



Strategic Social Media Use in Relation to Two Pastoral Outcomes in Eight Parishes of the Catholic Archdiocese of Nyeri

Charles Kinyua

Tangaza University, Kenya

Article History

Received: 22.06.2026

Revised: 10.10.2026

Accepted: 18.10.2026

Published: 20.10.2026

Keywords

Community

Intergenerational ministry

Social media

Utu

How to cite:

Kinyua, C. (2026). Strategic Social Media Use in Relation to Two Pastoral Outcomes in Eight Parishes of the Catholic Archdiocese of Nyeri. *Research Journal of Education, Teaching and Curriculum Studies*, 4(2), 82-95.

Abstract

Digital activity alone does not establish whether parish communication supports relationships across generations or community belonging. This study examined associations between parishioners' personal social media engagement, perceived parish digital practices and two distinct outcomes: intergenerational ministry and community building. An explanatory sequential mixed-methods design combined structured questionnaires from 389 parishioners with interviews involving 34 clergy and lay informants and 14 focus groups involving 105 youth and older parishioners. Eight parishes were selected through a multistage design, with one parish from each deanery and urban, peri-urban and rural settings represented. Frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations described responses. Two multiple linear regression models examined the outcome scores separately in the pooled survey sample; thematic analysis examined interviews and focus groups. The models accounted for 41.3% and 41.4% of variance in intergenerational ministry and community building scores, respectively. Strategic use had the largest reported standardised coefficient in each model ($\beta = .486$ and $.532$, respectively; $p < .001$). Church content interaction and perceived expression of Church life and values were also significant; general use frequency and digital confidence were not. Qualitative accounts emphasised communication continuity, shared generational responsibility and links between online participation and physical parish life. The findings inform a pastoral framework connecting purpose, reciprocal participation, accessible communication and accountable governance. Cross-sectional self-reports support associations rather than causal conclusions.

Copyright © 2026



Introduction

Mass livestreams, online prayer groups, homilies and parish notices extend religious communication beyond physical gatherings. Research on digital religion locates these practices within lived religious relationships, rather than treating technological adoption as evidence of stronger community (Campbell & Evolvi, 2020). Pandemic restrictions intensified questions about how digitally mediated participation relates to presence, belonging and sacramental life (Parish, 2020).



The Catholic Archdiocese of Nyeri provides a setting in which these questions intersect with urban, peri-urban and rural parish life. Its territory covers the whole of Nyeri County and part of Laikipia County (Archdiocese of Nyeri, n.d.-a). Participation therefore needs to be considered in relation to connectivity, device access, data affordability, language and opportunities for assistance. These are contextual conditions to examine, rather than evidence that all Kenyan parishioners share the same digital experience. Campbell's (2023) analysis of technological inaccessibility and reluctance as well as provides a comparative basis for examining such conditions.

Intergenerational ministry is operationalised here as shared worship, dialogue, mentorship, tradition sharing and trust across ages. Community building concerns recognition, connection, mutual support, parish identity and belonging. The outcomes are related but analysed separately. Utu situates these practices within recognition of the person and reciprocal responsibility (Nyoni & Rutalamulwa, 2024; Waitherero, 2021). This framing gives local relational meaning to the measures without assuming that every expression of African community is inclusive or that age alone determines a person's contribution.

In Nyeri, Small Christian Communities (SCCs) provide an established setting for communal prayer, catechesis and care; official parish descriptions document their role in parish life (Archdiocese of Nyeri, n.d.-c). Digital communication may support these existing relationships through prayer coordination, pastoral contact and shared service. The relevant question is how it connects with such relationships, including those of members with limited access, rather than whether digital participation can substitute for embodied Catholic worship (Parish, 2020).

