attendance level

	Less than 25%	25 to 50%	50 to 75%	More than 75%	Total of answers	SR/O
Students (n= 447)	15 3,4%	49 11,0%	165 36,9%	217 48,5%	446	1
Teachers (n=62)	1 0,2%	2 0,4%	26 5,8%	33 7,4%	62	0

In questions Q10: What is your opinion about the relevance of learning? Q11: What is your opinion about the teachers' commitment; Q12: What is your opinion about the Organization/Clarity of Classes. Q13: What is your opinion about the interaction of teachers with the class. Q14: What is your opinion about the teacher/student relationship. Q15: What is your opinion about the depth in approaching the subjects. Q16: What is your opinion about the Assessment/ratings. Q17: What is your opinion about the Works/readings.

The dimension of Perception about the Quality of Education best evaluated was the Relevance of the learning dimension (4.88), and the least well-evaluated was Assessment/classifications (4.15). All dimensions were rated significantly above the scale's midpoint ( $p < .05$ ). Internal consistency can be considered good.

All correlation coefficients for the Perception of Teaching Quality dimensions are significant, positive and moderate or high. The highest correlation occurs between the dimensions Teacher/student relationship and Teacher commitment ( $r = .735$ ).

Manova's multivariate tests indicate that there is at least one variable in which the differences in evaluation between students and teachers are statistically significant, Wilks' Lambda = .836,  $F(8, 444) = 10.900$ ,  $p = .001$ . Univariate tests indicate that, with the exception of the Relevance of learning dimension, teachers evaluate the remaining Perception of Teaching Quality dimensions significantly better than students ( $p < .05$ ).

#### **4.2. Social Responsibility of Higher Education Institutions**

The relational structure of the 38 items of the Social Responsibility of Higher Education Institutions scale was analyzed through exploratory factor analysis on the correlation matrix, with extraction of factors using the main components method, followed by Varimax rotation. The common factors retained were those that presented an eigenvalue (In linear algebra, an eigenvector or characteristic vector of a linear transformation is a non-zero vector that changes only by a scalar factor when that linear transformation is applied to it) greater than 1. The validity of the factor analysis was carried out using the KMO (0.971, excellent) and the Bartlett test (significant), which indicates acceptable values for its continuation. In order to improve the solution obtained, all questions with commonalities (quality or communal condition) were extracted lower than .40, and items with high factor weights in more than one factor (cross-loading) were eliminated. The factor analysis converged to a solution with 3 main components that explain 68.9% of the total variance.

The saturation of the items ( $> .40$ ) in each of the main components can be seen in the table below (Appendix 1.). The first main component integrates the items related to having structures to support the practice of social responsibility and explains 27.9% of the total variance, the second component groups the items related to the investigation of social responsibility topics (explains

23.9% of the total variance) and the third component integrates issues related to participation in debates and agreements related to social responsibility (explains 16.9% of the total variance).

The dimension of Social Responsibility of Higher Education Institutions that was best evaluated was the Research dimension (2.93) and the least well evaluated was Structures (2.72). These dimensions were evaluated significantly below the midpoint of the scale ( $p < .05$ ), which means that subjects do not perceive them very intensely in the practice of educational institutions.

When we compare the evaluations of the dimensions of social responsibility of educational institutions made by students, employees and teachers, Manova's Multivariate test indicates that there is at least one dimension in which the difference is statistically significant, Wilks' Lambda = .933,  $F(6, 858) = 5.029$ ,  $p = .001$ .

Manova's univariate tests allow us to conclude:

SR Structures,  $F(2, 531) = 14.455$ ,  $p = .001$ , teachers identify this dimension of social responsibility significantly more in the educational institutions where they work than employees or students. The difference between students and staff is not statistically significant.

SR Investigação,  $F(2, 512) = 15.671$ ,  $p = .001$ , teachers identify this dimension of social responsibility significantly more in the educational institutions where they work than employees or students. The difference between students and staff is not statistically significant.

SR Participation,  $F(2, 542) = 14.938$ ,  $p = .001$ , teachers identify this dimension of social responsibility significantly more in the educational institutions where they work than employees or students. The difference between students and staff is not statistically significant.

## 5. Conclusion and Recommendations

We believe that, for public policies—particularly in this context—to be the subject of future reflection and implementation, they must take into account studies conducted by external institutions on the national context (e.g., Kimbanda et al., 2021, 2024). Such studies provide the scientific foundation needed to enhance the credibility of decisions made at political and legislative levels. In this regard, alongside research focused on the Angolan higher education system, it is crucial to consider studies from other contexts, as they can further emphasize and validate the significance of future measures and decisions by national legislative authorities. Furthermore, it is essential to take into account students' perceptions of their university experiences, including cultural inclusion, academic challenges, institutional support and social interactions, assessing how these factors influence their integration and success (Perry et al., 2016). In addition, it is necessary to measure student autonomy, analyzing it through mentoring projects and other methods. Redefining how this autonomy is assessed can have an impact on pedagogical practices and curricula in higher education (Holmes, 2018), especially given the growing impact of technologies such as AI on the educational process (Nikoçeviq-Kurti & Bërdynaj-Syla, 2024). Institutions should also promote reflection among teaching staff to clearly define 'competences' and 'competence', developing fair assessments that guarantee the effectiveness of CBE and equity in assessment processes (Holmes et al., 2021).

