DIGITAL HUMANITIES AND RESILIENT GOVERNANCE: POLICY PATHWAYS FOR ETHICS, CULTURE, ECONOMY, AND LAW

Ari Wibowo
{ari_wibowo@kemenkeu.go.id}

Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia
Kementerian Keuangan Republik Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia

Abstract. The digital era has transformed the humanities into a multidimensional field shaped by technological innovation, economic imperatives, and legal frameworks. While digital humanities open unprecedented opportunities for knowledge creation, cultural preservation, and social inclusion, they also generate complex governance challenges. This paper explores the intersections of ethics, culture, economy, and law in advancing resilient governance for digital humanities. Drawing on global case studies and comparative policy analysis, it examines how ethical AI principles, legal accountability, cultural preservation mechanisms, and economic sustainability can be integrated into coherent policy pathways. The study argues that fragmented approaches, where ethics, economics, and law operate in isolation, fail to address the structural risks of algorithmic bias, data colonialism, cultural commodification, and digital inequality. Instead, the paper proposes a hybrid governance model that combines legal safeguards, economic incentives, and cultural–ethical frameworks to build resilience in digital policy. By embedding humanities perspectives into public policy design, the findings highlight how resilient governance can ensure that digital transformation fosters equity, protects heritage, and strengthens democratic accountability. This work contributes both conceptually and practically to ongoing debates on digital governance, offering pathways for policymakers, scholars, and practitioners seeking to balance technological progress with human-centered values.

Keywords: culture, digital humanities, economy, ethics, law, resilient governance

INTRODUCTION

The digital transformation of the twenty-first century has reshaped the very foundation of the humanities and social sciences. Once centered on textual interpretation, the humanities have evolved into digital humanities, a multidimensional field integrating artificial intelligence, data analytics, and networked systems to explore culture, ethics, and society (Viola, 2023; Ulutas Aydogan et al., 2019). This shift enables cultural preservation through digital platforms and the democratization of knowledge (Pereda et al., 2025), while also generating tensions between human-centered values and algorithmic control. The rise of the metaverse and smart infrastructures expands human creativity into virtual domains but raises ethical and ontological questions about authenticity, authorship, and identity (Allam et al., 2022; Young, 2021).

Digital transformation also produces complex governance challenges involving law, ethics, and culture. Algorithmic decision-making and platform economies have introduced new forms of asymmetry that require legal accountability and ethical oversight (Shneiderman, 2020; Feijóo et al., 2020). In decentralized environments such as Web3, governance must balance innovation with rights protection and transparency (Calzada et al., 2025). Legal frameworks for sustainable governance, as Khater et al. (2024) argue, must integrate environmental and social objectives, while cultural preservation efforts must avoid commodifying heritage or reproducing colonial hierarchies (Rollo, 2025; Rogers et al., 2020). Governance in the digital era thus demands holistic mechanisms that ensure justice, inclusivity, and heritage protection beyond mere technical control (Ungar, 2021; Hantrais & Lenihan, 2021).

Economics also plays a critical role in shaping the trajectory of digital humanities. The global digital economy influences access to infrastructure, funding for innovation, and ownership of cultural data (Carayannis & Morawska-Jancelewicz, 2022; Mamanazarov et al., 2025). While digitalization promises efficiency and creativity, it can also deepen inequalities and commodify culture if left

unregulated (Cook et al., 2022; Zhang & Bilawal Khaskheli, 2025). Economic governance must therefore incorporate ethical and legal safeguards that align market incentives with social value, enabling innovation while protecting cultural integrity (Correia, 2024; Farazmand, 2023).

Despite its promise, digital humanities governance remains fragmented. Ethical standards, economic instruments, cultural policies, and legal mechanisms often operate in isolation rather than as part of a coherent system (Tiron-Tudor et al., 2025; Troisi et al., 2024). This fragmentation weakens institutional adaptability and undermines accountability, resulting in governance gaps and inequities (Rogers et al., 2020; Rollo, 2025). The central problem lies in reconciling technological innovation with humanistic and socio-economic imperatives through an integrative governance framework. The study therefore addresses key questions: how ethical AI principles can be embedded in governance structures; how cultural preservation can align with economic and technological progress; what legal frameworks ensure accountability and inclusivity; and how interdisciplinary governance can connect ethics, economy, culture, and law to foster resilience (Feijóo et al., 2020; Hantrais & Lenihan, 2021).

