Journal of General Education and Humanities
Vol. 5, No. 5, October 2026, pp. 6659 – 6677, https://doi.org/10.58421/gehu.v5i5.2250
ISSN 2963-7147

Revitalizing Kaulinan Barudak through Community-Based Research: Socialization and Game Practice for Students and a Book Discussion for Primary School Teachers

Dwi Putri Kusumah[1], Fitria Khaerunnisa[2], Inayah Widyawati[3], Dhea Fania Rahmasary[4], Alifia Azhari Rahmah[5], Ade Mauludina Mahen[6], Aldy Hasbiya Sidiq[7], Ida Nursaadah[8], Dina Maulidya[9], Eva Mulyani[10]
[1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10]Universitas Siliwangi, Tasikmalaya, West Java, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received 2026-10-01
Revised 2026-10-25
Accepted 2026-10-26

Keywords:

Book discussion
Community-based research
Kaulinan barudak
Primary school
Traditional game revitalization

ABSTRACT

Traditional games need both a space for practice and a channel for knowledge to be passed on, yet, to the authors' search, community service reports rarely pair direct play with a teacher's discussion of a written reference. This activity revitalized kaulinan barudak (Sundanese children's traditional games) in Gunung Pereng, Tasikmalaya, with SDN 1, SDN 2, and SDN 5 as community partners. Community-Based Research (CBR) served as the partnership framework: needs stated by students in an initial questionnaire (n = 74) shaped the action, namely socialization and game practice for students and a book discussion (bedah buku) of Warisan Sepuh, Kaulinan Barudak with teachers. Responses were gathered with a student questionnaire (n = 74), observation by two observers, interviews with three students, a teacher questionnaire (n = 12), and minutes of the discussion; questionnaires and observation scores were analyzed descriptively, and interviews and minutes were analyzed thematically. Students' responses and observed behavior were positive, with engagement relatively low, and interviews showed enjoyment alongside shyness in some students. Teachers rated the book highly and asked for a printed copy and for guidance on age, curriculum, and safety. Partners took part in needs identification, action, and feedback, whereas design and analysis were carried out by the implementing team. The findings describe a single activity without a baseline or comparison group and do not show improved outcomes or sustainability. Pairing direct play with an accessible written reference may offer primary schools a workable starting point for cultural preservation, to be tested in repeated cycles.

This is an open-access article under the CC BY-SA license.

Corresponding Author:

Eva Mulyani
Universitas Siliwangi, Tasikmalaya, West Java, Indonesia
Email: evamulyani@unsil.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

Traditional games are cultural practices passed down across generations that carry local knowledge, social rules, and the values of the communities that own them. An ethnomotor study of 513 traditional sporting games in the Canary Islands showed that the repertoire of games reflects the local cultural emphasis on cooperation and the reuse of materials [1]. Their continuity therefore depends on opportunities for young people actually to play them, not merely to know their names. Evidence from Indonesia shows that this continuity cannot be taken for granted: a study of 155 primary school children in four districts of Luwu Raya found that only fifteen traditional games were still played, with causes that included a lack of playmates, conflicts among players, limited equipment, and parental prohibitions [2]. Because these causes are largely social, the decline of play does not stem solely from children. Schools are one space where games can be brought back: a qualitative study in 24 primary schools in the Special Region of Yogyakarta described local-wisdom-based learning through gobak sodor, hide-and-seek, and hopscotch as an affordable approach that also safeguards cultural heritage [3], and a community service effort positioned traditional games as an alternative physical activity to reduce children's dependence on gadgets [4].

In Sundanese culture, kaulinan barudak has been the target of community-level strengthening through awareness-raising, mentoring, and game demonstrations in Jatinangor District [5], and the character values of sondah, congklak, perepet jengkol, and bekel have been examined through a literature review of twelve articles [6], which examines existing writings and not students' experience in a particular activity. Schools support local culture through partnerships with the community and the government and through experiential activities embedded in the curriculum, as reported for a traditional festival at a junior high school in West Sulawesi [7], and, in primary schools in West Java, through the local content curriculum, habituation, and extracurricular and cultural activities [8], [9]. Educators' knowledge, however, is not automatically adequate: prospective primary school teachers in Spain initially tended to prioritize tangible over intangible heritage [10]. Because traditional games are rarely visible physically in the classroom, educators need reference sources that help them recognize and explain them.

Before the activity, a questionnaire completed by 74 students of SDN 1, SDN 2, and SDN 5 Gunung Pereng showed that most students knew the term kaulinan barudak (86.5%), but only 29.7% knew all of the rules and could teach friends, and only 29.7% had played more than three times in the previous month. Most were interested in trying games they had never played (85.1%), and 93.2% agreed that a guidebook should be produced. Knowing the name of a game is thus not the same as mastering its rules and having played it, and the data point to two needs at once: direct play experience for students and an easy-to-use written reference for students and teachers. These figures are descriptive, portray only the starting point of the activity at three schools, and are not generalized.

Research on traditional games in primary schools generally examines outcomes, such as social skills through modified traditional sporting games, character formation in physical education, a game-based character education model validated in one primary school,

fundamental movement skills, the social responsibility of children aged seven to nine, and students' responses and character in congklak play [11]–[16]. This orientation produces evidence that can be compared and used to design instruction, but it treats games as a means to other ends. Studies closer to experience describe students' interaction and social skills through observation, interviews, and documentation [17], a series of Sundanese games applied in a project linked to cultural character values [18], and a predominantly positive emotional experience among 226 students in the Canary Islands after an intervention of traditional sporting games [19]. Frameworks of learning through play place the learner's experience and teacher facilitation among the dimensions of quality [20], and a synthesis of 87 studies shows that choice and joy are widely used as indicators of play [21]. Engagement is not uniform, however: a fifth-grade case study reported passive engagement among some participants amid growing cooperation and sportsmanship [22]. A description of students' experience therefore needs to record both what went well and what hindered it.

The community service reports reviewed here describe awareness-raising, mentoring, and demonstrations at the community level [5] or the use of games as an alternative physical activity [4]. To the authors' literature search, none of the reports reviewed combines direct game practice for students with a discussion of a written reference by teachers, and studies in primary schools tend to focus on one group of participants; this statement is limited to the authors' search. The novelty of this activity therefore lies in combining, within one partnership cycle, direct game practice for students and a book discussion for teachers, and in describing both groups' responses together with the level of partner participation, without testing improvement in outcomes.

