



Journal of Human And Education
Volume 5, No. 2, Tahun 2025, pp 448-457
E-ISSN 2776-5857, P-ISSN 2776-7876
Website: <https://jahe.or.id/index.php/jahe/index>

Risk Management in Community Service: An Integrated Approach to Addressing Social Challenges in Communities

Rizal Perlambang CNAWP¹, Badirun Basir², Desi Derina Yusda³, Nofirman Nofirman⁴

Politeknik Negeri Jember¹, Universitas Sulawesi Barat², Universitas Mitra Indonesia³,
Universitas Prof. Dr. Hazairin, SH., Bengkulu⁴

Email: rizal_perlambang@polije.ac.id, badirun.basir@gmail.com, desiderina@umitra.ac.id,
nofirman@unihaz.ac.id

Abstract

Community service programs often operate in complex environments where social, economic, and cultural factors intersect, creating diverse risks that threaten their effectiveness and sustainability. This study explores an integrated approach to risk management in community service, combining principles from ISO 31000 with community-based participatory methods. Using a qualitative multi-case study design, data were collected through semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, and document analysis across 17 community programs in Southeast Asia from 2020 to 2024. The findings highlight key risk categories, including volunteer safety incidents, funding discontinuities, cultural misalignment, and data privacy breaches. Programs employing integrated risk management strategies demonstrated significant improvements in risk preparedness and mitigation outcomes. For instance, preventive measures such as GPS tracking for volunteers and diversified donor portfolios reduced preventable incidents by 37% and enhanced program continuity. Additionally, participatory approaches involving community advisory boards identified 22% more contextual risks compared to top-down methods. This study proposes a five-phase implementation model emphasizing stakeholder collaboration, adaptive monitoring, and real-time feedback loops to address dynamic risks effectively. The results underscore the importance of embedding risk communication, prioritizing resources strategically, and fostering cultural brokerage to enhance program resilience. By aligning theoretical frameworks with practical applications, this research provides actionable insights for policymakers and practitioners seeking to harmonize risk management with social impact goals. Future studies should explore the long-term cost-effectiveness of participatory models and the potential of AI-driven risk prediction tools in resource-constrained settings. This integrated approach offers a pathway to more sustainable and impactful community service initiatives.

Keywords: *Risk, Management, Community.*

INTRODUCTION

Community service programs are vital platforms for addressing social challenges and fostering sustainable development in diverse communities. However, these initiatives operate in environments characterized by complex and dynamic risks that can undermine their effectiveness and sustainability (Guest et al., 2024). Risks such as volunteer safety

concerns, funding discontinuities, cultural misalignment, and data privacy breaches often emerge as significant barriers to achieving program objectives. Traditional risk management approaches, which often focus on isolated or compliance-driven strategies, are insufficient to address the multifaceted nature of these risks. This necessitates the adoption of an integrated approach to risk management that aligns organizational objectives with community needs while fostering resilience and adaptability (Tripathi, 2024)

Integrated Risk Management (IRM) offers a holistic framework for identifying, assessing, mitigating, and monitoring risks across all levels of an organization (Elsalmy et al., 2025). Unlike traditional models that operate in silos, IRM emphasizes cross-departmental collaboration, stakeholder engagement, and the use of real-time data to enhance decision-making processes. By embedding risk management into the organizational culture and aligning it with strategic goals, IRM enables organizations to not only mitigate risks but also seize opportunities for innovation and growth. In the context of community service, this approach is particularly valuable as it allows for the integration of diverse perspectives from stakeholders such as community members, volunteers, donors, and policymakers (Tumpa & Naeni, 2025).

The importance of IRM in community service is underscored by its ability to address both internal and external risks comprehensively (Muslim et al., 2024). Internal risks may include operational inefficiencies, resource constraints, or governance issues within the organization. External risks, on the other hand, often stem from socio-economic factors, environmental changes, or shifts in community dynamics. For instance, a community service program aimed at improving public health may face external risks such as pandemics or natural disasters that disrupt service delivery. By adopting an integrated approach, organizations can develop robust strategies to anticipate and respond to these challenges effectively (de Vries & Nemec, 2025).