Existing scholarship examines digital religious practice, institutional broadcasting, digital exclusion and intergenerational learning (Agyekum et al., 2023; Campbell, 2023; Campbell & Evolvi, 2020; Hodøl, 2021). These contributions leave a specific question for this Kenyan Catholic case: how do general platform use, Church-related engagement and perceived parish strategies relate to intergenerational ministry and community building when examined together? The practical problem is that online activity may circulate information without sustained dialogue, shared responsibility or inclusion. The study addresses this problem empirically without presuming a general failure of traditional communication or demonstrating widespread youth isolation.

RQ1: How are general social media use frequency, Church content interaction frequency, digital confidence, perceived expression of Church life and values, and strategic use associated with intergenerational ministry scores when considered together?

RQ2: How are general social media use frequency, Church content interaction frequency, digital confidence, perceived expression of Church life and values, and strategic use associated with community building scores when considered together?

RQ3: How do clergy, lay informants and focus group participants describe the practices and conditions that help explain the quantitative patterns?



Literature and theoretical framework

Digital religious communication and pastoral relationships

Campbell and Evolvi (2020) situate digital religion within emerging technologies, material practices and networked environments. Their account supports examining digital communication as part of parish relationships, participation and authority.

Hodøl (2021) found limited use of two-way communication among Norwegian churches, despite opportunities for dialogue. This is a comparative finding rather than a prediction about Kenya. Nyeri's communal parish structures may create opportunities for reciprocal engagement, but their existence does not establish that online channels actually realise those opportunities. Examining purposeful communication and generational participation allows this contextual question to remain empirical.

Receiving information differs from exchanging knowledge or working across generations (Gakahu, Barasa & Oruta, 2026). Relational communication may require invitations to contribute, inclusive moderation and shared parish tasks. Reach alone cannot establish reciprocity.

Campbell (2023) examines accessibility, experience and reluctance in churches' pandemic responses. These conditions affect who can benefit from religious communication and should be distinguished from the relational quality of participation.

Community and embodied parish relationships

Parish (2020) explores physical absence and virtual religious community during COVID-19. Her analysis connects technological adaptation with presence and belonging. Catholic digital communication must be considered alongside embodied worship, sacramental life, care and service.

Agyekum et al. (2023) examine online religious services, well-being and intergenerational learning in Ghana. Their work supports examining assistance across ages while leaving room for differences in church structures and social roles between Ghana and Kenya. In this study, the age categories are analytical groupings of adults, not equivalent claims about elderhood, authority or social status across African societies.

Utu as the primary relational framework

Utu offers an ethical interpretation of participation. Waitherero (2021) emphasises the human person and positive affirmation; Nyoni and Rutalamulwa (2024) connect dignity with interrelated life. Applied pastorally, these concerns ask whether communication recognises members and supports reciprocal involvement.

Seehawer (2023) places positive relationships and interdependence within Ubuntu scholarship. The comparison with Utu concerns relational responsibility; the two traditions are not treated as identical.

Young people's digital labour and older members' experience deserve recognition within shared ministry. Neither contribution is exclusive to an age group. A relational approach asks how different forms of knowledge can inform parish life.

Utu provides the primary normative framework: it asks whether digital ministry recognises persons and sustains reciprocal responsibility. Heidegger's philosophy of technology and Social Network Theory are



used as narrower interpretive resources, not as interchangeable epistemologies or an assertion that their ontologies are identical. Their roles are distinguished before applying them to the findings.

Technology and communication networks

Heidegger (1977) examines how technological thinking shapes what becomes visible and valuable. Enframing describes reality ordered as an available resource. Applied interpretively, it raises questions about viewing parishioners chiefly as audiences, content producers or numerical indicators.

Pastoral judgement asks what communication serves. Increased output may meet a need, but remains an incomplete aim unless connected with formation, care or shared participation. This distinction informs interpretation of general frequency and strategic use.

Social Network Theory considers relationships through which information and opportunities circulate. Granovetter (1973) offers a basis for examining connections across social circles. Catechists, association leaders and digitally active members may connect otherwise separated parish groups.