In Angola, over the last few decades, higher education and the job market have followed antagonistic paths, this is because the number of graduates grows year after year, and on the contrary, opportunities to enter the world of work have decreased. HEIs are oblivious to this reality, and that is why there is a systematic offer of courses, in different institutions, which annually send a number of graduates to the job market that is disproportionate to the needs of this new market.

The main points of limitation and bottlenecks in the quality management of HEIs in Angola, according to Kimbanda (2021) and Kimbanda et al. (2024), are divided into six domains: 1. Conceptual (distortion of the concept of school, HEIs with inadequate operating conditions); 2. Organization and

institutional management (structural disconnections in the system, lack of strategic planning, weak professionalization and specialization in management practices); 3. Financing (weaknesses in accountability, lack of transparency and rigor in fund management; curriculum); 4. Teaching staff (quantitatively and qualitatively insufficient, inadequate profile, small circle of teachers); 5. Student body (inadequacy of student profiles in relation to the entry profiles required for different courses, low income); 6. Lack of specialized inspection, evaluation and supervision services (lack of accurate information on the quality of services provided).

It is through this panorama that the promotion of quality emerges as one of the main foundations for Higher Education reforms in Angola, in terms of policies and organizational configuration based on strategic lines of intervention and action of HEIs. To this end, four axes of intervention are mentioned: consolidating the strategy and vision to be prioritized in Higher Education; strengthen the legal-institutional basis of the Higher Education subsystem in Angola; improve human, material and financial resources in Higher Education; promote academic and pedagogical activity and expand the Higher Education network throughout the national territory. In turn, the study of RSO gains significant importance in the functional framework of society, as in addition to allowing the establishment of norms of peaceful coexistence between subjects, it guides professionals towards respecting values and concepts that are the foundations of civic participation in life. and in the management of institutions.

## Declarations

**Author Contributions.** Conceptualization, FK, LL, LG and EM; methodology, FK, LG and EM; software, FK; validation, LL, LG and EM; formal analysis, LG and EM; investigation, FK; resources, FK; data curation, LL; LG and EM; writing—original draft preparation, FK, LL, LG and EM; writing—review and editing, LL and EM; visualization, FK, LL, LG and EM; supervision, LG and EM; project administration, FK and EM. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript

**Conflicts of Interest.** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

**Funding.** This work is funded by National Funds through the FCT—Foundation for Science and Technology, I.P., by project reference UIDB/05507/2020 and DOI identifier 10.54499/UIDB/05507/2020. Furthermore, we would like to thank the Centre for Studies in Education and Innovation (CI&DEI) and the Polytechnic of Viseu for their support.

**Acknowledgments.** The authors would like to thank all the participants in the study.

## References

- Arli, D., Ertaningsih, N. S., & Tjiptono, F. (2019). The impact of corporate social responsibility on customer loyalty: The mediating effect of brand image. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 207, 605–615.
- Ashley, P. A. (2005). *Ética e responsabilidade social nos negócios*. Editora Saraiva.
- Baca Neglia, H. (2016). *La responsabilidad social universitaria: propuesta conceptual y medición en el ámbito de una universidad privada de Lima, Perú* [Tese de doutoramento]. Universidad de Sevilla.
- Baird, J. (2006). Beyond professionalization: Enhancing the governance culture for Australian university governing boards. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 12, 297–309. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13583883.2006.9967175>
- Bertolini, J. C. G. (2009). Quality in higher education: from conceptual diversity to the inexorable subjectivity of definitions. *Avaliação*, 14(1), 127–149. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1414-40772009000100007>

