

THE DYNAMICS OF THEORETICAL APPROACHES IN CONTEMPORARY PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION STUDIES: CRITICAL ANALYSIS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

***Nurman¹, Zainal² & Ardiansyah³**

Doctor of Science in Management Program, Universitas Islam Riau, Pekanbaru, Indonesia

Master of Government Science Program, Universitas Islam Riau, Pekanbaru, Indonesia

Master of Law Program, Universitas Islam Riau, Pekanbaru, Indonesia

*Email: nurman07@soc.uir.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Public administration serves as a central pillar in the governance system, responsible for designing, implementing, and evaluating public policies. In the modern context, public administration has undergone significant transformation in response to the ever-evolving dynamics of social, political, economic, and technological developments. Globalization and digitalization, as well as the complexity of public problems, demand a more adaptive, innovative, and evidence-based public administration system. Research methodology plays an important role in determining the validity and reliability of scientific findings in public administration studies. Choosing the right method not only ensures the accuracy of the data collected but also increases the relevance of the analysis in answering research questions. In this context, a qualitative approach with descriptive and exploratory analysis was chosen to understand the concepts, patterns, and dynamics of the evolution of public administration theory in facing contemporary challenges. Critical Analysis of Contemporary Approaches in Public Administration. The evolution of public administration theory has been marked by a series of paradigms, each contributing unique insights into governance and service delivery. The Classical Public Administration (CPA) model, rooted in Max Weber's bureaucratic principles, emphasizes hierarchical organization, rule-based efficiency, and accountability. Impact of Theoretical Approaches on Policy Effectiveness and Governance. The impact of theoretical approaches on policy effectiveness and governance is profound, as these frameworks shape administrative structures, decision-making processes, and citizen engagement. Conclusion this study confirms that theoretical approaches in public administration continue to experience dynamic developments along with social, political, economic, and technological changes.

Keyword: Dynamics of theoretical, Contemporary, Public Administration, Critical Analysis and Policy Implication

PENDAHULUAN

Public administration serves as a central pillar in the governance system, responsible for designing, implementing, and evaluating public policies. In the modern context, public administration has undergone significant transformation in response to the ever-evolving dynamics of social, political, economic, and technological developments. Globalization and digitalization, as well as the complexity of public problems, demand a more adaptive, innovative, and evidence-based public administration system (Wibowo and Kertati 2022); Septiandika et al., 2022). This transformation includes not only changes in structure and process, but also in the way the government interacts with the community and the private sector (Seftyono, 2018). In the classical era, public administration was influenced by the Weberian bureaucratic approach, which emphasized hierarchy and formal rules. However, along

with changes in the needs of society, challenges have emerged to the effectiveness, efficiency, and transparency of governance (Lestari, 2017). New paradigms such as New Public Management (NPM) and New Public Governance (NPG) are beginning to be adopted, emphasizing private sector managerial principles and multi-actor collaboration in policy making (Fryer et al., 2009; Manganti, 2023). NPM, for example, focuses on results and accountability, while NPG emphasizes the importance of public participation in the policy process (Rachman & Marijan, 2021; Desrinelti et al., 2021).

The complexity of social problems, such as climate change and economic inequality, also influences the development of modern policies. A more dynamic and evidence-based approach to public administration is needed to produce inclusive and sustainable policies (Patarai, 2021; Zulfia et al., 2023). In this context, the government can no longer act as the sole actor, but must synergize with the private sector, civil society, and international organizations to create more effective solutions (Vries, 2010). Public participation in the policy process is an important element in a democratic system, allowing people to be involved in decision-making that affects their lives (Sapuan et al., 2024; Mujani & Irvani, 2020).

Advances in information and communication technology (ICT) also play an important role in the transformation of public administration, through the concepts of E-Government and Smart Governance. This technology enables the efficiency of public services and increases public participation in decision-making (Sumarsono et al., 2022; Suryono, 2018). The implementation of technology in public policy not only increases accountability and transparency but also creates governance that is more responsive to the needs of the community (Amalia, 2018). Thus, the study of public administration in the context of modern policy is becoming increasingly relevant to understanding how theoretical approaches can help address the challenges of contemporary governance (Alkhajar et al., 2023). Overall, public administration as a discipline has undergone significant developments, influenced by social, political, and economic changes, as well as demands to increase efficiency and effectiveness in public sector management. Theoretical approaches in public administration continue to evolve, reflecting the need to respond to emerging challenges in a complex global context (Andhika, 2018; Safitri et al., 2021).

The classical approach to public administration, rooted in Max Weber's bureaucratic theory, emphasizes the principles of rationality, hierarchy, formal rules, and specialization in government organizations. Weber argued that bureaucracy is needed to create a stable and professional administrative structure, which is expected to operate without political intervention. However, criticism of this bureaucratic model has arisen because of its rigid and inflexible nature, which often creates red tape or excessive administrative procedures, thus hampering the efficiency of public services (Syam et al., 2021).