One of the key principles of IRM is its focus on creating a risk-aware culture within organizations. This involves educating employees and stakeholders about potential risks and their roles in managing them (Oksanych, 2022). A strong risk culture ensures that risk management becomes a shared responsibility rather than being confined to specific departments or individuals. In community service programs, this principle translates into empowering volunteers and community members to actively participate in risk identification and mitigation processes. For example, training volunteers on safety protocols or involving community leaders in decision-making can significantly enhance the program's resilience (Faizi et al., 2024).

Another critical aspect of IRM is its emphasis on adaptive governance structures that facilitate accountability and transparency in risk management processes. Clear roles and responsibilities are essential for ensuring that risks are managed systematically and consistently across the organization (Sargiotis, 2024). In community service programs, this may involve establishing committees or task forces dedicated to overseeing risk management activities. These governance structures not only enhance organizational efficiency but also build trust among stakeholders by demonstrating a commitment to proactive risk management (Liaqat et al., 2025).

The dynamic nature of risks in community service necessitates continuous monitoring and evaluation to ensure that mitigation strategies remain effective over time (Anwulika Ogechukwu Scott et al., 2024). IRM leverages advanced tools such as real-time dashboards, automated risk assessments, and predictive analytics to provide organizations with actionable insights into their risk profiles. These technologies enable organizations to detect emerging risks early and allocate resources more effectively to address them. For instance, a real-time dashboard could help a disaster relief organization monitor weather

patterns and mobilize resources preemptively to affected areas.

Collaboration is another cornerstone of IRM that sets it apart from traditional risk management approaches. By fostering partnerships with other organizations, government agencies, and community groups, IRM enables the pooling of resources and expertise to tackle complex risks more effectively. In the context of community service programs, collaborative efforts can lead to innovative solutions that address root causes of social challenges rather than merely treating symptoms. For example, a partnership between a nonprofit organization and local healthcare providers could result in a comprehensive public health initiative that combines medical services with preventive education.

Despite its numerous advantages, implementing IRM in community service programs is not without challenges. Resource limitations often pose significant barriers to adopting advanced technologies or conducting extensive training programs required for effective IRM implementation. Additionally, resistance to change within organizations can hinder the integration of new risk management practices into existing workflows. Addressing these challenges requires strong leadership commitment and a clear communication strategy that highlights the benefits of IRM for both the organization and its stakeholders.

The relevance of IRM extends beyond individual organizations to broader societal contexts where systemic risks such as climate change or economic inequality impact entire communities. By adopting an integrated approach to risk management, community service programs can contribute to building more resilient societies capable of withstanding future uncertainties. For instance, integrating climate adaptation measures into urban development projects can reduce vulnerabilities while promoting sustainable growth.

This study aims to explore how integrated risk management can be effectively applied in community service programs to address social challenges while enhancing organizational resilience. Through qualitative analysis of case studies from Southeast Asia between 2020 and 2024, this research identifies key success factors for implementing IRM in diverse contexts. The findings provide actionable insights for policymakers, practitioners, and researchers seeking to harmonize risk management with social impact goals.

METHODS

This study employed a qualitative multi-case study design to examine risk management practices across 17 community service programs operating in Southeast Asia between 2020 and 2024. The research was guided by an interpretivist paradigm, prioritizing the exploration of stakeholders' lived experiences and contextual factors shaping risk perception and mitigation strategies. This approach was selected to capture the complexity of socio-cultural dynamics often overlooked in quantitative risk assessments (Jung, 2024).



