

Technium.

41/2023

2023
A new decade for social changes

Technium
Social Sciences

Powered by

PLUS
COMMUNICATION



International
Communication & PR



Community Outreach Awareness, Involvement, Motivation, and Challenges in a Philippine Catholic Higher Education Institution

Elmeer Meeynard D. Calimpos, Richelle Verdeprado-Mangga, Dennis V. Madrigal

Virlanie FAITH, Inc., Bacolod City, Philippines, University of Negros Occidental-Recoletos, Bacolod City, Philippines

calimpos.rbgsmssw@gmail.com

Abstract. Community outreach serves as a core function of higher education institutions which helps promote sustainable development goals worldwide. In the Philippines, universities have been mandated to provide extension activities and reach the most vulnerable communities in the country. Thus, the study used descriptive, comparative, and correlational approaches to determine the level of awareness, the extent of involvement, the degree of motivation, and the challenges in community outreach in a Catholic Higher Education Institution in the areas of spiritual-moral, education, sociocultural, health, economic, and environment. Using stratified random sampling, 459 students, faculty, and administrators participated in the study through a modified-standardized instrument. Mean, standard deviation, frequency, percentage distribution, Kruskal Wallis, and Spearman rank were used to analyze the data. The findings of the study unveiled that the respondents of the university have a very high level of awareness, a moderate extent of involvement, and a very high degree of motivation. The topmost challenge is time constraints. This signifies that members of the academic units are generally very aware of and highly motivated in community outreach, but involvement has yet to be enhanced. Findings suggest revisiting the community outreach plan and enriching its strategies to attain a more inclusive and progressive involvement among university stakeholders.

Keywords. Community Outreach, Catholic university, Higher Education Institutions, KAP model, quantitative, Philippine

1. Introduction

According to the report of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2020), the core mission of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) is to contribute to the achievement of many other goals— from alleviating poverty, strengthening the economic situation, and improving knowledge on health care and the climate crisis.

In a university in Malaysia, undergraduate healthcare students have shown that 88% are satisfied with community outreach activities (Suresan et al., 2019). On the other hand, a university in Vietnam established that action research for the betterment of community outreach strategies allowed improvement in the school's relations and services to their partner community (Kang & Martin, 2018).

In the Philippines, universities and colleges have been mandated by the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) to extend their outreach activities to partner communities through the Republic Act. No. 7722, otherwise known as the Higher Education Act of 1994, pursuant to Resolution No. 083-2010. Specifically, CHED Memorandum No. 08 has a directive that universities and colleges should provide extension activities in areas outside of the school, such as community-based social services, pilot projects, mobile clinics, and many others (CHED, 2010).

The Philippine Accrediting Association of Schools, Colleges, and Universities (PAASCU, 2021) stated that colleges and universities should provide a fundamental and all-pervasive component of community involvement. In a basic education department of a Catholic institution in Negros Occidental, the community outreach level of awareness and degree of motivation of the faculty were very high (Caytiles, 2020).

Several studies on community outreach awareness, involvement, and motivation in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) have been conducted globally (Adekalu et al., 2018; Farnell, 2020; Schatterman, 2014), in the ASEAN Region (Suresan et al., 2019; Kang & Martin, 2018), and in the Philippines (Tubo, 2017). In Negros Occidental, a study was conducted on the engagement in community outreach activities of basic education teachers (Caytiles, 2020). However, literature determining HEIs' awareness, involvement, and motivation in community outreach is still lacking, especially in a Catholic university. There is also a dearth of local studies about community outreach challenges. This is the research gap that this study intended to fill.

This study aimed to determine the level of awareness, the extent of involvement, and the degree of motivation in community outreach activities of a Catholic university in the areas of spiritual-moral, education, sociocultural, health, economic, and environment as assessed by students, faculty, and administrators during the academic year 2021-2022. Likewise, it aimed to identify the challenges of the Catholic university in community outreach activities. The findings of the study were used as the basis for the development of enhanced strategies for community outreach activities at a Catholic university.

2. Framework of the Study

This paper theorizes that awareness may influence the motivation of the students, faculty, and administrators of the Catholic university to involve in community outreach activities. This study is primarily anchored on Bandura's Knowledge-Attitude-Practice (KAP) model originated from Social Learning Theory (Boone et al., 1977). Specifically, this perspective allows change in human behavior by acquiring knowledge, generating attitudes and beliefs, and forming practices and behaviors. Significantly, it was highlighted by the proponent that knowledge of issues and possession of skills are required for behavioral change. It was likewise explained that if an individual holds positive attitudes and behaviors, she/he would have better motivative intention towards involving in community outreach activities of the Catholic university.

Relating the theory to the present study, this theory demonstrates the actuality or existence of the KAP model in the community outreach activities of a higher education institution. Understanding Bandura's KAP model is important in determining the awareness, involvement, motivation, and challenges of students, faculty, and administrators in community outreach activities. Furthermore, this model can provide a framework for developing strategies that would sustain awareness, involvement, and motivation of the university stakeholders toward evangelization and excellence.