Community-Based Research (CBR) is a partnership approach in which community members, organizational representatives, and researchers share participation in the stages of research, combine their expertise, and link knowledge to action that benefits the community [23]. It is grounded in relationships, co-learning, mutual benefit, and long-term commitment, not in a particular set of techniques [24], and genuine partnership is a demand that communities make of researchers [25]. This is consistent with the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage: the 2003 UNESCO Convention provides that states shall endeavour to ensure the widest possible participation of the communities and groups that create, maintain, and transmit such heritage and involve them actively in its management (Article 15), and it lists transmission through formal and non-formal education as a safeguarding measure (Article 2(3)) [26]. In this activity, CBR is linked to the objectives as follows: partners' needs are the basis for action (objective 1), the action is directed at students and teachers (objectives 2 and 3), and the level of partner participation is itself examined (objective 4). Because participation varies across projects, and in moderate-participation projects the research remains researcher-driven with community input [27], the activity is positioned at the level that matches the available data.

Teachers link play experience and knowledge stored in references. A phenomenological study in Turkey involving 12 classroom teachers and 5 physical education teachers reported that children's traditional games are seen as a cultural bridge [28], and a study of prospective teachers showed knowledge gaps about cultural elements in their surroundings [29]. Hence, teachers need written sources that can be read, discussed, and

applied in schools. The solution offered is a series of three activities: socialization of kaulinan barudak, game practice by students, and a book discussion (bedah buku) of Warisan Sepuh, Kaulinan Barudak with teachers. This community service activity, with a CBR approach, therefore aims (1) to identify students' needs as the basis for activities with the partner schools; (2) to carry out socialization and practice of kaulinan barudak with 74 students and describe their engagement and responses; (3) to carry out a book discussion with teachers and describe their responses and feedback; and (4) to examine convergence and differences across data sources and the level of partner participation. It does not test improvement in outcomes or cause-and-effect relationships. Its contribution is descriptive and practical: a documented cycle that other primary schools can adapt, and an explicit account of what was and was not recorded about partner participation.

2. METHOD

2.1 Approach, Target Group, and Community Partners

The activity was carried out with a Community-Based Research (CBR) approach that positioned SDN 1, SDN 2, and SDN 5 Gunung Pereng as community partners; in this approach, researchers and partners share participation, and knowledge is linked to action that benefits the community [23]. It differs from a conventional community service activity, in which material prepared in advance by the implementing team is typically delivered to participants, in three respects: the action was based on needs reported by partner students through an initial questionnaire; teachers' feedback on the book was gathered as material for revising it; and the level of partner participation was itself examined as an objective. The team operationalized CBR as a six-stage cycle, namely needs identification, planning, action with students, action with teachers, evaluation, and reflection and follow-up, and this mapping is the team's own formulation, not a standard sequence from the literature. The learning basis for the action with students is the social constructivist view that higher psychological functions develop through social interaction and joint activity [30], together with the view that learning takes place as participation in the practice of a community [31]; these were references for designing the practice, not hypotheses to be tested. Students learn kaulinan by playing them with friends, whereas teachers learn the content of the book through discussion with colleagues, so both are read as forms of participation in practice.

Partner participation differed by stage. In needs identification, partners took part through students' answers to the initial questionnaire. In planning, the book, the game materials, the evaluation instruments, and the program design were prepared by the implementing team, and the records do not document partners' involvement in decisions about content, schedule, or instruments. In implementation, students from the three schools took part in the socialization and practice, and teachers of SDN 2 Gunung Pereng took part in the book discussion held at their school. In evaluation, partners gave responses through questionnaires and interviews, and feedback during the discussion, whereas the analysis, interpretation, and writing were carried out by the implementing team without member checking by partners. The activity is therefore stated to be at a level of partnership limited to these stages, which in community-based projects is described as a moderate level at which the research remains researcher-driven with community input [27].

The activity was carried out in Gunung Pereng, Tasikmalaya, with primary school students and teachers as the target groups. The student group was 74 students from SDN 1, SDN 2, and SDN 5 Gunung Pereng who took part in the socialization and practice of kaulinan barudak and completed the questionnaires. They are the participants of the activity and not a sample drawn by a documented procedure: the records do not show how the schools selected them or their grade, age, or gender, so the data of the three schools were analyzed as one group and cannot be compared across schools. The teacher group was the 12 primary school teachers of SDN 2 Gunung Pereng who took part in the book discussion and completed the teacher response questionnaire.

The evaluation of the activity used a descriptive approach that portrays events and experiences directly with a low level of inference [32]. This approach focuses on portraying what happened as it happened, not on causal explanation, and it is suitable when the question is what and how an experience unfolded without being bound to a particular theoretical framework [33]. Likert data are reported numerically and descriptively (frequencies, percentages, means), without inferential tests, a baseline measurement with the same items, or a comparison group. Because the target groups, activities, and instruments for students and teachers differ, the two are read as two perspectives compared descriptively and are not merged into one score.

2.2 Stages of Activity in the CBR Cycle

The activity cycle had six stages. The first stage was community needs identification, namely the completion of the initial knowledge questionnaire by 74 students about knowledge, experience, interest, and the need for a guidebook to kaulinan barudak. The second stage was planning and preparation, which included preparing the book Warisan Sepuh, Kaulinan Barudak, the game materials and equipment, and the evaluation instruments in the form of an observation sheet, a student questionnaire, an interview guide, and a teacher questionnaire. The third stage was action with students, namely socialization in which the implementing team explained the games along with their rules and how to play them, followed by practice in which students from the three schools played Kaulinan Barudak with the support of the implementing team and under the observation of two observers. The fourth stage was action with teachers, namely a book discussion at SDN 2 Gunung Pereng on Friday, 25 September 2026 at 13.45 with two presenters, consisting of a discussion of the book and teachers' responses. The fifth stage was evaluation, namely the completion of the student and teacher questionnaires, student interviews, and the recording of the book discussion in minutes. The sixth stage was reflection and follow-up, namely the cross-reading of data sources and the recording of teachers' feedback as material for improving the book. This sequence places partners' needs as the basis for action, direct practice as the experience pathway for students, and the book discussion as the pathway for discussing knowledge with teachers. With this series, the activity does not stop at delivering material, but opens opportunities for students to experience the games and for teachers to discuss and give feedback on the reference source.

The record of the implementation is partial. The transcripts of two student interviews are dated 26 September 2026. The records do not contain the date and duration of the game

practice, the number of groups, or a complete list of the games played, so the games are described only from what students mentioned in the interviews (Section 3.2). For students, the procedure was an explanation of the games and their rules by the implementing team, followed by direct practice with the team accompanying the students and two observers recording the observation sheet.

