

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20475289

THE TRUST-AWARENESS PARADOX IN HIGHER EDUCATION: A KAP ANALYSIS OF SDG COMMUNICATION AND STAKEHOLDER ALIGNMENT IN A MULTI-CAMPUS UNIVERSITY

Jeng jeng M. Bolintao^{1*}, Eva Marie Codamon-Dugyon², Marah joy a. Nanglegan³, Ethel Jovy Garcia-Wacas⁴, Irene S. Calsiyao⁵, Dennis P. Ocampo⁶

¹PhD Designation/ Position: College Dean, College of Advanced Education/ Professor IV Affiliation: Ifugao State University, Main Campus, Address: Nayon, Lamut, Ifugao Email: je.mabo84@gmail.com Orcid No.: 0000-0002-0892-4684

²Designation/position: University President Affiliation: Ifugao State University Address of affiliation: Nayon, Lamut, Ifugao Email: ecdugyon@yahoo.com ORCID No: 0000-0002-2115-1102

³Designation/position: university director for extension and training/ professor 3 Affiliation: Ifugao State University Address of affiliation: Nayon, Lamut, Ifugao Email: joyalsiken@gmail.com ORCID No: 0000-0001-8915-9779

⁴Designation/position: Chairperson, Master of Arts in Education/Associate Professor 3 Affiliation: Kalinga State University Address of affiliation: Bulanao, Tabul City, Kalinga Email: ejmgarcia@ksu.edu.ph ORCID No:0000-0003-3513-9574

⁵Designation/position: professor, Affiliation: Kalinga State University, Address: P6 Bulanao, Tabuk City, Kalinga, Philippines, Email: iscalsiyao@ksu.edu.ph, ORCID No:0000-0002-9574-4453

⁶Assistant Professor III, Kalinga State University, Tabuk City, Kalinga. Philippines, dpocampo@ksu.edu.ph 0000-0002-2225-4197

Received: 03/12/2025
Accepted: 30/04/2026

Corresponding Author: Jeng jeng M. Bolintao
(je.mabo84@gmail.com)

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the alignment between the promise of institutional sustainability and the consciousness of the stakeholders in a multi-campus Higher Education Institution (HEI), using Ifugao State University (IFSU) as a case. The study depends on a Knowledge-Awareness-Perception (KAP) framework and explores the levels of awareness of Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) among faculty, staff, and students, and the perceived efficacy of different communication channels. The design was a descriptive-comparative and correlational one and included 684 respondents in six campuses. Results suggest that, overall, SDG awareness among employees is fairly high, although not even and stratified, based on demographic and institutional factors. Tenure and employment status have a significant influence on awareness, and permanent and long-term employees show a higher level of understanding. The students, most of whom have economically vulnerable backgrounds, indicate less and less uniform awareness, in turn. There are also differences in the levels of discipline, since students in technical disciplines are less involved in the notion of sustainability. One of the best contributions of the study is the discovery of the so-called Trust-Awareness Paradox in the sense of believing that

institutional communication channels that are popular (e.g., websites and formal lectures) work but correlate poorly with real awareness. Interpersonal and values-based networks, on the other hand, show a stronger correlation with in-depth understanding. These results can point out significant flaws in the institutional communication and onboarding practices, implying that the sustainability initiatives in HEIs should step out of dissemination and shift to more embracing and trust-based approaches to engagement. The paper offers a micro view of the SDG internalization, which is useful in enhancing institutional practices of sustainability.

KEYWORDS: Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); Higher Education Institutions (HEIs); Sustainability Awareness; Communication Strategies; Trust–Awareness Paradox; Knowledge–Awareness–Perception (KAP); Institutional Sustainability; Stakeholder Engagement; Multi-Campus Universities.

INTRODUCTION

The shift of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development brought about a paradigm change in global governance because of the inability to deal with the real-problem that led to economic, social, and environmental vulnerability. This was one of the major drawbacks of the MDGs (2000-2015), even though it resulted in a dramatic change in the specific indicators (United Nations, 2015). The 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) can be viewed as a multi-sectoral and comprehensive strategy that was adopted by the United Nations (UN) in response to the dynamics of the twenty-first century (Gupta & Vegelin, 2016; United Nations, 2015). Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) have now become critical channels to the localization of global sustainability requirements as opposed to being incidental participants in the same game. Institutional efficacy and the elementary duty of the HEI, like Ifugao State University (IFSU), was gauged by determining an organizational culture of sustainability, as in environmental conservation and the equitable management of natural resources (Alam, 2023; Flores-Aguilar et al., 2023; Wang, Geng, & Rodríguez-Casallas, 2021).

Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) are regarded as important players of the 2030 Agenda, which lie between the broad policy frameworks and their practical application in society. Even though the academic community has come far with its interdisciplinary endeavors, there is still a lingering issue of how institutional commitments can be translated into a meaningful understanding and engagement among stakeholders. It is notable that the literature identifies a number of fundamental functions that shape the role of HEIs in this regard such as responding to local issues by engaging in civil activities, sharing evidence-based solutions, developing cross-sectoral partnerships to facilitate collaboration and encouraging interdisciplinary research to ensure responsiveness to the multifaceted character of the SDGs (Corazza & Saluto, 2021; Leal Filho et al., 2019; Brown, Werbeloff, & Raven, 2019). Nevertheless, it is challenging to transfer institutional research outcomes to real stakeholder engagement in spite of these contributions. Since there are no clear guidelines on gathering data at the micro level, as Boeren (2019) notes, there is a gap in knowledge about the extent to which the SDGs have been internalized in institutional communities.