- Bezerra, S. Q., Silva, L. L. F., & Morgado, E. M. G. (2024). Profile, training, competences and attributions of the administrator profession in higher education. *Revista De Gestão Social E Ambiental*, 18(7), e06948. <https://doi.org/10.24857/rgsa.v18n7-112>
- Bhattacharyya, S., & Chakraborty, I. (2019). Impact of institutional accreditation on the quality of higher education in India: An empirical analysis. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 27(3), 320-338.
- Bizarria, F. P. A., Moreira, R. N., & Barbosa, F. L. S. (2018). Values and attitudes socially responsible in higher education institutions. *Revista Gestão e Planejamento*, 19, 244-261. <https://doi.org/10.21714/2178-8030gep.v19.4991>
- Burmistrova, N. A., Kormiltseva, E. A., Shmakova, A. P., & Loshchilova, M. A. (2017). An innovative approach to education in the context of sustainable development. *The European Proceedings of Social & Behavioural Sciences*, XXVI, 122-129. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2017.07.02.16>
- Burmistrova, N. A., Vasina, N. V., Filimonov, V. A., Kalnitskaya, I. V., Shmakova, A. P., & Ilina, N. I. (2018). The concept of smart-education for sustainable development. In *International Conference on the Theory and Practice of Personality Formation in Modern Society (ICTPPFMS-18)* (Vol. 198, pp. 192-196). <http://dx.doi.org/10.2991/ictppfms-18.2018.34>
- Caixeta, J. E., & Sousa, M. A. (2013). Social responsibility in higher education: Contributions from the school psychology. *Psicologia Escolar e Educacional*, 17(1), 133-140. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-85572013000100014>
- Calderón, A. I., Pedro, R. F., & Vargas, M. C. (2011). Social responsibility of higher education: The metamorphosis of Unesco discourse in focus. *Interface - Comunicação, Saúde, Educação*, 15(39), 85-98. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1414-32832011000400017>
- Capaldi, N., & Brown, G. T. (2019). A systematic review of the effectiveness of quality assurance processes in higher education institutions. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 27(1), 43-60. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-10-2017-0100>
- Castro, P., & Costa, R. C. (2022). The role of university social responsibility in sustainable development: A systematic review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 335, 27982. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.27982>
- Chen, H. T., Chen, Y. H., & Wu, C. C. (2020). Does institutional evaluation improve teaching quality in higher education? Evidence from Taiwan. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 28(4), 449-464. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-04-2020-0069>
- Chukwu, E. O., & Nwachukwu, J. C. (2023). Quality assurance in Nigerian higher education: A review of the effectiveness of accreditation and ranking. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 31(1), 4-20. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-12-2021-0124>
- Costas, J., & del Mar Fuentes-Fuentes, M. (2019). University social responsibility in the digital age: An analysis of institutional websites. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 228, 768-777. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.04.127>
- Dias Sobrinho, J. (2019). Quality, pertinence, relevance, social responsibility, public good. *Avaliação*, 24(1), 1-7. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1414-407720190001000017>
- Eidt, E. C., & Calgaro, S. (2021). University social responsibility - History and complexity implicit in the constitution of the concept. *Avaliação*, 26(1), 89-111. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1414-40772021000100006>

- Elfert, M. (2015). UNESCO, the Faure report, the Delors report, and the political utopia of lifelong learning. *European Journal of Education*, 50(1), 88-100. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12104>
- Fernandes, J. S., & Ferreira, M. P. (2019). University social responsibility: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 228, 710-723. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.04.156>
- García-Peñalvo, F. J., & Lytras, M. D. (2021). An overview of university social responsibility practices in the European higher education area. *Sustainability*, 13(2), 820. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13020820>
- Giuffré, L., & Ratto, S. (2014). A new paradigm in higher education: University social responsibility (USR). *Journal of Education & Human Development*, 3, 231-238.
- Gomes, F., & Cruz, A. (2022). Assessment of the quality of higher education institutions: The case of Portuguese polytechnics. *Quality in Higher Education*, 28(1), 22-37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2022.2028427>
- Holmes, A. G. (2018). Problems with assessing student autonomy in higher education: An alternative perspective and a role for mentoring. *Educational Process: International Journal*, 7(1), 24–38. <https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2018.71.2>
- Holmes, A. G. D., Tuin, M. P., & Turner, S. L. (2021). Competence and competency in higher education: Simple terms yet with complex meanings. *Educational Process: International Journal*, 10(3), 39–52. <https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2021.103.3>
- Husted, B. W., & Allen, D. B. (2020). Corporate social responsibility in the multinational enterprise: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Journal of World Business*, 55(2), 101074. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2019.101074>
- Khan, S. (2015). Total quality management in research and development sections of different sectors: A social responsibility. *IJRITCC*, 3(2), 616-621.
- Kim, M., & Park, J. (2021). The effects of corporate social responsibility on firm performance: The mediating role of innovation. *Sustainability*, 13(2), 667. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13020667>
- Kimbanda, F. J. C. (2021). *Sistemas de qualidade no ensino superior em Angola: Contributos para modelos de melhoria da qualidade e responsabilidade social* [Tese de doutoramento]. Universidade Fernando Pessoa.
- Kimbanda, F., Gouveia, L. B., Leonido, L., Rodrigues, J., & Morgado, E. G. (2024). Quality systems in higher education in Angola: Contributions and recommendations for improvement. In Silva, C., Silva, S., Mota, D., & Peres, P. (Eds.), *Smart learning solutions for sustainable societies* (pp. 29-41). Springer, Singapore. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-0661-7\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-0661-7_3)
- König, J., Lehmann-Waffenschmidt, M., & Stock, M. (2020). Sustainability in higher education institutions: A systematic review of the literature on university social responsibility. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 249, 119430. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.119430>
- Le, T. T. H., & Hoang, T. H. T. (2022). The role of quality assurance in enhancing the quality of higher education: Evidence from Vietnam. *Journal of International Education in Business*, 15(1), 92-108. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIEB-04-2021-0034>
- Lee, Y. J., & Liu, J. (2020). Quality assurance in higher education: A review of literature from 2010 to 2019. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 42(4), 397-412. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2020.1722120>



