



Copyright © 2020 by Academic Publishing  
House Researcher s.r.o.  
All rights reserved.  
Published in the Slovak Republic  
European Journal of Contemporary Education  
E-ISSN 2305-6746  
2020, 9(3): 505-519  
DOI: 10.13187/ejced.2020.3.505  
[www.ejournal1.com](http://www.ejournal1.com)

**IMPORTANT NOTICE!** Any copying, reproduction, distribution, republication (in whole or in part), or otherwise commercial use of this work in violation of the author(s) rights will be prosecuted in accordance with international law. The use of hyperlinks to the work will not be considered copyright infringement.



## Attitudes Towards Social Responsibility Among Faculty Members of the Hashemite University

Omar T. Al-batayneh <sup>a</sup>, Zohair Hussein Al-Zoubi <sup>a,\*</sup>, Rana Mohammad rawashdeh <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Faculty of Educational Sciences, Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan

### Abstract

The study aimed to identify the level of social responsibility among the faculty members of the Hashemite University, from their point of view, and also aimed identify if there any statistically significant differences in the level of social responsibility due to faculty (humanities and science), academic rank (tutor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor), and years of experience (less than 5 years, 5-10 years, 11-20 years, and more than 20 years). The sample consisted of 274 faculty members, and the study was conducted in the academic year 2018/2019. The methodology was a questionnaire containing a total of 44 items under the headings of self-responsibility, collective responsibility, religious moral responsibility, and national responsibility. After analyzing the data, the results showed that the level of social responsibility among the faculty members was ranked as 'average', with the order of the four dimensions as follows: moral and religious responsibility was ranked highest, followed by national responsibility, self-responsibility, and finally, collective responsibility all with an average level. The results also showed that there were no statistically significant differences in the level of social responsibility by faculty, academic rank, or years of experience. The authors' recommendation to benefit from faculty members' consultancy in the university and in different disciplines.

**Keywords:** social responsibility, faculty, Hashemite university.

### 1. Introduction

In the past, institutions operated freely without regard to the various effects and implications they might have on the environment in which they operated, whether internally or externally. However, the widespread scientific and technological developments of today's business environment, and the transition of societies to the knowledge economy or digital economy, clearly indicate the important role that business plays in various sectors worldwide (Abed-Baqir, 2012).

---

\* Corresponding author

E-mail addresses: [zohair971@yahoo.com](mailto:zohair971@yahoo.com) (Z. Hussein Al-Zoubi),  
[Rawashdeh\\_rana@yahoo.com](mailto:Rawashdeh_rana@yahoo.com) (R. Mohammad rawashdeh)

Large enterprises are competing with their inventions and discoveries, whether in goods or services. The impact of these organizations has influenced national governments at various levels, all under the heading of social responsibility (Diafi, 2010).

Social responsibility is defined as what a person is responsible and attributable for, including things and actions he has done, social responsibility has three dimensions. First, the economic dimension is based on the principles of competition and technological development. It includes a wide range of elements of social responsibility that must be taken into account within the framework of respect for fair and free competition rules and the full benefit of technological development that does not harm society or the environment (Al-Gali, Al-Ameri, 2009). Second is the social dimension: the institution must contribute to the well-being of the society in which it operates and improve and care for the affairs of its employees; this is reflected positively in these institutions and societies by increasing their productivity, developing their capabilities, and providing professional and occupational security, healthcare, and community care (Samadi, Athmni, 2008). Third is the environmental dimension: the organization must take into account its environmental impact, and work to contribute to the elimination of toxic emissions and waste, to maximize efficiency and productivity from available resources, and to reduce practices that may negatively affect the enjoyment of the countryside and future generations of these resources (Shaheen, 2011).

Several indicators are used to measure the level of social responsibility: social indicators, social performance indicators for the organization's workers, and social performance indicators (Hilalo, 2013).

Social responsibility is based on several principles: environmental reform and protection, values and ethics, accountability, strengthening and enhancing authority, financial performance and results, workplace specifications, collaborative relationships, quality products and services, and community engagement (Al-Hassan, 2014). If it is difficult to define the concept of responsibility for companies, it is more difficult to agree on the definition of responsibility for universities (Rahal, 2011).

The issue of social responsibility of universities is not new, but it is currently presented globally as a concept that must be highlighted and incorporated firmly in the curricula, roles and outcomes of universities. This means that all educational institutions, including universities, must place social responsibility at the heart of their strategies, as in all other institutions in society (Mohammed, 2016). Universities have a key role in addressing the problems and challenges facing society and finding solutions by following the scientific method and by conducting specialized studies and research (Al-Rawashada, 2011). Graduates have been provided with the values, skills and knowledge to carry out their various community roles (Amer, 2007); this calls for ascertaining the nature and quality of the contribution of the higher educational institutions to these attributes, especially relating to citizenship, tolerance, dialogue, acceptance of others, creative thought and morality (Rahal, 2011).

