
SOCIAL INNOVATION AND UNIVERSITY SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY. THE CASE OF STUDENTS FROM A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION IN CHILE

Omar Acuña-Moraga, Danilo Cumián-Albornoz, Guipsy Rebolledo-Aburto, Lorena Miranda-Navarro, Pedro Severino-González, Jairo Dote-Pardo, Juan Yévenes-Jara, Edwards Núñez-Acevedo and Tomás Zapata-Soto

SUMMARY

This study investigates the perception of social innovation within the framework of university social responsibility (USR) among students at a religious institution in Chile. Data were collected through a quantitative questionnaire administered to 200 students using a non-probabilistic sampling method. The analysis involved statistical processing, including assessments of internal consistency, central tendency measures, dispersion indicators, and inferential statistics. The findings reveal a high valuation of social innovation among participants,

with variations observed based on sociodemographic characteristics. The study concludes that higher education institutions should allocate resources and create opportunities to implement social innovation strategies, in order to align with the evolving demands and challenges of a dynamic, rapidly changing society. Future research should expand the sample to include diverse contexts and employ various methodological approaches to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon.

Introduction

Environmental and social challenges have driven the development of strategies aimed at meeting the needs of different stakeholder groups (Severino-González *et al.*, 2018; Maynard *et al.*, 2023). Social innovation has emerged as a model, policy, and strategy designed to address both local and global issues by leveraging

the capacities and endogenous resources of communities (Pérez-González and Lutsak-Yaroslava, 2017). This approach aligns with the principles of University Social Responsibility (USR), a concept recognized for its complexity and multifaceted nature. USR reflects a range of interpretations and applications, emphasizing its inherent flexibility, multidimensionality, and multidisciplinary scope

(Sarmiento-Peralta *et al.*, 2021; Acuña-Moraga *et al.*, 2022a; Flores-Fernandez *et al.*, 2022). Recent research has been driven by the need for a comprehensive understanding of this field, including its historical context and the identification of emerging research areas (Wu *et al.*, 2023; Benzies *et al.*, 2024).

Research on social innovation has emerged from a range of theoretical frameworks,

including economic, political science/management, inclusive/participatory, and hybrid perspectives, each offering distinct definitions and models (Van der Have and Rubalcaba, 2016; Ascanio *et al.*, 2023). When examining social innovation within the context of education, it becomes evident that this field can address various objectives and encompass diverse disciplines (Batista and

KEYWORDS / Higher Education / Social Innovation / Sustainable Development Goals / Religious Institutions / University Social Responsibility /

Received: 09/18/2024. Modified: 10/25/2024. Accepted: 11/04/2024.

Omar Acuña-Moraga. Graduate in Administrative Sciences, Commercial Engineer and Master in Business Administration, Universidad del Bío-Bío, Chile. Academic, Universidad del Bío-Bío, Chile.

Danilo Cumián-Albornoz. Graduate of Science in Business Administration, Commercial Engineer. Research, School of Commercial Engineering, Faculty of Engineering and Business, Universidad Adventista de Chile, Chile.

Guipsy Rebolledo-Aburto. Graduate of Science in Business Administration and Commercial Engineer, Universidad Católica de la Santísima Concepción.

Chile. Academic, Universidad Adventista de Chile, Chile.

Lorena Miranda Navarro. Bachelor's Degree in Public Accounting and Master in Finance, Escuela Superior de Comercio y Administración, México. PhD Innovation and Social Responsibility, Universidad Anáhuac, Mexico. Professor and researcher, Facultad de Responsabilidad Social, Universidad Anáhuac Mexico, Mexico.

Pedro Severino-González. Graduate in Administrative Sciences, Commercial Engineer, and Master in Business Administration, Universidad del Bío-Bío, Chile. Academic, Universidad Católica del Maule, Chile. Address: Department of

Economics and Administration, Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences, Universidad Católica del Maule. San Miguel Avenue 3605, Talca, Chile. e-mail: pseverino@ucm.cl.

Jairo Dote-Pardo. Graduate in Administrative Sciences, Commercial Engineer, and Master in Business Management, Universidad del Bío-Bío, Chile. Professor, Department of Economic and Administrative Sciences. Researcher, Center for Management and Applied Economics. Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile.

Juan Yévenes-Jara. Graduate in Administrative Sciences, Commercial Engineer and Master in Business Administration,

Universidad del Bío-Bío, Chile. Master in Business Administration, University of Guelph, Canada. Academic, Universidad del Bío-Bío, Chile.

Edwards Núñez-Acevedo. Bachelor of Medicine and Surgeon Physician, Universidad Nacional de Trujillo, Peru. Master's Degree in Medicine, Universidad Cesar Vallejo, Peru. Doctorate in Medicine, Universidad Nacional de Trujillo, Peru. Professor and researcher, Universidad Nacional de Trujillo, Peru.

Tomás Zapata-Soto. Graduate in Administrative Sciences, Commercial Engineer and Master in Business management, Universidad del Bío-Bío, Chile.