3. Methodology

This study used descriptive, comparative, and correlational research design to determine the level of awareness, the extent of involvement, the degree of motivation, and the challenges in community outreach in a Catholic university. Four hundred fifty-nine randomly selected students, faculty, and administrators of selected academic units of the Catholic university during the academic year 2021-2022 responded to the modified-standardized survey instrument. Descriptive, comparative, and correlational analyses were employed using the appropriate statistical tools. Data pertaining to the awareness, involvement, and motivation in community outreach were statistically treated using mean and standard deviation. Meanwhile, challenges encountered in community outreach activities were statistically treated using frequency and percentage distribution. Moreover, Kruskal Wallis was used to determining the significant difference in the level of awareness, the extent of involvement, and the degree of motivation in community outreach activities when respondents are grouped according to academic unit and designation. Lastly, Spearman rank correlation was used to determine the significant relationship between involvement and awareness and motivation in community outreach activities. To address general principles of respect for persons, benevolence, justice, and ethical soundness, the researcher upholds the ethical guidelines set by the Philippine Health Research Ethics Board (PHREB).

4. Results and Discussion

Level of Awareness of the Respondents in Community Outreach

Table 1 presents the level of awareness of the respondents as a whole and according to designation and academic unit. This data set shows that the university has a very high level of awareness ($M=3.70$, $SD=0.39$) in community outreach activities. By designation, the administrators ($M=3.90$, $SD= 0.17$) have a very high level of awareness in community outreach. By academic unit, the College of Arts and Sciences ($M=3.80$, $SD= 0.29$) has a very high level of awareness in community outreach activities. In community outreach areas, the university has a higher level of awareness in education ($M=3.76$, $SD=0.46$) and spiritual-moral ($M=3.75$, $SD=0.41$) compared to economic ($M=3.53$, $SD=0.59$) and environment ($M=3.66$, $SD=0.57$).



Table 1. A

Level of Awareness of the Respondents in Community Outreach

Variable	Spiritual-Moral			Education			Sociocultural			Health		
	M	SD	Int	M	SD	Int	M	SD	Int	M	SD	Int
Designation												
Administrator	3.92	0.15	VH	4.00	0.00	VH	3.97	0.09	VH	3.88	0.35	VH
Faculty	3.87	0.30	VH	3.90	0.29	VH	3.87	0.28	VH	3.83	0.37	VH
Student	3.67	0.45	VH	3.67	0.52	VH	3.65	0.47	VH	3.63	0.54	VH
Academic Unit:												
CABACS	3.72	0.43	VH	3.71	0.50	VH	3.69	0.51	VH	3.66	0.54	VH
CAMHS	3.73	0.48	VH	3.72	0.53	VH	3.69	0.49	VH	3.74	0.52	VH
CAS	3.82	0.31	VH	3.82	0.39	VH	3.83	0.34	VH	3.85	0.36	VH
CCJE	3.79	0.29	VH	3.81	0.40	VH	3.74	0.36	VH	3.78	0.42	VH
CoEd	3.76	0.46	VH	3.83	0.45	VH	3.81	0.36	VH	3.75	0.44	VH
CoEng	3.70	0.45	VH	3.72	0.49	VH	3.65	0.44	VH	3.59	0.57	VH
RBGS	3.74	0.37	VH	3.77	0.42	VH	3.78	0.34	VH	3.75	0.44	VH
School of Law	3.83	0.34	VH	3.82	0.39	VH	3.85	0.30	VH	3.68	0.47	VH
Whole	3.75	0.41	VH	3.76	0.46	VH	3.73	0.43	VH	3.70	0.50	VH

Mean Scale: 3.25-4.00=Very High Level of Awareness (VHLA), 2.50-3.24=High Level of Awareness (HLA), 1.75-2.49=Low Level of Awareness (LLA), 1.00-1.74=Very Low Level of Awareness (VLLA)

Table 1. B

Level of Awareness of the Respondents in Community Outreach

Variable	Economic			Environment			Awareness		
	M	SD	Int	M	SD	Int	M	SD	Int
Designation									
Administrator	3.69	0.59	VH	3.88	0.35	VH	3.90	0.17	VH
Faculty	3.68	0.55	VH	3.81	0.47	VH	3.83	0.28	VH
Student	3.44	0.59	VH	3.58	0.60	VH	3.62	0.42	VH
Academic Unit:									
CABACS	3.51	0.61	VH	3.68	0.51	VH	3.67	0.42	VH
CAMHS	3.41	0.70	VH	3.61	0.70	VH	3.65	0.48	VH
CAS	3.70	0.43	VH	3.77	0.46	VH	3.80	0.29	VH
CCJE	3.59	0.46	VH	3.52	0.58	VH	3.72	0.33	VH
CoEd	3.63	0.53	VH	3.86	0.35	VH	3.77	0.37	VH
CoEng	3.42	0.59	VH	3.63	0.58	VH	3.62	0.40	VH
RBGS	3.65	0.51	VH	3.66	0.53	VH	3.74	0.34	VH
School of Law	3.49	0.70	VH	3.50	0.75	VH	3.74	0.35	VH
Whole	3.53	0.59	VH	3.66	0.57	VH	3.70	0.39	VH

Mean Scale: 3.25-4.00=Very High Level of Awareness (VHLA), 2.50-3.24=High Level of Awareness (HLA), 1.75-2.49=Low Level of Awareness (LLA), 1.00-1.74=Very Low Level of Awareness (VLLA)

This indicates that the university stakeholders are very aware of the goals and objectives of community outreach and that community outreach activities exist in each area or thrust, such as spiritual-moral, education, sociocultural, health, economic, and environment. The respondents of the university have a higher level of awareness in the area of education

because members of the academic units believe that it further enhances their knowledge and skills in community building and that through seminars and workshops, they can generate awareness about their selected topics among the community participants. In addition, the university respondents have a higher level of awareness in the area of spiritual-moral, which means the school's evangelical mission deepens the consciousness of stakeholders as community outreach enriches faith and serves God.

