

Multi-Actor Approaches in Cultural Governance: A Bibliometric Analysis

Ahmad Rosandi Sakir¹  , Ivonny Yeany Rahanra¹, Jeanly Waisapy¹, Reynold Nikijuluw¹ 

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Received 7 Apr 2026
Revised 8 Apr 2026
Accepted 8 Apr 2026
Available Online 8 Apr 2026

KEYWORD

Multi-Actor Approaches; Cultural Governance; Bibliometric Analysis

AFFILIATION

1. Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Pattimura University, Ambon, Indonesia

CONTACT

Ahmad Rosandi Sakir,
Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Pattimura University, Ambon, Indonesia
Email: ahmadrosandi8@gmail.com

CITE THIS ARTICLE

Sakir, A.R. Rahanra, I.Y. Waisapy, J. Nikijuluw, R. (2026). "Multi-Actor Approaches in Cultural Governance: A Bibliometric Analysis", CITA HUMANITY: Journal of Social Humanities and Community Development 1(1), 1-18.
<https://journal.citacendekia.com/humanity/article/view/19>

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Research on multi-actor approaches in cultural contexts has become increasingly important as attention to collaborative governance, heritage management, tourism, and sustainable territorial development continues to grow. However, the literature on this topic remains dispersed across different fields and has not been widely mapped in a systematic manner. This study aims to examine the development of scholarly publications on multi-actor approaches in culture.

Method: This study employed a bibliometric approach with a PRISMA-style identification and screening process. Data were retrieved from the Scopus database and limited to 52 journal articles published between 2013 and 2026. The analysis was conducted using RStudio to identify publication trends, source productivity, citation performance, authorship structure, and keyword occurrence.

Results: The findings show that this topic has experienced considerable growth, with an annual growth rate of 13.18%. The literature is distributed across 44 different sources, indicating its interdisciplinary character. The authorship structure is collaborative, with an average of 3.52 authors per article. Keyword analysis identifies stakeholder as the central theme, closely associated with decision making, sustainable development, governance approach, and co-creation.

Conclusions: These findings confirm that multi-actor approaches have become an important perspective for understanding cultural governance. The novelty of this article lies in offering a bibliometric mapping specifically focused on cultural contexts, while also providing direction for future research and practice that is more comparative, critical, integrated, and participatory.

ABSTRAK

Pendahuluan: Kajian mengenai pendekatan multi-aktor dalam konteks budaya semakin penting seiring meningkatnya perhatian terhadap tata kelola kolaboratif, pengelolaan warisan budaya, pariwisata, dan pembangunan wilayah yang berkelanjutan. Meskipun demikian, literatur tentang topik ini masih tersebar di berbagai bidang dan belum banyak dipetakan secara sistematis. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis perkembangan publikasi ilmiah mengenai pendekatan multi-aktor dalam budaya.

Metode: Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan bibliometrik dengan proses identifikasi dan penyaringan bergaya PRISMA. Data diambil dari basis data Scopus dan dibatasi pada 52 artikel jurnal yang terbit pada periode 2013–2026. Analisis dilakukan menggunakan RStudio untuk mengidentifikasi tren publikasi, produktivitas sumber, kinerja sitasi, struktur kepenulisan, dan kemunculan kata kunci.

Hasil: Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa topik ini mengalami pertumbuhan yang cukup pesat, dengan laju pertumbuhan tahunan sebesar 13,18%. Literatur tersebar dalam 44 sumber yang berbeda, menunjukkan karakter interdisipliner. Struktur kepenulisan bersifat kolaboratif, dengan rata-rata 3,52 penulis per artikel. Analisis kata



This work is licensed under [CC BY-SA 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/). This license enables reusers to distribute, remix, adapt, and build upon the material in any medium or format,

so long as attribution is given to the creator.

kunci menunjukkan bahwa *stakeholder* menjadi tema sentral yang berkaitan erat dengan *decision making*, *sustainable development*, *governance approach*, dan *co-creation*.

Kesimpulan: Temuan ini menegaskan bahwa pendekatan multi-aktor telah menjadi perspektif penting dalam memahami tata kelola budaya. Kebaruan artikel ini terletak pada pemetaan bibliometrik yang secara khusus memotret perkembangan pendekatan multi-aktor dalam konteks budaya serta membuka arah riset dan praktik yang lebih komparatif, kritis, terintegrasi, dan partisipatif.

1. INTRODUCTION

Cultural governance is increasingly shaped by interactions among multiple actors rather than by the state alone. In contemporary cultural settings, decision-making, resource mobilization, heritage protection, tourism development, community participation, and cultural regeneration are often negotiated through networks involving governments, communities, private organizations, experts, civil society groups, and digital intermediaries. This shift has made multi-actor arrangements a significant lens for understanding how cultural policies are designed, implemented, and contested. As cultural issues become more closely linked to sustainability, social inclusion, and territorial development, the role of collaborative and participatory governance in cultural contexts has become more visible and more complex.

Previous studies have examined multi-actor approaches in various cultural domains. Research has addressed European cultural routes as networked cultural initiatives, multi-agency management in World Heritage governance, participatory governance of culture and cultural heritage, and the strategic integration of culture and tourism policy (Su et al., 2017; Campomori & Casula, 2023). Other studies have focused on urban regeneration, heritage enhancement, obsolete neighborhood renewal, digital cultural platforms, and community-based tourism governance, showing that cultural governance increasingly depends on coordination among heterogeneous stakeholders with different interests, values, and capacities (Bottero et al., 2020; Liboriussen & Martin, 2020; Gúdel et al., 2025; Su et al., 2017; Ririhena et al., 2026). Together, these studies indicate that culture has become a field in which governance is no longer linear, but relational, negotiated, and multi-layered.

At the same time, the literature shows that multi-actor approaches in culture are discussed across fragmented subfields, including heritage conservation, cultural tourism, social innovation, urban transformation, rural landscapes, digital platforms, and creative practices. This fragmentation is intellectually productive, but it also creates an important research gap. Existing studies are largely case-based, sector-specific, and geographically dispersed, which makes it difficult to identify the broader intellectual structure of the field. As a result, there is still limited knowledge about how research on multi-actor approaches in culture has evolved over time, which themes dominate the field, which sources and authors are most influential, and how different strands of scholarship are connected.