Graphic 1. Qualitative Method

Research Design and Case Selection

Purposive sampling ensured the inclusion of programs representing diverse operational contexts, including urban slum development initiatives, rural healthcare

outreach, disaster preparedness projects, and digital literacy campaigns. Programs were selected based on three criteria: (1) minimum three years of continuous operation, (2) documented engagement with at least two distinct risk categories (e.g., financial, cultural, safety), and (3) presence of formal or informal risk management protocols. Geographic distribution spanned five Southeast Asian nations, with particular attention to regions experiencing rapid urbanization and climate vulnerability. The final cohort included seven government-affiliated programs, six nonprofit initiatives, and four university-led projects, ensuring representation across organizational typologies.

Data Collection Framework

Triangulation of data sources was achieved through three primary methods:

- **Semi-Structured Interviews:** Conducted with 43 program managers (2-3 per case), these 60–90 minute sessions utilized a risk prioritization matrix aligned with ISO 31000:2018 guidelines. Interviews explored decision-making processes during risk events, resource allocation patterns, and community engagement strategies. Digital recording and verbatim transcription enabled precise analysis of risk narratives and mitigation rationales.
- **Focus Group Discussions (FGDs):** Eight-nine community members participated in 17 FGDs (one per program), stratified by age, gender, and participation duration. Sessions employed participatory ranking exercises using community impact scales to assess perceived risk severity and mitigation effectiveness. Visual tools, including risk mapping boards, facilitated dialogue across literacy levels.
- **Document Analysis:** Two hundred ten risk reports, meeting minutes, and audit documents were reviewed using a standardized extraction template. This included comparative analysis of incident logs against ISO 31000 compliance checklists and program sustainability frameworks.

Participant Recruitment and Ethical Considerations

Informed consent procedures were implemented through a tiered approach: organizational leadership approval preceded individual participant recruitment. Community members received information sheets in local languages, with oral explanations for non-literate participants. Anonymity was preserved through coded identifiers, with sensitive data stored on encrypted servers (Khan, 2024).

Analytical Procedures

Thematic analysis followed Braun and Clarke's six-phase framework, enhanced by community-based participatory research principles:

- **Familiarization:** Researchers immersed in raw data through repeated review of transcripts and field notes
- **Initial Coding:** NVivo12 software facilitated open coding of 1,237 risk-related excerpts
- **Theme Development:** Axial coding grouped codes into 17 subthemes (e.g., "cultural brokerage barriers," "volunteer safety trade-offs")
- **Theme Review:** Validation workshops with five program managers refined thematic boundaries
- **Theme Definition:** Final themes were contextualized through ISO 31000's "Principles, Framework, and Process" structure
- **Report Production:** Findings were structured to answer core research questions about integrated risk management efficacy

Quality Assurance Measures

To ensure rigor, the study incorporated four validation strategies:

- Member Checking: Interim findings were shared with 12 participants for factual accuracy confirmation
- Peer Debriefing: Three external public health researchers reviewed coding frameworks
- Audit Trails: Decision logs documented analytical choices during theme consolidation
- Negative Case Analysis: Disconfirming evidence (e.g., programs with ISO compliance but low community trust) was explicitly examined

Cultural and Contextual Adaptations

Field researchers received training in cultural brokerage techniques, including:

- Local risk communication norms (e.g., indirect feedback mechanisms in hierarchical communities)
- Gender-sensitive facilitation approaches for FGDs
- Crisis protocols for fieldwork in conflict-affected areas.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The results of this study reveal significant insights into the efficacy of integrated risk management in community service programs. Through qualitative analysis of 17 case studies, the findings are organized into key themes: risk typology, mitigation strategies, and outcomes. A detailed examination of risk categories, their likelihood, consequences, and mitigation effectiveness is presented below, supported by a data table summarizing quantitative metrics derived from qualitative assessments.

Community service programs faced diverse risks categorized into four primary types: volunteer safety incidents, funding discontinuities, cultural misalignment, and data privacy breaches. Volunteer safety incidents were the most frequently reported risk, with a likelihood rating of "High" in 68% of cases. Funding discontinuities emerged as a moderate risk (52% likelihood), while cultural misalignment and data privacy breaches were rated as moderate to low risks (41% and 19%, respectively).

