



Cultural Intelligence and Governance Innovation: Pathways to a Shared Future and a Sustainable United Nations in the Information Age

David Haruna Mrisho

St. Augustine University of Tanzania, Department of Public Relations and Advertising

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100700278>

Received: 11 July 2026; Accepted: 16 July 2026; Published: 30 July 2026

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the interplay between cultural intelligence and governance innovation in promoting inclusive prosperity and ensuring the United Nations' sustainability in the digital age. Integrating concepts from cultural intelligence, digital governance, collaborative governance, and international relations, the study contends that uniting cultural diversity with innovative institutional approaches is essential for effective global cooperation. Cultural intelligence enables individuals and organizations to navigate and engage with cultural differences, while governance innovation establishes systems that enhance participation, transparency, accountability, digital inclusion, and adaptability. This study adopts a qualitative, conceptual methodology, reviewing academic literature, United Nations reports, and governance case studies. It examines inclusive policy models, culturally responsive peacekeeping, digital inclusion, responsible artificial intelligence governance, and collaborative multilateralism as strategies for building a community with a shared future. The findings indicate that integrating cultural intelligence with governance innovation can enhance the United Nations' inclusivity, forward-thinking capacity, legitimacy, and resilience.

Keywords: Cultural intelligence, governance innovation, United Nations, digital inclusion, artificial intelligence, multilateralism, shared future, sustainability

INTRODUCTION

The twenty-first century is defined by globalization, swift technological development, electronic communication, and growing interconnectedness among nations. However, the world faces complex problems such as climate change, conflict, inequality, health crises, displacement, misinformation, and cybersecurity threats. These problems cross national borders and cannot be solved by a single country or by traditional diplomatic methods alone (Held et al., 1999; Hale, 2020; Laya, 2024).

The United Nations, being the main organization for international cooperation, must continue to improve its practices and structures. Weiss and Wilkinson (2018) found that international organizations face growing pressure to show their legitimacy, effectiveness, and responsiveness, especially as global disputes increase. Laya (2024) also added that today's global risks require renewed multilateralism that is built on shared responsibility, solidarity, international law, and institutional reform.

Cultural intelligence is essential to building this understanding. Earley and Ang (2003) define cultural intelligence as the capacity to operate effectively in culturally diverse settings. Recent studies indicate that cultural intelligence facilitates intercultural communication, flexible leadership, creativity, knowledge sharing, and group work in multicultural organizations (Semenov & Randrianasolo, 2024; Yang, Yang, & Jiang, 2024; Teixeira & Klein, 2024). This makes it directly relevant to United Nations diplomacy, peacekeeping, development, humanitarian work, and multicultural workplaces.



Governance innovation uses cultural intelligence to build systems that include and respect cultural differences in decision-making. Examples of governance innovation include digital consultation platforms, community feedback tools, participatory policymaking, open data projects, partnership networks, and responsible AI frameworks (Osborne, 2010; Dean, 2023; Jäntti et al., 2023). discusses the existing link between cultural intelligence and governance innovation, and its importance in the pathways towards the sustainable future of the United Nations in the information age. CQ helps people engage constructively across multiple cultures, while governance innovation provides systems that improve participation, respect, transparency, and equity in everyday governance practices (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008; Ansell & Gash, 2008; Bason, 2010).

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

Cultural Intelligence

Cultural intelligence is the ability of individuals and organizations to understand, interpret, and respond accordingly to differences in cultural values, communication styles, social expectations, beliefs, practices, and institutional environments. Unlike other intelligence models, CQ centers mainly on functioning and adapting across cultural environments (Earley & Ang, 2003; Ang & Van Dyne, 2008).

The most widely used cultural intelligence framework consists of four dimensions: metacognitive, cognitive, motivational, and behavioral CQ. Metacognitive CQ refers to awareness of cultural assumptions and an individual's ability to reconsider interpretations during interactions. Cognitive CQ refers to a person's knowledge of the cultural norms, institutions, values, and practices of a new culture they are being exposed to. Motivational CQ refers to confidence and preparedness to engage with and adapt to cultural differences, while behavioral CQ is understood as the skill of adapting verbal and nonverbal behavior to a new cultural environment (Ang et al., 2007; Van Dyne et al., 2012).