The prevailing phenomenon of modern institutional assessment is a kind of bibliometric

hegemony whereby World University Rankings (WURI), including Times Higher Education (THE) Impact Rankings and QS World University Rankings, have become the major adjudicators of prestige. These systems promote the concept of scientific production, namely the productivity of research and the density of citation to be the final measure of SDG contribution (Times Higher Education, 2021; QS World University Rankings, 2022). It is a reductionist technique that favors macro-level exposure and often disregards micro-level ignorance that goes on within the organization. This stress can be illustrated with references to IFSU, which has recently won among the top 101-200 in the WUR in terms of Innovation. More importantly, this appreciation was the product of a focused group effort of a chosen group of authors- a small group of faculty and staff-writers. Although it creates an external image of excellence, this success underscores an underlying danger of institutional isomorphism, in which the production of science by the specialized few results in an elite facade of obedience, which might conceal an underlying lack of awareness by the rest of the university. Devoid of granular information about stakeholder cognizance, such rankings will be shallow measures of success.

The optimum situation to an HEI is a culture of being completely aligned, which is a situation where all the stakeholders are engaged in the sustainability agenda. Nevertheless, there remains a large Knowledge-Awareness-Perception (KAP) gap. Although the UN defines information and knowledge as prerequisites to development (United

Nations, 1997) the awareness of the world is deplorably uneven, with a 16-44 percent range in different national settings (OECD, 2017). This deficit in a multi-campus university can be seen in the form of the Trust-Awareness Paradox: The Trust-Awareness Paradox is an institutional effect where world prestige and innovation ranking produce an external face of sustainability that becomes a veneer of sustainability excellence when it is not mirrored in the inner cognizance or operational literacy of the larger campus community.. A lack of stakeholder awareness is one of the threats that are significant to the 2030 targets (Akinlolu et al., 2017). Unless the general population of the university is able to discern the main principles of the SDGs, they are never able to hold the university responsible, which disconnects the institutional policy with the actual social change.

The complexity of institutional policy to stakeholder perception requires a complicated communication architecture to bridge the gap. The existing approaches capitalize on multiple channels,

such as digital channels (social networks, email), traditional channels (radio, TV), and institutional educational systems (workshops, formal curricula). The effectiveness of these pathways is, however, not equal. Suggestions: Data indicate that, although digital tools are considered to be effective, they may not succeed in breaking the systemic onboarding failures. In particular, there is a major gap in access and engagement of new workers or non-permanent workers. This is an indication that the SDG information dissemination is also largely limited by the employment status and tenure, but not only by the preference of the media. Silencing communication among the permanent employees in sizable groups continues the Trust-Awareness Paradox and keeps temporary workers and other new stakeholders in the state of informational exclusion (Leal Filho *et al.*, 2021).

The current literature has an apparent gap on interaction between stakeholder awareness and perceived communication effectiveness at the lower hierarchy of a multi-campus university. The majority of the studies are concerned with the research outputs of macro-level, and internal organizational culture is overlooked. It is an urgent research as any failure at the campus level in internalizing the SDGs will clearly lead to the stalling of the achievement of the 2030 targets. This study, based on Ifugao State University (IFSU) as a representative example, an institution having a high global innovation profile but having a complex internal composition, describes the lack of alignment between external and internal literacy.

The research seeks to fill these gaps by looking at the extent to which the Ifugao State University (IFSU) is working in line with the overall sustainability agenda. It examines the question on whether institutional innovation can actually be reflected in the general level of awareness among the various stakeholder groups through the use of a Knowledge-Awareness-Perception (KAP) framework. Particularly, the research is aimed at determining the SDG awareness of faculty, staff, and students, in particular, regarding the objectives, their universal aspect, and the period 2030. It further examines the effectiveness of various communication strategies, compares between traditional and digital and institutional methods, and further evaluates whether there is varying awareness among the demographic variables, such as sex, employment, education, and length of service.

Investigating how well stakeholders perceive the success of various information dissemination policies and what is the correlation between the awareness

level and perception. The rest of this paper is framed in a manner that gives a granular analysis of these dynamics.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Evolution of Global Sustainability Frameworks

The move of global development paradigms at the beginning of the 21st century signaled the turn of short-term, selfish developmental purposes to a comprehensive, multi-faceted approach to human and global prosperity. M Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) were developed by the United Nations (UN) in a year 2000 to ensure that some of the basic urban problems such as extreme poverty and primary education are mitigated by 2015. The MDGs sparked immense genesis, but in the end, they could not cover the systemic and inter-related issues at the root of environmental degradation and socio-economic disparities (UN MDG Report 2015). This resulted in the 2030 Agenda of Sustainable Development being adopted in 2015, and the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). It is a wider framework that focuses on a three-fold convergence of economic growth, social inclusion, and environmental protection (UN, 2015). Public awareness is one of the cornerstones of the success of the 2030 Agenda, as it is a non-negotiable condition of stakeholder involvement and institutional engagement over the long run (Kumi, 2019; Odoom *et al.*, 2021). Knowledgeable people have a high chance of being interested in development policies and holding governance structures accountable. Nonetheless, there is reason to believe that there exists a chronic awareness issue, according to global data. An example of this is the 2016 surveys that revealed that general SDG awareness was vastly different across geography, with only 16% in Russia and 44% in India having awareness of the SDG (OECD, 2017). Moreover, although GlobeScan (2016) has observed that knowledge about the SDGs is slowly surpassing that of the former MDG system, the proportion of knowledgeable people in the world is only three in out of ten people who claim to have a high level of knowledge. Such a gap is a severe threat to the 2030 Agenda; as long as there is no set of general awareness, the pressure needed to institutional responsibility is impossible.