This gap makes the topic increasingly urgent to study. Cultural governance today faces growing pressures from urban change, sustainability transitions, digitalization, tourism intensification, and competing claims over identity, memory, and public value. In such conditions, multi-actor arrangements are often presented as practical solutions for coordination and participation, yet they may also generate tensions related to power asymmetry, representation, institutional fragmentation, and unequal access to decision-making. Without a systematic overview of the literature, discussions on multi-actor governance in culture risk remaining scattered and

descriptive. A clearer mapping of the field is therefore needed to support more coherent academic debate and to provide a stronger basis for future cultural policy and governance research.

The novelty of this study lies in its specific focus on multi-actor approaches in cultural contexts through a bibliometric perspective. While prior studies have explored particular cultural sectors or individual governance cases, few have systematically mapped the development of this topic across the broader cultural governance literature. By examining journal articles indexed in Scopus, this study offers a structured overview of publication trends, influential sources, citation patterns, and thematic concentrations related to multi-actor approaches in culture. In this sense, the study does not merely summarize previous findings, but identifies the intellectual landscape of the field and highlights its emerging directions.

Accordingly, this study addresses the following research question: How has research on multi-actor approaches in cultural governance developed, and what major themes, publication patterns, and intellectual structures characterize this field? Based on this question, the study aims to analyze the evolution of the literature, identify its dominant themes and influential contributions, and reveal the main research directions that shape scholarly discussion on multi-actor cultural governance. By doing so, this article is expected to contribute both to the advancement of bibliometric scholarship and to a better understanding of how culture is governed through multi-actor interactions.

2. METHOD

This study employed a bibliometric approach to examine the development of research on multi-actor approaches in cultural contexts. Bibliographic data were retrieved from the Scopus database and exported in CSV format for analysis. The initial search identified 67 records. To maintain document-type consistency and analytical focus, only publications categorized as journal articles were retained. As a result, 15 non-article records, consisting of conference papers, reviews, book chapters, and a book, were excluded prior to screening, leaving a final dataset of 52 journal articles.

The selected records were screened through titles, abstracts, and keywords to ensure their relevance to the topic of multi-actor approaches in culture. All 52 retrieved articles were accessible in full text and met the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the bibliometric analysis. A PRISMA-style flow diagram was used to present the article selection process in a transparent and systematic manner. However, this study did not adopt PRISMA as a full systematic review protocol, because the objective of the research was bibliometric mapping rather than systematic review synthesis.

The final dataset was analyzed descriptively to identify the intellectual structure and publication patterns of the field. The analysis focused on annual publication trends, source productivity, citation performance, authorship structure, and keyword occurrence. The bibliographic variables examined included authors, article titles, years of publication, source titles, abstracts, author keywords, index keywords, affiliations, and citation counts. These indicators were used to map the evolution of research on multi-actor approaches in culture, identify dominant themes, and reveal influential contributions within the literature.

The bibliometric analysis was conducted using RStudio as the main analytical software environment. RStudio was used to organize, process, and visualize the bibliographic data extracted from Scopus, allowing the study to examine publication trends, source productivity,

citation performance, authorship structure, and keyword occurrence in a systematic manner. The use of RStudio also supported the generation of descriptive bibliometric outputs and thematic mapping, which facilitated the interpretation of the intellectual development of research on multi-actor approaches in cultural contexts.




FIGURE 1
PRISMA-style flow diagram of article selection for the bibliometric analysis.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Article Profile

The dataset used in this study consists of 52 journal articles indexed in Scopus. These publications span the period from 2013 to 2026, indicating that research on multi-actor approaches in cultural contexts has developed over more than a decade. However, the distribution over time is not even. The largest concentration of publications appears in the most recent period, especially between 2023 and 2026, which accounts for 32 of the 52 articles. This pattern suggests that multi-actor perspectives in cultural governance, heritage, tourism, and community-based development have gained stronger scholarly attention in recent years.

The publication profile also shows that the field is highly dispersed across academic outlets. The 52 articles were published in 44 different journals, indicating that this topic has not yet been concentrated within a single dominant source. A small number of journals contributed more than one article, such as *Sustainability (Switzerland)* and *Current Issues in Tourism*, each with three articles, followed by *Heritage*, *TECHNE*, *Cities*, and *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management*.

and Sustainable Development, each with two articles. In terms of language, the corpus is dominated by English-language publications, with a smaller number of articles published in Italian, French, and Spanish. This distribution reflects the interdisciplinary and international character of the literature.

From the perspective of authorship and impact, the dataset involves a broad range of contributors and themes. The 52 articles were written by 173 unique authors, with an average of approximately 3.52 authors per article, suggesting that collaborative writing is common in this field. The total number of citations recorded in the corpus is 583, with an average of 11.21 citations per article. Several highly cited works focus on urban regeneration, heritage conservation planning, participatory governance, and multi-actor management, indicating that the literature is shaped by both cultural governance debates and broader discussions on sustainability, participation, and territorial development. Table 1 presents the profile of all articles included in the analysis.

