

Revisiting Governance Theory: A Comprehensive Framework for 21st-Century Public Administration

Tomi Apra Santosa¹, Anwar Manahor², Siti Fatimah Bin Salmah³

¹Akademi Teknik Adikarya, Kerinci. Indonesia

²Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Selangor. Malaysia

³Universiti Brunei Darussalam, Bandar Seri Begawan. Brunei Darussalam

Correspondence: santosa2021@yahoo.com¹



Received: August 13, 2025 | Revised: August 23, 2025 | Accepted: August 30, 2025



<https://doi.org/10.69812/jgs.v2i2.157>

ABSTRACT

The evolving socio-political, economic, and technological landscapes of the 21st century demand a critical reassessment of governance theory to ensure its relevance in addressing complex and dynamic challenges. This study aims to revisit classical and contemporary approaches by examining their strengths, limitations, and applicability to modern public administration. Employing an integrative literature review, the research synthesizes conceptual and empirical insights from governance paradigms including network governance, collaborative governance, and adaptive governance sourced from leading academic databases. The analysis reveals that while classical hierarchical models provide structural stability and clear authority, they are increasingly inadequate for responding to transnational issues such as climate change, pandemics, technological disruption, and global inequality. Conversely, contemporary paradigms highlight the importance of flexibility, stakeholder collaboration, and evidence-based decision-making supported by digital transformation. The findings indicate that effective governance in the 21st century requires an integrated framework that balances normative ideals of transparency, accountability, and inclusivity with practical imperatives of responsiveness, resilience, and innovation. This synthesis underscores the necessity of feedback mechanisms, organizational learning, and multi-level coordination to navigate uncertainty and create sustainable public value. The study concludes that the future of governance lies not in discarding classical theories entirely, but in reconfiguring them through a comprehensive model that harmonizes structural order with adaptability, thus equipping institutions to manage global complexities while preserving legitimacy and public trust.

Keyword: Public Administration, Adaptive Governance, Multi-Level Governance, Institutional Resilience



INTRODUCTION

The changes in the global environment in the 21st century are marked by the acceleration of globalization that strengthens interconnections between

countries in the economic, political, social, and cultural fields. Free trade flows, human mobility, information exchange, and market integration have created new opportunities for growth and innovation, but at the same time pose challenges in governance (Syarifudin et al., 2025; Salazar et al., 2025).

These global dynamics require governments to be able to respond to transnational issues such as migration, cybersecurity, and economic inequality with a cross-sectoral and cross-border approach. On the other hand, the digital revolution has changed the way public organizations and society interact, where information technology, big data, and artificial intelligence are essential components of decision-making. This transformation requires the bureaucracy to adapt to a more participatory, transparent, and data-based governance model (Kumar Singh Asst Professor & Kumar Singh, 2025; Vlahos, 2025)(Komarudin et al., 2025; Rintia et al., 2025).

In addition, the complexity of public policy is increasing due to the overlap of global and local problems, which are often multidimensional and interrelated (Romualdo & Wilkins, 2025). The climate crisis demands comprehensive mitigation and adaptation policies, while global health pandemics, such as COVID-19, demonstrate the limited capacity of public institutions to respond effectively to emergencies.

Geopolitical conflicts and tensions between countries also complicate political stability and economic resilience, requiring flexible governance while adhering to the principles of justice, accountability, and sustainability (Michaud, 2025). In this context, public administration functions not only as a service provider, but also as a strategic actor capable of coordinating various stakeholders to meet the challenges of the 21st century collaboratively and adaptively (Richardson, 2004; Ćorović et al., 2025).

The need for an adaptive, inclusive, and evidence-based governance system is becoming increasingly urgent amid uncertain and rapidly changing global environmental dynamics (Hind, 2025). Adaptive governance systems allow governments to respond to changing social, economic, and political conditions with high flexibility, as well as leverage continuous learning from previous policy experiences (Folke et al., 2005).

This adaptivity also plays an important role in anticipating long-term risks, such as the impact of climate change and technological disruption, through dynamically adjustable policy mechanisms (Binza et al., 2012). On the other hand, inclusivity in governance ensures that decision-making processes involve diverse actors including marginalized groups in order to strengthen policy legitimacy and prevent social inequality (Ansell & Gash, 2008).