The Pivotal Role of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in SDG Attainment

Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) are becoming key players in the global search process

towards sustainability (Klofsten et al., 2019; Leal Filho et al., 2019). Other than their traditional role of teaching, the universities have been charged with the responsibility of matching their academic, operational and civic roles with the 2030 Agenda. Among the mechanisms of contribution listed in the literature, there are the promotion of sustainability literacy among the future leaders and the interdisciplinary research usage in order to resolve complex ecological issues (Brown et al., 2019). HEIs are also considered local civic engagement centers, sharing the knowledge to overcome community-specific development barriers (Corazza & Saluto, 2021; Findler et al., 2019). The speeding up of institutional commitment tends to be further influenced by the rise of international bibliometric-based rankings. Rankings like Times Higher Education (THE) Impact Rankings and the QS World University Rankings now assess HEIs with regards to their scientific performance in regards to SDGs and citation impact (Chankseliani and McCowan, 2021; Times Higher Education, 2021). Although these rankings establish a high-level of competition enhancing an environment of institutional transparency, it also poses a danger of rewarding the superficiality of compliance rather than sustainability transformation at the roots. In the context of a higher education institution such as Ifugao State University (IFSU) which has scored in the World University Rankings as an institution in terms of Innovation (WURI), to retain such high status, the internal stakeholders; the employees and the students, need to have a highly developed comprehension of how sustainability requirements are internalized among them.

The Awareness-Knowledge Distinction and the Conceptual Paradox

The analysis of sustainability communication requires creating the difference between the surface perception and the deep understanding. The literature highlights that the two states of mind have conceptual differences: Awareness is characterized by the capacity to notice or grasp a new trend or framework whereas knowledge is a more intense familiarity or comprehension gained through education and experience. Knowledge is the profound understanding of the topic and awareness is merely knowing or hearing about it (Alordiah et al., 2023). Although overall awareness scores are high, as an example, the employees of IFSU have a high overall mean awareness rating of 3.96, there remains a large gap of disconnection. Studies by Hestness et al. (2021) and Leal Filho et al. (2018) note

a deficit in the gap between knowledge of the SDGs as a concept and lack of practical implementation knowledge. The outcome of this lack of connection is the so-called Trust-Awareness Paradox. Information in this paradox is that, in as much as broad institutional communication can work to enhance increased awareness, it is generally unsuccessful in enhancing the trust or even the social capital to induce the step towards action knowledge. The fact that the SDGs are well-reached via digital channels does not necessarily imply the level of institutional attachment or value-based congruence that is essential to embed the SDGs at the very individual level.

Analysis of SDG Communication Pathways

A combination of diverse communication channels is important to the implementation of SDGs, yet their functionality in reality is not as evident as it is advantageous to believe that it is (Borg, 2021). Multi-campus environments are distinctively marked by a difference between what appears to be said to work and what appears to enhance knowledge. Electronic and institutional modules, such as, are always ranked high. The use of websites (M=4.33) is considered as the most suitable in sharing versatile and contextual data and schools and structured lectures (M=4.26) can be regarded as a significant factor of formal learning and alignment. There is also a notable difference in videos (M=4.23), in the sense that they can help to make it more captivating and easier to watch. Email and social networks facilitate increasing access and make information more inclusive, but it seems that their potential to stimulate active use differs based on the factors such as age or position in the institution.

Simultaneously, more conventional and face-to-face channels appear to work in a different fashion. Although covering a smaller number of people, some sources, including family and friends (M=3.94) demonstrate a moderate correlation with a certain awareness that helps establish the type of social trust, which makes messages stick. The same trend is observed in the case of faith-based organizations (M=3.89), which are more likely to view the SDGs as value-oriented and, in trying to do so, tend to produce more credibility than official or governmental communication. This opposition leads to such a paradox as it can be said, a Trust-Awareness Paradox. Digital infrastructures are useful and widespread, but they are also likely to be places where people don't trust each other. On the other hand, the interpersonal and values-based channels have a smaller reach but seem to have a bigger impact

on how people really understand things. This manifestation of tension can be observed in Evidence of IFSU, where people who have greater knowledge about SDG-related initiatives are more likely to attach value to those sources that relate more to them. It hints at the idea that translating a deeper shift of knowing the SDGs to effectively internalizing them can be prerequisite by switching to a less digital and more interpersonal of communication methods.

Sustainability Inequality in Demographic and Structural Inequality.

There is no monolith of sustainability literacy; it greatly depends on employment status, tenure, and the level of education. The empirical findings highlight the systemic structural breakdown of the onboarding and internal knowledge management of large HEIs.

Employment Status and Tenure

There is a major gap between permanent and non-permanent workers. Timed staff show a greater awareness with SDGs ($p = 0.011$) and the countries around the world that it aims to help ($p = 0.028$) than their non-permanent staffs. More importantly, tenure is one of the main predictors of awakening about the time horizon of the 2030 Agenda ($p = 0.001$). Less than five years old: The level of awareness of employees with lower than five years of employment is significantly lower than that of long-term employees. This enhances the danger of relying on imprudent dependence on institutional memory and accrual over time than onboarding. In effect, new employees are walking into a sustainability vacuum and this jeopardizes carrying organizational objectives.

Educational Attainment

Although the general awareness of what the SDGs are is relatively the same among education levels, the understanding of how it is applied worldwide (target countries) is much greater among doctorate educated people ($p = 0.020$, $M=4.15$). This implies that higher education training is necessary to give the context required to global policy framework, which may be lacking in undergraduate education.

