

Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi

Media Pengembangan Ilmu dan Praktek Administrasi
 Volume 22 | Number 2 | December 2025

Vol. 22 No.2
 pp 257-269 © 2025
 ISSN 1829 - 8974
 e-ISSN 2614-2597

PREPARING INDONESIA'S FUTURE GOVERNANCE LEADERS: REVIEWING NEW HORIZONS FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION EDUCATION

¹ Mujibur Rahman Khairul Muluk, ² Sajida

¹Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Administrative Science, Universitas Brawijaya; Indonesia

²Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia

¹mrkhairulmuluk@ub.ac.id, ² sajida@staff.uns.ac.id

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article history :

Submit:

25-06-2025

First Revision:

24-12-2025

Accepted:

24-12-2025

ABSTRACT

This research examines the future trajectories of public administration science in Indonesia, considering the evolving demands of governance and problems in pedagogy. This analysis is primarily based on an extensive literature review that examines how various trends from both global and national contexts, including digitalization, interdisciplinary shifts, and value pluralism, influence curricula, leadership preparation, and research expectations. Identified are enduring deficiencies in institutional capacity, advancements in teaching, and methodological diversity. The report asserts that public administration education requires reconfiguration to transcend bureaucratic training and focus on ethical leadership, systems thinking, and local governance literacy. The document serves as a conceptual instrument for realigning public administration initiatives to the evolving difficulties of governance and preparing a new cohort of public leaders for dynamic, value-driven, and adaptive public service.

Keywords:

Public Administration;
Curriculum Reform;
Pedagogical Innovation;
Indonesia; Future-
 Oriented Education

© The Author(s)



This work is licensed under a
 Creative Commons Attribution-
 NonCommercial- ShareAlike 4.0
 International License.

A. INTRODUCTION

Public administration education in Indonesia is currently at a critical turning point, shaped by increasing governance complexity and changing societal expectations of public leadership. Increasingly, public leaders are expected to be not only technically sound but also ethically conscious, strategically adaptive, and globally literate. At the same time, Indonesia's higher education system is undergoing fundamental changes, including curriculum realignment, pedagogical renewal, and stronger accountability through specialized accreditation mechanisms. Notable changes include the recent shift from the centralized National Accreditation Board for Higher Education (BAN-PT) to the domain-specific accreditation body, Independent Accreditation Institution for Social, Political, Administrative and Communication Sciences (LAMSPAK). In fact, this acknowledges that public administration programs require evaluative frameworks specific to the discipline rather than solely generic institution audits.



The problems underlying public administration education go far beyond the question of accreditation. If at all, the historical attempts at curriculum reform in Indonesian public administration education have struggled to catch up fully with the ever-changing demands of public service practice (Holzhacker et al. 2015; Muhtada 2017). When implemented for enhanced responsiveness and autonomy, the decentralization policy with varied outcomes provided opportunities for the other regions to move forward in these aspects. Differences in institutional capacity, quality of instruction, and resource availability have prevented the proper implementation of competency-based curricula in one region compared to another (Dewi 2021). In addition, the PA programs are also criticized for having an excessively normative content, little methodological diversity, and the insufficient integration of current issues such as climate governance, digital transformation, and participatory policymaking.

Global transformations have become increasingly relevant for public administration education reform in Indonesia. International developments such as growing interdependence, digital governance, and the expanding influence of artificial intelligence have reshaped public administration practices worldwide (Puppim de Oliveira et al., 2015; Shestakova et al., 2023). Educational innovations are needed that would make output graduates have capabilities beyond the usual boundary. Globally oriented, inter-disciplined approaches, for example, problem-based learning and dual vocational education, attract huge attention for bridging academic training with real-world governance scenarios (Ricciucci, 2018). However, in Indonesia, at a very early stage, these are still not very widely or thoroughly implemented, being confined mostly to a few leading universities or specialized programs.

Running parallel to e-government reforms in Indonesia are the varied levels of digital readiness among public agencies, which hinder reform processes. National policy initiatives geared toward the e-government and digital innovation spheres frequently do not yield desirable outcomes during implementation due to inadequate sociodigital infrastructure and human capital (Sihombing & Lumbantobing, 2024). Their presence evokes an epistemological gap, which calls for public administration courses that foster critical thinking about digital ethics, data governance, and integration of technologies.

Such reform ought to encompass all dimensions of curriculum renewal, pedagogical innovation, and leadership development; there is great potential in developing curricula that integrate new governance concepts such as anticipatory leadership, behavioral governance, and systems thinking, which would transcend the traditional impacts of disciplinary divisions. Pedagogies must adopt interactive practice-oriented strategies such as simulation exercises, role-play engagements, and community involvement, which are a departure from traditional lecture-based formats (Kutergina, 2017; Bharath, 2021). Similarly, in doing so, leadership formation ought to be woven into the undergraduate teaching tapestry as an all-important element rather than a side issue, with ethical reasoning, strategic skill, and emotional intelligence being emphasized from the very heart of the educational experience (Kuchinke, 2017; van der Wal, 2020).

Moreover, institutions must reorient their quality assurance practices away from purely compliance-driven accreditation processes toward proactive, continuous quality enhancement that emphasizes reflective academic cultures and responsiveness to societal needs. Lastly, addressing the intersection between local and global values remains imperative. Public administration education in Indonesia must reconcile local cultural contexts characterized by collectivist and culturally nuanced governance norms with the global administrative values of efficiency, transparency, and accountability (de Graaf & van der Wal, 2017; Klingner, 2014). Navigating this intersection requires educators and institutions to adopt comparative, reflexive pedagogies that enable graduates to appreciate diverse governance paradigms critically and constructively.