This shows that although bureaucracy aims to increase efficiency, in practice, it often hinders it. In response to bureaucratic rigidity, scientific approaches to public administration began to be introduced, including Scientific Management by Frederick Winslow Taylor and the Principles of Administration theory by Henri Fayol. This approach emphasizes the importance of work standards and operational efficiency, as well as a clear division of tasks in public organizations (Aqsa & Nugroho, 2023). However, this approach is still trapped in a technocratic view that pays little attention to social aspects and the needs of a dynamic society (Brandsen & Honingh, 2013).

This suggests that despite efforts to improve efficiency, these approaches often fail to take into account the broader social context. In the mid-20th century, there was a shift towards a more

humanistic approach to public administration, sparked by Elton Mayo's Hawthorne Effect studies. This study showed that social and psychological factors have a significant influence on organizational productivity, which later became the basis for Human Relations Theory (Gurung, 2022). This theory emphasizes the importance of communication, leadership, and motivation in public administration, and suggests that human relations in government organizations are critical to achieving effective administrative goals (Meijer, 2015). Subsequently, the Public Choice theory emerged, popularized by James Buchanan and Gordon Tullock, which argued that individuals in the public sector act based on their self-interest. Therefore, a mechanism is needed to minimize policy distortions caused by the interests of bureaucrats and politicians. The crisis of bureaucratic efficiency in the late 20th century gave rise to New Public Management (NPM) as a new paradigm in public administration. NPM adopts managerial principles from the private sector, such as results orientation, decentralization, and performance-based accountability (Osborne & Radnor, 2016). Although NPM focuses on increasing efficiency and innovation in governance, this approach has also been criticized for tending to prioritize market logic that risks ignoring social and justice aspects in public services (Edelenbos & Meerkerk, 2016). Along with the increasing complexity of public problems, the New Public Governance (NPG) approach has emerged, which emphasizes the involvement of many actors in policy making and public service delivery.

This theory, introduced by Stephen Osborne, emphasizes the importance of collaboration between government, the private sector, civil society, and international organizations in addressing public problems (Osborne, 2006). NPG differs from NPM, because it emphasizes more on networks and the role of government as a facilitator in coordinating various interests, which is considered more relevant in the context of complex modern governance (Osborne, 2010). The development of information and communication technology (ICT) has also brought significant changes in public administration through the concept of Digital Governance. The digitalization of public services enables higher efficiency, greater transparency, and increased public participation in the policy-making process (Dunleavy, 2005). Thus, public administration continues to adapt to changing times and the challenges faced, indicating that a more inclusive and responsive approach to public needs is needed.

The concept of E-Government and Smart Governance has become a major focus in public administration, especially in the context of utilizing information and communication technology (ICT) to improve the quality of public services. E-Government, which integrates big data, artificial intelligence (AI), and blockchain technology, has the potential to create a more responsive and participatory government (Tiika et al., 2024; Islam & Ehsan, 2015; Osei-Kojo, 2016). However, although many countries have adopted this approach, there is a significant research gap regarding its implementation and effectiveness in diverse contexts. One of the main gaps in public administration research is the limited adaptation of theories to changing social and political dynamics. For example, the New Public Management (NPM) approach that is widely applied in developed countries often fails in developing countries due to the lack of adequate institutional reforms (Mutiarin & Misran, 2021; Hammerschmid et al., 2018).

Research shows that although NPM focuses on efficiency and accountability, its application in countries with governance challenges such as corruption and resource constraints is still controversial (Mutiarin & Misran, 2021; Hammerschmid et al., 2018). In addition, the more inclusive New Public Governance (NPG) approach has also not been empirically evaluated in different contexts, making it difficult to measure its effectiveness in increasing public participation (Liu & Yuan, 2015). Another

gap lies in the lack of empirical studies comparing the effectiveness of different theoretical approaches in different contexts. For example, although there is a lot of research on E-Government in developed countries, research exploring barriers to its implementation in developing countries is still rare (Molobela & Uwizeyimana, 2023).

This suggests the need for more in-depth research to understand how social, political, and economic contexts influence the success of E-Government and Smart Governance implementation (Tiika et al., 2024; Islam & Ehsan, 2015; Osei-Kojo, 2016). The challenge of measuring the long-term impact of implementing a particular theory in public administration is also a significant gap. Many studies focus on the short-term results of implementing a particular policy, but its impact on the quality of public services in the long term has not been systematically studied (Jordan & Battaglio, 2013; Iacovino et al., 2015). The Adaptive Governance approach, which emphasizes flexibility in decision-making, also needs to be studied more deeply to understand how it can provide sustainable impact in the face of uncertainties such as climate change or global pandemics (Janssen & Voort, 2016). Finally, the lack of integration between theory and technological innovation in the implementation of public policy is also a concern.

The theory of bureaucratic accountability that emphasizes hierarchical control still needs to be adjusted to the concept of algorithmic governance, where decision-making is increasingly influenced by AI and big data analysis (Kalalo et al., 2024). Further research is needed to understand how theoretical approaches can adapt to technological developments without neglecting the basic principles of good governance, such as accountability, transparency, and public participation (Osei-Kojo, 2016; Janssen & Voort, 2016). Overall, despite the progress in the implementation of E-Government and Smart Governance, the existing research gaps indicate the need for further exploration of the implementation and effectiveness of theoretical approaches in public administration. This study aims to identify and examine the evolution of theoretical approaches, analyze the effectiveness of their implementation, and identify factors that influence the success or failure of the implementation of public administration theories.

