
Empowering Communities through Participatory Educational Planning: A Review of Strategies and Outcomes

Sri Nurhayati*, Pawwaz Najmi Izzatillah, Tiaranissa Anindita, Desi Silitonga, Ipin Sutisna, M. Zenal Muttaqin, Yuyu Karimah, Rahma Nurhikmatussolihah, Eka Pelitawati, Neni Anggraeni, Rony Silalahi, Lim Fredy, Rita Sukarso, Zahrina Amalia, Yayang Siti Nurlia, Mochamad Ardioga

Program Studi Pendidikan Masyarakat, FIP, IKIP Siliwangi, Jl. Terusan Kebon Rumput, Cimahi, Indonesia 40521

*Corresponding Author: srinurhayati@ikipsiliwangi.ac.id

Article History

Received : June 16th, 2025

Revised : July 17th, 2025

Accepted : August 20th, 2025

Abstract: Participatory planning in community-based education is increasingly recognized as a critical strategy to advance equity, learner agency, and context-sensitive program development. This study systematically synthesizes empirical and theoretical literature to examine how participatory planning is conceptualized, implemented, and evaluated in diverse community education contexts. Using a systematic literature review, 35 peer-reviewed articles published between 2000 and 2025 were analyzed from Scopus database. Studies were selected based on defined inclusion criteria, and key data were thematically reviewed to identify patterns in participatory strategies, enabling conditions, and educational outcomes. The findings reveal that participatory planning enhances curricular relevance, democratic governance, and social inclusion, especially when embedded in authentic and culturally responsive processes. It aligns educational practices with community priorities, strengthens stakeholder collaboration, and fosters long-term program sustainability. However, its effectiveness is often constrained by structural challenges, including institutional rigidity, uneven power dynamics, and limited facilitator capacity. The review highlights that the success of participatory planning is context-dependent and relational, requiring deliberate adaptation and sustained institutional support. This study advances an integrative framework linking forms of participation with educational impact and contributes a cross-contextual synthesis to the literature. It affirms the potential of participatory planning to democratize education and calls for further research into digital innovations, long-term outcomes, and governance-sensitive implementation.

Keywords: participatory planning, community-based education, learner agency, educational governance

INTRODUCTION

Participatory planning within community-based education has garnered increasing prominence as a transformative strategy to foster educational equity, democratize decision-making, and enhance contextual relevance. Rooted in a diverse array of theoretical traditions—including Situational Strategic Planning, the Third Focus Approach, Cultural-Historical Activity Theory, and distributed leadership—this paradigm emphasizes participatory governance, social learning, and collective agency (Alexander & Hjortso, 2019). These frameworks argue for a shift from bureaucratic, hierarchical models of educational planning toward inclusive, dialogic, and

territorially grounded approaches that recognize the knowledge and agency of all stakeholders. As international educational discourse increasingly centers on lifelong learning, civic participation, and the Sustainable Development Goals, participatory planning provides an essential mechanism for bridging macro-level policies with micro-level community realities (Kennedy & Tilly, 2022).

The historical trajectory of community-based education underscores its deep entanglement with emancipatory pedagogy and transformative practice. Its origins in popular education movements, such as European folk schools and Latin American Freirean traditions, have laid the conceptual groundwork for participatory engagement as both an

epistemological and political act (Hasan & Nurhayati, 2012; Nurhayati, 2021; Rahmat et al., 2024; Zhang & Perkins, 2023). In contemporary applications, participatory methodologies—including Participatory Research, Participatory Action Research (PAR), and Participatory Design—have been employed across various educational levels and settings to center learner agency and cultivate co-responsibility in curriculum development and institutional governance (Ngwenya et al., 2021). These methods are further validated by real-world implementations such as collaborative school design projects in South Korea and peer-led health education initiatives in Canada, which demonstrate the capacity of participatory planning to generate context-sensitive and socially embedded educational interventions (Jung & Kim, 2024).

Top-down planning models, while effective in standardizing implementation and achieving rapid scalability, frequently disregard the cultural specificity, historical complexity, and lived experiences of local communities (Yoshida & van der Walt, 2018). In contrast, participatory approaches offer the promise of dialogic engagement and contextual responsiveness, yet they encounter persistent difficulties in achieving coherence across scales, ensuring sustained facilitation, and navigating institutional constraints. Hybrid planning frameworks, which aim to integrate the structural efficiencies of top-down systems with the adaptive capacities of participatory models, have been proposed as a viable pathway to balance these competing imperatives (Petko et al., 2015). Nevertheless, the success of such integrative efforts is contingent upon the availability of institutional support, the competencies of planning agents, and the establishment of enabling environments for inclusive governance (Hakiman & Sheely, 2025).

