



The Role of Local Culture in Shaping Social Justice Practices in Multicultural Societies

Sukarni¹, Dina Nurhayati¹, Arifin Hasan¹

¹Universitas Negeri Makassar

Corresponding Author: Sukarni

Article Info

Article History:

Received September 9, 2024

Revised September 22, 2024

Accepted October 29, 2024

Keywords:

Local Culture, Social Justice,
Multicultural Societies.

Abstract

This paper analyses how local culture helps to instigate social justice in the multicultural societies with special concern on the intersection of culture systems with the contemporary system of governance. Although the traditional body of management thought tends to view justice in terms of universalized principles, this study shows how justice is defined and practiced in diversified ways, relative to cultures. The qualitative research methodology is based on interviews, observations, and the study of documents, which were used to answer the question of how local traditions, norms, and practices affect the perceptions of fairness, legitimacy, and inclusion in various communities. Results indicate the local culture is both an advantage and an obstacle in the execution of justice. On the one hand, it gives a sense of legitimacy and creates trust by culturally resonant practices of consensus-building, dialogue, and restorative practices. On the contrary, cultural traditions can reproduce exclusions or contradict international standards of equity and rights. The paper also finds the convergence of cultural and modern systems of justice in the form of hybrid modes of governance whereby organizations and societies can negotiate the tensions between tradition and universality. The management implications are far reaching: leaders and institutions need to transcend procedural justice systems to culturally infused and reflexive and participatory practices. This study has made contributions on the management research by not only contributing to the body of research on justice as a culturally mediated concept but also offers implications that can be of great use to policymakers and organizations aiming to work in a culture sensitive and ethical manner. Finally, the paper suggests that there is a need to shift management practices towards dialogical, hybrid and inclusive visions of justice which acknowledge the constitutive practice of culture in determining sustainable social outcomes.

Introduction

The concept of social justice has emerged as one of the most urgent problems of the twenty-first century because the societies all over the world face the question of fairness, equity, and inclusion in more diverse settings. Although the social justice notion has been commonly positioned within the discourse of universal values like equality, equitability, and human rights, the realities of how justice is lived out are strongly influenced by specific cultural values and practices. In a multicultural world, where individuals of various ethnic, religious, and cultural background coexist, intersection between common ideas of justice and local cultural practices can be both a problem and a chance (Sánchez et al., 2024). This intersection is important in determining more inclusive strategies of governance, social policy and community

development. Social justice as a concept is dynamic and multi-dimensional in nature. John Rawls, in his philosophical underpinnings, puts emphasis on justice as fairness highlighting the essence of equal opportunities and equal distribution of resources in the society (Singleton et al., 2021). Later Amartya Sen extended this point of view by relating justice to the abilities of people to lead the lives they cherish, and, as a result, the significance of context in the realization of justice (Williams, 2021). Nancy Fraser goes a step further to locate social justice in the realms of recognition, redistribution and representation that collectively highlight material and cultural aspects of justice (Saaida & Saaidah, 2023). These paradigms lead to the fact that justice is not only legal and economic but also cultural and is determined by the way communities establish what is fair, inclusive and participatory.

Local culture in multicultural societies is a prism in which societies understand justice. Culture as a collective system of meanings, values, and practices is extremely important in the practice and perception of justice (Rendon et al., 2021). An illustration is that the idea of justice as defined by many indigenous people does not focus on punishment but on practices that help restore harmony, recovery, and social responsibility (Rigon, A. (2022)). This is unlike the western models of justice that would emphasize on the individual responsibility by law. These disparities reinforce the importance of cultural diversity in the justice practices.

The issues of multiculturalism can be traced in the society where the mixture of customs and contemporary systems of government frequently leads to contradictions. Believes that multiculturalism should not only be tolerant of difference, but there need to be institutional structures that acknowledge and empower the minority cultures (Pandey et al., 2022). In the absence of this acknowledgement, minority groups cannot enjoy structural exclusion and cultural marginalization even though equality on paper. As an example, studies in Southeast Asia show that customary laws (adat) are often concomitant with state law, and they are even complementary to other universal standards of human rights (Suprayitno et al., 2024). On the same note, in Africa, the traditional conflict resolution mechanisms can effectively deliver justice in the community, however when incorporated with formal legal institutions, they encounter problems (Levac et al., 2021).