2.3 Evaluation Techniques

Prior-knowledge data were obtained from a questionnaire of 13 multiple-choice items and two short-answer items covering knowledge and experience, opinions and benefits, interest and desire to play, and the need for media or a guidebook. Only the multiple-choice items are reported in this article, as numbers of students and percentages of the 74 students, and items that allowed more than one choice are reported as numbers of respondents choosing each option. Observation used a sheet of 15 indicators on ten aspects (engagement, cooperation, communication, sportsmanship, rule compliance, tolerance, empathy, social interaction, positive emotion, and perseverance) with a scale of 1 = not visible, 2 = starting to be visible, 3 = visible, and 4 = very visible, completed by two observers without narrative notes; behavior is reported as observed engagement or interaction, not as psychological constructs. The student questionnaire was administered after play and consisted of 18 statements with four options (1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree) on six aspects, namely enjoyment and interest (items 1–3), engagement in play (4–6), social interaction (7–9), emotion and inclusion (10–12), educational value (13–15), and appreciation and willingness to preserve (16–18). A four-point scale without a neutral option was used so that respondents commit to a tendency, at the risk of response bias [34]. The instruments were not tested for validity and reliability psychometrically because the analysis is descriptive, and this is acknowledged as a limitation.

The instruments were prepared by the implementing team in the planning stage on the basis of the aims of the activity and the aspects named above; the records do not document expert review or a pilot test. Because the aim is to describe participants' responses to a single activity, and not to measure a latent construct or to compare groups, item scores were not combined into a psychometric index, the six aspects are groupings of items for reporting and not validated subscales, and no claim of construct measurement is made. Descriptive reporting of Likert data at the item and aspect level is common practice [37], and validity and reliability were not tested, which is acknowledged as a limitation. The two observers completed the observation sheet; the records do not document how they were briefed on the indicators or a procedure for resolving differences, so differences were handled by averaging their scores (Section 2.4).

Semi-structured interviews were conducted by the implementing team with three students using a guide of 15 questions about experience, enjoyment, engagement, cooperation, communication, sportsmanship, understanding of rules, lessons learned, interest in playing again, willingness to introduce the games, and preservation. Informants were selected purposively, that is, as participants who could provide information in line with the aims of the activity [35], with the criteria of having taken part in the series of games and coming from different schools so that the context would vary; this selection is not meant to

represent all students. Three students, one per school, were interviewed so that each school's context had at least one voice, not to reach thematic saturation; with so few informants, the interview data illustrate experience and cannot be taken as evidence about students in general. Interviews with children are commonly used to capture children's perspectives while attending to participants' consent and comfort [36]. The transcripts of two students are dated 26 September 2026 and contain time markers, all transcripts use everyday Indonesian mixed with Sundanese terms, and informants' identities are anonymized by school of origin. The teacher questionnaire contained 25 items on five aspects, namely content appropriateness (items 1–5), presentation and language (6–10), cultural value and preservation (11–15), educational value (16–20), and practicality and utilization (21–25), with the same scale as the student questionnaire. The teacher items assess the book from the teachers' point of view and are therefore not read as a measurement of outcomes in students. The minutes of the book discussion are handwritten notes containing requests, responses, feedback, and answers during the discussion, and they are reported as a summary of the content of the discussion without quoting teachers' names.

2.4 Data Analysis Techniques

The questionnaire data were analyzed quantitatively and descriptively with frequencies, percentages, and means per item and aspect, as is common in reporting Likert data [37]. Agreement was calculated from scores of 3 and 4. Mean categories were set with equal-width intervals, namely $(4 - 1)/4 = 0.75$ [38], yielding four categories used as descriptions of tendency and not as norms: 1.00–1.75 (very low), 1.76–2.50 (low), 2.51–3.25 (high), and 3.26–4.00 (very high), with the labels not visible, starting to be visible, visible, and very visible for observation. The 74 students answered the 18 questionnaire items, yielding 1,332 responses. In the observation, the scores of the two observers were averaged per indicator and aspect, and exact agreement is reported as a picture of consistency, not as a reliability coefficient. The interview transcripts and the minutes were analyzed thematically in six phases, namely familiarization, initial coding, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining themes, and reporting [39]. Coding was inductive and carried out by the implementing team on statements in the transcripts and notes in the minutes; each theme was checked by returning to the transcripts or minutes to confirm that statements supported it, and no independent second coder was used. Quotations are selective and are not used to show prevalence. Triangulation of sources (students, observers, teachers) and techniques (questionnaires, observation, interviews, minutes) was used to look for convergence, complementarity, and differences, without requiring all sources to agree [40]. Findings were separated from their interpretation, and student and teacher data were read as complementary perspectives, not as cause-and-effect relationships. Teachers' feedback in the minutes was treated as the partner's voice, whereas interpretation was carried out by the implementing team without member checking by partners, so the interpretation is the responsibility of the team.

2.5 Ethical Considerations

The activity was carried out as a community service activity at the partner schools, with children as participants. Student identities in the interviews are anonymized by school of origin, teachers' names are not quoted from the minutes, and results are reported in aggregate. The activity records do not contain a formal ethical clearance, written parental consent, or a record of how students' assent to be interviewed was obtained; this is acknowledged as a limitation. In the next cycle, parental consent for the observation and interviews should be obtained, students' assent recorded, and the schools' permission documented in writing.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Community Needs Identification: Students' Initial Knowledge of Kaulinan Barudak

At the needs identification stage, the team identified students' prior knowledge before the socialization, and students' answers were treated as the partners' voice about their own needs.

Table 1. Results of the students' initial knowledge questionnaire (n = 74)

Indicator	Number of students	%
Knows the term kaulinan barudak ("know it well")	64	86.5
Has heard of the term but does not understand it well	9	12.2
Has never heard of the term	1	1.4
Knows all of the rules and can teach friends	22	29.7
Knows some of the rules	47	63.5
Other option or no answer (rules)	5	6.8
Played more than three times in the previous month	22	29.7
Played once or twice in the previous month	46	62.2
Never played in the previous month	5	6.8
No answer (play in the previous month)	1	1.4
School had held a traditional Sundanese game activity	71	95.9
Very interested or interested in trying new games	63	85.1
Agree or strongly agree that a guidebook should be produced	69	93.2

Table 1 reports the answers of the 74 students who completed the questionnaire as numbers and percentages of the 74; a student who left an item unanswered is counted under "no answer" or "other option". Sixty-four students (86.5%) knew the term kaulinan barudak, 9 (12.2%) had heard of it but did not understand it well, and 1 had never heard of it. Knowledge of the rules was limited: 47 students (63.5%) knew only some of the rules and 22 (29.7%) knew all of them and could teach friends, whereas the other 5 (6.8%) chose another option or did not answer. Play experience in the previous month was uneven: 22 students (29.7%) had played more than three times, 46 (62.2%) once or twice, and 5 (6.8%) never, and 1 student gave no answer. Cingciripit was known by 62 students (83.8%) and endog-endogan by 56 (75.7%), followed by loncat tinggi and ngadu kaleci (48 each; 64.9%) and congklak (41; 55.4%), whereas dam-daman (2 students), surser (3), lelempengan (4), and perepet jengkol (7) were known by fewer than one tenth of the students. In terms of

interest, 63 students (85.1%) were very interested or interested in trying games they had never played, although 10 students left this item unanswered. The reasons given were that it looked fun and they wanted to play with friends (48 students; 64.9%), that they wanted to reduce playing with gadgets or online games (20; 27.0%), and that they wanted to try something new (16; 21.6%). Finally, 69 students (93.2%) agreed or strongly agreed that a guidebook should be produced, most expecting pictures or photos of the steps of play (62; 83.8%). These initial data became the basis for the activity because they show a need for direct play experience and a written reference, but they do not show any change after the activity.