INNOVACIÓN SOCIAL Y RESPONSABILIDAD SOCIAL UNIVERSITARIA. EL CASO DE LOS ESTUDIANTES DE UNA INSTITUCIÓN RELIGIOSA EN CHILE

Omar Acuña-Moraga, Danilo Cumián-Albornoz, Guipsy Rebolledo-Aburto, Lorena Miranda-Navarro, Pedro Severino-González, Jairo Dote-Pardo, Juan Yévenes-Jara, Edwards Núñez-Acevedo y Tomás Zapata-Soto

RESUMEN

Este estudio investiga la percepción de la innovación social dentro del marco de la responsabilidad social universitaria (RSU) entre los estudiantes de una institución religiosa en Chile. Los datos se recolectaron a través de un cuestionario cuantitativo administrado a 200 estudiantes utilizando un método de muestreo no probabilístico. El análisis implicó el procesamiento estadístico, incluyendo evaluaciones de consistencia interna, medidas de tendencia central, indicadores de dispersión y estadísticas inferenciales. Los resultados revelan una alta valoración de

la innovación social entre los participantes, con variaciones observadas según las características sociodemográficas. El estudio concluye que las instituciones de educación superior deben asignar recursos y crear oportunidades para implementar estrategias de innovación social, con el fin de alinearse con las demandas y desafíos evolutivos de una sociedad dinámica y en rápido cambio. La investigación futura debería ampliar la muestra para incluir contextos diversos y emplear enfoques metodológicos variados para obtener una comprensión más completa del fenómeno.

INOVAÇÃO SOCIAL E RESPONSABILIDADE SOCIAL UNIVERSITÁRIA. O CASO DOS ESTUDANTES DE UMA INSTITUIÇÃO RELIGIOSA NO CHILE

Omar Acuña-Moraga, Danilo Cumián-Albornoz, Guipsy Rebolledo-Aburto, Lorena Miranda-Navarro, Pedro Severino-González, Jairo Dote-Pardo, Juan Yévenes-Jara, Edwards Núñez-Acevedo e Tomás Zapata-Soto

RESUMO

Este estudo investiga a percepção da inovação social dentro do framework da responsabilidade social universitária (RSU) entre os estudantes de uma instituição religiosa no Chile. Os dados foram coletados por meio de um questionário quantitativo administrado a 200 estudantes utilizando um método de amostragem não probabilística. A análise envolveu o processamento estatístico, incluindo avaliações de consistência interna, medidas de tendência central, indicadores de dispersão e estatísticas inferenciais. Os resultados revelam uma alta valorização da ino-

vação social entre os participantes, com variações observadas com base nas características sociodemográficas. O estudo conclui que as instituições de ensino superior devem alocar recursos e criar oportunidades para implementar estratégias de inovação social, a fim de alinhar-se com as demandas e desafios evolutivos de uma sociedade dinâmica e em rápido crescimento. Pesquisas futuras devem expandir a amostra para incluir contextos diversos e empregar abordagens metodológicas variadas para obter uma compreensão mais abrangente do fenômeno.

Helal, 2023; Sarfo *et al.*, 2024). This exploration can involve a variety of strategic models and policies that reflect the multifaceted nature of contemporary educational systems. Such approaches help identify trends and challenges that either complement or critique the vast array of educational policies, practices, and activities (Giesecke and Schartinger, 2021; Feijóo-Quintas *et al.*, 2024).

Higher education, when viewed through the lens of social innovation, encounters numerous challenges that have tested the effectiveness of models and strategies employed by universities globally (Severino-González *et al.*, 2019; Acuña-Moraga *et al.*, 2022b). These challenges have

spurred the development and implementation of various strategies by universities aimed at addressing the needs of their surrounding communities (Acuña-Moraga *et al.*, 2020; Satar *et al.*, 2023; Sampaio and Sebastião, 2024). Nevertheless, the discourse on social innovation often emerges in contexts where institutional leaders prioritize power, empowerment, and instrumentalism (Phillips *et al.*, 2024). Such dynamics have the potential to constrain or undermine the broader societal benefits of social innovation, limiting its impact on creating democratic and inclusive solutions (Obreja *et al.*, 2024; Tu *et al.*, 2024).

According to Maynard *et al.* (2023), research on social innovation in educational contexts

has been conducted across various countries, including Turkey, Serbia, Morocco, China, and Italy. These studies have explored a range of themes such as sustainability, transformative leadership, and social responsibility (Severino-González *et al.*, 2022a; Hinduja *et al.*, 2023). Additionally, other works have investigated aspects such as innovation culture, creativity, co-creation, and social entrepreneurship (Bandono *et al.*, 2023; Garcia, 2023; Graciano *et al.*, 2023; Osama and Adam, 2024). The value of these investigations is evident in their demonstration of how social innovation is closely linked to the development of skills associated with global citizenship, personal and social responsibility,

sustainable development goals (SDGs), CSR, character education, and values-based training (Romero-Argueta *et al.*, 2020; Siritheeratharadol *et al.*, 2023; Basson and Steenkamp, 2024).

It is clear that Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and social innovation are inter-related through their shared characteristics, principles, and values (Adel *et al.*, 2022; Severino-González *et al.*, 2022a). University Social Responsibility (USR) represents a dynamic and consensus-driven management model designed to address the needs of various stakeholders within educational communities (Flores-Fernandez *et al.*, 2022). Core values such as solidarity, empathy, justice, dignity, and freedom are fundamental to

this model, which emphasizes collaborative decision-making focused on human needs (Vallaey and Rodríguez, 2019; Severino-González *et al.*, 2024). Research conducted in various countries underscores the significance of these principles in enhancing university management practices (Barrera-Rodríguez *et al.*, 2023).

According to Urrunaga-Pastor *et al.* (2023), Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) exemplifies universities' commitment to fostering and disseminating knowledge that cultivates ethical and responsible professionals (Severino-González *et al.*, 2023a; Fremstad and Ewins, 2024). This commitment is reflected across various dimensions such as curricular management, organizational policies, applied research, technological transfer, and community engagement (Vallaey and Rodríguez, 2019; Flores-Fernandez *et al.*, 2022; Severino-González *et al.*, 2024). To effectively address these areas, it is crucial to consider multiple approaches and perspectives, taking into account the unique aspects of social innovation as implemented by higher education institutions of varying disciplines, sizes, ideological orientations, religious affiliations, and cultural contexts (Meikle *et al.*, 2022; Chen *et al.*, 2023; Fauzi *et al.*, 2023).