In responding to these interconnected challenges, this paper addresses four central research questions: First, what global and national trends shape contemporary public administration science? Second, what internal disciplinary and institutional challenges does the field face in maintaining relevance and rigor? Third, which strategic responses encompassing academic collaboration, methodological innovation, and institutional reform are currently being adopted to strengthen public administration education? Lastly, how do evolving local-global values and pedagogical innovations reshape the educational mission of public administration programs? Through critical synthesis and conceptual reflection, this study aims to provide a coherent roadmap toward a future-proof, responsive, and contextually informed approach to public administration education in Indonesia.

B. METHOD

In this study, the authors employ a narrative literature review approach to examine the dynamics shaping public administration science at both global and national levels, with specific attention to disciplinary challenges, strategic reform orientations, and pedagogical implications. This study follows a narrative literature review approach as outlined by Thi and Bui (2021). The review is guided by four research questions focusing on : (1) What are the major global and national trends affecting the development of public administration science today? (2) What major challenges and internal limitations are confronting public administration in seeking to remain relevant and rigorous? (3) What strategic responses, including academic collaboration, methodological innovation, and institutional reform, are being adopted or proposed to bolster public administration education and research? and (4) How are both local and global values, as well as pedagogical transformations, determining the future direction of public administration education? Consistent with these objectives, the review prioritizes conceptual interpretation and thematic synthesis of scholarly work relevant to public administration education and governance. The literature search was conducted primarily using the Scopus database, complemented by Google Scholar to capture additional contextually relevant publications. A concept-based search strategy was applied using the following search string: TITLE-ABS-KEY ("public administration" AND education OR pedagog*).

This initial search yielded 3,259 records. To enhance relevance and academic rigor, the results were subsequently refined through a series of filters, including: (1) English-language publications, (2) journal sources only, (3) final-stage publications, (4) article-type documents, and (5) records indexed under the exact keyword "Public Administration." Following this refinement process, 486 journal articles constituted the core literature pool for analytical consideration. From this corpus, sources were selected based on their substantive relevance to the four analytical dimensions underpinning the study. Priority was given to peer-reviewed journal articles published between 2010 and 2024, while seminal works published earlier were included selectively to support conceptual grounding. The selection process was iterative and informed by the extent to which each source contributed to clarifying trends, challenges, strategic responses, or pedagogical shifts in public administration education. The reviewed literature was examined through focused analytical reading oriented toward answering the research questions, prioritizing interpretive synthesis and cross-study reasoning over formal coding techniques. As emphasized in the narrative literature review tradition, this approach allows researchers to actively engage with diverse bodies of scholarship, surface contradictions, and construct integrative insights that extend beyond mere summarization (Juntunen & Lehenkari, 2021). This approach enables the integration of diverse strands of scholarship into a coherent analytical narrative that supports theory development and policy-relevant interpretation.

C. RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

1) Key National and Global Trends Shaping the Future of Public Administration Science

RQ1: What are the key global and national trends influencing the development of public administration science today?

The future of public administration science is driven by the confluence of national and global trajectories. These trajectories reflect the rapidly evolving governance environment shaped by technological innovation, sustainability concerns, globalization, and ongoing transformation in public sector management. Both international developments and local institutional dynamics are collectively redefining the competencies, values, and functions of public administration as a discipline and practice.

One of the most significant global trends is the advancement of digitization and e-government practices. Online technologies have transformed public sector operations by enhancing decision-making processes, promoting accountability, and improving transparency. However, the diffusion of e-government systems remains uneven globally. For example, regions such as Latin America lag behind due to institutional and infrastructural constraints (Pina et al., 2008; Rubino-Hallman & Hanna, 2006).

Despite these barriers, digital transformation is enabling greater citizen engagement and fostering trust in government institutions through more accessible services (Tiika et al., 2024).

Globalization reorganizes public administration due to the heightened tensions between national sovereignty and networked cross-border governance. There are similarities in how the diversity management and multicultural policy frameworks are pursued as nations become interdependent (Klingner, 2014). At the same time, the obligations of climate change and sustainability are forcing public organizations to adopt more flexible mission-based governance systems. With the increase in compatibility with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), these reforms require an administrative restructure attaching significance to operational efficiency and societal resilience over time (Eakin et al., 2011; Meuleman, 2021; Puppim de Oliveira et al., 2015).

Technological innovations, particularly artificial intelligence and big data, are becoming integral to state functions. While these tools can enhance service delivery and improve policy analysis, they also raise significant concerns about human rights, algorithmic transparency, and ethical governance (Dorovskaya et al., 2020; Shestakowska et al., 2023). Thus, global trends in public administration do not merely introduce new tools and procedures they also demand new ethical frameworks and capacities for critical governance.

At the national level, countries such as China illustrate a divergent path in public sector reform one that does not emulate Western models but instead evolves through politics-led, coordinated approaches (Jing, 2021). This form of nationally contextualized reform emphasizes the strategic role of central leadership and long-term planning in shaping administrative transformation. Additionally, performance management systems are gaining prominence. These systems increasingly prioritize citizen feedback mechanisms and human resource development as key levers for improving public sector outcomes (Mirica et al., 2019; Wei, Liu, et al., 2024). In line with this, digital communication platforms and social media have facilitated the rise of smart governance models characterized by open data, transparency, and participatory decision-making (Lopes, 2017). The Indonesian case also reflects these global-national intersections. While national reforms have promoted digitization and decentralization, actual implementation often reveals disparities in capacity, coordination, and infrastructure. Thus, public administration science in Indonesia must address not only institutional redesign but also the broader conditions both global and national that shape governance reform in practice.