The evidence-based governance approach is increasingly recognized as an essential strategy in producing effective and accountable policies. The use of empirical data, scientific analysis, and performance indicator-based evaluations can minimize political bias as well as improve policy accuracy (Nutley et al., 2007). In practice, the integration of evidence into governance processes requires adequate institutional capacity, including data infrastructure, competent human resources, and an organizational culture that supports rational decision-making (Ramaul et al., 2025).

By combining the principles of adaptivity, inclusivity, and the use of evidence, public governance can become more responsive to contemporary challenges while also being oriented towards sustainable public value creation. Classical governance theories rooted in traditional public administration paradigms often emphasize hierarchical structures, rigid bureaucratic procedures, and

centralized lines of command. Although this approach provides clarity of authority and organizational stability, it tends to be less responsive to rapid and complex environmental changes (Weber, 2017).

The hierarchical-bureaucratic model also often hinders innovation because it prioritizes procedural compliance over adaptation to social and technological dynamics (Peters, 2010). In the context of globalization and the digital revolution, this approach has become less relevant because it is unable to accommodate multi-stakeholder engagement and collaborative decision-making across sectors (Alibašić, 2025; Al-Thani, 2025).

In addition, the limitations of classical governance theory can be seen in its tendency to strictly separate policy-makers and policy implementers, which often results in gaps in communication and ineffective implementation (Hughes, 2012). Overly centralistic structures can also ignore local knowledge and public participation, thereby undermining policy legitimacy. As the complexity of public issues increases such as the climate crisis, global pandemics, and technological disruption rigid bureaucratic approaches face the major challenge of delivering a rapid, adaptive, and inclusive response.

This condition encourages the need to reconstruct governance theory towards a more flexible, participatory, and evidence-based model, in order to be able to respond to the demands of 21st-century public administration. The paradigms of network governance, collaborative governance, and adaptive governance emerged in response to the limitations of the classical governance model that tends to be hierarchical and centralized (Rubaii, 2016).

Network governance emphasizes the importance of horizontal relationships between organizations, both in the public, private, and civil society sectors, to achieve common goals through coordination and exchange of resources (Rhodes, 2007). This approach recognizes that many public issues are cross-institutional and require synergy between actors who have different authorities and interests. Meanwhile, collaborative governance focuses on a deliberative process that involves various stakeholders in joint decision-making, with the aim of building consensus, strengthening policy legitimacy, and increasing the effectiveness of implementation (Ansell & Gash, 2008).

On the other hand, adaptive governance is evolving as a framework that emphasizes the capacity of institutions to respond to uncertainty and rapid change through continuous learning, policy experimentation, and feedback mechanisms (Folke et al., 2005). This paradigm is particularly relevant in the face of global challenges such as climate change, health crises, and technological disruption, where uncertainty is an inevitable element (Testa et al., 2025). The development of these three paradigms demands the establishment of a new governance conceptual framework that is able to integrate cross-sectoral networks, inclusive collaborative processes, and evidence-based adaptivity.

Thus, public governance can be more responsive, participatory, and sustainable in the face of the complexities of the 21st century (Jalonen, 2025). emphasized that network governance is one of the relevant models to overcome the limitations of traditional bureaucratic systems, especially in the context of cross-sector and cross-organizational relationships. Research by Ansell and Gash (2008) shows that collaborative governance can increase policy legitimacy and strengthen public trust through the active involvement of stakeholders(Runya et al., 2015).

They emphasized the need for feedback mechanisms, collective learning, and the ability to innovate in designing public policies. This study is relevant because

it underscores that the challenges of the 21st century such as climate change, global pandemics, and technological disruption require governance models that are not only responsive, but also flexible and oriented towards long-term sustainability (Elatmani & El, 2025; Hergüner, 2024). By combining the findings of these various studies, the development of a comprehensive governance conceptual framework can have a strong theoretical foundation as well as be applicable to public administration in the modern era.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses an integrative literature review approach to examine, compare, and synthesize theories of public governance that have developed from classical to contemporary paradigms. This method was chosen because it is able to combine conceptual and empirical findings from various disciplines, resulting in a more comprehensive conceptual framework (Snyder, 2019). The data collection process is carried out through literature search on reputable scientific databases, such as Scopus, Web of Science, and ScienceDirect, using the keywords "governance theory," "public administration," "network governance," "collaborative governance," and "adaptive governance." The inclusion criteria include articles published in the last 20 years, in English, and discussing the conceptual framework or application of governance models in the context of public administration.

