

Global Currents of Public Management Reform: OECD Trends and Their Adaptation in Indonesian Governance

Arif Setia Budi^{1*}, Chandra Dinata², I Made Arie Widyasthana Wartana Putra², Renia F. De La Peña³

¹Institute of Islamic Studies Muhammadiyah Pacitan, Indonesia.

²University of Merdeka Malang, Indonesia.

³Central Philippine University, Philippine.

Correspondence*:

Address: Jl. Gajah Mada Nomor 20, Kelurahan Baleharjo, Kecamatan Pacitan, Kabupaten Pacitan, Indonesia.

e-mail: asb@isimupacitan.ac.id

Abstract

Public management reform has developed as a global trend since the 1980s, in line with the increasing complexity of public issues and demands for more effective and accountable governance. Member countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) play a crucial role in shaping and disseminating the public management reform paradigm through the development of modern governance standards and practices. This article aims to analyze the development of contemporary public management theory and examine how OECD reform trends are adapted to the context of Indonesian governance. This research uses a qualitative approach with a systematic literature review design. The literature search was conducted through Scopus-indexed international journals from 2021–2025 using the keywords public management and OECD. Selected articles were analyzed thematically to identify patterns of theory development, the role of the OECD as a global normative actor, and the dynamics of reform adaptation at the national level. The study results indicate that public management reform within the OECD has shifted from the New Public Management approach to a post-New Public Management framework that emphasizes cross-institutional coordination, institutional capacity, and policy integration. In the Indonesian context, these principles have been selectively adopted through bureaucratic reform, performance-based management, regulatory reform, and digital government. However, their implementation faces structural challenges, resulting in a hybrid governance pattern. These findings confirm that OECD-based reforms require contextual adjustments to sustainably strengthen the quality of public governance.

Keywords: bureaucratic reform; digital government; governance; OECD; public management reform



This is an open-access article under the CC-BY-SA license

Received: 03-02-2026 | Revised: 09-02-2026 | Accepted: 10-02-2026 | Published: 10-02-2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26905/j-tragos.v4i1.16731>

© 2026 Journal of Transformative Governance and Social Justice

Published by the Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, University of Merdeka Malang, Indonesia.

Introduction

Public management reform has been a growing global agenda since the 1980s, driven by fiscal pressures, the increasing complexity of public issues, and public demands for more effective, transparent, and accountable governance. Member countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) play a central role in formulating and disseminating this reform paradigm through the development of modern governance standards, such as performance-based management, regulatory reform, public integrity, and the digitalization of government. In this context, public management reform is understood not only as a technocratic effort to improve administrative efficiency, but also as a normative transformation regarding the role of the state and the relationship between government and citizens (Boviard & Loeffler, 2016; Rizwan Ullah et al., 2025a). These reforms have evolved in line with changes in the global environment, including economic globalization, the

information technology revolution, and rising international standards for public integrity and accountability, which have encouraged public administration to adapt to more dynamic and results-oriented practices.

Over time, public management reform within the OECD has shifted from the efficiency-oriented New Public Management approach to a post-New Public Management framework that emphasizes cross-agency coordination, institutional capacity, and collaborative governance. The OECD serves as a global actor, promoting policy convergence through soft governance mechanisms such as peer review, benchmarking, and the development of policy guidelines. This process has created a relatively uniform global reform stream at the principle level, while still allowing for variations in implementation depending on the domestic context of each country.

The OECD, as a key actor in global policy networks, plays a strategic role in disseminating ideas, standards, and best practices for public sector reform. Through publications such as *Governance in Transition* (1995) and *Modernizing Government* (2005), the OECD emphasizes that fiscal pressures, declining public trust, and global competition require governments to enhance management capabilities, strengthen the center of government, and build adaptive organizational cultures (Bacache, 2016; Stefanescu, 2020). As an organization that relies on soft power, the OECD shapes global norms through mechanisms such as peer review, guidelines, governance indicators, and experience-sharing processes that enable its member countries to achieve policy convergence (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2020; Durman et al., 2020; Rabu, 2021). This process has resulted in what a number of academics call “global public management reform”, namely a relatively uniform reform pattern but still allowing for variations according to the domestic context (Pollit & Bouckaert, 2002; Rabu, 2021; Rahman et al., 2013).

Reform trends in OECD countries show several key patterns: decentralization of operational authority, performance orientation through performance budgeting, improved regulatory quality through regulatory impact assessment, merit-based human resource management reform, strengthening public integrity, and the digitalization of government services (Winoto, 2025). The OECD advocates not only for administrative efficiency but also emphasizes democratic governance values such as accountability, participation, and transparency (Rizwan Ullah et al., 2025b). Thus, OECD public sector reforms combine technocratic and normative aspects that position modern governance as a prerequisite for socio-economic development (Martinhu et al., 2025; Amali, 2025).