Studies by Semenov and Randrianasolo (2024) conclude that metacognitive CQ cannot be applied mechanically. It requires individuals in new cultural situations to examine assumptions, interpret according to their own contexts, and hence adapt to each intercultural environment. The effects of different CQs may therefore be context-dependent, and behavior considered fitting within one culture may be inappropriate in another. Metacognitive CQ, in this scenario, enables people to question stereotypes, monitor their assumptions, and revise their interpretations when in a new cultural setting.

A diplomat, for example, may know a negotiating culture, but the knowledge may not reflect the specific individuals involved in the negotiating process. Metacognitive CQ helps the diplomat assess whether expectations about hierarchy, directness, consensus, disagreement, or personal relationships apply in the process of negotiating culture and procedures. Motivational and behavioral CQ, in this case, will support persistent engagement and appropriate adjustments in communication (Semenov & Randrianasolo, 2024; Livermore, 2015).

Yang et al. (2024) suggested in their study that metacognitive and motivational dimensions of cultural intelligence can promote creativity through intercultural citizenship behavior and social engagements. They indicated that culturally intelligent employees do more than avoid misunderstandings; they engage themselves in knowledge exchange, support colleagues from different cultural settings, and help culturally different groups transform their previous cultural perspectives into new ideas.

Cultural intelligence is not something static. CQ evolves through learning processes, intercultural interactions, friendships, community activities, critical incidents and events, and reflection on new experiences. This view is also supported by Teixeira and Klein (2024), who assert that CQ enforces the use of practical training, simulations, mentoring, language learning, field engagement, and reflective methods in international organizations.

The application of CQ is important to the work the UN undertakes, especially in peacekeeping missions. Missions bring together international military personnel, police officers, civilian experts, national employees, humanitarian



organizations, and local communities. These actors differ in language, religion, professional culture, gender expectations, authority relationships, and interpretations of peace, justice, and security; CQ hence helps those engaged in the missions to better understand each other towards the effectiveness of the mission's agenda (Autesserre, 2021; von Billerbeck et al., 2024).

Governance Innovation

Governance innovation is understood as the creation or redesign of institutional settings, administrative procedures, public services, decision-making procedures, and technological systems to improve effectiveness and job performance, transparency, inclusion, and adaptability amid changing work environments. It is more than the adoption of new technologies. Rather, it entails transforming organizational cultures, institutional relationships, administrative practices, and approaches to public participation and stakeholder engagement (Bason, 2010; Osborne, 2010).

E-government is a good example of government innovation. Through digital platforms, citizens can easily access public documents and services, communicate with government authorities, monitor public expenditure, and participate in consultations on national development. Janssen and Estevez (2013) argue that digital public-service innovation can promote more integrated, efficient, and responsive governance. However, its effectiveness depends not only on technological capacity but also on institutional coordination, administrative reform, and the redesign of existing government processes.

Community-based governance represents an essential dimension of institutional innovation. It focuses on the active participation of citizens and local communities in identifying public needs, establishing policies, and monitoring the implementation of programs for national development. Jäntti, Paananen, Kork, and Kurkela (2023) claim that citizen participation should be integrated across the strategic, managerial, and citizen-interface levels of government. Governance innovation facilitates citizens' engagement and participation in understanding and actively participating in a nation's development processes.

The use of artificial intelligence expands the possibilities for governance innovation, though introducing major ethical and institutional risks. AI systems can support climate simulation, disease surveillance, humanitarian logistics, translation, document analysis, public service delivery, and early warning mechanisms. These applications strengthen the ability of governments and international organizations to process large amounts of information and respond rapidly to complicated challenges. Nevertheless, poorly governed AI systems may reproduce bias, reinforce discrimination, violate privacy, spread misinformation, and create uncertainty regarding responsibility for automated decisions (Floridi et al., 2018; Wirtz, Weyerer, & Sturm, 2020).

