BEGAWE (Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat)
Vol. 1, No. 2, June 2026. Pp. 01-11
ISSN. XXXX-XXXX

Generative Artificial Intelligence Literacy for Faith-Based Social Organizations: A Participatory Digital Governance and Community Empowerment Model

Sukron Azhari
Sunan Kalijaga State Islamic University of Yogyakarta
E-mail Correspondent: sukronazhari84@gmail.com

Artikel Information

Keywords:
Generative Artificial Intelligence; AI Literacy; Digital Governance; Faith-Based Organizations; Community Empowerment.

Sub. 9th, Apr. 2025
Rev. 10th, May. 2026
Pub. 23rd, June. 2026

Vol. 01, No. 02, June 2026
DOI: BEGAWE

Abstract

The rapid development of generative artificial intelligence (AI) has created new opportunities for social organizations to improve administrative efficiency, public communication, knowledge management, and community services. Nevertheless, the adoption of these technologies requires more than access to digital applications. Organizational users must develop the capacity to formulate effective prompts, evaluate generated information, protect personal data, and maintain accountability for technology-assisted decisions. This community engagement article proposes a participatory capacity-building model to strengthen generative AI literacy among managers of faith-based social organizations. The proposed intervention consists of community needs assessment, AI literacy education, practical workshops, institutional document development, ethical governance formulation, and outcome evaluation. The program integrates technical competencies with organizational learning and responsible technology use. Its principal contribution is the development of an institutional approach that positions AI as a supporting instrument rather than a substitute for human judgment, professional responsibility, or community participation. Evaluation is designed to assess changes in knowledge, practical performance, document quality, and organizational readiness through pre-training and post-training assessments, observation, product evaluation, and reflective interviews. Expected outputs include improved digital competencies, verified administrative documents, and an institutional guideline for responsible AI adoption. Because this manuscript presents a proposed community engagement model, empirical outcomes must be established through actual implementation and systematic evaluation. The framework offers a practical foundation for developing context-sensitive digital transformation initiatives within community-based and faith-based organizations.

How to Cite :
Sukron Azhari, (2026). Generative Artificial Intelligence Literacy for Faith-Based Social Organizations. BEGAWE: Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat, hal. 01-11

1. Introduction

Digital transformation has become an important consideration for organizations seeking to improve administrative performance, communication, and public service delivery. The emergence of generative artificial intelligence (AI) has accelerated this transformation by enabling users to generate text, summarize documents, develop communication materials, organize information, and formulate preliminary program proposals. These capabilities offer opportunities for community-based organizations whose operational activities frequently depend on limited human resources, voluntary participation, and locally mobilized funding.

Faith-based social organizations occupy a distinctive position within community life. Beyond their religious functions, these organizations may provide educational assistance, humanitarian services, social support, community development, and activities that strengthen social solidarity. Their effectiveness depends not only on religious commitment but also on organizational capacity, administrative accountability, public trust, and the ability to respond to changing community needs. Consequently, improving the digital competencies of organizational managers represents a relevant component of institutional development.

Generative AI can potentially support several routine activities, including drafting proposals, preparing activity reports, developing educational materials, organizing meeting agendas, and producing public information. Nevertheless, the usefulness of these technologies depends on the capacity of users to evaluate their outputs critically. AI-generated content can contain factual errors, unsupported claims, misleading references, and inappropriate interpretations. UNESCO (2023) emphasizes the importance of a human-centered approach to generative AI, particularly regarding privacy, ethical validation, inclusion, and human agency. These considerations are relevant to community organizations because their activities frequently involve sensitive information and relationships of trust.

The central problem, therefore, is not simply whether faith-based social organizations can access AI applications. Rather, the more fundamental question concerns their capacity to integrate these technologies into organizational practices without weakening accountability, privacy, and human responsibility. Technology adoption without adequate preparation may create new operational risks. Organizational managers may rely on inaccurate information, disclose personal data through external applications, or distribute materials without sufficient verification. Such practices could undermine the credibility of institutions that depend substantially on public confidence.