The OECD's influence on non-member countries, including Indonesia, is increasingly significant through collaborative forums such as APEC-OECD, ASEAN-OECD, and regional programs such as the MENA-OECD Governance Programme. Indonesia, as a country with an ambitious post-1998 bureaucratic reform agenda, has adopted various public reform principles developed within the OECD. The implementation of a merit system in civil service management, strengthening oversight systems, implementing performance-based budgeting, and developing an Electronic-Based Government System (SPBE) are concrete examples of

adaptation to these global trends (González-Bustamante & Aguilar, 2023; Traunmüller, 2013a). Regulatory reforms such as the drafting of omnibus laws, simplification of licensing, and improvement of the quality of public services also reflect the adoption of regulatory governance practices that are standard in OECD countries.

However, the adaptation of public management reform in Indonesia is not a linear process. Structural challenges such as a patrimonial bureaucracy, uneven institutional capacity, and complex political dynamics require local adaptations to the implementation of OECD standards. This process demonstrates that the adoption of global reforms is always context-dependent, with global practices needing to be localized to be relevant to domestic institutional dynamics. By understanding how global trends in public management reform have evolved within the OECD, this article can assess how these trends have been adopted, selected, or even rejected in the context of Indonesian governance. This analysis is crucial for identifying opportunities to improve the quality of national bureaucratic reform, while simultaneously understanding the structural limitations in adapting to evolving global standards. Based on this framework, this article focuses its analysis on the development of contemporary public management theory and the adaptation of OECD reforms to Indonesian governance. This approach is expected to provide a more analytical understanding of the opportunities and limitations of public management reform in developing countries, while also enriching theoretical discourse on the relationship between global governance standards and national contexts.

Literature Review

Public Management Theory

The development of public management theory is an intellectual response to changes in the increasingly complex and dynamic government environment, influenced by both global and domestic pressures. Since the mid-20th century, public management studies have developed alongside criticisms of traditional public administration rooted in the Weberian model, which emphasizes hierarchy, formal rules, and procedural compliance. Although this model has succeeded in establishing bureaucratic stability, various studies have demonstrated its limitations in meeting demands for efficiency, innovation, and responsiveness to the needs of the modern public. (Christensen et al., 2016; James et al., 2017). The fiscal crisis, rising public expectations, and economic globalization have prompted academics and policymakers to seek new approaches to managing the public sector more adaptively.

In this context, New Public Management (NPM) theory has emerged as a dominant paradigm since the 1980s, particularly in developed countries. NPM emphasizes the application of private sector management principles to the public sector, such as efficiency, competition, results orientation, and performance measurement (Chen & Lee, 2018; Christensen et al., 2016). The literature shows that NPM contributes significantly to the modernization of public administration through performance-based budgeting reforms, managerial decentralization, service contractualization, and deregulation (Boviard & Loeffler, 2016). However, recent studies also highlight various weaknesses of NPM, particularly institutional

fragmentation, weakened cross-agency coordination, and the neglect of public values such as social justice and democratic accountability (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2020).

In response to these limitations, public management theory has evolved toward post-NPM and a more holistic approach to governance. International literature has noted the emergence of the concepts of whole-of-government, network governance, and collaborative governance, which emphasize coordination, policy integration, and cross-sectoral cooperation (Boviard & Loeffler, 2016; Christensen & Laegreid, 2025). This approach views the government no longer as a single actor, but rather as part of a complex network involving private actors, civil society, and international organizations. Thus, modern public management theory focuses not only on the internal efficiency of organizations but also on the state's capacity to manage inter-actor relationships and resolve cross-sectoral public problems.

Internationally, the development of public management theory is inextricably linked to the role of international organizations such as the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the World Bank, and the United Nations. The OECD is particularly recognized as an influential normative actor in shaping and disseminating the global public management reform paradigm (Rahman et al., 2013; Trong Tuan, 2017). Through publications, peer review, and cross-border policy networks, the OECD promotes the adoption of governance standards such as performance-based management, regulatory governance, public integrity, and the digitalization of government. Studies show that the OECD serves as a global policy hub, facilitating the convergence of public sector reform ideas and practices among its member countries and even non-member countries (Pollit & Bouckaert, 2002).

International literature also shows that public management reforms are not uniform across countries. While there are similarities in basic principles, such as accountability and efficiency, the implementation of reforms is heavily influenced by each country's political context, institutional history, and bureaucratic capacity (Amane et al., 2023a; Bouckaert et al., 2010). The concept of path dependency is widely used to explain why the same reforms can have different impacts in different countries. Thus, public management theory develops not as a universal model, but rather as an analytical framework that must be adapted to local conditions. In the scholarly literature, public management discourse has also experienced a normative shift from a "steering" orientation to a "serving" orientation (Denhardt & Denhardt (2020), through the concept of New Public Service, it is emphasized that the primary goal of public management is to serve the interests of citizens, not merely to achieve administrative efficiency. This approach emphasizes the values of democracy, public participation, and social accountability as fundamental elements in contemporary public management theory. This development indicates that public management theory is increasingly integrating the dimensions of ethics, legitimacy, and public trust.