The social responsibility of universities thus has two major aspects. First is commitment, that is the involvement and empowerment of the various members of the university community to performing their social responsibility. Executing social responsibility cannot occur in isolation or by a specific group of people, but must be consistent with the overall mission of the institution (Shaldan, 2014). Second is self-diagnosis, conducted by universities in order to evaluate their status in terms of strengths and weaknesses, and identify areas for improvement. They have to analyze the existing conditions to determine their level of social responsibility. This self-diagnosis is carried out by various members of the community, both internally by academic staff and students, and externally by community members, government officers, graduates, suppliers and others (Keita, 2016). Investigation and implementation involve the communication of the self-diagnostic results among all participating groups, both internal and external. The data can be summarized as strengths and weaknesses, critical points, and demands/suggestions. The summary of key results and proposals for improvement can be presented through talks, meetings, reports, brochures, official presentations, etc. (Fedrico, 2012: 24).

The social responsibility of academics has national, human, social, and ethical dimensions and implications, and requires each of them to perform their duties to the fullest in teaching, scientific research, community service and development (Al-Thaity, 2015). From the first post as a researcher, the scientific method must play a crucial role in solving the problems of society and

meeting the needs and aspirations of its members (Ahuandu, 2016). Nevertheless, if scientific research remains confined within the framework of the university and is used for purely personal purposes such as promotion and obtaining personal or material gains, as in the case in many third-world countries, then the academic's role is transformed from a producer of scientific knowledge that would be beneficial to society to a mere employee who is considered a stranger to society, unable to respond to the challenges facing society or to bring about any reform or change to the real world (Al-Shafei, 2016).

The participation of citizens, particularly active ones such as members of civil society organizations, in prioritizing studies and research brings a number of benefits and gains for both the researchers and society, such as promoting the values of participation, interaction, dialogue, the sense of responsibility and a sense of belonging (Al-Otaibi, 2013). Therefore, the involvement of citizens in the process of scientific research will strengthen the sense of belonging to society, and will reflect the values of citizenship (Al-Buasir, 2017). Sharing the results of research with citizens will eventually raise their awareness of the studies' results, and increase their interest in participating and enthusiastically approaching these work (Al Khattab et al., 2015). The partnership between universities and the local community provides the researcher with the opportunity to gain various insights, ideas and experiences to recognize the fact that many thinkers and visionaries and those with practical experience are outside the walls of the university. Therefore, seeking help from them, or giving them the opportunity to become involved in studies, reinforces the principle of community conscience or social responsibility (Arando, 2016).

The university faculty member is considered the driving force of research through scientific method and ability, with active participation in the sensitivity and study of social problems (Shaheen, 2011). The researcher must propose solutions and alternatives to deal with these problems, apply the results of studies in different fields of life, work regularly to improve his own performance and scientific knowledge and expertise, increasing the knowledge in his field of specialization, and disseminating it through attending conferences and seminars (Al-Fahid, 2012). The researcher's target is to develop and benefit society, not solely to obtain a degree (Hamdan, 2011).

The knowledge society requires that faculty members have appropriate conditions/that encourage them to research, develop and teach effectively (Awad, 1999). However, the current reality is that many obstacles prevent faculty members from fulfilling their roles in accordance with the requirements of knowledge (Najdat, 2010).

This is confirmed by studies monitoring the major obstacles preventing faculty members from performing their roles. For example, performance constraints in the educational process include a gap between the university's preparation of students and the requirements of the labour market, and lack of consideration of the tendencies and abilities of students when accepting them at university. There are also performance constraints in the field of scientific research (Al-Hammouri, 2013), which include the lack of a policy to market the results of scientific research, and the inadequate provision of laboratories, services and equipment (Ruweished, 2007). The barriers to community service include the few incentives encouraging faculty members to serve the community, and the lack of quantifiable means available to the university to participate in community services. Finally, there are personal constraints affecting the performance of faculty members, including insufficient salaries to achieve a decent standard of living, and poor services provided by the faculty club to its members (Al-Gali, Al-Ameri, 2005).

Without doubt, these constraints have a significant impact on the preparation and composition of faculty members among the knowledge society, which requires them to be always informed of the latest research and studies. This will not happening the light of their low incomes, the absence of appropriate university services, and the presence of many of the obstacles outlined above.