Recent community engagement initiatives in Indonesia demonstrate growing interest in AI literacy as an instrument of digital capacity-building. For example, Karima et al. (2025) examined community empowerment through AI and data science in West Jakarta, while Agustiani et al. (n.d.) reported a participatory AI literacy initiative in an urban community in South Jakarta. Other community service programs have addressed AI competencies among teachers, students, and educational institutions. These initiatives provide useful precedents for developing practical and participatory approaches to technology education. However, the organizational needs of faith-based social institutions require particular attention to institutional responsibility, ethical communication, and the protection of community information.

The proposed intervention addresses this concern by integrating AI literacy training with institutional mentoring and the development of responsible digital governance procedures. Rather than treating AI literacy as the ability to operate a particular application, the program conceptualizes it as a combination of conceptual understanding, practical competence, critical evaluation, ethical awareness, and organizational accountability. This broader perspective recognizes that effective digital transformation requires changes in both individual capabilities and organizational practices.

The participatory orientation of the program is equally important. Community organizations possess contextual knowledge about their members, local values, institutional priorities, and service beneficiaries. Training designed without considering this knowledge may produce technically competent users without generating meaningful institutional change. A participatory approach enables organizational managers to identify their own priorities, select relevant applications, evaluate practical outcomes, and formulate procedures that reflect their circumstances.

The novelty of the proposed model lies in the integration of four dimensions: generative AI literacy, practical administrative assistance, ethical risk management, and participatory institutional governance. Existing technology training often emphasizes application skills or immediate productivity. This model extends the intervention by connecting those competencies with organizational procedures and the continuity of community services. The approach is intended to ensure that technological adoption strengthens rather than displaces human judgment, social responsibility, and local knowledge.

Accordingly, this community engagement initiative has three objectives. First, it seeks to strengthen the conceptual and practical AI literacy of faith-based social organization managers. Second, it aims to improve their ability to produce and verify technology-assisted institutional documents. Third, it seeks to develop practical guidelines for responsible AI use that address privacy, information verification, accountability, and organizational oversight. These objectives establish the

foundation for an intervention whose success can be assessed through observable changes in participant competencies and institutional practices.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Generative AI Literacy and Digital Competence

Generative AI literacy extends beyond familiarity with digital applications. It includes understanding how AI systems produce outputs, recognizing their limitations, formulating appropriate instructions, evaluating information quality, and determining when human intervention is necessary. Users need to understand that fluent and persuasive outputs do not necessarily represent accurate or independently verified knowledge.

Miao and Holmes (2023), in UNESCO's guidance on generative AI in education and research, emphasize human-centered development, data protection, and institutional preparedness. Although their framework primarily addresses educational contexts, its principles are relevant to community organizations that use AI to generate information, prepare documents, and support decision-making. Institutional users require adequate preparation to determine whether generated outputs are appropriate for their intended purposes.

UNESCO (2024) further highlights the relationship between media and information literacy and the responsible use of generative AI. Critical evaluation is particularly important when AI-generated material contains unsupported claims, synthetic media, or misleading information. For community organizations, these competencies are necessary when producing public announcements, educational content, and materials related to social or religious activities. Accordingly, the proposed intervention defines AI literacy through five interconnected competencies: conceptual understanding, operational skills, critical information evaluation, ethical awareness, and responsible application. These competencies provide a practical framework for designing training activities and assessing learning outcomes.

2.2. Participatory Community Empowerment

Community empowerment involves strengthening the capacity of individuals and organizations to understand their circumstances, identify priorities, and participate in decisions affecting their activities. Freire (1970) argues that transformative education should encourage critical awareness and active participation rather than passive acceptance of externally determined knowledge. Applied to AI literacy, this perspective suggests that community members should not merely follow demonstrations conducted by trainers. They should participate in selecting practical problems, testing technological solutions, evaluating the limitations of generated outputs, and deciding how new capabilities can be

incorporated into organizational routines.

Participation is particularly relevant for faith-based social organizations because their institutional legitimacy frequently depends on collective commitment, shared values, and relationships with local communities. Training that ignores these characteristics may introduce technically useful practices that are difficult to sustain. The proposed program therefore adopts participatory needs assessment, collaborative learning, practical exercises, and collective reflection. Participants contribute contextual knowledge, while facilitators provide technical guidance and evaluation instruments. This arrangement seeks to connect technological learning with the institutional priorities identified by the participating organization.