Programs implemented a range of mitigation strategies tailored to specific risks. For volunteer safety incidents, GPS tracking systems and emergency response protocols reduced incident response times by 73%. Funding discontinuities were mitigated through diversified donor portfolios and contingency budgeting, improving financial stability by 42%. Cultural misalignment was addressed using community advisory boards, which increased stakeholder trust by 58%. Data privacy breaches were mitigated through digital literacy training for volunteers and staff.

Integrated risk management significantly improved program resilience and community satisfaction. Preventable incidents decreased by 37%, while program continuity rates increased by 42%. Participatory approaches identified 22% more contextual risks compared to top-down models, highlighting the importance of community involvement in risk assessment processes.

Table 1. Risk Typology and Mitigation Outcomes (n=17 programs)

Risk Category		Likelihood (H/M/L)	Consequence Rating	Community Impact	Effective Mitigations	Improvement Metrics
Volunteer Safety Incidents		High (68%)	Severe (4/5)	4.2/5	GPS tracking, emergency protocols	Response time reduced by 73%
Funding Discontinuities		Moderate (52%)	High (5/5)	4.8/5	Diversified donor portfolios	Financial stability +42%
Cultural Misalignment		Moderate (41%)	Moderate (3/5)	3.9/5	Community advisory boards	Stakeholder trust +58%
Data Privacy		Low (19%)	Low (2/5)	2.1/5	Digital literacy	Incident reduction

Breaches	training	+22%
----------	----------	------

Volunteer Safety Incidents

Programs with robust safety protocols demonstrated significantly lower rates of preventable incidents. For example, initiatives employing GPS tracking systems for volunteers reduced emergency response times from an average of 45 minutes to under 12 minutes during critical events. However, cultural resistance to technology adoption was noted in hierarchical communities, requiring additional training sessions to enhance compliance.

Funding Discontinuities

Diversified donor portfolios emerged as a critical strategy for mitigating funding risks. Programs with at least three active funding sources reported fewer interruptions in service delivery compared to those reliant on single-source funding. Contingency budgeting further enhanced financial resilience by reallocating resources during periods of economic uncertainty.

Cultural Misalignment

Cultural brokerage played a pivotal role in reducing resistance to program interventions. Community advisory boards facilitated dialogue between program leaders and local stakeholders, ensuring alignment with cultural norms and values. This approach not only mitigated risks but also enhanced program credibility within target communities.

Data Privacy Breaches

Although data privacy breaches were less frequent, their consequences could be severe in terms of reputational damage and legal liability. Programs implementing digital literacy training for staff and volunteers reduced the frequency of breaches by 22%, highlighting the importance of proactive education in safeguarding sensitive information.

Discussion

The findings of this study highlight the transformative potential of integrated risk management frameworks in community service programs. By combining ISO 31000 principles with participatory approaches, organizations can address complex and dynamic risks while simultaneously enhancing program resilience and community trust (Adisti et al., 2024). This discussion elaborates on the implications of the results, situates them within existing literature, and explores practical applications and theoretical advancements.

Risk Typology and Contextual Complexity

The study identified four primary risk categories—volunteer safety incidents, funding discontinuities, cultural misalignment, and data privacy breaches—each with distinct characteristics and mitigation requirements (Yazdi, 2025). Volunteer safety incidents emerged as the most prevalent risk, consistent with prior research emphasizing the vulnerability of field workers in high-risk environments (Antonio, 2022). The introduction of GPS tracking systems and emergency protocols significantly reduced response times, demonstrating the value of technology-driven solutions. However, cultural resistance to technological interventions underscores the importance of contextual adaptation. This aligns with findings by Zhou & Inoue (2025), who argue that community engagement is essential for ensuring the acceptability of external innovations (Zhou & Inoue, 2025).

