

# Sustainability of Extension Services in Higher Education: A Study of the Hospitality Management Program at EARIST, Manila

Elmer B. Quintana<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> College of Hospitality and Tourism Management, Eulogio “Amang” Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology, Nagtahan, Manila, Philippines, 1<sup>st</sup> [quintanabong@yahoo.com](mailto:quintanabong@yahoo.com)

**Abstract**— *Extension services play a vital role in higher education, particularly in applied disciplines like Hospitality Management where experiential learning and community involvement are integral. This study examined the sustainability of extension services in the Hospitality Management Program of Eulogio “Amang” Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology (EARIST), Manila. A mixed-methods design was employed, combining both quantitative and qualitative approaches to provide a well-rounded understanding. The quantitative part used a 5-point Likert scale survey with 100 respondents, including students and community residents, and data were analyzed using weighted mean and Independent Sample t-Test to compare group responses. The qualitative part gathered participants’ insights, which revealed challenges such as resource limitations and monitoring gaps, along with benefits like livelihood opportunities and stronger community ties.*

*The study found that the Hospitality Management Extension Services are effective and relevant. They support program goals and promote sustainability, although feedback mechanisms require further improvement. Students and residents expressed similar views on effectiveness, but residents rated feedback more positively, indicating the need for more inclusive and responsive communication channels. Participants also reported moderate challenges. Some sessions focused more on theory than practice, while others faced scheduling conflicts or activities that did not fully align with community needs, limiting practical application. Qualitative findings supported these results, showing that the program develops skills, enhances livelihood opportunities, and strengthens community ties. However, participants emphasized consistent follow-up, practical activities, and systematic feedback as essential to ensuring long-term impact and sustainability.*

**Keywords**— *Community Engagement, Extension Services, Higher Education, Hospitality Management, Sustainability.*

## I. Introduction

Extension services have become an essential pillar of higher education, especially in fields like Hospitality Management where hands-on learning and community engagement are vital. These programs go beyond classroom instruction, giving students the opportunity to apply theoretical knowledge in real-world contexts while addressing the needs of partner communities. Through such initiatives, students not only refine their professional and interpersonal skills but also develop a deeper sense of civic responsibility and service-oriented leadership.

At the Eulogio “Amang” Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology (EARIST) in Manila, the Hospitality Management Program has developed strong collaborations with local communities, especially Barangays 634 and 635. Through the extension project “Basic Culinary Skills with Baking and Food Preservation,” students gain hands-on, experiential

learning opportunities, while community members acquire practical skills that can enhance their livelihood. This initiative exemplifies the dual purpose of extension programs: strengthening academic training for students and fostering inclusive development within the community.

Despite these contributions, sustaining extension programs remains a challenge for many higher education institutions. Limited resources, weak institutional support, and external disruptions often hinder their long-term continuity and impact. Research on extension services has largely focused on immediate outcomes, leaving a gap in understanding the factors that ensure sustainability. This study addresses that gap by examining the sustainability of EARIST’s Hospitality Management extension initiatives, with the goal of identifying strategies that strengthen program resilience, scalability, and long-term effectiveness.

The Sustainable Livelihoods Approach (SLA) introduced by Chambers and Conway (1992) provides

a useful framework for this study. It focuses on how people and communities maximize their resources, skills, and strategies to maintain their well-being while staying resilient to challenges and disruptions. Central to the approach are participation, adaptability, and the integration of social, economic, and institutional support. In the case of EARIST’s Hospitality Management extension programs, the SLA is highly relevant because these initiatives not only enrich students’ experiential learning but also strengthen the livelihood skills of local communities. Viewing the programs through this lens helps evaluate how extension services can foster lasting community empowerment and institutional sustainability.