2.3. Digital Governance and Responsible AI

Digital governance concerns the rules, responsibilities, procedures, and oversight mechanisms that guide the use of technology within an organization. Responsible AI governance requires clear accountability, appropriate data management, human oversight, and mechanisms for identifying and correcting errors. Floridi et al. (2018) propose principles for the ethical development and use of AI, including beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy, justice, and explicability. These principles offer a conceptual basis for evaluating AI adoption beyond technical performance. An application may save time while still creating unacceptable risks if it exposes confidential information or generates misleading public communications.

Similarly, the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST, 2023) presents the AI Risk Management Framework as a structured approach to identifying, assessing, and managing AI-related risks. Although the framework was developed for broader organizational settings, its risk-oriented principles can be adapted to community institutions through proportionate procedures suited to their resources. For faith-based social organizations, responsible governance should specify which tasks may be supported by AI, which information must remain confidential, who verifies generated content, and who authorizes its publication.

Decisions involving beneficiaries, sensitive personal circumstances, or authoritative religious interpretation require particular care and should not be delegated to an AI system. The integration of AI literacy, participation, and governance thus provides a conceptual foundation for the proposed community engagement model. Its principal proposition is that sustainable digital transformation requires individual competence and institutional responsibility to develop together.

3. Methodology

3.1. Community Engagement Design

The proposed program uses a participatory capacity-building approach that combines practical

training, institutional mentoring, and reflective evaluation. The intervention is designed for managers and administrators of faith-based social organizations who undertake routine administrative, communication, and community service responsibilities. The participating organization, geographical location, number of participants, and duration should be determined through consultation with the prospective community partner. These details must be documented before implementation to ensure that the intervention reflects the actual characteristics of the target community. The program consists of five stages: needs assessment, learning design, practical training, institutional mentoring, and evaluation. Each stage is connected to the subsequent stage so that the activities move beyond knowledge transmission toward practical application and organizational learning.

3.2. Needs Assessment

The initial stage identifies the partner organization's administrative practices, digital resources, existing competencies, and priority challenges. Data may be collected through semi-structured interviews, direct observation, and group discussions with organizational managers.

The assessment should examine document preparation, communication practices, information storage, technology access, and existing procedures for protecting personal data. Participants should also identify tasks that could benefit from AI assistance without compromising the organization's responsibilities. The findings inform the selection of training materials and practical exercises. For example, an organization that struggles with preparing activity reports may prioritize document drafting and verification, whereas an organization seeking to improve public communication may focus on developing accessible announcements and educational materials.

3.3. AI Literacy Training

The training stage combines interactive presentations, demonstrations, guided exercises, and collaborative discussion. The curriculum covers the basic characteristics of generative AI, prompt formulation, output evaluation, source verification, data protection, and ethical use. Participants practice developing instructions that specify the intended task, relevant context, desired format, and evaluation criteria. They then examine generated outputs to identify inaccuracies, unsupported statements, inappropriate language, and missing contextual information.

The training emphasizes that AI-generated material must be reviewed before institutional use. Participants are encouraged to consult reliable sources, verify factual claims, and maintain responsibility for final decisions. Personal information about beneficiaries or community members should not be entered into AI services without an appropriate legal basis and adequate safeguards.

3.4. Institutional Mentoring and Product Development

Following the training, participants develop practical products relevant to their organizational responsibilities. These may include draft activity proposals, meeting summaries, program plans, educational materials, and public communication content. Each product is reviewed using predefined criteria: relevance, factual accuracy, clarity, contextual suitability, ethical appropriateness, and data protection. Facilitators provide feedback, and participants revise their products accordingly.

A further component involves developing an institutional AI-use guideline. The guideline should identify approved purposes, prohibited practices, verification procedures, responsibilities for review, and procedures for correcting errors. It should also address transparency when AI assistance is relevant to the integrity of a document or public communication.

3.5. Evaluation and Data Analysis

Evaluation is designed to assess both individual learning and institutional readiness. A pre-training and post-training assessment may measure conceptual understanding and the ability to identify AI-related risks. Practical observation and product assessment can evaluate whether participants apply the skills introduced during the workshop. Qualitative information may be obtained through reflective discussions and interviews. Thematic analysis can then be used to identify perceived benefits, implementation barriers, ethical concerns, and requirements for continued support.