Governance innovation in the United Nations' system should therefore be assessed according to its contribution to public value, human rights, institutional legitimacy, and fair participation in the development agenda. Efficiency alone can not be the measure of successful innovation. Governance systems must also be transparent, understandable, accessible, contestable, culturally responsive, and accountable to the people and communities affected by their decisions. Innovation should therefore strengthen, rather than weaken, democratic participation, institutional trust, and the protection of fundamental rights (Meijer, Curtin, & Hillebrandt, 2012; Batool et al., 2025).

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a qualitative research design to assess the existing link between cultural intelligence and governance innovation as pathways to a sustainable United Nations in the information age.

The study relies on a purposive review of academic books, peer-reviewed journal articles, United Nations publications, and selected policy documents. Fundamental works were used to define cultural intelligence, collaborative governance, institutional innovation, and global interdependence. Recent academic studies



published mainly between 2023 and 2026 were then used to strengthen the discussion of CQ development, creativity, local peacebuilding knowledge, citizen participation, digital poverty, artificial-intelligence governance, and contemporary multilateralism (Semenov & Randrianasolo, 2024; Dean, 2023; Batool et al., 2025; Ofori et al., 2026).

Linking Cultural Intelligence and Governance Innovation

Cultural intelligence and governance innovation are mutually reinforcing concepts because they address distinct yet interrelated dimensions of inclusion and social interactions that foster the sustainable development of nations and a sustainable United Nations. Cultural intelligence enhances an individual's ability to understand cultural diversity and adapt to new cultural situations, while governance innovation enhances participation and responsiveness in institutional settings (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008; Osborne, 2010). At the individual level, culturally intelligent individuals are confident in challenging stereotypes, recognize and propose alternative perspectives, and make some adjustments to communication approaches in new cultural settings. It is also important to point out that individual sensitivity does not guarantee inclusion when institutional procedures restrict participation or centralize decision-making. Governance systems are required to ensure that different viewpoints are regularly collected, considered, and reflected in decision-making (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Jäntti et al., 2023).

Community Participatory platforms, local community advisory committees, and local community feedback procedures can enhance the reflection of cultural respect in institutional practice and hence foster governance innovation. Community Liaison Assistants, for instance, may provide peacekeeping officials with information on threats, social relationships, community leaders, and potential conflict dynamics within a local community.

This knowledge becomes valuable only when mission structures allow it to influence patrol planning, early-warning systems, mediation, and civilian-protection strategies (Eckhard, 2021; von Billerbeck et al., 2024). Governance innovation can fail when cultural context is ignored. Cultural intelligence enables organizations to identify such differences and offer multiple participation channels rather than applying a single, universal format (Hofstede, 2001; Semenov & Randrianasolo, 2024). The link is equally essential in AI governance. Technical designers may seek universal categories and standardized outputs, yet concepts such as identity, family, privacy, vulnerability, authority, and community responsibility are interpreted differently among diverse societies. Without cultural knowledge and local participation, automated systems may misclassify people or misunderstand the social environments in which data are produced (Floridi et al., 2018; Batool et al., 2025). For example, an automated humanitarian system may classify households based on assumptions about nuclear-family structures, formal employment, permanent addresses, and standardized names. These categories may not represent extended families, informal livelihoods, nomadic communities, displaced people, or societies with different naming practices. Involving local experts and affected communities in system design and testing can reduce these risks (Wirtz et al., 2020; Batool et al., 2025).

The combination of CQ and governance innovation can consequently strengthen institutional legitimacy. People are more likely to trust institutions when procedures are transparent and when their languages, knowledge, identities, and concerns receive meaningful recognition. Such integration also increases institutional resilience because organizations with strong community relationships can obtain better information, identify emerging problems, and adapt their responses more effectively (Meijer et al., 2012; Autesserre, 2021).