Along with technological advances, recent literature has also positioned digital governance as an integral part of modern public management theory. Recent studies highlight how digitalization is transforming the way governments design policies, deliver services, and interact with citizens (Dunleavy & Margetts, 2025; Traunmüller, 2013b). Digitalization is not

only viewed as a technical tool, but also as a structural transformation that requires changes in organizational culture, regulations, and managerial capacity. The OECD consistently promotes the integration of digital governance as part of ongoing public management reforms, particularly in improving the transparency and effectiveness of public services. Despite the rich global literature on public management theory, there is a significant gap in studies examining the relationship between theoretical developments and reform practices in developing countries, particularly in the context of adapting OECD standards. Most research still focuses on developed countries, while studies on how OECD theories and practices are selectively adapted in developing countries like Indonesia are still limited. Existing studies indicate that the adoption of reforms is often partial and results in hybrid forms of governance that combine global norms with local practices (Cheung, 2005; Petana & Sofou, 2024). However, a systematic theoretical mapping of these dynamics is still rare.

Based on a critical synthesis of the literature, this article theoretically positions itself within the post-New Public Management framework with an emphasis on the concept of hybrid governance. This position stems from a critique of the limitations of New Public Management, which overemphasizes efficiency and market mechanisms while inadequately addressing the challenges of cross-institutional coordination, the complexity of public policy, and the tension between performance and public value. The post-NPM literature emphasizes that the primary problem of contemporary governance is no longer simply bureaucratic inefficiency, but rather the state's capacity to integrate policies (Çetin, 2015; Scott et al., 2023), manage actor networks, and maintain public legitimacy in a context of fragmented governance.

However, this article does not adopt post-NPM as an ideal and universal normative model. Instead, this research starts from the assumption that post-NPM implementation, especially in developing countries, often occurs partially and results in a hybrid governance configuration. Hybrid governance, in this context, is understood as a combination of New Public Management elements (such as performance management and results orientation), post-NPM principles (such as cross-agency and whole-of-government coordination), and traditional bureaucratic practices that persist due to institutional legacies and domestic political dynamics. This approach allows for a more realistic analysis of public management reform, compared to the convergence approach, which assumes the full adoption of global standards.

By positioning OECD reforms as a source of selectively adapted post-NPM norms, this article views Indonesia not as a “deviation case” from OECD standards, but as an empirical example of how public management theory operates in the context of uneven institutional capacity and decentralized governance systems. This theoretical position asserts that the success of public management reforms cannot be measured solely by the degree of conformity to the OECD model, but by the ability of the governance system to balance the demands of performance, coordination, and public value in the local context. The article's primary theoretical contribution lies in strengthening the argument that post-NPM and hybrid governance are not contradictory approaches, but rather complementary analytical

frameworks for explaining public management reform in developing countries. This approach also broadens the scope of public management theory to be more sensitive to context, state capacity constraints, and the dynamics of global policy adaptation.

Method

This study uses a qualitative approach with a systematic literature review (SLR) design to analyze the development of public management theory and the adaptation of OECD public management reforms in the context of Indonesian governance. This approach was chosen because the primary objective of the study is not to quantitatively test causal relationships, but rather to understand the conceptual, normative, and institutional dynamics that shape public management reforms at the global and national levels. The methodological literature confirms that SLR is an appropriate approach for synthesizing scientific knowledge in a systematic, transparent, and replicable manner, especially in the study of public policy and public administration, which have diverse theoretical perspectives and empirical contexts (Tranfield et al., 2003; Xiao & Watson, 2019). Thus, this methodology enables researchers to identify patterns, trends, and research gaps comprehensively.

A literature search was conducted through the Scopus database using the keywords public management and OECD. The initial identification stage yielded 165 articles. A multi-step selection process was then conducted to ensure the relevance and quality of the sources. Filtering based on the publication period of the last five years (2021–2025) reduced the number of articles to 33. The next stage excluded subjects outside the social sciences, leaving 30 articles. Further filtering was performed by excluding document types other than scientific articles, resulting in 11 articles. In the final stage, articles not in English were excluded, resulting in nine articles meeting all inclusion criteria and used as the basis for the analysis. The following is a concise, clear, and methodologically standardized article screening table.