Local culture is therefore both an enabling and limiting force of social justice practices in multicultural contexts. On the one hand, it offers culturally palpable structures of realizing fairness, including the consensus-based decision-making frameworks, collective land ownership, and obedience to the elders, resulting in structuring cohesion and inclusiveness (Dai & Azhar, 2024). Alternatively, exclusion or discrimination may also be propagated through cultural norms, especially as traditional culture reinforces gender inequality, hierarchical power or the silencing of minority voices. Such duality means that the mobilization of culture in justice practices deserves a thorough investigation of which aspects can be used to achieve inclusivity and which can become a detriment to the implementation of universal principles of justice.

The fact that there is a growing migration and transnational movement around the world also compounds the need to comprehend the role of culture in justice. Multicultural societies do not only exist in postcolonial countries or indigenous populations but are also developed in the city centers of Europe, North America, and Asia where the diasporic communities have formed new cultural interaction (Zhang et al., 2022). Such interactions usually require these hybridized forms of justice, which are a mix of cultural practices and universal practices. Indicatively, Religious freedom, indigenous land rights, or Multicultural education policies provide an

illustration of how states negotiate the conflicts between attention to cultural diversity and the imposition of shared norms of justice (Abuso, 2022). Meanwhile, local culture may be used as the strong means to reach the objectives of social justice. The cultural values of solidarity, reciprocity and mutual assistance are mostly tapped by community-based organizations, faith-based programs, and grassroots movements to promote justice among the marginalized groups (Porto et al., 2021). These practices that are culturally based are not only advantageous in enhancing legitimacy but also create trust and inclusivity among societies that are otherwise not part of the formal justice systems. Local culture, in this sense is not a backdrop but it is a dynamic in influencing the ways the justice is imagined and enacted.

Nonetheless, the connection between culture and justice is dynamic; it does not remain the same as societies change, modernize, get affected by the global forces. According to Anthony Atikurrahman et al. (2022), in late modernity, the process of reinterpreting traditions is a constant element as people and communities attempt to maneuver through new environments. This implies cultural practices that affect justice in the current context might be hybrid in nature incorporating the indigenous culture with the principles of modern governance. A good illustration is that the models of restorative justice implemented in Western criminal systems usually draw upon the indigenous traditions, and in this case, the cultural values may change the overall justice practices (Mirza & Neelam, 2023).

The present research is placed in this intersection, where the theme of the study is the active role of local culture in the process of social justice in multicultural societies. This study demonstrates that cultural traditions interact with justice systems in subtle ways through the analysis of narratives, experiences and practices at the community level. The value of the work is that it enhances the perception of social justice as something that is grounded in context, negotiated culturally, and embedded in the social world, rather than an all-purpose, one-size-fits-all phenomenon. The importance of local culture as an element must be considered to deepen theoretical arguments about the concept of justice and to enhance the practical work of building multicultural societies, which are inclusive, fair and harmonious.

Method

The research design used in this study was a qualitative research design in an interpretive paradigm. The qualitative approach became the choice as the focus of the study was to investigate and learn how local culture prompts social justice in multicultural societies. The research did not aim at trying to quantify variables or prove hypotheses but rather tried to entrap meanings, values, and experiences that come about as a result of cultural interactions. Interpretive paradigm was deemed suitable due to its ability to interact with the perspectives of the participants in a highly detailed manner and the realization that justice as a social construction is a socially constructed concept. This design allowed the researcher to go beyond superficial descriptions and acquire knowledge of how culture is actively engaged in the construction of justice practices.