2) Challenges and Opportunities in Advancing Public Administration Science

RQ2: What major challenges and internal limitations does public administration face in remaining relevant and rigorous?

Despite the advancement of new governance paradigms, many of the challenges in public administration today lie in implementation. The success of e-government reforms and other modernization efforts hinges on strong leadership and effective inter-agency collaboration (Rubino-Hallman & Hanna, 2006; Tiika et al., 2024). The pressure to perform in digitally enabled, network-based public management structures often collides with institutional inertia, siloed bureaucracies, and uneven political will.

Additionally, while New Public Management (NPM) reforms have contributed to gains in operational efficiency, they have also posed risks to long-term adaptability. Narrow performance targets and short-term efficiency metrics may come at the expense of public value, inclusion, and sustainability. This has triggered calls for more balanced models of governance that can reconcile the need for agility with the imperative for resilience and public accountability (Eakin et al., 2011). Nevertheless, these challenges open new windows for innovation and reform. Advances in technology, benchmarking tools, and international collaboration can be mobilized to confront increasingly complex governance agendas. If effectively integrated into policy and academic environments, these instruments can enhance the relevance and responsiveness of public administration in diverse contexts.

From an academic standpoint, public administration also faces internal disciplinary challenges. A major concern is the persistent avoidance of macroeconomic questions within the field. Such omissions limit the discipline's capacity to address broader governance issues such as fiscal stability, public investment, and inequality (Han et al., 2020). Moreover, public administration has struggled with methodological rigidity and fragmentation. An overreliance on quantitative approaches has led to the underrepresentation of critical, normative, and practice-based inquiry. At the same time, the separation

between academic research and practitioner knowledge has widened, weakening the field's ability to inform and be informed by real governance dynamics (Raadschelders, 2011).

Addressing these issues requires a commitment to methodological pluralism and theoretical diversity. As Nesbit et al. (2011) argue, public administration must deepen its intellectual foundations without sacrificing applied relevance. This includes building connections between disciplines, encouraging reflective scholarship, and integrating multiple modes of knowledge production.

3) Strategies for Academic Collaboration and Differentiation, Key Clusters, National and Global Trends.

RQ3: What strategic responses including academic collaboration, methodological innovation, and institutional reform are being adopted or proposed to strengthen public administration education and research?

To strengthen the discipline, PA programs must move beyond siloed traditions and adopt interdisciplinary approaches that bridge research and practice. Drawing insights from law, economics, sociology, management, and political science can foster academic differentiation and practical excellence (Stazyk & Frederickson, 2018). Inclusiveness in knowledge production is also vital. Expanding the epistemic boundaries of governance studies to include global South perspectives, community-based expertise, and non-Western administrative traditions can significantly enrich the field (Ashley et al., 2021). At the institutional level, universities must ensure that theoretical rigor is matched by curricular responsiveness. This means preparing students with not only conceptual frameworks but also the methodological tools both qualitative and quantitative required for navigating real-world governance problems (Nesbit et al., 2011). Faculty development and digital integration are equally important. Training educators in updated pedagogical strategies, incorporating emerging technologies, and creating spaces for innovation within academic settings are crucial for keeping programs competitive and contextually relevant (van der Wal, 2020).

International collaboration offers another powerful avenue for academic development. Co-authorships, cross-border teaching initiatives, and joint research projects increase scientific impact while exposing scholars to diverse governance models (Jing et al., 2024). For Indonesian public administration programs, leveraging such partnerships can help align educational output with international standards and comparative learning. Beyond pedagogical reform, public administration as a discipline is being reshaped by broader knowledge system changes. Globalization, Europeanization, and transnational governance frameworks have altered funding streams, thematic priorities, and scholarly networks (Ashley et al., 2021; Bouckaert, 2010; van der Wal, 2024). These dynamics call for a rethinking of how public administration is studied and taught not only in content, but in the orientation of research toward global challenges.

The marketisation of public services, inspired by managerialist logic, continues to shape organizational patterns in the public sector. Efficiency metrics now guide not only service delivery but also institutional design and personnel evaluation (Farazmand, 2006). In response, public administration must maintain its multidisciplinary roots while adapting to the political imperatives of democratization and governance equity (Wei, Liu, et al., 2024). Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) represent another key driver of change. Constructed under the United Nations, the SDGs demand innovative public administration frameworks especially in the Global South where institutions must reconcile development goals with capacity constraints (Puppim de Oliveira et al., 2015).

Finally, research collaboration is being prioritized. The increasing rate of co-authored publications and international grant partnerships reflects a globalized research environment where impact is shaped not only by content but also by networks and reach (Jing et al., 2024). Public administration (PA) is an interdisciplinary field in itself and brings in various insights and methodologies from a very wide spectrum of disciplines including law, economics, management, political science, sociology, and psychology. Such diversity has ultimately resulted into the formation of different clusters that mark the distinct core areas of research and practice in the public administration science as summarized on Table 1.