Gender and Student Digital Engagement

The issue of gender in HEIs is delicate. The IFSU has a majority of female students (51.3) and employees (56.9), although women do not show the same interest as men in SDG information. Male students express greater awareness of learning about SDGs through digital platforms ($M=3.60$) than

female students ($M=3.34$, $p = 0.010$).). Instead, they benefit more from interpersonal channels and structured learning environments by female students (UNESCO, 2019). Such gendered consumption patterns are not to be ignored because they result in disparities in awareness and further exacerbate the Trust-Awareness Paradox.

Identifying Knowledge Gaps and Study Contribution

Although sustainability studies have become widespread, Boeren (2019) notes that there is a crucial and severe data gap in the literature that is filling the gap at the micro-level and how HEIs are actually doing in terms of SDGs. Certainly, there is a particular lack of studies researching the awareness of stakeholders and perceived usefulness of communication in a system with multiple campuses of higher education, which encounters unique logistic and cultural challenges regarding the uniformity of messages. The research paper addresses these gaps by offering a Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices (KAP) analysis of one of the multi campus public universities in the Philippines. This study will provide the finer-grained information needed to go beyond the overarching measures and tackle the demographic and structural obstacles that go between awareness and action by comparing 325 employees with 359 students at six campuses.

Implications of Strategic Implications to Institutional Sustainability.

The results of this critical analysis imply that HEIs are bound to forego one-size-fits-all communication models. To alleviate the Trust-Awareness Paradox, an institution has to resort to deliberate, all-purpose, and extended communication strategies, which go beyond mere digital reach. To switch to a more trust-based model, the deficit on onboarding of new hires and the digital engagement gap among female students have to be addressed. With the help of high-trust in-person networks and high-reach digital ones, HEIs can transition the stakeholders to the stage of idea-to-conceptual recognition until the stages of active alignment with the 2030 Agenda. Then and only can the university take an important part in the process of global sustainability.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design and Philosophical Framework

This study methodological architecture has its foundations in an advanced descriptive-comparative and correlational research design, which has been

designed in such a way that it can be used as a baseline diagnosis instrument to assess the sustainability of institutions. It is determinable by the phenomenon of "Trust-Awareness Paradox" when apparent familiarity with the sustainability terms is at the surface, but there is a severe lack of conceptual insight. Through this twin-layered design, the study goes beyond mere data reporting to explore the overall compatibility of Knowledge, Awareness, and Practice (KAP). University is not only a place to learn. It can also represent a small version of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. This philosophical basis is in line with what Flores-Aguilar et al. (2023) and Leal Filho et al. (2019) say that Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) have a moral duty to respond to global problems by acting locally, by sharing resources and cooperating to stakeholders. This design gives the analytical rigor needed to find out how people feel about and understand sustainability initiatives at the Ifugao State University (IFSU), a state university in the Philippines with multiple campuses. It also shows how these initiatives can be put into practice at different levels of the organization.

Participants and Stratified Purposive Sampling

The respondents of the research involved 684 in total to provide a representative and statistically strong picture of the inner ecosystem of the university. This sample was divided into 325 employees of the university and 359 students at the six campuses of IFSU. To reduce the impact of selection bias, the researchers used stratified purposive sampling method to ensure that the sample size included front-line stakeholders who are critical in SDG implementation. Strata were a priori, down to levels of institutional roles and university affiliation, which included sex, employment type (permanent vs. non-permanent) and enrollment in individual of the nine different units of the university, College of Advanced Education (CAE), College of Agriculture and Sustainable Development (CASD), College of Health Sciences (CHS), College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), College of Criminal Justice Education (The demographic make-up of the sample displays larger institutional and world educational patterns. Particularly, the large proportion of the employee (56.9) population and student population (51.3) is female. This width is methodologically relevant because it reflects the growing stature of women in higher education that UNESCO (2019) and the World Bank (2020) record so that it could form a reliable foundation in comparative analysis in a workforce with diverse representation. The

purposive sampling was applied to the participants based on their role as active participants in the sustainability debate in the university, and the information provided by the participants would include responses of the people most impacted by the institutional communication channels.

Research Instrumentation and Data Collection

A questionnaire-like study tool was designed to focus the intricacies of knowledge within the institution and it was specially tailored to disclose the gap between awareness and profound knowledge. The instrument consists of two essences. The former is an awareness scale consisting of 8 items assessing knowledge of particular SDG targets, timeframe (2030) and global applicability of the goals. Based on the theoretical framework of Alordiah et al. (2023), the given scale differentiates between a surface-level familiarity, i.e., the simple awareness of a trend, and deep understanding learned during formal/informal education. The second part is a 14 item scale which measures the perceived effectiveness of the institutional communication channels. The scale is inclusive of modern digital (websites and videos), traditional media (radio, press and television), and interpersonal or values-based networks (friends, family and religion-based organizations). The device was deployed using a mixed personal and electronic system after ethical consent of institutions, guaranteeing the best coverage and the soundness of data throughout the six campuses of the university.

Statistical Framework and Analytical Suite

The Data used are quantitative in nature and were processed and analyzed using the Statistical Package of the Social Sciences (SPSS) and all significance tests were done at a level of alpha of $p < .05$ significance. To handle the perceived baseline levels of SDG awareness and communication effectiveness (SOP 1 and SOP 3), descriptive statistics such as the Mean and Standard Deviation has been calculated. In the comparative study (SOP 2), the research based its work with the help of a strong inference. Differences between binary groups (Sex and Employment Status) were compared using Independent Samples t-tests. One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine hypothesis of homogeneity of variance and difference among groups with respect to multi-group variables: Education Level, Service Length, and College affiliation. To prevent the Type, I error by all standards, the Least Significant Difference (LSD) post-hoc test was used only in the case the ANOVA produced the significant F-value, which enabled the identification of the

group variances in particular. Lastly, Pearson R Correlation was done to establish the relationship between the levels of awareness and the perceived effectiveness of dissemination strategies (SOP 4), with the hypothesis that greater conceptual knowledge is associated with greater receptiveness to the institutional communication.

