THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN UNIVERSITY SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY, DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION AND INTENTION TO CONTINUE USING E-LEARNING IN PRIVATE UNIVERSITY

Le Quoc Thang[1], Le Thanh Tiep[2*]

[1] Ho Chi Minh City University of Economics and Finance, Vietnam
[2] University of Economics Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam
[*]Corresponding author: Email: tieplt@ueh.edu.vn

Received: September 09, 2025 *Accepted:* November 26, 2025 *Published:* March 25, 2026
DOI: 10.52932/jfmr.v4i1en.1094

Appendix 1. A Summary of The Literature Review of Previous Studies

No.	Authors	Contents	Factors	Results
1	Phan et al. (2024)	The purpose is to assess the impact of lecturers' perceptions of university social responsibility (USR) on job satisfaction through university image	USR, SSA	Faculty perceptions of USR have a positive impact on their satisfaction, and this relationship is indirectly influenced by the school.
2	Maurya and Yadav (2024)	With an emphasis on student experiences, emotions, and perceptions, the study explores the complexities and difficulties of the rapid transition to online learning. It focuses on the importance of incorporating student feedback to improve virtual learning environments, even in the face of technological advances.	DGT	Analyze the differences in access to technology and teaching capacity in addition to highlighting the benefits of the digital transformation caused by the pandemic. Analyze the COVID-19 related digital revolution in education, recognizing both its positive and negative aspects.
3	Lu and Khan (2024)	Exploring the impact of university service quality on student satisfaction in the context of innovative practice of "Internet + Education" to study whether there are any differences in students' perceptions of service quality under the influence of digital literacy levels	DGT, SSA	The results confirm that the impact of translation quality on learner satisfaction varies according to digital literacy level.
4	AL-Hawamleh (2024)	Elucidating the relationship between system quality, perceived usefulness, ease of use, user satisfaction, and continuance intention of using online training	SSA, ELE	Information quality assertions for platforms and courses positively influence perceived usefulness, system quality, and perceived ease of use. Additionally, perceived usefulness and ease of use are significantly related to user satisfaction.
5	Siti et al. (2023)	Research examining and measuring digital transformation in the education sector, especially higher education	DGT, ELE	Resources, information systems, organizational structures and culture influence the success of digital transformation and service quality in education.

No.	Authors	Contents	Factors	Results
6	Vutsova et al. (2023)	Comparing students' perceptions of different elements of social responsibility and approaches to social responsibility in university curricula	USR	Explore social responsibility training as part of higher education programs
7	Tariq et al. (2023)	Examine and explore the satisfaction level of university students participating in online learning in the context of private higher education institutions	SSA	Identify and inform non-public higher education institutions about the specific areas of online learning that contribute most significantly to university student satisfaction
8	Ngan and Dung (2023)	A study on the application of technology acceptance model (TAM), information system success model (ISS) and student satisfaction	SSA, ELE	Information quality, technology, interaction in the E-learning environment, perceived usefulness, instructors and learners indirectly influence the intention to continue online learning through satisfaction.
9	Van (2023)	Digital transformation in education and training is concerned in many countries. This study evaluates the current situation regarding to digital transformation.	DGT, ELE	Analyzing and evaluating the situation in Vietnam, proposing solution to complete digital transformation in the field of education and training.
10	Ejdys 2022)	Identify the factors and relationships behind satisfaction and future intention to use e-learning among students. Examine the relationships between computer self-efficacy (CSE), facilitation (FC), satisfaction (S) and future intention to use e-learning (FI)	SSA, ELE	Higher computer self-efficacy and facilitating conditions led to higher user satisfaction with online learning. However, facilitating conditions influenced user satisfaction more than computer self-efficacy construct variables.
11	Latif et al. (2022)	Examining the impact of university social responsibility (USR) on university performance (UP) through the mediating role of service quality, student satisfaction, university reputation and student trust	USR, ELE	Significant and positive effect of USR on intervening variables. All survey results were found to have an important intervening role in the relationship between USR and UP
12	Canh et al.(2022)	Identifying factors influencing learner satisfaction with online teaching and learning	SSA	The three factors that influence satisfaction include technology, interaction, and learner. In addition, technology has a positive influence while interaction has a negative influence on learner satisfaction.
13	Vu et al. (2022)	To examine and determine the relationship between digital transformation, satisfaction, word-of-mouth communication and online learning continuation intention of students in universities	DGT, SSA, ELE	Positive interactions between students, faculty, and schools with digital transformation; between digital transformation and student satisfaction and word-of-mouth communication; between satisfaction with oral discussion performance and intention to continue online learning.
14	Ali et al. (2021)	Assess the relationship of university social responsibility and self-	USR, SSA	There is a positive influence between self-efficacy, school social

