SWARNA
Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat
ejournal.45mataram.ac.id/index.php/swarna

Vol. 5, No. 10 October 2026
e-ISSN: 2963-184X
pp. 2654-2662

Cross-Cultural Collaboration and Student Learning in an International Community Engagement Program

Jastin Martino[1], Hannah Fithrotien Salsabila Nadiani[2], Vicky Taniady[3], Ulul Ilmi[4], Devanka Diaz Ayu Pitaloka[5]
[1]Bina Nusantara University
[2]Institut Agama Islam Attarmasi Pacitan
[3]Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
[4]Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta
[5]Institut Seni Indonesia Surakarta

CorrespondingAuthor: jastin.martino@binus.ac.id

Article History:
Received: 02-10-2026
Revised: 14-10-2026
Accepted: 28-10-2026
Keywords:
International Community Engagement; Cross-Cultural Collaboration; Design Thinking; Experiential Learning; Work-Integrated Learning

Abstract: *Although international community engagement programs are widely implemented across higher education, qualitative evidence detailing how students internally process cross-cultural friction and contextual design adaptation remains sparse compared to administrative reporting. This study addresses this gap through a reflection-centered qualitative inquiry, analyzing reflection transcripts from ten Indonesian and Singaporean student participants (BINUS University and Singapore Polytechnic) engaged in short-term rural field projects at A Green and Yayasan KDM. Using reflexive thematic analysis grounded in Kolb's experiential learning cycle and Schön's reflection-in-action, the analysis revealed four core experiential dynamics. Intercultural dialogue developed by combining emotional translation with rapid visual sketching, while working-pace mismatches between structured planning and local flexibility were resolved through nightly debriefings and user-evidence affinity synthesis. Unscripted rural constraints forced a design pivot toward low-tech cardboard mockups refined through elder ergonomic feedback, while an immersive community stay shifted student perspectives away from top-down technical assumptions toward active community listening and empathy-rooted design ethics. These findings offer a reflective framework for structuring debriefings and ethical co-design in international service-learning, moving beyond superficial activity metrics.*

© 2026 SWARNA: Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat

INTRODUCTION

Short-term international community engagement (Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat) provides a real-world educational space where cross-border student teams execute human-centered Design Thinking under rural infrastructural constraints. The Learning Express (LeX) program brings together BINUS University (Indonesia) and Singapore Polytechnic (Singapore) students across two distinct partner sites in Indonesia: A Green and Yayasan KDM. Guided by human-centered Design Thinking encompassing empathy building (Sense & Sensibility), problem definition (Emphaty), ideation, and prototyping students

interact directly with local home-industry owners and rural residents to develop accessible physical mockups, such as cardboard models, tailored to site-specific resource limits (Brown & Wyatt, 2010; Razzouk & Shute, 2013; Weyrauch & Riedausser, 2016). This experiential setting requires active observation and real-time adjustments as structured classroom frameworks encounter unscripted field conditions (Kolb, 1984; Schön, 1983).

Experiential learning theory posits that learning occurs as concrete field interactions trigger reflective observation and active experimentation in applied settings (Kolb, 1984). In cross-cultural student teams, working across linguistic and institutional differences requires active communication strategies, combining emotional translation with non-verbal visual tools (Chan et al., 2021; Salter et al., 2021). Concurrently, managing differing institutional working paces balancing structured task tracking with local contextual flexibility demands continuous interpersonal alignment among team members (Ferns et al., 2025; Schön, 1983). Through structured reflection, students analyze these field interactions, re-evaluating initial assumptions regarding technical problem-solving and cross-border collaboration (Mezirow, 1997; Valencia-Forrester, 2025).

Despite growing scholarly interest in international service-learning, higher education community engagement literature frequently focuses on administrative output logs or asserts unverified claims of community economic change and permanent hardware adoption. Standard PkM reports rarely document how students qualitatively process cross-cultural friction, translate emotional meaning across language barriers, reconcile mismatched work paces, or adapt design methodologies to rural constraints. Consequently, the internal learning processes, team adjustments, and contextual design shifts experienced by students remain under-examined in international service-learning scholarship.