The relationship between USR and social innovation is evident in higher education contexts, due to the implications that innovations have in university settings (Effendi, 2023). In this sense, USR, through social innovation, contributes to the creative solution of various problems that exist in society (Bragaglia, 2024). All of which facilitates the generation of responses to common challenges in coherence with the common good among the interest groups that make up an educational community (Arbieto Mamani *et al.*, 2023).

Studying USR and social innovation within the context of religious education is

particularly relevant due to the values promoted by faith-based educational systems (Vivanco, 2018; Severino-González *et al.*, 2023b; Kleindienst, 2024). Such education often emphasizes values like dignity, empathy, solidarity, justice, and participation (Stieger and Tröhler, 2023; Wüthrich-Grossenbacher, 2024). These values are instrumental in fostering social innovations that address the needs of various stakeholder groups and instill Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) principles in university students from an early age (Moral *et al.*, 2021; Flores-Fernández *et al.*, 2022).

The dimensions of social innovation are diverse and vary depending on the theoretical and methodological framework employed. García-Aracil *et al.* (2024) propose an analysis based on competencies, identifying three key dimensions: organizational, entrepreneurial, and collaborative. In contrast, Mafrá *et al.* (2024) incorporate the principles of the SDGs, highlighting dimensions related to the economy, society, and environment. For this study, the framework proposed by Villa *et al.* (2014) is particularly relevant, as it focuses on educational contexts and facilitates the collection of perspectives from university students.

Given the challenges universities face in maintaining their relevance and impact on society, there is a risk that higher

education may struggle to align with the evolving needs of the community (Vallaey and Rodríguez, 2019). This underscores the importance of investigating social issues and understanding the expectations of strategic groups regarding innovation through the lens of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), due to its broad relevance and impact (Flores-Fernández *et al.*, 2022). This study addresses the following research question: What is the perception of social innovation within the framework of USR among students at a religious institution in Chile? The objective is to explore this perception and gain insights into how social innovation is viewed from the USR perspective by these students.

Methodology

The present study employs an exploratory, cross-sectional design, focusing on the application of a quantitative questionnaire administered at a single point in time. This approach facilitates the analysis of university students' perceptions regarding social innovation. The sample used is non-probabilistic and convenience-based, selected to allow for practical data collection within the given context.

Procedures and participants

This research has received approval from the Scientific

Ethics Committee of the Adventist University of Chile (No. 2021-07, January 27, 2021). Data collection was conducted using a digital questionnaire, distributed via a Google Forms® link shared through emails from March 12, 2021, to March 24, 2021. The study population consists of 2,214 university students enrolled at the religious institution. The sample comprises 200 students who participated voluntarily and freely (Table I).

Instrument

This research utilized a questionnaire comprising three sections. The first section includes filter questions to ensure that respondents are university students from the religious institution. The second section gathers sociodemographic information, such as sex, age, and academic level. The third section features a scale assessing perceptions of social innovation, adapted from Villa *et al.* (2013). This scale is composed of four dimensions: Curricular and pedagogical, Organizational, Research, development, and innovation, Relationship with the environment, and Environmental (Table II).

As for the response options, a Likert-type scale is available, where: 1= Disagree, 2= Somewhat disagree, 3= Neither agree nor disagree, 4= Agree, and = Strongly agree.

TABLE I
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE COMPOSED OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Dimension	Characteristic	Values (%)
Sex	Female	34
	Male	66
Age (years)	Between 18 and 21 years old	44
	Between 22 and 24 years old	37
	More than 25 years old	19
Level (year)	First year	4
	Second year	8
	Third year	34
	Fourth year	24
	Fifth year or more	30

TABLE II
SOCIAL INNOVATION PERCEPTION SCALE

Dimension	Variable	Items
Curricular and pedagogical	V1	You consider that the university encourages the development of skills related to social innovation during vocational training.
	V2	You believe that it is important that there is greater interest in social innovation at the university.
	V3	You University students must take ownership of the concept of social innovation.
	V4	The degree you study should include subjects with an emphasis on social innovation.
	V5	You believe that vocational training programs have an impact on social reality.
Organizational	V6	In the university, there are regulations, rules, and/or mechanisms for implementing social innovation.
	V7	You have witnessed the implementation of social innovation projects at the university.
	V8	Social innovation is presented as a priority in the university's mission or ideology.
	V9	The university creates spaces for student organizations for the development of practices related to social innovation.
Research, development and innovation	V10	Research on social innovation that can be carried out at the university contributes to economic regeneration and entrepreneurship.
	V11	Applications generated by social innovation research are beneficial for citizenship, ecological development, social inclusion, and job opportunities.
	V12	He has seen how the university guarantees accessibility to resources, services, and infrastructure for research into social innovation.
Relationship with the environment	V13	Universities need to promote social innovation among citizens.
	V14	There are spaces for dialogue, consultation, and reflection regarding social innovation with the participation of citizens.
	V15	Learn about social innovation projects that the university has implemented in the community.
Environmental	V16	Environmental responsibility has been incorporated as part of the strategic plan of his career.
	V17	The university collaborates with institutions and organizations in the public, private and social sectors to promote sustainable ecological development.
	V18	Its curriculum transversally integrates sustainable development content from the perspective of social innovation.

Procedure and data analysis

Once the data collection was completed, the responses were exported into a Microsoft Excel® spreadsheet. The database was then coded and imported into SPSS version 22 for analysis. The analytical procedures included assessing internal consistency, calculating measures of central tendency and dispersion, conducting normality tests, and identifying statistically significant differences.

Results

This section outlines the key findings related to the research question and objective. It includes an analysis of central tendency and dispersion measures for the social innovation scale, which involves calculating the mean, median, standard deviation, and internal consistency coefficient. Additionally, statistical

differences are examined in relation to the sociodemographic characteristics of the university students.