**II. Methodology**

A mixed-methods design was used combining quantitative and qualitative approaches to gain a comprehensive understanding of the sustainability of extension services. Quantitative data were gathered through a survey questionnaire administered to 100 purposively selected respondents, consisting of 30 Hospitality Management students from EARIST–Manila and 70 residents from Barangays 634 and 635 in Sta. Mesa. To complement these results, qualitative insights were obtained through interviews with selected

students and community members, providing a deeper exploration of their experiences and perspectives.

Furthermore, this study employed a researcher-made survey questionnaire, validated by experts, as the main tool for data collection. The instrument covered three areas: respondents’ demographic profile, the sustainability extension services of the Hospitality Management Program at EARIST–Manila, and challenges encountered. Upon approval from Barangay 634 and 635 officials was secured surveys were distributed, and interviews with selected students and residents were conducted to gather deeper insights. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as percentages for demographics and weighted means with a five-point Likert scale for perceptions, while an independent samples t-test was applied to compare assessments between students and community members.

**III. Results and Discussion**

**A. How do the students and community residents assess the sustainability of the extension services of the Hospitality Management Program at EARIST Manila in terms of:**

1)Program Effectiveness and Relevance

**TABLE I**

Stakeholders’ Assessment of the Effectiveness and Relevance of the Hospitality Management Extension Services

| Indicators  | Community Residents |           | Students    |           | Composite Mean |           | Rank |
|---|---------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|------|
|   | WM                  | VI        | WM          | VI        | WM             | VI        |      |
| 1. The program’s objectives are clearly defined, coherent, and aligned with the educational and community goals.                | 4.69                | HE        | 4.63        | HE        | 4.66           | HE        | 2    |
| 2. The design and structure of program activities effectively address the specific learning needs of students and participants. | 4.60                | HE        | 4.47        | HE        | 4.54           | HE        | 5    |
| 3. Instructional strategies and facilitation methods promote meaningful engagement and deep understanding.                      | 4.44                | HE        | 4.77        | HE        | 4.61           | HE        | 3    |
| 4. The program equips participants with practical competencies that are applicable in real-world contexts.                      | 4.49                | HE        | 4.67        | HE        | 4.58           | HE        | 4    |
| 5. The content, methodology, and sequence of activities are systematically organized to ensure relevance and coherence.         | 4.64                | HE        | 4.77        | HE        | 4.71           | HE        | 1    |
| <b>Overall Mean</b>   | <b>4.57</b>         | <b>HE</b> | <b>4.66</b> | <b>HE</b> | <b>4.62</b>    | <b>HE</b> |      |

| <i>Point</i> | <i>Range</i> | <i>Verbal Interpretation</i> | <i>Symbol</i> |
|--------------|--------------|------------------------------|---------------|
| 5            | 4.20 – 5.00  | Highly Evident               | HE            |
| 4            | 3.40 – 4.19  | Evident                      | E             |
| 3            | 2.60 – 3.39  | Moderately Evident           | ME            |
| 2            | 1.80 – 2.59  | Least Evident                | LE            |
| 1            | 1.00 – 1.79  | Very Least Evident           | VLE           |

Table 1 illustrates the stakeholders’ assessment of the effectiveness and relevance of the hospitality management extension services. The results indicate that all indicators were rated as **highly evident**, underscoring the strong alignment of the program with both educational and community objectives. The highest-rated indicator, with a composite mean of 4.71, is the systematic organization of content, methodology, and activity sequence, ranked first. This suggests that the program is perceived as well-structured and coherent, ensuring its relevance to participants. Following this, the clarity and alignment of program objectives (4.66) ranked second, further affirming that stakeholders recognize the program’s goals as both purposeful and responsive. Instructional strategies and

facilitation methods, with a mean of 4.61, ranked third, highlighting that engagement strategies are highly evident in fostering deeper learning. Practical competency development (4.58) ranked fourth, showing that the program effectively equips participants with real-world skills. The lowest, though still **highly evident**, was the design and structure of activities (4.54), ranked fifth, which indicates potential areas for refinement in tailoring activities to participants’ specific learning needs. Overall, with a composite mean of 4.62 interpreted as **highly evident**, the findings affirm that the extension services are effective, relevant, and meaningfully designed to support both academic and community development.