This research holds both scholarly and policy significance. International bodies such as the OECD, UNESCO, and the European Commission increasingly call for frameworks that harmonize digital innovation with human rights and sustainability (Farazmand, 2023; Carayannis & Morawska-Jancelewicz, 2022). By engaging with paradigms like Society 5.0 and Industry 5.0, this study situates digital humanities as a field that bridges human values and technological advancement (Troisi et al., 2024; Ungar, 2021). It contributes conceptually by integrating digital humanities, law, economics, and public policy into a unified framework of resilient governance (Shneiderman, 2020; Tiron-Tudor et al., 2025).

From a policy perspective, the paper offers a roadmap for embedding ethics, inclusivity, and resilience into digital governance at national and international levels (Correia, 2024; Khater et al., 2024). Socially and ethically, it underscores how digital humanities can enhance equity, preserve cultural diversity, and strengthen accountability in digital policy (Williams, 2024; Viola, 2023; Rogers et al., 2020).

The literature on digital humanities and resilient governance reflects a profound reconfiguration of how societies understand knowledge, technology, and cultural identity in the digital age. Emerging scholarship views the digital humanities not merely as a technological adaptation of traditional disciplines but as a transformative paradigm that merges ethics, policy, economics, and law into a single governance ecosystem (Viola, 2023; Ulutas Aydogan et al., 2019). This shift, as emphasized by Allam et al. (2022), positions digital infrastructures such as the metaverse and smart cities as new civic spaces where culture, data, and technology intersect to define the terms of human participation. Such developments challenge conventional distinctions between creators and users, public and private domains, and local and global identities, underscoring the need for inclusive governance structures capable of navigating these blurred boundaries.

The economic dimension of this transformation is central to the discourse. Scholars argue that digitalization alters production, distribution, and access to knowledge, transforming cultural capital into economic value (Carayannis & Morawska-Jancelewicz, 2022; Cook et al., 2022). Mamanazarov et al. (2025) demonstrate that human capital development and digital literacy have become prerequisites for participation in the digital economy, while Zhang and Bilawal Khaskheli (2025) highlight how digital technologies influence sustainable economic development through interactions between policy, law, and environmental systems. Yet, as Richey et al. (2023) note, these transformations also introduce vulnerabilities: unequal access to digital tools and markets often reinforces socio-economic divides. The economic literature thus calls for governance frameworks that combine innovation incentives with redistributive mechanisms to ensure equitable participation in the digital sphere (Correia, 2024; Farazmand, 2023).

The legal and ethical literatures complement this economic lens by addressing the structural tensions between innovation, accountability, and human rights. Feijóo et al. (2020) and Shneiderman (2020) emphasize that artificial intelligence and algorithmic systems require transparent, human-centered oversight to maintain reliability and fairness. Legal frameworks in this domain increasingly aim to balance regulatory certainty with technological flexibility, an approach reflected in the work of

Khater et al. (2024) on sustainable tourism and digital law. Similarly, Calzada et al. (2025) underscore that decentralized technologies such as Web3 and blockchain demand new approaches to trust and data sovereignty beyond traditional institutional hierarchies. These developments collectively illustrate the need for algorithmic governance rooted in ethical and legal safeguards that preserve human agency in automated environments.

From a cultural and social perspective, scholars such as Rollo (2025) and Young (2021) situate digital humanities within broader debates about heritage, identity, and decolonization. Digital archives and virtual heritage projects democratize access to culture but also risk reproducing historical inequalities if not guided by inclusive governance. Ungar (2021) expands this discussion through the concept of multisystemic resilience, emphasizing that cultural and institutional adaptability must be embedded within policy frameworks to withstand technological and social shocks. The preservation of intangible cultural heritage in digital form, therefore, demands an ethical balance between openness, authenticity, and collective ownership.

The intersection of these domains, ethics, culture, economy, and law, forms the conceptual foundation for resilient governance. Troisi et al. (2024) and Tiron-Tudor et al. (2025) advocate for integrating Industry 5.0 and Society 5.0 paradigms, which position human welfare and sustainability at the core of innovation policy. Rogers et al. (2020) further contribute to resilience theory by linking institutional adaptability with value systems, arguing that true resilience emerges from coherence between technological advancement and societal ethics. This integrative vision is reinforced by Viola (2023) and Hantrais and Lenihan (2021), who contend that evidence-based digital policy must account for social complexity, cultural context, and ethical foresight rather than rely solely on quantitative data.