RESEARCH METHODS

Research methodology plays an important role in determining the validity and reliability of scientific findings in public administration studies. Choosing the right method not only ensures the accuracy of the data collected but also increases the relevance of the analysis in answering research questions. In this context, a qualitative approach with descriptive and exploratory analysis was chosen to understand the concepts, patterns, and dynamics of the evolution of public administration theory in facing contemporary challenges (Supriyadi, 2021; Haryani & Puryatama, 2020). This approach allows researchers to explore complex phenomena and understand how public administration theory develops and is applied in various policy contexts (Zulkenedi et al., 2023). Although the qualitative approach is the main method, this study also adopts mixed-methods elements to enrich the analysis. The use of secondary quantitative data supports the interpretation of qualitative findings, thus providing a more holistic understanding of the development of public administration theory (Aryanti & Prasajo, 2021; Edward et al., 2024). The methods used in this study include systematic literature analysis to examine the development of public administration theory, case studies to see the application of theory in the context of certain public policies, and secondary data analysis from various relevant sources (Kurniawati et al., 2023; Herizal et al., 2020). In terms of data sources, this study utilizes a

combination of primary and secondary data. Primary data were obtained through in-depth interviews with academics, policy makers, and public administration practitioners, as well as focus group discussions to explore perspectives from various stakeholders (Ramayanti et al., 2022; Nurlelah et al., 2023). Secondary data include literature reviews of scientific journals, academic books, policy reports, and government documents, as well as case studies from various countries to understand variations in the application of public administration theory (Ponto et al., 2024; Tenrisau, 2021). The triangulation approach was used to ensure the validity and reliability of the data by comparing the results of interviews, document studies, and findings from academic literature (Sutangsa, 2024; Zulkenedi et al., 2023).

The data analysis techniques used in this study include thematic analysis for qualitative data and quantitative descriptive analysis for secondary data. Thematic analysis helps in identifying patterns in interview data and policy documents, while quantitative descriptive analysis provides context to the qualitative findings by measuring historical trends in public administration reform (Aneta et al., 2022; Siregar et al., 2023). Comparative case analysis was also applied to identify patterns of success or challenges in the implementation of public administration theory, considering factors such as governance models and levels of decentralization (Tambotoh & Gaol, 2023; Mahardika & Rizki, 2021). By combining various analytical methods, this study ensures that the interpretation of the findings is based on strong and credible evidence (Setyaningsih, 2022; Septiandika & Aderovi, 2022).

DISCUSSION

Critical Analysis of Contemporary Approaches in Public Administration

The evolution of public administration theory has been marked by a series of paradigms, each contributing unique insights into governance and service delivery. The Classical Public Administration (CPA) model, rooted in Max Weber's bureaucratic principles, emphasizes hierarchical organization, rule-based efficiency, and accountability. This model has historically provided stability and predictability in public administration, ensuring uniformity in service delivery through standardized procedures (Christensen, 2019). However, its rigidity often leads to inefficiencies, particularly in dynamic environments where adaptability is crucial (Mykolaichuk et al., 2024). The bureaucratic emphasis on control can result in excessive red tape, slow decision-making, and a lack of innovation, which are significant drawbacks in addressing contemporary governance challenges (Shon & You, 2020). In response to the limitations of CPA, New Public Management (NPM) emerged, advocating for market-oriented reforms, privatization, and performance measurement (Bergström & Styhre, 2021).

NPM has introduced efficiency-driven practices, such as outsourcing public services, which have been credited with reducing operational costs and enhancing service quality in various contexts, including the UK (Bhuiyan & Perry, 2023). Nevertheless, NPM's focus on efficiency can undermine public accountability and social equity, as market-driven approaches may prioritize profitability over accessibility for marginalized populations (Shon & You, 2020). Furthermore, an over-reliance on performance indicators can lead to short-termism, neglecting broader societal outcomes and long-term policy effectiveness (Bäck et al., 2016). The advent of New Public Governance (NPG) and Collaborative Governance represents a shift towards recognizing the complexity of modern governance challenges. NPG emphasizes the importance of governance networks, stakeholder participation, and co-

production of public services, acknowledging that effective policy solutions often require collaboration among diverse actors, including government, civil society, and the private sector (Kusumasari et al., 2023). For instance, the European Union's climate change governance framework exemplifies how multi-stakeholder engagement can enhance policy legitimacy and effectiveness (Farazmand & Balilaj, 2015). However, the coordination of diverse actors presents challenges, including resource demands and potential power imbalances that may hinder inclusive governance (Kukovič & Justinek, 2020).