Pathways to a Shared Future

Inclusive Policy Systems

Inclusive policy systems ensure that cultural diversity is recognized while equality, dignity, and fair participation are protected. Inclusion should go beyond symbolic representation and affect agenda-setting, policy design, resource assignment, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation (Sen, 1999; Fraser, 2008).



Within the United Nations, inclusive policymaking requires meaningful participation by people directly affected by programs and decisions. These may include women, young people, and Indigenous communities, persons with disabilities, refugees, local authorities, linguistic minorities, and civil-society organizations. Ansell and Gash (2008) argue that joint governance becomes more legitimate when affected stakeholders participate directly in deliberation and issue resolution.

Environmental governance offers an important example. Scientific evidence can be strengthened by Indigenous and local knowledge of ecosystems, seasonal change, agriculture, land stewardship, and water management. Berkes (2012) argues that traditional ecological knowledge comprises accumulated observations and practices that can contribute to adaptive environmental governance when communities are respected as knowledge holders rather than merely treated as program beneficiaries.

Peacebuilding provides another example of the significance of inclusive frameworks. Agreements negotiated only among national political elites may overlook local conflicts involving land, identity, livestock, resources, customary authority, and community security. Autesserre (2021) demonstrates that locally led approaches can identify everyday conflict dynamics that international actors frequently miss.

However, participation must be connected to decision-making. Jäntti et al. (2023) explain that participatory instruments are effective only when reinforced by strategic commitments, management practices, resources, and links to formal institutional processes. The UN should therefore explain how consultation findings affect programs and provide reasons when community recommendations are not adopted.

Inclusive guidelines also require equity-impact assessments. Before introducing a digital platform or AI system, institutions should determine which groups possess access, which languages are supported, whose data are represented, who may be excluded, and what appeal mechanisms exist. Such assessments assist in distinguishing substantive inclusion from formally equal yet practically unequal access (Fraser, 2008; Batool et al., 2025).

Digital Inclusion

Digital inclusion involves reliable infrastructure, affordable connectivity, appropriate devices, accessible design, digital competence, relevant content, language support, privacy protection, and secure participation. Ofori et al. (2026) show that digital poverty is sustained via fragmented ecosystems and weak coordination as well as by gaps in infrastructure and skills.

The effects of digital exclusion are especially significant in the Global South. Communities may depend heavily on mobile devices and unstable networks, while government platforms may be designed for fast connections and desktop computers. Digital services should therefore use low-bandwidth formats, mobile-compatible interfaces, accessible language, and offline alternatives (Ofori et al., 2026).

Accessibility should also include persons with disabilities. A platform may contain valuable information but remain unusable when images lack descriptions, videos lack captions, forms cannot be navigated with assistive technology, or instructions use unnecessarily complicated language. Meaningful digital inclusion requires that accessibility be incorporated into design rather than added after implementation (Ofori et al., 2026).

Cultural and linguistic inclusion are equally important. Automated translation can increase access, but literal translation may fail to communicate local meanings, social sensitivities, and trusted forms of expression. Human review, community testing, and culturally knowledgeable language specialists should complement digital translation systems (Semenov & Randrianasolo, 2024; Batool et al., 2025).

Digital participation should not completely replace face-to-face communication. Dean (2023) explains that digital technology can reshape citizen participation and may emphasize monitoring over early influence. Hybrid



mechanisms combining community meetings, local representatives, telephone services, radio, mobile platforms, and online consultations can reach a wider range of participants.

Digital inclusion also requires institutional coordination. Ofori et al. (2026) identify fragmentation among governments, private companies, civil-society organizations, donors, and communities as a major obstacle to sustainable digital participation. The United Nations can help coordinate these actors while making sure that local communities influence priorities and implementation.