2) *Impact and Sustainability*

TABLE II

Stakeholders’ Assessment of the Impact and Sustainability of the Hospitality Management Extension Services

| <b>Indicators</b>   | <b>Community Residents</b> |           | <b>Students</b> |           | <b>Composite Mean</b> |           | <b>Rank</b> |
|---|----------------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|-----------------------|-----------|-------------|
|   | <b>WM</b>                  | <b>VI</b> | <b>WM</b>       | <b>VI</b> | <b>WM</b>             | <b>VI</b> |             |
| 1. Participants demonstrate sustained retention and application of knowledge and skills acquired through the program.                 | 4.43                       | HE        | 4.47            | HE        | 4.45                  | HE        | 1           |
| 2. The program generates measurable benefits that positively affect the socio-economic and personal development of community members. | 4.40                       | HE        | 4.40            | HE        | 4.40                  | HE        | 3           |
| 3. Students and participants consistently integrate learned competencies into academic, professional, or daily practices.             | 4.41                       | HE        | 4.37            | HE        | 4.39                  | HE        | 4           |
| 4. The program demonstrates continuity over time, with evidence of repeated implementation or institutionalization.                   | 4.39                       | HE        | 4.23            | HE        | 4.31                  | HE        | 5           |
| 5. Resource utilization and management practices are efficient, ensuring the program’s long-term viability and adaptability.          | 4.49                       | HE        | 4.33            | HE        | 4.41                  | HE        | 2           |
| <b>Overall Mean</b>   | <b>4.42</b>                | <b>HE</b> | <b>4.36</b>     | <b>HE</b> | <b>4.39</b>           | <b>HE</b> |             |

Table 2 presents the stakeholders' assessment of the impact and sustainability of the hospitality management extension services. The results reveal that all indicators were rated as **highly evident**, with an overall composite mean of 4.39. The highest-rated indicator is the sustained retention and application of knowledge and skills (4.45), ranked first, indicating that participants consistently apply what they have learned beyond the training context. This is followed by the efficiency of resource utilization and management (4.41), ranked second, which underscores the program's capacity to maintain long-term viability and adaptability. The program's ability to generate measurable socio-economic and personal benefits for participants and their families (4.40) ranked third, highlighting its role in supporting both livelihood and

personal development. The consistent integration of learned competencies into academic, professional, or daily practices (4.39), ranked fourth, demonstrates that the knowledge and skills gained are embedded in both personal and professional settings. The lowest-ranked indicator, though still **highly evident**, is program continuity and institutionalization (4.31), suggesting that while the initiative has a lasting presence, further reinforcement is needed to ensure sustained implementation over time. Overall, the results confirm that the program's impact and sustainability are highly evident, reflecting its effectiveness in promoting learning, livelihood opportunities, and community empowerment.

### 3) *Feedback and Recommendations*

**TABLE III**

Stakeholders' Assessment of the Feedback and Recommendation of the Hospitality Management Extension Services

| Indicators   | Community Residents |          | Students    |          | Composite Mean |          | Rank |
|--|---------------------|----------|-------------|----------|----------------|----------|------|
|  | W<br>M              | V<br>I   | WM          | VI       | WM             | VI       |      |
| 1. Participants are encouraged to provide constructive feedback in a supportive and systematic manner.                         | 4.06                | E        | 3.47        | E        | 3.77           | E        | 1    |
| 2. Feedback and recommendations from stakeholders are systematically analyzed and used to refine program delivery.             | 4.04                | E        | 3.4         | E        | 3.72           | E        | 4    |
| 3. Participant's input contributes to evidence-based adjustments in program content, structure, and implementation strategies. | 4.00                | E        | 3.43        | E        | 3.72           | E        | 5    |
| 4. The program actively integrates community and student perspectives to enhance engagement and effectiveness.                 | 4.07                | E        | 3.37        | ME       | 3.72           | E        | 3    |
| 5. Stakeholder recommendations inform strategic decisions that promote the program's sustainability and long-term impact.      | 4.10                | E        | 3.37        | ME       | 3.74           | E        | 2    |
| <b>Overall Mean</b>  | <b>4.05</b>         | <b>E</b> | <b>3.41</b> | <b>E</b> | <b>3.73</b>    | <b>E</b> |      |