Collaborative Governance extends the principles of NPG by fostering inter-organizational partnerships and deliberative decision-making, particularly in addressing complex policy issues such as environmental sustainability. The co-management of fisheries in Norway illustrates the potential of collaborative approaches to improve resource management outcomes. Yet, challenges related to trust-building, conflict resolution, and the need for long-term commitment can impede the effectiveness of collaborative governance initiatives. The success of these approaches often hinges on institutional capacity and the ability to navigate the complexities of stakeholder dynamics. The impact of these theoretical approaches on policy effectiveness is profound. CPA ensures consistency and rule-based governance but lacks the flexibility needed in rapidly changing environments. NPM enhances efficiency but risks compromising equity and accountability.

In contrast, NPG and Collaborative Governance promote inclusivity and responsiveness, yet their success is contingent upon effective coordination and institutional support. Empirical evidence suggests that hybrid approaches, which integrate elements from various models, can yield improved policy outcomes. For example, Singapore's public administration combines CPA's bureaucratic discipline with NPM's efficiency and NPG's collaborative principles, resulting in a balanced governance framework that enhances stability and responsiveness. In examining case studies, the U.S. healthcare system serves as a compelling illustration of the contrasting impacts of NPM and Collaborative Governance. The Affordable Care Act (ACA) implemented market-based reforms aimed at increasing competition and efficiency; however, challenges related to affordability and access persist, particularly for low-income populations.

Conversely, state-level collaborative governance initiatives, such as community health partnerships, have demonstrated improved service coordination and health outcomes, highlighting the potential benefits of collaborative approaches in public administration. In conclusion, the landscape of public administration is characterized by a rich tapestry of theoretical approaches, each with its strengths and limitations. While traditional models like CPA and NPM have contributed to the efficiency and stability of public services, contemporary frameworks such as NPG and Collaborative Governance offer pathways to more inclusive and adaptive governance. The integration of these approaches may hold the key to addressing the complex challenges faced by public administration today.

Impact of Theoretical Approaches on Policy Effectiveness and Governance

The impact of theoretical approaches on policy effectiveness and governance is profound, as these frameworks shape administrative structures, decision-making processes, and citizen engagement. Classical Public Administration (CPA) emphasizes rule-based governance and policy consistency, which can be beneficial in stable environments but may lack the flexibility required in dynamic contexts (Yekimov & Nianko, 2021). In contrast, New Public Management (NPM) focuses on enhancing service

efficiency and cost-effectiveness, yet it often risks undermining public accountability and social equity (Edelenbos et al., 2016). New Public Governance (NPG) and Collaborative Governance advocate for inclusive and participatory governance, but their success is contingent upon the institutional capacity and coordination mechanisms in place (Rumman & Szilágyi, 2018).

Empirical studies indicate that hybrid approaches, which integrate elements from various models, can lead to improved policy effectiveness. For instance, the Singaporean government exemplifies this by combining CPA's bureaucratic discipline with NPM's efficiency-driven reforms, while also incorporating NPG principles in urban planning (Kamugumya & Olivier, 2016). This balanced approach fosters stability, efficiency, and responsiveness in public administration, demonstrating the value of integrating diverse theoretical frameworks to address complex governance challenges. The U.S. healthcare system serves as a pertinent case study illustrating the contrasting impacts of NPM and Collaborative Governance. The Affordable Care Act (ACA) implemented market-based reforms aimed at increasing competition and efficiency in healthcare provision; however, challenges related to affordability and accessibility persist, particularly for low-income populations (Kadhun & Hamad, 2023).

Conversely, state-level collaborative governance initiatives, such as community health partnerships, have shown promise in enhancing service coordination and improving health outcomes (Khan et al., 2022). This highlights the necessity of considering the context and specific needs of the population when selecting governance models. In the Netherlands, the public transport system showcases the effectiveness of NPG principles. The government collaborates with municipalities, private operators, and citizen groups to develop sustainable transport policies, resulting in an integrated transport network that balances efficiency, accessibility, and environmental sustainability (Riaz et al., 2020).

However, challenges in aligning stakeholder interests and ensuring financial sustainability remain critical issues that need to be addressed to maintain the effectiveness of such collaborative governance models. The evolution of public administration theories provides policymakers with a variety of frameworks for governance and service delivery. Each approach—ranging from CPA to NPM, NPG, and Collaborative Governance—offers distinct advantages and limitations. Policymakers must carefully assess which model aligns best with their governance context, institutional capacity, and public service objectives. The increasing complexity of societal challenges, coupled with rapid technological advancements, necessitates an adaptive and evidence-based approach to public administration (Batubara et al., 2019).

Contextual adaptation and institutional readiness are crucial for the successful implementation of public administration approaches. For example, CPA may be more suitable in bureaucratic settings where rule-based governance is essential, while NPM is often more applicable in environments seeking efficiency-driven reforms (Purwanto et al., 2018). In decentralized governance structures, NPG and Collaborative Governance provide the flexibility and inclusivity needed to engage multiple stakeholders in decision-making processes (Sibanda et al., 2024). Balancing efficiency, equity, and accountability is another critical consideration. While NPM enhances efficiency through market-driven mechanisms, it may compromise equity and public accountability. Policymakers must ensure that efficiency measures do not marginalize disadvantaged communities or reduce access to essential public services.