The findings reveal that respondents in the area of education have a higher level of awareness because this type of community outreach engagement shapes people's minds and actions. To be holistic means to shape a person's behavior and learning potential (DeRosa, 2018). Awareness of their purpose as educators at a Catholic university shows a complete comprehension of the part they must play in the evangelistic communities of faith (Caytiles, 2020).

Extent of Involvement of the Respondents in Community Outreach

Table 2 presents the extent of involvement of the respondents as a whole and according to designation and academic unit. This data set shows that respondents of the university have a moderate extent of involvement ($M=3.24$, $SD=0.82$) in community outreach activities. In community outreach areas, the university has a higher extent of involvement in spiritual-moral ($M=3.66$, $SD=0.94$) and environment ($M=3.52$, $SD=1.08$) compared to education ($M=3.05$, $SD=0.86$), sociocultural ($M=3.20$, $SD=1.09$), health ($M=2.74$, $SD=1.20$), and economic ($M=3.01$, $SD=1.19$).

The results show that being very highly aware does not always translate into a very great extent of involvement. It was also discovered that university stakeholders actively participated in community outreach initiatives in the areas of spiritual-moral and environment. The stakeholders are encouraged to participate in community outreach activities linked to spirituality and morality, such as free baptism, mass weddings, feeding, and gift-giving, as part of the Catholic university's objective towards Christian evangelization. On the other hand, administrators, faculty, and students were moved and inspired to mobilize environmental initiatives due to the negative repercussions and irreparable harm brought about by the climate crisis, which they had observed and experienced in their local communities.

Since community outreach organizers and implementers must prepare for comprehensive learning modules on the themes covered in tutorials, sessions, or seminars, the area of education may have minimal involvement for most of the academic units in the university. Nonetheless, the nature of community outreach activities does not apply to other fields of discipline. Therefore, other community outreach areas with a moderate extent of involvement, such as sociocultural, health, and economic, may only be limited to selected academic units of the Catholic university, depending on their fields of specialization.

This study strengthens the findings of Caytiles (2020) that being aware is not enough and that administrators and faculty need to actively participate in the realization of the community outreach thrusts of the academic community. Therefore, community development seminars and workshops based on the framework of the community extension office are highly recommended since outreach coordinators of the Catholic university are not highly skilled or expert community development organizers.

The findings of this study support the findings of Melé (2022) as it noted that the university respondents' greater extent of community outreach involvement in the area of spiritual morality suggests that stakeholders were enlightened about the significance of community outreach as an evangelical thrust of the school. To put it another way, they have

always been fully aware that a Catholic institution's community outreach is a crucial part of its evangelization efforts (Pedrosa & Madrigal, 2021). It was also supported by the study of Rickenbacker et al. (2019) that due to the adverse effects and permanent harm caused by the climate catastrophe, university stakeholders were encouraged to mobilize environmental activities.

Table 2. A

Extent of Involvement of the Respondents in Community Outreach

Variable	Spiritual-Moral			Education			Sociocultural			Health		
	M	SD	Int	M	SD	Int	M	SD	Int	M	SD	Int
Designation												
Administrator	4.46	0.40	VG	3.63	0.72	GE	3.88	0.64	GE	3.56	0.86	GE
Faculty	3.62	0.91	GE	3.15	0.82	ME	3.18	1.07	ME	2.84	1.22	ME
Student	3.66	0.96	GE	2.99	0.88	ME	3.19	1.11	ME	2.66	1.19	ME
Academic Unit:												
CABACS	3.66	0.96	GE	2.96	0.82	ME	3.09	1.10	ME	2.42	1.16	LE
CAMHS	3.64	0.85	GE	2.84	0.82	ME	2.96	1.03	ME	3.52	1.12	GE
CAS	3.97	0.74	GE	3.37	0.71	ME	3.78	1.01	GE	2.90	1.16	ME
CCJE	4.04	0.78	GE	3.51	0.79	GE	3.52	1.01	GE	3.57	0.93	GE
CoEd	3.78	0.99	GE	3.43	0.97	GE	3.25	1.02	ME	2.47	1.03	LE
CoEng	3.52	0.97	GE	3.00	0.87	ME	2.99	1.12	ME	2.57	1.20	LE
RBGS	3.61	1.06	GE	2.86	0.98	ME	3.39	1.08	ME	2.75	1.18	ME
School of Law	3.20	0.93	ME	2.78	0.69	ME	2.94	1.01	ME	2.16	1.04	LE
Whole	3.66	0.94	GE	3.05	0.86	ME	3.20	1.09	ME	2.74	1.20	ME

