Reconceptualizing Human Capital Through Multicentric Digital Governance & Cross-Border Synchronization

Dana-Marie Ramjit

Department of Political Science, St. Mary's University, Calgary, Canada

Correspondence Author E-mail: dana-marie.ramjit@stmu.ca

Keywords:	Abstract
Digitalization; Human capital governance; Multicentric digital governance.	This paper interrogates the transformation of human capital governance under the accelerating energies of digital globalization and technological innovation. It identifies a central governance problem: existing institutional arrangements are increasingly inadequate to address the ethical, distributive, and social challenges posed by algorithmic systems, digital platforms, and data-driven decision-making. While prior research has explored digital governance in areas such as e-government and automation, little attention has been paid to how these dynamics are reshaping human capital governance as a multi-scalar and ethically charged domain. The purpose of this study is to analyze these transformations and advance the concepts of multicentric digital governance and cross-border synchronization, which reconceptualize workforce governance as an adaptive, pluriversal, and participatory process. The discussion highlights the dual challenge of leveraging digital tools to enhance efficiency and inclusion while mitigating risks such as bias, commodification, and inequality. The paper concludes by outlining policy solutions that balance innovation with principled oversight, offering a framework for building resilient, equitable, and ethically grounded structures of human capital governance in the digital age. The conceptual framework advanced in this study offers insights for the broader governance and organizational studies literature, illustrating how digitalization reshapes authority, ethics, and stakeholder engagement across sectors.
Kata kunci:	**Abstrak**
Digitalisasi; Tata kelola modal manusia; Tata kelola digital multisentris.	Makalah ini bertujuan menelaah bagaimana tata kelola modal manusia mengalami transformasi di tengah percepatan globalisasi digital dan inovasi teknologi. Persoalan utama yang diangkat adalah bahwa kerangka kelembagaan yang ada semakin tidak memadai untuk menghadapi tantangan etika, distribusi, dan sosial yang muncul dari sistem algoritmik, *platform* digital, serta pengambilan keputusan berbasis data. Walaupun penelitian terdahulu banyak membahas tata kelola digital dalam konteks *e-government* maupun otomasi, sedikit yang menyoroti dampaknya pada tata kelola modal manusia yang kompleks dan sarat dimensi etis. Studi ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis perubahan tersebut dan mengembangkan konsep *multicentric digital governance* serta *cross-border synchronization*. Kedua konsep ini mereposisikan tata kelola tenaga kerja sebagai proses yang adaptif, pluriversal, dan partisipatif. Diskusi menyoroti tantangan ganda dalam optimalisasi teknologi digital untuk meningkatkan efisiensi dan inklusi sekaligus mitigasi risiko bias, komodifikasi, dan ketimpangan. Makalah ini merekomendasikan kebijakan yang menyeimbangkan inovasi dengan pengawasan etis serta mengajukan kerangka tata kelola modal manusia yang adil dan berkelanjutan. Konsep ini memperluas studi tata kelola dengan menyoroti bagaimana digitalisasi mengubah otoritas, etika dan peran pemangku kepentingan lintas sektor.
Article info 	

1. Introduction

The digital age has triggered a fundamental change in governance, unsettling long-standing models of organizational leadership grounded in centralized, hierarchical authority. For much of the twentieth century, governance, whether in the public sector or within organizations, was conceived through a state-centric, top-down lens, wherein legitimacy, control, and administrative capacity stemmed from tightly managed bureaucratic structures. Since the early 2000s, a convergence of three interrelated dynamics: the empowerment of digitally engaged individuals, the fragmentation of governance across hybrid public–private domains, and the emergence of platform-mediated synchronization, has restructured the contours of authority and workforce engagement (Zelli, 2011; Zhou, 2017). These forces have exposed a process of digital disaggregation: control and accountability no longer rest exclusively within institutional hierarchies but are instead distributed across fluid, interdependent ecosystems of actors (Biermann et. al., 2020; Statman et al., 2018; Herring et al., 2020).

Central to this transformation is the figure of the digital worker, a participant whose agency disrupts conventional notions of the passive subject or compliant employee (Dedema & Rosenbaum, 2024; Gruszka & Böhm, 2020; Griffiths, 2015). Increasingly, workers are demanding roles in deliberative and co-productive processes, thereby compelling organizations and institutions to reimagine services, leadership, and governance through the lenses of transparency, responsiveness, and collective stewardship (Pūraitė et al., 2020; Moskatova et al., 2021).

At the core of this shift is the growing influence of private digital actors in domains traditionally governed by organizational authority. This blurring of boundaries raises crucial concerns around accountability, control, and democratic legitimacy (Nair, 2024; Thi Duyen, 2021). As private platforms assume outsized roles in shaping communication, decision-making, and labor coordination, employers must navigate the complexities of multi-nodal, transboundary governance environments. The implications for Human Capital Management (HCM) are profound. Authority now becomes negotiated rather than imposed, and legitimacy must be continuously earned through ethical conduct, adaptability, and shared vision (Fu & Barbour, 2023). These developments are not only reshaping policy processes, but also redefining how human capital is governed across sectors (Gardenier et al., 2024; Zuboff, 2022).

Despite significant scholarship on governance and digitalization, current models remain conceptually limited. What was once considered a stable and dominant model of governance is regarded as historically contingent, conceptually limited, and misaligned with the decentralized, networked, and contested realities

of the twenty-first century. Traditional models, rooted in hierarchical and technocratic models, are inadequate in addressing the dispersed authority, pluriversal norms, and moral priorities that characterize the digital age. Jae-Moo and Hong (2013) emphasize the reduction in governmental roles as networks expand, characterizing the government's function as increasingly supportive rather than controlling and reflecting the broader societal shift towards decentralized governance. Berardo et al. (2020) explore how networks have catalyzed new theoretical advancements in governance literature, arguing for a comprehensive evaluation of collaborative governance that acknowledges its emergent properties in contemporary contexts. Similarly, Arnold's (2020) historical analysis of transnational governance mechanisms illustrates how contextual factors matter, such as reshaping governance standards and questioning the permanence of dominant concepts.

Remarkably, the digital transformation of governance introduces an overwhelming duality. On one hand, emerging technologies empower new forms of management, collaboration, and collective voice. On the other, they expose human capital systems to risks such as algorithmic bias, pervasive surveillance, commodification of worker data, and widening asymmetries of power between institutions and platform providers (Jobin et al., 2019; Minbaleev et al., 2021; Maksimenko et al., 2021). These dynamics echo the urgency of a governance archetype that is not only technically agile but also ethically grounded in transparency, equity, and democratic accountability. This paper addresses a pressing governance problem: the accelerating digitalization of human capital systems is outpacing the capacity of traditional institutional arrangements to manage its ethical, social, and distributive consequences.