Hybrid governance models that integrate elements of CPA, NPM, and NPG may offer a balanced approach that optimizes service delivery while maintaining accountability and inclusivity. Strengthening collaborative governance is essential for addressing complex policy challenges such as climate change and public health crises. Multi-actor governance frameworks that facilitate collaborative decision-making are increasingly necessary. For instance, during the COVID-19 pandemic, governments worldwide adopted collaborative governance models that engaged various stakeholders to ensure effective crisis responses. This underscores the importance of developing institutional mechanisms that support collaboration and resource-sharing across sectors.

In conclusion, the interplay of different theoretical approaches significantly influences policy effectiveness and governance. Policymakers must navigate the complexities of these frameworks, considering contextual factors, administrative capacity, and governance objectives to optimize public administration systems. The future of public administration will likely be shaped by the integration of digital technologies, collaborative governance, and innovative financing models, ensuring that governance remains responsive to the needs of citizens and the challenges of an evolving society.

CONCLUSION

This study confirms that theoretical approaches in public administration continue to experience dynamic developments along with social, political, economic, and technological changes. The evolution of public administration theory, which was initially rooted in the rigid and hierarchical Weberian bureaucratic model, has undergone a transformation towards more flexible, collaborative, and technology-based governance. This shift is driven by various factors, including the increasing complexity of public policy, demands for transparency and accountability, and rapid advances in digital technology that enable efficiency and innovation in government administration.

In the modern context, the public administration approach no longer only focuses on strict bureaucratic structures, but also on managerial aspects, evidence-based policies, and community participation in the decision-making process. More responsive and inclusive governance models, such as New Public Management (NPM), New Public Governance (NPG), and technology-based approaches such as E-Government and Smart Governance, are becoming increasingly relevant in responding to the challenges of contemporary public administration. Thus, public administration theory must continue to develop and adapt in order to remain relevant in facing the dynamics of the times.

This research provides significant contributions to various parties, including academics, policy makers, and practitioners in the field of public administration. For academics, this research enriches the literature related to the evolution of public administration theory and provides a new perspective in understanding the dynamics of governance. For policy makers, the findings of this research can be a basis for formulating more effective, adaptive, and community-based public policies. Meanwhile, for practitioners, this research can be a reference in developing more innovative and results-oriented policy implementation strategies.

Although this research has limitations, especially in empirical scope and the possibility of variations in the implementation of theory in various government contexts, opportunities for further research are still wide open. Several aspects that can be explored in future studies include the integration of technology in public administration, the role of artificial intelligence in policy decision-making, local

wisdom-based approaches in governance, and comparative studies on the implementation of various public administration theories in countries with different political and administrative systems.

With the increasingly in-depth study of public administration, it is hoped that governance policies and practices can be increasingly optimal in responding to global challenges in this digital era. Effective, inclusive, and sustainable public administration will be the key to creating a more transparent, accountable government that is able to provide quality public services to the community. Therefore, research in this field needs to be continuously developed so that public administration theory and practice can continue to innovate and adapt to the needs of the times.

REFERENCE

- Wibowo, Agusta Ari, and Indra Kertati. 2022. "Reformasi Birokrasi Dan Pelayanan Publik." *Public Service and Governance Journal*.
- Septiandika, V., Suchyo, I., Rahmadi, A., & Fitria, N. (2022). Seminar dan pelatihan pada mahasiswa terkait identifikasi isu kebijakan dan penyusunan policy brief. *Jurnal Cemerlang Pengabdian Pada Masyarakat*, 5(1), 153-162. <https://doi.org/10.31540/jpm.v5i1.1891>
- Seftyono, C. (2018). Politik kebijakan publik: pengantar untuk mahasiswa dan peneliti pemula (draft).. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/qy6ns>
- Lestari, L. (2017). Civil society organizations di aras lokal. *Jurnal Trias Politika*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.33373/jtp.v1i2.1059>
- Fryer, K., Antony, J., & Ogden, S. (2009). Performance management in the public sector. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 22(6), 478-498. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513550910982850>
- Manganti, G. (2023). Analisis partisipasi masyarakat dalam pelaksanaan kebijakan publik. *DeCive*, 3(11). <https://doi.org/10.56393/decive.v3i11.2053>
- Rachman, R. and Marijan, K. (2021). Kebijakan pemanfaatan media sosial dinas perpustakaan & kearsipan surabaya. *Inovasi*, 18(1), 103-111. <https://doi.org/10.33626/inovasi.v18i1.280>
- Desrinelti, D., Afifah, M., & Gistituati, N. (2021). Kebijakan publik: konsep pelaksanaan. *Jrti (Jurnal Riset Tindakan Indonesia)*, 6(1), 83. <https://doi.org/10.29210/3003906000>
- Patarai, M. (2021). Desentralisasi kebijakan dalam otonomi daerah. *Jurnal Sosial Teknologi*, 1(11), 1406-1417. <https://doi.org/10.59188/jurnalsostech.v1i11.237>
- Zulfia, I., Endrawan, G., Rosika, C., Syamsi, S., & Frinaldi, A. (2023). Implementasi kebijakan inovasi daerah dalam peningkatan kinerja organisasi. *Kebijakan Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi*, (Vol. 14 No. 2, Juni 2023). <https://doi.org/10.23969/kebijakan.v14i2.6666>
- Vries, J. (2010). Is new public management really dead?. *Oecd Journal on Budgeting*, 10(1), 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1787/budget-10-5km8xx3mp60n>
- Sapuan, M. and Aras, M. (2024). Implementasi kebijakan publik program percepatan infrastruktur kelurahan (pik). *Jurnal Pengabdian Ibnu Sina*, 3(2), 153-162. <https://doi.org/10.36352/j-pis.v3i2.862>