Research Site and Context

The research was undertaken in a multicultural community context in which various ethnic and cultural groups co-exist. The location was chosen intentionally due to the fact that it embodies the struggles and prospects of multiculturalism, including coexistence of indigenous cultures, legal frameworks and cross-ethnic relations. In this respect, the local culture does not just exist

as a source of identification; it also serves as a pattern of dealing with conflicts, government and even social inclusion. The selected setting was a fertile source of insights on the process of negotiating and implementing cultural traditions in the quest to achieve justice.

Participants and Sampling

Purposive sampling was the method of selection of participants as the participants were chosen among individuals with strong knowledge and experience in cultural practices and justice mechanisms. They were community leaders, community elders, cultural practitioners, local policy makers and minority group members. Overall, 25 participants were involved, and this covered diversity based on ethnicity, gender, and their positions in the community. Such a variation enabled the study to obtain various viewpoints of the ways in which local culture guides the practices of justice. Sampling was based on the principle of saturation, i.e. recruitment was furthered until no new meaningful information was obtained by adding new participants.

Data Collection Methods

There were three primary methods of data collection, which included semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, and analysis of documents. The main method was the semi-structured interviews that allowed participants to discuss their experience and views, as well as be flexible enough to explore certain cultural concerns further. The discussions in focus groups were carried out with the representatives of the various cultural groups in order to capture the dynamics of dialogue and sharing of meanings. Besides, the local policy regulations, individual community agreements, and customary laws were also analyzed to present additional context and triangulation findings. These approaches were combined to guarantee that both the rich and multi-dimensional data were obtained, including the personal stories and collective practices.

Data Analysis

The thematic analysis was used to analyze the data. The data were obtained by initially transcribing interviews and discussions word-to-word, then reading through the transcripts multiple times to become familiar with it. Primary coding was done to find important ideas, concepts and patterns. The codes were then divided into categories, which denoted general themes including cultural values of fairness, conflict resolution mechanisms and problems in the integration of the culture and formal justice systems. These themes were developed by comparing data sources in a continuous manner and there were consistency and depth in the interpretation. The analysis was aimed at identifying the cultural practices and also gaining insight into their meanings concerning social justice.

Result and Discussion

The findings of this paper provide a detailed discussion of the role of local culture in the practices and perceptions of social justice within multicultural communities. Based on interviews, observations, and documentary analysis, the results indicate the subtle aspects in which the cultural values, traditions and communal norms have a bearing on the definition of fairness, legitimacy, and power. Instead of seeing justice as something fixed or universal, the data portray its dynamicity as it is incorporated in daily practices and mediated by cultural systems. The findings are arranged in major thematic areas, which surfaced during the

fieldwork, such as local culture as a framework of justice, fusion of cultural and modern justice systems, and difficulties encountered in using cultural approach to social justice. All themes are introduced with facts and first-hand voices of the participants, and the realities of justice are projected onto the analysis as the foreground.

Local Culture as a Framework of Justice

This research results indicate that local culture offers a powerful normative system in terms of which communities derive insights and exercise justice. Instead of being confined to the conclusions of state law, or universal definitions, there is always a focus on the fact that fairness, conflict resolution, and inclusion are interwoven with traditions and experiences of a particular culture that are intergenerational. In this regard, local culture serves as a governing principle and as a working mechanism of bringing harmony to multicultural societies. Among the most noticeable factors that came out of the interviews was the necessity of having consensus in decision-making. Some participants explained the way justice is pursued as a non-top-down process through collective discourse up to the point of agreeing. It is a cultural practice of unity, respect and solidarity. According to one of the elders of that community:

“In our tradition, justice is not about who wins or loses. It is about finding balance so that everyone feels respected. That is why we always sit together until all voices are heard.”

This is a demonstration of how cultural systems value communal peace more than confrontational results unlike more individualistic justice systems. Customary practices were also found to be very crucial in determining the perceptions of fairness in the community. Interviewees shared ritual and traditional processes that facilitate reconciliation and renew social relations as opposed to death-penalty-only. In illustration, in cases of conflict between families, the elderly tend to arrange a mediation ceremony during which both parties are urged to accept errors and make symbolic signs of forgiveness. One of the actors in such practices said:

“When conflict arises, we do not first think about punishment. We think about how to heal the relationship. Our culture teaches us that broken ties must be repaired for the community to remain strong.”