TABLE 1
Profile of Articles Included in the Bibliometric Dataset

No.	Authors	Title	Source Title
1	(Campomori & Casula, 2023)	How to frame the governance dimension of social innovation: theoretical considerations and empirical evidence	Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research
2	(Lampropoulos et al., 2021)	Assessing the performance of current strategic policy directions towards unfolding the potential of the culture–tourism nexus in the Greek territory	Heritage
3	(Severo, 2017)	European Cultural Routes: Building a Multi-Actor Approach	Museum International
4	(L'Erario, 2024)	Combining agriculture, community, and circular economy: Chilean GIAHS and NIAHS for the dynamic conservation of rural landscape heritage in marginal areas	Capitale Culturale
5	(Liboriussen & Martin, 2020)	Honour of Kings as Chinese popular heritage: Contesting authorized history in a mobile game	China Information
6	(Ceinar et al., 2025)	Chapter 9: Rethinking Top-Down Approaches in the Ethics of Co-Design: The Case of Reggio Emilia Collaborative Governance Model	Research in Urban Sociology
7	(Violano et al., 2024)	Europe vs Hong Kong partnership agreements: reversing trends	TECHNE
8	(Djarmika et al., 2024)	Just Transition in Biofuel Development towards Low-Carbon Economy: Multi-Actor Perspectives on Policies and Practices in Indonesia	Energies
9	(Belletti et al., 2024)	Multilevel governance in farmers' markets: a stakeholder analysis in Tuscany	Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems
10	(Cristofari et al., 2025).	A Model of Mountain Social-Ecological Systems to Catalyze Multi-Actor Collaborations Toward Sustainability	Earth's Future
11	(PilarVettori, 2024)	Common goods, cities, territories: processes for the reactivation of disused public assets	TECHNE
12	(Bottero et al., 2020)	Experimenting community impact evaluation (CIE) for assessing urban regeneration programmes: The case study of the area 22@ Barcelona	Cities
13	(Bravaglieri et al., 2025)	Multi-actor rural innovation ecosystems: Definition, dynamics, and spatial relations	Journal of Rural Studies
14	(Jiménez Rios et al., 2025)	Towards Industry 5.0: a stakeholder analysis to understand the human role in the adoption of a heritage bridge human-centric digital twin framework	Structure and Infrastructure Engineering
15	(H. Huang et al., 2024)	20 years review of the multi actor multi criteria analysis (MAMCA) framework: a proposition of a systematic guideline	Annals of Operations Research

No.	Authors	Title	Source Title
16	(Güdel et al., 2025)	Strategic ownership configurations to foster intangible cultural heritage in Japanese football events	Frontiers in Sports and Active Living
17	(Dieu et al., 2025)	Reconfiguring smart tourism satisfaction in a transforming Heritage City: a fuzzy-set study of tourists and residents in Huế, Vietnam	Current Issues in Tourism
18	(Saenz, 2023)	Corporate social responsibility strategies beyond the sphere of influence: Cases from the Peruvian mining industry	Resources Policy
19	(Lusiani and Luca Zan et al., 2013)	A value-based monitoring system to support heritage conservation planning	Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development
20	(Wiryawan et al., 2026)	Integrated Spatial Governance for Sustainable Tourism in Bali	Journal of Sustainable Development and Regulatory Issues
21	(Long et al., 2025)	Theoretical cognition and evolutionary path of neo-endogenous development in traditional villages	Resources Science
22	(Taormina & Bonini Baraldi, 2022)	Unveiling forms of participation in the governance of UNESCO World Heritage Sites	European Spatial Research and Policy
23	(Ciampa, 2023)	A Creative Approach for the Architectural Technology: Using the ExtrArtis Model to Regenerate the Built Environment	Sustainability (Switzerland)
24	(Severo M, 2017)	European Cultural Routes: Building a Multi-Actor Approach	Culture et Musees
25	(Sianipar et al., 2023)	Multi-Actor Systems in Water–Energy Nexus: Identifying Critical Stakeholders in Floatovoltaic (Floating Photovoltaic) Project	Water (Switzerland)
26	(Dell’Anna et al., 2020)	Designing a decision support system to evaluate the environmental and extra-economic performances of a nearly zero-energy building	Smart and Sustainable Built Environment
27	(Su et al., 2017)	Multi-agency management of a World Heritage Site: Wulingyuan Scenic and Historic Interest Area, China	Current Issues in Tourism
28	(Wu & Keeney, 2025)	Advancing a multi-actor model of artist-in-residence practice	Cultural Trends
29	(Núñez-Camarena et al., 2023)	Memory and Identity: Citizen Perception in the Processes of Heritage Enhancement and Regeneration in Obsolete Neighborhoods—The Case of Polígono de San Pablo, Seville	Land
30	(Mazaherylaghab, 2025)	Green infrastructure planning and balanced territorial development: Insights from Milan Rural Metropolis	Journal of Environmental Management
31	(Tregua et al., 2020)	#10yearschallenge: How co-creation permeated tourism research. A bibliometric analysis	European Journal of Tourism Research
32	(Wardana et al., 2023)	Community Participation-Based Tourism Governance in Post COVID-19 (Case Study on Conservation in Borobudur Temple)	International Journal of Conservation Science
33	(Su et al., 2021)	Tourism place making through the bioluminescent “Blue Tears” of Pingtan Islands, China	Marine Policy
34	(Mai & Liu, 2026)	Generative AI and the tourist experience: reconfiguring en-route and post-trip value co-creation and co-destruction	Current Issues in Tourism
35	(Craufurd Smith et al., 2021)	Media ownership transparency in Europe: Closing the gap between European aspiration and domestic reality	European Journal of Communication
36	(Heras et al., 2019)	Heritage values: towards a holistic and participatory management approach	Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development
37	(Argyropoulos & Stratigea, 2019)	Sustainable management of underwater cultural heritage: The route from discovery to engagement—Open issues in the Mediterranean	Heritage