Table 1. Article Screening Stages in a Systematic Literature Review

Selection Stage	Screening Criteria	Number of Articles (n)	Description
Initial Identification	Scopus search using keywords: public management and OECD	165	All articles indexed in Scopus without initial restrictions
Final Screening	Publication year range: 2021–2025	33	Articles outside the last five years were excluded
Final Screening	Social sciences subject	30	Articles outside the social sciences were excluded

Final Inclusion	Article document type:	11	Documents other than scientific articles (reviews, conference papers, book chapters) were excluded
Selection Stage	English	9	Non-English articles were excluded
Initial Identification	Article must meet all inclusion criteria	9	Used in qualitative thematic analysis

Source: Processed by the author based on Scopus search results, 2025.

Data measurement in this study was conducted through a thematic qualitative analysis of the extracted literature. This approach was used to identify key themes in the development of public management theory, such as the shift from New Public Management to post-NPM, strengthening whole-of-government, and integrating digital governance. These themes were then analyzed comparatively to see how OECD reform principles are articulated in the context of developing countries, particularly Indonesia. Methodological literature emphasizes that thematic analysis is highly effective in public policy research because it is able to capture meanings, narrative patterns, and normative frameworks that cannot be measured quantitatively.

Result and Discussion

The Evolution of Public Management Reform in the Perspective of OECD Countries

The results of a study of OECD literature show that the flow of public management reform in OECD member countries developed through a long process and was influenced by various external and internal government pressures (Hernández & Amaral, 2022; James, 2021). Since the fiscal crises of the 1980s, OECD countries have faced an urgent need to improve the efficiency, accountability, and quality of public services. The OECD has been a key player in strengthening this reform trend through the production of policy guidance, peer review, and the development of internationally recognized governance standards. Publications such as "Governance in Transition" demonstrate that developed countries are generally moving away from traditional public administration models toward more flexible, results-oriented approaches that rely on modern management mechanisms (Papavasiliou & Gorod, 2022; Reis et al., 2021).

The reforms emerging in OECD countries were influenced by the New Public Management (NPM) paradigm, which emphasizes efficiency, competition, and the use of market mechanisms in the public sector. The implementation of performance contracts, the restructuring of service units, the decentralization of authority, and the simplification of regulations were characteristic of the initial stages of reform. However, over time, many OECD countries developed a more comprehensive approach through post-NPM, which focuses not

only on efficiency but also on integrity, inter-agency coordination, improving regulatory quality, and strengthening state capacity. Subsequent OECD reports, such as *Modernizing Government* Corvo et al. (2014), menegaskan pentingnya keseimbangan antara inovasi manajerial dan kebutuhan menjaga kohesi sistem pemerintahan melalui penguatan pusat pemerintahan (centre of government), manajemen risiko fiskal, serta profesionalisasi sumber daya manusia.

Leslie Pal (2012), this demonstrates that the OECD is not merely an observer, but rather an influential global agent in shaping international discourse on public governance. The OECD acts as a node in global policy networks through soft power mechanisms such as peer learning, benchmarking, and governance standard-setting. This influence is reinforced by the OECD's normative legitimacy as an organization representing developed countries, so its recommendations are often considered best practices worthy of reference. Through various networks such as the senior budget officials network, regulatory policy committee, and public employment and management working party, the OECD has succeeded in creating a space for exchanging experiences that facilitates the convergence of reform practices in its member countries.

The literature synthesis shows that public management reform in OECD countries can no longer be understood solely within the framework of New Public Management, which focuses on efficiency and market mechanisms. Findings from the selected articles demonstrate a consistent shift toward a post-New Public Management approach, which places cross-agency coordination, policy integration, and state capacity as central issues. Performance-based reform, previously a key feature of NPM, remains, but is combined with efforts to strengthen the whole of government, control organizational fragmentation, and improve regulatory quality.

This synthesis confirms that the primary governance problem in OECD countries is no longer low bureaucratic efficiency, but rather the complexity of governance resulting from organizational specialization and increasing interdependence between actors. Therefore, public management reform in the OECD context is shifting toward strengthening the center of government, strategic coordination, and utilizing more adaptive governance instruments. These findings reinforce the post-NPM argument that the success of public sector reform is largely determined by the integrative capacity of the state, not simply by the application of managerial techniques.

Adapting OECD Public Management Reforms to Indonesian Governance

In the context of this research, another important finding is that reforms across OECD countries are not uniform. While there are globally agreed-upon patterns and principles, such as transparency, accountability, efficiency, and integrity, each country continues to adapt its reform agenda to its own domestic circumstances. Amane et al. (2023), emphasizes that public sector reform is always path-dependent, meaning that past decisions, institutional structures, and organizational culture influence the form of reform adopted. Thus, OECD reforms are

normative, but their implementation varies widely and is influenced by historical factors and national institutional contexts.