The key ideas emphasized in these restorative practices are that cultural wisdom is central to enhancing social cohesion and averting conflict cycles. Besides, justice practices are legitimate to local cultural values. Residents of a community showed more confidence in traditional procedures than in formal institutions which were seen to be far away or inflexible. Participants argued that cultural leaders have power because they know the traditions so well and they are morally upright in the society. As one participant stated:

“People come to our elders because they know the decisions will be fair. The elders carry the wisdom of our ancestors, and that gives more trust than going to the government office.”

These words show that culture-based justice systems can not only create compliance but can also create voluntary acceptance of decisions, based on common cultural values. Nonetheless, the use of local culture as a justice framework also demonstrates a more general criticism of formal constraint. Most of the participants also noted that the state law does not tend to cover

the complexity of the multicultural environments, in which different traditions coexist. Cultural practices in contrast have been viewed as being flexible and capable of relating to the demands of the society. Incorporating justice into cultural forms that are familiar to the communities makes them feel more of ownership of outcomes. Such cultural root-taking leads to the perpetuation of justice in different societies.

Integration of Cultural and Modern Justice Systems

The paper concluded that communities tend to follow a path of cultural assimilation with contemporary legal systems and establish a new type of justice that will be legitimate to both. As respondents repeatedly stressed, cultural practices offer trust and social bonding, but contemporary institutions are needed to resolve problems that the community cannot handle, including problems with outsiders or that need to be documented in legal terms. Such a dual dependence also proves that cultural and formal systems are not perceived as opposites as they complement each other, being in collaboration to increase the level of fairness in a multicultural environment. Among the common themes of interviews was the fact that traditional leaders usually form the initial channel of conflict resolution. It is after local mediation failure that the cases are passed through the formal legal institutions. Such a stratification corresponds to the cultural values of the internal solutions of the problem and the need to recognize the state law. An area policy-maker remarked:

“When people have problems, they always go first to the elders. But if the conflict cannot be solved in that way, then the case is taken to the government or the court. Both systems work hand in hand.”

This means that the communities share the concept of the importance of cultural legitimacy and are also aware of the power of the state. The participants also explained the examples of collaboration between the cultural institutions and the representatives of the government. In some instances, government officials value the results of customary mediation and make them part of the official records hence the legitimization of cultural processes in the official system. One participant shared:

“There are times when the government listens to the decision of the adat council and accepts it as part of the settlement. This makes people feel that our culture is respected by the law.”

This kind of integration does not only legitimize the local traditions; it also creates trust between communities and the state institutions. The other important observation was the flexibility with which communities move across cultural and modern systems depending on the nature of conflict. In the case of interpersonal conflicts, the cultural mediation was ideal since it focused on reconciling and social peace. Participants recognized the necessity of state mechanisms with respect to economic or legal issues. A participant noted:

“If it is about land boundaries inside the village, we use adat rules. But if it involves companies or outsiders, we go to the government because they have the power to enforce.”

This is an indication of practical style whereby cultural and modern systems are applied selectively to achieve as much justice as possible. Nevertheless, there are no difficulties with the merging of cultural and modern systems. Other participants raised the issue of how formal

system can at times weaken cultural authority through the implementation of strict procedures that do not hold the values of the communities. Others were concerned that cultural practices do not necessarily correspond to the Human Rights requirements, especially where women or minority voices are involved. As one participant observed:

“The problem is sometimes the court does not understand our traditions, and sometimes our traditions also do not fully protect everyone equally. So, we need both systems to correct each other.”

This observation highlights the fine line that must be maintained in the combining the two approaches. All in all, the results indicate that integration produces a dynamic justice system that could be more sensitive to multicultural realities. Whereas cultural systems offer a sense of familiarity, moral legitimacy, and community peace, the modern justice systems offer enforceability, clarity of processes, and correspondence with the larger legal norms. This interrelationship between these systems can be described as a shifting manner where communities are trying to maintain cultural identity and at the same time utilize the state institutions to get to a full justice.