Heidegger's (1977) critique sensitises interpretation to the reduction of ministry to output and numerical visibility. Social Network Theory instead directs attention to the relationships through which communication circulates (Granovetter, 1973). General platform use need not create ties across generations, whereas Church-related interaction and purposeful shared activity may offer opportunities for such connections. These propositions guide interpretation of the quantitative pattern as well as the qualitative accounts; the survey does not directly measure network brokerage or enframing.

Method

Research design and setting

The explanatory sequential design combined survey analysis with subsequent interviews and focus groups. The latter explored communication, participation and institutional conditions. Integration compared reported associations with participants' experiences.

The study was conducted in Cathedral, Gatarakwa, Karatina, Mukurwe-ini, Nanyuki, Narumoru, Othaya and Tetu parishes. The Archdiocese of Nyeri covers the whole of Nyeri County and part of Laikipia County. Nanyuki Parish is within its Nanyuki Deanery, as confirmed by the Archdiocese's official parish directory (Archdiocese of Nyeri, n.d.-a, n.d.-b). Its location in Laikipia County therefore does not place it outside the study's ecclesiastical scope. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction and county boundaries are distinct.

Multistage cluster sampling selected one parish from each of the eight deaneries, followed by age-stratified selection within the sites. The selected sites comprised three urban parishes (Cathedral, Karatina and Nanyuki), three peri-urban parishes (Mukurwe-ini, Narumoru and Othaya), and two rural parishes (Gatarakwa and Tetu). Deanery coverage and varied settings broaden contextual coverage but do not establish statistical representativeness of every parish or parishioner in the Archdiocese.

Participants and data collection

The planned survey sample was 400; the final analytical sample comprised 389 respondents, equivalent to 97.25% of the target. This figure describes target attainment rather than a verified response rate. The analysis included adults aged 18 years and above who consented to participate. Youth were defined as



aged 18–35 years ($n = 192$); the comparative older-generation category was aged 36 years and above ($n = 197$). The latter category does not classify all its members as elderly.

Table 1 presents the achieved quantitative sample. The demographic and parish-location categories reproduce the reported survey distributions; they are separate summaries rather than a cross-tabulation of parish membership and location.

Table 1: Quantitative Participant Distribution

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Age	18–35 years	192	49.4
Age	36 years and above	197	50.6
Gender	Female	219	56.3
Gender	Male	170	43.7
Reported location	Urban	176	45.2
Reported location	Peri-urban	131	33.7
Reported location	Rural	82	21.1
Parish	Cathedral	50	12.9
Parish	Gatarakwa	37	9.5
Parish	Karatina	62	15.9
Parish	Mukurwe-ini	50	12.9
Parish	Nanyuki	50	12.9
Parish	Narumoru	46	11.8
Parish	Othaya	53	13.6
Parish	Tetu	41	10.5

Note. $N = 389$. Percentages are calculated within each characteristic and may not total 100 because of rounding. Source: Study survey.

Key informants were purposively selected for active parish membership, knowledge or use of parish social media, a relevant ministry or communication role, and consent to interview recording. Informants included clergy and people involved in catechesis, associations, SCCs, youth ministry, choirs and parish communication. These criteria sought informed accounts of parish practice rather than a statistically representative leadership sample.

The qualitative phase comprised 34 key informants and 105 focus group participants. Fourteen groups were conducted in seven parishes: seven youth groups and seven older-generation groups. Focus group participants comprised 46 youth and 59 older-generation members, including 60 women and 45 men. Key informants were distinct from focus group participants. Mukurwe-ini contributed five key informant interviews but no focus group; the achieved coverage is shown in Table 2.