Descriptive Statistics

Table III presents the means, medians, and standard deviations (SD) for each variable, along with the internal consistency coefficients for the dimensions of the social innovation scale. In the Curricular and Pedagogical dimension, it can be noted that the highest value is found in variable V3 ($\bar{x} = 4.46$, $M = 5$, $SD = 0.633$), due to the importance that students give to the University's expressions of interest in social innovation. On the other hand, regarding the Organizational dimension, the highest value is observed in variable V9 ($\bar{x} = 3.34$, $M = 4$, $SD = 1.105$), due to the provision of student organization spaces for the development of practices related to social innovation. In relation to

the Research, Development, and Innovation dimension, the highest rating is found in V11 ($\bar{x} = 4.10$, $M = 4$, $SD = 0.848$), due to the recognition of the benefits involved in research on social innovation for society. Regarding the Relationship with the Environment dimension, the highest value is identified in variable V13 ($\bar{x} = 4.45$, $M = 5$, $SD = 0.64$), since future professionals value the importance that the university gives to training in topics linked to social innovation from the perspective of citizenship. In correspondence with the Environmental dimension, the highest value is identified in V17 ($\bar{x} = 3.71$, $M = 4$, $SD = 0.995$), because students recognize the collaborations that the University develops with institutions and organizations that promote sustainable ecological development. Finally, regarding internal consistency, Cronbach's Alpha coefficients range according to the values

reached in each dimension, from low to acceptable.

Inferential analysis

Inferential analysis involves conducting tests to identify the most suitable indicators based on the data distribution, with the goal of determining statistically significant differences. Following the application of the Shapiro-Wilk and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests, it was determined that the data are not normally distributed. As a result, the Kruskal-Wallis H test and the Mann-Whitney U test were utilized to examine statistical differences. The subsequent analysis focuses on identifying significant differences based on the sociodemographic characteristics of the university students, specifically sex, age, and academic level (year).

Table IV presents the means (\bar{x}), medians (M), standard deviations (SD), and p-values

TABLE III
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS AND CONSISTENCY COEFFICIENTS

Dimension	Variable	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation (SD)	Cronbach's Alpha
Curricular and pedagogical	V1	3.43	4	1.091	0.651
	V2	4.46	5	0.633	
	V3	4.42	5	0.697	
	V4	4.34	5	0.816	
	V5	4.14	4	0.872	
Organizational	V6	3.30	3	0.885	0.561
	V7	3.29	3	1.105	
	V8	3.25	3	1.054	
	V9	3.34	4	1.105	
Research, development, and innovation	V10	3.73	4	0.872	0.624
	V11	4.10	4	0.848	
	V12	3.32	3	1.045	
Relationship with the environment	V13	4.45	5	0.64	0.619
	V14	3.29	3	1.034	
	V15	3.18	3	1.181	
Environmental	V16	3.41	4	1.191	0.796
	V17	3.71	4	0.995	
	V18	3.28	3	1.182	

according to sex. It is observed that significant differences are observed in some variables that constitute the Organizational, Relationship with the Environment, and Environmental dimensions. Among them, the dimension that presents the greatest number of significant differences is Organizational, particularly the statistical differences found in V6 (p-value= 0.045), V7 (p-value= 0.007), and V8 (p-value= 0.032). In relation to the above, in all cases the highest values are expressed by the subjects who are part of the male group, due to the recognition they give to the provision of regulations, standards, and/or mechanisms that regulate the implementation of social innovation, in addition to the experience lived due to the University's prioritization of the development of social innovation projects. Such practices may consider various challenges that underlie the principles of sustainability (Severino-González *et al.*, 2022b). The above-mentioned could contribute to the facility's virtuous

behavior that benefits the entire society through socially responsible actions (Sarmiento-Peralta *et al.*, 2021). All of which is consistent with the values of CSR that have materialized through each of its areas of impact (Acuña-Moraga *et al.*, 2022b).

Table V presents the means (\bar{x}), medians (M), standard deviations (SD), and p-value according to age (years). It is possible to identify that there is an exclusive difference in a variable that integrates the Curricular and Pedagogical dimension. In relation to the above, the difference is found in V2 (p-value= 0.008). In this sense, it can be observed that the older the student is, the greater the value he or she gives to the recognition expressed by the University regarding the interest in actions that constitute social innovation, with the highest value being expressed by the group of students over 25 years old (\bar{x} = 4.61, M= 5, SD= 0.50). In relation to the above, these social innovations have links with the SDGs and CSR,

because social innovation seeks to satisfy the needs of interest groups as well as socially responsible and sustainably transcendental actions (Acuña-Moraga *et al.*, 2020). It is important to consider the implications that CSR has in each of its areas of impact (Vallaey and Rodríguez, 2019; Severino-González *et al.*, 2024).

Table VI presents the means (\bar{x}), medians (M), standard deviations (SD), and p-value according to level (year). It is possible to identify that there are significant differences in two variables that exclusively integrate the Organizational dimension. In this sense, concerning the variable V6 (p-value= 0.020), the highest value is expressed by the group of students who are in the First Year, due to the provision of regulations, norms, and/or mechanisms for implementing social innovation (\bar{x} = 4.25, M= 4, SD= 0.71). Likewise, with respect to the variable V9 (p-value= 0.001), students who are in their Fifth Year or more value the availability of spaces

for the development of student activities related to social innovation (\bar{x} = 3.75, M= 4, SD= 0.88). These spaces demonstrate the importance that the University gives to the promotion of initiatives that seek to help society, which encourages the design of shared strategies according to the needs of educational actors (Severino-González *et al.*, 2020; Acuña-Moraga *et al.*, 2022a).