Responsible Artificial Intelligence

Artificial intelligence is increasingly relevant to global governance because it can support disaster prediction, climate analysis, humanitarian logistics, disease surveillance, translation, and large-scale data processing. However, these applications can result in discrimination, privacy violations, inaccurate classifications, and unclear responsibility when introduced without effective oversight (Floridi et al., 2018; Wirtz et al., 2020).

Responsible AI governance requires institutions to identify who designed a system, who authorized its use, what data it uses, how its accuracy was tested, and who is accountable when its decisions cause harm. Batool et al. (2025) argue that governance should occur throughout the AI lifecycle rather than only after deployment.

Human monitoring must be meaningful, particularly when systems influence access to food, housing, healthcare, employment, humanitarian assistance, migration protection, or public benefits. A human reviewer must possess the authority, knowledge, and information necessary to challenge an automated output rather than merely approve it (Wirtz et al., 2020; Batool et al., 2025).

Cultural intelligence can strengthen AI governance by revealing assumptions hidden inside datasets, categories, and evaluation standards. Culturally varied design teams and local participants are more likely to identify cases in which apparently neutral classifications fail to represent particular communities (Semenov & Randrianasolo, 2024; Yang et al., 2024).

For instance, a humanitarian risk-assessment system might use household income, property ownership, formal employment, or registered addresses as indicators of vulnerability. These measures may fail in contexts dominated by informal work, shared property, displacement, or communal resource systems. Community participation and local testing can improve both the equity and usefulness of such systems (Batool et al., 2025; Ofori et al., 2026).

Collaborative Multilateralism

Climate change, pandemics, artificial intelligence, cybersecurity, migration, and financial volatility cannot be addressed by governments acting independently. Collaborative multilateralism therefore requires cooperation among states, international organizations, civil society, businesses, researchers, local governments, and community groups (Hale, 2020; Laya, 2024).

Different actors contribute different forms of knowledge and capacity. Universities may provide independent research, technology companies may offer technical expertise, civil-society organizations may represent affected communities, and local governments may contribute implementation experience. Ansell and Gash (2008) emphasize that effective collaboration requires trust, common understanding, dialogue, and clear institutional procedures.

However, multi-stakeholder cooperation can reproduce unequal power. Large states, corporations, and well-funded organizations may control negotiations, while lesser states and community organizations struggle to attend meetings, obtain information, or influence technical discussions. Fraser's (2008) account of participatory justice suggests that fair participation necessitates focus on representation as well as formal access.



The UN can reduce these disparities in equality through translation, travel support, accessible digital participation, transparent speaking procedures, conflict-of-interest declarations, proportionate representation, and publication of consultation outcomes. Such measures help prevent collaborative governance from becoming a process in which powerful actors merely confirm decisions already made (Dean, 2023; Jäntti et al., 2023).

Collaborative multilateralism must also connect participation to implementation. The participation of multiple actors can improve policy creativity, but it can also create unclear responsibility. Institutions should identify what each partner contributes, who makes final decisions, how performance is monitored, and how affected communities can raise concerns (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Young, 2023).

Toward a Community with a Shared Future

The concept of a community with a shared future emphasizes global interdependence, consultation, shared responsibility, mutual benefit, and cooperation across political and cultural differences. It contests zero-sum approaches through recognizing that security, prosperity, public health, environmental protection, and technological stability increasingly depend on collective action (Qin, 2018; Laya, 2024).

Qin's (2018) relational theory of world politics provides an important intellectual basis for this perspective. Relational theory emphasizes that international actors are defined by their relationships and that stable cooperation requires a focus on coexistence, mutual recognition, and the processes by which relationships are maintained.

Zhao's (2021) discussion of the Tianxia system similarly considers the possibility of a world order based on inclusion and mutual responsibility rather than permanent exclusion and rivalry. Although such approaches require critical evaluation, they contribute to debates about how global governance might move beyond narrow national competition.

Cultural intelligence supports a shared future through equipping actors to communicate and cooperate across cultural and ideological separations. Governance innovation complements CQ by developing institutions through which diverse actors can participate, exchange knowledge, monitor decisions, and resolve disagreements (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008; Osborne, 2010).