There is a notable absence of systematic analysis concerning how diverse communities conceptualize empowerment, make decisions, and navigate planning processes within their specific socio-political and cultural contexts (Natarajan & Hassan, 2024). Additionally, widespread deficits in facilitation skills, inadequate policy support, and the lack of institutionalized participatory mechanisms inhibit scalability and impact (Eshkol & Eshkol, 2017). While isolated successes exist, there is insufficient cross-contextual synthesis of participatory strategies and outcomes. Few

studies systematically compare participatory models across different governance environments, educational levels, or geographical regions. To address these shortcomings, this study conducts a systematic literature review of participatory planning in community-based education, spanning publications from 2010 to 2024. The review seeks to map the landscape of participatory approaches in adult, non-formal, and community education, analyzing how participation is conceptualized and practiced, the conditions under which it succeeds or fails, and the multi-dimensional outcomes it produces across educational, social, economic, and environmental domains. Drawing from interdisciplinary sources, the review captures empirical insights and theoretical innovations that have emerged in the last decade, with attention to both global trends and locally situated practices.

METHOD

This study employed a systematic literature review (SLR) to examine the conceptualizations, strategies, and impacts of participatory planning within community-based education contexts. The SLR methodology was selected for its capacity to integrate dispersed empirical findings and theoretical insights across the fields of education, public policy, and community development. It supports the identification of patterns, gaps, and conceptual advancements in a structured and replicable manner (Iswahyudi et al., 2023; Nurhayati, Kurnianta, et al., 2024). The review was conducted through a structured search of Scopus as a major academic database. These databases were chosen for their comprehensive coverage of scholarly publications in education and related disciplines. Keyword combinations included “participatory planning,” “community-based education,” “non-formal education,” “adult learning,” and “collaborative planning,” employing Boolean operators and truncation techniques (e.g., *participat**, *educat**) to capture a wide range of relevant publications. The search was limited to English-language peer-reviewed articles published between 2000 and 2025 to ensure topical relevance.

Studies were eligible for inclusion if they (1) were peer-reviewed, (2) addressed participatory planning or community engagement in education, and (3) presented empirical findings

or systematic theoretical models. Excluded materials included opinion pieces, conference abstracts, editorial notes, and studies focused exclusively on formal schooling without reference to non-formal or community-based participation. From an initial pool of 476 articles, 410 remained after de-duplication. A subsequent screening of titles and abstracts yielded 96 articles for full-text review. After applying the inclusion criteria, 35 studies were selected for final analysis. Key variables were extracted from each article using a standardized protocol, including publication details, country of study, research design, participatory strategy, stakeholder involvement, and documented outcomes. The analysis employed an inductive thematic approach guided by Braun and Clarke's (2006) framework. Coding was performed manually, allowing for close engagement with the material and iterative refinement of emerging themes. Three core analytical dimensions structured the synthesis: (1) the typologies and intensities of participation; (2) enabling and limiting contextual conditions; and (3) the educational, social, economic, and environmental outcomes associated with participatory processes. Emphasis was placed on the relational dynamics between participatory design and observed programmatic impacts. Analytical rigor was enhanced through peer-based triangulation, wherein interpretations were reviewed and discussed among multiple researchers to minimize bias and increase reliability. Each included study underwent a quality appraisal using an adapted version of the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) checklist, focusing on research clarity, methodological coherence, validity of findings, and depth of reflexivity. Only studies meeting minimum quality benchmarks were retained in the synthesis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This systematic review elucidates the complex, multidimensional impacts of participatory planning within community-based educational contexts, highlighting its potential to generate transformative outcomes across pedagogical, social, economic, environmental, and institutional domains. These impacts, however, are not the mere result of participatory structures alone; rather, they are contingent upon the quality, inclusiveness, and contextual

integration of participatory engagement. In the educational dimension, participatory planning has demonstrably increased pedagogical relevance, accessibility, and learner engagement. Empirical evidence supports the notion that community-informed curriculum development and pedagogical strategies are more responsive to local epistemologies and learner realities (Wood & McAteer, 2023). The implementation of Participatory Action Research (PAR) frameworks, such as the Community Research Fellows Training (CRFT), has not only improved learning outcomes but also deepened participant agency and cognitive engagement (McGowan et al., 2015). Similarly, decentralized school governance models in South Asia have led to measurable increases in enrollment and reductions in dropout rates (Mozumder & Halim, 2006), while programs like GEAR UP in the United States have effectively integrated familial and communal aspirations into postsecondary preparation (Jenkins & Bolshakova, 2024).