Ethical Considerations and Procedural Rigor

The study followed sound methodology and strong data integrity. Ethical procedures were carefully observed throughout the research process, and appropriate measures were in place to protect the data collected. Participation was voluntary, and each respondent gave informed consent before completing the survey. Across all six campuses, the information gathered was handled with strict confidentiality to ensure that participants' rights were fully respected. These measures ensure that the study meets recognized quality standards.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results show a clear difference in gender and socioeconomic status between the university's students and its staff. The school has a strong academic reputation, but many of its students come from poor families, which affects how they respond to Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) initiatives. This means that even though the university can promote sustainability, the realities of the students may affect how involved they are. So, for SDG efforts to really work, they need to be open to and responsive to these situations.

Employee Demographics

Table 1. Frequency and Percent Distribution of Employees' Gender

Sex	Frequency	Percent
Male	140	43.1
Female	185	56.9
Total	325	100.0

Table 1 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of employees in accordance with their gender. As shown, the employee population (n=325) was predominantly female, with 56.9%, while the remaining 43.1% were males.

Table 2. Frequency and Percent Distribution Employees' Educational Attainment

Education	Frequency	Percent
College Level	3	0.9
College Graduate	179	55.1
MA/MS	79	24.3
PhD	59	18.2
Post-graduate	5	1.5
Total	325	100.0

Length of Service. Out of the 325 respondents, majority of the employees of this university with a 47.1 years' service are of 5 years or less of service and the rest both 5- 20 years of service comprise 43.1. The smallest are those employees who work the 31-40 years and above (3.1%). The employees in the university are rather young and new with almost half (47.1) of them having a tenure of 5 years or less. It complies with international tendencies of accelerating staff turnover and hiring younger employees in higher education because of retirements and an expansion of institutions (OECD, 2020; World Bank, 2021). Less time of service could also be indicative of the contractual or non-permanent employment trends in universities (UNESCO, 2019). But other research claims that longer service among employees contributes to institutional stability and continuity, which parts of such distributions could be absent (Altbach, 2015).

Table 3. Frequency and Percent Distribution Employees' Length of Service

Length of Service	Frequency	Percent
5 years below	153	47.1
5-10 years	92	28.3
11-20 years	48	14.8
21-30 years	22	6.8
31-40 years and above	10	3.1
Total	325	100.0

Employment Status. There are more permanent employees (60.6%) employed in this university compared to male counterpart (39.4%).

Most of the employees (60.6) of the university are permanent and 39.4 of them are non-permanent. It is consistent with a pattern in the general higher education sector of the public where stable jobs remain typical, particularly with faculty and long-term employees (OECD, 2020; World Bank, 2021). Institutional loyalty and job security is traditionally connected to permanent status (Altbach, 2015). Nevertheless, the extreme levels of contract-based or non-permanent employees have also been noticed worldwide which indicates the shifts to flexible employment and finances limitations (UNESCO, 2019).

Table 4. Frequency and Percent Distribution Employees' Employment Status

Employment Status	Frequency	Percent
Permanent	197	60.6
Non-permanent	128	39.4
Total	325	100.0

Table 4. shows that employees that holds permanent status (60.6%), and is largely comprised of a newer workforce, with 47.1% having served less than five years.

Student Demographics

Table 5: Students' Gender

Sex	Frequency	Percent
Male	175	48.7
Female	184	51.3

The college population (n=359) represents a higher gender balanced but severely impoverished population (51.3% female). More than two-thirds of all students (66.9%) are in households with earnings of Php 10,000 per month or less.

Table 6: Students' College Distribution (Top Concentrations)

College	Frequency	Percent
CET (Engineering and Technology)	82	22.8
CCJE (Criminal Justice Education)	58	16.2
CASD (Agriculture and Sustainable Development)	53	14.8

Table 7: Students' Monthly Family Income

Income Range	Frequency	Percent
< Php. 5,000.00	56	15.6
Php. 5,000 – 10,000	184	51.3
Php. 11,000-20,000	56	15.6
Php. 21,000+	63	17.5

The gender composition of the workforce (56.9% female) is slightly imbalanced as compared to the student body (51.3%). More to the point, the high population density of the students in technical colleges (CET) and the fact that 66.9 percent of them have an annual income that is below the Php 10,000 mark implies that any SDG communication plan must consider the potential cases of digital poverty and primacy in economic survival over interaction with global policies.

Theme I: The Institutional Memory Advantage

SDG literacy in the university is not a scholarly product but a process of Organizational Learning (Argyris and Schön, 1996), in which the key agents of sustainability enculturation are tenure and stability.

Employee Awareness Baseline: General awareness is high (M=3.96), and the identification of SDGs as a concept factors in the highest (M=4.10). Nonetheless, this awareness has a structural stratification.

Stability Factor: There is a much higher awareness of permanent employees becoming permanent in all the developmental spectrums ($p < 0.05$). Interestingly, permanent employees demonstrate better knowledge of target countries ($p=0.028$) and periods ($p=0.036$). Additionally, permanent employees are also found to receive more information on SDG through formal education (M=4.16) than non-permanent employees (M=3.84,

$p=0.002$), indicating that institutional training and professional growth would appear to be gatekept or simply less accessible to temporary employees.

The Tenure Effect: There is a disadvantage to new employees (a protectively disadvantage).