- Mujani, S. and Irvani, D. (2020). Sikap dan perilaku warga terhadap kebijakan penanganan wabah covid-19. *Politika Jurnal Ilmu Politik*, 11(2), 219-238. <https://doi.org/10.14710/politika.11.2.2020.219-238>
- Sumarsono, C., Muchsin, S., & Sunariyanto, S. (2022). Analisis model implementasi kebijakan publik pada pemerintah desa di kecamatan dau kabupaten malang. *Publisia Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Publik*, 7(2), 228-249. <https://doi.org/10.26905/pjiap.v7i2.8344>
- Suryono, A. (2018). Kebijakan publik untuk kesejahteraan rakyat. *Transparansi Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Administrasi*, 6(2), 98-102. <https://doi.org/10.31334/trans.v6i2.33>
- Amalia, S. (2018). Pemimpin baru dan tantangan peningkatan kualitas kebijakan publik. *Jurnal Wacana Kinerja Kajian Praktis-Akademis Kinerja Dan Administrasi Pelayanan Publik*, 21(1). <https://doi.org/10.31845/jwk.v21i1.131>
- Alkhajar, E., Monalisa, M., Sari, S., & Luthfia, A. (2023). Dunia digital dan kebijakan publik: urgensi imunitas publik terhadap hoaks.. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/evjax>
- Andhika, L. (2018). Meningkatkan kepercayaan publik terhadap pemerintah melalui redesain proses kebijakan. *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan Kajian Ilmu Pemerintahan Dan Politik Daerah*, 3(1), 24-42. <https://doi.org/10.24905/jip.3.1.2018.2442>
- Safitri, U., Nuarizal, A., & Gistituati, N. (2021). Urgensi analisis kebijakan. *Jrti (Jurnal Riset Tindakan Indonesia)*, 6(1), 72. <https://doi.org/10.29210/3003818000>
- Aqsa, Q. and Nugroho, B. (2023). A literature review: cross-sector collaboration arrangements to deliver public services and goods. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, 40, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v40i1.8342>
- Brandsen, T. and Honingh, M. (2013). Professionals and shifts in governance. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 36(12), 876-883. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2013.798809>
- Dunleavy, P. (2005). New public management is dead-long live digital-era governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16(3), 467-494. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mui057>
- Edelenbos, J. and Meerkerk, I. (2016). Introduction: three reflecting perspectives on interactive governance.. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781783479078.00006>
- Gurung, R. (2022). Pedagogical implications of ghāṭu folk dance in efl classes. *Journal of Nelta Gandaki*, 5(1-2), 87-98. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jong.v5i1-2.49283>
- Meijer, A. (2015). E-governance innovation: barriers and strategies. *Government Information Quarterly*, 32(2), 198-206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2015.01.001>
- Osborne, S. (2006). The new public governance?1. *Public Management Review*, 8(3), 377-387. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719030600853022>
- Osborne, S. (2010). The new public governance?.. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203861684>
- Osborne, S. and Radnor, Z. (2016). The new public governance and innovation in public services., 54-70. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781316105337.003>