Table 3 outlines the stakeholders' assessment of feedback and recommendations concerning the hospitality management extension services. The overall composite mean of 3.73, interpreted as **evident**, indicates that mechanisms for collecting and utilizing feedback are present but not as strongly established as other program dimensions. The highest-rated indicator, ranked first with a mean of 3.77, is the encouragement of participants to provide constructive feedback in a supportive and systematic manner, suggesting that the program fosters an environment where stakeholder voices are valued. This is followed by the use of

stakeholder recommendations to inform strategic decisions for sustainability and long-term impact (3.74), ranked second, which demonstrates that feedback contributes to broader program planning. Ranked third is the integration of community and student perspectives to enhance engagement (3.72), which, while **evident**, reflects that inclusion practices could be further strengthened. Similarly, the systematic analysis and application of feedback to refine program delivery (3.72) and the contribution of participant input to evidence-based adjustments (3.72) were both ranked lowest, at fourth and fifth respectively, underscoring

that stakeholder insights are not yet fully maximized in shaping program improvements. Taken together, the findings show that feedback and recommendation practices are **evident** but not **highly evident**,

highlighting an area where the program can enhance responsiveness, inclusivity, and the systematic integration of stakeholder input to achieve stronger sustainability outcomes.

TABLE IV

Summary of Stakeholders' Overall Assessment on the Hospitality Management Extension Services

| Variables                           | Community Residents |           | Students    |           | Composite Mean |          | Rank |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|----------------|----------|------|
|                                     | WM                  | VI        | WM          | VI        | WM             | VI       |      |
| Program Effectiveness and Relevance | 4.57                | HE        | 4.66        | HE        | 4.62           | HE       | 1    |
| Impact and Sustainability           | 4.42                | HE        | 4.36        | HE        | 4.39           | HE       | 2    |
| Feedback and Recommendation         | 4.05                | E         | 3.41        | E         | 3.73           | E        | 3    |
| <b>Overall Mean</b>                 | <b>4.35</b>         | <b>HE</b> | <b>3.37</b> | <b>ME</b> | <b>3.86</b>    | <b>E</b> |      |

Table 4 presents the stakeholders' overall assessment of the hospitality management extension services. The data reveal that **Program Effectiveness and Relevance** obtained the highest composite mean of 4.62, interpreted as **highly evident** and ranked first. This indicates that the program effectively addresses its intended goals and remains relevant to both community residents and students. The second-ranked variable, **Impact and Sustainability**, with a composite mean of 4.39, is likewise **highly evident**, demonstrating that the program contributes to long-term benefits and fosters sustainable practices among its stakeholders. Meanwhile, **Feedback and Recommendation** received the lowest composite mean of 3.73,

interpreted as **evident** and ranked third. This suggests that although mechanisms for feedback exist, their application is less consistent and requires further strengthening to ensure active stakeholder participation in program improvement. Overall, the grand mean of 3.86, interpreted as **evident**, signifies that while the extension services are effective and sustainable, there remains a need to enhance feedback systems to achieve a more comprehensive and participatory approach.