Statistically significant differences ($p < 0.01$) are shown to mean that employees who serve less than 5 years are exhibiting lower values in key metrics compared to more experienced employees: • Time Horizons: M=3.74 (<5 years) vs. M=4.36 (21–30 years).

• Goal Identification: M=3.84 (<5 years) vs. M=4.22 (5–10 years).

• Digital Information Receipt: M=3.71 (<5 years) vs. M=4.40 (31–40+ years).

These data show that institutional memory results in SDG awareness. Non-permanent and newer personnel do not undergo the acculturation process, which takes place during decades of work at a university, so that an effective shift in the direction of the proactive, instead of the passive, onboarding procedures has to be implemented.

Theme II: Disciplinary Silos and STEM Divide.

A disciplinary background analysis shows that there is a considerable dichotomy between the integration of Triple Bottom Line in higher education and the relative isolation of technical and STEM disciplines.

Employee Educational Gradient: Global awareness is associated with academic level of education. Doctorate graduates show a much better awareness of global SDGs implementation (M=4.15, $p=0.020$) in comparison to college graduates (M=3.84).

The gap in student disciplinary record:

The CAE Superiority: The College of Advanced Education (CAE), is the standard of awareness, especially in exposure to formal education (M=4.36, "Aware).

•The Middle Ground: College of Agriculture and Sustainable Development (CASD) is located in between, demonstrating a high level of awareness in formal education (M=3.96) and trailing CAE in the global environment.

• The STEM Deficit: The College of Engineering (COE) and the College of Engineering and Technology (CET) pose an institution-level challenge. The fewest number of goals is (M=3.26): the outlier is the pure engineering track (COE), with students falling into the range of neither aware nor not aware (Neither Aware nor Not Aware). The time horizon of 2030 is (M=3.39): the outlier is the pure engineering track (COE). This is quite a contrast to

CET ($M=3.57$ in goals), meaning that the more abstract the engineering course, the more it is lacking developmental setting.

Regardless of having the biggest student bodies, STEM colleges continue to be closed. As CAE students are in a state of professional neutrality, being aware of global policy space, COE students are, in parallel, emphasizing technical proficiency over the comprehension of the frames through which their future inventions would put the world into progress.

Theme III: The Digital-Gender Paradox

The shift in a professional workforce to a digital native student body provides some form of a paradox: students are not informed about SDG information in digital channels to the same extent as the older workforce that are in charge of them.

Employee Gender Equity: No substantial difference between male and female employees with regards to SDG awareness indicates that there is an equal flow of professional information.

The Student Digital-Gender Gap: A large digital engagement gap arises between students ($p=0.010$). Male students ($M=3.60$, "Aware") are much more aware of SDG information obtained through email and social networks as compared to female students ($M=3.34$, "Neither Aware").

Digital Native Anomaly:

Let alone employees: Mean 3.85 (Qualitative status: Aware).).

Students: Mean 3.47 (Qualitative status: Would not classify).).

This requires a radical shift in organizational digitally-based communication. There is the indicator of the status of students who are described as being "Neither Aware" indicating that the current strategies of social media do not penetrate the digital circles of students. It could also be caused by the fact that 66.9% of students have low income since, despite having average data access ($M=3.55$), the lack of digital access may act as an aggravating factor on top of digital poverty since employees have full campus connectability.

Theme IV: The Trust-Awareness Paradox

The major problem of the university is the unrelatedness between the perceived trustworthiness of the communication channels and trust that can influence awareness.

Initially Effectiveness Hierarchy: The question of whether employees consider certain formal, broadcast kinds to be the most effective, shows the following:

1. Websites/Internet (4.33)
2. Schools (4.26)
3. Lectures/Workshops (4.26)

Awareness-Trust Correlation (The Paradox): Broadcast channels (Websites, TV, Radio) received high ratings in their effectiveness, but only demonstrate weak but significant correlations (R values of 0.23 to 0.36) with actual awareness. On the other hand, interpersonal and values-based networks are most effectively buy-in in terms of the highest level of psychological engagement:

- **Friends and Family:** $R = 0.435$ (Moderate Correlation)
- **Faith-based Organizations:** $R = 0.418$ (Moderate Correlation)
- **Pamphlets/Brochures:** $R = 0.418$ (Moderate Correlation)

This reveals the "Trust-Awareness Paradox." The university prioritizes digital broadcasts and formal lectures, yet the individuals with the deepest awareness are those whose knowledge is rooted in community-based and faith-based circles. The institution is investing in the most "effective-looking" channels while underutilizing the channels that actually correlate with deep-seated awareness.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The study shows that there is a Gap in the Tenure: SDG awareness is now an institutional time-in-service, putting new and temporary personnel at a structural disadvantage.

The STEM Silo: The pure engineering tracks (COE) are the least connected with the world 2030 agenda, placed under the category of Neither Aware.

Digital-Gender Divide: Digital awareness among students lag behind employees and the institutional social media is not reaching female students well.

The Trust Gap: Personal and religious networks are found to have greater correlations with awareness than those of the main digital and broadcast tools of the university.

Policy Recommendations

1. Mandatory SDG Onboarding: To pay attention to the tenure gap, the Human Resource Management Office should go beyond passive enculturation and introduce mandatory SDG orientation programs to all new and none of permanent employee.
2. Transdisciplinary STEM Requirement: College of engineering and CET Deans should be able to incorporate the 17 global goals in core engineering programs with particular technical skills incorporating the Triple Bottom Line of sustainability.
3. Values-Based Communication Circles: University can capitalize on moderate correlation (0.418) of

faith-based organizations. The institution must not rely on social media being passively broadcasted, but instead create so-called Sustainability Circles with the help of which interpersonal networking and campus leaders or heads of ministry can be trusted and built.