No.	Authors	Contents	Factors	Results
		efficacy with e-learning usage. In addition, test the influence of the mediating role of learner satisfaction.		responsibility and intention to use e-learning system. The mediating role of satisfaction is also confirmed.
15	Cardinali and De Giovanni (2021)	Examine the relationship between digital technology and CSR to explore an organization's ability to achieve responsible digitalization goals as well as use some green practices that allow an organization to increase its chances of achieving responsible digitalization goals	USR, DGT	Provide a multi-component definition of corporate social responsibility, as well as affirm the linear relationship that exists between social responsibility and digital transformation, thereby leading to responsible digital transformation.
16	Rajeh et al. (2021)	Identifying factors influencing student satisfaction and continuance intention toward online learning	SSA, ELE	Efforts to increase student satisfaction and intention with online learning should be directed towards adopting easy and useful online learning platforms. In addition, students should be trained and motivated to continue learning online and increase their confidence.
17	Hermawan (2021)	Explore the challenges and opportunities perceived by students in non-public universities through the implementation of online learning as an innovative learning method	DGT	Improvements in convenience, infrastructure and knowledge absorption are needed for e-learning to thrive. Provide student perspectives on online learning, alongside instructor evaluations for optimizing program design
18	Santos et al. (2020)	Understanding customer expectations of university social responsibility is fundamental to the creation and implementation of successful strategies and programs.	USR, SSA	There is an impact of the school's social responsibility on service quality and satisfaction. In addition, the strategy focusing on sustainable development positively affects students' cognition and functioning.

Appendix 2. The structure and items

Variables	Items	Description	Sources
Education	EDU		
	EDU1	Fostering respect for diversity and equal opportunities among students	Vázquez et al. (2014)
	EDU2	Recognition of student's opinions and participation	
	EDU3	Education in human and social values and fostering civic solidarity	
Cognitive	COG		
	COG1	Incorporation of sustainable values to scientific research	Vázquez et al. (2014)
	COG2	Scientific research on social problems and the knowledge generation	
	COG3	Implementing research on environmental sustainability	

Variables	Items	Description	Sources
	COG4	Application of scientific knowledge to the development of new environment-friendly products, technologies and processes	
Social	SOC		
	SOC1	Sensitizing, educational campaigns on social responsibility in areas of influence which are close to the university	Vázquez et al. (2014)
	SOC2	Sensitizing educational campaigns on environmental protection in areas of influence which are close to the university	
	SOC3	Organization of volunteering programs for students, professors and staff	
Organization	ORG		
	ORG1	Fostering entrepreneurship among students	Vázquez et al. (2014)
	ORG2	Transferring knowledge to companies	
	ORG3	Collaborating with employers to improve vocational training ang hiring	
University Social Responsibility	USR		
	USR1	My university has a high potential to contribute to environmental respect	Rasoolimanesh et al. (2024), Latif et al. (2022), Tan et al. (2021), Vázquez et al. (2014)
	USR2	My university has a high potential to contribute to the resolution of social problems	
	USR3	The university treats employees very well	
	USR4	My university has a high potential to contribute to economic development	
	USR5	The university returns some of what it has received to society	
	USR6	The university behaves honestly with their customers	
Lecturer	LEC		
	LEC1	When the school changes to online training, lecturers update and implement quickly	Vu et al. (2022)
	LEC2	Lecturers are comfortable participating in online teaching	
	LEC3	Lecturers apply many different teaching methods	
	LEC4	Lecturers are enthusiastic and friendly with students	Canh et al. (2022)
Student	STU		
	STU1	Students who do well in online learning	Ngan and Dung (2023), Vu et al. (2022), Canh et al. (2022)
	STU2	Students have many digital resources to support their learning	
	STU3	Students receive support from their families, teachers and schools when using new technology	

Variables	Items	Description	Sources
	STU4	Students can handle technical issues well in online learning, without much help	
University	UNI		
	UNI1	Using the school's digital infrastructure is easy	Vu et al. (2022)
	UNI2	In-building learning spaces are tailored to the individual	
	UNI3	The relationships between departments create a unified structure	
Digital transformation	DGT		
	DGT1	Applying technology in training programs	Vu et al. (2022)
	DGT2	Applying technology in communication with current students, graduates and potential students	
	DGT3	Developing own software for training activities	
	DGT4	Collaborating with partners to accelerate digital transformation	
Student Satisfaction	SSA		
	SSA1	I am satisfied with my overall university experience	Ngan and Dung (2023), Canh et al. (2022) Nhan et al. (2022), Ejdys (2022), Latif et al. (2022)
	SSA2	I will recommend this university to others	
	SSA3	My university experience meets my expectations	
	SSA4	The use of e-learning tools gives me the feeling that I am competent and able to perform important activities	
	SSA5	They consider online learning as effective as offline learning	
Intention to continue using E-learning	ELE		
	ELE1	I will frequently use the e-learning system in the future	Ngan and Dung (2023), Vu et al. (2022), Ejdys (2022), Puriwat and Tripopsakul (2021), Rajeh et al. (2021)
	ELE2	I want to continue to register for online learning in the future	
	ELE3	He will always try to use e-learning in his day life	
	ELE4	He is intending to visit the e-learning system portal frequently to check news or course information	
	ELE5	He plans to continue to use e-learning frequently	