Disciplinary Clusters

Pillar disciplinary clusters in PA are political science, examining governance, policy-making, and institutional dynamics; management, focusing on organizational behavior, human resource management, and efficiency in administration; law, which deals with legal frameworks, compliance with regulations, and roles within institutions; sociology regarding dynamics of workforce and policy impacts on society; and economics, analyzing public finance with the economic underpinnings of administrative decisions. Those clusters reflect interdisciplinary roots of public administration and provide a very solid framework for the understanding of governance processes (Bouckaert, 2019; Ongaro, 2019).

Thematic Clusters

Thematic clusters deal with specific areas of public administration. Public policy deals with the entire cycle of shaping, implementing and evaluating policies in areas like health, education and security. NPM includes the concepts that are borrowed from the private-sector for accountability and performance measurement in the public sector. Network governance is about collaborative efforts and networks in the realization of regional economic development as well as cluster-based strategies (Gallardo & Stich, 2013). In addition, philosophy provides the basis for probing into ethics, political philosophy and the philosophy of law when it comes to public administration, thus contributing to a deeper understanding of the discipline's normative foundations and the normative underpinnings of public administration (Ongaro, 2019).

Methodological Clusters

Methodological clusters describe instruments and techniques of use in the PA research. Bibliometric analysis is a prime method used to track trends on the thematic area under study in public administration through time, while science mapping helps visualize the interdisciplinary exchange of knowledge within and beyond PA (Vogel, 2014; Vogel & Hattke, 2022). This would, therefore, give an opportunity to researchers to study the evolution and to point out new interests developing within the field.

Geographical and Institutional Clusters

Geographical and institutional clusters imply the extent to which collaboration cuts across geographical boundaries and institutions. Regional cooperation examines how geography and regional agreements impact research networks in PA. Institutional collaboration refers to the impact of key institutions from the UK, USA, and Canada, institutions that dominate international research in the field (Wei, Yang, et al., 2024). These clusters thus reflect globalization in public administration research and its potential in collaboration to produce knowledge.

Table 1. Core Analytical Clusters of Public Administration Science

Cluster Type	Key Areas
Disciplinary	Political Science, Management, Law, Sociology, Economics
Thematic	Public Policy, New Public Management, Network Governance, Philosophical Foundations
Methodological	Bibliometric Analysis, Science Mapping
Geographical/Institutional	Regional Cooperation, Institutional Collaboration

Source: Authors Analysis. 2024

The key centralized clusters in science of public administration seems to truly imbibe the character that it is dynamic and interdisciplinary. So the disciplinary foundations would provide theoretical base for the thematic areas which would deal with specific areas of governance challenges; while the methodical clusters would provide research tools and collaboration on geographical and institutional basis would underline global character of the field. These clusters thus give global reflection towards the changes with respect to their priorities and complexities in public administration as well as keeping the topics meets modern challenges in the domain of governance itself.

4) Influence of Local and Global Values also Current Trends in Pedagogical Approaches.

RQ4: How do local and global values, as well as pedagogical transformations, shape the future direction of public administration education?

Public administration science is nurtured by the growth and evolving tussle between both local and global values. Those values become internalized within administrators' decisions, governance practices, and the very foundations of public administration. Local values in public administration mainly refer to the particular local context wherein governance takes place along with the different cultural, social, or institutional components. It is most significant to note that the profile of the local administrator and his own set of values plays a determining role, as it is known that decision-making is very dependent on the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral characteristics of the administrators. For example, the public policy decision of South Korea closely relates to administrators' values on economic and job ethics that underlie the significance of localized value systems in constructing governance practices (Campbell et al., 2014; Kim, 2008).

Professional, ethical, humanistic, and democratic public service values are integral in the foundation of legitimacy and effective administrative behavior. The premise is that decisions are made in consonance with personal credibility, professional competency, and adherence to the democratic practice (DeForest Molina & McKeown, 2012). Mediatisation and professionalism, also in local government, emphasize organizational efficiency above the democratic ideal within unwanted tension between local aims and higher governance ideals (Sandén & Turunen, 2020).

Public administration, with globalization in its toes, is putting significant pressure on administrations to take up the practices that have been guided by global governance principles. These include the management of tensions within globalism and localism, public policy making under-market forces, and so on. It has become a call for administration officials to perform well in diverse, multicultural contexts, which compare domestic diversity management with global multicultural policies (Klingner, 2014).

Comparative public administration therefore gives the priority to the importance of adapting global "smart practices" to national circumstances. It also prefers an approach that does not call for just borrowing best practices from other settings but rather redefined under cultural and contextual variables so that the sustainability of administrative reforms grows stronger (Klingner, 2014). Furthermore, a diversity of approaches exists on how global public values are interpreted. Political scientists tie the values to public interests, economists compare them with private values and those in legal studies put them as rights or entitlements thus complicating the act of getting global perspectives within public administration (de Graaf & van der Wal, 2017).

The public policy development is where local and global values interact, as it requires the local community to be able to institute public policies while following global governance standards. Policy effectiveness is contingent on the breadth of local insights and global values enabling adaptive and context-specific governance (White & Bourne, 2007). For instance, a multidisciplinary scientific approach where political science, economics and law enriches the understanding of public values and their use across different governance functions (de Graaf & van der Wal, 2017).

Local and global values together shape public administration science- they make the contours of decision making at the side of administration while also being liable to imply certain governance practices and build up-theoretical frameworks. While local values focus on a cultural and societal nuance, global values drive governance into more inclusiveness and flexibility. Such articulation of the values gives public administration its contextual relevance and global relevance, thus calling for a multidisciplinary and comparative approach to governance.