3.2 Implementation of the Game Activities

The action with students had two parts. In the socialization, the implementing team introduced kaulinan barudak, which, according to the students, included an explanation of many games along with their rules and how to play them. In the practice, students from the three schools tried the games directly while the team walked around to accompany them, and two observers recorded the activity on the observation sheet. The games the students mentioned in the interviews were congklak, bekles, sasarungan, lelempengan, cingkurulung, sapintrong (high jump over a rotating rope), perepet jengkol, cating, the rotated sarong (bubuledan), kukuyaan, nininjaan, and orok-orokan. These games differ in character: some can be played alone, some are played with friends, and some require cooperation, such as perepet jengkol, sapintrong, cingkurulung, lelempengan, and orok-orokan, which students linked to cooperation. The observation indicators refer to group members and turns of play, which suggests that some games were played in groups with a turn-taking rule. Students from different schools played together, and two students said they made new friends. The records do not contain the date and duration of the practice, the number of groups, or a complete list of all the games played, so this description is limited to what is recorded in the interview transcripts and observation sheets, and the list of games above is not meant to be exhaustive.

3.3 Students' Responses and Engagement

The student questionnaire (74 students; 1,332 responses) gave an overall mean of 3.52 (very high), with 94.1% of responses at a score of 3 or 4, and all six aspects fell in the very high category (Table 2). Engagement in play had the lowest mean (3.39; 90.1% agreement), whereas appreciation and willingness to preserve (3.59) and enjoyment and interest (3.58) were highest; the difference among aspects was only 0.20 points, so the pattern is read as even, with engagement relatively lowest. At the item level, the highest means were item 18 (wanting kaulinan to keep being played; 3.69) and item 1 (feeling happy; 3.68), and the lowest were item 4 (active from start to finish; 3.24, in the high category), item 12 (confident; 3.34), and item 8 (cooperating; 3.39). Responses of 1 or 2 appeared most often on item 4 (11 students; 14.9%). These means describe students' responses after play and are not compared with the situation before the activity.

Table 2. Student questionnaire results by aspect (n = 74)

Aspect	Items	Valid responses	Score 1 / 2 / 3 / 4	Mean	% Agree (3–4)	Category
Enjoyment and interest	1–3	222	0 / 12 / 69 / 141	3.58	94.6	Very high
Engagement in play	4–6	222	4 / 18 / 87 / 113	3.39	90.1	Very high
Social interaction	7–9	222	5 / 13 / 67 / 137	3.51	91.9	Very high
Emotion and inclusion	10–12	222	1 / 12 / 92 / 117	3.46	94.1	Very high
Educational value	13–15	222	1 / 3 / 90 / 128	3.55	98.2	Very high
Appreciation and willingness to preserve	16–18	222	6 / 4 / 66 / 146	3.59	95.5	Very high
Overall	**1–18**	**1,332**	**17 / 62 / 471 / 782**	**3.52**	**94.1**	**Very high**

The two observers gave total scores of 55 and 56 out of a maximum of 60 (overall mean 3.70, very visible) and gave identical scores on 12 of 15 indicators (80%); the largest difference was one point, on indicators 4, 6, and 13, so the observers did not fully agree in assessing group cooperation, communication, and positive interaction. This exact agreement is reported as a picture of consistency, not as a reliability coefficient. The engagement aspect (indicators 1–3) received a score of 3 (visible) from both observers on all three indicators, so its mean, 3.00, was the lowest. Cooperation and communication were 3.75 each, social interaction was 3.50, and sportsmanship, rule compliance, tolerance, empathy, positive emotion, and perseverance were 4.00 each. The sheets contain scores without narrative notes, so they describe how visible behavior was on the indicators observed but not how, when, or in which students it appeared, and they come from two sheets for the whole activity and not from separate observation of each group or school. No indicator fell in the low or very low category.

Thematic analysis of the three transcripts produced seven themes: an enjoyable experience, cooperation and communication, accepting winning and losing, uneven engagement, understanding of rules and new games, lessons as interpreted by students, and ways to keep the games played. The student from SDN 1 mentioned bekles as a favorite, the student from SDN 5 mentioned perepet jengkol, congklak, and cating, and the student from SDN 2 mentioned cating and the rotated sarong; the themes are read as the perspectives of three students, not as prevalence. All three described the activity as enjoyable, and two of them linked it to new friends ("Happy, fun, made new friends."; "Because I like playing. I met new friends."). The student from SDN 5 said that perepet jengkol requires togetherness because without it it is "Not fun. We fall.", and the student from SDN 2 invited friends with "Let's do it together so it is fast and neat." All three were happy when they won and accepted losing ("It's okay, sportsmanlike."; "It's just a game."), although the student from SDN 2 mentioned feeling sad before saying that it is normal in a game. Engagement was not uniform: the student from SDN 5 rated their own activity as "Not very active." because of "Many people." and the student from SDN 1 did not ask to try because of shyness, whereas the student from SDN 2 said they actively tried many games. Understanding of the rules also differed ("Fairly."; "A little."; "Very easy."), and sapintrong, lelempengan, nininjaan, and orok-orokan were mentioned as new. The lessons mentioned included cooperation, balance,

and reducing the use of gadgets. All three were willing to teach the games to friends or family, an answer given to a closed question, and mentioned ways to keep the games alive with "Teach them.", "invited to play", or "Invite them to play. Tell them it's fun."

Compared across the three student sources, engagement was relatively lowest in each of them. Item 4 had the lowest questionnaire mean (3.24), the observers recorded engagement at the visible but not yet very visible level (3.00), and in the interviews one student rated their own activity as "Not very active." because of "Many people.", another did not ask to try because of shyness, and the third said they actively tried many games. On inclusion and confidence, the sources differed in emphasis: the observers recorded tolerance and empathy as very visible (4.00), whereas the confidence item was relatively low (3.34), and two students were less active, one because of shyness and one because of the number of people. The sources differ in scale, informant, and level (the observers rated the whole activity, whereas students reported their own experience), so they are compared in direction and not in size.