While existing research has examined digital governance in domains such as e-government, algorithmic regulation, and workforce modernization, the literature remains fragmented and insufficiently attentive to the specific reconfiguration of human capital governance under conditions of digital globalization. Prior studies have illuminated either the efficiencies promised by platformization or the risks posed by algorithmic bias and data commodification, yet few have systematically connected these dynamics to the governance of human capital as a multi-scalar, ethically charged, and policy-relevant domain.

The purpose of this paper, therefore, is to analyze how digital platforms, algorithmic systems, and participatory networks are transforming the governance of human capital, and to advance a conceptual framework that balances technological innovation with inclusion, ethical and environmental responsibility. By doing so, the study contributes to closing a critical gap in public administration

and governance scholarship, offering the foundations of what may be termed Multicentric Digital Governance and Cross-Border Synchronization, a framework that reconceptualizes workforce governance as an adaptive, pluriversal, and participatory process capable of addressing twenty-first-century challenges.

This manuscript adopts a conceptual review to synthesizing scholarship across governance, labor relations, digital transformation, and organizational theory. Rather than presenting new empirical data, it critically evaluates existing literature to identify emerging patterns, theoretical gaps, and implications for human capital governance in the digital era. The methodological framework is both analytical and integrative, effectively merging insights from political science, public administration, and management research to construct a comprehensive multi-scalar governance framework that is resilient, ethical, and participatory. This model addresses the complexities of digitally networked environments while the research aspires to advancing deeper understanding and enhancement of human capital governance in the digital era.

2. Traditional Human Capital Management

Traditional HCM has centered on workforce optimization to improve efficiency and achieve strategic goals. Rooted in a centralized, top-down model, it treats human capital chiefly as a resource for economic performance. Traditional HCM practices often revolve around strict control over centralized recruitment processes. Organizations prioritize qualifications and experiences that align with specific needs and develop training programs aimed at enhancing employee competencies related to designated roles, focusing primarily on technical skills and adherence to organizational standards (Odden, 2011).

A hallmark of traditional HCM is the reliance on standardized performance metrics and evaluation criteria. Companies use performance appraisals to assess employee contributions against predetermined goals, which can foster a competitive rather than collaborative workplace culture (Radieva & Kolomiiets, 2019; Crook et al., 2011). This focus on individual performance outcomes often neglects the complexities of human capital contributions to organizational success, highlighting the need for a more nuanced understanding of workforce dynamics (Crook et al., 2011).

Additionally, in traditional frameworks, Human Resource (HR) departments frequently act as administrative entities responsible for staffing, compliance, and contractual matters, rather than as strategic partners in organizational planning (Jacobson et al., 2013). Such a reactive approach limits the capacity of HR to play a significant role in shaping organizational culture and

ensuring long-term success. The adoption of Strategic Human Capital Management (SHCM) is often minimal, particularly within government agencies, leading to missed opportunities for proactive engagement in decision-making (Jacobson et al., 2013).

Traditional HCM approaches tend to emphasize individual capabilities over collaborative efforts. This individualistic perspective often leads to hierarchical structures with clearly defined roles, but may overlook the importance of teamwork and cooperation. Strict adherence to individual achievements can impede knowledge sharing and the development of a cohesive organizational culture, essential for navigating complex environments and fostering innovation (Hamadamin & Atan, 2019).

While traditional HCM practices have optimized performance in stable environments, they exhibit significant limitations in today's dynamic and interconnected landscape. The reliance on rigid hierarchies and fixed roles can stifle innovation and adaptability, particularly amid rapid technological change and evolving workforce expectations (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2004).

As expectations shift towards increased employee engagement and empowerment, traditional practices face scrutiny regarding their effectiveness in promoting inclusive and participatory organizational cultures (Shkoda, 2021). The movement towards more collaborative approaches, such as multicentric governance, signifies an acknowledgement of the limitations of traditional HCM. Organizations are increasingly called to redefine HCM as a negotiation of roles and relationships among diverse stakeholders, integrating frameworks that embrace digital transformation and collaborative governance to foster resilient and ethically grounded workforce systems aligned with contemporary dynamics (Irtyshcheva et al., 2020).

3. Network Governance: A Foundation for Multicentric Digital Governance

Rethinking organizational leadership for the digital era means moving beyond traditional hierarchical paradigms that have long shaped governance and HCM. Contemporary scholarship highlights the need for a theoretical reorientation grounded in the intersecting frameworks of multicentric governance and digital transformation. These perspectives provide a foundation for understanding how human capital governance is evolving into a networked, adaptive, and ethically informed system that transcends rigid territorial boundaries and centralized authority (Roe, 2020).

Network governance has emerged as a crucial paradigm in contemporary public administration, advocating a shift from traditional hierarchical governance

structures to more fluid, collaborative frameworks (Wang & Ran, 2023). This transformation is set against the backdrop of New Public Governance (NPG), which emphasizes the integration of public values and stakeholder engagement across diverse governance landscapes (Krogh & Triantafillou, 2024). As organizations navigate the complexities of the digital era, understanding network governance becomes essential for developing effective HCM.

Network governance refers to the interconnectedness of various actors, government entities, non-profits, private sector organizations, and citizens, working collaboratively to achieve shared goals (Bryson et al., 2014). Unlike centralized models, network governance adopts a decentralized approach that enhances agility and responsiveness, requiring public managers to engage in cross-sector collaborations, thereby contributing to public value creation while also ensuring democratic legitimacy. The importance of these inter-organizational relationships emphasizes the need for a theoretical framework that accommodates multiple perspectives and integrates diverse stakeholder inputs.

The defining features of network governance include flexibility, interdependence, and shared authority (Triantafillou, 2019). These characteristics facilitate the dissemination and transfer of knowledge across different entities, enabling organizations to respond rapidly to emerging challenges (Klijn & Koppenjan, 2012). In this context, leaders are required to navigate complex interactions among various stakeholders, accommodating differing interests and leading collaborative interchanges. By promoting partnerships and leveraging technological advancements, organizations can optimize resources while enhancing overall governance efficacy (Luna-Reyes & Gil-García, 2014).

The rise of the digital world plays a significant role in network governance. The integration of digital tools allows for greater connectivity among stakeholders, enabling them to communicate and collaborate more effectively (Xiao et al., 2022). This digital engagement gives rise to a more participatory governance model, where citizens have an active role in decision-making processes, moving beyond merely passive recipients of policy directives (Young & Tanner, 2022). Hence, public governance evolves into a relational process in which transparency and stakeholder involvement become core components of governance models.