The concept of social responsibility has been addressed by many researchers, including Samadi (2009) who found that Jordanian universities in the Northern region exercise social responsibility at different levels, ranging from high to medium degree. Abdul Latif (2010) found several individual factors that help universities to perform their social role and their social responsibilities, including partnerships with governments, the private sector, business and civil society. The university should have programmers and activities that reflect its responsibility towards society. The study by Najati (2011) conducted on the top ten universities in the world

found that these universities have a great interest in the area of social responsibility, and that they provide sufficient information about the services in which they are involved. Abed-Baqir's (2012) study found that teachers do not suffer from a lack of social responsibility and there are no differences between males and females regarding their role. Shaldan (2014) has showed that the social responsibility of the Islamic University was high, but that there were differences by faculty, although not by the age or gender of faculty members. Al-Thaity (2015) study showed that the departments of educational management in Saudi universities achieved social responsibility through academic programmers and scientific research, with an emphasis on solving the difficulties and problems facing them in achieving social responsibility. Keita (2016) also showed that a modern curriculum has a prominent role in promoting social responsibility in general. Ahandu (2016) found that the quality of social responsibility depends on its planning, spreading its culture, and promoting teamwork. Al-Shafi's (2016) study revealed that the level of availability of social responsibility in educational sectors in the Gaza Strip is high, with a relationship between democratic leadership and social responsibility. The Al-Basir Study (2017) found that the deans of Imam Mohammed Bin Saud Islamic University colleges are highly aware of the difficulties in activating social responsibility in their colleges. Moumni and Maani (2017) indicated that the level of social responsibility among students of the University of Jordan was average, and that there are differences in its degree according to specialization, the family's place of residence, or the practice of parents for volunteering.

### **Research problem and questions**

There is no doubt that the social responsibility of faculty members is great in light of dynamic and life changes. They are required to assume responsibility towards their society in respect of its skills and knowledge, defending its traditions and interacting with its problems; this responsibility must extend beyond the walls of the university, and question its own teaching. Hence this study aims to identify the level of social responsibility of the members of faculties of the Hashemite University.

The current study therefore seeks to answer the following questions:

Question 1: What is the level of social responsibility among the faculty members of the colleges of the Hashemite University?

Question 2: Are there differences in the level of social responsibility by college, academic rank, and years of experience?

### **Objectives of the study**

This study aims to:

1. Identify the level of social responsibility of the faculty members at the Hashemite University, from their point of view.
2. Identify differences in the level of social responsibility between members of the humanities and science faculties.
3. Trace differences in the level of social responsibility between faculty members, according to academic rank.
4. Show differences in the level of social responsibility between faculty members according to their years of experience.

### **Importance of study**

The importance of this study has both theoretical and practical aspects. In terms of theoretical importance, it tries to identify the level of social responsibility among faculty members at the Hashemite University faculties, and is unique in its approach to variables such as college, academic rank and years of experience. In terms of practical importance, it provides a tool for researchers to conduct related studies, applying the tool in other environments. It supplies sufficient scientific information that is crucial to the senior managements of higher education institutions in the formulation of instructions supporting the concept of social responsibility.

### **Terms of the study**

**Social responsibility:** is the individual's self-commitment to the community, the concern it entails, the attempt to understand its problems, and to participate with it in the achievement of a task, sensing the needs of the community and other groups to which it belongs (Al-Athama, Samadi, 2009).

**Faculty member:** The Jordanian State Universities Act of 2001 defined the faculty as a professor, associate professor, assistant professor, teacher, and assistant teacher. A faculty member must have obtained a university degree or professional qualification in his field of specialization, be able to carry out university work, especially teaching, be medically and physically competent, and not have been convicted of any felony or misdemeanor against public honor and morality.

**Hashemite University:** established in 1995, and located in the city of Zarqa, central province. It is composed of 19 colleges and in the academic year 2018/2019 had a total of 28,000 students and 609 faculty members.

#### **Limitations of the study**

The study is limited to faculty members at The Hashemite University employed in the second semester of the academic year 2018/2019. The results of this study are determined by the validity and consistency of the tools used.

## **2. Methodology**

### **Population**

The study population is made up of the 609 faculty members of the Hashemite University, divided among 19 faculties, during the second semester of the academic year 2018/19. The study scale were distributed to (309) faculty members, which is half of the study population, however, 35 tools were excluded due to incomplete data. The sample consists of 274 faculty members chosen at random from all faculties of the university, representing some 45 % of the whole population. [Table 1](#) shows the distribution of sample members by the selected variables.