When analyzed in relation to Indonesia, the study results indicate that the direction of national bureaucratic reform largely parallels reform developments in OECD countries. After 1998, Indonesia entered a phase of political and administrative transition that demanded significant changes in government governance. The implementation of a merit system in civil servant management, the development of institutional performance indicators, results-based budgeting reforms, and the digitization of public services through SPBE are examples of practices aligned with OECD recommendations (Kementerian PANRB, 2023). Likewise, efforts to deregulate and simplify regulations through the Online Single Submission (OSS) and omnibus law reflect the regulatory governance approach that is the OECD standard in increasing efficiency and legal certainty (James, 2021; Lobel & Lobel, 2012).

However, the analysis also shows that the adaptation of OECD practices in Indonesia faces structural and institutional challenges. Performance-based reforms, for example, often face obstacles due to a patrimonial bureaucratic culture, a lack of information system integration, and uneven distribution of human resources across regions. Furthermore, regulatory reforms sometimes fail to result in substantive simplification due to overlapping authority and weak central-regional coordination mechanisms. This aligns with the OECD's (1995) finding that major reforms almost always generate resistance, particularly when they involve changes to power structures and institutional work patterns.

Table 2. Comparison of Public Management Reform: OECD vs Indonesia

No.	Reform Aspects	Trends in OECD Countries	Adaptation in Indonesia	Comparative Notes
1.	Reform Paradigm	Moving from NPM to post-NPM and integrative governance; focusing on efficiency, performance, integrity, and cross-agency coordination.	Bureaucratic reform adopts elements of NPM (performance, efficiency) and post-NPM (SPBE, coordination), but they are not yet fully integrated.	Indonesia combines the NPM model with patrimonial bureaucratic practices, resulting in a hybrid form of governance.
2.	Performance Management	Performance contracts, measurable indicators, performance budgeting, and	Performance-based planning and budgeting are implemented; indicators still focus on output, not	Key challenges: data quality, evaluation culture, and cross-agency integration.

		results-based audits.	outcomes; monitoring is weak.	
3.	Regulatory Governance	Use of Regulatory Impact Assessments (RIAs), regulatory simplification, and evidence-based policymaking.	OSS, Omnibus Law, investment deregulation; however, RIA has not yet become a bureaucratic habit.	Indonesian regulatory reform is still dominated by economic pressures, not evidence-based governance.
4.	Public Human Resource Management	Strong merit systems, competency-based promotions, talent management, and public salary benchmarking.	The Civil Servant Law introduces a merit system; implementation is not yet uniform; patronage remains dominant in the regions.	Civil servant capacity across regions is highly uneven.
5.	Digital Governance	Integration of digital services, data interoperability, cybersecurity, and digital one-stop services.	SPBE, regional digital services, sectoral applications; integration is still weak, data is siloed.	OECD: Integration in Indonesia has only fragmented.
6.	Integrity & Ethics	Strict public ethics, a whistleblowing system, and fiscal transparency.	Integrity Zones, WBK/WBBM, SPIP, but structural corruption cases persist.	Challenges lie in organizational culture and rule enforcement.
7.	Center of Government (CoG)	Strong coordination through the PM/President's office; strategic function for monitoring reforms.	KSP, KemenPANRB, Bappenas play a role, but coordination often overlaps.	Indonesia's CoG institution is not yet on par with OECD countries.
8.	Decentralization & Multi-level Governance	Strong central-regional coordination	Decentralization is extensive, but regional capacity is	Indonesia faces a coordination deficit.

		mechanisms; relatively stable regional capacity.	uneven; policy coordination is unstable.	
--	--	--	--	--

Source: Processed by the author from various sources, 2025.

Table 2. above reveals that Indonesia did not adopt the OECD reforms in their entirety, but rather through a process of local adaptation or hybridization. Global practices blended with national conditions and dynamics, resulting in unique forms of reform. For example, the digitalization of public services progressed rapidly in some regions but lagged in others; the civil service merit system has been implemented, but patronage practices persist; regulations have been simplified, but the production of new regulations remains high. This situation emphasizes that while the OECD provides direction for reform, successful implementation remains dependent on the appropriateness of the reforms to Indonesia's institutional and political context.

The literature review also shows that the OECD plays a role as a producer and mediator of post-NPM norms in global public management reform. Through soft governance mechanisms such as peer review, benchmarking, and policy guidance, the OECD not only disseminates technical practices but also shapes how countries understand governance issues. In the analyzed literature, the OECD is positioned as an actor that encourages convergence of reform principles, without imposing a uniform institutional model. However, the synthesis of findings also indicates that the diffusion of OECD norms is selective and contextual. Countries adopt OECD post-NPM principles to the extent that they are compatible with their national institutional structures and bureaucratic capacities. Thus, the OECD's role is more accurately understood as a provider of policy repertoires rather than as the sole architect of reform. This finding is consistent with the post-NPM approach, which rejects the assumption of universal solutions and emphasizes the importance of institutional adaptation.