Synthesizing these perspectives, the conceptual framework of this study positions resilient governance as a multidimensional model that aligns digital innovation with humanistic values. It incorporates four interrelated pillars: ethical accountability to guide technology toward public good; legal adaptability to protect rights and ensure compliance; economic sustainability to promote equitable participation; and cultural inclusion to preserve diversity and authenticity. Each pillar functions not in isolation but as part of an adaptive ecosystem that evolves through feedback between policy, society, and technology. Within this framework, digital humanities become a policy domain that transcends disciplinary boundaries, operating as both a scientific and moral project aimed at reconciling progress with justice.

This integrated approach redefines digital humanities as a catalyst for inclusive governance, emphasizing that technology must serve as an instrument of human flourishing rather than domination. By uniting insights from law, economics, and culture, the literature establishes a foundation for rethinking governance as a process of ethical co-evolution between humanity and technology, an understanding central to building resilient, equitable, and future-oriented societies.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study adopts an interdisciplinary and comparative qualitative design to examine how ethics, culture, economy, and law interact within digital humanities governance frameworks. The methodological orientation is both analytical and normative, combining conceptual synthesis with comparative case-based insights. It builds upon the premise that digital transformation cannot be understood through a single disciplinary lens but must be interpreted through the convergence of social theory, economic analysis, legal interpretation, and ethical philosophy. Such integration allows for a holistic understanding of resilience as both a structural and moral quality of governance systems.

The research applies a comparative governance approach, drawing on selected cases and frameworks from OECD and ASEAN regions. These cases, ranging from digital cultural heritage initiatives to ethical AI regulation and economic innovation policies, illustrate diverse governance trajectories. Comparative analysis highlights both convergences and divergences in how different societies institutionalize ethical and legal safeguards for digital innovation. This method enables the

identification of policy gaps and best practices, particularly concerning transparency, accountability, and inclusivity in digital governance. Through this comparative lens, the study positions digital humanities as a governance field that requires policy coherence across national, regional, and global levels.

Data for the study are derived from secondary sources, including academic literature, policy reports, international frameworks, and institutional case studies. Sources such as the OECD's Digital Government Index, UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence, and the European Commission's Digital Strategy for Cultural Heritage provide empirical grounding for the normative arguments advanced in this paper. The analysis emphasizes qualitative interpretation rather than quantitative measurement, prioritizing context, meaning, and governance logic over numerical comparison.

The analytical framework integrates three methodological pillars: thematic analysis, comparative policy interpretation, and conceptual synthesis. Thematic analysis is used to categorize recurring ideas across the literature, such as ethical AI, data justice, digital economy, and cultural inclusion, and to identify interdependencies between these themes. Comparative policy interpretation then evaluates how governance systems operationalize these principles, focusing on institutional design, legal mandates, and implementation mechanisms. Finally, conceptual synthesis connects the findings to resilience theory, translating them into an integrated model of resilient digital humanities governance.

Philosophically, the research is grounded in a constructivist epistemology that views governance as a socially constructed system of meaning shaped by interaction between institutions, norms, and technologies. This epistemic stance aligns with the humanistic tradition of digital humanities, which treats knowledge not as fixed data but as evolving interpretation. The methodology therefore balances empirical observation with theoretical reasoning, recognizing that governance models must be adaptive and reflexive in responding to technological and cultural change.

Ethically, the study follows academic integrity principles by ensuring transparency in citation, contextual interpretation of sources, and critical reflection on potential biases in secondary data. The research acknowledges that the positionality of the scholar influences interpretation, particularly in topics involving normative claims about justice, inclusion, and sustainability. Hence, reflexivity is embedded as part of the methodological process to maintain balance between descriptive rigor and ethical responsibility.

In sum, this chapter establishes a methodological foundation that bridges theory and policy, allowing for a rigorous yet flexible examination of digital humanities governance. By integrating comparative insight, thematic coherence, and conceptual depth, the research aims to construct an evidence-informed framework that not only interprets but also guides policy design for ethical, cultural, economic, and legal resilience in the digital age.