Challenges in Applying Local Culture to Social Justice

Although the research proves that local culture brings legitimacy and trust in the justice practices, it also indicates that there are a number of issues when cultural traditions are put into application within the context of social justice in multicultural societies. These problems are caused by conflicts between cultural relativism and equality in general, and even contradictions inside the cultural practices themselves. The risk of exclusion within cultural traditions is one of the most common issues that are brought up. A few participants commented that not every member of the community is equally benefiting through customary processes, especially women and the minority. In most cultural environments, decision making is usually controlled by the male elders thus limiting the other voices. As one of the female respondents remarked:

“In meetings, women are usually silent because the elders decide everything. Our voices are respected in the family, but in public matters, tradition makes it harder for us to speak.”

This is a demonstration of cultural authority, although respected, unintentionally supporting hierarchical structures, which constrain inclusivity. The other problem is that there might be the clash of cultural practice with the state law or human rights norms. As much as communities prefer cultural mediation, certain traditional practices may contradict the law especially where there is a domestic issue, inheritance or rights to children. One of the activists in the area was concerned:

“Sometimes tradition tells us to keep problems inside the family, but this means women or children do not get the justice they deserve. The law says one thing, but culture says another.”

Such tension illustrates how hard it is to balance the culture preservation and universality of justice. Participants also pointed out the issue of cultural inflexibility with regard to social change. There are practices that were meaningful in the past that might not be responding fully to the realities of the present multicultural societies. An example here would be traditional land

ownership laws that do not match the economic interests of the younger generation, or the migrants. A participant observed:

“The adat rules are strong, but sometimes they cannot solve new problems like when companies enter or when different ethnic groups claim the same land. The tradition was not designed for these situations.”

This implies that culture offers good guidance but it has to change as it evolves in the contemporary settings. There also exists the problem of power dynamics in the communities. Cultural power is usually concentrated in the hands of few members of the elders or leaders who might make prejudiced decisions when the leaders consider their interests or those of their clan. A number of the participants indicated that there have been cases where people in authority have manipulated cultural processes. As one interviewee stated:

“Most of the time adat decisions are fair, but there are times when leaders use their position to protect their relatives. That is when people feel culture is not serving justice.”

This draws attention to the frailty of culture mechanisms to inner abuse. Lastly, members also noted the concern regarding the fact that formal institutions overlooked them at times, and it led to the uncertainty regarding the validity of cultural practices. The state failure to recognize cultural decisions limits their effectiveness, especially in matters that are to be enforced by law. The presence of this gap leaves the communities in a precarious situation because they appreciate cultural authority yet they need formal support to guarantee long-term solutions.

Cultural Foundations of Justice and Managerial Implications in Multicultural Organizational Contexts

The main implication of the present study is that social justice is not something that can be handled as an entirely technical or procedural entity; rather, it should be based on the cultural lifeworld's, in which organizations are situated. The modern literature on management has unnecessarily assumed that justice frameworks are uniform policies that can be applied repeatedly in context (Marang'a, et al., 2024). However, as this paper has demonstrated, justice within multicultural worlds is a matter that is contextually sensitive because the local culture does not only offer normative legitimacy, but it also sets the patterns of expectations of justice and inclusion (Park, 2023). To managers, this highlights that corporate social responsibility (CSR) and governance efforts cannot be formulated based on assumptions of the headquarters about universal justice; they should interact with the cultural repertoires that define how stakeholders are perceived in different settings (Keating et al., 2024).