- Meléndez, E. A. B., & García, F. A. R. (2019). A framework for university social responsibility in Mexican public universities. *Sustainability*, 11(18), 4927. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11184927>
- Mendes, M. C. B. (2014). Avaliação e gestão da qualidade no ensino superior em Angola: Traços emergentes. *Meta: Avaliação*, 6(17), 145-175. <https://doi.org/10.22347/2175-2753v6i17.234>
- Milana, M., Rasmussen, P., & Holford, J. (2016). Societal sustainability: The contribution of adult education to sustainable societies. *International Review of Education*, 62(5), 517–522. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-016-9595-0>
- Morgado, E. G., Rodrigues, J. B., & Leonido, L. (2024a). Rethinking teacher training from an inclusive and community dialogical perspective. *Journal of Education and E-Learning Research*, 11(1), 219–228. <https://doi.org/10.20448/jeelr.v11i1.5430>
- Morgado, E. M. G., Licursi, M. B., & Silva, L. L. F. (2024b). Education and Heritage: Memory, Identity and Educational Dynamics. *Revista De Gestão Social E Ambiental*, 18(8), e05960. <https://doi.org/10.24857/rgsa.v18n8-038>
- Morgado, E. M. G., Licursi, M. B., & Silva, L. L. F. (2024c). The Role of the Teacher: Function, Missions and Timeless Purposes. *Revista De Gestão Social E Ambiental*, 18(1), e06475. <https://doi.org/10.24857/rgsa.v18n1-174>
- Morgan, W. J., & White, I. (2013). Looking backward to see ahead: The Faure and Delors reports and the post-2015 development agenda. *Zeitschrift Weiterbildung*, 4, 40-43.
- Nikoçeviq-Kurti, E., & Bërdynaj-Syla, L. (2024). ChatGPT integration in higher education: Impacts on teaching and professional development of university faculty. *Educational Process: International Journal*, 13(3), 22–39. <https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2024.133.2>
- Ong, F. H., & Lee, S. S. (2019). Improving higher education quality through institutional assessment: Insights from a Malaysian university. *Quality in Higher Education*, 25(1), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2019.1578061>
- Ormazabal, M., & Arroyave, P. C. (2023). The effect of corporate social responsibility on customer engagement: The mediating role of social identity. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 172(1), 49-62. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04647-w>
- Ouyang, Y., Liu, C., & Guo, X. (2023). The effect of university social responsibility on students' pro-environmental behavior: The mediating role of environmental attitude. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 318, 128441. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.128441>
- Pansari, A., & Kumar, V. (2022). Understanding the impact of corporate social responsibility on customer behavior: An empirical investigation. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 50(2), 301-320. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-020-00747-3>
- Peng, Y., Chen, S., & Chen, J. (2021). University social responsibility in China: A content analysis of official documents. *Sustainability*, 13(18), 10207. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su131810207>
- Perry, C. J., Weatherford, J., & Lausch, D. (2016). Asian international students' perceptions of their university experience. *Educational Process: International Journal*, 5(4), 270–278. <https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2016.54.1>
- Pompeu, R. M. (2011). *A responsabilidade social da universidade na formação de capital humano e como ferramenta de desenvolvimento local sustentável: Os casos da UTAD e da UNIFOR* [Tese de Doutoramento]. Universidade de Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro.