No.	Authors	Title	Source Title
38	(Liu et al., 2026)	Quantitative Perceptual Analysis of Feature-Space Scenarios in Network Media Evaluation Using Transformer-Based Deep Learning: A Case Study of Fuwen Township Primary School in China	Buildings
39	(Kyvelou & Ierapetritis, 2019)	How to make blue growth operational? A local and regional stakeholders perspective in Greece	WMU Journal of Maritime Affairs
40	(Iaione et al., 2022)	Participatory Governance of Culture and Cultural Heritage: Policy, Legal, Economic Insights From Italy	Frontiers in Sustainable Cities
41	(Ririheha et al., 2026)	Regulatory Reform, Food Security, and Indigenous Communities: Efforts to Realize Inclusive Governance	Journal of Governance and Regulation
42	(Ferretti & Grosso, 2019)	Designing successful urban regeneration strategies through a behavioral decision aiding approach	Cities
43	(Le et al., 2025)	Reassembling French Colonial Heritage in Postcolonial Hanoi: Towards Co-creative Urban Futures	Space and Culture
44	(Psalti et al., 2022)	Interdisciplinary Project for the Catholicon Rehabilitation of the Varnakova Monastery	Scientific Culture
45	(Sutomo et al., 2024)	Evaluating Policy Environment for Community-based Rural Tourism: Multi-Actor Perspectives in Tourism Value Chain	Journal of Regional and City Planning
46	(L. Huang et al., 2024)	The Protection of Urban Spatial Structures in Historic Cities: A Multi-Actor Perspective of the Cultural Space Construction in Fuzhou, China	Sustainability (Switzerland)
47	(Tomprou, 2023)	Opportunities and Challenges for the Creation and Governance of Productive Landscapes in Urban Transformations: The Case of Klosterøya Urban Fruit Forest Park	Sustainability (Switzerland)
48	Saleh R.; Ost C.	Innovative business model for adaptive reuse of cultural heritage in a circular economy perspective	International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business
49	(García-Ortega et al., 2020).	Corporate social responsibility in the mining industry in Latin America: A multiactor model	America Latina Hoy
50	(Rao et al., 2024)	Under the iceberg of "one-stop": explore multi-actor engagement in one-stop digital cultural platforms through actor-network and commons theories	Aslib Journal of Information Management
51	(Lei et al., 2026)	Symbiosis or rupture? Multi-PATH in symbiotic systems	Annals of Tourism Research
52	(Setiawan et al., 2021)	Sustainable Vacation Industry Mobility Criteria in Heritage Cultural Natural Conserved Areas	International Journal on Advanced Science, Engineering and Information Technology

3.2 Result

To provide an initial overview of the dataset, the main bibliometric characteristics of the selected articles are presented first. This overview is intended to show the general profile of the literature, including its publication period, authorship pattern, collaboration structure, keyword distribution, and citation performance.

TABLE 2

Main bibliometric information of the dataset

Description	Results
Timespan	2013–2026
Sources	44
Documents	52
Annual Growth Rate	13.18%
Authors	171

Description	Results
Authors of Single-Authored Documents	7
International Co-Authorship	34.62%
Co-Authors per Document	3.52
Author's Keywords (DE)	263
References	7,383
Document Average Age	3.46
Average Citations per Document	11.21

Table 2 shows that the literature on multi-actor approaches in cultural contexts has developed within a relatively recent timespan, covering publications from 2013 to 2026. The dataset consists of 52 articles published in 44 different sources, indicating that the field is characterized by a broad and dispersed publication pattern rather than concentration in a few dominant journals. The annual growth rate of 13.18% suggests that this topic has expanded considerably over time, particularly as cultural governance, stakeholder engagement, and collaborative management have become increasingly relevant in discussions of sustainability, heritage, tourism, and territorial development. The bibliometric profile also indicates a relatively young body of literature, as reflected by the document average age of 3.46 years, while the average citation rate of 11.21 citations per document shows that the field has already achieved a meaningful level of academic visibility.

The authorship structure further confirms that this field is shaped largely by collaboration. A total of 171 authors contributed to the 52 articles, with an average of 3.52 co-authors per document. Only seven articles were written by a single author, while the international co-authorship rate reached 34.62%, showing that cross-border collaboration is a significant feature of this research area. In addition, the corpus contains 263 author keywords and 7,383 references, indicating substantial thematic diversity and strong engagement with a wide body of prior scholarship. Overall, these figures suggest that research on multi-actor approaches in culture is not only growing but is also being developed through interconnected, multi-authored, and internationally informed academic networks.




FIGURE 2
Annual scientific production (x-axis: publication year; y-axis: number of articles)

As shown in Figure 2, the x-axis represents publication years from 2013 to 2026, while the y-axis represents the number of articles published each year. The annual scientific production demonstrates that the topic developed slowly in its early period and then accelerated significantly in more recent years. Publications were very limited between 2013 and 2018, with only occasional contributions, but output increased more clearly from 2019 onward. The field maintained a

moderate level of productivity in 2019 and 2020, followed by a slight decline in 2021 and 2022, before rising sharply again in 2023, 2024, and 2025. The highest point appears in 2025, with ten articles published in a single year, while 2026 already records five articles. This pattern suggests that multi-actor approaches in culture have become an increasingly important subject of scholarly attention, especially in recent years when debates on cultural sustainability, participatory governance, digital transformation, and stakeholder collaboration have intensified.




FIGURE 3
Most relevant sources

The distribution of publication outlets in Figure 3 reveals that the field remains highly interdisciplinary. *Current Issues in Tourism* and *Sustainability (Switzerland)* are the most productive sources, each contributing three articles, while *Cities*, *Heritage*, *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, and *TECHNE* each contributed two articles. The remaining sources are represented by a single article. This distribution indicates that research on multi-actor approaches in cultural contexts is not confined to one disciplinary domain, but instead spans tourism studies, sustainability studies, urban studies, heritage management, and cultural policy. The absence of a single overwhelmingly dominant source also suggests that the field is still evolving and is being shaped through multiple academic conversations rather than through one consolidated research tradition.




FIGURE 4
Most local cited sources

The local citation structure presented in Figure 4 offers additional insight into the intellectual foundations of the field. The most locally cited source is Macharis, followed by Ostrom and Iaione,

with other influential names including Latour, Ost, Lusch, Moropoulou, Stratigea, Throsby, and Van Balen. This pattern indicates that the literature draws on several major conceptual traditions, including multi-actor decision analysis, commons and governance theory, participatory and collaborative governance, cultural economics, and value-based heritage management. In particular, the prominence of Ostrom points to the continued relevance of institutional and collective governance perspectives, while authors such as Iaione and Latour suggest the importance of collaborative public governance and relational approaches in understanding how multiple actors shape cultural processes and policy outcomes.




FIGURE 5
Most relevant authors

A similar pattern of dispersion can be seen in the authorship productivity shown in Figure 5. Sianipar CPM appears as the most productive author with three documents, while Bottero M, Dell’Anna F, Hoshino S, Liu S, Liu Y, Severo M, Stratigea A, Su MM, and Wall G each contributed two documents. This distribution shows that no single author dominates the field, which reinforces the earlier observation that research on this topic is still developing across diverse scholarly communities. At the same time, the repeated appearance of several authors suggests the emergence of a small but identifiable group of contributors who are helping to shape the direction of research on multi-actor cultural governance, tourism, heritage, and sustainability.