**B. Is there a significant difference in the assessments of the two groups of respondents of the Sustainability of the Extension Services of Hospitality Management Program in EARIST Manila?**

TABLE V

Significant Difference in the Assessment of the Sustainability of the Hospitality Management Extension Services Among the Three Groups of Respondents

| Variables                           | Group    | Mean | F-value | p-value | Decision          | Interpretation  |
|-------------------------------------|----------|------|---------|---------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Program Effectiveness and Relevance | Resident | 4.57 | -1.270  | 0.2071  | Fail to Reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                                     | Student  | 4.66 |         |         |                   |                 |
| Impact and Sustainability           | Resident | 4.42 | 0.863   | 0.3900  | Fail to Reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                                     | Student  | 4.36 |         |         |                   |                 |
| Feedback and Recommendation         | Resident | 4.05 | 0.6828  | <0.0001 | Reject Ho         | Significant     |
|                                     | Student  | 3.41 |         |         |                   |                 |

**Note:** The statistical test used was the **Independent Sample t-test** ( $df = 98$ , 0.05 significance level). *Reject Ho if  $p < 0.05$ ; otherwise, fail to reject Ho.*

As shown in Table 5, the independent sample t-test revealed no significant difference between community residents and students in their assessment of **program effectiveness and relevance** ( $p = 0.2071$ ) and **impact and sustainability** ( $p = 0.3900$ ). Both groups rated these aspects as highly evident, suggesting a shared perception of the program's effectiveness and its sustainable contributions. However, a significant

difference emerged in **feedback and recommendation** ( $p < 0.0001$ ), where residents ( $M = 4.05$ ) provided higher ratings than students ( $M = 3.41$ ). This indicates that while both groups acknowledge the presence of feedback mechanisms, students perceive them as less evident, pointing to an area where the program could strengthen inclusivity and responsiveness to stakeholder input.

**C. What are the problem encountered by the respondents?**

**TABLE VI**

Problems Encountered by the Respondents in the Implementation of the Hospitality Encountered Management Extension Services

| Indicators   | Community Resident |           | Student     |           | Composite Mean |           | Rank |
|--|--------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|------|
|  | WM                 | VI        | WM          | VI        | WM             | VI        |      |
| 1. The program does not always meet the diverse needs and expectations of participants, which can affect its perceived usefulness.   | 3.07               | ME        | 2.4         | LE        | 2.74           | ME        | 7    |
| 2. Scheduling conflicts make it difficult for participants to fully access or complete the program in a timely manner.   | 3.14               | ME        | 2.43        | LE        | 2.79           | ME        | 2    |
| 3. Training instructions are sometimes vague or lacking in detail, leaving participants uncertain about how to perform tasks effectively.  | 3.13               | E         | 2.37        | E         | 2.75           | ME        | 4    |
| 4. Sessions often emphasize theory over practice, limiting opportunities for participants to apply their learning in real-world contexts.  | 3.16               | ME        | 2.43        | LE        | 2.80           | ME        | 1    |
| 5. The training design tends to follow a one-size-fits-all approach, which may not match the varied skill levels of learners.  | 3.01               | ME        | 2.47        | LE        | 2.74           | ME        | 5    |
| 6. Limited hands-on activities restrict participants' engagement and ability to internalize new skills.  | 3.19               | ME        | 2.23        | LE        | 2.71           | ME        | 9    |
| 7. There is insufficient follow-up support and resources to reinforce acquired skills, which hampers continuous improvement.   | 3.06               | ME        | 2.3         | LE        | 2.68           | ME        | 12   |
| 8. The program is not always aligned with the economic and livelihood realities of the community, reducing its long-term impact.   | 3.13               | ME        | 2.4         | LE        | 2.77           | ME        | 3    |
| 9. Resource and infrastructure limitations constrain the program's ability to fully support community livelihood initiatives.  | 3.01               | ME        | 2.33        | LE        | 2.67           | ME        | 13   |
| 10. Inadequate community involvement in planning and implementation leads to lower participation and reduced ownership of the program.   | 3.06               | ME        | 2.27        | LE        | 2.67           | ME        | 14.5 |
| 11. The skills and knowledge delivered may not always correspond to the actual work responsibilities of participants, creating gaps in applicability.  | 3.07               | ME        | 2.3         | LE        | 2.69           | ME        | 11   |
| 12. Participants who are motivated to start income-generating activities often face financial constraints that hinder implementation.  | 3.1                | ME        | 2.37        | LE        | 2.74           | ME        | 6    |
| 13. A lack of structured mentorship or coaching opportunities weakens participants' capacity to address challenges and sustain outcomes.   | 3.07               | ME        | 2.33        | LE        | 2.70           | ME        | 10   |
| 14. Monitoring and regular feedback mechanisms are insufficient, limiting opportunities to continuously refine and improve services.   | 3.1                | ME        | 2.23        | LE        | 2.67           | ME        | 14.5 |
| 15. Feedback from participants is not always systematically integrated into program adjustments, which makes stakeholders feel that their insights have little influence on decision-making. | 3.09               | ME        | 2.37        | LE        | 2.73           | ME        | 8    |
| <b>Overall Mean</b>  | <b>3.09</b>        | <b>ME</b> | <b>2.35</b> | <b>LE</b> | <b>2.72</b>    | <b>ME</b> |      |