The social ramifications of participatory planning are equally significant. Methodologies such as the Concerns Report Method (CRM) have facilitated grassroots agenda-setting and civic empowerment (Arellano et al., 2015). Broader participatory architectures have strengthened community networks, increased ownership over local initiatives, and improved civic solidarity (Newell et al., 2020). Participatory urban design projects in Canadian contexts exemplify how community agency can be institutionalized through inclusive governance structures (Nasca et al., 2019). Comparable results have been documented in Latin America, where participatory elements in Social Investment Funds (SIFs) correlated with higher community engagement, enhanced institutional trust, and improved educational access (Heinrich & Lopez, 2009). Economically, the integration of community voices within educational planning has catalyzed collective efficacy and broader social development. Evidence from Bangladesh illustrates that participatory school management simultaneously advances educational equity and socio-economic mobility (Mozumder & Halim, 2006). In parallel, SIF-based interventions have shown that community-driven planning enhances the legitimacy and uptake of public service provisions, laying foundations for localized economic empowerment (Heinrich & Lopez, 2009). Environmental sustainability has also benefited from participatory educational

planning. Localized planning processes in Canada have incorporated community input to shape spatial and environmental design, resulting in increased investment and long-term stewardship (Newell et al., 2020). Children's involvement in urban safety initiatives in South Korea further illustrates how participatory methodologies can foster ecological awareness and civic responsibility from an early age (Jung & Kim, 2024).

Regarding learning outcomes, community engagement has emerged as a foundational enabler of academic persistence and achievement. Trust among educators, families, and community actors is consistently identified as a precondition for improved literacy and numeracy (Fauzi & Nurhayati, 2025; Ibrahim et al., 2018; Kobayashi & Ogawa, 2025; Nur'aeni et al., 2023). Participatory school governance—via School Management Committees and Parent-Teacher Associations—has demonstrably improved educational performance in under-resourced settings (Álvarez-Álvarez, 2017; Latif et al., 2023; Nurhayati et al., 2023; Suharyat et al., 2023). Supplementary teaching models, community-led tutoring, and volunteerism in African contexts have also yielded significant learner gains (Khairunnisa et al., 2024; Prastowo et al., 2025; Ratnawulan et al., 2025; Sanfo, 2020; Taniguchi & Hirakawa, 2016).

From a design perspective, participatory co-creation methods—such as PAR, co-design, and collaborative curriculum development—have facilitated psychological empowerment, learner motivation, and iterative innovation (Ding et al., 2024; Quinn, 2015; Tuhkala, 2021), 2021; Quinn, 2015; Ding et al., 2024). Teacher participation in instructional design has enhanced pedagogical alignment, increased professional efficacy, and supported sustainable practice, particularly within Professional Learning Communities (Law et al., 2017; Munggarani et al., 2025; Musa et al., 2024; Musa & Nurhayati, 2024; Nurhayati & Musa, 2025; Suwartono et al., 2025). Digital inclusion efforts—ranging from accessible platforms and gamified participation tools to youth-led design sprints—have been instrumental in bridging equity gaps (Dindler et al., 2024; Wakil & Dalsgaard, 2013). Sustainability of participatory efforts is enabled by institutional adaptability, stakeholder integration, and iterative learning structures. PLA frameworks provide flexible architectures for continual feedback and local knowledge

integration (Labbé et al., 2015; Makrakis & Kostoulas-Makrakis, 2023; Subakti et al., 2022). Effective participatory models are increasingly augmented by ICT tools, system dynamics simulations, and multilevel facilitation structures to respond to institutional complexity (Shange et al., 2025; Stave et al., 2019). The role of multi-sectoral alliances—including universities, state actors, and civil society—has proven critical in sustaining educational initiatives and scaling participatory innovations (Leal Filho et al., 2025; Singha, 2024). Within adult learning contexts, participatory planning has reinforced mutuality, critical inquiry, and adaptive expertise. The integration of participatory scenario planning (PSP) and Youth Participatory Action Research (YPAR) has promoted transformative praxis among marginalized populations, enabling them to influence programmatic and policy-level changes (Giovanelli et al., 2020). Participatory design environments have enhanced adult educators' reflective and inclusive teaching practices, fostering equitable learning conditions (Ngwenya et al., 2021; Nurhayati, 2024; Nurhayati, Tersta, et al., 2024; Ratnawulan et al., 2025; Safuri et al., 2022; Tiarawati et al., 2023).