Table 2: Qualitative Participants by Parish

Parish	Key informants	FGD participants	Total
Cathedral	6	15	21
Gatarakwa	5	13	18
Karatina	4	15	19
Mukurwe-ini	5	0	5
Nanyuki	4	18	22
Narumoru	2	16	18
Othaya	4	18	22
Tetu	4	10	14
Total	34	105	139

Note. FGD = focus group discussion. Fourteen focus groups were conducted in seven parishes. Source: Study interviews and focus groups.

A structured questionnaire recorded demographic characteristics, individual digital engagement and agreement with items on parish practices and pastoral relationships. KoboCollect supported electronic administration, including offline entry and respondent assistance. Key informant interviews and focus group discussions used guides addressing digital practices, generational relationships, belonging, leadership and pastoral priorities. Instruments were piloted outside the main sites.

Outcome and predictor measures

Intergenerational ministry was measured through eight agreement items covering shared ministries and worship, tradition sharing, safe discussion, dialogue, mentorship, belonging, trust and community across generations. Community building used six agreement items concerning recognition, connection, support, charity coordination, parish identity and trust. Responses ranged from 1, strongly disagree, to 5, strongly agree. The reported composite means were 3.67 for intergenerational ministry and 3.92 for community building.

Strategic use comprised five agreement items: social media planning, connections between online engagement and in-person participation, cultural and linguistic relevance, privacy and personal boundaries, and digital literacy provision. It therefore measures respondents' perceptions of several parish practices. It is not an externally audited assessment of an implemented strategic plan.

The two dependent variables were continuous composite scores for intergenerational ministry and community building. Strategic use was a composite predictor of perceived parish practices; general use frequency, Church content interaction frequency, digital confidence and Church life and values were individual-level single-item predictors. The measures therefore distinguish personal engagement from respondents' evaluations of institutional practice; they are not platform-specific causal estimates.

Four additional predictors were single-item measures. General social media use frequency and Church content interaction frequency distinguished overall platform use from engagement with religious



content. Digital confidence assessed respondents' confidence in using digital tools. Church life and values assessed how far social media was perceived to reveal Church life and values, with response categories from not at all to fully. This measure should not be interpreted as a direct test of personal faith, doctrinal knowledge or agreement between generations.

Table 3: Summary of Composite Measures

Measure	Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	α
Intergenerational ministry	8	3.67	0.69	.861
Community building	6	3.92	0.68	.856
Strategic use	5	3.67	0.71	.738

Note. $N = 389$. Agreement responses ranged from 1 to 5. α denotes Cronbach's internal consistency coefficient. Source: Study survey.

The internal consistency coefficients for the three multi-item scales are reported in Table 3. These coefficients support consistency within the reported scales but do not establish their discriminant validity. No alpha coefficient applies to a single-item measure. Some thematic overlap between predictor and outcome items remains important for interpreting the models.

Quantitative and qualitative analysis

Frequencies and percentages summarised categorical responses; means and standard deviations summarised scale and item scores. Spearman rank-order correlations examined bivariate relationships. Two multiple linear regression models used the pooled sample of 389 respondents, with the same five predictors and a separate continuous outcome in each model. Age groups described the sample; they were not the dependent variables. These models examined overall associations rather than differences in slopes between youth and older members. Age-specific effects would require stratified models or interaction terms, which were not estimated.

Coefficients describe conditional associations, not causal effects or validated forecasts. Standardised coefficients permit descriptive comparison within the models, but cannot establish intervention effectiveness. Their interpretation depends on coding, measurement and assumptions.

Thematic analysis followed Braun and Clarke (2006), with NVivo supporting transcript organisation. Interpretation first considered participants' accounts, then used Utu to examine recognition and reciprocity and the narrower technological and network perspectives to explore communication priorities and connections. Integration compared these themes with the regression patterns; it did not turn philosophical concepts into measured regression variables.

Ethical procedures

Ethical review was sought from Tangaza University's Institutional Ethics Review Committee, alongside research authorisation from the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation. Participants received information about the study, voluntary participation and withdrawal. Consent preceded data collection. Personal identifiers were removed, and access to stored data was restricted. The researcher's pastoral role made attention to voluntariness and the influence of institutional authority particularly relevant.