4. Multicentric Digital Governance

According to Rosenau (2003), communication technologies reshape not only political power and identity but also organizational belonging. The traditional view of the employee as a fixed subject of an organization is giving way to a more fluid and mobile digital worker, connected across digital, local, and transnational spaces

(Englert et al., 2020; Ichij, 2023). This digital worker's relationship to their organization is increasingly defined by issue-based affiliations, digitally mediated networks, and participatory demands, rather than static roles or positional authority. The organizational spheres become more expansive and networked, requiring HCM practices to accommodate pluralized identities and collective digital engagement beyond conventional boundaries (Emden, 2022; Antonakis, 2019).

Multicentric governance offers a vital lens to understand the fragmentation and redistribution of authority that characterize modern human capital governance. In this context, managing human capital is less about top-down control and more about coordinating, negotiating, and reciprocally engaging diverse stakeholders, workers, managers, digital platform intermediaries, civic tech innovators, and transnational actors (du Plessis et al., 2024). As Cerny (2022) and Ramjit (2022) argue, power and influence in modern systems now circulate through relational networks that cut across traditional hierarchies. Consequently, organizational legitimacy and workforce commitment increasingly depend on leaders' ability to mediate interests, enable co-production of work processes, and respond with agility and transparency to the evolving expectations of digital workers (Harfst & Wiesner, 2024; Peter, 2023).

Digital transformation, the second axis of this framework, acts as both an enabler and disruptor of HCM. Artificial Intelligence (AI), alongside emerging technologies such as data analytics, blockchain, and cloud platforms, is reshaping the ways organizations recruit, develop, and engage talent (Badiger et al., 2024). These tools can enhance transparency, improve decision-making, and create participatory platforms that amplify employee voice and collaboration (Ruthvika, 2025). However, they also introduce new ethical challenges, including algorithmic bias in hiring and evaluation, pervasive surveillance, data commodification, and widening inequities, that human capital governance must confront proactively (Avancha et al., 2023).

Hence, digital transformation requires a reflexive governance approach, one that inserts ethical principles of justice, equity, and accountability at the core of HCM strategies (Prathomwong & Singsuriya, 2022; Aloustani et al., 2020; Öztürk, 2012). The urgency of new governance theory is accentuated by global challenges such as climate change, pandemics, migration, and economic volatility, which disrupt traditional employment patterns and demand more flexible, cross-sector human capital responses (Kucharčíková & Mičiak, 2018). In this context, effective governance demands hybrid systems that align local workforce needs with global digital opportunities. Notably, the figure of the global digital worker is central, as

they are able to co-create solutions and sustain organizational resilience in complex environments (Katapally, 2020; Fitzwater, 2020). This vision decentralizes authority over human capital and reframes workforce as a constant negotiation between local and global teams.

Advancing HCM in the digital age requires a governance framework that is porous, participatory, and principled, capable of navigating the complexities of dispersed authority while remaining anchored in democratic accountability and ethical responsibility. By integrating multicentric governance and digital transformation into human capital theories and practices, organizations can better adapt to the challenges and opportunities of twenty-first-century workforce governance.

5. Technology & Ethics

The digital revolution is redefining HCM within organizations, not only by streamlining bureaucratic functions but by transforming the very relationship between institutions and their workforce. At the forefront of this change is the integration of data analytics and AI, which signals a shift from a traditional hierarchical approach towards an algorithmic governance and data-driven decision-making in talent management systems (Radha et al., 2024; Kosuru et al., 2023).

Otoo (2019) highlights how AI-driven talent analytics allows organizations to make informed strategic HR decisions that directly influence employee performance and retention. Sinulingga et al. (2024) emphasizes the unprecedented challenges organizations face in acquiring and retaining talent amid rapid technological changes, specifically due to the rise of AI and automation, and highlight the need to integrate AI into talent management for a more adaptable workforce capable of responding to continuous change.

The ethical implications surrounding the use of AI in HCM are evident in the research conducted by Basnet (2024), which outlines how organizations must navigate the ethical landscape when implementing AI and machine learning systems in HR practices. Evidently, reflexive governance is essential to ensuring that the benefits derived from AI technologies do not exacerbate inequalities but instead contribute to a fair and equitable workplace environment.

Digital platforms now mediate transparency and empowerment in workforce governance by providing employees with direct access to organizational processes and enabling participatory engagement in decision-making (Mirghaderi et al., 2023). This evolving dynamic reflects a hands-on ethos in which workers are no longer passive recipients of administrative mandates but active co-creators in

shaping workplace policies and governance models (Ramezani et al., 2023). However, these technological advances also reveal complex challenges that caution against uncritical celebration of digital progress (College & Bajpai, 2021).

A serious tension lies in the uneven distribution of digital capacity and access, which risks deepening existing workforce inequalities. Effective use of smart technologies presupposes digital literacy, infrastructure, and equitable access, conditions that remain unevenly distributed across socio-economic and geographic divides (Shabbir & Porwal, 2025; Eden et al., 2024). Without deliberate inclusion strategies, digital innovations may inadvertently exclude marginalized workers or amplify disparities in opportunities and workplace influence. Furthermore, the environmental impact of AI, especially the energy-intensive processes of training large-scale machine learning models, introduces sustainability considerations into human capital governance (Halsband, 2022).

These realities mean that human capital managers must leverage technological innovation while implanting ethical governance and ecological responsibility at the core of workforce systems (Alakitan & Makinde, 2024). Such a mandate goes beyond mere technological adaptation and calls for a normative shift in evaluating innovation, not solely by gains in efficiency or speed, but by its capacity to promote inclusion, fairness, accountability, and environmental stewardship (Sibuea, 2025; Alim, 2024).

Consequently, digital ethics must become foundational to human capital governance frameworks. Practices that prioritize privacy by design, enforce transparent algorithmic accountability in recruitment and evaluation, and incorporate sustainability criteria in technology procurement are essential (Gao et al., 2024; Mensah & Lbg, 2024). Moreover, inclusive governance must ensure that digital participation and workforce empowerment extend beyond privileged groups to historically marginalized employees, amplifying their voices in organizational decision-making and governance (Maheshwari, 2024).

Reimagining human capital governance through the lens of technological innovation reveals that digital tools are not neutral instruments but active forces reshaping organizational values, redistributing power within workplaces, and redefining successful workforce governance in the twenty-first century.

6. Digital Social Movements

The rise of digitally enabled social movements captures a shift not only in political authority but also in how organizations ought to conceptualize human capital governance. In the digital age, the traditional top-down model of workforce organization is increasingly challenged by heterarchical forms of power that reflect

broader societal demands for inclusion, transparency, and collective agency (Gray & Warren, 2024; Thiel, 2023). Just as social movements leverage digital platforms to amplify marginalized voices and coordinate distributed action across geographic and temporal boundaries (Cutolo & Vang, 2021; Fadlallah & Phillips, 2020), employees and workers today are similarly empowered to engage as active co-creators of organizational culture and governance.