**Table 1.** Distribution of the study sample

Variable	Category	Frequency	%
College	Humanities	129	52.9
	Sciences	145	47.1
Academic rank	Teacher	23	8.4
	Assistant Professor	76	27.7
	Associate Professor	90	32.8
	Full Professor	85	31.1
Years of Experience	Less than 5 years	61	22.2
	5-10 years	84	30.6
	11-20 years	77	28.1
	More than 20 years	52	19.1
Total		274	%100

### **Instrument**

A questionnaire measuring the social responsibility of faculty members was designed based on previous research, including Abdul Latif (2010), Hello (2013), Saldan & Saima (2014), Al-Bayti (2015), Al Khattab (2015), Muhammad(2016), and Al-Basir (2017). It was initially formed in two parts: Part 1 included the variables: college, academic rank, years of experience. The second part comprised 44 items divided into four dimensions: self-responsibility (8), collective responsibility (12), religious and moral responsibility (10), and national responsibility (14).

**Performance validity**

In order to verify its credibility the questionnaire was presented to ten faculty members of the Hashemite University and the University of Jordan for their opinions on the integrity of the items and their dimensions in terms of their scientific accuracy and language formulation. Six of the original 50 items were deleted, leaving 44, and others were amended. The A 5-point Likertscale was used to measure responses: 5 = very large, 4 = large, 3 = average, 2 = weak, and 1 = very weak.

**Reliability**

The stability factor of the instrument was calculated using the test-retest method; a preliminary sample was distributed to 30 faculty members who were not counted in the main study. Two weeks later, the test was reapplied to the sample itself. After checking the answers, recording the grades and finding the relationship between the first and second tests using Pearson’s uncertainty coefficient, the internal consistency was found to be was statistically significant(Cronbach’s Alpha 0.93). See [Table 2](#).

**Table 2.** Reliability(test-retest) and Cronbach’s Alpha

Dimensions of social responsibility	Cronbach’s Alpha	test-retest
Self-responsibility	.89	.85
Collective responsibility	.91	.86
Religious moral responsibility	.88	.87
National responsibility	.88	.89
Overall average	.93	.91

**Procedures**

After verifying the credibility and stability of the instrument, and identifying the study community and sample, the questionnaire was distributed to the faculty members in the departments of the various colleges. The researchers explained to the sample members the purpose of the study, and the method of answering it. They emphasized the confidentiality of the data, which was purely for scientific research purposes.

**Statistical methods**

In order to answer the first research question, the means and standard deviations of the scores were extracted. The T-test was used in addition to the mono-contrast analysis test to answer the second question.

**3. Results**

**Question 1:** What is the level of social responsibility among the faculty members of the Hashemite University colleges?

The results are listed in [Table 3](#).

**Table 3.** Means and standard deviations for the responses to the social responsibility dimensions

N	Dimension	Rank	Mean	Standard deviation	Level of social responsibility
1	Self-responsibility	3	3.59	0.72	Moderate
2	Collective responsibility	4	3.41	0.74	Moderate

3	Moral and religious responsibility	1	3.77	0.65	High
4	National responsibility	2	3.61	0.69	Moderate
5	Overall mean dimensions		3.61	0.55	Moderate

The level of social responsibility for each dimension and overall was moderate. The total arithmetic average of social responsibility dimensions was 3.61 out of 5, and the mean for the dimensions ranged from 3.41 to 3.77.

The ranking of the dimensions was as follows: religious and moral responsibility scored 3.77, national responsibility was second at 3.61, self-responsibility was third at 3.59, and fourth was collective responsibility at 3.41.

An explanation is the fact that social responsibility plays an important role in the stability of life for individuals and communities. It protects society, upholds its laws and limits forms of abuse. Each individual performs his duty and responsibility towards himself and his community, and works in order to reflect his honesty, which is his responsibility. Since the individual is like a cell in the body of society, the body is not healthy unless all its cells are safe and perform their tasks, responsibilities and duties. Faculty members should always be models to be followed by students and the community. These results agree with those of Al-Samadi (2009), Al-Thabeti (2015), Space (2016) and Al-Basari (2017).

The following section discusses the individual dimensions of social responsibility.

**Self-responsibility**

The results for each item in this dimension are presented in [Table 4](#).

**Table 4.** Means and standard deviations for items on the level of self-responsibility

N	Phrase	Order	Mean	Standard Deviation	Evaluation
1	When I do a job, I do my best	5	3.52	0.90	Moderate
2	I am happy to be invited to solve problems in my family	6	3.50	1.07	Moderate
3	I care for the books I borrow from the library and return them without any damage	2	3.58	1.12	Moderate
4	It worries me to get to the lecture late	3	3.57	1.16	Moderate
5	I sacrifice some of my rights for the happiness of my family	7	3.44	1.05	Moderate
6	I believe in the saying “after me, the flood”	8	3.33	1.08	Moderate
7	When I borrow books from the university library, I return them on time	1	3.59	0.99	Moderate
8	I specify time for reading and self-education	4	3.56	1.12	Moderate
Overall average			3.59	0.72	Moderate

The responses were all at the moderate level, with a mean value of 3.59 and a range of 3.33 to 3.59. The item "When I borrow books from the University Library, I return them on time", scored the highest (average of 3.59), and the "After me the flood" item the lowest (3.33).