Discussion

This study aims to explore the perception of social innovation within the framework of USR among students at a religious institution in Chile. The findings reveal statistical differences according to the sociodemographic characteristics of the research subjects. In alignment with Benzies *et al.* (2024), it is essential to affirm that social innovation plays a crucial role in crafting responses to social challenges, as outlined in the 17 SDGs, encompassing its five pillars: people, prosperity, peace, partnerships, and the planet, with 17 specific objectives.

TABLE IV
MEAN (\bar{X}), MEDIAN (M), STANDARD DEVIATION (SD), AND P-VALUE ACCORDING TO SEX

Dimension	Variable	Female			Male			p-value
		\bar{x}	M	SD	\bar{x}	M	SD	
Curricular and pedagogical	V1	3.33	4	1.15	3.62	4	0.95	0.175
	V2	4.44	4	0.62	4.50	5	0.66	0.348
	V3	4.43	5	0.69	4.40	5	0.72	0.793
	V4	4.31	4	0.82	4.38	5	0.81	0.458
	V5	4.14	4	0.88	4.12	4	0.86	0.761
Organizational	V6	3.20	3	0.88	3.50	3	0.87	0.045
	V7	3.14	3	1.14	3.59	4	0.98	0.007
	V8	3.14	3	1.07	3.46	4	1.00	0.032
	V9	3.33	4	1.14	3.35	4	1.05	0.976
Research, development and innovation	V10	3.66	4	0.92	3.87	4	0.77	0.144
	V11	4.10	4	0.88	4.09	4	0.79	0.718
	V12	3.23	3	1.02	3.49	3	1.07	0.115
Relationship with the environment	V13	4.39	4	0.67	4.56	5	0.56	0.096
	V14	3.23	3	1.03	3.38	3	1.04	0.304
	V15	3.04	3	1.16	3.46	4	1.18	0.013
Environmental	V16	3.34	4	1.27	3.53	4	1.01	0.522
	V17	3.58	4	1.05	3.96	4	0.84	0.018
	V18	3.22	3	1.26	3.38	3	1.02	0.546

TABLE V
MEAN (\bar{X}), MEDIAN (M), STANDARD DEVIATION (SD), AND P-VALUE ACCORDING TO AGE (YEARS)

Dimension	Variable	Between 19 and 21 years old			Between 22 and 24 years old			More than 25 years			p-value
		\bar{x}	M	SD	\bar{x}	M	SD	\bar{x}	M	SD	
Curricular and pedagogical	V1	3.41	4	1.02	3.43	4	1.09	3.45	4	1.27	0.943
	V2	4.32	4	0.62	4.55	5	0.68	4.61	5	0.50	0.008
	V3	4.38	4	0.63	4.40	5	0.79	4.55	5	0.65	0.276
	V4	4.29	4	0.76	4.28	5	0.92	4.55	5	0.69	0.151
	V5	4.03	4	0.80	4.19	4	0.95	4.26	5	0.86	0.165
Organizational	V6	3.31	3	0.93	3.20	3	0.87	3.47	3	0.80	0.335
	V7	3.26	4	1.19	3.21	3	1.06	3.50	4	1.01	0.420
	V8	3.22	3	1.04	3.17	3	1.08	3.45	4	1.03	0.367
	V9	3.29	4	1.10	3.37	4	1.10	3.39	4	1.15	0.746
Research, development and innovation	V10	3.77	4	0.74	3.73	4	0.89	3.63	4	1.10	0.903
	V11	4.06	4	0.78	4.13	4	0.92	4.11	4	0.86	0.614
	V12	3.39	4	1.09	3.17	3	0.98	3.42	3	1.06	0.109
Relationship with the environment	V13	4.44	4	0.54	4.43	5	0.74	4.53	5	0.65	0.520
	V14	3.37	3	1.02	3.15	3	1.07	3.37	3	0.97	0.256
	V15	3.17	3	1.17	3.08	3	1.19	3.39	4	1.18	0.398
Environmental	V16	3.39	3	1.09	3.36	4	1.29	3.53	4	1.22	0.625
	V17	3.64	4	0.99	3.69	4	1.03	3.89	4	0.95	0.293
	V18	3.36	3	1.12	3.08	3	1.25	3.47	3	1.16	0.228

According to García-Aracil *et al.* (2024), social innovation can be examined through

dimensions related to competencies, specifically organizational, entrepreneurial, and

collaborative. In contrast, this study explores social innovation from the perspective of

students, focusing on various initiatives categorized into the dimensions Curricular and

TABLE VI
MEANS (\bar{X}), MEDIANS (M), STANDARD DEVIATIONS (SD), AND P-VALUE ACCORDING TO LEVEL (YEAR)