Through the findings, the concept of cultural embeddedness is shattered as just a symbolic act. Culture is not marginal; it becomes constitutive of practices of justice. This finding is consistent with the previous appeals in cross-cultural management that claimed that a thorough assimilation of local norms into organizational practice is necessary as opposed to the superficial adaptations of cultural (Buzeta et al., 2024). Indicatively, the consensus-driven decision-making and restorative processes found in this research study are consistent with managerial principles of participatory governance, and inclusivity of stakeholders (Raza & Zaman, 2021). These similarities hint at the idea that management theories of justice have much to learn by thinking more directly about anthropological and sociological conceptualizations

of culture, thus deepening the managerial strategies of equity and inclusion. The existence of these cultural grounds causes considerable tensions when the managerial practices aim to align the local traditions to the international norms. There is a growing globalization of organizations that are guided by universal systems of governance like the UN Sustainable Development Goals or ISO compliance regimes that focus on universal principles of justice and equality (Zhang, 2021). However, as seen in this case, cultural constructs can enable, as well as restrict, such constructs. Women or minorities being left out of certain cultural practices will also find an echo in critical management scholarship cautioning against blind adoration of local culture, but counseling against a blind dismissal of the cultural authority (Moriuchi & Moriyoshi, 2024). This poses a dilemma to managers since they need to respect cultural legitimacy and at the same time make sure that justice systems do not perpetuate injustices. The managerial dilemma, however, is how to develop reflexive governance practices enabling the possibility of dialogue between the universal norms and local cultural systems (Boudreau et al., 2022).

The merging of cultural and contemporary justice systems traced in this paper provides a didactic guide in hybrid governance. Institutional duality in emergent markets has been a long-standing concept of management literature, in which an organization has to contend with two types of legal institutions: official institutions and unofficial cultural norms (Larsson & Knudsen, 2022). This paper gives a practical example of such action hybridity, where organizations and communities use layered systems to solve conflict and develop legitimacy. These results support the observation that effective management in multicultural societies entails institutional bricolage mixing cultural logics with the modern managerial structures in order to produce hybrid practices that are legitimate and enforceable (van Waes et al., 2021). The managerial implications run more than governance into leadership and organization behavior. Culturally sensitive leaders can more easily resolve differences amongst stakeholders and also be able to cross-culturalize justice norms (Luoma & Hietanen, 2024). This is in line with the literature on the cultural intelligence (Bentalh & Alla, 2024) and inclusive leadership (Carbajal & Acur, 2024) which emphasizes the ability of leaders to relate well with diversity. What this research contributes is to empirically prove that not only are leaders in multicultural societies administering diversity, but they are, in fact, negotiating incompatible justice systems, which need cultural authenticity as well as procedural justice. This increases the leadership position to an administrative coordination level to ethical mediation making managers to become brokers of justice in cross-cultural levels.

However, the results also call upon organizations to perceive the boundaries of cultural relativism. There should be a balance between tolerance and cultural practices and universal obligations to equity, human rights and accountability as has been demonstrated in management research on ethics and corporate governance (Hammett, et al., 2022). The paper explains that communities tend to have faith on customary processes, at the same time the same processes could be exposed to elite capture or even the silencing of marginalized voices. This is echoed by the critics of stakeholder theory who observe power inequalities and the possibility of marginalization in participatory procedures (Scuotto et al., 2024). The managers should therefore resist the temptation to idolize cultural frames but ought to establish justice structures that are culturally resonant as well as critically reflexive and inclusive.

The other implication is a methodological implication to management research. In too many cases, management literature has favored quantitative conceptualizations of justice and fairness (Allen & Girei, 2024) without taking into account the experiences of societies where such ideas

are put into practice. The approach to conducting qualitative research on the topic of the cultural frameworks proves that the plurality of methodology has to be considered in the management research. The aspects of ethnographic sensitivity, narrative analysis and participatory approaches can help to contribute to our knowledge on how justice is experienced, negotiated and institutionalized in culturally diverse situations. It is not a luxury but a necessity in order that management scholarship be not overtaken by multicultural society. This research has policy and organizational strategic implication. In what can be defined as multicultural settings, such as in extractive industries, delivery of public services or multinational supply chain, contact with the local culture is not a choice. It is a strategic requirement to create legitimacy, thwart conflict and assure sustainable operations. Nevertheless, this involvement should not be formal. Managers should institute systems of cultural dialogue, co-design justice practices with communities and align the joint practices with wider organizational and ethical obligations. It is in this way that culture as a risk factor is turned into a resource towards sustainable justice practice.