- Popescu, C., & Ardelean, D. (2020). University social responsibility as a tool for sustainable development in higher education. *Sustainability*, 12(5), 1784. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12051784>
- Raja, N. S., Nair, P. K., & Ramakrishnan, M. (2021). Quality of higher education: A comparative analysis of student and faculty perceptions. *Education and Information Technologies*, 26(5), 4653-4669. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10473-6>
- Raposo, N. V. (2011). A qualidade no ensino superior: Exigências e limitações. *Revista Portuguesa De Pedagogia*, 357-372. [https://doi.org/10.14195/1647-8614\\_Extra-2011\\_28](https://doi.org/10.14195/1647-8614_Extra-2011_28)
- Ribeiro, C., & Magalhães, A. M. (2014). Politics of social responsibility at the university: Concepts and challenges. *Educação, Sociedade & Culturas*, 42, 133–156.
- Sánchez-Gómez, M. C., Gutiérrez-Broncano, S., & González-Álvarez, M. C. (2021). Evaluation of the quality of higher education: Analysis of the Spanish experience. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 29(1), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-08-2019-0078>
- Savelyeva, T., & Douglas, W. (2017). Global consciousness and pillars of sustainable development: A study on self-perceptions of the first-year university students. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 18(2), 218-241. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-04-2016-0063>
- Sepetis, A., Goula, A., Kyriakidou, N., Rizos, F., & Sanida, M. G. (2020). Education for sustainable development and corporate social responsibility in higher education institutions (HEI): Evidence from Greece. *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.4236/jhrss.2020.82006>
- Serao, L. A. J., Oliveira, F. B., Pires, M. A., & Sant'Anna, A. A. (2017). Valorização do tema “Responsabilidade Social” em instituições de ensino superior? Análise de cursos de administração no estado do Rio de Janeiro. *Cadernos EBAPE.BR*, 15(spe), 462-481. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1679-395160284>
- Taylor, R., & Pearson, A. (1994). Total quality management in research and development. *The TQM Magazine*, 6(1), 26–34. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09544789410052723>
- UNESCO. (1998). *Declaração mundial sobre educação superior: Declaração mundial sobre educação superior no século XXI; Visão e ação, marco referencial de ação prioritária para a mudança e o desenvolvimento da educação superior*. UNESCO.
- UNESCO. (2016). *Repensar a educação: Rumo a um bem comum mundial?* UNESCO.
- Vallaey, F. (2006). O que significa responsabilidade social universitária. *Estudos*, 24(36), 35-56.
- Vallaey, F., De la Cruz, C., & Sasia, P. M. (2009). *Responsabilidad social universitaria: Manual de primeros pasos*. McGraw-Hill Interamericana Editores.
- Vieira, C. C. N., Beckhauser, S. P. R., & Parisotto, M. (2018). Responsabilidade social universitária: Um estudo sobre seu significado para os representantes dos grupos de interesse de uma universidade. *Revista de Negócios*, 23(4), 7-24. <https://doi.org/10.7867/2447-920X>
- Zhu, Y., & Hu, Y. (2020). Developing a university social responsibility assessment index: A study based on China's Project 985 universities. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 266, 121916. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.121916>