Nonetheless, the literature reveals persistent structural and procedural barriers. Power asymmetries within communities, differential facilitator capacities, and institutional inertia often constrain the effectiveness of participatory initiatives (Hakiman & Sheely, 2025; Nasca et al., 2019). Additionally, access to digital technologies and inclusive design methods remains uneven, disproportionately excluding low-literate or technologically marginalized populations (Ahmad et al., 2024; Kalenda et al., 2022; Nurhayati et al., 2025; Susanti & Nurhayati, 2024). The reviewed corpus substantiates that participatory planning—when contextually embedded, equitably facilitated, and institutionally supported—can generate robust educational and developmental outcomes. Crucially, it is the depth, deliberativeness, and adaptiveness of community involvement—not its nominal presence—that determines the transformative potential of such planning frameworks. These findings constitute the empirical and conceptual foundation for subsequent theoretical elaboration and policy innovation aimed at advancing sustainable, community-responsive education systems.

Discussion

This systematic review synthesizes a growing body of empirical and theoretical work affirming that participatory planning constitutes a dynamic, multifactorial approach capable of reshaping the landscape of community-based education. The review reveals that the realization of participatory benefits—across educational, social, economic, environmental, and institutional dimensions—is predicated upon context-specific conditions, the quality of facilitation, stakeholder alignment, and the adaptability of supporting institutions. These findings corroborate conceptual models positioning participatory engagement as contingent rather than deterministic.

Crucially, the literature underscores the pedagogical efficacy of participatory planning through its capacity to enhance curricular relevance and learner agency. By incorporating community-driven epistemologies and centering local knowledge, participatory approaches interrupt traditional, technocratic modes of educational delivery (Wood & McAteer, 2023). These insights lend empirical support to theoretical frameworks advanced by Freire (1970) which conceptualize participation not solely as a procedural mechanism but as an epistemic and political reorientation. Within this paradigm, participatory education emerges as both an emancipatory praxis and a vector for epistemological justice.

Socially, the review elucidates how participatory frameworks function as vehicles for cultivating civic trust, solidarities, and community cohesion. Participatory methodologies, when enacted with fidelity, deepen social capital and amplify community agency (Arellano et al., 2015; Newell et al., 2020). Empirical evidence from disparate geographies—including Honduras, Canada, and Uganda—consistently demonstrates that communities engaged substantively in planning processes exhibit heightened commitment to educational investment and stronger accountability mechanisms (Heinrich & Lopez, 2009; Kobayashi & Ogawa, 2025; Nasca et al., 2019). However, these outcomes are highly sensitive to the integrity of participation. Superficial or symbolic engagement often reproduces disaffection and institutional mistrust. Equally significant is the role of design infrastructure and leadership modalities in mediating participatory success. Studies centered

on Participatory Learning and Action (PLA) and ICT-mediated planning frameworks reveal that sustained and meaningful participation necessitates institutional architectures capable of iterative engagement, local adaptation, and multi-stakeholder coordination (Makrakis & Kostoulas-Makrakis, 2023; Stave et al., 2019). This is particularly salient within adult learning environments, where heterogeneity in learner biographies, constraints, and expectations calls for high relational competence and context-sensitivity in planning processes (Ngwenya et al., 2021).

The literature further identifies trust and power as pivotal mediating constructs in participatory processes. Across nearly all studies, trust emerges not only as a prerequisite but also as a product of participatory interaction (Ibrahim et al., 2018). However, endemic asymmetries—whether along lines of class, gender, or institutional authority—frequently compromise the equitable distribution of voice and influence. This reinforces the critical facilitative function, whereby planners are required to surface and navigate power differentials, engineer deliberative spaces, and foster authentic stakeholder dialogue. Despite the evidentiary richness of current literature, several epistemological and methodological lacunae persist. First, longitudinal evaluations examining the sustainability of participatory interventions are sparse, limiting our understanding of long-term impact. Second, there remains a dearth of integrative mixed-methods studies capable of triangulating qualitative narratives with quantitative measures such as learning outcomes, empowerment indices, or institutional responsiveness. Third, the implications of digital participation—especially in contexts marked by infrastructural scarcity—are underexplored (Ampatzidou et al., 2018; Wakil & Dalsgaard, 2013). These limitations suggest fertile ground for future investigation. A recurrent tension within the reviewed literature pertains to the dialectic between local autonomy and external facilitation. While endogenous leadership enhances ownership and cultural fit, it frequently necessitates exogenous resources, technical expertise, or legitimating alliances. The emergence of hybrid governance models—balancing grassroots agency with cross-sectoral collaboration—offers a pragmatic response, yet also invites critical scrutiny concerning

dependency and cooptation (Leal Filho et al., 2025; Singha, 2024).