Conclusion

This paper also shows that the local culture is no longer the peripheral effect but is a constitutive structure of how social justice is understood, negotiated and institutionalized within societies that are multicultural. When we locate justice in the specific logics of culture, we find opportunities as well as tensions of management: the opportunities of using cultural legitimacy to create trust, inclusivity, and sustainable governance, and the tensions of dealing with cultural practices that can be inconsistent with the universal obligations to equity and human rights. The management scholarship and practice implication is obvious--justice cannot be narrowed to standardized policies and abstract principles but rather must be entrenched in culturally resonant, critically reflexive, and institutionally hybrid practices. This understanding requires policy-makers, leaders, and managers to develop cultural intelligence, ethical reflexivity, and participatory strategies of engagement to survive the multicultural environment. Finally, it is through the breaking down of cultural structures into contemporary systems of governance that the organizations will be able to cease compliance-based solutions in favor of truly transformative practices of justice which help to bolster legitimacy, empower varied stakeholders, and promote sustainable social results.

References

- Abuso, G. (2022). Opportunities and Challenges in Integrating Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Diversity in International Studies. *Diversity, Inclusion, and Decolonization*, 220-235. <https://doi.org/10.51952/9781529216677.ch014>
- Allen, S., & Girei, E. (2024). Developing decolonial reflexivity: Decolonizing management education by confronting white skin, white identities, and whiteness. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 23(2), 246-264. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2022.0387>
- Atikurrahman, M., Indriyani, J. G., & Adzhani, S. A. (2022). Pluralism in the time of postcolonialism: Cultural diversity of Malay-Indonesian archipelago in Upin-Ipin and Adit-Sopo-Jarwo. *NOBEL: Journal of Literature and Language Teaching*, 13(1), 18-34. <https://doi.org/10.15642/NOBEL.2022.13.1.18-34>

- Bentalha, B., & Alla, L. (2024). Revealing the subtleties: The art of qualitative studies in science and management. In *Applying qualitative research methods to management science* (pp. 1-21). IGI Global.
- Bondarenko, D. M. (2023). *Post-colonial nations in historical and cultural context*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Boudreau LeBlanc, A., Williams-Jones, B., & Aenishaenslin, C. (2022). Bio-ethics and one health: a case study approach to building reflexive governance. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 10, 648593. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.648593>
- Buzeta, C., De Keyzer, F., Dens, N., & De Pelsmacker, P. (2024). Branded content and motivations for social media use as drivers of brand outcomes on social media: a cross-cultural study. *International Journal of Advertising*, 43(4), 637-671. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02650487.2023.2215079>
- Carbajal-Pina, C., & Acur, N. (2024). From principles to practice: Responsible implementation of emerging technologies through innovation dilemmas. *IEEE transactions on engineering management*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TEM.2024.3479413>
- Dai, J., & Azhar, A. (2024). Collaborative governance in disaster management and sustainable development. *Public Administration and Development*, 44(4), 358-380. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.2071>
- Hammett, D., Jackson, L., & Bramley, R. (2022). Beyond 'do no harm'? On the need for a dynamic approach to research ethics. *Area*, 54(4), 582-590. <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12795>
- Keating, D. J., Cullen-Lester, K. L., & Meuser, J. D. (2024). Virtual work conditions impact negative work behaviors via ambiguity, anonymity, and (un) accountability: An integrative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 109(2), 169.
- Larsson, M., & Knudsen, M. (2022). Conditions for reflexive practices in leadership learning: The regulating role of a socio-moral order of peer interactions. *Management Learning*, 53(2), 291-309. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507621998859>
- Levac, L., Stinson, J., Manning, S. M., & Stienstra, D. (2021). Expanding evidence and expertise in impact assessment: informing Canadian public policy with the knowledges of invisible communities. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, 39(3), 218-228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14615517.2021.1906152>
- Luoma, J., & Hietanen, J. (2024). Reflexive quantitative research. *Academy of Management Review*, (ja), amr-2021. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2021.0234>
- Marang'a, M., Jack, M., Edgar, A., & Irene, N. (2024). Greening the Justice System: Frameworks, Theories, Elements and Practice Imperatives. *Theories, Elements and Practice Imperatives*. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4939330>
- Mirza, S., & Neelam, A. (2023). Portrayal of Clash of Cultures in Immigrants' Lives in a Multicultural Society in Hanif Kureishi's "My Son the Fanatic". *SSRN*. <https://doi.org/10.15642/NOBEL.2022.13.1.18-34>