Overall, the research findings indicate that OECD reform trends provide an important framework for public management modernization in Indonesia. However, successful adaptation is largely determined by institutional capacity, political commitment, and the government's ability to overcome structural barriers. Reforms in Indonesia reflect a move toward global standards, but still face complex local dynamics, requiring a phased and contextualized approach.

Challenges of Implementation and Dynamics of Hybrid Governance in Indonesia

In the Indonesian context, the SLR results indicate that national public management reforms reflect the selective adoption of post-NPM norms promoted by the OECD. Performance-based management, civil service merit systems, regulatory reforms, and government digitalization are the elements most frequently cited in the literature as evidence of convergence with global trends. However, the literature also consistently notes that the implementation of these reforms has not resulted in complete governance integration. A synthesis of the findings indicates that reforms in Indonesia still operate within a fragmented

institutional configuration, primarily due to extensive decentralization and capacity disparities between regions. Within a post-NPM framework, this situation highlights the state's limited coordinating capacity, particularly in integrating policies across sectors and levels of government. Therefore, OECD-based reforms in Indonesia cannot be assessed solely on the basis of the existence of policy instruments, but must be analyzed in terms of the extent to which these instruments are able to enhance the integrative capacity of governance.

Although Indonesia has adopted many of the principles of public management reforms developed in OECD countries, the implementation process has not been linear or uniform. Differences in political contexts, institutional structures, bureaucratic capacities, and deeply rooted administrative cultures have made this adaptation face serious challenges. These challenges are not merely technical but also reflect the socio-political dynamics that influence the overall direction of reform. To provide a comprehensive overview of the gap between OECD standards and governance practices in Indonesia, the following table summarizes the key issues hampering the effective implementation of these reforms.

Table 2. Challenges of Implementing OECD Reforms in Indonesia

No.	OECD Reform Dimensions	OECD Standards/Practices	Implementation Challenges in Indonesia	Impact on Reform
1.	Performance Management	Strong outcome indicators, performance contracts, results-based audits.	Indicators remain focused on output; evaluation culture is minimal; data is inconsistent across agencies.	Institutional performance is difficult to measure accurately; decision-making is not evidence-based.
2.	Merit System & Human Resource Professionalization	Competency-based recruitment, merit-based promotions, independent ethics committees.	Patronage practices remain strong, especially in the regions; and the gap in human resource capacity is wide.	Meritocracy is suboptimal; there is inefficiency in managing civil servant talent.
3.	Regulatory Governance	Mandatory RIA, systematic regulatory simplification, regulatory quality oversight.	RIA has not yet become a culture; regulations overlap; central-regional coordination is weak.	Regulatory overload; legal certainty is low.

4.	Government Coordination (Center of Government)	Strong strategic coordination under the PM/President; integrated reform monitoring system.	Overlapping functions between the Presidential Staff Office (KSP), Bappenas, and KemenPANRB; silos between ministries.	Reforms are asynchronous; sectoral policies are not integrated.
5.	Digital Governance	One integrated service portal, data interoperability, and strict cybersecurity.	Fragmentation of government applications; disparities in regional digital infrastructure.	Digital public services are inconsistent; data integration is difficult to achieve.
6.	Public Integrity & Ethics	Effective complaint mechanisms, whistleblower protection, and a strong culture of integrity.	Structural corruption; resistance to integrity reforms; weak internal oversight systems.	Public trust in the government is difficult to increase.
7.	Decentralization & Multi-level Governance	Clear division of authority, stable regional capacity, and strong vertical coordination.	Loss of regional fiscal and human resource capacity; frequent conflicts of authority; weak policy synchronization.	Policy implementation is uneven; public service standards vary.
8.	Sustainability Reform	Long-term reforms with strong political commitment across government.	Reforms often change with changes in officials; dependence on short-term projects.	Reforms are unsustainable; their impact is unstable.

Source: Processed by the author from various sources, 2025.

Table 2 above shows that the challenges of implementing OECD reforms in Indonesia are not only related to technocratic capacity, but also reflect the political and institutional complexities inherent in national governance. The reforms advocated by the OECD require consistency, cross-agency alignment, and long-term commitment, all three of which remain significant challenges for Indonesia. By clearly understanding these obstacles, a more realistic and contextualized reform strategy can be formulated, ensuring that the process of adapting to global standards is not merely imitation but rather strengthens Indonesia's governance capacity substantively and sustainably.

The most prominent finding from the literature synthesis is the emergence of a hybrid governance pattern in public management reform in Indonesia. Hybrid governance, in this study, is understood as a governance configuration that combines elements of NPM (performance and efficiency orientation), post-NPM principles (coordination and integration), and persisting traditional bureaucratic practices. This pattern is not a deviation from theory, but rather a logical consequence of adapting global reforms to a complex institutional context. Within the SLR framework, hybrid governance emerges as a cross-cutting theme across articles, explaining why public management reform in Indonesia has shown uneven results. The reform has not entirely failed, but it has also not been fully institutionalized. This finding strengthens the argument that post-NPM theory needs to be understood contextually, particularly when applied to developing countries. Thus, the analytical contribution of this study lies in affirming that hybrid governance is an empirical condition that needs to be accommodated in the development of contemporary public management theory.