Mean Scale: 4.20-5.00=Very Great (VG), 3.40-4.19=Great (GE), 2.60-3.39=Moderate (ME), 1.80-2.59=Low (LE), 1.00-1.79=Very Low (VLE)

Table 2. B

Extent of Involvement of the Respondents in Community Outreach

Variable	Economic			Environment			Involvement		
	M	SD	Int	M	SD	Int	M	SD	Int
Designation									
Administrator	4.00	0.93	GE	4.38	0.69	VG	4.00	0.41	GE
Faculty	3.06	1.24	ME	3.39	1.08	ME	3.25	0.80	ME
Student	2.96	1.16	ME	3.56	1.07	GE	3.21	0.83	ME
Academic Unit:									
CABACS	2.95	1.10	ME	3.48	1.08	GE	3.14	0.79	ME
CAMHS	2.61	1.13	ME	3.62	0.96	GE	3.28	0.73	ME
CAS	3.48	1.08	GE	3.58	0.94	GE	3.52	0.68	GE
CCJE	3.56	0.93	GE	3.93	0.88	GE	3.73	0.63	GE
CoEd	3.11	1.17	ME	4.04	1.03	GE	3.42	0.86	GE
CoEng	3.04	1.24	ME	3.44	1.08	GE	3.14	0.86	ME
RBGS	2.98	1.30	ME	3.39	1.32	ME	3.17	0.96	ME
School of Law	2.47	1.19	LE	2.85	0.92	ME	2.78	0.73	ME
Whole	3.01	1.19	ME	3.52	1.08	GE	3.24	0.82	ME

Mean Scale: 4.20-5.00=Very Great (VG), 3.40-4.19=Great (GE), 2.60-3.39=Moderate (ME), 1.80-2.59=Low (LE), 1.00-1.79=Very Low (VLE)

By designation, the administrators ($M=4.00$, $SD=0.41$) show a great extent of involvement compared to faculty ($M=3.25$, $SD=0.80$) and students ($M=3.21$, $SD=0.83$). By academic unit, the College of Arts and Sciences ($M=3.52$, $SD=0.68$), College of Criminal Justice Education ($M=3.73$, $SD=0.63$), and College of Education ($M=3.42$, $SD=0.86$) have a great extent of involvement compared to College of Accountancy, Business and Computer Studies ($M=3.14$, $SD=0.79$), College of Allied Medical Health Sciences ($M=3.28$, $SD=0.73$), College of Engineering ($M=3.14$, $SD=0.86$), Recoletos de Bacolod Graduate School ($M=3.17$, $SD=0.96$), and School of Law ($M=2.78$, $SD=0.73$).

This indicates that university administrators are committed and responsive to one of the catholic higher education institution's agenda, which is Transformative Community Building. Noticeably, the respondents of the three academic units with the highest extent of involvement fall under the strand of the Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS), wherein the nature of the discipline is relevant and responsive to any of the community outreach areas, a community development framework designed by the Community Development Office of the Catholic university. Nevertheless, other academic units may be unable to relate with all other community outreach areas due to a lack of orientation or exposure to various activities.

The findings of Myers (2019) support this result as it noted that administrators are more involved in community outreach activities because of their essential role in serving as models to their faculty and students. The findings of Holmes et al. (2022) regarding community extension activities in higher education institutions support the results of this study on the importance of community outreach alignment with the academic unit's field of expertise.

Degree of Motivation of the Respondents in Community Outreach

Table 3 reports the degree of motivation the different designations and academic units have toward community outreach activities. This data set shows that respondents of the university have a very high degree of motivation ($M=3.52$, $SD=0.43$) in community outreach activities. By academic unit, the College of Allied Medical Health Sciences ($M=3.38$, $SD=0.44$), College of Engineering ($M=3.44$, $SD=0.42$), and School of Law ($M=3.29$, $SD=0.42$) are less motivated compared to other academic units.

Table 3

Degree of Motivation of the Respondents in Community Outreach			
Variable	M	SD	Interpretation
Designation			
Administrator	3.72	0.38	Very High
Faculty	3.54	0.41	Very High
Student	3.50	0.44	Very High
Academic Unit:			
CABACS	3.55	0.42	Very High
CAHMS	3.38	0.44	Very High
CAS	3.69	0.31	Very High
CCJE	3.69	0.36	Very High
CoEd	3.66	0.45	Very High
CoEng	3.44	0.42	Very High
RBGS	3.52	0.45	Very High
School of Law	3.29	0.42	Very High
Whole	3.52	0.43	Very High

Mean Scale: 3.25-4.00= Very High, 2.50-3.24=High, 1.75-2.49=Low, 1.00-1.74=Very Low

This indicates that in participating in community outreach activities, university stakeholders have experienced a sense of fulfillment or accomplishment, served God and the Church, and fulfilled their duty and responsibility than recognizing it as a mere requirement. In relation to this, the university administrators, faculty, and students discovered their authentic and true purpose and meaning by joining community outreach activities. However, being motivated is insufficient to participate highly in community outreach activities.