Results

Perceptions of parish digital practices

Respondents' ratings of strategic-use items varied (Table 4). Privacy and personal boundaries, cultural and linguistic relevance, and connections between online engagement and in-person participation were rated highest, while social media planning and digital literacy provision were rated lowest. These values describe respondents' perceptions, rather than an independent assessment of whether practices met a specified standard.

Digital literacy provision also showed the greatest dispersion. A combined 27.0% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the item. For social media planning, 28.3% were neutral. The pattern suggests that respondents' experience of planning and training was less consistently affirmative than their experience of relevance and boundaries.

Table 4: *Perceptions of Parish Digital Practices*

Practice	M	SD
Social media planning	3.46	0.96
Online engagement and in-person participation	3.82	1.00
Cultural and linguistic relevance	3.87	0.89
Privacy and personal boundaries	3.88	0.89
Digital literacy provision	3.33	1.26

Note. N = 389. Responses ranged from 1, strongly disagree, to 5, strongly agree. Source: Study survey.

Perceptions of the two outcomes were generally affirmative. The highest intergenerational ministry item mean was 3.82 for strengthening community and belonging for young and old; tradition and catechetical wisdom sharing had the lowest mean at 3.46. Community building item means ranged from 3.84 for networks and trust across age groups to 4.06 for feeling recognised and valued within the parish family. These findings point to favourable evaluations alongside areas where the reported experience was less strong.

Bivariate relationships

Intergenerational ministry and community building were positively correlated, $r_s = .588$, $p < .001$. The relationship is consistent with their shared emphasis on belonging and parish relationships, while leaving them as distinct measured outcomes. It does not show that one outcome produces the other.

Strategic use had the largest reported bivariate correlation among the five digital variables with each outcome: $r_s = .501$ for intergenerational ministry and $r_s = .566$ for community building. Church life and values correlated at .387 and .340, respectively. Church content interaction frequency had a correlation of .208 with each outcome. Digital confidence correlated at .202 with intergenerational ministry and .183 with community building. General use frequency showed correlations of .133 and .184.



The bivariate ordering therefore suggested stronger associations for perceived strategic practices and the expression of Church life and values than for general platform use. Regression analysis examined how the relationships appeared when the five predictors were considered together.

Regression results for intergenerational ministry

The intergenerational ministry model was statistically significant (Table 5). It accounted for approximately 41.3% of variation in the measured outcome within the sample. The proportion refers to variance in survey scores, not to a percentage improvement in ministry or the proportion of parishioners benefiting from social media.

Strategic use had the largest standardised coefficient, followed by Church life and values; Church content interaction frequency had a smaller significant coefficient (Table 5).

General use frequency was not significant after accounting for the other included predictors. Digital confidence was also not significant (Table 5). These results do not demonstrate that general use or confidence is irrelevant to ministry. They indicate that the measures did not show statistically significant conditional associations in this particular model.

Table 5: Regression Model for Intergenerational Ministry

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p
Constant	1.196	0.180	—	6.636	< .001
Social Media Use Frequency	−0.031	0.036	−.042	−0.853	.394
Church Content Interaction Frequency	0.073	0.027	.127	2.732	.007
Digital Confidence	0.003	0.029	.004	0.099	.922
Church Life and Values	0.156	0.029	.236	5.405	< .001
Strategic Use	0.476	0.042	.486	11.394	< .001

Note. $N = 389$. $R^2 = .413$; adjusted $R^2 = .405$; $F(5, 383) = 53.863$, $p < .001$. B = unstandardised coefficient; SE = standard error; β = standardised coefficient. Source: Study regression results; estimates retained without re-estimation.

Regression results for community building

The community building model was statistically significant (Table 6). It accounted for approximately 41.4% of variation in perceived community building scores. Substantial variation remained outside the variables included in the model.