This is because the participation of the individual with colleagues is dictated by attention and the understanding of what is required to help the group achieve its objectives. When a member accepts these criteria, he serves, guides, and masters its affairs, and participates in showing the individual's abilities and highlighting his position. The self-responsibility of a faculty member relies on him understanding and accepting his social role and performing it in light of the criteria specified. His active participation in team work accomplishes the goals fully, limited only by the collective behavior's of the group. This evaluative participation is directive and corrective at the same time.

**Collective responsibility**

The results for each item are presented in [Table 5](#).

**Table 5.** Means and standard deviations for the items on the level of collective responsibility

N	Phrase	Order	Mean	Standard Deviation	Evaluation
1	I join my colleagues in talking about community problems	8	3.38	1.02	Moderate
2	I like to participate in group discussions	1	3.57	0.99	Moderate
3	I love participating in the funerals of martyrs	9	3.36	1.00	Moderate
4	I adhere to the university's laws and regulations constantly	2	3.53	0.99	Moderate
5	I prefer to work in a group than to work alone	10	3.33	1.01	Moderate
6	I would like to participate in volunteer work	3	3.50	0.90	Moderate
7	Cooperation is essential to the success of any group	11	3.32	0.90	Moderate
8	I believe that the leader of any group is solely responsible for its actions	4	3.48	0.99	Moderate
9	I participate in collecting donations to help those in need	5	3.44	1.00	Moderate
10	Maintaining group values is essential	7	3.39	0.98	Moderate
11	I make sure that my behaviour is acceptable to my colleagues and society	12	3.25	1.01	Moderate
12	I complete my university research and reports on time	6	3.45	1.06	Moderate
Overall Average			3.41	0.74	Moderate

The level of collective responsibility had an overall average of 3.41, with individual items ranging from 3.25 to 3.57. The item "I would like to participate in collective discussions", was ranked first (3.57), and "I make sure that my behavior is acceptable to my colleagues and society last (3.25).

This is because the faculty member has an emotional attachment to the community and is concerned for its integrity, cohesion, continuity and the achievement of its objectives. This concern

is linked to the levels of emotion with the group, which the individual involuntarily follows without choice, purpose or self-awareness. In addition to the feelings and unity shared within the group, the individual's feeling of unity with the group is important, whether good or the bad. The group is also rational, as it fills the individual's mind, thoughts and being, and becomes the subject of his consideration where he gives it a great deal of attention by studying, analyzing, and comparing it to others.

**Moral and religious responsibility**

Table 6 presents the results for the individual items.

**Table 6.** Means and standard deviations for items on the level of moral and religious responsibility

N	Phrase	Order	Mean	Standard Deviation	Level of Responsibility
1	I would like to have a collection of religious books	6	3.72	0.85	High
2	I am committed to my appointments with my colleagues	5	3.78	0.95	High
3	Apologizing to colleagues for being late to an appointment is necessary	4	3.88	0.75	High
4	I take into account the rationalization of consuming water and electricity	7	3.56	1.07	High
5	I am very careful not to throw litter on the floor	9	3.54	1.01	High
6	I am upset when I see graffiti that insults public decency	3	3.98	0.78	High
7	I work to achieve my goals regardless of the medium	10	3.50	1.00	High
8	It hurts me to see students wasting water	8	3.55	1.02	High
9	Maintaining the facilities and equipment used at the university is necessary	1	4.10	0.76	High
10	I know that religion promotes cleanliness and environmental preservation	2	4.05	0.80	High
Overall Average			3.77	0.65	High

Table 6 indicates that the level of moral and religious responsibility was high in every case and overall, with an overall mean of 3.77, and items ranging from 3.50 to 4.10. The item "Maintaining facilities and equipment that are used in the university is necessary "was ranked in first place with an average of 4.10, and "I work to achieve my goals regardless of the means" was last (3.50).

This can be explained by pointing out that the university teacher is the cornerstone of the institution, career and no university can perform its functions effectively and achieve its objectives without the availability of qualified manpower, which is expected to perform its social responsibility either individually or collectively. Thus, if higher education institutions are to achieve their goals successfully, the responsibilities of the university teacher increase; they are no longer limited to the delivery of knowledge, but now involve establishing values and spreading knowledge and skills in society.

**National responsibility**

Table 7 presents these results.