Literature analysis is carried out through a thematic analysis process to identify patterns, gaps, and theoretical integration from various sources. Each article that meets the inclusion criteria is coded based on key themes, such as the principles of adaptivity, multi-stakeholder collaboration, and the use of evidence in policymaking. The results of the analysis are then synthesized to formulate a conceptual framework for public governance that integrates the advantages of the network governance paradigm, collaborative governance, and adaptive governance. This approach allows research to produce powerful theoretical contributions while also providing practical implications for policy makers and public administration practitioners in the 21st century.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Characteristics and Relevance of the Contemporary Paradigm

Network governance emerged as one of the contemporary paradigms that offers solutions to the limitations of the classical hierarchical governance approach. In the context of cross-institutional issues, such as climate change, cybersecurity, and natural resource management, cross-sectoral networks enable the exchange of information, resources, and capacity between actors from various domains, including government, the private sector, and civil society (Rhodes, 2007).

This approach promotes flexible horizontal coordination, so that it can accelerate responses to complex problems that cannot be solved by one institution alone. By building relationships based on trust and interdependence, network governance expands the capacity of public governance to reach resources and knowledge beyond traditional institutional boundaries (Júnior, 2025). In its implementation, network governance requires intensive communication mechanisms and an effective coordination system (Bobkier et al., 2025).

This is important to avoid policy overlap or conflicts of interest between the actors involved. Information disclosure and shared accountability are prerequisites for the success of cross-sectoral networks, especially in issues involving global

and local interests at the same time. Meanwhile, collaborative governance focuses on the effectiveness of deliberative processes involving various stakeholders in decision-making. This paradigm departs from the understanding that the complexity of public problems requires contributions from various perspectives, including from groups of people directly affected by policies (Ansell & Gash, 2008).

Through collaborative forums, stakeholders can build common understanding, align goals, and formulate more inclusive solutions. The advantage of collaborative governance lies in its ability to strengthen the legitimacy of policies, because the decisions taken reflect the aspirations and interests of various parties. The success of collaborative governance relies heavily on factors such as facilitative leadership, clarity of the rules of the game, and trust between actors (Emerson et al., 2012).

A transparent, consensus-oriented deliberative process can minimize resistance to policy implementation (Syarifudin et al., 2025). In addition, collaborative governance also has a strategic role in building social capacity, where intensive interaction among stakeholders can create valuable social capital for the sustainability of cooperation in the future. In the context of public governance, this paradigm has become increasingly relevant in the era of information disclosure, where public participation is seen as an essential component of a healthy democracy.

Adaptive governance is a paradigm that emphasizes the capacity of institutions to learn, innovate, and respond dynamically to uncertainty. This approach is particularly relevant in dealing with the challenges of the 21st century characterized by high uncertainty, such as natural disasters, global pandemics, and disruptive technological changes (Folke et al., 2005). Adaptive governance encourages feedback mechanisms that allow for continuous evaluation and adjustment of policies. Thus, public policy is not only reactive to emerging problems, but also proactive in anticipating future changes and risks.

The key to the success of adaptive governance is the ability to integrate learnings from a variety of policy experiences into the process of formulating and implementing new strategies. This requires an openness to innovation, the courage to experiment, and a willingness to admit and correct mistakes. Emphasizes that adaptive governance must involve a wide range of actors from the local to global levels to ensure a contextual and effective response (Michaud, 2025). By combining the principles of adaptivity with cross-sector collaboration and networking, adaptive governance can be an important foundation for the construction of a responsive, inclusive, and sustainable public governance framework in the 21st century.

2. Synthesis of 21st Century Governance Principles

The principles of governance in the 21st century demand an integration between the normative values that are the moral foundation of government and practical demands that are directly related to the effectiveness of policies. Normative values such as transparency, accountability, and public participation are the main pillars of good governance that ensure public legitimacy and trust in the government (UNDP, 1997).

However, in the contemporary context, these principles must be harmonized with practical needs such as responsiveness to crises and institutional resilience in the face of disruption (Romualdo & Wilkins, 2025). This integration is important because normative values without practical capabilities will result in

governance that is ideal in theory but weak in implementation, while practical demands without normative values risk giving birth to effective but unjust policies.

The role of digital technology is a crucial element in accelerating the policy process in the information age. Digital transformation allows governments to access, process, and analyze large amounts of data in real-time, so that decision-making can be faster and more accurate (Mergel et al., 2019). Technologies such as big data analytics, artificial intelligence, and geographic information systems open up opportunities to formulate evidence-based policies, while improving the efficiency of public services. The integration of digital technology also strengthens the principle of transparency through open government data that makes it easier for the public to access information and monitor government performance.