To address this gap, this study examines qualitative reflection records from BINUS University and Singapore Polytechnic students participating in the LeX program across both the A Green and Yayasan KDM partner sites. Positioning qualitative reflection as a systematic documentation plan, the inquiry captures student learning processes, collaborative friction, and contextual prototype adaptations. Student reflection statements regarding prospective tool utility are analyzed strictly as student expectations and learning intentions rather than verified community-level economic impacts. Directed by this objective, the study addresses a single exploratory research question: (RQ1**)** How do Indonesian and Singaporean students reflect on cross-cultural collaboration and learning through their participation in an international community engagement program?

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs a qualitative, reflection-centered design to examine experiential learning and cross-cultural student collaboration within an international community engagement framework (Bringle & Hatcher, 2002; Jacott & Nyland, 2022). Jointly conducted by BINUS University (Indonesia) and Singapore Polytechnic (Singapore), the Learning Express (LeX) program established a short-term field project across two rural Indonesian partner sites: A Green and Yayasan KDM. Field execution applied Singapore Polytechnic's four-phase Learning Express Design Thinking methodology: (1) Sense & Sensibility; (2) Empathy gathering via walk-throughs and interview logs; (3) Ideation through cross-institutional brainstorming and visual sketching; and (4) Prototyping & Contextual User Testing, constructing low-cost physical mockups and observing end-user handling with rural residents (Brown & Wyatt, 2010; Castiblanco Jimenez et al., 2021; Weyrauch & Riedausser, 2016).

Purposive sampling selected 10 student participants (Campbell et al., 2020; Patton, 2015): five from BINUS University (participant codes ID01-ID05) and five from Singapore Polytechnic (participant codes SG01-SG05). The research dataset consists exclusively of a qualitative corpus of incorporating transcribed field logs, focus group transcripts, and exit reflection logs (Crouch & McKenzie, 2006). Student notes of community interactions served as reflective prompts for student learning, whereas the unit of analysis is bounded strictly to the reflection transcripts of the 10 student participants. Student reflections regarding prospective tool utility were analyzed strictly as participant learning expectations rather than verified evidence of community economic or technological impact (Valencia-Forrester, 2020).

Data analysis followed Braun and Clarke's (2006, 2019, 2021) six-phase Reflexive Thematic Analysis framework (familiarization, coding, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining themes, report production), using Kolb's (1984) Experiential Learning Cycle and Schön's (1983) reflection-in-action as analytical lenses. Findings follow a three-layer framework: Layer 1 presents written verbatim evidence or reflection record summaries attributed to codes ID01-ID05 and SG01-SG05; Layer 2 provides contextual interpretation of field interactions, language mediation, work-pace adjustments, and rural design limits; and Layer 3 connects empirical findings to experiential learning theories and community engagement literature. Research trustworthiness was established through source triangulation across transcript types, audit trails of coding decisions, and reflexive peer debriefings (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Qualitative findings from the Learning Express (LeX) reflection dataset are organized across four candidate themes. Each thematic section presents written verbatim evidence from student reflection transcripts, interprets interactional dynamics within the rural field settings of A Green and Yayasan KDM, and grounds findings in experiential learning theories and community engagement literature. Table 1 provides a compact overview synthesizing candidate themes, participant codes, recorded document types, core field dynamics, and theoretical frameworks.

Table 1. Synthesis of Candidate Themes, Participant Data, Field Context Dynamics, and Theoretical Frameworks