FIGURE 6
Keyword co-occurrence network

The thematic structure of the literature is visualized in Figure 6, which places stakeholder as the central and most prominent keyword in the co-occurrence network. Its dominant position

indicates that the literature primarily understands multi-actor approaches through the lens of stakeholder interaction, negotiation, and coordination. The network can also be interpreted through its color clusters. The green cluster connects stakeholder with decision making, urban regeneration, and strategic approach, suggesting a strong orientation toward participatory planning and collective choice. The red cluster groups stakeholder with cultural and heritage-tourism related terms, indicating that cultural value is frequently negotiated through heritage use, tourism, and actor interaction. The blue cluster links governance approach, co-creation, and innovation, reflecting the rise of collaborative governance models and value-creation processes. The purple cluster connects sustainable development with agriculture, showing the linkage between cultural governance and territorial sustainability agendas. Meanwhile, the orange and brown clusters relate to urbanization, biodiversity, and renewable energies, showing that the multi-actor perspective also extends to broader socio-ecological transitions beyond conventional heritage management.

Taken together, these results indicate that research on multi-actor approaches in cultural contexts is a growing, collaborative, and conceptually diverse field. The literature has expanded rapidly in recent years, is published across a broad range of journals, and is shaped by multiple theoretical traditions rather than a single dominant framework. At the same time, the strong centrality of *stakeholder* and the prominence of collaborative, participatory, and sustainability-related concepts suggest that the field is increasingly oriented toward understanding culture as a negotiated arena involving multiple interests, institutions, and forms of value. This makes the study of multi-actor cultural governance particularly relevant for explaining how cultural policy, heritage management, tourism development, and community-based initiatives are being reconfigured in contemporary settings.

3.3 Discussion

The findings indicate that research on multi-actor approaches in cultural contexts has moved from a marginal topic into a more visible and expanding field of inquiry. The sharp increase in publication output in recent years suggests that multi-actor perspectives are becoming increasingly important for understanding contemporary cultural governance. This growth is closely related to broader academic and policy concerns, particularly those involving participatory governance, heritage sustainability, collaborative planning, and cross-sectoral coordination. In this sense, the literature reflects a wider transition from state-centered cultural management toward more networked and negotiated forms of governance in which multiple actors play active roles in shaping cultural agendas.

At the same time, the distribution of articles across 44 sources shows that the field remains highly dispersed and interdisciplinary. This dispersion indicates both strength and limitation. On the one hand, it demonstrates that multi-actor approaches in culture are relevant across several domains, including tourism, urban studies, heritage management, sustainability, and public policy. On the other hand, the absence of a clearly dominant journal or tightly consolidated publication core suggests that the field has not yet matured into a fully integrated body of scholarship. Instead, it is still being developed through multiple conversations that often intersect but do not always converge conceptually. This helps explain why bibliometric mapping is particularly useful for this topic: it reveals connections that may remain less visible when the literature is approached only through isolated case studies.

The collaboration pattern identified in the results also provides an important insight into the nature of this research area. The relatively high number of co-authors per document and the substantial level of international co-authorship suggest that the study of multi-actor cultural governance itself is shaped by collaborative knowledge production. This is not surprising, because the topic inherently deals with interaction, coordination, and shared decision-making among diverse actors. In other words, the collaborative structure of the literature mirrors the collaborative logic of the phenomenon being studied. The international character of co-authorship also indicates that the field is not limited to one regional tradition, but is increasingly informed by transnational academic exchange and comparative perspectives.

Another important implication emerges from the local citation structure. The prominence of authors such as Macharis, Ostrom, Iaione, and Latour suggests that the field is conceptually anchored in several intersecting traditions: multi-actor and multi-criteria decision analysis, commons and institutional governance, collaborative public governance, and relational approaches to socio-technical and cultural processes. This means that research on multi-actor approaches in culture does not stand alone as a purely sectoral discussion. Rather, it draws theoretical strength from broader governance debates that help explain how actors negotiate interests, build legitimacy, coordinate action, and construct public value. The continuing relevance of Ostrom, in particular, suggests that issues of collective action, institutional arrangements, and shared resource management remain highly influential even in cultural settings.

The keyword co-occurrence network further reinforces the central role of stakeholders in this field. The dominance of the term *stakeholder* indicates that the literature conceptualizes culture not merely as an object of preservation or promotion, but as a governance arena involving multiple interests, values, and claims. The association of *stakeholder* with *decision making*, *sustainable development*, *governance approach*, *co-creation*, and *innovation* reveals that cultural processes are increasingly understood through participatory and negotiated frameworks. This suggests a shift away from linear policy implementation toward more interactive models in which public institutions, communities, professionals, market actors, and civil society organizations jointly influence cultural outcomes. The appearance of connected themes such as heritage tourism, urbanization, biodiversity, and renewable energies also shows that multi-actor approaches are no longer confined to traditional cultural heritage management, but are expanding into broader socio-ecological and territorial development agendas.

Taken together, these findings suggest that the literature is developing in a direction that is both promising and still fragmented. The field has clear momentum, strong collaborative features, and a recognizable thematic center, yet it also remains dispersed across topics and publication outlets. This implies that future research should move beyond descriptive stakeholder identification and engage more critically with issues such as power asymmetry, representation, institutional capacity, and the uneven distribution of influence among actors in cultural governance processes. More comparative studies are also needed to examine how multi-actor arrangements operate across different cultural sectors, territorial settings, and governance regimes. Such efforts would help transform the field from a growing collection of interdisciplinary contributions into a more coherent framework for understanding how culture is governed through complex actor relationships.

4. CONCLUSION

The findings indicate that research on multi-actor approaches in cultural contexts has moved from a marginal topic into a more visible and expanding field of inquiry. The sharp increase in publication output in recent years suggests that multi-actor perspectives are becoming increasingly important for understanding contemporary cultural governance. This growth is closely related to broader academic and policy concerns, particularly those involving participatory governance, heritage sustainability, collaborative planning, and cross-sectoral coordination. In this sense, the literature reflects a wider transition from state-centered cultural management toward more networked and negotiated forms of governance in which multiple actors play active roles in shaping cultural agendas.