These evolving developments reflect a broader shift in public administration education that responds to societal change, technological advancement, and the growing demands placed on public administrators. Contemporary pedagogical trends increasingly emphasize interdisciplinary, technology-rich, and experiential learning approaches to better prepare students for the realities of public governance (See: Table 2). Public administration programs now draw more systematically on interdisciplinary frameworks, particularly political science, sociology, and economics to provide a more comprehensive understanding of governance and enable students to engage with multifaceted societal challenges more effectively (Knott, 2019; Riccucci, 2018). At the same time, experiential learning methods, including simulations, case studies, and real-time assignments, have become central to public administration education, helping bridge the gap between theory and practice and strengthening practical competencies for public service (Bharath, 2021; Kutergina, 2017). Technological integration further reinforces these shifts, as blended learning models combine face-to-face instruction with online platforms, while artificial intelligence and big data applications enhance instructional customization,

learning analytics, and pedagogical effectiveness (He & Wang, 2020). Alongside these developments, public administration education continues to prioritize research methods and data-driven decision-making, with comparative and experiential approaches increasingly used to deepen students' methodological understanding and analytical capacity in addressing complex public issues (Engbers, 2016). The growing emphasis on critical thinking and ethical decision-making also signals a renewed commitment to preparing future administrators to navigate moral dilemmas, uphold public trust, and sustain democratic values in governance practice (van Dijk et al., 2019). Innovative pedagogical tools, including the use of films and other media, further support conceptual understanding and engagement, while fostering cultural sensitivity and ethical awareness among students (Bharath, 2021). In parallel, methodological pluralism has gained prominence, reflecting the recognition that diverse research approaches are necessary to capture the complexity of governance challenges and to cultivate a holistic understanding of public administration (Miller, 2012). Finally, globalization has reinforced the importance of international and comparative perspectives, as the study of administrative cultures and governance practices across countries broadens students' horizons and enhances their adaptability within an increasingly interconnected public service environment (Cepiku, 2011; Liddle, 2017).

Table 2. Key Pedagogical Trends in Public Administration Education

Trend	Description
Interdisciplinary Programs	Integration of diverse disciplines for holistic governance education
Practical Relevance	Use of experiential learning methods like simulations and case studies
Technological Integration	Adoption of blended learning models and AI-driven teaching strategies
Research Methods	Emphasis on innovative and comparative approaches to research methodology
Critical Thinking and Ethics	Focus on ethical decision-making and critical thinking skills
Media and Storytelling	Use of films and media to illustrate concepts and enhance engagement
Methodological Pluralism	Emphasis on diverse research methods to address complex issues
Global Perspectives	Inclusion of international and comparative views in public administration

Source: Authors Analysis. 2024

The general trends in public administration education steer towards interdisciplinary, experiential, and technology-aided education. By imparting practical skills with ethical and global perspectives, these methodologies make students well-prepared to meet their demands under modern public governance.

Discussion

In Indonesia's evolving public sector, public administration science should not be viewed merely as a response to changing accreditation systems or government intervention. It should be conceptualized as one of the proactive actions in equipping future public leaders with capacities to address the complexity, volatility and ethical sensitivity of policy environments. As emphasized by Kusumasari et al. (2023), the turbulent environment forces public administration to the greatest limits, leading to revolutionary changes, especially pertaining to the post-pandemic hybrid governance, where adaptability and speed are truly essential qualities of effective leadership. To prepare for the next generation of leaders, both internal academic reform and external institutional responsiveness are needed. Internally, public administration education development must bring forth a multidisciplinary and problem-based curriculum that would foster critical thinking and ethical reasoning. As Denhardt and Denhardt (2003) argue through the lens of New Public Service, a public servant is no longer only a passive implementer of policy but rather becomes a facilitator in democratic engagements and co-production. These roles necessitate pedagogical approaches that go beyond bureaucratic rationalism.

The role of uncertainty and technological transformation cannot be overstated. In the context of artificial intelligence (AI) integration, for instance, Shestakovska et al. (2023) argue that "public servants will need new kinds of cognitive agility to handle not only task complexity but also the moral trade-offs embedded in algorithmic governance". This highlights the importance of developing both technical and reflective literacies. It is no longer sufficient for future public leaders to master budgeting or administrative law they must also navigate dilemmas posed by data privacy, surveillance, and

algorithmic decision-making (Shestakovska et al., 2023; Riccucci, 2018). The concept of efficiency, which once dominated the narrative of public administration, is also being revisited. As Manzoor (2014) points out, "the future of efficiency in public organizations cannot be divorced from questions of equity and legitimacy" (in *A Look at Efficiency in Public Administration*). In other words, preparing the next generation of public leaders is not just about streamlining systems but recalibrating values. As global crises from pandemics to environmental degradation challenge institutional trust, the cultivation of ethical leadership becomes paramount (McDonald III, 2021). Globally, several countries have already redefined the focus of public administration education (Kusumasari et al., 2023). In Indonesia, such innovations remain sporadic, often concentrated in flagship universities. This uneven distribution of pedagogical innovation reveals a deeper challenge in leadership development: unequal institutional readiness. As Holzhacker et al. (2015) warn, decentralization without institutional capacity leads to "fragmentation and inconsistent outcomes" across higher education providers.