3.4 Action with Teachers: The Book Discussion

The discussion of the book Warisan Sepuh, Kaulinan Barudak was held at SDN 2 Gunung Pereng on Friday, 25 September 2026 at 13.45 with two presenters and the teachers of SDN 2 Gunung Pereng as participants. The book discussion functioned as a forum for discussing the book with teachers, and the available minutes record the discussion part, whereas the details of the presenters' exposition of the book's content are not recorded in them. From these notes, it appears that the forum developed into a discussion and question-and-answer session in which teachers conveyed requests, shared experiences, and gave feedback on the content of the book, and the presenters responded. One teacher said that the book file was rather hard to read and asked for one printed book as library material at the school, and the presenters said they were ready to provide it. Another teacher shared the experience that in the co-curricular activity at the school, games had already been introduced along with their connection to mathematics. The same teacher expressed appreciation for the effort of writing the book, then gave feedback detailed in the following section, and a question also arose about the reason for choosing kaulinan as the theme. Unlike the teacher questionnaire, which gathers assessments as scores, this forum gave teachers room to state their needs and objections in their own words. The book discussion thus functioned as a forum for disseminating knowledge and also as a forum for gathering feedback on the content and usefulness of the book, although the number of teachers present is not reported in the minutes and is therefore not stated here.

3.5 Teachers' Feedback and Questionnaire Results

Based on the minutes of the discussion, the teachers' discussion did not focus only on the content of the book, but also developed to cover teachers' experience in introducing traditional games to students, the potential use of kaulinan barudak in learning, and the need for easy-to-use reference sources. The need for an easy-to-use form of the book is seen in the request for a printed book because the digital file is hard to read. Teachers' experience is seen in the mention of a co-curricular activity that had already introduced games and linked

them to mathematics. Feedback on content included a gap between chapters 3 and 4 and several things missed in chapter 4: the absence of advice on games suited to particular ages, the need for details of implementation in the Kurikulum Merdeka and of the assessment that can be done, and the absence of details on risk levels and the level of teacher supervision. The presenters responded that the book had not yet been specified for implementation in schools, that details of risk levels were not yet possible because of limited time and data, and that the theme of kaulinan was chosen because kaulinan contains values such as being systematic that are needed in mathematics learning. The supervising lecturer did not emphasize only mathematics. The minutes do not record in detail who delivered each point, so the content is read as a range of participants' responses, not as the number of teachers who agree with a view. This range of responses matters because it shows teachers' needs that are not captured by the scored questionnaire.

Twelve teachers completed the questionnaire, yielding 300 responses, all at a score of 3 (40 responses) or 4 (260 responses; 86.7%), with no scores of 1 or 2. The overall mean was 3.87 (very high), and aspect means ranged from 3.80 (presentation and language) to 3.97 (content appropriateness), with practicality and utilization and educational value at 3.85 each and cultural value and preservation at 3.87. Items 1, 4, 5, and 25 had a mean of 4.00, and the lowest was item 9 (coherence of presentation; 3.58), followed by items 8, 15, 17, 21, and 22 (3.75 each). Because every response fell in the two highest categories and most in the highest, the questionnaire shows a ceiling effect: differences among items are small, the scale did not register dissatisfaction, and the scores should not be read as discriminating among aspects. Ratings given by teachers in their own school about a book presented by the implementing team may also reflect courtesy, so the specific feedback in the minutes is the more informative source. The ratings express teachers' satisfaction with the book and their views of it; they are not evidence of its effectiveness in classroom teaching, which was not observed or measured.

The minutes agree in direction with the questionnaire. The appreciation for the writing of the book and the request for a printed book point the same way as the item on the book's usefulness (item 25; 4.00) and the encouragement to introduce kaulinan to students (item 24; 3.92); the feedback on gaps between chapters and things missed points the same way as coherence of presentation being the lowest item (item 9; 3.58); and the feedback on implementation in schools and supervision points the same way as the relatively lower means on items 21 and 22 (3.75). The teachers' positive assessment was thus accompanied by specific feedback, not merely positive responses, and the teachers' figures are read separately from the students' figures because their items assess the book.

3.6 Integration of Findings Across Sources

Table 3 integrates the sources. The findings from the student questionnaire, observation, and interviews come from the same students and are comparable in direction, whereas the findings from teachers come from a different group, instrument, and object (the book) and are complementary. Among the student sources, engagement was relatively lowest in all of them, cooperation, communication, and sportsmanship were consistent across the available techniques, and inclusion and confidence differed in emphasis. Among

the teachers, high ratings were accompanied by specific feedback on coherence, ease of instructions, and feasibility. The relationship between student data and teacher data cannot be stated as cause and effect because they come from different groups and activities.

Table 3. Summary triangulation matrix (Comparable: findings from the same students; Complementary: findings from different groups or objects)

Focus	Student questionnaire and observation	Student interviews	Teacher questionnaire	Minutes of the book discussion	Synthesis
Enjoyable experience	Aspect 3.58; item 1 = 3.68; positive emotion 4.00	Fun, happy, crowded, new friends	Item 20 = 3.92	Appreciation for the writing of the book	Comparable: convergent; teacher data complementary
Engagement	Lowest aspect 3.39; item 4 = 3.24; observation lowest 3.00	Less active: shy (SDN 1), many people (SDN 5); active (SDN 2)	—	—	Comparable: convergent in direction; varies among students.
Cooperation and communication	Item 8 = 3.39; item 9 = 3.51; item 13 = 3.53; observation 3.75	Togetherness; inviting others to play	Items 16 and 19 = 3.83	—	Comparable: convergent
Sportsmanship and rules	Item 14 = 3.58; item 15 = 3.55; observation 4.00	Accepting losing; rules understood to varying degrees	Item 17 = 3.75	—	Comparable: partly convergent
Inclusion and confidence	Item 11 = 3.43; item 12 = 3.34; tolerance and empathy 4.00	Shyness; many people; new people	—	—	Comparable: differs in emphasis.
Recognition and continuity	Aspect 3.59; item 17 = 3.42	Knowing more; willing to teach; "Teach them.", "invited to play"	Aspect C 3.87; item 24 = 3.92	Co-curricular activity had introduced games	Complementary : same direction
Book quality and usefulness	—	—	Item 9 = 3.58; items 21 and 22 = 3.75; item 25 = 4.00	Printed book requested; feedback on content, age, Kurikulum Merdeka, risk	Complementary : satisfaction, not effectiveness

4. DISCUSSION

4.1 Interpreting Students' Experience and Engagement

The convergence of the questionnaire, observation, and interviews on an enjoyable experience points in the same direction as the predominantly positive emotional experience reported among 226 students in the Canary Islands [19]. That study used a multi-session intervention, whereas this activity describes a single point in time without a baseline measurement, so the similarity in direction does not mean that games cause positive feelings. In the framework of learning through play, learner experience is one dimension of quality alongside teacher facilitation [20]; the findings here lie in the experience dimension, not in learning outcomes. Joy is reflected in the positive emotion score and in students' statements, whereas choice, an indicator of play in a synthesis of 87 studies [21], was not measured and can be asked about in follow-up activities. Cooperation, communication, sportsmanship, and rule compliance were present in students' experience and in observed behavior, in line with a qualitative study of student interaction [17], but only as visible behavior.