These findings are supported by Tubo's (2017) assertion that community outreach activities are enjoyable when motivation is high. This could be attributed to Pedrosa and Madrigal (2021) emphasizing the value of outreach activities. It was noted in the phenomenological study that university employees agree that the school's outreach efforts demonstrate its evangelistic mission. Lastly, the findings of Caytiles (2020) regarding the degree of motivation support the result of the study, as she noted that the mission of evangelization of a Catholic institution depends greatly on the keen interest in community outreach since it is through motivation that one is enabled and given the confidence to show compassion to those who are in need.

Differences in the Level of Awareness of the Respondents in Community Outreach according to the Designation

There was a significant difference in the level of awareness [$\chi^2(2)=38.196, p=0.000$] in community outreach activities and the areas of spiritual-moral [$\chi^2(2)=30.334, p=0.000$], education [$\chi^2(2)=27.821, p=0.000$], sociocultural [$\chi^2(2)=31.883, p=0.000$], health [$\chi^2(2)=17.300, p=0.000$], economic [$\chi^2(2)=21.560, p=0.000$], and environment [$\chi^2(2)=21.965,$

p=0.000] when respondents are grouped according to the designation. Post hoc test using Dunn's test revealed that, in general, students (M=3.62) are significantly less aware than faculty (M=3.83) and administrators (M=3.90).

Table 4

Differences in the Level of Awareness of the Respondents in Community Outreach according to the Designation

Variable	χ^2	df	p
Spiritual-Moral	30.334*	2	0.000
Education	27.821*	2	0.000
Sociocultural	31.883*	2	0.000
Health	17.300*	2	0.000
Economic	21.560*	2	0.000
Environment	21.965*	2	0.000
Awareness	38.196*	2	0.000

Note: *difference is significant when $p < 0.05$

The findings show that, in comparison to faculty and administrators, students are less knowledgeable about the goals and objectives of the community outreach thrusts of the University Community Development Office, such as spiritual-moral, education, sociocultural, health, economic, and environment and its relevance in their respective fields of discipline.

When grouped according to the designation, Schatterman's (2014) research finds that students' class schedules and academic priorities are just one of several factors that discourage them from knowing more about community outreach goals and their connection to the vision and mission of the Catholic institution.

Difference in the Level of Awareness of the Respondents in Community Outreach according to Academic Unit

There was no significant difference in the level of awareness [$\chi^2(7)=8.815$, $p=0.266$] in community outreach activities and the areas of spiritual-moral [$\chi^2(7)=5.455$, $p=0.605$], education [$\chi^2(7)=4.813$, $p=0.863$], health [$\chi^2(7)=11.647$, $p=0.113$], economic [$\chi^2(7)=12.862$, $p=0.076$], and environment [$\chi^2(7)=10.533$, $p=0.160$] when respondents are grouped according to the academic unit. There was a significant difference in the level of awareness in community outreach activities in the area of sociocultural [$\chi^2(7)=14.449$, $p=0.044$]. Post hoc test using Dunn's test revealed that respondents from the School of Law (M=3.85) are significantly more aware than respondents from the College of Engineering (M=3.65).

Table 5

Difference in the Level of Awareness of the Respondents in Community Outreach according to Academic Unit

Variable	χ^2	df	p
Spiritual-Moral	5.455	7	0.605
Education	4.813	7	0.683
Sociocultural	14.449*	7	0.044
Health	11.647	7	0.113
Economic	12.862	7	0.076
Environment	10.533	7	0.160
Awareness	8.815	7	0.266

Note: *difference is significant when $p < 0.05$

The results denote that the School of Law is technically more aware of issues pertaining to the growth of moral principles and goodwill among society's citizens. Meanwhile, the College of Engineering is more aware of community outreach activities related to Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM). This means that the academic unit is more conscious of community-based outreach activities such as seminars and workshops on welding, installation of solar lights in off-grid communities, construction of foot walk on rough roads in far-flung areas, and many others.

The results are consistent with Cabedo et al. (2018) observation that there is a significant difference in sociocultural awareness when grouped according to the academic unit because engineering majors are less aware that sociocultural activities seek to support social justice, strengthen community ties, and raise awareness of societal issues while the School of Law has significantly greater awareness than other units because it is a humanity-based department (Nolan-Arañez & Ludvik, 2018), which has deepened its understanding on the impact of promoting compassion for others through legal support, particularly for the marginalized communities.

Difference in the Extent of Involvement of the Respondents in Community Outreach according to Designation

There was no significant difference in the extent of involvement in community outreach activities in the areas of sociocultural [$\chi^2(2)=3.508$, $p=0.173$] and health [$\chi^2(2)=5.841$, $p=0.054$]. There was a significant difference in the extent of involvement [$\chi^2(2)=8.817$, $p=0.012$] in community outreach activities and the areas of spiritual-moral [$\chi^2(2)=6.943$, $p=0.031$], education [$\chi^2(2)=8.354$, $p=0.015$], economic [$\chi^2(2)=6.093$, $p=0.048$], and environment [$\chi^2(2)=8.254$, $p=0.016$] when respondents are grouped according to the designation. Post hoc test using Dunn's test revealed that administrators ($M=4.00$) are significantly more involved than students ($M=3.21$) and faculty ($M=3.25$).