Digital platforms function as vital intermediaries, dissolving hierarchical barriers and enabling new modes of workforce engagement that prioritize dialogue, shared purpose, and responsiveness (Mirghaderi et al., 2023). This participatory ethos mirrors the dynamics observed in movements such as Black Lives Matter and #EndSARS, where digitally mediated civic agency transcends traditional structures to adopt solidarity and collective action (Saaida, 2024; Oghogho & Osazuwa, 2024). For HCM, this means reimagining employees not as passive resources but as digitally connected agents who expect to contribute meaningfully to organizational decisions, policies, and innovation processes.

Moreover, the expansion of digital citizenship models, exemplified by initiatives like Estonia's e-Residency program, demonstrates how governance can become more inclusive, borderless, and responsive to diverse stakeholders (Katapally, 2020; Fitzwater, 2020). Translating this to human capital governance, organizations are called to embrace flexible, hybrid frameworks that accommodate diverse identities, facilitate trans-local collaboration, and promote equitable access to participation and professional development.

However, the transition toward heterarchical governance in workforce contexts is not without challenges. Just as decentralized social movements can encounter issues of coordination, fragmentation, and strategic coherence (Miller, 2019), organizations face the task of balancing distributed employee empowerment with coherent leadership and operational alignment. This complexity requires human capital strategies that prioritize continuous feedback loops, transparent communication channels, and adaptable resource allocation to harness the collective intelligence of the workforce effectively.

In this light, contemporary human capital governance must evolve into a collaborative, networked process that acknowledges employees as co-architects of organizational purpose and culture (Gardenier et al., 2024). By integrating lessons from social movements' digital activism, organizations can cultivate resilient, inclusive, and ethically grounded environments where workforce engagement contributes directly to organizational legitimacy and adaptive capacity. Ultimately, the digitally empowered worker becomes a vital steward of organizational success, shaping governance not through compliance but through active, participatory

agency aligned with twenty-first-century values of justice, equity, and transparency.

7. Cross-Border Synchronization

As governance shifts from rigidly state-centric systems toward more fluid, multicentric arrangements, organizations must reorient their organizational practices to reflect the realities of transnational collaboration, distributed authority, and cross-border civic engagement (Radovanović, 2024; Wuthnow, 2023). Central to managing these dynamics and arising out of this research, is the concept of cross-border synchronization, alignment of governance practices and policies across national and organizational boundaries facilitated by digital platforms and transnational networks. This synchronization enables diverse stakeholders, governments, organizations, civil society, and digital workers, to exchange knowledge and set common standards despite geographical and jurisdictional differences (Tangi et al., 2021). This framework supports decentralized networked governance, promoting collective action and shared responsibility on a global scale, crucial for addressing complex worldwide challenges.

Cross-border synchronization is driven by a few key developments. First, the concept of global citizenship, an ethical and political orientation, which transcends national borders and emphasizes collective responsibility for addressing shared challenges such as climate change, migration, digital inequality, and geopolitical conflict (Ferguson & Mansbach, 2010; Parker, 2009). For human capital governance, this means cultivating a workforce capable of operating within diverse cultural and political contexts while responding to global priorities with agility and ethical awareness.

Traditional notions of citizenship rooted in singular national allegiance are increasingly supplanted by plural, networked forms of political agency. As individuals participate in transnational advocacy, digital activism, and global knowledge economies, their expectations of governance, including workplace governance, shift accordingly. Employees today demand more than transactional relationships; they seek meaning, equity, and alignment with global ethical imperatives in their professional environments (Fontana, 2023; Orr et al., 2023).

Second, social movements play a foundational role in shaping workforce expectations. Movements such as Fridays for Future, MeToo, and climate justice coalitions have redefined civic participation, demonstrating how digital platforms can organize labor, amplify marginalized perspectives, and build solidarity across geographic and institutional divides (Giugni, 2023; Rucht, 2023; Lynn, 2025). The lessons from these movements extend directly into human capital strategy,

highlighting the need for participatory, inclusive, and ethically anchored approaches to workforce engagement and leadership.

This reimagining of civic and institutional roles challenges organizations to move beyond performance metrics narrowly focused on output and efficiency. Instead, legitimacy and organizational success increasingly hinge on responsiveness to global challenges, inclusive dialogue with diverse stakeholders, and ethical coherence across all levels of governance (Boels et al., 2025; Chow & Ren, 2023). Public institutions and private organizations alike are now judged not only by how well they manage human capital internally but also by their contributions to global justice, sustainability, and democratic resilience.

Third, the rise of the digital attention economy has intensified institutional accountability. As Shultz and Karsgaard (2023) note, platforms like social media now serve as global public spheres, where reputations are built, challenged, and redefined in real time. For human capital leaders, this means that internal governance decisions, on hiring, diversity, remote work, environmental policies, and ethics, are increasingly visible, subject to public scrutiny, and influential in shaping institutional legitimacy (Joinau, 2023).

Despite the opportunities presented by cross-border synchronization, organizations must also navigate significant challenges. The risk of exacerbating inequalities among workers remains a pressing concern, as uneven access to resources and technological capabilities may hinder equitable participation in transnational governance processes (Matkovskyy, 2020). Additionally, the environmental consequences of globalization prompt organizations to integrate sustainability considerations into their cross-border strategies (Jin & Meng, 2023). This evolving paradigm calls for a governance model that champions transparency, equity, and shared responsibility. Organizations can enhance their legitimacy and resilience by ensuring that governance practices successfully integrate ethical principles and prioritize participatory engagement with diverse stakeholders, globally (Grüne et al., 2023; Sathyanarayan & Sugavanam, 2019).

Cross-border synchronization emerges as a crucial concept in HCM and global governance, underscoring the interdependent nature of contemporary challenges and opportunities. It requires organizations to harmonize their governance practices across borders while respecting local dynamics, fostering a sense of global citizenship that prioritizes collective responsibility. By adopting a synchronized approach, organizations can strive for inclusivity, sustainability, and ethical coherence, ultimately enhancing their capacity to respond effectively to the complexities of an interconnected world. Embracing cross-border synchronization

as part of human capital governance not only supports organizational resilience but also contributes to a more just and equitable global framework for governance.