## About the Contributor(s)

**Francisco Jacucha Kimbanda** University of Agostinho Neto, Angola.

Email: [francisco.jacucha@uan.ao](mailto:francisco.jacucha@uan.ao)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-5383-8372>

**Levi Leonido** University of Trás-Os-Montes E Alto Douro, School of Human and Social Sciences, Portugal

Email: [levileon@utad.pt](mailto:levileon@utad.pt)

**Luís Borges** University of Fernando Pessoa, Science and Technology Faculty, Porto, Portugal

Email: [lmbg@ufp.edu.pt](mailto:lmbg@ufp.edu.pt)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2079-3234>

**Elsa Morgado** Instituto Politécnico De Bragança Escola Superior De Educação, Portugal

Email: [elsamorgado@gmail.com](mailto:elsamorgado@gmail.com)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3653-7876>

---

**Publisher's Note:** *The opinions, statements, and data presented in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributors and do not reflect the views of Universitepark, EDUPIJ, and/or the editor(s). Universitepark, the Journal, and/or the editor(s) accept no responsibility for any harm or damage to persons or property arising from the use of ideas, methods, instructions, or products mentioned in the content.*

---

## Appendix

### Appendix I.

**Table 12.** Summary chart

	Type	Never	Not often	Many times	Always	No opinion
...establishes cooperation agreements with the main actors in social development (State, NGOs, international organizations, companies, etc.).	Student	<b>90</b> 31,7%	<b>116</b> 40,8%	<b>45</b> 15,8%	<b>33</b> 11,6%	158
	Teacher	<b>6</b> 10,7%	<b>19</b> 33,9%	<b>12</b> 21,4%	<b>19</b> 33,9%	6
	Employee	<b>29</b> 25,0%	<b>31</b> 26,7%	<b>40</b> 34,5%	<b>16</b> 13,8%	15
...participates in networks, commissions or working groups on development issues at local, national and international level.	Student	<b>77</b> 26,3%	<b>127</b> 43,3%	<b>51</b> 17,4%	<b>38</b> 13,0%	139
	Teacher	<b>9</b> 15,8%	<b>17</b> 29,8%	<b>13</b> 22,8%	<b>18</b> 31,6%	5
	Employee	<b>21</b> 19,3%	<b>40</b> 36,7%	<b>29</b> 26,6%	<b>19</b> 17,4%	16
...actively participates in the discussion of community issues with key stakeholders.	Student	<b>78</b> 25,7%	<b>137</b> 45,2%	<b>51</b> 16,8%	<b>37</b> 12,2%	130
	Teacher	<b>7</b> 13,0%	<b>13</b> 24,1%	<b>17</b> 31,5%	<b>17</b> 31,5%	8
	Employee	<b>24</b> 21,6%	<b>27</b> 24,3%	<b>39</b> 35,1%	<b>21</b> 18,9%	15
...provide students and teachers with opportunities to interact with various social sectors.	Student	<b>37</b> 12,5%	<b>84</b> 28,4%	<b>89</b> 30,1%	<b>86</b> 29,1%	127
	Teacher	<b>0</b> 0,0%	<b>14</b> 23,7%	<b>15</b> 25,4%	<b>30</b> 50,8%	2
	Employee	<b>21</b> 19,1%	<b>28</b> 25,5%	<b>38</b> 34,5%	<b>23</b> 20,9%	10
... has an explicit policy to address some represented or marginalized groups (e.g. racial minorities, people with physical or mental disabilities, etc.	Student	<b>68</b> 24,9%	<b>101</b> 37,0%	<b>64</b> 23,4%	<b>40</b> 14,7%	156
	Teacher	<b>4</b> 7,4%	<b>17</b> 31,5%	<b>15</b> 27,8%	<b>18</b> 33,3%	8
	Employee	<b>25</b> 22,1%	<b>33</b> 29,2%	<b>32</b> 28,3%	<b>23</b> 20,4%	15
...studies proposals to solve the country's social problems.	Student	<b>78</b> 30,7%	<b>85</b> 33,5%	<b>49</b> 19,3%	<b>42</b> 16,5%	167
	Teacher	<b>26</b> 23,4%	<b>31</b> 27,9%	<b>32</b> 28,8%	<b>22</b> 19,8%	15
	Employee	<b>1</b> 2,0%	<b>11</b> 22,4%	<b>15</b> 30,6%	<b>22</b> 44,9%	12