A community with a shared future should not require cultural uniformity. Sustainable cooperation must accommodate diverse histories, traditions, and development experiences while upholding commitments to human dignity, peaceful engagement, international law, and equality among states. Cultural intelligence is valuable precisely because it enables cooperation without assuming that all societies must become identical (Semenov & Randrianasolo, 2024).

The concept should also be evaluated through practical outcomes. Global initiatives should be assessed according to whether they reduce inequality, improve representation, protect rights, strengthen peaceful cooperation, and distribute technological improvements fairly. A shared future should therefore function not only as a diplomatic aspiration but also as a standard for evaluating global institutions (Sen, 1999; Fraser, 2008).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The sustainability of the United Nations depends in part on its ability to combine culturally intelligent leadership with inclusive, accountable governance innovation. CQ helps international actors understand cultural differences, reconsider assumptions, and adapt their communication. Governance innovation creates the structures through which inclusion, participation, transparency, and accountability can become regular institutional practices (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008; Bason, 2010).

Recent studies show that cultural intelligence contributes to adaptive behavior, intercultural learning, creativity, cooperation, and effective knowledge exchange. These outcomes are particularly relevant to the UN because its



personnel and stakeholders operate throughout diverse cultural, political, and occupational environments (Semenov & Randrianasolo, 2024; Teixeira & Klein, 2024; Yang et al., 2024).

First, cultural intelligence should be integrated into UN recruitment, leadership development, peacekeeper preparation, diplomatic training, and staff assessment. Training should include reflective learning, practical simulations, language awareness, local engagement, and in-depth analysis of cultural assumptions rather than relying on simplified descriptions of national cultures (Teixeira & Klein, 2024; Semenov & Randrianasolo, 2024).

Second, the UN should strengthen the role of local cultural expertise. Community Liaison Assistants, translators, local researchers, journalists, women's organizations, youth groups, customary leaders, and civil-society organizations should be treated as knowledge partners. Institutional mechanisms should ensure that their information influences planning and policy-making (Eckhard, 2021; von Billerbeck et al., 2024).

Third, digital-governance initiatives should be designed around inclusion rather than technical innovation. Platforms should undergo assessments of accessibility, affordability, privacy, language, cultural effect, and equality. Non-digital and low-bandwidth alternatives should remain available where access is unequal (Dean, 2023; Ofori et al., 2026).

Fourth, the UN ought to establish clear and enforceable standards for responsible AI. These should include lifecycle oversight, transparency, human-rights assessments, independent auditing, meaningful human review, community participation, appeal mechanisms, and clearly assigned accountability (Wirtz et al., 2020; Batool et al., 2025).

Fifth, participatory mechanisms should provide meaningful influence rather than symbolic consultation. Participants should be notified about how their contributions affected decisions, while marginalized groups should receive translation, accessibility, financial, and technological support where required (Young, 2023; Jäntti et al., 2023).

Finally, collaborative multilateralism should be expanded while remaining transparent and accountable. States, civil society, academia, businesses, local communities, and young people can contribute knowledge and resources, but partnership arrangements must prevent powerful actors from exerting control over decision-making (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Fraser, 2008; Laya, 2024).

The combination of cultural intelligence and governance innovation can enhance the United Nations' inclusivity, trustworthiness, adaptability, and capacity to anticipate global challenges. This approach turns cultural diversity into a resource for cooperation and helps ensure that technological development promotes inclusive prosperity rather than exacerbating exclusion (Yang et al., 2024; Ofori et al., 2026).

REFERENCES

1. Ang, S., & Van Dyne, L. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement, and applications*. M. E. Sharpe.
2. Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., Ng, K. Y., Templer, K. J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, N. A. (2007). Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision-making, cultural adaptation, and task performance. *Management and Organization Review*, 3(3), 335–371.
3. Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571.
4. Autesserre, S. (2021). *The frontlines of peace: An insider's guide to changing the world*. Oxford University Press.
5. Bason, C. (2010). *Leading public sector innovation: Co-creating for a better society*. Policy Press.
6. Batool, A., Zowghi, D., & Bano, M. (2025). AI governance: A systematic literature review. *AI and Ethics*, 5, 3265–3279.