8. Conclusion

The digital age has fundamentally changed human capital governance . No longer confined to institutional silos or national policy frameworks, human capital governance now operates across interconnected, data-driven, and participatory systems shaped by digital technologies, civic innovation, and global interdependence. As explored throughout this paper, the transformation of governance in the digital era reflects a broader realignment of power, legitimacy, and capability, one that positions human capital not merely as a policy target, but as the core infrastructure of democratic resilience, economic innovation, and collective well-being.

This redirection demands a new style of governance, one that prioritizes inclusivity, adaptability, and co-creation. The emergence of a digitally empowered public, transnational social movements, and global civic identities has challenged traditional authority structures and elevated the role of networked, participatory systems in shaping human development outcomes. As Congge et al. (2023), Amicelle (2022), and Hogan et al. (2017) have shown, these developments introduce new complexities: algorithmic bias, data sovereignty, digital stratification, and the uneven distribution of participatory capacity. Yet they also create opportunities for more responsive, ethical, and socially embedded systems of human capital governance.

Governance legitimacy derives not only from institutional performance, but from the ability to ethically navigate uncertainty, integrate diverse knowledge, and involve citizen co-producers. Human capital governance must evolve beyond technocratic efficiency to embrace ethical responsiveness, collaborative foresight, and inclusive innovation. At the heart of this shift is the digital public space, which increasingly mediates how knowledge, skills, and capabilities are produced, recognized, and distributed. Platforms that once served as channels of information now function as ecosystems for civic learning, labor market signaling, and distributed decision-making. As Araby (2024) and Mkrtchyan and Melkumyan (2023) demonstrate, digital tools can dramatically improve access to education, workforce development, and policy responsiveness, if they are designed with transparency, equity, and local relevance in mind.

This paper contributes to the evolving conversation on human capital governance by revealing the correlation among digital transformation, civic engagement, and global interdependence. By shifting the focus from institutional

control to collective capacity-building, it reflects the urgent need for systems that are resilient, just, and responsive to the realities of a hyperconnected world. Policymakers, researchers, and practitioners can use these insights to design governance systems that empower people, not just as economic assets, but as agents of democratic renewal, ecological stewardship, and social transformation. Beyond human capital governance, the principles of multicentric digital governance and cross-border synchronization provide a conceptual lens for understanding digitally mediated authority, ethics, and participatory decision-making in broader public administration, organizational management, and transnational policy contexts.

9. Policy Recommendation

Several key policy recommendations follow from this analysis. First, organizations must institutionalize digital ethics frameworks. Governance frameworks must go beyond consultation and instead institutionalize co-creation with affected communities, especially those historically marginalized. This includes designing participatory platforms for policy development, curriculum design, and labor market forecasting that reflect the lived experiences of diverse populations (Mendonça & Asenbaum, 2025; Dryzek, 2020). Second, organizations should encourage participatory governance in human capital systems. Citizen advisory networks, composed of educators, employers, students, technologists, and civil society actors, should be embedded within human capital systems. These networks serve as critical nodes for foresight, accountability, and contextual intelligence, as recommended by Reitstatter & Galter (2025) and Podder et al. (2025).

Third, addressing the digital divide is not peripheral but central to ensuring inclusive human capital outcomes. Organizations should prioritize investments in digital literacy, participatory skills, and infrastructure to enable equitable access to governance and opportunity (Bhimavarapu, 2025; Wilson et al., 2024). Fourth, given the growing reliance on AI in educational assessments, hiring platforms, and performance evaluations, systems of human capital governance must adopt open data standards, algorithmic audit mechanisms, and environmental accountability (Gao et al., 2024; Mensah & Lbg, 2024; Halsband, 2022). Fifth, human capital governance must be experimental and adaptive. Policy labs should be established to co-design, test, and iterate education and workforce policies in collaboration with communities grounded in humility and inclusivity, to ensure flexibility and responsiveness (Bogdanova et al., 2025; Kocot, 2024).

These recommendations outline a governance paradigm that is flexible, participatory, and ethically grounded, capable of navigating the turbulence of digital transformation while protecting human dignity and advancing social

justice. These strategies aim not merely to modernize the administrative system, but to reimagine human capital governance as a participatory, ethical, and future-ready enterprise. Organization, in this framework, is not to dictate outcomes but to facilitate an ecosystem where diverse actors, citizens, employers, educators, and civil society can collaboratively shape learning, work, and well-being.

References

Araby, M. A. A. A. (2024). Transforming citizen engagement in e- governance framework: a conceptual analysis. *JAKPP* (Jurnal Analisis Kebijakan &Amp; Pelayanan Publik), 213 235. https://doi.org/10.31947/jakpp.v10i2.35497

Antonakis, A. (2019). The Structural Dimension of the Public Sphere (pp. 115–150). Springer fachmedien wiesbaden. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-25639-5_8

Amicelle, A. (2022). Big data surveillance across fields: Algorithmic governance for policing & regulation. *Big Data & Society*, 9(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517221112431

Alakitan, M., & Makinde, E. (2024). Where are the ethical guidelines? Examining the governance of digital technologies and AI in Nigeria. *Policy & Internet*. https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.416

Alim, M. (2024). Examining the Interplay Between Innovation Index, Innovation Efficiency and Sustainability Index: A Cross-Group Analysis of G7 and E7 Countries. Verimlilik Dergisi, 77–88. https://doi.org/10.51551/verimlilik.1344038

Aloustani, S., Atashzadeh-Shoorideh, F., Zagheri-Tafreshi, M., Nasiri, M., Barkhordari-Sharifabad, M., & Skerrett, V. (2020). Association between ethical leadership, ethical climate and organizational citizenship behavior from nurses' perspective: a descriptive correlational study. *BMC Nursing*, 19(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-020-0408-1

Arnold, N. (2020). Accountability in transnational governance: the partial organization of voluntary sustainability standards in long-term account-giving. Regulation &Amp; Governance, 16(2), 375-391. https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12357

Avancha, S., Pandian, P., & Jain, S. (2023). Risk Management in IT Service Delivery Using Big Data Analytics. *Universal Research Reports*, 10(2), 272–285. https://doi.org/10.36676/urr.v10.i2.1330

Biermann, F., Driel, M. v., Vijge, M. J., & Peek, T. (2020). Governance fragmentation. *Architectures of Earth System Governance*, 158-180. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108784641.008

Basnet, S. (2024). Navigating the ethical landscape: considerations in implementing ai-ml systems in human resources. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, 5(3), 3436-3447. https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.5.0324.0755

Badiger, M., Naik, A., Singh, C., Mehnaz, F. C., Smitha, A. B., Adiga, S., & Shetty, S. (2024). AI in Healthcare Data Analytics Trends and Transformative Innovations (pp. 1–52). IGI Global.https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-7277-7.ch001

Berardo, R., Fischer, M., & Hamilton, M. (2020). Collaborative governance and the challenges of network-based research. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 50(8), 898 913. https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074020927792