Table 6

Difference in the Extent of Involvement of the Respondents in Community Outreach according to the Designation

Variable	χ^2	df	p
Spiritual-Moral	6.943*	2	0.031
Education	8.354*	2	0.015
Sociocultural	3.508	2	0.173
Health	5.841	2	0.054
Economic	6.093*	2	0.048
Environment	8.254*	2	0.016
Involvement	8.817*	2	0.012

Note: *difference is significant when $p < 0.05$

This shows that university administrators could fulfill their important duties as role models in community outreach despite heavy workloads and demanding schedules. The results demonstrated that lay administrators are more actively involved in outreach initiatives in the spiritual-moral, educational, economic, and environmental community outreach areas than their counterparts. Similarly, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED), Philippine Accrediting Association of Schools, Colleges, and Universities (PAASCU), and Philippine Association of Colleges and Universities Commission on Accreditation (PACUCOA) requirements for the lay administrators may have been one of the main reasons they were greatly involved in community outreach activities.

The results of the study strengthen the findings of Holland (2019), noting that since it is important for administrators to set an example for their teachers and students, they are more likely to participate in community outreach activities. In addition, the faculty and students are less involved in community outreach activities because of time constraints and conflicting schedules of classes and extracurricular activities (Adams & Blair, 2019).

Difference in the Extent of Involvement of the Respondents in Community Outreach according to Academic Unit

There was a significant difference in the extent of involvement [$\chi^2(7)=35.696$, $p=0.000$] in community outreach activities and the areas of spiritual-moral [$\chi^2(7)=21.891$, $p=0.003$], education [$\chi^2(7)=34.841$, $p=0.000$], [$\chi^2(7)=29.341$, $p=0.00$], health [$\chi^2(7)=56.349$, $p=0.000$], economic [$\chi^2(7)=28.449$, $p=0.000$], and environment [$\chi^2(7)=30.185$, $p=0.00$] when respondents are grouped according to the academic unit. Post hoc test using Dunn's test revealed that respondents from the School of Law ($M=2.78$) are generally significantly less involved than other academic units.

Table 7

Difference in the Extent of Involvement of the Respondents in Community Outreach according to Academic Unit

Variable	χ^2	df	p
Spiritual-Moral	21.891*	7	0.003
Education	34.841*	7	0.000
Sociocultural	29.341*	7	0.000
Health	56.349*	7	0.000
Economic	28.449*	7	0.000
Environment	30.185*	7	0.000
Involvement	35.696*	7	0.000

Note: *difference is significant when $p < 0.05$

The findings denote that, in comparison to other academic units, respondents of the School of Law are less exposed to community outreach activities. The findings also denote that stakeholders in the academic unit are hampered from prioritizing this endeavor because of their status as working professionals and the academic pressure to read, comprehend, and memorize regularly. Generally, the findings suggest that to encourage the academic units to participate in community outreach, the focus of the implementation should be more aligned and relevant to the course curriculum of each academic program.

The results of the study strengthen the findings of Farnell (2020) that the School of Law is least involved because of the academic loads that hinder them from actively participating in the community outreach of the school. This finding implies that its higher degree of awareness in community outreach activities under the sociocultural area is expected to create better opportunities for the stakeholders to get involved.

Difference in the Degree of Motivation of the Respondents in Community Outreach according to Designation and Academic Unit

There was no significant difference in the degree of motivation of the respondents in community outreach activities when they were grouped according to designation [$\chi^2(2)=2.778$, $p=0.249$]. There was a significant difference in the degree of motivation of the respondents in community outreach activities when they were grouped according to the academic unit [$\chi^2(7)=40.024$, $p=0.000$]. Post hoc test revealed that respondents from the College of Education ($M=3.66$), College of Arts and Sciences ($M=3.69$), and College of Criminal Justice Education ($M=3.69$) are significantly more motivated than respondents from the College of Engineering ($M=3.44$), College of Allied Medical Health Sciences ($M=3.38$), and School of Law ($M=3.29$).

Table 8

Differences in the Degree of Motivation of the Respondents in Community Outreach according to the Designation and Academic Unit

Variable	χ^2	df	p
Designation	2.778	2	0.249
Academic Unit	40.024*	7	0.000

Note: *difference is significant when $p < 0.05$

This indicates that among academic units, courses under the Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS) are more driven to involve in different community outreach activities of the Catholic university. Also, the results denote that these academic units are technically working directly with people and the community, which is their source of motivation. The academic unit's fields of discipline and competencies are more likely to inspire them to turn theories and concepts they learn and teach into real actions. The results denote that students and faculty under the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) courses are significantly less motivated since they are expected to work on technological innovations relevant to their academic learning that can immensely improve the quality of life of partner communities.

The study responds to the conclusion of Brand et al. (2019) that educating people in the community is one of the major reasons social science majors are motivated to organize and join outreach activities. The results of the study strengthen the findings of Aslam et al. (2018), noting that courses under the STEM curriculum, such as engineering majors and allied health sciences, are effective in ideating and building technological prototypes as solutions to community-based problems.

Relationship between Involvement and Awareness and Motivation of the Respondents in Community Outreach

Spearman rank correlation was used to determine the significant relationship between involvement and awareness and motivation in community outreach activities. There was significant relationship between involvement and awareness [$r_s(457) = 0.350$, $p = 0.000$] and motivation [$r_s(457) = 0.502$, $p = 0.000$] in community outreach activities.