Three features of the data suggest why engagement was relatively low, although responses were positive overall. First, the students who were less active attributed it to the number of people or to shyness, and the setting brought together students from three schools, so some students were among unfamiliar peers; the relatively low confidence item (3.34) is consistent with this, and enjoyment and shyness can be present at the same time in a new social situation. Second, the observation indicators refer to group members and turns of play, so in games played in turns some waiting is built into the activity and may lower an item such as being active from start to finish (item 4; 3.24) even when students enjoy the game; narrative observation notes would be needed to confirm this interpretation. Third, passive engagement among some participants amid growing cooperation and sportsmanship was also reported in a fifth-grade case study [22]. Group size and composition were not recorded in this activity, so these explanations remain hypotheses; smaller mixed groups, roles for hesitant students, and teacher facilitation [20] can be tried and recorded in the next cycle.

Most studies of traditional games in primary schools assess outcomes [11]–[16], and the community service reports reviewed describe awareness-raising and demonstrations [5] or physical activity as an alternative to gadgets [4]. This activity adds a documented account of students' experience in cross-school play, including what hindered engagement, and of teachers' responses to a reference book within one partnership cycle, which supports treating students' experience as an object of study in its own right [20], [21]. It also relates to the finding that a lack of playmates makes games increasingly rare [2]: cross-school play provided playmates for the duration of the activity, although whether it affects play outside the activity was not recorded.

4.2 Teachers' Feedback and Prospects for Classroom Use

The teachers' specific feedback is more informative than their scores. Advice on games suited to particular ages, details of implementation in the Kurikulum Merdeka and of the assessment that can be done, and details of risk levels and the level of teacher supervision are the conditions under which a teacher can decide whether and how to bring a game into the classroom, so they bear on the role of teachers as a link between games and students [28]. The presenters' answers, that the book had not yet been specified for implementation in schools and that details of risk levels were not yet possible because of limited time and data, show that these are gaps to be filled by revision and not matters to be assumed away. The question about why kaulinan was chosen as the theme, which the presenters answered in terms of values such as being systematic that are needed in mathematics learning, also shows that teachers expect the link to learning to be explained.

The book discussion can contribute to future classroom practice in three ways: it surfaced what teachers need in a reference source, it gave teachers a chance to relate the games to their own practice, as the teacher did who had already introduced games and their connection to mathematics in a co-curricular activity, and it produced an agenda for revising the book. It does not follow that teachers will implement the activities. No use of the book in teaching was recorded, and the request for a printed copy because the digital file was hard to read shows that access is itself a precondition. Routes that already exist in primary schools, namely the local content curriculum and habituation [8] and extracurricular and cultural

activities [9], are possible entry points, and the knowledge gaps about cultural elements in teachers' surroundings [29] and the tendency to prioritize tangible over intangible heritage [10] suggest that written references remain needed.

4.3 Community Participation within the CBR Framework

Partner participation was recorded in needs identification, action, and feedback, which corresponds to the moderate level at which research remains researcher-driven with community input [27]. Even this participation was mediated by the team's instruments: students' needs were expressed through a questionnaire, and teachers' views through a scored questionnaire and handwritten minutes, so the partners' voice was consultative and not yet deliberative. Design, analysis, and member checking were carried out by the team alone, so the interpretation in this article is the team's responsibility, and the activity is not claimed to be community-based research with full participation. Mutual benefit [24] was recorded in concrete exchanges: students played with students from other schools, teachers had a forum to discuss the book, the team obtained data and substantive feedback, and the teachers' request for a printed book was met by the presenters' readiness to provide a copy. Benefit to the wider community beyond the three schools was not examined. Because genuine partnership is a demand that communities make of researchers [25], the next cycle can involve partners from the design of the activity and instruments, in discussing the results with teachers and student representatives, and in preparing the revision of the book.

4.4 Observed Outcomes, Expected Benefits, and a Follow-up Model

A distinction needs to be kept between what was observed and what is expected. What was observed is that students reported and showed enjoyment and cooperation in a single session and that some were less active, that teachers rated the book highly and gave specific feedback, and that partners took part in the stages described above. What is expected but not observed is an improvement in knowledge of the rules or in interest, continued play after the activity, teachers' use of the book, and the sustainability of the program. Table 4 links the two for each group of actors; its right-hand column consists of proposals that have not been tested.

Among the proposals, the one most directly supported by the data is invitation among friends: the three interviewed students said they would teach the games to friends or family. They mentioned ways to keep the games alive ("Teach them.", "invited to play"), in line with the finding that a lack of playmates makes games increasingly rare [2] and with strengthening kaulinan barudak through awareness-raising and demonstrations in the community [5]. This answer was given to a closed question, so it expresses willingness and not behavior. A partnership among schools, the community, and the government is described as a supporting condition [7], and the cross-school activity across three schools in Gunung Pereng can be read as a small example of partnership among schools. The activity can therefore become a basis for follow-up in the form of documentation, regular play, and integration into school activities, with sustainability stated as a potential and not as a result.