At the same time, the distribution of articles across 44 sources shows that the field remains highly dispersed and interdisciplinary. This dispersion indicates both strength and limitation. On the one hand, it demonstrates that multi-actor approaches in culture are relevant across several domains, including tourism, urban studies, heritage management, sustainability, and public policy. On the other hand, the absence of a clearly dominant journal or tightly consolidated publication core suggests that the field has not yet matured into a fully integrated body of scholarship. Instead, it is still being developed through multiple conversations that often intersect but do not always converge conceptually. This helps explain why bibliometric mapping is particularly useful for this topic: it reveals connections that may remain less visible when the literature is approached only through isolated case studies.

The collaboration pattern identified in the results also provides an important insight into the nature of this research area. The relatively high number of co-authors per document and the substantial level of international co-authorship suggest that the study of multi-actor cultural governance itself is shaped by collaborative knowledge production. This is not surprising, because the topic inherently deals with interaction, coordination, and shared decision-making among diverse actors. In other words, the collaborative structure of the literature mirrors the collaborative logic of the phenomenon being studied. The international character of co-authorship also indicates that the field is not limited to one regional tradition, but is increasingly informed by transnational academic exchange and comparative perspectives.

Another important implication emerges from the local citation structure. The prominence of authors such as Macharis, Ostrom, Iaione, and Latour suggests that the field is conceptually anchored in several intersecting traditions: multi-actor and multi-criteria decision analysis, commons and institutional governance, collaborative public governance, and relational approaches to socio-technical and cultural processes. This means that research on multi-actor approaches in culture does not stand alone as a purely sectoral discussion. Rather, it draws theoretical strength from broader governance debates that help explain how actors negotiate interests, build legitimacy, coordinate action, and construct public value. The continuing relevance of Ostrom, in particular, suggests that issues of collective action, institutional arrangements, and shared resource management remain highly influential even in cultural settings.

The keyword co-occurrence network further reinforces the central role of stakeholders in this field. The dominance of the term stakeholder indicates that the literature conceptualizes culture not merely as an object of preservation or promotion, but as a governance arena involving multiple interests, values, and claims. However, the prominence of stakeholder also reveals an analytical limitation: much of the literature still identifies who is involved without asking clearly enough who

has greater control over agendas, resources, rules, and legitimacy within the network. In other words, participation is often mapped more carefully than power. This matters because multi-actor governance can appear inclusive on the surface while still reproducing hierarchy, elite capture, or institutional dominance in practice. The association of stakeholder with decision making, sustainable development, governance approach, co-creation, and innovation therefore should be read not only as evidence of collaborative governance, but also as a reminder that future studies need to examine asymmetry, representation, and bargaining power more explicitly.

Taken together, these findings suggest that the literature is developing in a direction that is both promising and still fragmented. The field has clear momentum, strong collaborative features, and a recognizable thematic center, yet it also remains dispersed across topics and publication outlets. From a practical point of view, the co-creation theme identified in this study can be translated into concrete community empowerment strategies at the local level. For community development practitioners, the findings suggest several operational steps: mapping actors together with their relative influence, creating routine deliberative forums in which community voices can shape priorities, co-designing programs and benefit-sharing mechanisms, strengthening local facilitation and mediation capacity, and building transparent monitoring arrangements so that collaborative commitments can be evaluated publicly. In cultural villages, heritage neighborhoods, community-based tourism destinations, and local creative initiatives, such an approach can help move governance from symbolic participation toward shared responsibility. In this sense, bibliometric themes such as stakeholder, decision making, sustainable development, and co-creation are not only academic clusters, but practical entry points for building more inclusive cultural governance.

Funding

The authors state that no funding sources were involved.

CrediT Author Statement

AR Sakir: Conceptualization, Methodology, Data Curation, Software, Formal Analysis, Visualization, Writing – Original Draft Preparation. **IY Rahanra:** Validation, Supervision, Writing – Review & Editing, Investigation. **J Waisapy:** Resources, Data Curation, Investigation, Writing – Review & Editing. **R Nikijuluw:** Supervision, Validation, Project Administration, Writing – Review & Editing.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares that there are no conflicts of interest.

ORCID

AR Sakir  [0000-0003-4449-5941](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4449-5941)

R Nikijuluw  [0009-0000-2800-9339](https://orcid.org/0009-0000-2800-9339)

REFERENCES

- Argyropoulos, V., & Stratigea, A. (2019). Sustainable management of underwater cultural heritage: The route from discovery to engagement—Open issues in the mediterranean. *Heritage*, 2(2), 1588–1613. <https://doi.org/10.3390/heritage2020098>
- Belletti, G., Torres Salcido, G., Scarpellini, P., Mengoni, M., & Marescotti, A. (2024). Multilevel governance in farmers' markets: a stakeholder analysis in Tuscany. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2024.1401488>