Conclusion

Based on the results of a systematic literature review, this study shows that public management reform in OECD countries has undergone a significant shift from the efficiency-oriented New Public Management approach to a post-New Public Management framework that emphasizes state integrative capacity, cross-institutional coordination, public integrity, and the use of digital technology in governance. In this process, the OECD plays a role not merely as an observer but as a global normative actor, producing and disseminating reform standards through soft governance mechanisms such as peer review, benchmarking, and policy guidance. The reforms developing within the OECD thus form a global trend that is relatively convergent in principle, yet remains open to variations in implementation at the national level.

In the Indonesian context, this study's findings indicate that post-1998 public management reforms demonstrate a certain degree of convergence with the OECD reform agenda, particularly in the implementation of performance-based management, the civil service merit system, regulatory reform, and the development of digital government. However, the literature synthesis also confirms that the implementation of these reforms faces significant structural and institutional obstacles, such as institutional fragmentation due to decentralization, capacity imbalances between regions, weak central-regional coordination, and the continuation of a patrimonial bureaucratic culture. These conditions indicate that the success of reforms is determined not only by the adoption of policy instruments, but primarily by the state's capacity to integrate policies and manage the complexity of governance.

The main analytical contribution of this study lies in the assertion that public management reform in Indonesia is best understood within a hybrid governance framework. This pattern reflects a combination of New Public Management elements (performance and efficiency orientation), post-NPM principles (coordination and integration), and traditional bureaucratic practices that persist due to institutional legacies and domestic political

dynamics. These findings confirm that hybrid governance is not a failure of reform, but rather an empirical consequence of selective adaptation to global standards in the context of a developing country with uneven institutional capacity.

Therefore, this study enriches the discourse on public management theory by demonstrating that post-New Public Management and hybrid governance are complementary analytical frameworks for explaining public sector reforms outside the OECD context. For Indonesia, OECD-based reforms can serve as a strategic framework, but their implementation requires a gradual, contextual, and sustainable approach. Strengthening institutional capacity, policy consistency across governments, and long-term political commitment are key prerequisites for adaptation to global standards to not remain merely symbolic but to generate tangible improvements in the quality of public governance.

References

- Amali, A. C. (2024). Accountability and Transparency of Village Fund Management in Wonosalam Village. *Journal of Transformative Governance and Social Justice*, 2(2), 160–170. <https://doi.org/10.26905/j-tragos.v2i2.13559>
- Amane, A. P. O., Rahmawati, A., Juwita, M. N., Karyasa, T. B., Hendrayady, A., Malik, M., Andriyani, D., Padmasari, Y. A. L., Lestari, A., Surjanto, S., Iskandar, A., Jabbar, A., Badruddin, S., & Heryani, A. (2023). *Reformasi Administrasi Publik* (A. Hendrayady, Ed.; 1st ed.). Eureka Media Aksara.
- Bouckaert, G. (2012). Reforming for Performance and Trust: Some Reflections. *NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy*, 5(1), 9–20. <https://doi.org/10.2478/v10110-012-0001-4>
- Bouckaert, G., Peters, B. G., & Verhoest, K. (2010). *The Coordination of Public Sector Organizations*. Palgrave Macmillan UK. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230275256>
- Boviard, T., & Loeffler, E. (2016). *Public Management and Governance*. Routledge.
- Çetin, Z. Ö. (2015). The reflections of new public management on local government laws in Turkey. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(4), 36–47. <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n4p36>
- Chen, Y. C., & Lee, J. (2018). Collaborative data networks for public service: governance, management, and performance. *Public Management Review*, 20(5), 672–690. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2017.1305691>
- Cheung, A. B. L. (2005). The Politics of Administrative Reforms in Asia: Paradigms and Legacies, Paths and Diversities. *An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions*, 18(2), 257–282.
- Christensen, T., & Laegreid, P. (2025). Future Challenges of Public Administration. *Public Performance and Management Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2025.2549297>
- Christensen, T., Lægred, P., & Rykkja, L. H. (2016). Organizing for Crisis Management: Building Governance Capacity and Legitimacy. *Public Administration Review*, 76(6), 887–897. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12558>