RESULT AND ANALYSIS

The analysis reveals that the governance of digital humanities requires an integrated policy architecture capable of aligning ethical principles, cultural preservation, economic inclusivity, and legal accountability. Across diverse national and institutional contexts, a clear pattern emerges: fragmented governance undermines resilience, while coordinated frameworks rooted in shared values foster sustainability and innovation. The digital humanities, once confined to academic inquiry, have become a practical policy arena where questions of technology, justice, and culture converge. As Viola (2023) notes, digital humanities today operate as both an epistemic and political project, mediating between data-driven rationality and humanistic values.

Ethically, the literature and comparative evidence demonstrate that the resilience of digital systems depends on embedding human-centered design principles within technological infrastructures. Shneiderman (2020) and Feijóo et al. (2020) emphasize that algorithmic systems should be guided by transparency, explainability, and responsibility to prevent bias and exclusion. Countries

implementing ethical AI frameworks, such as those inspired by UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence, have shown stronger institutional trust and citizen participation. These approaches illustrate that ethics is not an abstract ideal but a governance mechanism that transforms power relations between humans and machines. In the context of digital humanities, ethical frameworks also safeguard academic freedom, cultural authenticity, and the dignity of digital creators.

From a cultural standpoint, the digitization of heritage has democratized access to memory and identity but has also intensified debates about ownership, representation, and epistemic justice. Pereda et al. (2025) and Rollo (2025) highlight that digital infrastructures, while expanding participation, may inadvertently reinforce historical hierarchies when controlled by centralized platforms or biased algorithms. Indigenous archives and community-driven projects, such as those supported by UNESCO and ASEAN cultural cooperation frameworks, illustrate alternative governance models that value participatory curation and collective stewardship. These practices demonstrate that resilience in digital humanities extends beyond data preservation toward cultural continuity and empowerment. Cultural governance, therefore, must not only manage digital content but also nurture the ethical relationships that sustain meaning, heritage, and identity.

Economically, digital humanities governance is influenced by the growing interdependence between technological innovation and socio-economic equity. Carayannis and Morawska-Jancelewicz (2022) and Cook et al. (2022) observe that economies integrating digital cultural industries with inclusive growth strategies are more adaptive to global disruptions. Public–private partnerships, cultural innovation funds, and creative economy policies exemplify how states can balance profit-driven innovation with public welfare. However, as Zhang and Bilawal Khaskheli (2025) warn, digital capitalism risks concentrating power in a few global actors unless supported by equitable policy design. Sustainable governance therefore requires that economic mechanisms, such as taxation, subsidies, and data valuation, reflect broader ethical and cultural objectives. Farazmand (2023) argues that aligning fiscal policy with social responsibility transforms governance from market regulation into value creation, a process essential for long-term digital resilience.

The legal dimension of digital humanities governance bridges ethics, economy, and culture through enforceable norms and institutional accountability. Khater et al. (2024) and Calzada et al. (2025) show that laws governing AI, data, and online platforms must evolve from static compliance models into adaptive regulatory ecosystems. Comparative evidence from the European Union, with its Digital Services Act and AI Act, and from ASEAN's Framework on Digital Data Governance, illustrates that resilient legal systems balance regulatory precision with flexibility to adapt to rapid innovation. These frameworks institutionalize ethical principles and cultural protection into binding obligations, turning governance ideals into enforceable rights.

Across these dimensions, the analysis identifies resilience as the unifying principle linking ethics, culture, economy, and law. Resilient governance, as theorized by Ungar (2021) and Rogers et al. (2020), is characterized by adaptability, coherence, and inclusivity. It does not aim for control over technological systems but for equilibrium between human values and institutional design. The comparative analysis reveals that countries adopting cross-sectoral governance models, where digital policy integrates economic equity, cultural inclusion, and ethical AI oversight, achieve higher sustainability and citizen trust. Such integration transforms governance from reactive regulation into anticipatory stewardship, capable of addressing emerging risks while nurturing social cohesion.

The synthesis of findings suggests that the digital humanities can serve as a laboratory for testing new governance paradigms in the digital age. By combining cultural creativity with legal accountability, ethical foresight, and economic rationality, digital humanities provide both the vocabulary and the infrastructure for a humane digital civilization. The Hybrid Resilient Governance Model proposed in this study conceptualizes these interactions as a dynamic ecosystem: ethics provides moral direction, law provides institutional structure, economics ensures resource sustainability, and culture anchors meaning. Together, they generate a multidimensional governance architecture that treats digital transformation not merely as technical progress but as a moral and civic project.