Taken holistically, this review positions participatory planning as a non-linear, negotiated, and contextually inflected practice. Its efficacy is not attributable to formulaic application but to the strategic orchestration of cultural resonance, institutional flexibility, facilitative capacity, and iterative learning. The geographic and sectoral heterogeneity of the studies—from rural education initiatives in Malawi to urban design processes in North America—illuminate both the plasticity and contextual boundedness of participatory approaches. Future scholarship must therefore engage with the political economy of participation, critically examine digital tools for democratic engagement, and develop robust evaluative frameworks that capture the dialectics of process and impact. The transformative promise of participatory planning in community-based education is empirically substantiated yet pragmatically constrained. Its potential to democratize learning, redistribute epistemic authority, and scaffold contextually grounded knowledge production is clear. However, realizing this potential demand institutional willingness, theoretical sophistication, and an ethical commitment to shared ownership and reflexive practice in educational design.

CONCLUSION

This study synthesizes current literature on participatory planning in community-based education, demonstrating its potential to enhance curricular relevance, learner agency, social cohesion, and sustainability when tailored to local contexts and supported by inclusive facilitation. These outcomes depend on the authenticity and depth of stakeholder engagement, rather than the participatory model alone. Rather than a fixed model, participatory planning is a flexible, context-responsive practice shaped by institutional, political, and cultural dynamics. Its effectiveness hinges on skilled facilitation, institutional commitment, and shared decision-making. Persistent challenges—including power imbalances and weak policy frameworks—continue to limit its transformative potential. This review contributes an integrative framework linking participation levels to educational outcomes and offers cross-contextual insights to inform practice. It also addresses the

fragmentation in participatory planning literature by unifying diverse empirical findings. Future research should examine the long-term effects of participatory approaches, assess digital engagement tools, and explore implementation across varied governance settings. The study affirms that participatory planning remains a vital mechanism for democratizing education and advancing inclusive, community-driven reform.

REFERENSI

- Ahmad, S. M., Nurhayati, S., & Kartika, P. (2024). Literasi Digital Pada Anak Usia Dini: Urgensi Peran Orang Tua dalam Menyikapi Interaksi Anak dengan Teknologi Digital. *Kiddo: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam Anak Usia Dini*, 5(1).
- Alexander, I. K., & Hjortsø, C. N. (2019). Sources of complexity in participatory curriculum development: an activity system and stakeholder analysis approach to the analyses of tensions and contradictions. *Higher Education*, 77(2), 301–322. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-018-0274-x>
- Álvarez-Álvarez, C. (2017). The improvement of community participation in school with interactive groups. *Revista Complutense de Educacion*, 28(3), 809–822. https://doi.org/10.5209/rev_RCED.2017.v28.n3.49857
- Ampatzidou, C., Gugerell, K., Constantinescu, T., Devisch, O., Jauschneg, M., & Berger, M. (2018). All work and no play? Facilitating serious games and gamified applications in participatory urban planning and governance. *Urban Planning*, 3(1), 34–46. <https://doi.org/10.17645/up.v3i1.1261>
- Arellano, R., Balcazar, F. E., Alvarado, F., & Suarez, S. (2015). A participatory action research method in a rural community of Mexico. *Universitas Psychologica*, 14(4), 1197–1208. <https://doi.org/10.11144/Javeriana.upsy14-4.parm>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Dindler, C., Iversen, O. S., Kanstrup, K. H., Van Mechelen, M., & Wagner, M.-L. (2024).