Table 9

Relationship Between Involvement and Awareness and Motivation of the Respondents in Community Outreach

Variable	R_s	df	p
Awareness-Involvement	0.350*	457	0.000
Motivation-Involvement	0.502*	457	0.000

Note: *correlation is significant when $p < 0.05$

Generally, the findings denote that high levels of awareness and motivation cannot immediately translate to a greater extent of involvement. As for awareness and involvement, the findings proved that although raising involvement through awareness campaigns is possible, awareness alone cannot guarantee an increase in involvement due to potential risks and challenges in the implementation. Thus, better strategies for executing community

outreach activities are highly recommended. As for motivation and involvement, this is most likely because of a person's capacity for free will, which allows them to be driven but still make a conscious decision not to act on it.

The findings of the study strengthen the findings of Caytiles (2020) that although awareness in community outreach activities can raise involvement, awareness cannot directly increase involvement due to other factors. This is also most likely due to a person's power of choice, such that a person may be aware and motivated, but he or she still chooses not to take concrete actions (Valdés-Cuervo et al., 2022).

Challenges Encountered by the Respondents in Community Outreach

Table 10 shows the summary of observed items reported as the challenges encountered by the surveyed participants in the conduct of community outreach activities. Among the major challenges are time constraints 70.8% (f=325), safety/health concerns during the time of pandemic 55.8% (f=256), parents/guardian consent 25.1% (f=115), lack of cooperation of the university stakeholders 19.0% (f=87), and problems in coordination with the community beneficiaries 15.3% (f=70).

Table 10

Challenges Encountered by the Respondents in Community Outreach

Variable	f	%
Time constraint	325	70.8
Safety and/or health during the time of the pandemic	256	55.8
Parents/Guardians' consent	115	25.1
Lack of cooperation of university stakeholders	87	19.0
Problems in coordination with the beneficiaries	70	15.3

Note: *multiple responses

This indicates that faculty members struggle to join community outreach activities because they primarily focus on instructional responsibilities, student consultations, and research. Likewise, students are having problems in terms of time management that they cannot allocate a schedule to participate in their academic unit's community outreach activities. Hence, the community outreach involvement of the university stakeholders was influenced by the COVID-19 pandemic, given that face-to-face events are strictly prohibited by the Department of Health (DOH). Meanwhile, the students are restricted by their parents from joining due to potential risks and dangers in activities outside of the university. Moreover, the result also denotes that members of the academic unit lack cooperation since they are not technically part of the planning phase and/or cannot relate to the community outreach activities offered by the academic unit. Furthermore, due to the community partner's dynamic culture and community outreach services that cannot be forced as they have their priorities, it creates problems in coordination with the community beneficiaries.

The finding is supported by Adams and Blair (2019), stating that time constraints are the most common hindrances to implementing community outreach activities. The result of the study in terms of safety and health issues strengthens the findings of Israilov et al. (2020) due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Mongue and Colyott (2020) also expressed that guardian

consent comes third as a common challenge and is a problem because some parents are strict with their children's activity in school. The study responds to the conclusion of Schmalzbauer et al. (2018), proving that problems in coordination with students and faculty can also hinder the implementation of the outreach and is a hindrance.

Overall, the KAP model plays a significant role in strengthening the community outreach of a Catholic university. This could be concluded that the results validate the theoretical framework of the study, which theorizes that awareness may influence the motivation to involve. However, a significant impact on community outreach involvement yielded the result to a moderate extent due to reasonable limits caused by the observed challenges.

5. Conclusion

Community outreach is an essential component that converges the curriculum and provides opportunities to the stakeholders in a higher education institution to apply the theories and concepts in partner communities. The members of the academic community will be more involved in community outreach when the focus of the implementation is aligned with their respective fields of discipline. Thus, a participatory approach in implementing community outreach activities will build a culture of lifelong learning and inclusive growth among university stakeholders. Hence, implementing enhanced strategies for community outreach activities will help the Catholic university attain a more active, progressive, and responsive involvement based on the community's needs.

6. Limitations of the Study

There is a recognized limitation in terms of the general findings of the study that only covers the college graduating students, School of Law graduating students, and second-year graduate school students, as these groups were the last to have participated in the face-to-face implementation of community outreach activities prior to the Catholic university's online classes due to COVID-19 pandemic. Thus, the result may differ if there were no restrictions on physical and social contact during the conduct of the study. Another perceived limitation is that the results of the study were only the perceptions of the respondents. Employing a qualitative method could have discovered more salient findings on community outreach of a higher education institution.

7. Practical Application

This paper has value to the University Community Development Office of a higher education institution. It will be useful to revisit and reevaluate the community outreach activities plan of all academic units. The findings of this research were used to propose enhanced community outreach activities strategies. This better framework will provide effective ways of sustaining awareness and motivation while enhancing community outreach involvement. Furthermore, the results of the study also contribute to the new body of knowledge and have significant value in the scientific community.

8. Directions for Future Research

The present study recommends that future researchers conduct a study on the impact of community extension activities on the Catholic university's partner community in the last

five years. Future researchers can also undertake similar studies through the theoretical lens of qualitative research.