- Syam, H., Gani, H., Akib, H., Mukmin, A., & Bare, R. (2021). Public entrepreneurship.. <https://doi.org/10.2991/aebmr.k.210928.112>
- Hammerschmid, G., Walle, S., Andrews, R., & Mostafa, A. (2018). New public management reforms in europe and their effects: findings from a 20-country top executive survey. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 85(3), 399-418. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852317751632>
- Iacovino, N., Barsanti, S., & Cinquini, L. (2015). Public organizations between old public administration, new public management and public governance: the case of the tuscany region. *Public Organization Review*, 17(1), 61-82. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-015-0327-x>
- Islam, M. and Ehsan, M. (2015). E-governance as a paradigm shift in public administration., 103-117. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-4666-8358-7.ch005>
- Janssen, M. and Voort, H. (2016). Adaptive governance: towards a stable, accountable and responsive government. *Government Information Quarterly*, 33(1), 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2016.02.003>
- Jordan, T. and Battaglio, R. (2013). Are we there yet? the state of public human resource management research. *Public Personnel Management*, 43(1), 25-57. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026013511064>
- Kalalo, E., Putri, I., Mariana, L., & Arifin, A. (2024). The influence of public administration science paradigm shift in its realization good governance. *Jurnal Inovasi Ilmu Sosial Dan Politik (Jisop)*, 5(2), 171-178. <https://doi.org/10.33474/jisop.v5i2.20185>
- Liu, S. and Yuan, Q. (2015). The evolution of information and communication technology in public administration. *Public Administration and Development*, 35(2), 140-151. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.1717>
- Molobela, T. and Uwizeyimana, D. (2023). E-governance as a new public administration paradigm: a rhetoric or reality?. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science* (2147-4478), 12(8), 348-356. <https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v12i8.2931>
- Mutiarin, D. and Misran, M. (2021). New public management new public comparison meta-analysis developed and developing country policies. *Journal of Government and Civil Society*, 5(2), 146. <https://doi.org/10.31000/jgcs.v5i2.3969>
- Osei-Kojo, A. (2016). E-government and public service quality in ghana. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 17(3). <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.1620>
- Tiika, B., Tang, Z., Azaare, J., Dagadu, J., & Otoo, S. (2024). Evaluating e-government development among africa union member states: an analysis of the impact of e-government on public administration and governance in ghana. *Sustainability*, 16(3), 1333. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16031333>
- Aneta, A., Aneta, Y., & Djafri, N. (2022). Pengembangan manajemen berbasis pelayanan administrasi publik pada tingkat pendidikan anak usia dini. *Jurnal Obsesi Jurnal Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini*, 6(4), 3669-3679. <https://doi.org/10.31004/obsesi.v6i4.2478>

- Aryanti, D. and Prasojo, E. (2021). Manajemen pengetahuan pada sektor publik: sebuah tinjauan literatur sistematis 2010-2021. *Jurnal Academia Praja*, 4(2), 333-357. <https://doi.org/10.36859/jap.v4i2.445>
- Edward, A., Adnan, M., & Khaidir, A. (2024). New public manajemen: studi kasus penerapan new public manajemen dalam organisasi publik di indonesia. *future*, 2(2), 54-62. <https://doi.org/10.61579/future.v2i2.97>
- Haryani, T. and Puryatama, A. (2020). Pelayanan prima melalui penyelenggaraan mal pelayanan publik di indonesia. *Kybernan Jurnal Studi Kepemerintahan*, 3(1), 40-54. <https://doi.org/10.35326/kybernan.v1i1.580>
- Herizal, H., Mukhrijal, M., & Wance, M. (2020). Pendekatan akuntabilitas pelayanan publik dalam mengikuti perubahan paradigma baru administrasi publik. *Journal of Governance and Social Policy*, 1(1), 24-34. <https://doi.org/10.24815/gaspol.v1i1.17327>
- Kurniawati, R., Lubis, A., Indrayana, S., Kurniawan, B., & Rahmawati, D. (2023). Rekonstruksi penelitian hukum administrasi negara melalui pendekatan bibliometrik: sebuah tinjauan komprehensif tentang perkembangan dan kontribusi literatur. *Sanskara Hukum Dan Ham*, 2(01), 20-29. <https://doi.org/10.58812/shh.v2i01.244>
- Mahardika, A. and Rizki, R. (2021). Analisis implementasi kebijakan penataan pasar tradisional dan toko modern di kota medan. *Jurnal Indonesia Sosial Sains*, 2(10), 1647-1654. <https://doi.org/10.36418/jiss.v2i10.431>
- Nurlelah, E., Hasan, F., & Situmorang, Y. (2023). Perancangan sistem informasi pelayanan administrasi terpadu satu pintu berbasis web. *Jurnal Teknik Komputer*, 9(1), 16-25. <https://doi.org/10.31294/jtk.v9i1.13970>
- Ponto, I., Patty, J., & Sakir, A. (2024). Upaya pencegahan patologi birokrasi melalui penerapan good government untuk menciptakan birokrasi yang efisien. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Administrasi*, 14(2), 112-124. <https://doi.org/10.33592/jiia.v14i2.4952>
- Ramayanti, F. and Yuliani, F. (2022). Efektivitas dinas kependudukan dan pencatatan sipil kabupaten kuantan singingi dalam memberi pelayanan publik pada masa pandemi covid-19. *Jurnal Niara*, 15(2), 235-251. <https://doi.org/10.31849/niara.v15i2.8887>
- Septiandika, V. and Aderovi, M. (2022). Efektivitas layanan cepat administrasi kecamatan guna mendorong lahirnya good governance. *Populika*, 10(2), 33-41. <https://doi.org/10.37631/populika.v10i2.507>
- Setyaningsih, G. (2022). Perancangan aplikasi e-surat berbasis mobile pada pemerintahan desa kedunggede kecamatan lumbir. *Jatasi (Jurnal Teknik Informatika Dan Sistem Informasi)*, 9(2), 1430-1448. <https://doi.org/10.35957/jatasi.v9i2.2128>
- Siregar, D., Simanjorang, E., & Prayoga, Y. (2023). Penyelenggaraan administrasi dalam mendukung good goverance. *Munaddhomah Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 3(4), 398-405. <https://doi.org/10.31538/munaddhomah.v3i4.307>
- Supriyadi, E. (2021). Pergeseran dalam paradigma ilmu administrasi publik. *Jurnal Rasi*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.52496/rasi.v3i1.117>