Candidate Theme	Participant Codes & Source Documents	Core Field Interaction Dynamic	Theoretical Framework & Literature Anchor
Theme 1: Intercultural Communication & Visual Strategy	ID01 (Daily Field Log & Written Reflection Essay)SG02 (Daily Reflection Journal & Focus Group Discussion Notes)	Language barriers during household visits required student pairs to balance emotional translation with rapid visual sketching to gather user feedback.	Kolb's (1984) Experiential Learning Cycle (CE RO); Schön's (1983) Reflection-in-Action; Intercultural Communication Competence (Chan et al., 2021; Salter et al., 2021).
Theme 2: Teamwork Dynamics & Work-Pace Alignment	ID02 (Post-Project Survey & Written Reflection Log)SG04 (Written Reflection Essay & Group-Chat Log Summary)ID04 (Final Presentation Q&A Transcript & Written Reflection)	Working-pace friction between structured task execution and local adaptability was reconciled through nightly debriefing routines and user-evidence affinity synthesis.	Schön's (1983) Reflection-on-Action; Work-Integrated Learning (WIL) Team Dynamics (Ferns et al., 2025; Jackson & Dean, 2023); Human-Centered Design Synthesis (Bender-Salazar, 2023; Brown & Wyatt, 2010).

Candidate Theme	Participant Codes & Source Documents	Core Field Interaction Dynamic	Theoretical Framework & Literature Anchor
Theme 3: Contextual Design Thinking in Rural Settings	SG01 (Program Blog Post & Written Reflection Essay)ID03 (Focus Group Discussion Notes & Field Journal)SG03 (Design Thinking Portfolio Reflection & Exit Survey Log)	Rural field unpredictability required shifting from elaborate initial ideas to low-tech cardboard mockups, which were simplified following elder ergonomic testing.	Kolb's (1984) Complete Experiential Cycle (CE RO AC AE); Frugal Innovation & Human-Centered Design (Castiblanco Jimenez et al., 2021; Weyrauch & Riedausser, 2016).
Theme 4: Experiential Reflection & Mindset Shifts	ID05 (Exit Interview Notes & Personal Reflection Log)SG05 (Post-Program Exit Interview & Written Reflection Log)	Extended community living re-oriented student perspectives away from assumed technical answers toward active listening and empathy-rooted engineering ethics.	Mezirow's (1997) Theory of Perspective Transformation; Ethical Discipline in WIL (Valencia-Forrester, 2020, 2026); Social Responsibility in Engineering (Bielefeldt & Canney, 2016; Conlon, 2008).

Theme 1: Intercultural Communication & Visual Strategy

Language barriers during village household visits required cross-border student pairs to develop flexible communication methods. In a daily field log and reflection essay, participant ID01 (BINUS University) observed that interpretation extended beyond linguistic conversion: "*I realized that translation wasn't just about changing Bahasa Indonesia into English, but helping my Singaporean teammates feel the emotion behind the villagers' stories*" (ID01, Daily Field Log & Written Reflection Essay). This reflective realization illustrates how a concrete experience (CE) of field interpretation prompts reflective observation (RO) within Kolb's (1984) experiential learning cycle. Rather than treating speech as literal word substitution, ID01 engaged in Schön's (1983) reflection-in-action by interpreting emotional tone and social context for Singaporean peers. In intercultural communication literature, this shift represents intercultural communication competence, where effective cross-cultural engagement relies on empathetic awareness and relational interpretation (Chan et al., 2021; Salter et al., 2021).

When spoken channels proved constrained during household visits, Singaporean student SG02 (Singapore Polytechnic) deployed visual tools to maintain dialogue: "*When words failed, visual sketching saved us. Drawing our ideas allowed the villagers to point out what worked and what didn't instantly*" (SG02, Daily Reflection Journal & Focus Group Discussion Notes). SG02's recourse to "*drawing our ideas*" represents active experimentation (AE) in response to communication obstacles. By presenting hand-drawn sketches directly to village residents, student pairs created an immediate, non-verbal feedback loop. This empirical interaction aligns with co-design research demonstrating that low-fidelity visual representations reduce cognitive distance and support participatory feedback in resource-constrained community settings (Castiblanco Jimenez et al., 2021; Sutipitakwong & Jamsri, 2020; Valencia-Forrester, 2020). Combining ID01's emotional translation with SG02's visual sketching allowed the student teams to gather community insights across language boundaries.