Dimension	Variable	First			Second			Third			Fourth			Fifth or more			p-value
		\bar{x}	M	SD	\bar{x}	M	SD	\bar{x}	M	SD	\bar{x}	M	SD	\bar{x}	M	SD	
Curricular and pedagogical	V1	3.63	4	0.92	3.44	4	1.26	3.37	4	1.11	3.48	4	1.09	3.42	4	1.08	0.965
	V2	4.25	4	0.46	4.69	5	0.48	4.37	4	0.67	4.48	5	0.55	4.52	5	0.70	0.179
	V3	4.38	4	0.52	4.75	5	0.45	4.28	4	0.77	4.48	4	0.51	4.45	5	0.79	0.131
	V4	4.38	5	0.74	4.31	5	0.79	4.40	5	0.74	4.21	4	0.77	4.37	5	0.96	0.546
	V5	3.88	4	0.64	4.50	5	0.73	4.00	4	0.86	4.19	4	0.92	4.18	4	0.89	0.140
Organizational	V6	4.25	4	0.71	3.50	4	1.10	3.21	3	0.91	3.35	3	0.79	3.18	3	0.83	0.020
	V7	3.75	4	0.89	3.00	3	1.41	3.22	4	1.18	3.40	3	0.92	3.3	4	1.09	0.640
	V8	3.88	4	0.64	3.56	4	1.32	3.19	3	1.01	3.23	3	0.99	3.15	3	1.10	0.196
	V9	2.63	3	0.74	3.44	4	0.96	3.10	3	1.19	3.25	4	1.19	3.75	4	0.88	0.001
Research, development and innovation	V10	3.13	3	0.99	3.94	4	1.00	3.63	4	0.90	3.77	4	0.72	3.83	4	0.89	0.155
	V11	4.00	4	0.54	4.50	5	0.52	3.96	4	0.89	4.19	4	0.84	4.08	4	0.89	0.158
	V12	4.00	4	0.76	3.38	4	1.15	3.24	3	1.16	3.54	4	0.90	3.12	3	0.98	0.057
Relationship with the environment	V13	4.25	4	0.71	4.69	5	0.48	4.43	4	0.53	4.50	5	0.72	4.4	4	0.72	0.286
	V14	4.00	4	0.76	3.38	4	1.09	3.24	3	1.05	3.38	3	1.04	3.15	3	1.01	0.201
	V15	2.88	3	1.13	3.06	3	1.29	3.16	3	1.18	3.29	3	1.20	3.18	3	1.17	0.898
Environmental	V16	3.38	3	0.74	3.25	4	1.39	3.38	4	1.09	3.58	4	1.22	3.33	4	1.28	0.710
	V17	3.88	4	0.84	3.88	4	1.09	3.69	4	0.90	3.65	4	1.04	3.72	4	1.08	0.864
	V18	3.63	3	0.92	3.69	4	1.35	3.25	3	1.16	3.46	3	1.03	3.00	3	1.26	0.131

Pedagogical, Organizational, Research, Development and Innovation, Relationship with the Environment, and Environmental. This approach aligns with the framework proposed by Mafrá *et al.* (2024), which links social innovation actions to the SDGs. These actions create value that can be assessed through the dimensions of economy, society, and environment.

Now, according to Valencia-Arias *et al.* (2024), USR and the development of social innovations can contribute to student satisfaction and, at the same time, to the loyalty of graduates. For its part, this study shows the implications of social innovation strategies from USR according to the needs of each group of students. On the other hand, according to Villanueva-Paredes *et al.* (2024), social innovation strategies in university contexts contribute to the challenges of sustainability.

Social innovation, according to Machado *et al.* (2023), is driven by social justice through experiential activities that

allow knowledge and energy to be directed toward students' passions or commitments that might be consistent with community needs. The findings of this study can inform the design of strategies that leverage experiential learning and personal testimony to foster meaningful and profound educational experiences. This approach is consistent with Wüthrich-Grossenbacher's (2024) perspective, as confessional education aims to cultivate values such as dignity, respect, solidarity, and empathy.

Conclusions

Social innovation and USR are frameworks and strategies that facilitate the development of initiatives in increasingly dynamic and complex environments, aligning with the needs of various stakeholders within educational communities. Therefore, designing strategies based on the findings of this study should also integrate insights from other research that addresses key elements related to social innovation and USR.

This comprehensive approach can enhance the formulation of strategies that are more suited to the potential and needs of the population, ensuring greater relevance and effectiveness.

Regarding the limitations of this study, several improvements are recommended for future research. First, expanding and diversifying the sample could capture a broader range of perspectives and enhance the generalizability of the findings. Additionally, exploring various countries would provide insights into how cultural aspects and idiosyncrasies might influence the results. Furthermore, incorporating qualitative techniques and more complex methodologies would offer a deeper understanding of the studied phenomenon. These steps could significantly enrich the comprehension of social innovation and USR.

As for future lines of research, it is recommended to carry out comparative studies between different HEIs. It is also necessary to compare the geographical location of

universities in search of cultural implications. Finally, it is essential to design explanatory studies that allow a robust understanding of the phenomenon under study.

REFERENCES

- Acuña-Moraga O, Salazar-Botello CM, Muñoz-Jara YA, Severino-González P, Carriel-Baez LA (2022a) Responsabilidad social universitaria y satisfacción laboral: percepción de profesores de cátedra en una universidad estatal y pública de Chile. *Interciencia* 47: 568-575.
- Acuña-Moraga O, Severino-González P, Garrido-Véliz V, Martín-Fiorino V (2020) Consumo sustentable y responsabilidad social. Una visión convergente que contribuye al desarrollo sustentable. *Interciencia* 45: 384-389.
- Acuña-Moraga O, Severino-González P, Sarmiento-Peralta G, Stuardo-Solar C (2022b) Consumo sustentable en Chile: una aproximación a los objetivos de desarrollo sostenible (ODS). *Información Tecnológica* 33: 181-190.
- Adel HM, Zeinhom GA, Younis RAA (2022). From university social-responsibility to social-innovation strategy for quality