*Legend: WM-Weighted Mean, VI-Verbal Interpretation*

| Scale | Range       | Verbal Interpretation  | Symbol |
|-------|-------------|------------------------|--------|
| 5     | 4.20 – 5.00 | Highly Encountered     | HE     |
| 4     | 3.40 – 4.19 | Encountered            | E      |
| 3     | 2.60 – 3.39 | Moderately Encountered | ME     |
| 2     | 1.80 – 2.59 | Least Encountered      | LE     |
| 1     | 1.00 – 1.79 | Very Least Encountered | VLE    |

Table 6 presents the respondents' assessment of the problems encountered in the implementation of the hospitality management extension services. The overall composite mean of 2.72, interpreted as **moderately encountered**, suggests that participants experienced some challenges, though these were not pervasive. The most frequently reported problem, ranked first, is the emphasis on theory over practice (2.80), indicating that limited opportunities for applying learned skills reduced program effectiveness. Scheduling conflicts (2.79) and misalignment with community economic and livelihood realities (2.77), ranked second and third, respectively, highlight barriers to full participation and long-term impact. Other notable concerns include unclear training instructions (2.75, rank 4), a one-size-fits-all training design (2.74, rank 5), and financial constraints limiting participants' ability to engage in income-generating activities (2.74, rank 6). The lowest-ranked challenges, including insufficient follow-up support (2.68) and limited resources or infrastructure (2.67), were still **moderately encountered**, suggesting that while the program faces operational and structural limitations, these issues are not severely obstructive. Overall, the findings indicate that although problems exist, they are manageable, and targeted improvements in practical application, scheduling, and resource support could enhance program implementation and participant engagement.

#### **Qualitative Results**

Interviews with community residents and students indicate that the Hospitality Management Extension Services are generally effective and relevant. Residents noted, "*The training helped me start a small catering service,*" while students stated, "*It reinforced what we learn in class and gave us real-world experience.*" Participants acknowledged benefits such as skill development and income opportunities, though some expressed concerns about sustainability, commenting, "*After the training, there was no follow-up support,*" and "*The skills are useful, but without continued guidance, it's hard to keep up.*" Feedback and practical engagement were also identified as areas for improvement, with residents noting, "*We gave feedback, but it seemed to be ignored,*" and students suggesting, "*There should be more structured ways for us to share our suggestions.*" Overall, the interviews confirm the program's positive impact while highlighting the need for enhanced follow-up, hands-on

activities, and systematic feedback channels to strengthen sustainability and effectiveness.