	Type	Never	Not often	Many times	Always	No opinion				
...promotes volunteering by students and/or teachers.	Student	57	20,4%	107	38,4%	58	20,8%	57	20,4%	143
	Teacher	24	21,6%	28	25,2%	38	34,2%	21	18,9%	12
	Employee	8	14,5%	11	20,0%	16	29,1%	20	36,4%	6
...promotes concern and sensitivity towards the environmental and social environment.	Student	48	17,4%	116	42,0%	65	23,6%	47	17,0%	142
	Teacher	24	22,0%	42	38,5%	26	23,9%	17	15,6%	14
	Employee	1	1,8%	11	19,6%	21	37,5%	23	41,1%	6
...develops research/investigation projects aimed at solving problems related to social development.	Student	49	17,7%	111	40,1%	63	22,7%	54	19,5%	147
	Teacher	22	20,8%	31	29,2%	35	33,0%	18	17,0%	16
	Employee	0	0,0%	17	29,8%	18	31,6%	22	38,6%	5
...establishes links and contacts with other actors (e.g. Government, companies, communities) to develop research suited to social needs.	Student	57	20,9%	96	35,2%	75	27,5%	45	16,5%	157
	Teacher	27	23,1%	34	29,1%	36	30,8%	20	17,1%	11
	Employee	1	1,8%	13	23,2%	20	35,7%	22	39,3%	6
...complex problems are investigated in an interdisciplinary way.	Student	58	20,6%	109	38,7%	68	24,1%	47	16,7%	154
	Teacher	26	23,4%	31	27,9%	35	31,5%	19	17,1%	18
	Employee	8	15,1%	24	45,3%	7	13,2%	14	26,4%	8
...teachers from different specialties get involved in community support projects.	Student	71	27,4%	102	39,4%	50	19,3%	36	13,9%	169
	Teacher	19	16,8%	41	36,3%	39	34,5%	14	12,4%	14
	Employee	5	9,6%	18	34,6%	15	28,8%	14	26,9%	9
...has specific means of disseminating and transferring knowledge to society.	Student	67	24,2%	115	41,5%	61	22,0%	34	12,3%	153
	Teacher	26	22,2%	32	27,4%	33	28,2%	26	22,2%	12
	Employee	4	7,4%	20	37,0%	13	24,1%	17	31,5%	7
...organizes academic events accessible to the community.	Student	58	22,2%	92	35,2%	64	24,5%	47	18,0%	164
	Teacher	25	21,6%	24	20,7%	37	31,9%	30	25,9%	12
	Employee	0	0,0%	18	31,6%	18	31,6%	21	36,8%	5
...research projects incorporate student participation.	Student	56	19,8%	121	42,8%	67	23,7%	39	13,8%	141
	Teacher	21	18,4%	22	19,3%	35	30,7%	36	31,6%	10
	Employee	4	7,0%	14	24,6%	18	31,6%	21	36,8%	5
...researchers have the time and resources to help and advise students who want to.	Student	58	20,8%	104	37,3%	70	25,1%	47	16,8%	152
	Teacher	25	22,1%	26	23,0%	32	28,3%	30	26,5%	15
	Employee	7	12,5%	18	32,1%	12	21,4%	19	33,9%	5
...requires teachers and students to conduct research with social impact.	Student	60	21,7%	105	38,0%	64	23,2%	47	17,0%	159
	Teacher	25	23,6%	30	28,3%	27	25,5%	24	22,6%	16
	Employee	5	9,1%	14	25,5%	14	25,5%	22	40,0%	7
...requires that research projects respect ethical considerations.	Student	55	19,9%	96	34,8%	75	27,2%	50	18,1%	156
	Teacher	23	20,2%	26	22,8%	32	28,1%	33	28,9%	15
	Employee	1	1,8%	11	19,3%	18	31,6%	27	47,4%	4
...stimulates students' capacity for entrepreneurship and initiative.	Student	44	15,7%	115	41,1%	52	18,6%	69	24,6%	150
	Teacher	17	15,5%	31	28,2%	32	29,1%	30	27,3%	17
	Employee	3	5,4%	12	21,4%	19	33,9%	22	39,3%	6
...promotes open discussion of issues that generate conflict in society or that are very controversial	Student	59	20,8%	120	42,3%	65	22,9%	40	14,1%	146
	Teacher	25	21,7%	27	23,5%	38	33,0%	25	21,7%	15
	Employee	4	7,1%	14	25,0%	16	28,6%	22	39,3%	6
...participates in networks, commissions or working groups on development issues at local, national and international level.	Student	67	24,3%	103	37,3%	62	22,5%	44	15,9%	157
	Teacher	23	20,0%	30	26,1%	35	30,4%	27	23,5%	10
	Employee	4	7,5%	16	30,2%	14	26,4%	19	35,8%	9
...promotes training actions/courses dedicated to ethics, social responsibility and development.	Student	48	17,4%	47	17,0%	116	42,0%	65	23,6%	142
	Teacher	24	22,0%	17	15,6%	26	23,9%	42	38,5%	14
	Employee	1	1,8%	11	19,6%	23	41,1%	21	37,5%	6
...develops environmental education actions for administrative staff and teachers.	Student	66	23,7%	106	38,0%	54	19,4%	53	19,0%	158
	Teacher	30	26,3%	29	25,4%	27	23,7%	28	24,6%	13
	Employee	5	9,1%	18	32,7%	12	21,8%	20	36,4%	6
...seeks to practice among all its members the "4 RE": Reuse, Recycle, Reduce, Respect.	Student	65	26,2%	85	34,3%	47	19,0%	51	20,6%	178
	Teacher	33	29,7%	28	25,2%	30	27,0%	20	18,0%	19
	Employee	6	12,2%	18	36,7%	11	22,4%	14	28,6%	12
	Student	66	25,9%	77	30,2%	59	23,1%	53	20,8%	178
	Teacher	27	24,3%	29	26,1%	36	32,4%	19	17,1%	15