- accreditation and sustainable competitive advantage during COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Humanities and Applied Social Sciences* 4: 410-437.
- Arbieto Mamani O, Mendoza Vargas M G, Pozo Enciso R S, Huamán Flores E, Villafuerte Palomino T, Alvarez Chavez W (2023) University social responsibility (USR) in the context of Peruvian society: A systematic review. *F1000Research* 12: 1170.
- Ascanio JH, Valle JA, Viruel MJM, López RR (2023) Fundamentación teórica de la innovación social: el problema de la modelización en un campo de estudio sin consolidar. *CIRIEC-España, Revista de Economía Pública, Social y Cooperativa* (108): 131-162.
- Bandonó A, Mukhlis M, Susilo AK, Prabowo AR, Maksum A (2023) Collaborative Learning in Higher Education in the Fourth Industrial Revolution: A Systematic Literature Review and Future Research. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research* 22: 209-230.
- Barrera-Rodríguez AM, Echeverri-Gutiérrez PA, Redondo-Ramírez I, Hernández-Ramírez L (2023) University social responsibility: bibliometric analysis and research trends. *International Journal of Educational Management* 37: 787-809.
- Basson R, Steenkamp G (2024) Developing accounting students as responsible leaders: A workshop on social innovation. *South African Journal of Business Management* 55: 4335.
- Batista LF, Helal DH (2023) Education and social innovation: a framework based on a systematic review. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research* 36: 407-433.
- Benzies KM, Nicholas DB, Hayden KA, Barnas T, de Koning, A, Bharwani, JA, Day J (2024) Definición de innovación social para instituciones de educación postsecundaria: un análisis de concepto. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications* 11: 1-11.
- Bragaglia F (2024) The University and the Neighbourhood—Opportunities and Limits in Promoting Social Innovation: The Case of AuroraLAB in Turin (Italy). *Sustainability* 16: 829.
- Chen YS, Yan X, Liew CBA (2023) University Social Responsibility in China: The Mediating Role of Green Psychological Capital. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 20: 3634.
- Effendi TD (2023) Student-Centered Innovation Project as University Social Responsibility (USR). *Innovation in the Social Sciences* 1: 150-174.
- Fauzi MA, Wahab NA, Ahmad MH, Abidin I (2023) University social responsibility: the present and future trends based on bibliometric analysis. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education* 16: 948-965.
- Feijóo-Quintas S, Gerbaudo-González N, Gandoy-Crego M, Gutiérrez-Moar MDC, Costa E, Facal D (2024) Higher Education Institutions as Strategic Centers for Promoting Social Innovation in Gerontology: Insights from the Senior Innovation Lab Training Initiative. *Geriatrics* 9: 76.
- Flores-Fernandez L, Severino-González P, Sarmiento-Peralta G, Sánchez-Henríquez J (2022) Responsabilidad social universitaria: diseño y validación de escala desde la perspectiva de los estudiantes de Perú. *Formación Universitaria* 15: 87-96.
- Fremstad E, Ewins K (2024) Academic citizenship through the bundle of academic roles. *Journal of Praxis in Higher Education* 6: 42-54.
- García MB (2023) Fostering an innovation culture in the education sector: A scoping review and bibliometric analysis of hackathon research. *Innovative Higher Education* 48: 739-762.
- García-Aracil A, Isusi-Fagoaga R, Planells-Aleixandre E (2024) Students' perspectives of alignment between teaching-learning methods and the promotion of social innovation competencies. *Higher Education Research & Development* 43: 1479-1494.
- Giesecke S, Schartinger D (2021) El potencial transformador de la innovación social para, en y por la educación. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship* 15: 140-160.
- Graciano P, Lermen FH, Reichert FM, Padula AD (2023) The impact of risk-taking and creativity stimuli in education towards innovation: A systematic review and research agenda. *Thinking Skills and Creativity* 47: 101220.
- Hinduja P, Mohammad RF, Siddiqui S, Noor S, Hussain A (2023) Sustainability in higher education institutions in Pakistan: a systematic review of progress and challenges. *Sustainability* 15: 3406.
- Kleindienst P (2024) The Role of Education on Human Dignity: Fostering Peace and Diminishing Violence. *Religions* 15: 66.
- Machado J, Courneya J, Idrees A, Morsillo R, Richards N, Panitch M, Wehbi S (2023) From Spark to Insight: Student Engagement in Social Innovation as a Pathway for Personal and Professional Development. *About Campus* 28: 4-14.
- Mafrá RF, Casagrande JL, Dutra ARDA, Nunes NA, Dias FT, Barbosa SB, Salgueirinho Osório de Andrade Guerra JB (2024) Social Innovation as a Support for the Visibility of Vulnerable Communities. *Sustainability* 16: 4390.
- Maynard A, Symonds JE, Blue T (2023) Adolescent social innovation education: A scoping review. *International Journal of Educational Research* 119: 102184.
- Meikle PA, Morris LR (2022) University Social Responsibility: challenging systemic racism in the aftermath of George Floyd's murder. *Administrative Sciences* 12: 36.
- Moral M, Ramirez O, Cort M, Ashley G (2021) Authoritative Education: The Recommended Practice for Educators. *The Journal of Adventist Education* 83: 26.
- Obreja DM, Rughiniş R, Rosner D (2024) Mapping the conceptual structure of innovation in artificial intelligence research: A bibliometric analysis and systematic literature review. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge* 9: 100465.
- Osama AJ, Adam S (2024) The Antecedents and Driving Factors of Social Entrepreneurial Behavior in Saudi Arabia. A Systematic Literature Review from the Last Decade. *SAGE Open* 14: 21582440241257487.
- Pérez-González MC, Lutsak-Yaroslava NV (2017) La producción científica sobre la innovación social para el desarrollo local. Una revisión bibliométrica. *Revista Prisma Social* (19): 146-182.
- Phillips A, Luo R, Wendland-Liu J (2024) Shifting the paradigm: A critical review of social innovation literature. *International Journal of Innovation Studies* 8: 45-58.
- Romero-Argueta J, Coreas-Flores E, Severino-González PE (2020) Responsabilidad social del estudiante universitario en El Salvador: género y territorio. *Revista de Ciencias Sociales* 26: 426-441.
- Sampaio C, Sebastião JR (2024) Social Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship: Uncovering Themes, Trends, and Discourse. *Administrative Sciences* 14: 53.
- Sarfo I, Qiao J, Effah NAA, Djan MA, Pupilamp DA, Batame M, Achentisa R, Yeboah E, Kpakpo M, Zhu X (2024) A bibliometric analysis of China's rural revitalization paradox: opportunities for collaboration, social innovation and global development. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*: 1-43. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-023-04302-w>
- Sarmiento-Peralta G, Severino-González P, Santander-Ramírez V (2021) Responsabilidad social: voluntariado universitario y comportamiento virtuoso. El caso de una ciudad de Perú. *Formación universitaria* 14: 19-28.
- Satar MS, Aggarwal D, Bansal R, Alarifi G (2023) Mapping the Knowledge Structure and Unveiling the Research Trends in Social Entrepreneurship and Inclusive Development: A Bibliometric Analysis. *Sustainability* 15: 5626.
- Severino-González P, Gallardo-Vázquez D, Saldía-Barahona H, Villanueva-Arequipeño T, Sarmiento-Peralta G, Romero-Argueta JDJ (2024) University social responsibility and environmental education. Challenges for the training of socially responsible professionals. *Interciencia* 49: 104-110.
- Severino-González P, Medina-Giacomozzi Á, Pujol Cols L (2018) Responsabilidad social en escuelas de educación primaria en Chile: tensiones y desafíos. *Encuentros* 16: 11-22.
- Severino-González P, Mendivelso Carrillo H, Suarez-Peñaranda K, Parra Bello F, Muñoz-Huacacán S, Romero-Argueta J, Sarmiento-Peralta G, Campos-Andaur P, Kinney IS (2023a) Prosociality and social responsibility. The case of students of a confessional University in Chile. *Interciencia* 48: 212-219.
- Severino-González P, Romero-Argueta J, Lira-Ramos H, Imperatore S, Ortiz-Medina I (2022a) Responsabilidad social universitaria y competencias socioemocionales. Escala de percepción de los estudiantes de El Salvador. *Interciencia* 47: 126-132.
- Severino-González P, Romero-Argueta J, Villalobos-Antúnez JV, Garrido-Véliz V (2020) Social responsibility of higher education students. Motivations for its development in times of