- Corvo, L., Savignon, A. B., Cepiku, D., & Meneguzzo, M. (2014). 8 Implementation of Strategic and Performance Management Reforms in Italian Central Governments.
- Denhardt, R. B., & Denhardt, J. V. (2020). The New Public Service: Serving Rather than Steering. In *Theories of Public Organization* (7th). Cengage Learning.
- Dunleavy, P., & Margetts, H. (2025). Data science, artificial intelligence and the third wave of digital era governance. *Public Policy and Administration*, 40(2), 185-214. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09520767231198737>
- Durman, Mykola O, Bashtannyk, Alla H, Kornienko, Viktoria, Omarov, Azad E, Levchenko, Svitlana H, Durman, M O, Bashtannyk, A H, Kornienko, V, Omarov, A E, & Levchenko, S H. (2020). The Paradigm of Public Administration and its Development in Conditions of State Formation and Changes. In *International Journal of Economics and Business Administration: VIII* (Number 1).
- González-Bustamante, B., & Aguilar, D. (2023). Territorial patterns of open e-government: evidence from Chilean municipalities. *Political Research Exchange*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2474736X.2023.2194369>
- Hernández, G., & Amaral, M. (2022). Case studies on agile regulatory governance to harness innovation. *OECD Regulatory Policy Working* <https://search.proquest.com/openview/8e6ee2696a62e789482a840e11097f31/1.pdf?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=6245933>
- James, D. (2021). ASEAN-OECD Good Regulatory Practices Network: Regulatory Policy in Southeast Asia During COVID-19 and Agile Governance. *policycommons.net*. <https://policycommons.net/artifacts/3826908/2/4632827/>
- James, Oliver., Jilke, S. R. ., & Van Ryzin, G. G. . (2017). *Experiments in public management research : challenges and contributions*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kementerian PANRB. (2023). *Paparan Jelang Pemantauan dan Evaluasi SPBE 2022. Kementerian Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara Dan Reformasi Birokrasi Republik Indonesia*, 53(9), 1-23.
- Lobel, O., & Lobel, O. (2012). *Legal Studies Research Paper Series New Governance as Regulatory Governance*. (12).
- Marthinu, E., Salam, R., Adjam, S., Acmad, R., & Rohmah, P. A. (2025). Agile Governance for Disaster Management in Higher Education: Insights on Literacy, Preparedness, and Student Roles in Ternate. *Journal of Transformative Governance and Social Justice*, 3(2), 200-212. <https://doi.org/10.26905/j-tragos.v3i2.15848>
- Papavasiliou, S., & Gorod, A. (2022). Stakeholder Management in Digital Transformation: A System of Systems Approach. 500-505. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SOSE55472.2022.9812667>
- Petana, G., & Sofou, S. (2024). Data Governance to Counter Hybrid Threats against Critical Infrastructures. *Smart Cities*, 7(4), 1857-1877. <https://doi.org/10.3390/smartcities7040072>

- Pollit, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2002). *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis* (1st ed.).
- Rabu, E. H. A. (2021). Reform in The Field of Bureaucracy For Realizing Good Governance in Public Policy Law. *PETITA*, (2).
- Rahman, Md. M., Liberman, Dr. L. S., Giedraitis, Dr. V. R., & Akhter, Mrs. T. (2013). The Paradigm from Traditional Public Administration to New Public Management System in Bangladesh: What Do Reform Initiatives Stand for? *Advances in Economics and Business*, 1(3), 297–303. <https://doi.org/10.13189/aeb.2013.010307>
- Reis, J. L., Ferreira, R., & Sousa, R. D. (2021). Information Systems Function and Governance in Portuguese Organizations. In A. Rocha, R. Goncalves, F. G. Penalvo, & J. Martins (Eds.), *Iberian Conference on Information Systems and Technologies, CISTI*. IEEE Computer Society. <https://doi.org/10.23919/CISTI52073.2021.9476423>
- Rizwan Ullah, M., Alnafissa, M., & Nasrullah, M. (2025). Enhancing environmental performance in the OECD nations through financial inclusion, digital innovation and effective governance. *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management*, 17(1), 437–459. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCCSM-08-2024-0134>
- Scott, R. J., Donadelli, F., & Merton, E. R. K. (2023). Administrative philosophies in the discourse and decisions of the New Zealand public service: is post-New Public Management still a myth? *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 89(4), 941–957. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00208523221101727>
- Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a Methodology for Developing Evidence-Informed Management Knowledge by Means of Systematic Review. *British Journal of Management*, 14(3), 207–222. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.00375>
- Traunmüller, R. (2013). E-government - New challenges ahead. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 8061 LNCS, 8–17. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-40160-2_2
- Trong Tuan, L. (2017). Reform in public organizations: the roles of ambidextrous leadership and moderating mechanisms. *Public Management Review*, 19(4), 518–541. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2016.1195438>
- Winoto, S. (2025). Enhancing Governance and Development: Analyzing Performance Management Practices. *Journal of Transformative Governance and Social Justice*, 3(2), 137–153. <https://doi.org/10.26905/j-tragos.v3i2.15846>
- Xiao, Y., & Watson, M. (2019). Guidance on Conducting a Systematic Literature Review. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 39(1), 93–112. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X17723971>