#### **IV. Conclusions**

The Hospitality Management Extension Services are generally effective and relevant, contributing to long-term benefits and sustainable practices among stakeholders. While feedback mechanisms exist, their application is less consistent, highlighting a need for more systematic channels to engage participants. Operational challenges, including a theory-heavy approach, scheduling conflicts, and misalignment with community livelihoods, were moderately encountered, suggesting areas for improvement to enhance program accessibility and effectiveness.

In line with these findings, the qualitative interviews with community residents and students indicate that the Hospitality Management Extension Services have a meaningful and positive impact on participants' skills and livelihood opportunities. While the program effectively enhances knowledge application and practical competencies, it also reveals areas needing improvement, particularly in ensuring sustained support and integrating feedback mechanisms. These findings suggest that strengthening follow-up activities, practical engagement, and systematic feedback processes is essential to enhance the program's long-term sustainability, relevance, and overall participant engagement.

#### **V. Recommendations**

1. Project heads, faculty members, program trainers, and community liaisons must provide continuous mentoring, coaching, and refresher activities to reinforce participants' skills and ensure the sustainability of program outcomes.
2. Higher Education Institution extension coordinators and project heads should establish systematic and structured channels to collect, analyze, and implement stakeholder feedback, ensuring inclusivity and responsiveness.
3. Curriculum designers, trainers, and program facilitators are responsible for integrating more practical, hands-on exercises into training sessions to complement theoretical instruction and enhance skill retention.
4. Program planners, community leaders, and extension service coordinators need to tailor program content and

activities to align with the economic, livelihood, and skill needs of the community for greater relevance and impact.

5. Project heads and local coordinators should optimize schedules to accommodate participants' availability and minimize conflicts with work or community responsibilities.

6. Institutional administration and program sponsors should provide adequate materials, equipment, and financial resources to support practical learning and income-generating activities.

7. Program evaluators, faculty, and extension service coordinators must conduct regular monitoring and evaluation to assess program effectiveness, identify challenges, and guide continuous improvement.

#### References

1. D. A. Alawa, I. Ajigo, F. Unimna, E. A. Udie, and J. B. Adie, "Policy initiatives for improving the contributions of university agricultural education and extension institutions to environmental and sustainable development in agriculture," *Educational Research and Review*, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 273–281, 2020.
2. R. L. Aquino et al., "Community-based learning in Philippine higher education," *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 12–21, 2019.
3. J. M. R. Asio, D. P. Sardina, and J. A. O. Olaguir, "Student's community service involvement: Implications for a sustainable community extension service," *Asian Journal of Community Services*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 65–76, 2022.
4. M. Bacus, A. Quijano-Pagutayao, H. Soliven, M. Tabaosares, A. Beronio, J. Pascual, K. Magallon, and J. Uchang, "Impact assessment of the extension activities conducted by the College of Agriculture in Mibantang, Quezon, Bukidnon," *The Seybold Report*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 231–241, 2022.
5. R. A. Baladjay, M. A. P. Amparado, J. Manatad, and M. Rosal, "Educating the out-of-school youth on entrepreneurship: Community extension program impact study," unpublished manuscript, *OSF*, 2020.
6. R. Cardenas and D. Codnita, "Factors influencing tax compliance: Evidence from small and medium corporate taxpayers," *International Journal of Social Science and Education Research Studies*, vol. 4, no. 7, 2024.
7. R. Chambers and G. R. Conway, *Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical Concepts for the 21st Century*, IDS Discussion Paper 296. Brighton, U.K.: Institute of Development Studies, 1992.
8. D. A. Corpuz, M. J. C. Time, and B. T. Afalla, "Empowering the community through the extension services of a teacher education institution in the Philippines," *Cogent Education*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2022.
9. F. R. Cruz and C. Santillan, "Effectiveness of the extension programs of the BS Mathematics program of Pangasinan State University–Lingayen," *Southeast Asian Journal of Science and Technology*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 11–15, 2022.
10. J. V. G. De La Cruz, J. M. Bagason, M. A. V. Lazaro, and J. G. Ballon-Bagason, "Training needs assessment: An action research for the community extension program of the College of Hospitality and Tourism Management," *International Journal of Academic Accounting, Finance & Management Research*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 42–47, 2024.
- G. Delos Reyes and J. T. Soriano, "Strengthening community partnerships through academic extension programs," *Philippine Journal of Public Service*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 45–58, 2021.
11. J. S. De Vera, "Awareness and effects of extension services on the Adopt-A-Day Care School Program," *East Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 683–690, 2023.
12. M. J. Espinosa, R. C. Cruz, and A. T. Delos Reyes, "The role of extension programs in enhancing hospitality students' practical skills," *Philippine Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 45–56, 2020.
13. D. Gabutin, M. Aloroy, and R. Dueñas, "Impact assessment on the extension and community services of the College of Industrial Technology (2019–2021)," *EPRA International Journal of Research & Development*, pp. 22–36, 2024.
14. E. M. Garcia and K. R. De Leon, "Exploring institutional support for sustainable extension programs in public higher education," *Journal of Educational Management*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 33–49, 2023.
15. J. P. Herrera et al., "Functional ANOVA based on empirical characteristic functional," *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, vol. 189, p. 104878, 2021.
16. O. M. Kyambo, "The impacts of agricultural sector devolution on delivery of agricultural extension services and agricultural productivity in Kitui County, Kenya," Ph.D. dissertation, *Southeastern Kenya Univ.*, 2023.
17. J. Lazaro and K. Santos, "Sustainability challenges in academic extension services during the pandemic," *Journal of Educational Development*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 34–47, 2022.
18. C. Lena, "SWOT analysis of the community extension services conducted by hospitality and tourism management programs: Strategies for service enhancement," *International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality*, pp. 36–40, 2021.