Bogdanova, M., Parashkevova, E., Smokova, M., & Stoyanova, M. (2025). Agile management of innovation networks—A theoretical approach. *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development*, 9(1), 10517. https://doi.org/10.24294/jipd10517

Bhimavarapu, U. (2025). Artificial Intelligence and Digital Health Equity (pp. 319–336). Igi global. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-3384-7.ch013

Boels, L., Boels, A., Alberto, R., & Hoogland, K. (2025). Citizens' data-ing with contemporary data in their daily life. ZDM – Mathematics Education. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11858-025-01665-4

Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Bloomberg, L. (2014). Public value governance: moving beyond traditional public administration and the new public management. *Public Administration Review*, 74(4), 445-456. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12238

Cerny, P. (2022). *Heterarchy in world politics*. (n.d.). Routledge & CRC Press. https://www.routledge.com/HeterarchyinWorldPolitics/Cerny/p/book/9781032403410

College, A., & Bajpai, A. (2021). Digital Tension: A Comparison Between Democracies and Authoritarian Regimes. *Political Expertise: POLITEX*, 17(4), 330–340. https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu23.2021.401

Congge, U., Guillamón, M., Nurmandi, A., Salahudin, N., & Sihidi, I. T. (2023). Digital democracy: A Systematic Literature Review. *Frontiers in Political Science*, *5*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2023.972802

Chow, C., & Ren, L. (2023). Negotiating civic identity across different political contexts: Immigrant participation in social movements and political incorporation. *Sociology Compass*, 17(12). https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.13140

Crook, T. R., Todd, S. Y., Combs, J. G., Woehr, D. J., & Ketchen, D. J. (2011). Does human capital matter? a meta-analysis of the relationship between human capital and firm performance.. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(3), 443-456. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022147

Cutolo, D., & Vang, J. (2021). Digital platforms (pp. 93–104). Edward Elgar. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781839104145.00017

Crumpacker, M. and Crumpacker, J. M. (2004). Elevating, integrating, and institutionalizing strategic human capital management in federal agencies through the chief human capital officer. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 24(3), 234-255. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371x04266419

Dedema, M. and Rosenbaum, H. (2024). Socio-technical issues in the platform-mediated gig economy: a systematic literature review: an annual review of information science and technology (arist) paper. *Journal of the Association for Information Science an Technology*, 75(3), 344-374. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24868

Dryzek, J. (2020). Global deliberative democracy (pp. 100–103). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780367816681-42

Eden, C., Adeniyi, I., & Chisom, O. (2024). Promoting Digital Literacy And Social Equity In Education: Lessons From Successful Initiatives. *International Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research*, 6(3), 687–696. https://doi.org/10.51594/ijmer.v6i3.880

Emden, C. J. (2022). Changing Perceptions of the Public Sphere. berghahn books. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780857455017

Englert, S., Woodcock, J., & Cant, C. (2020). Digital workerism: technology, platforms, and the circulation of workers' struggles. tripleC: Communication, Capitalism &Amp; Critique. *Open Access Journal for a Global Sustainable Information Society*, 18(1), 132-145. https://doi.org/10.31269/triplec.v18i1.1133

Estonia's e-Residency initiative. (2014). *Estonia's e-Residency: Digital nation*. https://eresident.gov.ee/

Fadlallah, H., & Phillips, R. A. (2020). Governance of Voice in Digital Platforms. *Proceedings of the International Association for Business and Society*, 31, 24–36. https://doi.org/10.5840/iabsproc2020314

Ferguson, Y., & Mansbach, R. (2004). Postinternational politics (pp. 1–34). Cambridge University. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511491344.002

Ferguson, Y. H., & Mansbach, R. W. (2010). Postinternational Theory. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190846626.013.467

Fu, J. S., & Barbour, J. B. (2023). Contextualizing communication for digital innovation and the future of work. *Journal of Communication*, 74(1), 36–47. https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqad031

Fontana, L. B. (2023). Identity in Latin American Social Movements (pp. 590–606). Oxford University. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190870362.013.30

Fitzwater, L. (2022). The Global Citizen, Globalized Lifestyles and Pedagogy (pp. 55–69). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-10928-7_4

Gao, D. K., Mittal, S., Haverly, A., Chen, J., & Wu, J. (2024). AI Ethics. *International Journal of Business Analytics*, 11(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.4018/ijban.338367

Gardenier, A. M., Est, R. v., & Royakkers, L. (2024). Technological citizenship in times of digitization: an integrative framework. *Digital Society*, 3(2). https://doi.org/10.1007/s44206-024-00106-1

Gil-García, J. R., Dawes, S. S., & Pardo, T. A. (2017). Digital government and public management research: finding the crossroads. *Public Management Review*, 20(5), 633 - 646. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2017.1327181

Gray, S. W. D., & Warren, M. E. (2024). What kind of power can citizens exercise beyond the state? Globalizing democracy through representative claim-making. *International Theory*, 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1017/s175297192400006x

Griffiths, M. (2015). Empowering citizens. In Editor(s) (Eds.), Title of the work (pp. xx–xx). Publisher. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-4666-8358-7.ch071

Giugni, M. (2023). Social Movements (pp. 355–371). Oxford University. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780192871787.013.18

Grüne, A., Hafez, K., & Holland, T. (2023). Transnational interdependence and new crisis communication governance? german media coverage of europe and asia during the covid 19 pandemic. *International Communication Gazette*, 85(8), 678-696. https://doi.org/10.1177/17480485231214372

Gruszka, K. and Böhm, M. (2020). Out of sight, out of mind? (in)visibility of/in platform-mediated work. *New Media &Amp; Society*, 24(8), 1852-1871. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444820977209

Harfst, P., & Wiesner, C. (2024). Measuring political legitimacy in two dimensions: internal and external measures. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 6. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2024.999743

Halsband, A. (2022). Sustainable AI and intergenerational justice. *Sustainability*, 14(7), Article 3922. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14073922

Hamadamin, H. H. and Atan, T. (2019). The impact of strategic human resource management practices on competitive advantage sustainability: the mediation of human capital development and employee commitment. *Sustainability*, 11(20), 5782. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11205782

Herring, E., Ismail, L., McCullough, A., & Saed, M. (2020). Somalia, fragmented hybrid governance and inclusive development. *Limited Statehood and Informal Governance in the Middle East and Africa, 1*86-204. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429504570-13

Hogan, M. *et al.* (2017). Governance, Transparency and the Collaborative Design of Open Data Collaboration Platforms: Understanding Barriers, Options, and Needs. In: Ojo, A., Millard, J. (eds) Government 3.0 – Next Generation Government Technology Infrastructure and Services. *Public Administration and Information Technology*, vol 32. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63743-3_12