- Sutangsa, S. (2024). Peran aparat administrasi publik dalam pencegahan korupsi: suatu analisis perspektif. *The World of Public Administration Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.37950/wpaj.v5i2.1888>
- Tambotoh, J. and Gaol, F. (2023). Pemantauan berkelanjutan menggunakan process mining pada layanan publik digital.. <https://doi.org/10.55981/brin.668.c539>
- Tenrisau, A. (2021). Landasan pengelolaan pertanahan dalam sistem penataan agraria berkelanjutan. *Jurnal Pertanahan*, 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.53686/jp.v11i2.109>
- Zulkenedi, Z., Frinaldi, A., & Magriasti, L. (2023). Desentralisasi administratif untuk mewujudkan pelayanan publik dan tata kelola pemerintahan yang baik. *Syntax Literate Jurnal Ilmiah Indonesia*, 8(6), 4326-4333. <https://doi.org/10.36418/syntax-literate.v8i6.12595>
- Bergström, O. and Styhre, A. (2021). It takes change to remain the same: the transformation of swedish government policy making in economic crises and the involvement of social partners. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 43(4), 1564-1587. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831x211020801>
- Bhuiyan, S. and Perry, J. (2023). Building global public administration knowledge: leveraging the power of collaboration. *Public Administration Review*, 84(3), 426-431. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13768>
- Bäck, H., Müller, W., & Nyblade, B. (2016). Multiparty government and economic policy-making. *Public Choice*, 170(1-2), 33-62. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11127-016-0373-0>
- Christensen, T. (2019). Organization theory and public administration.. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.1439>
- Farazmand, A. and Balilaj, A. (2015). Does asia have a unique theory of public administration for all seasons? an exploratory essay. *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration*, 37(3), 143-160. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23276665.2015.1087088>
- Kukovič, S. and Justinek, G. (2020). Modernisation trends in public administration in slovenia. *Hrvatska I Komparativna Javna Uprava*, 20(4), 623-647. <https://doi.org/10.31297/hkju.20.4.2>
- Kusumasari, B., Sajida, S., Santoso, A., & Fauzi, F. (2023). The reinventing of public administration in the new hybrid world. *Teaching Public Administration*, 42(2), 206-229. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01447394231191927>
- Mykolaichuk, M., Shpektorenko, I., Pershko, L., Pasichnyi, R., Blishchuk, K., & Dzvinchuk, D. (2024). Innovative competences in public administration: the key to sustainable development, increasing financial efficiency and ensuring national security. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*, 8(6), 1334-1343. <https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v8i6.2250>
- Shon, C. and You, M. (2020). Evaluation of health policy governance in the introduction of the new drg-based hospital payment system from interviews with policy elites in south korea. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(11), 3757. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17113757>
- Batubara, F., Ubacht, J., & Janssen, M. (2019). Unraveling transparency and accountability in blockchain., 204-213. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3325112.3325262>

- Edelenbos, J., Meerkerk, I., & Schenk, T. (2016). The evolution of community self-organization in interaction with government institutions: cross-case insights from three countries. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 48(1), 52-66. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074016651142>
- Kadhun, O. and Hamad, A. (2023). Performance evaluation of multi-organization e-government based on hyperledger fabric blockchain platform. *Ingénierie Des Systèmes D Information*, 28(2), 499-507. <https://doi.org/10.18280/isi.280227>
- Kamugumya, D. and Olivier, J. (2016). Health system's barriers hindering implementation of public-private partnership at the district level: a case study of partnership for improved reproductive and child health services provision in tanzania. *BMC Health Services Research*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-016-1831-6>
- Khan, S., Shael, M., Majdalawieh, M., Nizamuddin, N., & Nicho, M. (2022). Blockchain for governments: the case of the dubai government. *Sustainability*, 14(11), 6576. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14116576>
- Purwanto, A., Zuiderwijk, A., & Janssen, M. (2018). Group development stages in open government data engagement initiatives: a comparative case studies analysis., 48-59. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-98690-6_5
- Riaz, B., Ali, L., Ahmad, S., Islam, M., Ahmed, K., & Hossain, S. (2020). Community clinics in bangladesh: a unique example of public-private partnership. *Heliyon*, 6(5), e03950. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e03950>
- Rumman, N. and Szilágyi, R. (2018). Overview of the electronic public services in agriculture in jordan. *Journal of Agricultural Informatics*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.17700/jai.2018.9.2.433>
- Sibanda, B., Basheka, B., & Romburgh, J. (2024). Enhancing governance through blockchain technology in the south african public sector. *Africa's Public Service Delivery and Performance Review*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.4102/apsdpr.v12i1.734>
- Yekimov, S. and Nianko, V. (2021). Using public-private partnerships to improve the efficiency of housing and communal services. *E3s Web of Conferences*, 281, 08010. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202128108010>