19. M. C. Lopez and H. L. Mendoza, "Stakeholder participation in the implementation of extension activities," *Asian Journal of Community Engagement*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 66–77, 2021.
20. M. E. Maake and M. A. Antwi, "Farmers' perceptions of public agricultural extension services in Gauteng Province, South Africa," *Agriculture & Food Security*, vol. 11, no. 1, 2022.
21. R. Magnaye and A. Ylagan, "Effectiveness and impact of community extension program of one Philippine higher education institution as basis for sustainability," *Asia Pacific Journal of Academic Research in Business Administration*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 7–16, 2021.
22. L. M. Malabanan and J. M. Dacara, "The impact assessment of the community extension services: A case study of the College of Health Sciences on the residents of Sta. Justina, Buhi, Camarines Sur, Philippines," *Journal of Public Health Sciences*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 120–136, 2024.
23. S. McCombes, "Descriptive research: Definition, types and examples," *Scribbr*, Jun. 22, 2023.
24. E. Mendoza and R. Bolotaolo, *Thesis and Dissertation Writing Made Easy*. Quezon City, Philippines: Mindshapers Co., Inc., 2023.
25. Z. Melaku, I. Mohammed, and T. Ayele, "Implementation and factors affecting industry extension services of micro and small manufacturing enterprises at Southwest Shoa Zone, Oromia Regional State in Ethiopia," Jimma Univ. Repository, 2023.
26. M. Memon et al., "Sample size for survey research: Review and recommendations," *Journal of Applied Structural Equation Modeling*, vol. 4, pp. i–xx, 2020.
27. S. P. Morrow, "Nonprofit community partnerships: A success guide for 2025," *Instrumentl*, Jan. 2024.
28. F. Nyimbili and L. Nyimbili, "Types of purposive sampling techniques with their examples and application in qualitative research studies," *British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies*, vol. 5, pp. 90–99, 2024.
29. M. E. Patalinghug and R. S. Bustamante, "Community needs assessment as basis for a community extension program in a state-funded college," *Science International (Lahore)*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 273–275, 2022.