Irtyshcheva, I., Trushliakova, A., & Sirenko, I. (2020). Strategic human capital management in the context of digitalization. *Baltic Journal of Economic Studies*, 6(5), 178-183. https://doi.org/10.30525/2256-0742/2020-6-5-178-183

Jae-Moo, L. and Hong, S. (2013). A study on the network of disabled person rehabilitation using social network analysis: focus on the comparison between two governments. *Journal of Exercise Rehabilitation*, 9(6), 536-543. https://doi.org/10.12965/jer.130081

Jacobson, W. S., Sowa, J. E., & Lambright, K. T. (2013). Do human resource departments act as strategic partners? strategic human capital management adoption by county governments. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 34(3), 289-301. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371x13507158

Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of ai ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(9), 389-399. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2

Joinau, B. (2023). Cultural Governance and New Forms of Governmentality Focus on the South Korean Case. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 53(6), 358–374. https://doi.org/10.1080/10632921.2023.2280646

Jin, Y. and Meng, X. (2023). Interdependence and multilateral economic sanctions. *The World Economy*, 47(3), 983-1003. https://doi.org/10.1111/twec.13476

Mensah, G. B., & Lbg, A. (2024). AI Ethics. *Africa Journal For Regulatory Affairs*. https://doi.org/10.62839/ajfra/2024.v1.i1.32-45

Maheshwari, K., Jedan, C., Christiaans, I., Van Gijn, M., Maeckelberghe, E., & Plantinga, M. (2024). AI-Inclusivity in Healthcare: Motivating an Institutional Epistemic Trust Perspective. *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0963180124000215

Machen, R., & Nost, E. (2021). Thinking algorithmically: The making of hegemonic knowledge in climate governance. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 46(3), 555 569. https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12441

Matkovskyy, R. (2020). A measurement of affluence and poverty interdependence across countries: evidence from the application of tail copula. *Bulletin of Economic Research*, 72(4), 404-416. https://doi.org/10.1111/boer.12227

Maksimenko, I., Vashko, T., Zdrestova-Zakharenkova, S., & Nazarov, A. D. (2021). Digital transformation and its challenges to the strategic management system. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 106, 01035. https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202110601035

Mendonça, R. F., & Asenbaum, H. (2025). Decolonizing deliberative democracy. *European Journal of Social Theory*. https://doi.org/10.1177/13684310241297906

Minbaleev, A., Polyakova, T., & Makarov, O. S. (2021). Problems of ethical regulation of the use of artificial intelligence technologies. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 118, 04009. https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202111804009

Mirghaderi, L., Hildt, E., & Sziron, M. (2023). Ethics and Transparency Issues in Digital Platforms: An Overview. *AI*, 4(4), 831–844. https://doi.org/10.3390/ai4040042

Mkrtchyan, T. and Melkumyan, N. (2023). The foundations of digital transformation of the public administration system. *Alternative*, 118-127. https://doi.org/10.55528/18292828 2023.2-118

Moskatova, I., Author2, J. K., & Author3, L. M. (2021). Introduction. Digital Culture & Society. https://doi.org/10.14361/dcs-2021-070202

Nair, S. K. (2024). Digital Transformation and Its Challenges in the Hospitality Industry in Malaysia (pp. 369–388). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-7683-6.ch017

Orr, L. V., Fowler, A., & Huber, G. A. (2023). Is Affective Polarization Driven by Identity, Loyalty, or Substance? *American Journal of Political Science*, 67(4), 948–962. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12796

Otoo, F. N. K. (2019). Human resource management (hrm) practices and organizational performance. Employee Relations: *The International Journal*, 41(5), 949-970. https://doi.org/10.1108/er-02-2018-0053

Öztürk, H. (2012). Development of an administrative ethical behaviour scale. *Nursing Ethics,* 19(2), 289-303. https://doi.org/10.1177/0969733011419240

Katapally, T. R. (2020). A Global Digital Citizen Science Policy to Tackle Pandemics Like COVID-19. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 22(5), e19357. https://doi.org/10.2196/19357

Kosuru, S. K., Tadi, S., D, G., G, J., K, S., & K, S. S. S. (2023). Data Analytics and Artificial Intelligence. *Journal of Clinical and Pharmaceutical Research*, 15–17. https://doi.org/10.61427/jcpr.v3.i3.2023.112

Kocot, M., & Kłak, D. (2024). Employee Engagement In Innovation Processes In An Agile Organization. *Zeszyty Naukowe Wyższej Szkoły Humanitas Zarządzanie,* 25(4), 119–134. https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0054.9665

Klijn, E. and Koppenjan, J. (2012). Governance network theory: past, present and future. *Policy &Amp; Politics*, 40(4), 587-606. https://doi.org/10.1332/030557312x655431

Krogh, A. H., & Triantafillou, P. (2024). Developing New Public Governance as a public management reform model. *Public Management Review*, 26(10), 3040–3056. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2024.2313539

Kucharčíková, A. and Mičiak, M. (2018). Human capital management in transport enterprises with the acceptance of sustainable development in the slovak republic. *Sustainability,* 10(7), 2530. https://doi.org/10.3390/su10072530

Lynn, T. J. (2025). Social Movements. 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405165518.wbeoss159.pub3

Luna-Reyes, L. F. and Gil-García, J. R. (2014). Digital government transformation and internet portals: the co-evolution of technology, organizations, and institutions. *Government Information Quarterly*, 31(4), 545-555. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2014.08.001

Odden, A. (2011). Manage "human capital" strategically. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 92(7), 8-12. https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171109200703

Oghogho, E., & Osazuwa, S. (2024). The #EndSARS movement and the reshaping of political discourse in a digital age: A Nigerian case study. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Applied Science*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.51584/ijrias.2024.906017

Miller, J. E. (2019). Occupy Wall Street (pp. 127–151). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3030-17391-3_6

Parker, N. (2009). From Borders to Margins: A Deleuzian Ontology for Identities in the Postinternational Environment. Alternatives: *Global, Local, Political*, 34(1), 17–39. https://doi.org/10.1177/030437540903400102

Peter, F. (2023). Political Legitimacy (pp. 3-C1P65). oxford university pressoxford. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198872382.003.0001

Peter, F. (2020). The Grounds of Political Legitimacy. Journal of the American Philosophical Association, 6(3), 372–390. https://doi.org/10.1017/apa.2020.6

Podder, A., Roy, P., Ghosh, S., Sarkar, S. K., & Choudhury, R. R. (2025). Citizen Engagement and Smart Governance (pp. 35–68).   IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-369390306.ch002