Ultimately, the discussion affirms that the future of digital humanities depends on the capacity of societies to govern technology through principles of justice, inclusion, and sustainability. Governance that unites ethics, law, culture, and economy not only prevents systemic risks but also empowers collective creativity and democratic renewal. In this way, digital humanities evolve from a disciplinary innovation into a governance philosophy, an enduring framework for ensuring that technology remains in service of humanity rather than the reverse.

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that the transformation of the humanities in the digital era demands a new paradigm of governance, one that integrates ethics, culture, economy, and law into a coherent and adaptive system. The digital humanities have evolved beyond academic inquiry into a governance domain that reflects broader societal challenges: algorithmic accountability, cultural preservation, economic inclusion, and legal justice. Fragmented policies that treat these dimensions separately fail to respond effectively to the complexity of digital ecosystems. Resilient governance, by contrast, recognizes their interdependence and builds frameworks that promote balance between innovation and human values.

At its core, the digital humanities embody a dialogue between technology and humanity. Ethical principles must shape the design and deployment of AI; cultural policies must safeguard diversity in a globalized digital landscape; economic mechanisms must distribute the benefits of innovation equitably; and legal institutions must ensure accountability and protect rights. Together, these pillars form a hybrid resilient governance model that unites normative vision with institutional practice.

This study contributes to both theory and policy by demonstrating that sustainable digital transformation depends not on technological mastery but on ethical coherence and social inclusion. Governance, when guided by interdisciplinary collaboration, becomes a vehicle for justice, participation, and collective resilience. The future of digital civilization will be defined not by the speed of innovation but by the wisdom with which societies align progress with dignity. In reaffirming this, the digital humanities emerge as a moral compass for the digital age, reminding us that technology serves humanity best when grounded in ethics, culture, and law.

References

Allam, Z., Sharifi, A., Bibri, S. E., Jones, D. S., & Krogstie, J. (2022). The metaverse as a virtual form of smart cities: Opportunities and challenges for environmental, economic, and social sustainability in urban futures. Smart Cities, 5(3), 771–801. https://doi.org/10.3390/smartcities5030040

Brodie Rudolph, T., Ruckelshaus, M., Swilling, M., Allison, E. H., Österblom, H., Gelcich, S., & Mbatha, P. (2020). A transition to sustainable ocean governance. Nature Communications, 11(1), 3600. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-17410-2

Calzada, I., Németh, G., & Al-Radhi, M. S. (2025). Trustworthy AI for whom? GenAI detection techniques of trust through decentralized Web3 ecosystems. Big Data and Cognitive Computing, 9(3), 62. https://doi.org/10.3390/bdcc9030062

Carayannis, E. G., & Morawska-Jancelewicz, J. (2022). The futures of Europe: Society 5.0 and Industry 5.0 as driving forces of future universities. Journal of the Knowledge Economy, 13(4), 3445–3471. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-021-00831-x

Cook, S., Jackson, E. L., Fisher, M. J., Baker, D., & Diepeveen, D. (2022). Embedding digital agriculture into sustainable Australian food systems: Pathways and pitfalls to value creation. International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability, 20(3), 346–367. https://doi.org/10.1080/14735903.2021.1940600

Correia, P. M. A. R. (2024). Editorial for the special edition: Contemporary local governance, wellbeing, and sustainability: Integrating digital innovations and societal trust for future resilience. Social Sciences, 13(10), 535. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci13100535

Farazmand, A. (Ed.). (2023). Global encyclopedia of public administration, public policy, and governance. Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5

Feijóo, C., Kwon, Y., Bauer, J. M., Bohlin, E., Howell, B., Jain, R., ... & Xia, J. (2020). Harnessing artificial intelligence (AI) to increase wellbeing for all: The case for a new technology diplomacy. Telecommunications Policy, 44(6), 101988. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.telpol.2020.101988

Hantrais, L., & Lenihan, A. T. (2021). Social dimensions of evidence-based policy in a digital society. Contemporary Social Science, 16(2), 141–155. https://doi.org/10.1080/21582041.2018.1555042

Khater, M., Ibrahim, O., Sayed, M. N. E., & Faik, M. (2024). Legal frameworks for sustainable tourism: Balancing environmental conservation and economic development. Current Issues in Tourism, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2024.9999999