**Table 7.** Means and standard deviations for items on the level of national responsibility

N	Phrase	Order	Mean	Standard Deviation	Evaluation
1	I make sure to listen to the news	14	3.49	0.89	Moderate
2	I think that keeping public places clean is the duty of everyone in society	1	3.80	0.93	High
3	I do not care to attend political seminars	13	3.50	0.90	Moderate
4	I read about the history of my country in various aspects	2	3.71	1.05	High
5	I would like to help the owners of damaged houses	3	3.70	1.03	High
6	I do not like to read political books	12	3.52	0.90	Moderate
7	I participate in offering condolences to the martyrs	10	3.55	1.15	Moderate
8	I follow the events and changes taking place in my country	9	3.58	1.12	Moderate
9	I feel sad about any disaster occurring in my country	8	3.61	1.00	Moderate
10	I exercise my right to vote	7	3.63	0.89	Moderate
11	I am not interested in knowing how the Legislative Council works	11	3.57	0.86	Moderate
12	I make sure to show my country's Brightside	4	3.68	0.91	High
13	I participate in national celebrations	5	3.66	0.90	Moderate
14	The negativity of young people towards their homeland bothers me	6	3.64	0.88	Moderate
Overall Average			3.61	0.69	Moderate

The overall level of national responsibility was average (3.61) with mean values for individual items ranging from 3.49 to 3.80. The item "I believe that keeping public spaces clean is the duty of every person in society", was ranked high (3.80), and I make sure I listen to the news "was lowest (3.49).

This is due to the fact that social responsibility is one of the pillars of community life. It is a means of individual and collective progress, and development and human progress are also based on it. The value of the individual is measured in society by the extent to which he bears responsibility for himself and others. This is measured by his safety, mental health, and education in the development of social skills. This is one of the paths available to prepare a responsible citizen who is aware of his role towards himself and the aspects of life of his community.

The faculty member realizes that the development of social responsibility is essential to the upbringing of members of society, their raising and their preparation for life. The energy that the individual enjoys and employs in performing his duties also defends his rights at the same time. A neutral and objective person tries to find a balance between his duties and his rights, developing the sense of social responsibility that is required by mature adults. A person might feel unsatisfied when fulfilling his duties, at the same time imagining that he is not receiving all his rights. Thus, he will condemn his society with negative judgments, on the basis of which he establishes an attitude towards his society, which discourages him from any social responsibility; he abandons his conviction of a sense of social responsibility.

The faculty member is found to be following and participating in every small and large detail regarding the community and society, expressing his social responsibility towards the country and other citizens because he considers it to be at the core of his work and duty.

**Question 2:** Are there differences in the level of social responsibility among faculty members by college, academic rank, or years of experience?

**The college**

To answer this question, the t-test was used in addition to the descriptive statistics to test the four dimensions against faculty (science or humanities), as in [Table 8](#).

**Table 8.** T-test results for social responsibility by college

Dimension	College	Mean	Standard Deviation	df	T	Sig
Self-responsibility	Scientific	3.72	0.68	272	-0.694	0.48
	Humanities	3.81	0.60			
Collective responsibility	Scientific	3.53	0.74	272	-0.894	0.37
	Humanities	3.65	0.69			
Religious and moral responsibility	Scientific	3.45	0.63	272	0.325	0.74
	Humanities	3.40	0.85			
National responsibility	Scientific	3.63	0.70	272	-0.445	0.65
	Humanities	3.69	0.68			
Total	Scientific	3.58	0.53	272	-0.523	0.60
	Humanities	3.64	0.58			

Statistical significance level ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ )

There are no statistically significant differences between the mean values of social responsibility dimensions between colleges, since all the p-values of the calculated t-tests are larger than the alpha significance level ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ).

This lack of difference by college is due to the fact that faculty members' beliefs, regardless of their college, come from the commitment to the philosophy of the university. Universities seek to exercise social responsibility through commitment to serve the community. Moreover, they formulate the academic programmers that they offer according to the needs of society; they apply research that addresses the problems of society and offer the results to the needs of society. They also link their programmers to the philosophy of sustainable human development and introduce direct social programmers in the service of communities based on human rights.

**Academic rank**

ANOVA analysis of the level of social responsibility according to academic rank (teacher, assistant professor, associate professor, professor) is compared for the four dimensions, as shown in Table 9.

**Table 9.** ANOVA results for social responsibility by academic rank

Dimension	Source	Sum of squares	df	Mean squares	F	Sig
Self-responsibility	Between groups	0.497	3	0.124	0.285	0.88
	Within groups	43.940	270	0.435		
	Total	44.437	273			
Collective responsibility	Between groups	3.323	3	0.831	1.623	0.17
	Within groups	51.695	270	0.512		
	Total	55.018	273			
Religious and moral responsibility	Between groups	1.634	3	0.408	0.738	0.65
	Within groups	55.898	270	0.553		
	Total	57.532	273			
National responsibility	Between groups	3.405	3	0.851	1.811	0.13
	Within groups	47.472	270	0.470		
	Total	50.877	273			
Total	Between groups	1.619	3	0.405	1.319	0.26
	Within groups	1.008	70	0.307		
	Total	2.627	73			

There are no statistically significant differences at the significance level ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) with regards to social responsibility according to academic rank, overall or by individual dimensions.