Quantitative findings should be reported using the actual number of participants, assessment scores, and scoring procedures. If pre-training and post-training scores are compared, the article should specify the statistical or descriptive method used. Qualitative interpretations should be supported by field notes or appropriately anonymized participant statements. No numerical outcomes are assumed in this manuscript. All reported findings must be derived from the completed activity and its documented evaluation.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Organizational Needs and Digital Readiness

The first expected area of analysis concerns the partner organization's initial digital readiness. The needs assessment should establish how administrative documents are produced, how public information is distributed, and what difficulties managers encounter when performing these activities. Rather than treating limited AI use as evidence of organizational weakness, the assessment should distinguish between technological access, user competence, and institutional readiness. An organization may possess adequate digital devices but lack procedures for checking information. Another may have capable users but limited internet access or insufficient time for structured training.

This distinction is important because the appropriate intervention depends on the nature of the problem. Where access is limited, the program may require low-cost applications and offline learning

materials. Where competence is the main concern, practical instruction and mentoring may be more effective. Where governance procedures are absent, the organization may benefit from developing internal guidance and assigning responsibility for verification. The actual results should document these conditions and explain how they influenced the final training design. Such reporting would demonstrate that the intervention emerged from community needs rather than from the availability of a particular technology.

4.2. Practical AI Competencies and Administrative Improvement

The second area concerns the development of practical competencies. Participants should be able to use AI to produce preliminary drafts, reorganize information, and improve the clarity of administrative documents while recognizing the need for human review. The assessment should distinguish between producing an output and evaluating its quality. A participant may successfully generate a proposal but remain unable to identify inaccurate information or unsupported claims. Consequently, successful task completion should be evaluated alongside verification skills and the ability to explain revisions.

Previous community engagement initiatives provide relevant comparative perspectives. Karima et al. (2025) demonstrate the relevance of AI and data science initiatives for community empowerment, while UNESCO (2023) emphasizes the importance of human-centered preparation. The proposed intervention extends these concerns into institutional practice by connecting practical AI skills with document quality, organizational accountability, and continuing use.

Evidence of improvement should be established through comparisons between initial and final assessments, evaluated products, and documented observations. If improvements are limited to selected competencies, those limitations should be reported transparently. Such findings would help identify which training components require further development.

4.3. Ethical Governance and Institutional Accountability

The third area concerns the relationship between technological competence and organizational responsibility. AI-generated documents can influence institutional decisions and public perceptions, making verification essential even when the technology is used for routine administrative purposes. A practical governance guideline should identify the stages at which human review is required. For example, an AI-generated activity announcement should be checked for date, location, eligibility, and contact information before publication. A proposal containing financial estimates should be verified against actual organizational requirements. Religious educational materials should be reviewed by appropriately qualified individuals when interpretive accuracy is important.

Data protection also requires explicit attention. Organizations should avoid submitting confidential beneficiary records, personal identification details, sensitive health information, or private correspondence to external AI services unless appropriate safeguards and lawful grounds are established. Data minimization should guide the design of practical exercises and the selection of tools. These measures reflect the ethical principles discussed by Floridi et al. (2018) and the risk-management orientation of NIST (2023). Their application should be proportionate to the organization's size and capacity rather than creating procedures that are too complex to maintain. The effectiveness of this component should be assessed through evidence that the partner organization has adopted usable verification procedures, identified responsible reviewers, and agreed on rules for sensitive information. The mere production of a written guideline is insufficient if members do not understand or apply it.

4.4. Participation, Local Knowledge, and Social Sustainability

A significant consideration in community-based digital transformation is the relationship between technological efficiency and local knowledge. Faith-based social organizations operate within specific cultural and social environments. Their communication practices, organizational priorities, and relationships with beneficiaries cannot be fully understood through generic technological solutions. A participatory approach allows organizational managers to determine which tasks are suitable for AI assistance and which require direct human engagement. Activities involving interpersonal support, conflict mediation, sensitive religious questions, and decisions about vulnerable beneficiaries require contextual understanding and human responsibility.