Strategic use again had the largest standardised coefficient. Church content interaction frequency and Church life and values were also significant (Table 6).

General use frequency and digital confidence were not significant. The direction of these very small estimates should not be interpreted as evidence of harmful effects. The reported models instead show a similar pattern of conditional associations across the two outcomes.



Table 6: Regression Model for Community Building

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p
Constant	1.393	0.178	—	7.846	< .001
Social Media Use Frequency	-0.006	0.036	-.008	-0.163	.870
Church Content Interaction Frequency	0.087	0.026	.155	3.319	.001
Digital Confidence	-0.001	0.028	-.002	-0.043	.966
Church Life and Values	0.086	0.029	.131	3.020	.003
Strategic Use	0.514	0.041	.532	12.486	< .001

Note. $N = 389$. $R^2 = .414$; adjusted $R^2 = .407$; $F(5, 383) = 54.173$, $p < .001$. B = unstandardised coefficient; SE = standard error; β = standardised coefficient. Source: Study regression results; estimates retained without re-estimation.

The coefficient for Church life and values was larger in the intergenerational model, while Church content interaction frequency was somewhat larger in the community building model. These numerical differences are descriptive. No formal test comparing coefficients across models was reported, so they do not establish that the predictors operate differently between the two outcomes.

Qualitative findings on purposeful and sustained ministry

Participants regarded social media as a means of communicating faith beyond parish meetings, but also raised questions about how online activity connects with parish life. A youth participant expressed concern that comfort with online prayer and livestreaming could weaken physical fellowship. This was a participant perception; the study did not measure a causal effect of livestreaming on Mass attendance.

Consistency was a recurring issue. One participant described activity concentrated around major occasions:

“Church social media pages are very active during big events like Easter, Christmas, or a Feast Day, and then they go completely silent for months.”

Youth participant, focus group discussion

The account concerns continuity of parish communication, which individual general-use frequency does not measure. Participants valued routine sharing of Sunday readings, prayer and information between major events.

Participants sought identifiable, verifiable communication channels and clearer responsibility for accounts, content and oversight. Their accounts describe experienced governance, not an independently verified inventory of archdiocesan policy.

Resources and continuity were linked. Participants asked who would maintain communication systems, meet recurring costs and take responsibility when an individual volunteer or leader moved on. One association leader warned:

“It should not be something for one week only and then stop because people did not commit themselves.”



Parish association leader, focus group discussion

These concerns place continuity within institutional arrangements. Equipment and initial enthusiasm were not considered sufficient without sustained responsibility and resources.

Participants described younger members helping others with technology and seeking recognition of digital service. Catechists, association leaders and Small Christian Community coordinators could support generational contact. These accounts suggest collaboration without proving any programme's effectiveness.

Consent for images, confidentiality in prayer and protection of minors were safeguarding concerns. Appropriate language, responsible sharing and digital assistance contextualise the scale's emphasis on relevance, boundaries and capacity.

Discussion

The central finding is an association between perceived purposeful parish practice and two distinct pastoral outcomes, rather than evidence that social media exposure itself strengthens community. This accords with Campbell and Evolvi's (2020) account of digital religion as embedded in lived relationships. It also complements Hodøl's (2021) finding that church social media can prioritise broadcasting over dialogue: the Nyeri accounts identify continuity and shared responsibility as concerns, while the regression distinguishes Church-related interaction from general platform use. The settings and measures differ, so this is a conceptual comparison rather than a direct replication.

From a network perspective, frequent personal use may remain within existing age or friendship circles and need not connect parish generations. Church-related interaction and planned shared activities may offer opportunities for ties across these circles (Granovetter, 1973). This interpretation makes sense of the non-significant conditional coefficient for general use without claiming that network bridging was measured or caused the observed associations. The accounts of catechists, SCC coordinators and younger digital helpers suggest where such connecting roles could be investigated.