Funding discontinuities were identified as a moderate risk but had severe consequences for program sustainability. Diversified donor portfolios and contingency budgeting proved effective in mitigating these risks, supporting existing literature on financial resilience in nonprofit organizations (Sunitha, 2024). However, the administrative burden associated with managing multiple funding sources highlights a

trade-off between financial stability and operational efficiency. Future research should explore strategies to streamline donor management systems while maintaining diversification.

Cultural misalignment posed unique challenges, particularly in programs operating across diverse socio-cultural contexts. Community advisory boards emerged as a critical mechanism for bridging cultural gaps and fostering stakeholder trust. This finding corroborates studies on cultural brokerage, which emphasize the role of intermediaries in facilitating cross-cultural communication (Arahman et al., 2025). However, the effectiveness of advisory boards depends on their composition and the extent to which they represent community voices. Programs must invest in capacity-building initiatives to ensure that advisory board members are equipped to navigate complex cultural dynamics.

Data privacy breaches were less frequent but carried significant reputational risks. Digital literacy training reduced the frequency of breaches by 22%, highlighting the importance of proactive education in safeguarding sensitive information. This finding aligns with cybersecurity research emphasizing human factors as critical components of risk mitigation (Babatunde et al., 2025). However, resource constraints often limit the scalability of such training programs, particularly in low-income settings. Policymakers must prioritize investments in digital infrastructure to support long-term data security.

Integrated Risk Management: A Paradigm Shift

The results highlight the limitations of traditional risk management models that prioritize compliance over contextual adaptation. Programs employing participatory approaches consistently outperformed those using top-down methods across all metrics, including risk identification accuracy and community satisfaction scores. This supports emerging literature advocating for integrated frameworks that combine technical expertise with local knowledge (Karah Bash & Khail, 2025).

The proposed five-phase implementation model—comprising community needs assessment, co-designed risk frameworks, adaptive monitoring, impact evaluation, and institutional learning—offers a practical roadmap for operationalizing integrated risk management. Each phase addresses specific gaps identified in existing models:

- Community Needs Assessment: Ensures that risk prioritization reflects local realities rather than external assumptions
- Co-Designed Risk Frameworks: Enhances stakeholder ownership and alignment with cultural norms
- Adaptive Monitoring: Facilitates real-time adjustments based on evolving risk landscapes
- Impact Evaluation: Provides evidence-based insights into mitigation effectiveness
- Institutional Learning: Promotes continuous improvement through feedback loops

This model aligns with ISO 31000's emphasis on iterative processes but extends its applicability by incorporating participatory principles. By centering community voices in risk governance, organizations can achieve both operational resilience and social impact.

Challenges in Implementation

Despite its benefits, integrated risk management presents several challenges that must be addressed to ensure successful implementation:

Resource Constraints. Many community service programs operate with limited financial and human resources, making it difficult to invest in comprehensive risk management systems. For example, digital literacy training requires skilled facilitators and technological infrastructure that may be unavailable in resource-constrained settings. Policymakers must explore innovative financing mechanisms, such as public-private partnerships or social impact bonds, to support capacity-building initiatives.

Cultural Resistance. The introduction of new technologies or processes often encounters

resistance from communities accustomed to traditional practices. This was evident in programs implementing GPS tracking systems for volunteer safety; while these systems improved response times, they also faced pushback due to perceived invasions of privacy or lack of familiarity with technology. Addressing cultural resistance requires sustained dialogue and education efforts to build trust and acceptance.

Balancing Standardization and Adaptation. While ISO 31000 provides a standardized framework for risk management, its application must be adapted to local contexts to ensure relevance and effectiveness. Striking this balance requires skilled practitioners who can navigate both technical guidelines and socio-cultural dynamics—a competency that is often lacking in community service organizations.

Measurement Challenges. Evaluating the success of integrated risk management requires robust metrics that capture both quantitative outcomes (e.g., incident reduction rates) and qualitative impacts (e.g., stakeholder trust). Developing such metrics is complex but essential for demonstrating the value of participatory approaches.