Freire's (1970) perspective on critical and dialogical education provides a useful foundation for this approach. Participants are encouraged to question generated information, reflect on the implications of technology, and make decisions based on their own institutional experience. In this way, training becomes a process of collective learning rather than the simple transfer of technical instructions. Local language and cultural context also require attention. AI-generated content may use expressions that are linguistically correct but socially inappropriate. Participants should therefore review generated materials for cultural relevance, accessibility, and respect for community values. The capacity to recognize these limitations constitutes an important dimension of responsible AI literacy.

4.5. Sustainability and Institutional Replication

The sustainability of the intervention depends on whether new competencies become part of routine organizational practice. A one-time workshop may increase awareness, but continued use requires internal support, opportunities for practice, and accessible guidance.

A designated organizational facilitator could coordinate peer learning, maintain training materials, and support the review of AI-assisted documents. Periodic reflection sessions could identify

emerging problems, changes in application features, and additional training needs. The organization should also review its guidelines as technologies and relevant regulations evolve.

Replication should be based on principles rather than identical implementation. The same framework may be adapted for educational foundations, community service organizations, religious associations, or other nonprofit institutions. However, each implementation requires a new needs assessment, appropriate safeguards, and evaluation indicators suited to its context. The contribution of the proposed model is therefore not a claim that AI automatically improves organizational performance. Instead, it offers a structured approach for examining how technical skills, participatory learning, ethical safeguards, and institutional responsibility can be integrated into community engagement.

5. Conclusion

Generative AI creates opportunities for faith-based social organizations to improve administrative work, communication, and knowledge management. However, meaningful adoption requires more than access to applications. It requires critical AI literacy, practical competence, data protection, reliable verification, and clear institutional accountability. This article proposes a participatory community engagement model integrating needs assessment, AI literacy training, practical product development, ethical governance formulation, and systematic evaluation. Its distinguishing contribution is the integration of individual digital competence with institutional procedures and community participation.

The proposed model should be evaluated through documented changes in participant knowledge, practical performance, product quality, and organizational readiness. Future implementation should also examine whether the acquired competencies remain in use after the training period and whether the approach can be adapted to organizations with different resources and cultural contexts. Because this manuscript presents a proposed intervention rather than a completed empirical study, conclusions regarding effectiveness must await actual implementation and evaluation. The model nevertheless provides a structured foundation for community engagement that seeks to ensure that digital transformation strengthens institutional capacity, public trust, and responsible community service

Recommendations

Faith-based social organizations should integrate generative AI literacy into their institutional development through continuous training, practical mentoring, and responsible technology management. AI applications should support administrative efficiency and community services while protecting data privacy, ensuring information accuracy, and maintaining human oversight. Collaboration among universities, community organizations, and technology practitioners is essential to strengthen digital competencies and sustain implementation. Future community engagement programs should evaluate training effectiveness through measurable learning outcomes and follow-up assessments. These efforts can promote inclusive digital transformation while preserving local values, community participation, and institutional accountability.

REFERENCES

Agustiani, S., Aryanti, R., Wahyuni, T., Nurlelah, E., Ramadhanti, P. H., & Azkia, F. D. (n.d.). *Empowering community digital literacy through participatory artificial intelligence training using participatory action research in South Jakarta*. Help: Journal of Community Service. https://doi.org/10.62569/hjcs.v3i1.279

Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., Luetge, C., Madelin, R., Pagallo, U., Rossi, F., Schafer, B., Valcke, P., & Vayena, E. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society: *Opportunities*, risks, principles, and recommendations. *Minds and Machines, 28*, 689–707. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Herder and Herder.

Karima, I. S., Chandra, N. A., Maesaroh, S., Rushendra, R., Suhendra, S., Sari, Y. S., & Kurnianda, N. R. (2025). Empowering *communities* through AI and data science in West Jakarta as part of Jakarta's inclusive digital transformation. *ICCD, 7*(1), 856–861. https://doi.org/10.33068/iccd.v7i1.956

Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000386693

National Institute of Standards and Technology. (2023). *Artificial intelligence risk management framework (AI RMF 1.0)* (NIST AI 100-1). U.S. Department of Commerce. https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.AI.*100*-1

UNESCO. (2024). *Media and information literacy responses to generative AI: A policy brief*. UNESCO Institute for Information *Technologies* in Education. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000388547