Strategic use brought together planning, relevance, privacy, literacy support and online-physical links. Its association is compatible with Parish's (2020) emphasis on the relationship between virtual and embodied religious community. In Nyeri, SCCs offer a concrete setting for connecting digital notices and prayer with visits, care and shared service. This local institutional setting extends the interpretation beyond an individual's online experience. However, overlapping participation items and common self-report may inflate associations, and the scale cannot identify which strategic component matters most.

The non-significant conditional coefficient for digital confidence does not contradict Campbell's (2023) account of exclusion. Confidence may concern entry into digital participation, while the outcomes concern its relational quality. Agyekum et al. (2023) also direct attention to intergenerational learning. The Nyeri accounts of younger members assisting others are consistent with the possibility that communal digital labour supports participation despite limited individual confidence. Within Utu, such assistance can express reciprocity and recognition. This is an interpretive hypothesis: mediation, access thresholds and age-specific dependence were not tested.

Utu thus provides the principal ethical criterion for assessing ministry: whether persons are recognised and can contribute reciprocally. Heidegger's (1977) critique helps question an exclusive reliance on



output and visibility, while the network perspective identifies the importance of connections across groups. Their contribution is differentiated rather than philosophically merged. Together, the interpretations suggest that digital religion in this African Catholic setting is sustained through existing communal structures, practical assistance and institutional responsibility, not simply through individual online intensity.

A framework for digital pastoral ministry

The findings inform an evidence-informed proposal requiring local evaluation. Four connected priorities organise it: define the pastoral purpose and intended participants; create reciprocal activities across generations; provide accessible routes to content and participation; and establish governance that sustains trust and continuity. These are proposed planning priorities rather than statistically validated intervention components.

Parishes can connect online prayer, formation and service coordination with SCC meetings, visits and shared ministries. Relevant languages, assistance with devices and feasible alternatives for members with limited access should accompany digital provision. Named responsibility for accounts, content approval, consent, safeguarding, recurring costs and succession supports continuity. Review should consider contributions, support and common participation alongside views and reactions; baseline and follow-up evidence would be needed to assess change.

Conclusion

In eight sampled parishes of the Catholic Archdiocese of Nyeri, strategic use, Church content interaction and perceived expression of Church life and values were associated with intergenerational ministry and community building. General use frequency and digital confidence were not significant conditional on the other included predictors. These findings concern two separately modelled perceptions of pastoral life in the pooled sample, rather than causal effects or differences between age groups.

The theoretical contribution is to locate digital pastoral participation within relational and institutional arrangements. Utu makes recognition and reciprocal responsibility central; Heidegger's critique questions technological visibility as the measure of ministry; the network perspective directs attention to connections across social circles. The case suggests a way to understand digital religion in the Global South through supported, communal participation while leaving the proposed mechanisms open to further testing.

Pastoral application therefore requires purposeful communication, reciprocal generational participation, accessible routes for members with differing capabilities, and governance safeguards that preserve trust and continuity. These priorities connect digital practice with embodied parish life and provide a framework for evaluation rather than a guarantee of transformation.

However, the cross-sectional survey cannot establish temporal ordering or causal effects. Parishioners who already experience stronger community may evaluate strategic practices more favourably, while unmeasured conditions may influence both. The study's post-COVID-19 setting does not constitute a before-and-after test of pandemic effects.

Self-reported measures collected in the same survey are vulnerable to common-method influences, socially desirable responses and overlapping interpretations. Reliability coefficients alone do not



establish that strategic use, intergenerational ministry and community building are sufficiently distinct constructs. Future work should examine measurement structure and supplement perceptions with observations of participation and communication practices.

Multicollinearity concerns warrant caution in interpreting relative coefficients. Tolerance or variance inflation factors and residual checks are needed to assess the final models; the available results do not establish that all regression assumptions were satisfied. Predictor coding and consistency across correlations, coefficients and fit statistics also require verification against the original statistical output. No diagnostic values or revised model estimates are introduced here.