- Moriuchi, E., & Moriyoshi, N. (2024). A cross-cultural study on online reviews and decision making: An eye-tracking approach. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 23(1), 156-170. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.2165>
- Pandey, S. K., Newcomer, K., DeHart-Davis, L., McGinnis Johnson, J., & Riccucci, N. M. (2022). Reckoning with race and gender in public administration and public policy: A substantive social equity turn. *Public Administration Review*, 82(3), 386-395. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13501>
- Park, S. (2023). Bridging the global divide in AI regulation: a proposal for a contextual, coherent, and commensurable framework. *Wash. Int'l LJ*, 33, 216.
- Porto, M. F., Fasanello, M. T., da Rocha, D. F., & Palm, J. L. (2021). Emancipatory urban greening in the Global South: interdisciplinary and intercultural dialogues and the role of traditional and peasant peoples and communities in Brazil. *Frontiers in Sustainable Cities*, 3, 686458. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frsc.2021.686458>
- Raza, S. H., & Zaman, U. (2021). Leveraging luxury brands purchase intention through cultural congruent assertive advertising: Cross-cultural experimental evidence from Malaysia and Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS)*, 15(1), 138-165.
- Rendon, C., Osman, K. K., & Faust, K. M. (2021). Path towards community resilience: Examining stakeholders' coordination at the intersection of the built, natural, and social systems. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 68, 102774. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2021.102774>
- Rigon, A. (2022). Diversity, justice and slum upgrading: An intersectional approach to urban development. *Habitat International*, 130, 102691. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2022.102691>
- Saaida, M., & Saaidah, I. (2023). Understanding the Dynamics of Failure Development in Marginalized Areas: A Comprehensive Analysis. <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202312.0395.v1>
- Sánchez-Soriano, M., Arango-Ramírez, P. M., Pérez-López, E. I., & García-Montalvo, I. A. (2024). Inclusive governance: empowering communities and promoting social justice. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 6, 1478126. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2024.1478126>
- Scuotto, V., Magni, D., Garcia-Perez, A., & Pironti, M. (2024). The impact of innovation failure: Entrepreneurship adversity or opportunity?. *Technovation*, 131, 102944. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2023.102944>
- Singleton, B. E., Rask, N., Magnusdottir, G. L., & Kronsell, A. (2022). Intersectionality and climate policy-making: The inclusion of social difference by three Swedish government agencies. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, 40(1), 180-200. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23996544211005778>

- Suprayitno, D., Iskandar, S., Dahurandi, K., Hendarto, T., & Rumambi, F. J. (2024). Public policy in the era of climate change: adapting strategies for sustainable futures. *Migration Letters*, 21(S6), 945-958.
- van Waes, A., Nikolaeva, A., & Raven, R. (2021). Challenges and dilemmas in strategic urban experimentation An analysis of four cycling innovation living labs. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 172, 121004. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.121004>
- Williams, F. (2021). *Social policy: A critical and intersectional analysis*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Zhang, C. X., Yankholmes, A., & Morgan, N. (2022). Promoting postcolonial destinations: Paradoxical relations between decolonization and ‘East meets West’. *Tourism Management*, 90, 104458. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2021.104458>
- Zhang, X. A. (2021). Understanding the cultural orientations of fear appeal variables: a cross-cultural comparison of pandemic risk perceptions, efficacy perceptions, and behaviors. *Journal of Risk Research*, 24(3-4), 432-448. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2021.1887326>