4. Inclusive Digital Communication: To overcome the digital native exception, communication plans need to restructure in a low-data friendly manner towards the low-income students (66.9%) and targeted specifically to digital behaviors of the female student demographic.

By overcoming these contradictions, the university will be able to go beyond the superficial awareness to profound institutionalized sustainability, transforming the community into being not contented to be informed but to be genuinely engaged in the global 2030 agenda.

CONCLUSION

The university has a strong gender and socioeconomic difference between its personnel and student population, which is reflected in the institutional environment of the university. An analysis of demographic data shows a university population that is educationally strong but economically fragile and offers an essential environment where Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) campaigns can be established.

The main aim of the research was to assess the degree of Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) awareness and efficacy of the developed communication channels in Ifugao State University (IFSU), being one of the leading multi-campus universities in the Philippines (public). Using the Knowledge-Attitude-Practice (KAP) through the prism of the aforementioned theoretical framework, the study aimed to establish the extent to which knowledge about global sustainability held by institutional organizations is spread and absorbed by a heterogeneous crowd of academic communities. Although the study provides a strong foundation to the "Knowledge" and Attitude levels of the KAP model, the study itself can be used as a powerful diagnostic instrument that will help to reveal the structural impediments that do not allow the attributes to be converted into institutionalized Practice.

The quantitative data demonstrates the awareness of the SDG in general has a high base, but there are considerable demographic and disciplinary differences that question the consistency in the institutions.

Quantitative Benchmarks: Desirable level of awareness in employees was characterized by high baseline awareness with an overall mean of 3.96 and

comparatively lower but positive level of awareness was reported by students ($M = 3.65$).

A critical gap in memory exists: There is an Institutional Memory Gap of employment status and tenure. Table 7 and Table 9 results on employee level show that permanent and long-time employees (who have served company more than five years) are much more literate in terms of SDG timelines and target countries compared to newer or non-permanent employees. This implies that SDG knowledge in IFSU acquisition is now learned via gradual institutional osmosis and through exposure to it over the long term and not via systematic, standardized training.

Disciplinary Silos: Disciplinary association is one of the key (SDG literacy) determinants in students. Table 7 Analysis (Student Perspective): The analysis shows that the students in the college of advanced education (CAE) greatly beat those in the technical environment. Particularly, the lowest levels of awareness were found among students studying at the College of Engineering (COE) and the College of Engineering and Technology (CET) with respect to the actual number of goals, their usage across the globe, and the 2030-time horizon.

The greatest theoretical contribution of the study is the discovery of trust-awareness paradox. This effect is commonly defined as gauged effectiveness of channels of communication versus their actual effectiveness on awareness. As Table 10 shows, people considered the digital medium, university websites, to be the most efficient means of communication ($M = 4.33$). Nonetheless, Table 11, which is a correlation, indicates that in reality websites are least associated with actual awareness ($r = .237$). On the other hand, the researchers found moderate and statistically significant the relationships between high awareness and interpersonal or values based sources. Particularly, a consistent linkage to internalized knowledge was much stronger with Friends and Family ($r = .435$) and Faith-based organizations ($r = .418$) compared to formal digital broadcasts. This paradox implies the fact that information dissemination in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) is not simply a technical issue of being broadcast. Instead, sustainability goals internalization is strongly dependent on social capital. People tend to internalize and find meaning in SDG information more mediated by trusted networks, and shared belief systems and not impersonal and top-down online platforms.

To address the Trust-Awareness Paradox and overcome the elaborated literacy gaps, IFSU needs to implement the following organizational solutions:

Strategies: The university should shift its focus and structure towards a model where peers drive the endeavors, as opposed to a top-down dynamic where the university acts as a broadcaster. It includes the assignment of "Sustainability Champions" to every department to enable interpersonal transfer of SDG objectives on local and individual levels, through already trusted professional relationships.

- Specific Onboarding: To address the detected gap, namely the memory gap, Human Resources Development Office will have to introduce compulsory SDG onboarding exercises all new and non-permanent workers. This guarantees that sustainability literacy is a requirement of work and not a consequence of several years of service.

- Interdisciplinary, "Plug-ins": To break disciplinary silos, the university ought to incorporate SDG, "plug-ins" into STEM-based courses, namely both COE and CET. These modules should clearly cover the 2030 deadline and Global North/South dynamics in engineering capstone projects in relation to engineering technical innovation, connecting to the global socio-economic accountability (SDG 9).

This research offers a useful cross-sectional account of SDG awareness in one of the regional Philippine settings. The results are also limited by the fact that they were restricted to a geographical location and the nature of self-reported data. Although the research was successful in mapping the Knowledge and Attitude

variables of the KAP model, the other variable, which is the Practice, is the forthcoming research item. A longitudinal research that would break down the development of SDG awareness progressively and objectively assess the extent to which the suggested policies that imply social-capital-enhancement lead to quantifiable changes in sustainable practices and decision-making and employee behavior should be carried out in the future.

The importance of the shared values as an institution anchor cannot be overestimated in an era when the operations were decentralized, and the landscape of remote work was possible. This study shows that proper alignment of SDGs is not an administrative window dressing, but a fundamental contributor towards institutional resilience. With a less physicalized campuses being a component of the day-to-day work experience, social capital and interpersonal networks emerge as the key binding factors of institutional sustainability. This approach of expanding the Trust-Awareness Paradox and basing global aspirations on the ground of trusted local networks can enable the development of an informed, yet highly dedicated, to the 2030 Agenda workforce at IFSU (Leal Filho et al., 2019; UNESCO, 2020). Finally, sustainable development of higher education is determined by the possibility of converting abstract world targets into individual, collective obligations.