Appendix 3. Sample characteristics

Characteristics	Items	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	231	50.32
	Female	179	49.68
Ages	18 – 22	233	62.31
	Above 22 – 24	65	14.16
	Above 24	161	23.53

Years of studying	Under 2 yrs	240	52.28
	2 – 4 yrs	143	31.15
	4 – 6 yrs	41	8. 39
	Above 6 yrs	35	8.18
Programs	Undergraduate	219	47.71
	Second Undergraduate degree	78	16.99
	Certificate	65	14.16
	Postgraduate	97	35.30
Total		459	100

Appendix 4. Results of confirmatory factor analysis

Variables	**Outer Loadings**	**Variance Inflation Factor (VIF)**	**Cronbach's Alpha**	**Composite reliability (rho_a)**	**Composite reliability (rho_c)**	**Average variance extracted (AVE)**
EDU			*0.875*	*0.957*	*0.919*	*0.793*
EDU1	0.798	2.013				
EDU2	0.927	2.636				
EDU3	0.939	2.988				
COG			*0.856*	*0.866*	*0.903*	*0.701*
COG1	0.866	2.307				
COG2	0.881	2.352				
COG3	0.744	1.534				
COG4	0.850	2.214				
SOC			*0.839*	*0.851*	*0.903*	*0.756*
SOC1	0.828	1.759				
SOC2	0.887	2.245				
SOC3	0.892	2.095				
ORG			*0.785*	*0.823*	*0.872*	*0.694*
ORG1	0.817	1.735				
ORG2	0.865	1.518				
ORG3	0.817	1.721				
USR			*0.890*	*0.898*	*0.917*	*0.647*
USR1	0.860	2.839				
USR2	0.721	1.946				
USR3	0.809	2.822				
USR4	0.772	2.243				
USR5	0.790	2.511				
USR6	0.866	2.845				
LEC			*0.841*	*0.862*	*0.893*	*0.677*

Variables	Outer Loadings	Variance Inflation Factor (VIF)	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite reliability (rho_a)	Composite reliability (rho_c)	Average variance extracted (AVE)
LEC1	0.828	1.839				
LEC 2	0.723	1.584				
LEC 3	0.875	2.224				
LEC 4	0.857	2.206				
STU			*0.897*	*0.900*	*0.928*	*0.764*
STU1	0.881	2.725				
STU 2	0.878	2.499				
STU 3	0.855	2.250				
STU 4	0.882	2.596				
UNI			*0.746*	*0.747*	*0.855*	*0.663*
UNI1	0.796	1.506				
UNI 2	0.805	1.397				
UNI 3	0.840	1.644				
DGT			*0.815*	*0.821*	*0.878*	*0.644*
DGT1	0.804	1.735				
DGT 2	0.766	1.552				
DGT 3	0.798	1.763				
DGT 4	0.839	1.823				
SSA			*0.894*	*0.908*	*0.922*	*0.705*
SSA1	0.737	1.970				
SSA2	0.788	2.098				
SSA3	0.909	2.952				
SSA4	0.905	2.940				
SSA5	0.848	2.712				
ELE			*0.897*	*0.905*	*0.924*	*0.709*
ELE1	0.792	2.085				
ELE2	0.871	2.643				
ELE3	0.870	2.919				
ELE4	0.795	2.133				
ELE5	0.877	2.762				

Appendix 5. Fornell and Larcker criteria

	COG	DGT	EDU	ELE	LEC	ORG	SOC	SSA	STU	UNI	USR
COG	0.837										
DGT	0.561	0.802									
EDU	0.645	0.533	0.890								
ELE	0.480	0.687	0.461	0.842							
LEC	0.692	0.634	0.480	0.584	0.823						
ORG	0.605	0.562	0.531	0.524	0.575	0.833					
SOC	0.727	0.733	0.615	0.665	0.732	0.559	0.869				
SSA	0.672	0.676	0.481	0.741	0.745	0.656	0.730	0.840			
STU	0.462	0.614	0.320	0.644	0.673	0.482	0.709	0.634	0.874		
UNI	0.550	0.692	0.492	0.577	0.573	0.604	0.677	0.704	0.604	0.814	
USR	0.655	0.696	0.521	0.636	0.731	0.734	0.753	0.782	0.631	0.638	0.805

Appdendix 6. Heterotrait-Monotrait result

	COG	DGT	EDU	ELE	LEC	ORG	SOC	SSA	STU	UNI	USR
COG											
DGT	0.664										
EDU	0.708	0.595									
ELE	0.546	0.797	0.501								
LEC	0.806	0.745	0.521	0.655							
ORG	0.716	0.670	0.618	0.596	0.675						
SOC	0.849	0.879	0.667	0.763	0.858	0.641					
SSA	0.754	0.777	0.508	0.814	0.844	0.755	0.830				
STU	0.515	0.706	0.327	0.705	0.757	0.528	0.820	0.692			
UNI	0.687	0.885	0.585	0.700	0.716	0.762	0.854	0.858	0.726		
USR	0.744	0.810	0.545	0.701	0.836	0.851	0.855	0.871	0.694	0.777	

Appendix 7. Analysis of models