- Participatory Design Sprints-Employing PD Principles in a Condensed Format. *ACM International Conference Proceeding Series*, 2, 93–97. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3661455.3669876>
- Ding, S., Smith, J. B., Garrett, S., & Magerko, B. (2024). Redesigning EarSketch for Inclusive CS Education: A Participatory Design Approach. *Proceedings of ACM Interaction Design and Children Conference: Inclusive Happiness, IDC 2024*, 720–724. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3628516.3659383>
- Eshkol, B., & Eshkol, A. (2017). Participatory planning in Israel: from theory to practice. *Journal of Place Management and Development*, 10(3), 213–239. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPM-D-2016-0042>
- Fauzi, E. R., & Nurhayati, S. (2025). THE ROLE OF MANAGEMENT OF COMMUNITY READING GARDEN (TBM) TO INCREASING THE MOTIVATION OF ADULTS TO READ WITH AN ANDRAGOGICAL APPROACH. *Empowerment: Jurnal Ilmiah Program Studi Pendidikan Luar Sekolah*, 14(1), 69–74.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Giovanelli, A., Ozer, E. M., & Dahl, R. E. (2020). Leveraging Technology to Improve Health in Adolescence: A Developmental Science Perspective. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 67(2), S7–S13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2020.02.020>
- Hakiman, K., & Sheely, R. (2025). Unlocking the Potential of Participatory Planning: How Flexible and Adaptive Governance Interventions Can Work in Practice. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 60(1), 43–80. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12116-023-09415-x>
- Hasan, E. S., & Nurhayati, S. (2012). Pendidikan luar sekolah dan pembangunan manusia Indonesia. *Empowerment: Jurnal Ilmiah Program Studi Pendidikan Luar Sekolah*, 1(1).
- Heinrich, C. J., & Lopez, Y. (2009). Does Community Participation Produce Dividends in Social Investment Fund Projects? *World Development*, 37(9), 1554–1568. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2009.01.009>
- Ibrahim, M., Lawal, N., & Sylla, F. S. (2018). Improving reading and numeracy outcomes in Nigeria through strategic trust building. *Childhood Education*, 94(3), 25–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00094056.2018.1475700>
- Iswahyudi, M. S., Wulandari, R., Samsuddin, H., Sukowati, I., Nurhayati, S., Makrus, M., Amalia, M. M., Faizah, H., Febianingsih, N. P. E., & others. (2023). *Buku Ajar Metodologi Penelitian*. PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia. <https://buku.sonpedia.com/2023/09/buku-ajar-metodologi-penelitian.html>
- Jenkins, A. R., & Bolshakova, V. L. J. (2024). Extending a Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) Approach to Understanding and Addressing Postsecondary Awareness and Access. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 28(2), 189–200. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85199324157&partnerID=40&md5=c59f73d8f98650ff92577a751bbd8b83>
- Jung, B.-K., & Kim, D. (2024). Children as Key Actors in Participatory Planning: Co-Working Experience of Community Planning for Walking Safety Around Bongrae Elementary School in South Korea. *Planning Theory and Practice*, 25(3), 321–351. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2024.2363790>
- Kalenda, J., Vaculíková, J., & Kočvarová, I. (2022). Barriers to the participation of low-educated workers in non-formal education. *Journal of Education and Work*, 35(5), 455–469. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13639080.2022.2091118>
- Kennedy, M., & Tilly, C. (2022). Field Education and Community-Based Planning in a Worst-Case Scenario. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 42(4), 679–689. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X19847725>
- Khairunnisa, S. M., Nurhayati, S., Elshap, D. S., & others. (2024). Optimalisasi Peran Masjid Sebagai Pusat Pendidikan

- Masyarakat Di Tengah Pandemi Di Masjid Al Ihsan Pos Kulon Desa Kertamulya Kecamatan Padalarang Kabupaten Bandung Barat. *Comm-Edu (Community Education Journal)*, 7(1), 18–30.
- Kobayashi, T., & Ogawa, K. (2025). Community and parental participation in Ugandan public primary education: A mixed-method analysis. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2025.103225>
- Labbé, J., Dewey, C. E., Weber, L. J., McIntyre, J., Hoekstra, K., & Klapwyk, C. (2015). Strategic planning through a participatory learning and action framework: a Kenyan study. *Development in Practice*, 25(2), 277–287. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09614524.2015.1000828>
- Latif, M. A., Amir, R., Marzuki, K., Gaffar, F., & Nurhayati, S. (2023). Kolaborasi Strategis Lembaga PAUD dan Orang Tua di Era Digital melalui Program Parenting. *Jurnal Obsesi: Jurnal Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini*, 7(3), 3169–3180. <https://doi.org/10.31004/obsesi.v7i3.4485>
- Law, E. L.-C., Edlin-White, R., & Heintz, M. (2017). Let voices of both teachers and students on the development of educational technologies be heard. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (Including Subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, 10474 LNCS, 422–427. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-66610-5_37
- Leal Filho, W., Sigahi, T. F. A. C., Anholon, R., Rebelatto, B. G., Schmidt-Ross, I., Hensel-Börner, S., Franco, D., Treacy, T., & Brandli, L. L. (2025). Promoting sustainable development via stakeholder engagement in higher education. *Environmental Sciences Europe*, 37(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12302-025-01101-0>
- Makrakis, V., & Kostoulas-Makrakis, N. (2023). A Participatory Curriculum Approach to ICT-Enabled Education for Sustainability in Higher Education. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 15(5). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15053967>
- McGowan, L. D., Stafford, J. D., Thompson, V. L., Johnson-Javois, B., & Goodman, M. S. (2015). Quantitative evaluation of the community research fellows training program. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 3(JUL). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2015.00179>
- Mozumder, P., & Halim, N. (2006). Social capital fostering human capital: The role of community participation in primary school management in Bangladesh. *Journal of International Development*, 18(2), 151–162. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jid.1184>
- Munggarani, F., Nurhayati, S., & Taufikin, T. (2025). Emotional Resilience and Mindfulness in Educators: Insights into Stress, Well-Being, and Perceived Training Needs. *JURNAL DIMENSI*, 14(1), 171–183.
- Musa, S., & Nurhayati, S. (2024). Educators’ Resilience Amidst Digital Era Challenges: Case Study in Indonesia. *Journal of Electrical Systems*, 20(4s), 832–840. <https://doi.org/10.52783/jes.2121>
- Musa, S., Suherman, A. M., Sujarwo, S., & Nurhayati, S. (2024). Continuous Professional Growth: A Study Of Educators’ Commitment To Lifelong Learning. *Jurnal Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 43(2), 502–512. <https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v43i2.66654>
- Nasca, T. F., Changfoot, N., & Hill, S. D. (2019). Participatory planning in a low-income neighbourhood in Ontario, Canada: Building capacity and collaborative interactions for influence. *Community Development Journal*, 54(4), 622–642. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsy031>
- Natarajan, L., & Hassan, S. (2024). 9DF: a nine-dimensional framework for community engagement. *Town Planning Review*, 95(3), 283–306. <https://doi.org/10.3828/tpr.2024.8>
- Newell, R., Picketts, I., & Dale, A. (2020). Community systems models and development scenarios for integrated planning: Lessons learned from a participatory approach. *Community Development*, 51(3), 261–282. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2020.1772334>
- Ngwenya, N., Makoelle, T. M., & van der Merwe, M. (2021). Participatory Action Research as Change Strategy: A Case of Developing Inclusive Teaching and Learning Practices in an Adult Education