7. Berkes, F. (2012). *Sacred ecology* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
8. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. Sage.
9. Dean, R. (2023). Participatory governance in the digital age: From input to oversight. *International Journal of Communication*, 17, 3562–3581.
10. Earley, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*. Stanford University Press.
11. Eckhard, S. (2021). Bridging the citizen gap: Bureaucratic representation and knowledge linkage in international public administration. *Governance*, 34(2), 295–314.
12. Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., Luetge, C., Madelin, R., Pagallo, U., Rossi, F., Schafer, B., Valcke, P., & Vayena, E. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society. *Minds and Machines*, 28, 689–707.
13. Fraser, N. (2008). *Scales of justice: Reimagining political space in a globalizing world*. Columbia University Press.
14. Hale, T. (2020). Transnational actors and transnational governance in global environmental politics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 23, 203–220.
15. Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999). *Global transformations: Politics, economics and culture*. Stanford University Press.
16. Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Sage.
17. Janssen, M., & Estevez, E. (2013). Lean government and platform-based governance—Doing more with less. *Government Information Quarterly*, 30, S1–S8.
18. Jäntti, A., Paananen, H., Kork, A.-A., & Kurkela, K. (2023). Towards interactive governance: Embedding citizen participation in local government. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 55(8).
19. Laya, A. G. (2024). Reclaiming multilateralism. In H. H. Wang and M. L. Miao (Eds.), *Enhancing global governance in a fragmented world*. Springer.
20. Livermore, D. (2015). *Leading with cultural intelligence: The real secret to success* (2nd ed.). AMACOM.
21. Meijer, A. J., Curtin, D., & Hillebrandt, M. (2012). Open government: Connecting vision and voice. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 78(1), 10–29.
22. Ofori, F., Matos, S., & Tavalaei, M. (2026). Digital poverty in the Global South. *Management and Organization Review*, advance online publication.
23. Osborne, S. P. (Ed.). (2010). *The new public governance? Emerging perspectives on the theory and practice of public governance*. Routledge.
24. Qin, Y. (2018). *A relational theory of world politics*. Cambridge University Press.
25. Semenov, A. V., & Randrianasolo, A. (2024). An extended conceptualization of cultural intelligence. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 24(3), 563–586.
26. Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.
27. Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339.
28. Teixeira, K. A. S., & Klein, A. Z. (2024). The development of cultural intelligence in situated learning. *SAGE Open*, 14(4).
29. United Nations. (2024a). *Pact for the Future*.
30. United Nations. (2024b). *Global Digital Compact*.
31. Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., Ng, K. Y., Rockstuhl, T., Tan, M. L., & Koh, C. (2012). Subdimensions of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 6(4), 295–313.
32. Von Billerbeck, S., Coleman, K. P., Eckhard, S., & Zyla, B. (2024). Local knowledges in international peacebuilding: Acquisition, filtering, and systematic bias. *International Studies Review*, 26(4), viae047.
33. Weiss, T. G., & Wilkinson, R. (2018). *International organization and global governance* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
34. Wirtz, B. W., Weyerer, J. C., & Sturm, B. J. (2020). The dark sides of artificial intelligence: An integrated AI governance framework for public administration. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 43(9), 818–829.



35. Yang, Y., Yang, Q., & Jiang, C. (2024). How cultural intelligence facilitates employee creativity: The roles of intercultural citizenship behavior and perceived disharmony. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 24(3), 543–561.
36. Young, M. M. (2023). Citizen participation matters: Bureaucratic discretion matters more. *Public Administration*, 101(3), 747–771.
37. Zhao, T. (2021). *All under heaven: The Tianxia system for a possible world order*. University of California Press.