- Bottero, M., Bragaglia, F., Caruso, N., Datola, G., & Dell'Anna, F. (2020). Experimenting community impact evaluation (CIE) for assessing urban regeneration programmes: The case study of the area 22@ Barcelona. *Cities*, 99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2019.102464>
- Bravaglieri, S., Åberg, H. E., Bertuca, A., & de Luca, C. (2025). Multi-actor rural innovation ecosystems: Definition, dynamics, and spatial relations. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2024.103492>
- Campomori, F., & Casula, M. (2023). How to frame the governance dimension of social innovation: theoretical considerations and empirical evidence. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 36(2), 171–189. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13511610.2022.2036952>
- Ceinar, I. M., Levi, N., & Sgarbi, G. (2025). Chapter 9: Rethinking Top-Down Approaches in the Ethics of Co-Design: The Case of Reggio Emilia Collaborative Governance Model. *Research in Urban Sociology*, 1(2), 161–184. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1047-004220250000019010>
- Ciampa, F. (2023). A Creative Approach for the Architectural Technology: Using the ExtrArtis Model to Regenerate the Built Environment. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 15(11). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15119124>
- Craufurd Smith, R., Klimkiewicz, B., & Ostling, A. (2021). Media ownership transparency in Europe: Closing the gap between European aspiration and domestic reality. *European Journal of Communication*, 36(6), 547–562. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323121999523>
- Cristofari, H., Asse, D., Chanteloup, L., Guisan, A., Otero, I., Reynard, E., Urbach, D., & Randin, C. (2025). A Model of Mountain Social-Ecological Systems to Catalyze Multi-Actor Collaborations Toward Sustainability. *Earth's Future*, 13(4). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2024EF004818>
- Dell'Anna, F., Bottero, M., Becchio, C., Corgnati, S. P., & Mondini, G. (2020). Designing a decision support system to evaluate the environmental and extra-economic performances of a nearly zero-energy building. *Smart and Sustainable Built Environment*, 9(4), 413–442. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SASBE-09-2019-0121>
- Dieu, H. T. N., Chung, H. C., & Chung, N. (2025). Reconfiguring smart tourism satisfaction in a transforming Heritage City: a fuzzy-set study of tourists and residents in Huế, Vietnam. *Current Issues in Tourism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2025.2524740>
- Djarmika, P., Listiningrum, P., Sumarno, T. B., Mahira, D. F., & Sianipar, C. P. M. (2024). Just Transition in Biofuel Development towards Low-Carbon Economy: Multi-Actor Perspectives on Policies and Practices in Indonesia. *Energies*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.3390/en17010141>
- Ferretti, V., & Grosso, R. (2019). Designing successful urban regeneration strategies through a behavioral decision aiding approach. *Cities*, 95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2019.06.017>
- García-Ortega, B., De-Miguel-Molina, B., & Chirivella-González, V. (2020). Corporate social responsibility in the mining industry in latin america: A multiactor model. *America Latina Hoy*, 86, 23–40. <https://doi.org/10.14201/alh.22369>
- Gúdel, R., Hernández-Correa, E., Acebes, F., & Pajares, J. (2025). Strategic ownership configurations to foster intangible cultural heritage in Japanese football events. *Frontiers in Sports and Active Living*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fspor.2025.1638764>
- Heras, V. C., Moscoso Cordero, M. S., Wijffels, A., Tenze, A., & Jaramillo Paredes, D. E. (2019). Heritage values: towards a holistic and participatory management approach. *Journal of*

- Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, 9(2), 199–211. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCHMSD-10-2017-0070>
- Huang, H., Heuninckx, S., & Macharis, C. (2024). 20 years review of the multi actor multi criteria analysis (MAMCA) framework: a proposition of a systematic guideline. *Annals of Operations Research*, 343(1), 313–348. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10479-024-06357-y>
- Huang, L., Liu, S., & Kang, Z. (2024). The Protection of Urban Spatial Structures in Historic Cities: A Multi-Actor Perspective of the Cultural Space Construction in Fuzhou, China. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16010385>
- Iaione, C., De Nictolis, E., & Santagati, M. E. (2022). Participatory Governance of Culture and Cultural Heritage: Policy, Legal, Economic Insights From Italy. *Frontiers in Sustainable Cities*, 4. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frsc.2022.777708>
- Jiménez Rios, A., Plevris, V., & Nogal, M. (2025). Towards Industry 5.0: a stakeholder analysis to understand the human role in the adoption of a heritage bridge human-centric digital twin framework. *Structure and Infrastructure Engineering*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15732479.2025.2490126>
- Kyvelou, S. S. I., & Ierapetritis, D. G. (2019). How to make blue growth operational? A local and regional stakeholders perspective in Greece. *WMU Journal of Maritime Affairs*, 18(2), 249–280. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13437-019-00171-1>
- L'Erario, A. (2024). Combining agriculture, community, and circular economy: Chilean GIAHS and NIAHS for the dynamic conservation of rural landscape heritage in marginal areas. *Capitale Culturale*, 2024(29), 45–65. <https://doi.org/10.13138/2039-2362/3373>
- Lampropoulos, V., Panagiotopoulou, M., & Stratigea, A. (2021). Assessing the performance of current strategic policy directions towards unfolding the potential of the culture– tourism nexus in the greek territory. *Heritage*, 4(4), 3157–3185. <https://doi.org/10.3390/heritage4040177>
- Le, T. T. H., Quoc Viet, T., & Pham, M. P. (2025). Reassembling French Colonial Heritage in Postcolonial Hanoi: Towards Co-creative Urban Futures. *Space and Culture*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/12063312251392362>
- Lei, X., Guo, W., & Liu, T. (2026). Symbiosis or rupture? Multi-PATH in symbiotic systems. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2026.104149>
- Liboriussen, B., & Martin, P. (2020). Honour of Kings as Chinese popular heritage: Contesting authorized history in a mobile game. *China Information*, 34(3), 319–341. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0920203X20908120>
- Liu, Y., Li, Z., Luo, L., Wang, S., Wang, R., Wu, R., Xia, D., Cheng, S., Zou, Z., Li, X., Liu, Y., & Qi, Y. (2026). Quantitative Perceptual Analysis of Feature-Space Scenarios in Network Media Evaluation Using Transformer-Based Deep Learning: A Case Study of Fuwen Township Primary School in China. *Buildings*, 16(4). <https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings16040714>
- Long, X., Li, B., Yang, F., & Dou, Y. (2025). Theoretical cognition and evolutionary path of neo-endogenous development in traditional villages. *Resources Science*, 47(9), 1992–2004. <https://doi.org/10.18402/resci.2025.09.12>
- Lusiani and Luca Zan, M., Cristina Heras, V., Wijffels, A., Cardoso, F., Vandesande, A., Santana, M., Van Orshoven, J., Steenberghen, T., & Van Balen, K. (2013). A value-based monitoring system to support heritage conservation planning. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, 3(2), 130–147. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCHMSD-10-2012-0051>