Prathomwong, P. and Singsuriya, P. (2022). Ethical framework of digital technology, artificial intelligence, and health equity. *Asia Social Issues*, 15(5), 252136. https://doi.org/10.48048/asi.2022.252136

Pūraitė, A., Author2, B. C., & Author3, D. E. (2020). Algorithmic governance in the public sector: Is digitization a key to effective management? *Independent Journal of Management & Production*, 11(9), Article 1400. https://doi.org/10.14807/ijmp.v11i9.1400

Radieva, M. and Kolomiiets, V. (2019). Human capital functioning in strategic management of the   national economy. *Technology Transfer: Innovative Solutions in Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2, 23-25. https://doi.org/10.21303/2613-5647.2019.00929

Radovanović, M. (2024). Political Power and Its Representation. *AM Journal of Art and Media Studies*, 35, 37–48. https://doi.org/10.25038/am.v0i28.603

Ramjit, D., (2022). *From Postinternationalism to Heterarchy: Turbulence and Distance Proximities in a World of Globalization and Fragmentation* (P. G. Cerny, Ed.). Heterarchy in   World Politics. Routledge.

Radha, Mrs., Muralibabu, Mr., Partheeban, Mr., & Midunkumar, Mr. (2024). Role of Artificial Intelligence in Big Data Analytics. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technolog*y, 586–591. https://doi.org/10.48175/ijarsct-17089

Ramezani, M., Takian, A., Bakhtiari, A. *et al.* The application of artificial intelligence in health policy: a   scoping   review. *BMC   Health   Serv   Res* 23,   1416   (2023). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-023-10462-2

Reitstatter, L., & Galter, K. (2025). Learning From Listening To A Citizen Board. *Museological Review*, 27, 174–191. https://doi.org/10.29311/mr.vi27.4894

Roy, J. (2008). Beyond Westminster Governance: Bringing Politics And Public Service Into The Networked   Era. *Canadian   Public   Administration*,   51(4),   541-568. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-7121.2008.00041.x

Roe, M. (2020). Polycentrism. In: Governance, Policy and Juxtaposition. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-31848-2_5

Rosenau,   J.   N.   (2003).   Distant   proximities.   In *Princeton   University   Press eBooks*. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691231112

Ruthvika, M. (2025). AI-Powered Data Analytics: A Game Changer. *International Journal of Advanced   Research   in   Science,   Communication   and   Technology*,   97–102. https://doi.org/10.48175/ijarsct-24409

Rucht, D. (2023). Social Movements. Oxford University Press Oxford. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198877400.001.0001

Sathyanarayan, K. and Sugavanam, K. (2019). Influenced global consumption orientation impacts global brand attitude with reference to Indian consumers' perspective?. *Proceedings of the Proceedings of the 9th Annual International Conference on 4C's-Communication, Commerce, Connectivity, Culture.* https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.18-12-2018.2283811

Saaida, M. (2024). The Role of External Actors in the Arab Spring. Qeios. https://doi.org/10.32388/ppnek0

Sinulingga, G., Gunawan, A., Wibowo, U. D. A., Rina, R., & Aprilia, H. D. (2024). Talent management in the age of digital disruption: challenges and opportunities. *Global International Journal of Innovative Research*, 2(9), 2217-2230. https://doi.org/10.59613/global.v2i9.311

Sibuea, N. (2025). Digital Innovation as the Key to Efficiency and Accountability of Public Administration in Medan City, Indonesia. *Golden Ratio of Data in Summary*, 5(1), 24–31. https://doi.org/10.52970/grdis.v5i1.821

Shabbir, N., & Porwal, S. (2025). Digital Literacy: A Necessity In The 21st Century For India. *Information Technologies and Learning Tools*, 105(1), 222–231. https://doi.org/10.33407/itlt.v105i1.5883

Shkoda, T. (2021). Methodology in the modern theory of human capital and strategic management of human capital. *Edukacja Ekonomistów I Menedżerów*, 59(1). https://doi.org/10.33119/eeim.2021.59.8

Shultz, L. and Karsgaard, C. (2023). Taming global citizenship education within twitter's attention economy. *Journal of Creative Communications*, 19(1), 13-31. https://doi.org/10.1177/09732586231198960

Stattman, S. L., Gupta, A., Partzsch, L., & Oosterveer, P. (2018). Toward sustainable biofuels in the european union? lessons from a decade of hybrid biofuel governance. *Sustainability*, 10(11), 4111. https://doi.org/10.3390/su10114111

Tangi, L., Janssen, M., Benedetti, M., & Noci, G. (2021). Digital government transformation: a structural equation modelling analysis of driving and impeding factors. International *Journal of Information Management*, 60, 102356. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2021.102356

Thi Duyen, H. (2021). Digital transformation in higher education in Vietnam and its challenges nowadays. *Vinh University Journal of Science*, 50(4B). https://doi.org/10.56824/vujs.2021ed19

Thiel, A. (2023). Polycentric Governing and Polycentric Governance (pp. 98–120). Oxford University Press Oxford. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192866837.003.0005

Triantafillou, P. (2019). Trapped in the complexity bowl? public governance and the liberal art of governing. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 43(14), 1228-1236. https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2019.1668805

Wang, H., & Ran, B. (2021). Network governance and collaborative governance: a thematic analysis on their similarities, differences, and entanglements. *Public Management Review*, 25(6), 1187–1211. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2021.2011389

Wuthnow, R. (2023). Religion and Political Power (pp. 186–218). Oxford University Press New York. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197652534.003.0006

Wilson, S., Mc Ardle, R., Slight, R., Slight, S., Hassan, N., & Tolley, C. (2024). Strategies To Advancing Digital Health Equity: Perspectives From Underserved Groups. *European Journal of Public Health*, 34(Suppl 3). https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckae144.1123

Xiao, J., Han, L., & Zhang, H. (2022). Exploring driving factors of digital transformation among local governments: foundations for smart city construction in China. *Sustainability*, 14(22), 14980. https://doi.org/10.3390/su142214980

Young, S. and Tanner, J. (2022). Citizen participation matters. Bureaucratic discretion matters more. *Public Administration*, 101(3), 747-771. https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12867

Zelli, F. (2011). The fragmentation of the global climate governance architecture. *WIREs Climate Change,* 2(2), 255-270. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.104

Zhou, W. (2017). Institutional environment, public-private hybrid forms, and entrepreneurial reinvestment in a transition economy. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 32(2), 197-214. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2016.11.002

Zuboff, S. (2022). Surveillance Capitalism or Democracy? The Death Match of Institutional Orders and the Politics of Knowledge in Our Information Civilization. *Organization Theory*, 3(3). https://doi.org/10.1177/26317877221129290