Against this backdrop, Kusumasari et al. (2023) offer the notion of the *new hybrid world*, where leadership is marked by "interactive citizenship, borderless collaboration, and transformational strategy". This framing is critical in Indonesia's context, where local values such as gotong royong must harmonize with global principles of transparency, accountability, and sustainability. De Graaf and van der Wal (2017) argue that "public values are not universal; they are negotiated within cultural and political systems," thereby requiring future public leaders to develop cross-cultural competence and normative reflexivity. Additionally, global scholarly debates stress that the future of public administration research must be more anticipatory. McDonald III, et. al (2022), in their work *The Future of Public Administration Research*, advocate for a "problem-oriented, methodologically diverse, and practically engaged research agenda," noting that leadership education must connect with these scholarly trajectories to remain relevant.

This also necessitates curricular pluralism. As Goodsell (2006) asserts, "Public administration education must prepare students not only for the world that exists but for the world that is coming". In practical terms, this translates into embedding foresight studies, policy simulation, and behavioral insights into the academic formation of public servants. In addition, Goleman's (2011) concept of emotional intelligence, once seen as peripheral, now becomes central in a governance ecosystem increasingly marked by polarization and rapid change. The institutional dimension of leadership preparation should also not be ignored. As emphasized by McDonald III (2021), "transformation in public administration is not solely driven by pedagogical innovation but requires institutional cultures that value experimentation, autonomy, and cross-sectoral engagement". This calls for reform at the level of academic leadership and governance structures themselves not merely curriculum committees or accreditation frameworks.

While much attention has been given to regulatory shifts such as LAMSPAK's emergence, this article emphasizes that the deeper transformation lies in how universities position themselves as public institutions. They must not only meet external standards but shape the discourse around what constitutes meaningful, inclusive, and future-oriented public service. Leadership development in public administration should not be reactive but pre-emptive, addressing potential governance disruptions before they escalate into crises. Here, preparing the next generation of public leaders in Indonesia entails a comprehensive rethinking of public administration education. It requires epistemological openness, pedagogical boldness, institutional courage, and normative clarity. The challenge is not only to keep up with global trends but to define Indonesia's own leadership paradigm one that is rooted in local values, informed by global shifts, and committed to the public good.

Here, the main implications of this research are policy related and would provide benefits to the accreditation frameworks and curriculum governance in public administration education, especially in the Indonesian context. Over the years, organizing public administration has been through difficult conditions of uncertainty along with the digital age and a variety of values. Now, however, discipline-specific accreditation bodies like LAMSPAK are no longer just watching for compliance but are actively involved in the governance process that determines the academic orientation of the field. The argument of Bouckaert (2010), van der Wal (2020), and McDonald III et al. (2022) suggests that accreditation systems can attain developmental role by emphasizing outcome-based evaluations that acknowledge ethical leadership, systems thinking, interdisciplinary integration, and experiential learning as the main rather than relying on formalistic documentation and standardized indicators. The synthesis at the university level indicates the need for curriculum designs that move beyond the technocratic and bureaucratic training models towards problem-oriented, reflexive, and context-sensitive pedagogies.

Moreover, the new curriculum should be in line with global calls for public administration education that integrates leadership development, digital governance literacy, and normative reasoning across program structures (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2003; Riccucci, 2018; Kusumasari et al., 2024). In fact, such orientations in curricula are in tandem with the scholars' comparisons who argue that public administration education should not only equip the graduates for the existing administrative systems but also for the upcoming governance issues with such characteristics as sustainability, algorithmic decision-making, and hybrid governance (Meuleman, 2021; Shestakovska et al., 2023). More broadly, the findings suggest that effective reform in public administration education requires alignment between accreditation mechanisms, institutional quality assurance cultures, and academic leadership that values innovation, collaboration, and public values scholarship (de Graaf & van der Wal, 2017; Nesbit et al., 2011). In this sense, strengthening public administration education in Indonesia is less a matter of regulatory adjustment than of coordinated institutional learning, whereby accreditation bodies, universities, and educators collectively contribute to cultivating future public leaders capable of navigating complex, value-laden, and adaptive governance environments.

D. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The introduction to this review has emphasized the dire necessity of a forward-looking transformation of public administration science in Indonesia. This transformation must take root so that the discipline can come to terms with the increasing volatility, uncertainty, and complexity of governance, shunning technical training and normative assumptions. It is a finding that urges four things: that curricula relate directly to the multidimensional governance challenges of society, existing epistemic and pedagogical gaps be closed, leadership through integrative and experiential learning be encouraged, and critical reflection on values be part of a rapidly hybridizing policy world. Those contextual factors of Indonesia, such as decentralization, the digital divide, and institutional disparities, pose both threats and opportunities for reform. A public administration program must articulate a locally grounded public administration while remaining globally aware in its teaching framework. Some of the strategic directions would entail learning from interdisciplinary teaching, actively promoting ethical reasoning, and systems thinking through collaborative networks among academics, practitioners, and communities. There will also be development in this next generation of public leaders, through knowledge transmission and preparation to be able to become adaptable, empathetic, and public-oriented. Future inquiries will concentrate on investigating how pedagogies respond to complex realities of governance, institutionalizing competencies for leadership—but not on a technocratic module-bargaining between local values and global policy paradigms. The future of the discipline relies on its ability to reinvent itself as not just a training ground for bureaucrats, but as a space for critical, context-sensitive, and transformative public thinking.