- COVID-19 in Chile and El Salvador. *Utopía y Praxis Latinoamericana* 25: 439-452.
- Severino-González P, Sánchez-Limón M, Rodríguez-Jasso L, Reyes-Cornejo P (2023b) Percepción de estudiantes universitarios sobre responsabilidad social: entre el estallido social y la crisis sanitaria. *Formación universitaria* 16: 67-76.
- Severino-González P, Sarmiento-Peralta G, Villar-Olaeta J, Ramírez-Molina RI (2022b) Consumo sustentable socialmente responsable: el caso de estudiantes universitarios de una ciudad de Perú. *Formación Universitaria* 15: 219-230.
- Severino-González P, Villalobos Antúnez JV, Chamali-Duarte N, Vergara-Piña G, González-Soto N (2019) Social responsibility of university student and institutional educational policies. Recognizing the commitments to society. *Opción* (90): 1171-1197.
- Siritheeratharadol P, Tuntivivat S, Intarakamhang U (2023) Effects of a Transformative Learning Program for Developing Active Global Citizenship among Thai Students. *European Journal of Educational Research* 12: 749-758.
- Stieger SP, Tröhler D (2023) The Discovery of the Soul as a Place of Pilgrimage within: German Protestantism, Psychology, and Salvation through Education. *Religions* 14: 921.
- Tu JC, Zhang X, Liao X (2024) Analysis of Domain Intersection and Knowledge Evolution—The Development of the Fields of Social Innovation and Design Education. *Sustainability* 16: 2549.
- Urrunaga-Pastor D, Bendezu-Quispe G, Dávila-Altamirano D, Asmat MN, Grau-Monge J (2023) Bibliometric analysis of scientific production on university social responsibility in Latin America and the Caribbean. *F1000Research* 12: 1340.
- Valencia-Arias A, Rodríguez-Correa PA, Marín-Carmona A, Zuleta-Orrego J I, Palacios-Moya L, Pérez Baquedano C A, Gallegos A (2024) University social responsibility strategy: a case study. *Cogent Education* 11: 2332854.
- Vallaëys F, Rodríguez JÁ (2019) Hacia una definición latinoamericana de responsabilidad social universitaria. Aproximación a las preferencias conceptuales de los universitarios. *Educación XXI* 22: 93-116.
- Van der Have RP, Rubalcaba L (2016) Social innovation research: An emerging area of innovation studies? *Research Policy* 45: 1923-1935.
- Villa A, Arnau E, Cabezas C, Cancino R, Fernández-Lamarra N, Greising C, Guido E, Jouannet C, Mora CL, Morales M, Orellana O, Salazar C, Sánchez D, Solís V, Trujillo M, Villar J, López AL (2013) *Un modelo de evaluación de Innovación Social Universitaria Responsable: (ISUR)*. Publicaciones de la Universidad de Deusto, Deusto, España. 431 pp.
- Villanueva-Paredes G X, Juárez-Alvarez C R, Cuya-Zevallos C, Mamani-Machaca E S, Esquicha-Tejada J D (2024) Enhancing Social Innovation Through Design Thinking, Challenge-Based Learning, and Collaboration in University Students. *Sustainability* 16: 10471.
- Vivanco B (2018) Jesuit promotion of social justice. Social justice action at Jesuit universities in Spain, as assessed by teaching and research staff. *British Journal of religious education* 40: 70-83.
- Wu YJ, Goh M, Mai Y (2023) Social innovation and higher education: evolution and future promise. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications* 10: 1-14.
- Wüthrich-Grossenbacher U (2024) Young People Living with HIV in Zimbabwe Use the Conventional, Religious, and Traditional Health Systems in Parallel: Findings from a Mixed Methods Study. *Religions* 15: 239.