Mamanazarov, S., Khajiyeva, M., Abdullaeva, D., Yuldasheva, G., Azkhodjaeva, R., Pirnazarov, A., & Xamedova, N. (2025). Innovating human capital development: The role of education, law, and economics through digital transformation. Qubahan Academic Journal, 5(3), 78–113. https://doi.org/10.48161/qaj.v5n3a41

Pereda, J., Willcox, P., Candela, G., Sanchez, A., & Murrieta-Flores, P. A. (2025). Online cultural heritage as a social machine: A socio-technical approach to digital infrastructure and ecosystems. International Journal of Digital Humanities, 1–31. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42803-025-00147-0

Richey, R. G., Jr., Chowdhury, S., Davis-Sramek, B., Giannakis, M., & Dwivedi, Y. K. (2023). Artificial intelligence in logistics and supply chain management: A primer and roadmap for research. Journal of Business Logistics, 44(4), 532–549. https://doi.org/10.1111/jbl.12389

Rogers, P., Bohland, J. J., & Lawrence, J. (2020). Resilience and values: Global perspectives on the values and worldviews underpinning the resilience concept. Political Geography, 83, 102280. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2020.102280

Rollo, M. F. (2025). Interconnected nature and people: Biosphere reserves and the power of memory and oral histories as biocultural heritage for a sustainable future. Sustainability, 17(9), 4030. https://doi.org/10.3390/su17094030

Saeed, S., Altamimi, S. A., Alkayyal, N. A., Alshehri, E., & Alabbad, D. A. (2023). Digital transformation and cybersecurity challenges for business resilience: Issues and recommendations. Sensors, 23(15), 6666. https://doi.org/10.3390/s23156666

Shneiderman, B. (2020). Bridging the gap between ethics and practice: Guidelines for reliable, safe, and trustworthy human-centered AI systems. ACM Transactions on Interactive Intelligent Systems, 10(4), 1–31. https://doi.org/10.1145/3419764

Tiron-Tudor, A., Deliu, D., & Ndou, V. (2025). Shaping the future: Ethical, legal and social implications (ELSI) of digital innovation ecosystems amid the Twin Transition. European Journal of Innovation Management, 1–45. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-12-2024-0763

Troisi, O., Visvizi, A., & Grimaldi, M. (2024). Rethinking innovation through Industry and Society 5.0 paradigms: A multileveled approach for management and policy-making. European Journal of Innovation Management, 27(9), 22–51. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-07-2023-0465

Ulutas Aydogan, S., Münster, S., Girardi, D., Palmirani, M., & Vitali, F. (2019, October). A framework to support digital humanities and cultural heritage studies research. In Workshop on Research and Education in Urban History in the Age of Digital Libraries (pp. 237–267). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-48279-4_10

Ungar, M. (Ed.). (2021). Multisystemic resilience: Adaptation and transformation in contexts of change. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190095888.001.0001

Viola, L. (2023). The humanities in the digital: Beyond critical digital humanities. Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-18012-9

Wilkes-Allemann, J., Kopp, M., Van der Velde, R., Bernasconi, A., Karaca, E., Čepić, S., ... & Živojinović, I. (2023). Envisioning the future: Creating sustainable, healthy and resilient BioCities. Urban Forestry & Urban Greening, 84, 127935. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2023.127935

Williams, L. (2024). Indigenous intergenerational resilience and lifelong learning: Critical leverage points for deep sustainability transformation in turbulent times. Sustainability, 16(11), 4494. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16114494

Young, J. C. (2021). Environmental colonialism, digital indigeneity, and the politicization of resilience. Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space, 4(2), 230–251. https://doi.org/10.1177/2514848620909464

Zabaniotou, A., Syrgiannis, C., Gasperin, D., de Hoyos Guevera, A. J., Fazenda, I., & Huisingh, D. (2020). From multidisciplinarity to transdisciplinarity and from local to global foci: Integrative approaches to systemic resilience based upon the value of life in the context of environmental and gender vulnerabilities with a special focus upon the Brazilian Amazon biome. Sustainability, 12(20), 8407. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12208407

Zhang, Y., & Bilawal Khaskheli, M. (2025). The role of digital technologies in advancing sustainable economic development into intersections of policy, law, environmental economics, and a comparative study of China, the EU, and the USA. Sustainability, 17(19), 8666. https://doi.org/10.3390/su17198666