REFERENCE

Ashley, S., Kim, S., & Lambright, W. H. (2021). Charting three trajectories for globalising public administration research and theory. *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration*, 43(1), 11-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23276665.2020.1789482>

Bharath, D. M. N. (2021). Film in Public Administration Classrooms: Developing Responsible Administrators in the Information Age. *Teaching Public Administration*, 39(2), 133–155. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0144739420929384>

Bouckaert, G. (2010). Research in public administration for the future. *Society and Economy*, 32(1), 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.1556/SocEc.32.2010.1.2>

Bouckaert, G. (2019). Dissemination of scientific knowledge on reforming public administration: Some changing mechanisms; [Diseminacija Znanstvenih Spoznaja o Reformama Javne Uprave: Promjene u Mehanizmima]. *Croatian and Comparative Public Administration*, 19(1), 9 – 22. <https://doi.org/10.31297/hkju.19.1.1>

Campbell, J. W., Im, T., & Jeong, J. (2014). Internal efficiency and turnover intention: Evidence from local government in South Korea. *Public Personnel Management*, 43(2), 259–282. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026014524540>

Cepiku, D. (2011). Public administration PhD programmes in Italy: Comparing different disciplinary approaches. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 77(2), 379–396. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852311399238>

Dewi, A. U. (2021). Curriculum Reform In The Decentralization Of Education In Indonesia: Effect On Students'achievements. *Jurnal Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 40(1), 158-169.

de Graaf, G., & van der Wal, Z. (2017). Without Binders: Public Values Scholarship in Political Science, Economics, and Law Content and Contribution to Public Administration. *Public Integrity*, 19(3), 196–218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2016.1269277>

DeForest Molina, A., & McKeown, C. L. (2012). The Heart of the Profession: Understanding Public Service Values. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 18(2), 375–396. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2012.12001689>

Denhardt, R. B., & Denhardt, J. V. (2003). The new public service: An approach to reform. *International Review of Public Administration*, 8(1), 3-10.

Dorovskaya, Y., Mokhorov, D., Snetkov, V., Semenova, K., & Tebryaev, A. (2020). The Social Consequences of Innovations in Public Administration. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, 940(1). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899X/940/1/012044>

Eakin, H., Eriksen, S., Eikeland, P.-O., & Øyen, C. (2011). Public sector reform and governance for adaptation: Implications of new public management for adaptive capacity in Mexico and Norway. *Environmental Management*, 47(3), 338–351. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-010-9605-0>

Engbers, T. A. (2016). Comparative research: An approach to teaching research methods in political science and public administration. *Teaching Public Administration*, 34(3), 270–283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0144739416640850>

Farazmand, A. (2006). Global administrative reforms and transformation of governance and public administration. In *Handbook of Globalization, Governance, and Public Administration*. Taylor and Francis.

Gallardo, R., & Stich, B. (2013). The Extent of Cluster-Based Policies and the Political/Institutional Context: A Collective Case Study. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 27(4), 325–337. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891242413490793>

Goodsell, C. T. (2006). A new vision for public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 66(4), 623–635.

Han, Y., Xiong, M., & Frank, H. A. (2020). Public Administration and Macroeconomic Issues: Is This the Time for a Marriage Proposal? *Administration and Society*, 52(9), 1439–1462. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399720915292>

He, H., & Wang, T. (2020). Application of Blended Teaching in Public Administration Courses under the Background of Artificial Intelligence. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1575(1). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1575/1/012174>

Holzhacker, R. L., Wittek, R., & Woltjer, J. (2015). Decentralization and governance for sustainable society in Indonesia. In *Decentralization and governance in Indonesia* (pp. 3-29). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Jing, Y. (2021). Marching through the deep-water zone: Chinese public sector reforms and the way forwards. *Public Management Review*, 23(4), 475–482. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2020.1752039>

Jing, Y., Fan, W., Liu, M., & Xu, J. (2024). International collaboration in local government studies: a bibliometric analysis. *Local Government Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2024.2407920>

Juntunen, M., & Lehenkari, M. (2021). A narrative literature review process for an academic business research thesis. *Studies in higher education*, 46(2), 330-342.

Kim, S. (2008). Local Electronic Government Leadership and Innovation: South Korean Experience. *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration*, 30(2), 165–192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23276665.2008.10779349>

Klingner, D. E. (2014). U.S. Public administration: From local to global Donald E. Klingner; [La administración pública de los EE.UU.: de lo local a lo global]. *Reforma y Democracia*, 59, 187 – 218.

Knott, J. H. (2019). The Future Development of Schools of Public Policy: Five Major Trends. *Global Policy*, 10(1), 88–91. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.12648>

Kusumasari, B., Sajida, S., Santoso, A. D., & Fauzi, F. Z. (2024). The Reinventing of public administration in the new hybrid world. *Teaching Public Administration*, 42(2), 206-229.

Kutergina, E. (2017). Computer-Based Simulation Games in Public Administration Education. *NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy*, 10(2), 119–133. <https://doi.org/10.1515/nispa-2017-0014>

Liddle, J. (2017). Is there still a need for teaching and research in public administration and management? A personal view from the UK. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 30(6-7), 575–583. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-06-2017-0160>

Lopes, N. V. (2017). Smart governance: A key factor for smart cities implementation. *2017 IEEE International Conference on Smart Grid and Smart Cities, ICSGSC 2017*, 277–282. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSGSC.2017.8038591>

Manzoor, A. (2014). A look at efficiency in public administration: Past and future. *Sage Open*, 4(4), 2158244014564936.

McDonald III, B. D. (2021). Teaching in uncertain times: The future of public administration education. *Teaching Public Administration*, 39(1), 3-8.