	Type	Never		Not often		Many times		Always		No opinion
...has an organizational structure to prevent/correct abuses of power by its members, fraud, bribery and other corrupt practices.	Employee	<b>6</b>	12,0%	<b>13</b>	26,0%	<b>11</b>	22,0%	<b>20</b>	40,0%	12
...the procedures for the remuneration of Teachers and administrative staff are transparent and respect workers' rights.	Student	<b>69</b>	28,0%	<b>67</b>	27,2%	<b>64</b>	26,0%	<b>46</b>	18,7%	194
	Teacher	<b>24</b>	22,0%	<b>31</b>	28,4%	<b>26</b>	23,9%	<b>28</b>	25,7%	18
	Employee	<b>5</b>	10,4%	<b>5</b>	10,4%	<b>12</b>	25,0%	<b>26</b>	54,2%	14
...considers technical aspects rather than friendship aspects in the promotion of teaching and administrative staff.	Student	<b>62</b>	25,0%	<b>76</b>	30,6%	<b>64</b>	25,8%	<b>46</b>	18,5%	192
	Teacher	<b>21</b>	18,6%	<b>25</b>	22,1%	<b>43</b>	38,1%	<b>24</b>	21,2%	18
	Employee	<b>1</b>	2,1%	<b>9</b>	19,1%	<b>13</b>	27,7%	<b>24</b>	51,1%	15
...expressly prohibits the use of illegal practices (such as corruption, extortion, bribery).	Student	<b>49</b>	19,6%	<b>82</b>	32,8%	<b>69</b>	27,6%	<b>50</b>	20,0%	186
	Teacher	<b>19</b>	16,7%	<b>27</b>	23,7%	<b>33</b>	28,9%	<b>35</b>	30,7%	15
	Employee	<b>2</b>	3,9%	<b>3</b>	5,9%	<b>13</b>	25,5%	<b>33</b>	64,7%	10
...develop procedures to deal with complaints and resolve conflicts related to violations of the code of ethics.	Student	<b>47</b>	18,3%	<b>79</b>	30,7%	<b>59</b>	23,0%	<b>72</b>	28,0%	175
	Teacher	<b>22</b>	20,4%	<b>22</b>	20,4%	<b>30</b>	27,8%	<b>34</b>	31,5%	17
	Employee	<b>2</b>	3,8%	<b>7</b>	13,2%	<b>15</b>	28,3%	<b>29</b>	54,7%	8
...promotes strategies that promote the organization's values and ethical principles.	Student	<b>38</b>	13,0%	<b>77</b>	26,3%	<b>51</b>	17,4%	<b>127</b>	43,3%	139
	Teacher	<b>9</b>	15,8%	<b>13</b>	22,8%	<b>18</b>	31,6%	<b>17</b>	29,8%	5
	Employee	<b>19</b>	17,4%	<b>21</b>	19,3%	<b>40</b>	36,7%	<b>29</b>	26,6%	16
...has formal strategies and mechanisms to listen to and respond to concerns, suggestions and criticisms from staff or students.	Student	<b>51</b>	19,5%	<b>89</b>	34,1%	<b>74</b>	28,4%	<b>47</b>	18,0%	172
	Teacher	<b>18</b>	15,7%	<b>31</b>	27,0%	<b>39</b>	33,9%	<b>27</b>	23,5%	13
	Employee	<b>2</b>	3,7%	<b>8</b>	14,8%	<b>13</b>	24,1%	<b>31</b>	57,4%	7
...develops development and training activities for the continuous improvement of all its staff (administrative and teaching staff).	Student	<b>52</b>	19,9%	<b>94</b>	36,0%	<b>63</b>	24,1%	<b>52</b>	19,9%	175
	Teacher	<b>19</b>	17,3%	<b>33</b>	30,0%	<b>35</b>	31,8%	<b>23</b>	20,9%	15
	Employee	<b>3</b>	5,4%	<b>9</b>	16,1%	<b>18</b>	32,1%	<b>26</b>	46,4%	5
...uses its marketing campaigns to promote themes of social and environmental responsibility.	Student	<b>52</b>	21,8%	<b>91</b>	38,1%	<b>60</b>	25,1%	<b>36</b>	15,1%	195
	Teacher	<b>21</b>	18,4%	<b>30</b>	26,3%	<b>38</b>	33,3%	<b>25</b>	21,9%	14
	Employee	<b>3</b>	5,9%	<b>18</b>	35,3%	<b>13</b>	25,5%	<b>17</b>	33,3%	11
...develop strategic partnerships (with suppliers, companies, other universities, civil society organizations or public and international bodies) to promote campaigns on social responsibility.	Student	<b>58</b>	22,7%	<b>94</b>	36,7%	<b>55</b>	21,5%	<b>49</b>	19,1%	180
	Teacher	<b>15</b>	13,0%	<b>40</b>	34,8%	<b>32</b>	27,8%	<b>28</b>	24,3%	14
	Employee	<b>5</b>	10,2%	<b>13</b>	26,5%	<b>12</b>	24,5%	<b>19</b>	38,8%	13
...develops actions/programs to reduce the consumption of energy, water, toxic products and raw materials.	Student	<b>73</b>	28,2%	<b>95</b>	36,7%	<b>50</b>	19,3%	<b>41</b>	15,8%	183
	Teacher	<b>23</b>	19,5%	<b>44</b>	37,3%	<b>27</b>	22,9%	<b>24</b>	20,3%	13
	Employee	<b>8</b>	19,0%	<b>13</b>	31,0%	<b>8</b>	19,0%	<b>13</b>	31,0%	19
...has an office or person responsible for environmental matters.	Student	<b>89</b>	34,9%	<b>69</b>	27,1%	<b>57</b>	22,4%	<b>40</b>	15,7%	183
	Teacher	<b>29</b>	26,4%	<b>32</b>	29,1%	<b>24</b>	21,8%	<b>25</b>	22,7%	20
	Employee	<b>13</b>	29,5%	<b>10</b>	22,7%	<b>7</b>	15,9%	<b>14</b>	31,8%	18
...treats the environmental issue as a transversal issue in its organizational structure, including strategic planning.	Student	<b>90</b>	34,9%	<b>78</b>	30,2%	<b>49</b>	19,0%	<b>41</b>	15,9%	181
	Teacher	<b>29</b>	26,6%	<b>31</b>	28,4%	<b>30</b>	27,5%	<b>19</b>	17,4%	18
	Employee	<b>8</b>	17,0%	<b>19</b>	40,4%	<b>8</b>	17,0%	<b>12</b>	25,5%	15
...publishes an annual report on its environmental performance.	Student	<b>108</b>	44,6%	<b>55</b>	22,7%	<b>39</b>	16,1%	<b>40</b>	16,5%	191
	Teacher	<b>32</b>	29,4%	<b>28</b>	25,7%	<b>24</b>	22,0%	<b>25</b>	22,9%	22
	Employee	<b>13</b>	31,0%	<b>12</b>	28,6%	<b>5</b>	11,9%	<b>12</b>	28,6%	20