- Mai, S., & Liu, Z. (2026). Generative AI and the tourist experience: reconfiguring en-route and post-trip value co-creation and co-destruction. *Current Issues in Tourism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2026.2640203>
- Mazaherylaghab, H. (2025). Green infrastructure planning and balanced territorial development: Insights from Milan Rural Metropolis. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 390. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2025.126300>
- Núñez-Camarena, G. M., Clavijo-Núñez, S., Rey-Pérez, J., Aladro-Prieto, J.-M., & Roa-Fernández, J. (2023). Memory and Identity: Citizen Perception in the Processes of Heritage Enhancement and Regeneration in Obsolete Neighborhoods—The Case of Polígono de San Pablo, Seville. *Land*, 12(6). <https://doi.org/10.3390/land12061234>
- PilarVettori, M. (2024). Common goods, cities, territories: processes for the reactivation of disused public assets. *TECHNE*, 28, 201–210. <https://doi.org/10.36253/techne-15869>
- Psalti, A., Tsakoumaki, M., Andriotakis, G., Vobiri, J., Mouzakis, C., Moropoulos, N., Keramidas, V., Apostolopoulou, M., Delegou, E., & Moropoulou, A. (2022). Interdisciplinary project for the catholicon rehabilitation of the varnakova monastery. *Scientific Culture*, 8(2), 109–134. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5772569>
- Rao, Z., Liu, S., & Xiao, P. (2024). Under the iceberg of “one-stop”: explore multi-actor engagement in one-stop digital cultural platforms through actor-network and commons theories. *Aslib Journal of Information Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AJIM-01-2024-0023>
- Ririhena, S. W., Pattiselanno, A. E., Dewi, T. K., Pakidi, C. S., Tjilen, A. P., Tambaip, B., & Riyanto, P. (2026). Regulatory reform, food security, and indigenous communities: efforts to realize inclusive governance. *Journal of Governance and Regulation*, 15(2), 104–116. <https://doi.org/10.22495/jgrv15i2art9>
- Saenz, C. (2023). Corporate social responsibility strategies beyond the sphere of influence: Cases from the Peruvian mining industry. *Resources Policy*, 80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2022.103187>
- Setiawan, T. H., Putro, H. P. H., & Pradono, P. (2021). Sustainable Vacation Industry Mobility Criteria in Heritage Cultural Natural Conserved Areas. *International Journal on Advanced Science, Engineering and Information Technology*, 11(5), 2089–2095. <https://doi.org/10.18517/IJASEIT.11.5.13620>
- Severo, M. (2017). European Cultural Routes: Building a Multi-Actor Approach. *Museum International*, 69(1–2), 136–145. <https://doi.org/10.1111/muse.12157>
- Sianipar, C. P. M., Chao, Y.-M., & Hoshino, S. (2023). Multi-Actor Systems in Water–Energy Nexus: Identifying Critical Stakeholders in Floatovoltaic (Floating Photovoltaic) Project. *Water (Switzerland)*, 15(6). <https://doi.org/10.3390/w15061241>
- Su, M. M., Wall, G., Wang, Y., & Jin, M. (2017). Multi-agency management of a World Heritage Site: Wulingyuan Scenic and Historic Interest Area, China. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 20(12), 1290–1309. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2016.1261810>
- Su, M. M., Wall, G., Wu, B., Xu, H., Fu, X., & Deng, Y. (2021). Tourism place making through the bioluminescent “Blue Tears” of Pingtan Islands, China. *Marine Policy*, 133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2021.104744>
- Sutomo, Y. A. W., Sianipar, C. P. M., Onitsuka, K., & Hoshino, S. (2024). Evaluating Policy Environment for Community-based Rural Tourism: Multi-Actor Perspectives in Tourism Value Chain. *Journal of Regional and City Planning*, 35(3), 280–304. <https://doi.org/10.5614/jpwk.2024.35.3.3>

- Taormina, F., & Bonini Baraldi, S. (2022). Unveiling forms of participation in the governance of unesco world heritage sites. *European Spatial Research and Policy*, 29(2), 79–91. <https://doi.org/10.18778/1231-1952.29.2.05>
- Tomprou, M. O. (2023). Opportunities and Challenges for the Creation and Governance of Productive Landscapes in Urban Transformations: The Case of Klosterøya Urban Fruit Forest Park. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 15(4). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15042864>
- Tregua, M., D'auria, A., & Costin, H. (2020). #10yearschallenge: How co-creation permeated tourism research. a bibliometric analysis. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 24. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85078885422&partnerID=40&md5=edbd9ce0f8133b17915f0b34fce35389>
- Violano, A., Muzzillo, F., & Hui, D. (2024). Europe vs Hong Kong partnership agreements: reversing trends. *TECHNE*, 28, 60–73. <https://doi.org/10.36253/techne-15913>
- Wardana, S., Handayani, D., & Ilmika, A. (2023). Community participation-based tourism governance in post covid-19 (case study on conservation in borobudur temple). *International Journal of Conservation Science*, 14(4), 1591–1608. <https://doi.org/10.36868/IJCS.2023.04.22>
- Wiryawan, I. W. G., Julianti, L., Permadi, P. L. O., & Abdullah, N. B. (2026). Integrated Spatial Governance for Sustainable Tourism in Bali. *Journal of Sustainable Development and Regulatory Issues*, 4(1), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.53955/jsderi.v4i1.135>
- Wu, H.-C., & Keeney, K. (2025). Advancing a multi-actor model of artist-in-residence practice. *Cultural Trends*, 34(3), 414–430. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2024.2378325>

CITE THIS ARTICLE

Sakir, A.R. Rahanra, I.Y. Waisapy, J. Nikijuluw, R. (2026). "Multi-Actor Approaches in Cultural Governance: A Bibliometric Analysis", CITA HUMANITY: Journal of Social Humanities and Community Development 1(1), 1-18. <https://journal.citacendekia.com/humanity/article/view/19>

This work is licensed under [CC BY-SA 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/). This license enables reusers to distribute, remix, adapt, and build upon the material in any medium or format, so long as attribution is given to the creator.



cita
humanity

Copyright © 2026. The Author(s). Published by CV Cita Cendekia
E-ISSN 0000 0000 P-ISSN 0000 0000