McDonald III, B. D., Hall, J. L., O'Flynn, J., & Van Thiel, S. (2022). The future of public administration research: An editor's perspective. *Public Administration*, 100(1), 59-71.,

Meuleman, L. (2021). Public administration and governance for the sdgs: Navigating between change and stability. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 13(11). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13115914>

Miller, K. J. (2012). The future of the discipline: Trends in public sector management. In *Critical Perspectives on International Public Sector Management* (Vol. 1, pp. 1-24). Emerald Group Publishing Ltd. [https://doi.org/10.1108/S2045-7944\(2012\)0000001004](https://doi.org/10.1108/S2045-7944(2012)0000001004)

Mirica, S. C., Moga, L. M., & Dediu, B. I. (2019). Evaluation System for the Public Institutions Employees. *Eurasian Studies in Business and Economics*, 11(1), 83–91. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-18565-7_7

Muhtada, D. (2017). The prospects for public management reform in Indonesia. *JILS*, 2, 145.

Nesbit, R., Moulton, S., Robinson, S., Smith, C., Dehart-Davis, L., Feeney, M. K., Gazley, B., & Hou, Y. (2011). Wrestling with intellectual diversity in public administration: Avoiding disconnectedness and fragmentation while seeking rigor, depth, and relevance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21(SUPPL. 1), i13–i28. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muq062>

Ongaro, E. (2019). The teaching of philosophy in public administration programmes. *Teaching Public Administration*, 37(2), 135–146. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0144739419837310>

Pina, V., Torres, L., & Royo, S. (2008). E-government evolution in EU local governments: A comparative perspective. *Proceedings of the European Conference on E-Government, ECEG*, 445–454.

Puppim de Oliveira, J. A., Jing, Y., & Collins, P. (2015). Public Administration for Development: Trends and the Way Forward. *Public Administration and Development*, 35(2), 65–72. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.1716>

Raadschelders, J. C. (2011). The study of public administration in the United States. *Public Administration*, 89(1), 140–155. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2011.01906.x>

Riccucci, N. M. (2018). Public administration pedagogy: What is it? In *Handbook of Public Administration, Third Edition* (pp. 757–765). Taylor and Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315093215-20>

Rubino-Hallman, S., & Hanna, N. K. (2006). New technologies for public sector transformation: A critical analysis of e-government initiatives in Latin America and the Caribbean. *Journal of E-Government*, 3(3), 3–39. https://doi.org/10.1300/J399v03n03_02

Sandén, J., & Turunen, J. (2020). Public Servants' Values and Mental Mediatization – an Empirical Study of Swedish Local Government. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Administration*, 24(3), 3–28. <https://doi.org/10.58235/sjpa.v24i3.8596>

Shestakovska, T. (2023). Analysis of trends and challenges of the impact of digital technologies on public administration. *Economic Synergy*, (2), 8-22.

Shestakovska, T., Nikoliuk, O., Moskalets, I., Kazarian, O., Kazarian, G., & Botika, T. (2023). Infrastructural Support of the Innovation and Information Trajectory of Public Administration Development. *Economic Affairs (New Delhi)*, 68(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.46852/0424-2513.1s.2023.1>

Sihombing, T., & Lumbantobing, R. D. H. (2024). Digital technology adoption for village public administration—Evidence from Indonesia. *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development*, 8(4), 1-18.

Stazyk, E. C., & Frederickson, H. G. (2018). Handbook of American public administration. In *Handbook of American Public Administration*. Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781786432070>

Thi, N., & Bui, H. (2021). Methodology of the literature review: A comparison of systematic literature review and narrative literature review. *Int. J. Econ. Commer. Manag*, 367-371.

Tiika, B. J., Tang, Z., Azaare, J., Dagadu, J. C., & Otoo, S. N.-A. (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 (Switzerland)*, 16(3). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16031333>

van der Wal, Z. (2020). Trends and drivers of public administration in the twenty-first century. In *Handbook on Corruption, Ethics and Integrity in Public Administration* (pp. 10-28). Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781789900910.00008>

van der Waldt, G. (2024). Global and transnational governance: Implications for public administration teaching. *Teaching Public Administration*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01447394241229173>

van Dijk, G. H. G., Vivian, B. A., & Malan, L. P. (2019). Creating epistemic access through a scaffold approach: Academic literacy skills development for South African first-year public administration students. *Teaching Public Administration*, 37(2), 156-174. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0144739418822133>

Vogel, R. (2014). What Happened to the Public Organization? A Bibliometric Analysis of Public Administration and Organization Studies. *American Review of Public Administration*, 44(4), 383-408. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074012470867>

Vogel, R., & Hattke, F. (2022). A century of Public Administration: Traveling through time and topics. *Public Administration*, 100(1), 17-40. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12831>

Wei, R.-Z., Liu, X.-Y., & Lyu, P.-H. (2024). Bibliometrics of public administration research hotspots: Topic keywords, author keywords, keywords plus analysis. *Helijon*, 10(21). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.helijon.2024.e39352>

Wei, R.-Z., Yang, M., & Lyu, P.-H. (2024). RESEARCH COOPERATION NETWORK ANALYSIS IN THE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION DOMAIN. *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, 2024(71), 130-148. <https://doi.org/10.24193/tras.71E.8>

White, L., & Bourne, H. (2007). Voices and values: Linking values with participation in OR/MS in public policy making. *Omega*, 35(5), 588-603. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.omega.2005.11.002>