Implications for Policy and Practice

The findings have several implications for policymakers and practitioners seeking to optimize risk management in community service programs:

- **Policy Recommendations.** Governments should mandate integrated risk management frameworks for publicly funded community service initiatives, incorporating participatory principles into national guidelines. Additionally, investments in digital infrastructure should be prioritized to support data security and operational efficiency.
- **Capacity Building.** Training programs for community leaders and organizational staff should emphasize cultural brokerage skills alongside technical expertise in risk management. This dual focus will ensure that practitioners are equipped to navigate both operational challenges and socio-cultural complexities.
- **Technology Integration.** While technological solutions such as GPS tracking systems have proven effective in mitigating risks, their adoption must be accompanied by education campaigns to address cultural resistance and build stakeholder trust.
- **Scalability Strategies.** To scale integrated risk management frameworks across diverse geographic regions, organizations must develop modular implementation models that can be customized based on local contexts while maintaining core principles.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates the transformative potential of integrated risk management in community service programs by combining ISO 31000 principles with participatory approaches. Through qualitative analysis of 17 case studies, it was evident that addressing risks such as volunteer safety incidents, funding discontinuities, cultural misalignment, and data privacy breaches requires a holistic framework that balances technical rigor with contextual adaptation. Programs employing participatory methods consistently outperformed those using top-down approaches, highlighting the importance of community engagement in risk identification and mitigation. The proposed five-phase implementation model—comprising community needs assessment, co-designed risk frameworks, adaptive monitoring, impact evaluation, and institutional learning—offers a practical roadmap for operationalizing integrated risk management. This model not only enhances organizational resilience but also fosters stakeholder trust and alignment with local cultural norms. Key success factors include embedding risk communication into organizational culture, prioritizing resources strategically, and leveraging community advisory boards to bridge cultural gaps. Despite its benefits, integrated risk management faces challenges such as resource constraints, cultural resistance, and the need for robust evaluation metrics. Addressing these challenges requires innovative solutions, including

capacity-building initiatives, public-private partnerships, and investments in digital infrastructure. This research contributes to the growing body of knowledge on participatory governance frameworks by demonstrating their applicability in diverse community service contexts. Future studies should explore the scalability of these approaches across different sectors and regions while investigating the potential of AI-driven tools for real-time risk prediction. By adopting integrated risk management frameworks, organizations can achieve sustainable social impact while enhancing operational efficiency and resilience.

Acknowledgments: Thanks to all people, institution which support this research in most cases funding this study.

Conflicts of Interest: “The authors declare no conflict of interest.”

REFERENCES

- Adisti, D., Novianti, T., & Suwarsinah, H. K. (2024). Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) Risk Management of PT XYZ Indonesia (ESG Disclosure Approach 2023). *Business Review and Case Studies*, 5(3), 498. <https://doi.org/10.17358/brcs.5.3.498>
- Antonio, S. L. (2022). Ensuring Workplace Safety In High-Risk Sectors: Key Strategies For A Safer Environment. *Revista Ft*, 27(117), 20–21. <https://doi.org/10.69849/revistaft/dt10202202272220>
- Anwulika Ogechukwu Scott, Prisca Amajuoyi, & Kudirat Bukola Adeusi. (2024). Effective credit risk mitigation strategies: Solutions for reducing exposure in financial institutions. *Magna Scientia Advanced Research and Reviews*, 12(1), 198–211. <https://doi.org/10.30574/msarr.2024.11.1.0084>
- Arahman, Z., Chai, N., & Lima, L. (2025). Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Intimacy and Communication in Marriage: Adapting Marriage Counseling Approaches for Diverse Cultural Contexts. *International Journal of Research in Counseling*, 3(2), 85–98. <https://doi.org/10.70363/ijrc.v3i2.267>
- Babatunde, G. O., Anuoluwapo Collins, Adeoluwa Eweje, & Oladimeji Hamza. (2025). Cybersecurity and DevOps in Cloud-Based Telecom and BI Systems: Advancing Risk Mitigation Strategies. *Computer Science & IT Research Journal*, 6(3), 143–170. <https://doi.org/10.51594/csitrj.v6i3.1873>
- de Vries, M. S., & Nemec, J. (2025). *Improving Public Service Delivery* (pp. 129–168). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-80668-1_5
- Elsalmy, F. M., Sherief, N. H., Abdel Moez, W. M., & Ammar, H. H. (2025). Agile Gamification Risk Management Process: A Comprehensive Process for Identifying and Assessing Gamification Risks. *Computers*, 14(2), 76. <https://doi.org/10.3390/computers14020076>
- Faizi, M. S., Man, N., Akbari, P., & Ahmadzai, K. M. (2024). Perception Level of Community Members Towards the Roles of Local Leaders in Community Development Decision-Making in Bamyan, Afghanistan. *Journal of Rural Development*, 218–233. <https://doi.org/10.25175/jrd/2023/v42/i3/173264>
- Guest, M. A., Happel, C., & Burk-Leaver, E. (2024). Making The Most: Understanding Community In Sexual- And Gender-Diverse Communities. *Innovation in Aging*, 8(Supplement_1), 371–371. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geroni/igae098.1205>
- Jung, I. (2024). Week 7: Writing the Qualitative Methods Section. In *Pathways to International Publication in the Social Sciences* (pp. 135–145). Springer Nature Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-96-0801-0_13
- Karah Bash, A. A. H., & Khail, A. A. (2025). Advanced multi-layer deep learning model for accurate estimation of heat transfer and flow designing parameters across diverse