This is because, regardless of their academic rank, faculty members consider it their duty to participate in social responsibility with others in doing what is required, by understanding how to help the community satisfy its needs, solve its problems, reach its goals, achieve its well-being, and maintain its continuity.

**Years of experience**

Single contrast analysis (ANOVA) was used to measure years of experience against the four dimensions, as presented in Table 10.

**Table 10.** ANOVA results for social responsibility by years of experience

Dimension	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean squares	F	Sig
Self-responsibility	Between groups	0.497	3	0.124	0.285	0.88
	Within groups	43.940	270	0.435		
	Total	44.437	273			
Collective responsibility	Between groups	3.323	3	0.831	1.623	0.17
	Within groups	51.695	270	0.512		
	Total	55.018	273			
Religious and moral responsibility	Between groups	1.634	3	0.408	0.738	0.65
	Within groups	55.898	270	0.553		
	Total	57.532	273			
National responsibility	Between groups	3.405	3	0.851	1.811	0.13
	Within groups	47.472	270	0.470		
	Total	50.877	273			

There are no statistically significant differences at the significance level ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) with regards to social responsibility of the faculty members by years of experience, in all dimensions and overall.

This lack of statistically significant difference is because the number of years of experience represents the mindset of those who have extensive experience in their field of work. Responsibility towards students includes training, guidance, consultation and attention to the formation of positive trends towards understanding contemporary problems, while responsibilities towards the university include participating in the activities of committees, meetings and professional bodies, and representing the university in scientific and literary forums. Responsibility to the community includes serving with institutions related to the community, spreading community culture, providing consultation and conducting studies and research that address issues of interest to the community or contribute to addressing its problems, and contributing to strengthening the university's relationship with community institutions.

#### 4. Recommendations

In light of the results of the study, it is recommended to:

- Benefit from faculty members' consultancy in the university and in different disciplines.
- Prepare university programmers and mechanisms, that direct faculty members towards their responsibilities.
- Conduct training courses for faculty members to activate social responsibility in their lives.

- Use faculty members to hold seminars and give lectures on the problems facing society.
- Work to provide the material and human resources necessary to support the role of the university in community service.
- Benefit from the research of faculty members, which should address the problems of society in all fields, i.e. economic, scientific, legal, and environmental.
- Honor faculty members who interact with society's issues and problems.
- Establish a specialized department concerned with the areas of social responsibility and work on its application and activation in the university.
- Review the academic plans and programmers of the university, so that it contains courses specialized in the development of society, linking scientific courses to the problems of society.

## 5. Conclusion

The social responsibility of the university professor has ethical, national and human dimensions and implication, and it requires each them to carry out his duties to the fullest in teaching process, scientific research, and in serving and the local community. The results of the current study showed that the level of social responsibility among the faculty members was moderate. The results also showed that there were no statistically significant differences in the level of social responsibility by faculty, academic rank, or years of experience.