Theme 2: Teamwork Dynamics & Work-Pace Alignment

Cross-institutional collaboration between student pairs from differing academic and organizational backgrounds generated operational friction regarding working speed and

problem framing. Reflecting on initial team interactions, participant ID02 (BINUS University) noted: "*At first, their fast pace felt overwhelming, but once we set up a nightly sharing routine, we understood each other's work habits much better*" (ID02, Post-Project Survey & Written Reflection Log). The disorienting experience of mismatched work paces led team members to establish a structured communication protocol. Participant SG04 (Singapore Polytechnic) summarized this collaborative synthesis: "*BINUS students brought adaptability, while we brought structured planning. Blending both approaches made our project far stronger than working alone*" (SG04, Written Reflection Essay & Group-Chat Log Summary).

Establishing nightly debriefings allowed students to analyze daily field encounters and modify group workflows, exemplifying Schön's (1983) reflection-on-action. In work-integrated learning (WIL) literature, implementing deliberate reflective routines is recognized as a necessary mechanism for addressing team friction and building cross-institutional coordination (Ferns et al., 2025; Jackson & Dean, 2023). Internal friction also surfaced during the "*Point of View*" (POV) stage when defining the core problem statement. Participant ID04 (BINUS University) recorded how the team resolved competing interpretations: "*We had different ideas on what the real problem was. We solved it by going back to our interview sticky notes and letting the user's voice decide*" (ID04, Final Presentation Q&A Transcript & Written Reflection). Returning to physical affinity sticky notes allowed raw user statements to guide analytical consensus. In human-centered design frameworks, grounding problem framing in direct user evidence prevents interdisciplinary teams from imposing top-down assumptions on community partners (Bender-Salazar, 2023; Brown & Wyatt, 2010). Re-examining sticky notes enabled participants to shift from abstract disagreement to evidence-based decision-making, illustrating how structured reflection facilitates collaborative problem-solving (Mezirow, 1997; Razzouk & Shute, 2013).

Theme 3: Contextual Design Thinking in Rural Settings

Adapting laboratory-based Design Thinking frameworks to rural field settings required modifying structured methodologies in response to unscripted site conditions. Participant SG01 highlighted this operational contrast: "*In Singapore, Design Thinking is very structured in a lab. In the village, we had to adapt to unpredictable weather, local schedules, and language differences*" (SG01, Program Blog Post & Written Reflection Essay). Experiencing rural field conditions served as a concrete experience (CE) that challenged laboratory-trained expectations.

When initial concepts proved unsuited to village conditions, student teams executed a major design pivot. Participant ID03 documented: "O*ur initial idea was too fancy for the village. Seeing the community test our card-board model taught us that simple and usable beats complex every time*" (ID03, Focus Group Discussion Notes & Field Journal). Observing community members test the cardboard model in the village served as the direct empirical trigger for ID03's conceptual shift. This shift represents abstract conceptualization (AC) within Kolb's (1984) cycle, where field testing transforms into a generalized design principle prioritizing functional simplicity over elaborate design. This progression reinforces frugal innovation literature, which establishes that design for resource-constrained rural environments must prioritize local usability and maintainability (Brown & Wyatt, 2010; Weyrauch & Riedausser, 2016).



Figure 1. Field Activity Photo at Partner Site Yayasan KDM

Further iteration occurred when physical prototypes underwent direct user testing with village residents. Participant SG03 recorded handling initial prototype rejection: "*Our first prototype failed completely when tested by the local elder. It forced us to strip away unnecessary features and focus purely on ergonomics*" (SG03, Design Thinking Portfolio Reflection & Exit Survey Log). Experiencing prototype failure during elder testing prompted active experimentation (AE), leading the team to simplify the physical mockup to meet basic ergonomic needs. Figure 1 documents these field testing interactions, showing student pairs gathering user feedback at the partner site. SG03's willingness to strip away non-essential features after elder feedback illustrates Schön's (1983) reflection-in-action, validating research that positions rapid low-fidelity prototyping as an effective medium for achieving contextual usability in rural community projects (Castiblanco Jimenez et al., 2021; Kwon et al., 2023; Sutipitakwong & Jamsri, 2020).