- Centre in Gauteng East District of South Africa. *Interchange*, 52(3), 393–414. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10780-021-09435-3>
- Nur'aeni, R., Nurhayati, S., & Ansori, A. (2023). Enhancing Community Literacy Through Community Engagement Strategy: A Descriptive Study In Community Reading Park. *Empowerment: Jurnal Ilmiah Program Studi Pendidikan Luar Sekolah*, 12(2), 112–122.
- Nurhayati, S. (2021). *Pendidikan Masyarakat Menghadapi Digitalisasi*. El-Markazi.
- Nurhayati, S. (2024). Digital literacy in adult continuing education: implementation, best practices, and emerging trends. *Novateur Publications*, 1(1), 9–18. <https://novateurpublication.org/index.php/np/article/view/237>
- Nurhayati, S., Kurnianta, P. D. M., & Anggraeni, A. F. (2024). *Pengantar Karya Tulis Ilmiah*. PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia.
- Nurhayati, S., & Musa, S. (2025). Teaching With Purpose: Indonesian Educators' Response to The Challenges of Society 5.0. *International Conference on Research in Education and Science, ISTES*, 360–372. <https://www.scopus.com/record/display.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85217702992&origin=resultslist>
- Nurhayati, S., Qudsi, N. A., Rukanda, N., & Fitri, A. (2023). Parents-School Strategic Collaborations in Early Childhood School From-Home Learning During the Pandemic. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 15(1), 964–971. <https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v15i1.2605>
- Nurhayati, S., Taufikin, T., Judijanto, L., & Musa, S. (2025). Towards Effective Artificial Intelligence-Driven Learning in Indonesian Child Education: Understanding Parental Readiness, Challenges, and Policy Implications. *Educational Process International Journal*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2025.15.155>
- Nurhayati, S., Tersta, F. W., Karwanto, K., Mintarsih, M., Jasiah, J., Sulaiman, S., Mustapa, N., Sari, I. N., & Djamil, M. M. N. (2024). *Buku Ajar Pendidikan Orang Dewasa*.
- Petko, D., Egger, N., Cantieni, A., & Wespi, B. (2015). Digital media adoption in schools: Bottom-up, top-down, complementary or optional? *Computers and Education*, 84, 49–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2014.12.019>
- Prastowo, G. E. D., Nurhayati, S., & Fitriana, W. (2025). Entrepreneurship Education and Community Empowerment in Islamic Boarding School: Lessons from a Sustainable Sheep Farming Initiative. *Jurnal Ilmiah Profesi Pendidikan*, 10(1), 778–788.
- Quinn, S. (2015). Collaborative learning design in the middle school: Sculpting 21st century learners. *International Journal of Learning*, 22(1), 31–51. <https://doi.org/10.18848/1447-9494/cgp/v22/48747>
- Rahmat, A., Sutisna, A., Nurhayati, S., Hamdan, A., & Kuswantono, S. (2024). *Konsep Dasar Pendidikan Masyarakat*. Ideas Publisher.
- Ratnawulan, S., Nurhayati, S., Taufikin, Lotfi, F. Z., & Olugbade, D. (2025). Leveraging Digital Technology to Strengthen Adult Education and Engagement in Islamic Study Group (Majlis Ta'lim). *Journal of Education Research*, 6(1), 79–89. <https://doi.org/10.37985/jer.v6i1.2280>
- Safuri, M., Muhyiddin, Y., & Nurhayati, S. (2022). Agriculturally based Equivalent Education: Insights on Nonformal Education Human Resources and Program Quality. *Journal of Human, Earth, and Future*, 3(4), 441–451. <https://doi.org/10.28991/HEF-2022-03-04-04>
- Sanfo, M. B. J.-B. (2020). Leaving no place behind: Community participation and primary school students' learning achievements in Burkina Faso's small-scale gold mining communities. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 1. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2020.100010>
- Shange, H. S., Zogli, L.-K. J., & Dlamini, B. I. (2025). Green campus initiatives and strategies for sustainability in higher education. *Transformation in Higher Education*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.4102/the.v10i0.364>