REFERENCES

- Akinlolu, A. A., et al. (2017). Awareness of Sustainable Development Goals among citizens: Implications for policy implementation. *Sustainable Development Journal*, 25(4), 345–356.
- Alam, A. (2023). Sustainability in higher education: A global perspective. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 24(2), 215–230.
- Altbach, P. G. (2015). *Global perspectives on higher education*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1996). *Organizational learning II: Theory, method, and practice*. Addison-Wesley.
- Bebbington, J., & Unerman, J. (2020). Advancing research into accounting and the UN Sustainable Development Goals. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 33(7), 1657–1670.
- Boeren, E. (2019). Understanding Sustainable Development Goals in higher education: A data challenge. *Studies in Higher Education*, 44(10), 1835–1847.
- Borg, C. (2021). Communication and sustainability: The role of awareness in SDGs. *Sustainability Science*, 16(3), 789–801.
- Brown, R., Werbeloff, L., & Raven, R. (2019). Interdisciplinary research and SDGs. *Global Environmental Change*, 58, 101956.
- Chankseliani, M., & McCowan, T. (2021). Higher education and the Sustainable Development Goals. *Higher Education*, 81(5), 1065–1080.
- Corazza, L., & Saluto, P. (2021). Universities as sustainability drivers. *Sustainability*, 13(7), 3765.
- Cottafava, D., Ascione, F., Corazza, L., & Dhir, A. (2022). Higher education institutions and SDGs: A systematic review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 337, 130555.
- Dale, A., & Newman, L. (2005). Sustainable development, education, and literacy. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 6(4), 351–362.
- Findler, F., Schönherr, N., Lozano, R., Reider, D., & Martinuzzi, A. (2019). The impacts of higher education institutions on sustainable development. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 20(1), 23–38.

- Flores-Aguilar, M., et al. (2023). University engagement in SDGs: Evidence from developing countries. *Sustainability*, 15(4), 2991.
- Gaventa, J. (2005). Reflections on the uses of the 'power cube'. *IDS Bulletin*, 37(6), 23–33.
- GlobeScan. (2016). *Sustainable Development Goals awareness survey report*.
- Griggs, D., Nilsson, M., Stevance, A., & McCollum, D. (2017). *A guide to SDG interactions*. International Council for Science.
- Gupta, J., & Vegelin, C. (2016). Sustainable development goals and inclusive development. *International Environmental Agreements*, 16(3), 433–448.
- Hestness, E., et al. (2021). Understanding sustainability awareness in higher education. *Environmental Education Research*, 27(5), 678–695.
- Jati, H., et al. (2019). Public awareness and SDG implementation. *Journal of Development Studies*, 55(6), 1234–1248.
- Klofsten, M., et al. (2019). The entrepreneurial university and SDGs. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 141, 119–128.
- Kumi, E. (2019). Stakeholder participation in development policy. *World Development*, 120, 243–255.
- Leal Filho, W., et al. (2018). SDGs and sustainability in universities. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 172, 232–241.
- Leal Filho, W., et al. (2019). Implementing SDGs in higher education. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 20(5), 875–898.
- Leal Filho, W., et al. (2021). SDG awareness and engagement in HEIs. *Sustainability*, 13(2), 555.
- Lim, M., Jørgensen, P., & Wyborn, C. (2018). Reframing the Sustainable Development Goals. *Nature Sustainability*, 1(10), 557–559.
- Morley, L. (2016). Troubling intra-actions: Gender, power, and leadership. *Higher Education*, 72(1), 109–125.
- Nalubiri, R. (2010). Participation and development outcomes. *Development Practice*, 20(3), 423–435.
- Nilsson, M., et al. (2018). Mapping interactions between SDGs. *Nature Sustainability*, 1(2), 65–73.
- OECD. (2017). *Measuring distance to the SDG targets*. OECD Publishing.
- OECD. (2020). *Education at a glance 2020*. OECD Publishing.
- QS World University Rankings. (2022). *Methodology report*.
- Reckien, D., et al. (2017). Climate change and sustainability pathways. *Nature Climate Change*, 7, 697–703.
- SDSN. (2020). *Sustainable development report*.
- SDSN. (2021). *Global SDG index report*.
- Sterling, S., & Huckle, J. (2014). *Education for sustainability*. Routledge.
- Times Higher Education. (2021). *Impact rankings methodology*.
- UNDP. (2019). *Human development report*.
- UNDP. (2020). *SDG integration report*.
- UNDP. (2021). *SDG awareness and implementation report*.
- UNESCO. (2016). *Education for people and planet*.
- UNESCO. (2019). *Global education monitoring report*.
- UNESCO. (2020). *Education for sustainable development report*.
- United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*.
- Velazquez, L., Munguia, N., & Sanchez, M. (2015). Deterring sustainability in higher education institutions. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 106, 1–10.
- Vo, T., et al. (2022). Awareness and sustainability engagement. *Sustainability Science*, 17(4), 1503–1515.
- Waas, T., Verbryggen, A., & Wright, T. (2010). University contributions to sustainable development. *Sustainability*, 2(6), 1774–1800.
- Wang, C., Geng, Y., & Rodríguez-Casallas, J. (2021). Sustainability transitions. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 278, 123870.
- Wohlgezogen, F., et al. (2020). Interdisciplinary SDG research. *Research Policy*, 49(6), 103964.
- World Bank. (2020). *Education statistics report*.
- World Bank. (2021). *World development report*.