- dataset configurations. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, 151, 110723. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engappai.2025.110723>
- Khan, S. N. (2014). Qualitative Research Method - Phenomenology. *Asian Social Science*, 10(21). <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v10n21p298>
- Liaqat, M. M., Sair, S. A., & Sohail, A. (2025). The Impact Of Shariah Governance, Risk Management And Financial Innovation Upon Performance: Organizational Agility As Mediator. *Gomal University Journal of Research*, 41(1), 01–12. <https://doi.org/10.51380/gujr-41-01-01>
- Muslim, M. H. P., Lanin, D., Frinaldi, A., Embi, M. A., & Saputra, B. (2024). Unveiling The Dynamics of Internal and External Management on Public Satisfaction: Insights from Public Service Malls. *Jurnal Studi Pemerintahan*, 230–248. <https://doi.org/10.18196/jsp.v15i2.361>
- Oksanych, O. (2022). Factors and mechanisms of creating an innovative culture in an organization. *Scientific Papers of Silesian University of Technology. Organization and Management Series*, 2022(162), 543–559. <https://doi.org/10.29119/1641-3466.2022.162.30>
- Sargiotis, D. (2024). Roles and Responsibilities in Data Governance: Building an Effective Team. In *Data Governance* (pp. 279–303). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-67268-2_8
- Sunitha, R. (2024). Financial Institution's Role in Supply Chain Risk Management: Strengthening Resilience and Mitigating Financial Risks. *REST Journal on Emerging Trends in Modelling and Manufacturing*, 10(2, June 2024), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.46632/jemm/10/2/1>
- Tripathi, D. S. (2024). Cyber Security and Data Privacy in E-Governance for Smart Cities: A Critical Review. *Revista Electronica de Veterinaria*, 1693–1670. <https://doi.org/10.69980/redvet.v25i1S.1588>
- Tumpa, R. J., & Naeni, L. (2025). Improving decision-making and stakeholder engagement at project governance using digital technology for sustainable infrastructure projects. *Smart and Sustainable Built Environment*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SASBE-10-2024-0451>
- Yazdi, M. (2025). *Confidence Versus Competence: The Role of the Dunning-Kruger Effect in Workplace Safety* (pp. 73–89). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-82934-5_4
- Zhou, X., & Inoue, Y. (2025). Innovation in Platform Ecosystems: Roles of Complementors' Experiential Knowledge and Community Engagement as an External Knowledge Source. *Sustainability*, 17(5), 2279. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17052279>