Table 4. Observed outcomes and proposed follow-up by group (proposals not yet tested)

Group	Observed in this activity	Proposed follow-up (not yet tested)
Schools	Three schools took part; students from different schools played together; teachers of SDN 2 discussed the book, and a co-curricular activity there had already introduced games.	Regular game practice in smaller mixed groups within co-curricular, local content, or extracurricular activities [8], [9], with duration, groups, and narrative notes recorded
Teachers	Rated the book highly; asked for a printed copy; gave feedback on coherence, age suitability, Kurikulum Merdeka, assessment, and risk and supervision	Revise the book accordingly and provide a printed copy; hold a follow-up discussion on classroom use and record any use.
Students	Enjoyed the games; three interviewed students were willing to teach friends or family; some were less active or shy	Peer teaching and invitations among friends [2]; roles for hesitant students; ask about choice in play [21]
Local community	No involvement was recorded.	Involve parents and community practitioners in documenting and demonstrating the games [5], [7], [26], and invite partners to co-design the next cycle

4.5 Limitations

The limitations of this activity need to be noted. The interviews involved only three students, with follow-up questions that sometimes led the informants and were asked by the organizing team, so there may be a tendency to give pleasing answers. The observation consisted of two sets of scores without narrative notes or details of the unit of observation, and the four-point questionnaire without a neutral option has the potential for bias and concentrates on high scores [34]. There was no baseline measurement with the same items and no comparison group, so the student questionnaire and the initial data cannot be compared as change; the initial questionnaire and the experience questionnaire used different items; the instruments were developed by the team without documented review and were not tested psychometrically; and coding was carried out by the team without a second coder. Student data were not separated by school; the teacher questionnaire was completed by only 12 people from one school and shows a ceiling effect, and the minutes are handwritten notes without a recording. There is no documentation of the duration and number of groups in the game practice, of how participants were selected, or of ethical clearance and parental consent. Follow-up in the form of continued play at schools and teachers' use of the book has not been recorded, so sustainability is stated as a potential. Follow-up activities require follow-up data on play practice and use of the book, more informants from various schools, narrative observation notes, and a revision of the book according to teachers' feedback. This formulation is deliberately limited to description so as not to go beyond the available data, and it is the basis for caution in reading all the results in the previous sections.

5. CONCLUSION

This community service activity, carried out with a Community-Based Research approach together with three partner primary schools in Gunung Pereng, Tasikmalaya, aimed (1) to identify students' needs, (2) to carry out socialization and practice of kaulinan barudak and describe students' engagement and responses, (3) to carry out a book discussion and

describe teachers' responses, and (4) to examine convergence across data sources and the level of partner participation. Regarding the first aim, students knew the term but had uneven knowledge of the rules and limited recent play, and most wanted to try new games and agreed that a guidebook was needed. Regarding the second, students' responses and observed behavior were positive, with engagement being the relatively lowest area, and the interviews showed enjoyment alongside shyness in some students. Regarding the third, teachers rated the book highly and gave specific feedback on coherence, age suitability, curriculum integration, and risk and supervision. Regarding the fourth, the sources agreed in direction on most foci and differed on inclusion and confidence, and partners took part in needs identification, action, and feedback, whereas design, analysis, and member checking were not carried out together with them.

The main contribution of the activity is a documented cycle that pairs direct game practice for students with a book discussion for teachers, together with an explicit account of the level of partner participation; it suggests that direct play and an accessible written reference can be offered together as a starting point for cultural preservation in primary schools. The findings describe participants' experiences and responses at a single point in time, without a baseline measurement or comparison group and with limited documentation of the implementation and of ethical procedures. They do not show improvements in social skills, knowledge, or interest, do not show that teachers will use the book, and do not show that revitalization or sustainability has been achieved. Future activities should (1) hold regular game practice in smaller groups, with narrative observation notes and records of duration and groups; (2) revise the book according to teachers' feedback on age suitability, the Kurikulum Merdeka, and risk and supervision, and provide a printed copy; (3) involve partners in designing the instruments and discussing the results; and (4) follow students and teachers over time, with more informants from various schools and documented parental consent.

REFERENCES

[1] R. Luchoro-Parrilla, P. Lavega-Burgués, S. Damian-Silva, Q. Prat, U. Sáez de Ocáriz, E. Ormo-Ribes, and M. Pic, "Traditional games as cultural heritage: The case of Canary Islands (Spain) from an ethnomotor perspective," *Front. Psychol.*, vol. 12, Art. no. 586238, 2021, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.586238.

[2] E. Rustan and A. Munawir, "Eksistensi permainan tradisional pada generasi digital natives di Luwu Raya dan pengintegrasiannya ke dalam pembelajaran," *J. Pendidik. Kebud.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 181–196, 2020, doi: 10.24832/jpnk.v5i2.1639.

[3] Sukadari, E. W. Prihono, C. K. S. Singh, J. K. Syahruzah, and M. Wu, "The implementation of character education through local wisdom-based learning," *Int. J. Innov. Creat. Change*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 389–403, 2020.

[4] Purwanta, A. I. Rizkita, and H. K. Dewantoro, "Optimizing traditional games as alternative physical activities to reduce gadget dependency among children," *Parikesit (J. Pengabdian, Riset, Kreativitas, Inovasi, dan Teknol. Tepat Guna)*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 241–249, 2025, doi: 10.22146/parikesit.v3i2.16771.

[5] W. Dermawan, C. Purnama, and E. Mahyudin, "Penguatan "Kaulinan Barudak Sunda" sebagai permainan tradisional," *J. Pendidik. Pemberdaya. Masy.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 1–15, 2020, doi: 10.21831/jppm.v7i1.28798.

[6] M. R. A. Syah and Utomo, "Penanaman karakter peserta didik sekolah dasar melalui permainan tradisional Sukabumi "Kaulinan Barudak": Studi literature," *Pendas: J. Ilm. Pendidik. Dasar*, vol. 11, no.

2, pp. 235–246, 2026, doi: 10.23969/jp.v11i02.53101.

[7] H. Yatim, K. Jayadi, J. Jamilah, A. Abduh, and P. Prusdianto, "Integrating cultural heritage into education: The supportive role of schools in traditional festivals in West Sulawesi," *Discover Educ.*, vol. 4, Art. no. 379, 2025, doi: 10.1007/s44217-025-00847-2.

[8] M. Al-Akmam and D. Adela, "Pelestarian budaya Sunda melalui kurikulum muatan lokal di sekolah dasar," *Scholaria: J. Pendidik. Kebud.*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 204–215, 2026, doi: 10.24246/j.js.2026.v16.i2.p204-215.

[9] D. Adela and M. Al-Akmam, "Upaya pelestarian budaya Sunda di sekolah dasar," *BELAINDIKA: J. Pembelajaran dan Inovasi Pendidik.*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 191–198, 2024, doi: 10.52005/belaindika.v6i2.153.

[10] Y. Pérez-Guilarte and R. García-Morís, "The role of intangible heritage in critical citizenship education: An action research case study with student primary education teachers," *Educ. Sci.*, vol. 13, no. 8, Art. no. 801, 2023, doi: 10.3390/educsci13080801.

[11] J. Irmansyah, R. Lumintuarso, F. X. Sugiyanto, and P. Sukoco, "Children's social skills through traditional sport games in primary schools," *J. Cakrawala Pendidik*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 39–53, 2020, doi: 10.21831/cp.v39i1.28210.