- Singha, S. (2024). Engaging stakeholders for a sustainable future: Catalysts of green economy and renewable energy transitions. In *Green Economy and Renewable Energy Transitions for Sustainable Development* (pp. 208–223). <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-1297-1.ch012>
- Stave, K., Dwyer, M., & Turner, M. (2019). Exploring the value of participatory system dynamics in two paired field studies of stakeholder engagement in sustainability discussions. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 36(2), 156–179. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sres.2576>
- Subakti, H., Hendrowati, T. Y., Muhyiddin Tamimi, T., Roihani, D., Tamam, B., Hayat, M., Sholeh, R. M., Mustari, M., Ramadanti, I., Setyaningsih, R., Nurhayati, S., & Hendrawati, T. (2022). *Perencanaan Pendidikan Islam*. Media Sains Indonesia.
- Suharyat, Y., Nurhayati, S., Januliawati, D., Haryono, P., Muthi, I., & Zubaidi, M. (2023). Tantangan Pemberdayaan Orang Tua dalam Meningkatkan Mutu Layanan PAUD Era Digital. *Jurnal Obsesi : Jurnal Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini*, 7(1), 406–415. <https://doi.org/10.31004/obsesi.v7i1.3827>
- Susanti, M., & Nurhayati, S. (2024). Exploring Digital Literacy Usage For Self-Directed Learning: Rural Adolescents' Perspectives. *Jurnal Visi Ilmu Pendidikan*, 16(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.26418/jvip.v16i1.67216>
- Suwartono, T., Nurhayati, S., Mustari, M., & Erlawati, E. (2025). The adaptability and resilience of Indonesian EFL teachers during emergency online education. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*, 9(2), 1071–1081.
- Taniguchi, K., & Hirakawa, Y. (2016). Dynamics of community participation, student achievement and school management: the case of primary schools in a rural area of Malawi. *Compare*, 46(3), 479–502. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2015.1038500>
- Tiarawati, P. V., Nurhayati, S., Hidayah, S. N., & Boriboon, G. (2023). Blended Learning Approach Implementation to Improve Adults' Tahsin Ability in the Digital Era. *Cendekia: Jurnal Kependidikan Dan Kemasyarakatan*, 21(2), 180–196. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.21154/cendekia.v21i2.7111>
- Tuhkala, A. (2021). A systematic literature review of participatory design studies involving teachers. *European Journal of Education*, 56(4), 641–659. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12471>
- Wakil, N., & Dalsgaard, P. (2013). A Scandinavian approach to designing with children in a developing country - Exploring the applicability of participatory methods. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (Including Subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, 8117 LNCS(PART 1), 754–761. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-40483-2_53
- Wood, L., & McAteer, M. (2023). The affordances of PAR for a school-community partnership to enhance learner support in socio-economically challenged communities. *Action Research*, 21(1), 62–80. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14767503211023133>
- Yoshida, K., & van der Walt, J. L. (2018). The policy-implementation-results linkage for education development and aid effectiveness in the Education 2030 era. *Compare*, 48(1), 39–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2017.1283583>
- Zhang, Y., & Perkins, D. D. (2023). Toward an Empowerment Model of Community Education in China. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 73(1), 21–39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07417136211062252>