## References

- [Abdul Latif, 2010](#) – *Abdul Latif, S.* (2010). The Social Responsibility of King Saud University towards Saudi Society. A study of the university's experience in the field of environmental and community service. Paper presented to *second International Conference of the Sociology Department of the Faculty of Arts, Zigzag University.* (2): 663-691, Egypt.
- [Abed-Baqir, 2012](#) – *Abed-Baqir, N.* (2012). Social responsibility and its relationship to the functional performance of faculty members of the Faculty of Basic Education. *Journal of the Faculty of Basic Education.* 18(73): 537-657.
- [Ahandu, 2016](#) – *Ahandu, S.*(2016). Requirements for the quality of social responsibility in university education for community service. *Dirasat Journal,* 42, 46-63.
- [Al-Buasir, 2017](#) – *Al-Buasir, K.* (2017). Reality of social responsibility activation in faculties of Imam Muhammad ibn Saud Islamic University. *Journal of Scientific Research in Education.* 9(18): 511-546.
- [Al-Fahid, 2012](#) – *Al-Fahid, A.* (2012). Awareness of Security Responsibility among Saudi University Students. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Nayef Arab University for Security Sciences, Riyadh.
- [Al-Gali, Al-Ameri, 2005](#) – *Al-Gali, T., Al-Ameri, S.* (2005). Social Responsibility and Work Ethics. Amman: ,Wael Publishing House.
- [Al-Gali, Al-Ameri, 2009](#) – *Al-Gali, T., Al-Ameri, S.* (2009). Social Responsibility and Work Ethics. Amman: Wael Publishing House.
- [Al-Hammouri, 2013](#) – *Al-Hammouri, S.* (2013). Social responsibility: Theory and practice. Amman: Wael Publishing and Distribution House.
- [Al-Hassan, 2014](#) – *Al-Hassan, B.* (2014). The role of social responsibility in improving the organization's performance. Unpublished Master Thesis, Muhammad Khudair University, Algeria.
- [Al-Kattab et al., 2015](#) – *Al-Khattab, S., Abdullah, M., Al-Derwasha, A., Abu-Sharia, I.* (2015). The impact of social marketing and the application of social responsibility in enhancing the quality of educational services, field study on private schools and cultural centers in Maan City. *Dirasat: Management Science Studies.* 42(2): 443-460.
- [Al-Otaibi, 2013](#) – *Al-Otaibi, K.* (2013). The role of social activity in the development of social responsibility survey on pioneers of activity and high school students in Riyadh. Unpublished master Thesis, Nayef Arab University of Security Sciences, Riyadh.
- [Al-Rwashada, 2011](#) – *Al-Rwashada, A.* (2011). The role of the university in community service from the standpoint of the faculty members:Al-Balqa Applied University as a model. *Scientific Publishing Council-Kuwait University.* 40(4): 67-105.
- [Al-Samadi, Athamneh, 2008](#) – *Al-Samadi, A., Athamneh, S.* (2008). A study on constructing a scale for social responsibility among Jordanian college students. *University of Sharjah Journal for Humanities and Social Sciences.* 6(3): 273-298.

**Al-Shafei, 2016** – *Al-Shafei, N.* (2016). The role of leadership styles in promoting social responsibility in the directorates of education in Gaza governorates. Unpublished Master Thesis, Al-Aqsa University, Palestine.

**Al-Thaity, 2015** – *Al-Thaity, K.* (2015). Role of Saudi educational administration department in achieving social responsibility goals. *Taibahu University Journal for Educational Sciences*. 10(1): 51-67.

**Amer, 2007** – *Amer, T.* (2007). Envisioning a proposal to develop the role of universities in the service of society in light of modern global trends. *Journal of the Federation of Arab Universities*. 4: 355-381.

**Awad, 1999** – *Awad, A.* (1999). Social responsibility and its relationship to cognitive methods and control center. Unpublished Master Thesis, University of Assiut, Egypt.

**Diafi, 2010** – *Diafi, N.* (2010). Social Responsibility of the Foundation and Human Resources. Unpublished Master Thesis, Abu Bakar BelkaidTlemcen University, Algeria.

**Hamdan, 2011** – *Hamdan, M.* (2011). Problems of scientific research at private Palestinian universities and ways to overcome them from the point of view of faculty members, scientific research conference concepts, ethics, from 10-11 May Islamic University, Gaza.

**Hilalo, 2013** – *Hilalo, I.* (2013). The role of Palestinian universities in the service of society in their social responsibility from the point of view of faculty members: Case study. Unpublished Master thesis, Islamic University, Gaza.

**Keita, 2016** – *Keita, D.* (2016). Curriculum and its role in promoting social responsibility among students of higher education. *Journal of Psychological and Educational Sciences*. 3(2): 206-230.

**Mohammed, 2016** – *Mohammed, M.* (2016). A proposed perspective for developing the social responsibility for Egyptian universities on the light knowledge society. *Arab studies in education and psychology*. 80: 407-431.

**Moumni, Maani, 2017** – *Moumni, F., Maani, M.* (2017). Social responsibility and its relationship to certain environmental variables. *Journal of the Union of Arab Universities for Education and Psychology*. 15(2): 81-111.

**Njadat, 2010** – *Njadat, A.* (2010). The role of Jordanian universities in promoting social and security responsibility towards their communities. Paper presented to *second international conference of the Sociology Department of the Faculty of Arts at Zagazig University*, Egypt.

**Rahal, 2011** – *Rahal, O.* (2011). Community responsibility for universities between profitability and voluntary. Paper presented to Conference on Community Responsibility of Palestinian Universities, Nablus.

**Ruweished, 2007** – *Ruweished, F.* (2007). Freedom and Social Responsibility among students of the Faculty of Basic Education in Kuwait. *Journal of Educational Sciences*. First Issue, 176-20, Cairo University.

**Shaheen, 2011** – *Shaheen, M.* (2011). Community responsibility for universities. Paper presented to Community Responsibility of Palestinian Universities, Nablus.

**Shaldan, Sayma, 2014** – *Shaldan, F., Sayma, S.* (2014). The social responsibility of the Islamic University faculty members and the ways to activating it. *The Arab Journal for the Guarantee of The Quality of University Education*. 7(8): 149-179.