Respondents were nested within eight parishes, while the reported models do not establish adjustment for parish-level dependence. Shared parish conditions could affect uncertainty estimates. Age, education, location and other potentially relevant variables were not included in these five-predictor models. The associations are conditional on the included variables, not adjusted estimates across all relevant social and institutional conditions.

Recruitment through parish structures and screening for prior digital use may underrepresent people who are completely excluded from digital communication or weakly connected to parish life. The achieved sample should therefore not be interpreted as representing every parishioner in the Archdiocese. Qualitative accounts add contextual depth but do not establish the prevalence of each concern.

The analytical sample was 11 below the target, and Mukurwe-ini had interviews but no focus group. These coverage gaps limit assessment of non-participation and reduce the balance of qualitative evidence across sites. The pooled models also do not test differences in associations between youth and older members. Future work should document recruitment outcomes and compare generational pathways using suitable interaction or stratified analyses.

Longitudinal parish programmes could evaluate the framework using baseline measures, follow-up and suitable comparisons. Further research should examine specific strategic practices, generational collaboration and limited-access members. Direct network data could test the connecting roles interpreted here.



References

- Agyekum, B., Ali, W., Asamoah, M. K., Namoo, M. Y., & Al Nasiri, N. (2023). Streaming religious services during a public health crisis: How digital religion shapes population well-being and intergenerational learning. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 26(9), 850-872. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2023.2268553>
- Archdiocese of Nyeri. (n.d.-a). *About ADN*. <https://www.adnyeri.org/about-adn>
- Archdiocese of Nyeri. (n.d.-b). *Parishes*. <https://www.adnyeri.org/parishes>
- Archdiocese of Nyeri. (n.d.-c). *St. Charles Lwanga Ngangarithi Catholic Parish*. <https://www.adnyeri.org/st-charles-lwanga-ngangarithi-catholic-parish>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>
- Campbell, H. A. (2023). When churches discovered the digital divide: Overcoming technological inaccessibility, hesitancy & digital reluctance during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Ecclesial Practices*, 10(1), 36-61. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22144417-bja10046>
- Campbell, H. A., & Evolvi, G. (2020). Contextualizing current digital religion research on emerging technologies. *Human Behaviour and Emerging Technologies*, 2(1), 5-17.
- Gakahu, N., Barasa, D., & Oruta, E. (2026). Assessing Digital Governance Initiatives and Equitable, Inclusive Service Delivery in Kenya: A Case of Kisumu, Busia and Kakamega Counties. (2026). *Eastern African Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 5(2), 343-355. <https://doi.org/10.58721/rxcmx649>
- Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6), 1360-1380. <https://doi.org/10.1086/225469>
- Heidegger, M. (1977). *The question concerning technology and other essays* (W. Lovitt, Trans.). Harper & Row.
- Hodøl, H.-O. (2021). What a friend we have in Facebook: Norwegian Christian churches' use of social media. *Journal of Media and Religion*, 20(3), 123-142.
- Nyoni, K. Z., & Rutalamulwa, V. E. (2024). Pedagogical perspectives of Utu: Reclaiming primacy of African values for moral-ethical for youth development in Tanzania. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 6(6), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2024.v06i06.29388>
- Parish, H. (2020). The absence of presence and the presence of absence: Social distancing, sacraments, and the virtual religious community during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Religions*, 11(6), Article 276. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel11060276>
- Seehawer, M. (2023). Research agendas in an Ubuntu paradigm. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in the South*, 7(1), 41-61. <https://doi.org/10.36615/sotls.v7i1.351>
- Waitherero, S. N. (2021). Philosophy of Utuism and its positive affirmation. *International Journal of Culture and Religious Studies*, 2(2), 41-61. <https://doi.org/10.47941/ijcrs.329>