[12] Nevitaningrum, C. B. Mulyatno, and S. Nopembri, "Implementasi pembelajaran pendidikan jasmani berbasis permainan tradisional dalam membentuk karakter peserta didik sekolah dasar," *J. Pendidik. Jasmani Indones.*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 22–33, 2023, doi: 10.21831/jpji.v19i1.73492.

[13] A. Hafina, L. Nur, and A. A. Malik, "The development and validation of a character education model through traditional games based on the Socratic method in an elementary school," *J. Cakrawala Pendidik*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 404–415, 2022, doi: 10.21831/cp.v41i2.46125.

[14] Ariyanto, A. Triansyah, and U. Gustian, "Penggunaan permainan tradisional untuk meningkatkan keterampilan gerak fundamental siswa sekolah dasar," *J. Pendidik. Jasmani Indones.*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 78–91, 2020, doi: 10.21831/jpji.v16i1.30785.

[15] M. K. Sari and G. A. Nugrahanta, "Peran permainan tradisional untuk pendidikan karakter tanggung jawab sosial anak usia 7–9 tahun," *Edukatif: J. Ilmu Pendidik.*, vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 7653–7665, 2022, doi: 10.31004/edukatif.v4i6.4102.

[16] Syahrial, Asrial, D. A. Kurniawan, N. D. Kiska, and L. Damayanti, "Teaching primary school students through local cultural games for improving positive characters," *Int. J. Instr.*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 1047–1078, 2022.

[17] Z. E. T. Rifayanti, E. R. Salamah, P. Monkonsawasd, and S. Andari, "Analysis of student interaction and social skills in game activities in elementary school in Indonesian context," *IJORER: Int. J. Recent Educ. Res.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 43–55, 2025.

[18] N. L. Asyahidah, D. A. Dewi, and R. Sudarmansyah, "Internalisasi nilai karakter budaya Sunda melalui implementasi projek penguatan profil pelajar Pancasila berbasis permainan tradisional," *Pendas: J. Ilm. Pendidik. Dasar*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 158–175, 2025.

[19] R. Luchoro-Parrilla, P. Lavega-Burgués, and M. Pic, "Teaching sustainability through traditional sporting games," *Sustainability*, vol. 16, no. 13, Art. no. 5510, 2024, doi: 10.3390/su16135510.

[20] R. Parker, B. S. Thomsen, and A. Berry, "Learning through play at school – A framework for policy and practice," *Front. Educ.*, vol. 7, Art. no. 751801, 2022, doi: 10.3389/feduc.2022.751801.

[21] S. N. Dean and J. A. Wenner, "Patterns and representation in play-based learning: A systematic meta-synthesis of empirical studies in K-13+ settings," *Front. Educ.*, vol. 10, Art. no. 1557001, 2025, doi: 10.3389/feduc.2025.1557001.

[22] M. R. Firdaus, T. Supriyadi, and A. A. Rahman, "Traditional games for strengthening sportsmanship and cooperation in elementary school physical education," *J. Coaching Educ. Sports*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 206–216, 2026, doi: 10.31599/z5pk3053.

[23] B. A. Israel, A. J. Schulz, E. A. Parker, and A. B. Becker, "Review of community-based research: Assessing partnership approaches to improve public health," *Annu. Rev. Public Health*, vol. 19, pp. 173–202, 1998, doi: 10.1146/annurev.publhealth.19.1.173.

[24] N. B. Wallerstein and B. Duran, "Using community-based participatory research to address health disparities," *Health Promot. Pract.*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 312–323, 2006, doi: 10.1177/1524839906289376.

[25] M. Minkler, "Community-based research partnerships: Challenges and opportunities," *J. Urban Health*, vol. 82, no. 2, suppl. 2, pp. ii3–ii12, 2005, doi: 10.1093/jurban/jti034.
[26] UNESCO, *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, Paris, France, Oct. 17, 2003, Arts. 2(3) and 15.
[27] C. R. Spears Johnson, A. E. Kraemer Diaz, and T. A. Arcury, "Participation levels in 25 community-based participatory research projects," *Health Educ. Res.*, vol. 31, no. 5, pp. 577–586, 2016, doi: 10.1093/her/cyw033.
[28] A. Temel, M. Kangalgil, and O. Çali, "Teachers' views on the role of traditional children's games in education," *J. Educ. Recreat. Patterns*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 52–65, 2024, doi: 10.53016/jerp.v5i1.220.
[29] P. Suárez-Álvarez and A. Otero-Varela, "Working with cultural heritage from the local environment: Analysis of perceptions of future teachers," *Soc. Sci.*, vol. 14, no. 2, Art. no. 99, 2025, doi: 10.3390/socsci14020099.
[30] L. S. Vygotsky, *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*, M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, and E. Souberman, Eds. Cambridge, MA, USA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1978.
[31] J. Lave and E. Wenger, *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1991.
[32] S. Hall and L. Liebenberg, "Qualitative description as an introductory method to qualitative research for master's-level students and research trainees," *Int. J. Qual. Methods*, vol. 23, 2024, doi: 10.1177/16094069241242264.
[33] L. Doyle, C. McCabe, B. Keogh, A. Brady, and M. McCann, "An overview of the qualitative descriptive design within nursing research," *J. Res. Nurs.*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 443–455, 2020, doi: 10.1177/1744987119880234.
[34] I. Kusmaryono, D. Wijayanti, and H. R. Maharani, "Number of response options, reliability, validity, and potential bias in the use of the Likert scale education and social science research: A literature review," *Int. J. Educ. Methodol.*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 625–637, 2022, doi: 10.12973/ijem.8.4.625.
[35] S. Campbell *et al.*, "Purposive sampling: Complex or simple? Research case examples," *J. Res. Nurs.*, vol. 25, no. 8, pp. 652–661, 2020, doi: 10.1177/1744987120927206.
[36] Y. Sun *et al.*, "Methods and ethics in qualitative research exploring young children's voice: A systematic review," *Int. J. Qual. Methods*, vol. 22, 2023, doi: 10.1177/16094069231152449.
[37] H. Alkharusi, "A descriptive analysis and interpretation of data from Likert scales in educational and psychological research," *Indian J. Psychol. Educ.*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 13–16, 2022.
[38] J. L. Pimentel, "Some biases in Likert scaling usage and its correction," *Int. J. Sci. Basic Appl. Res.*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 183–191, 2019.
[39] L. S. Nowell, J. M. Norris, D. E. White, and N. J. Moules, "Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria," *Int. J. Qual. Methods*, vol. 16, 2017, doi: 10.1177/1609406917733847.
[40] P. Fusch, G. E. Fusch, and L. R. Ness, "Denzin's paradigm shift: Revisiting triangulation in qualitative research," *J. Soc. Change*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 19–32, 2018, doi: 10.5590/JOSC.2018.10.1.02.