References

- [1] Adams, R. V., & Blair, E. (2019). Impact of time management behaviors on undergraduate engineering students' performance. *Sage Open*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018824506>
- [2] Adekalu, S. O., Krauss, S. E., Ismail, I. A., & Suandi, T. (2018). Teaching professors' challenges about community engagement outreach and intervention in Nigerian universities. *International Journal of Academic Research of Business and Social Science*, 8, 191-204. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v8-i8/4458>
- [3] Aslam, F., Adefila, A., & Bagiya, Y. (2018). STEM outreach activities: An approach to teachers' professional development. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 44(1), 58-70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2018.1422618>
- [4] Boone, T., Reilly, A.J., & Sashkin, M. (1977). Social learning theory Albert Bandura Englewood Cliffs. *Group & Organization Studies*, 2(3), 384-385. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105960117700200317>
- [5] Brand, B. D., Brascia, K., & Sass, M. (2019). The community outreach model of service learning: A case study of active learning and service-learning in a natural hazards, vulnerability, and risk class. *Higher Learning Research Communication*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18870/hlrc.v9i2.452>
- [6] Cabedo, L., Royo, M., Moliner, L., & Guraya, T. (2018). University social responsibility towards engineering undergraduates: The effect of methodology on a service-learning experience. *Sustainability*, 10(6), 1823. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10061823>
- [7] Caytiles, O. (2020). *Awareness, motivation, and engagement in the community outreach program of teachers as an evangelical thrust of a Catholic Institution* [Unpublished manuscript]. Fray Luis De Leon Library, University of Negros Occidental- Recoletos. <https://bit.ly/3xfVFPE>
- [8] Commission on Higher Education (CHED). (2010). Revised guidelines for the outstanding Higher Education Institution (HEI) extension program award. <https://ched.gov.ph/wpcontent/uploads/2017/10/CMO-No.08-s2010.pdf>
- [9] DeRosa, A. (2018). *A practical guide for informationists*. Science Direct.
- [10] Farnell, T. (2020). *Community engagement in higher education: Trends, practices, and policies*. European Union.
- [11] Holland, B. (2019). *Factors and strategies that influence faculty involvement in public service*. Building the field of higher education engagement: Foundational ideas and future directions.
- [12] Holmes, A. F., Webb, K. J., & Albritton, B. R. (2022). Connecting students to community: Engaging students through course-embedded service-learning activities. *International Journal of Management Education*, 20(1). <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2022.100610>

- [13] Kang, D. Y., & Martin, S. N. (2018). Improving learning opportunities for special education needs (SEN) students by engaging pre-service science teachers in an informal experiential learning course. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2018.1505599>
- [14] Melé, D. (2022). The Catholic university—Identity, mission, and responsibilities. In *University Corporate Social Responsibility and University Governance* (pp. 167- 181). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-77532-2_9
- [15] Mongue, A. J., & Colyott, K. L. (2020). Testing impacts of goal-oriented outreach with the Girl Scouts: Can a single activity change attitudes towards insects? *bioRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.10.413583>
- [16] Myers, P. (2019). Leadership, empowerment, and motivation: An analysis of modern management. https://scholarship.claremont.edu/cmc_theses/2250
- [17] Nolan-Arañez, S. I., & Ludvik, M. B. (2018). Posting a framework for cultivating spirituality through public university leadership development. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*, 11(1), 94-109. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIT-08-2017-0018>
- [18] Pedrosa, G. U., & Madrigal, D. V. (2021). Experiences of being evangelized by the school's evangelizing mission: The case of employees in a Philippine Catholic University. *Technium Social Science Journal*, 20, 846. <https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v20i1.355>
- [19] Philippine Accrediting Association of Schools, Colleges and Universities (PAASCU). (2021). Handbook on Accreditation. bit.ly/3Z6xtva
- [20] Rickenbacker, H., Brown, F., & Bilec, M. (2019). Creating environmental consciousness in underserved communities: Implementation and outcomes of community-based environmental justice and air pollution research. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2019.101473>
- [21] Schatterman, A. M. (2014). Academics meet action: Community engagement motivations, benefits, and constraints. *Journal of Community Engagement and Higher Education*, 6(1), 17-30.
- [22] Schmalzbauer, J., Waggoner, M. D., & Walker, N. C. (2018). *Campus ministry*. The Oxford Handbook of Religion and American Education, 453-466.
- [23] Suresan, V., Jnaneswar, A., Swati, S. P., Jha, K., Goutham, B. S., & Kumar, G. (2019). The impact of outreach programs on academic development, personal development, and civic responsibilities of dental students in Bhubaneswar city. *Journal of Education and Health Promotion*, pp. 8, 188. https://doi.org/10.4103/jehp.jehp_56_19
- [24] United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2020). Higher education institutions' engagement with the community. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000374128>
- [25] Valdés-Cuervo, A. A., Aquino-Zúñiga, S. P., Parra-Pérez, L. G., & Grijalva-Quiñonez, C. S. (2022). The role of teachers' practices in low-SES mothers' motivation and

involvement in education. *Children and Youth Services Review*.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chidyouth.2021.1063>