Theme 4: Experiential Reflection & Mindset Shifts

Immersive engagement within rural partner villages prompted re-evaluations of professional identity, technical authority, and ethical responsibility among student participants. Participant ID05 eflected on this personal perspective shift: "*Living with the community changed my perspective. In the future, I will always start any project by listening first rather than assuming I know the answer*" (ID05, Exit Interview Notes & Personal Reflection Log).



Figure 2. Joint Student Group Photo

Extended residency in the partner village served as the primary trigger for ID05's cognitive shift, moving the student away from top-down assumptions toward an inquiry-first orientation. This habit-of-mind shift exemplifies Mezirow's (1997) theory of perspective transformation, where disorienting field experiences prompt critical reflection on ingrained assumptions about expert authority. ID05's commitment to "listening first" directly reinforces Valencia-Forrester's (2017, 2020, 2026) work-integrated learning framework, which positions active listening as an ethical discipline and essential competency in community engagement.

Matching this, participant SG05 recorded a shift in engineering values: "*LeX opened my eyes to real-world social impact. It showed me how engineering and design principles must be rooted in human empathy*" (SG05, Post-Program Exit Interview). Figure 2 documents the combined student cohort and community partners following a joint reflection debriefing session. SG05's realization illustrates how field immersion connects technical discipline with human empathy. In accordance with ethical non-overclaim protocols, SG05's reflection strictly records an internal re-orientation of engineering values, rather than an unverified claim of long-term community transformation. This outcome aligns with literature on social responsibility in higher education, demonstrating that community-engaged service-learning encourages technical students to integrate engineering rigor with ethical social accountability (Bielefeldt & Canney, 2016; Conlon, 2008; Ferns et al., 2025). Engaging in structured reflection allowed participants to convert immediate field encounters into lasting learning gains (Bringle & Hatcher, 2002; Jacott & Nyland, 2022; Kolb, 1984).

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Participation in the Learning Express international community engagement program illustrates that cross-cultural student learning occurs through adaptive field practice and structured reflection. Indonesian and Singaporean students reflected on cross-border collaboration by reconciling language barriers through emotional translation and visual sketching, addressing work-pace friction via nightly debriefings and user-evidence affinity synthesis, and pivoting from elaborate ideas to low-tech cardboard mockups following elder ergonomic testing. These experiential encounters re-oriented student mindsets from top-down assumptions toward active community listening and empathy-rooted design ethics. In accordance with ethical reporting boundaries, these outcomes record internal participant learning gains, collaborative competencies, and reflective shifts rather than verified empirical evidence of permanent technology adoption or village economic transformation.

To strengthen future international higher education community engagement, program organizers should institute mandatory nightly reflective debriefings to resolve inter-institutional team friction, pair cross-border engineering students with host-country peers trained in emotional translation, and enforce early low-fidelity physical prototyping using accessible local materials to ensure contextual usability.

ACKNOWLEDGE

We extend our sincere gratitude to BINUS University, Singapore Polytechnic, and the program facilitators for their guidance throughout the Learning Express (LeX) program. We deeply appreciate the student participants for their dedication, and the community members, local artisans, and elders at A Green and Yayasan KDM for their hospitality and invaluable co-design insights.

REFERENCES

Baumber, A., Kligyte, G., Pratt, S., Melvold, J., Allen, L., Bowdler, B., Le Hunte, B., Buck, A., & Key, T. (2024). Wisdom on all sides: Reciprocal partnerships in transdisciplinary project-based work-integrated learning. International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning, 25(2), 215–233.http://hdl.handle.net/10453/179633

Bender-Salazar, R. (2023). Design thinking as an effective method for problem-setting and needfinding for entrepreneurial teams addressing wicked problems. Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship, 12, Article 24. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-023-00291-2

Bielefeldt, A. R., & Canney, N. E. (2016). Changes in the social responsibility attitudes of engineering students over time. Science and Engineering Ethics, 22(5), 1535–1551. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-015-9706-5

Bilous, R. H., Hammersley, L., & Lloyd, K. (2018). Reflective practice as a research method for co-creating curriculum with international partner organisations. *International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning*, *19*(3), 287-296.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 11(4), 589–597. https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). One mapping technique, diverse analytical goals: Reflexive thematic analysis in qualitative research. SAGE Publications.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2002). Campus-community partnerships: The terms of engagement. Journal of Social Issues, 58(3), 503–516. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4560.00273

Brown, T., & Wyatt, J. (2010). Design thinking for social innovation. Stanford Social Innovation Review, 8(1), 30–35.

Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D., & Walker, K. (2020). Purposive sampling: Complex or simple? Research case examples. Journal of Research in Nursing, 25(8), 652–661. https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987120927206

Castiblanco Jimenez, I. A., Mauro, S., Napoli, D., Marcolin, F., Vezzetti, E., Rojas Torres, M. C., Specchia, S., & Moos, S. (2021). Design thinking as a framework for the design of a sustainable waste sterilization system: The case of Piedmont Region, Italy. Electronics, 10(21), Article 2665. https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics10212665

Chan, S. C. F., Ngai, G., Ho-Yin Yau, J., & Por Kwan, K. (2021). Impact of international service-learning on students' global citizenship and intercultural effectiveness development. International Journal of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement, 9(1), Article 8. https://doi.org/10.37333/001c.31305

Conlon, E. (2008). The new engineer: Between employability and social responsibility. European Journal of Engineering Education, 33(2), 151–159. https://doi.org/10.1080/03043790801996371

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Crouch, M., & McKenzie, H. (2006). The logic of small samples in interview-based qualitative research. Social Science Information, 45(4), 483–499. https://doi.org/10.1177/0539018406069584

Ferns, S. J., Zegwaard, K. E., Pretti, T. J., & Rowe, A. D. (2025). Defining and designing work-integrated learning curriculum. Higher Education Research & Development, 44(2), 371–385. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2024.2399072

Jackson, D., & Dean, B. A. (2023). The contribution of different types of work-integrated learning to graduate employability. Higher Education Research & Development, 42(1), 93–110. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2022.2048638

Jacott, L., & Nyland, B. (2022). Service-learning and intercultural competence in higher education: A framework for global community engagement. Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 26(2), 45–62.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development. Prentice-Hall.

Kwon, B., Kim, H., & Lee, M. (2023). Empowering rural innovation through rapid prototyping: A design thinking case in agricultural cooperatives. International Journal of Innovation and Regional Development, 15(1), 23–38.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. SAGE Publications.

Mezirow, J. (1997). Transformative learning: Theory to practice. New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 1997(74), 5–12. https://doi.org/10.1002/ace.7401

Patton, M. Q. (2015). Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Razzouk, R., & Shute, V. (2013). What is design thinking and why is it important? Review of Educational Research, 82(3), 330–348. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654312457429

Salter, P., Lowrie, K., Howard, E., Bhati, A., Wong, C., Miles, D., & Jones, P. (2021). A continuum for global citizenship: Analyzing the complex transformations of service-learning. International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning, 22(2), 199–211.

Schön, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. Basic Books.

Sutipitakwong, S., & Jamsri, P. (2020). Pros and cons of tangible and digital wireframes. In Proceedings of the 2020 IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference (FIE) (pp. 1–5). IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/FIE44824.2020.9274234

Valencia-Forrester, F. (2017, August 15). Purpose WIL. University-led WIL. https://faithvalencia-forrester.com/2017/08/15/purpose-wil/

Valencia-Forrester, F. (2020). Inclusive work-integrated learning in journalism education: A wise practice framework 10.25904/1912/1825

Valencia-Forrester, F. (2026). Sustaining community-engaged work-integrated learning: A decade of listening-centred, community-co-designed practice. Education Sciences, 16(9), Article 1566. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci16091566

Weyrauch, T., & Riedausser, J. (2016). What is frugal innovation? Three defining criteria. Journal of Frugal Innovation, 2, Article 1. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40669-016-0005-y