The concept of data-driven decision-making is an integral part of modern results-oriented governance. By utilizing valid and verified data, the government can formulate policies that are in accordance with field conditions and measure their effectiveness objectively (Janssen & van der Voort, 2016). This approach not only increases accountability, but also reduces political bias in decision-making. The challenge is to ensure data quality, maintain information security, and protect citizens' privacy so that public trust is maintained.

Feedback mechanisms and continuous learning are at the heart of policy sustainability in the 21st century. A systematic evaluation process allows the government to identify policy weaknesses early and make necessary adjustments. The adaptive governance model encourages continuous organizational learning, where each policy cycle becomes a source of knowledge for future improvement (Argyris & Schön, 1996).

Thus, policies are not static, but continue to evolve according to changes in the environment and societal needs (Hind, 2025). The integration of normative values, practical demands, the use of digital technology, and continuous learning creates a more responsive, inclusive, and sustainability-oriented public governance framework. This framework is not only relevant for dealing with short-term challenges such as health crises or natural disasters, but also for building long-term resilience in the face of uncertain global dynamics. By combining all these elements, 21st-century governance can optimally realize public value, while maintaining public legitimacy and trust in public institutions (Binza et al., 2012; Ramaul et al., 2025).

3. Criticism of Classical Governance Theory

The classical governance model that is hierarchical and bureaucratic does have the main strength in providing a clear structure, a firm division of authority, and a defined chain of command (Weber, 1947). This approach allows public organizations to operate with discipline, order, and procedural certainty, thereby minimizing the risk of abuse of authority. However, in the context of rapid socio-political change, this model tends to show rigidity in adapting to external dynamics. The inability to respond quickly to complex and unexpected situations is one of the fundamental obstacles in its relevance in the 21st century (Peters, 2019).

In addition, classical governance often places decision-making exclusively at the top level, with minimal public participation. This structure assumes that the highest authorities have the best information and capacity to make decisions, so that the contributions of non-governmental actors are less taken into account (Osborne, 2006). As a result, the resulting policies have the potential to be less responsive to the needs of the community and do not reflect the diversity of

perspectives on the ground. This is inversely proportional to the demands of modern governance that emphasizes openness and inclusivity of processes (Alibašić, 2025).

Another significant criticism is the limitations of the bureaucratic model in accommodating policy flexibility. Rigid procedures, overly detailed operational standards, and a focus on formal compliance make bureaucracies often slow to adopt innovation (Kettunen & Kallio, 2020). In crisis situations, such as pandemics or natural disasters, the inability to improvise policies quickly can have serious consequences for the effectiveness of public services. Therefore, an approach that relies solely on classical governance risks hampering the adaptive capabilities of institutions (Vlahos, 2025; Kumar & Kumar, 2025).

The gap between policy makers and policy implementers is also a major highlight. In many cases, strategic decisions are made without considering the technical and operational realities on the ground (Hill & Hupe, 2014). This causes policy implementation to often be hampered by mismatches between design and actual conditions. Such communication and coordination gaps can reduce the effectiveness of policies and even create distortions in the achievement of goals (Al-Thani, 2025). Overall, while classical governance theory remains relevant in providing a structural foundation and formal accountability, its limitations in terms of flexibility, public participation, and adaptability demand a paradigm shift. The shift towards a more collaborative, network-based, and adaptive approach is an urgent need for governance to be able to respond to the complex challenges of the current era of globalization and digitalization (Ansell & Torfing, 2021).

CONCLUSION

The results of this study conclude that contemporary governance paradigms including network governance, collaborative governance, and adaptive governance offer a more responsive, inclusive, and flexible approach than classical governance theories that tend to be hierarchical and bureaucratic. This development is in line with the increasing complexity of public problems that are cross-sectoral, multi-actor, and dynamic, thus requiring a new conceptual framework that integrates normative values such as transparency, accountability, and participation with practical demands such as responsiveness and institutional resilience. The use of digital technology and data-driven approaches further strengthens governance's capacity to formulate policies that are fast, adaptive, and evidence-based.

In addition, this research shows that the effectiveness of 21st century governance relies heavily on the ability of institutions to facilitate collaboration between stakeholders, develop sustainable feedback mechanisms, and build organizational learning cultures. Although classical governance theory still has an important role to play in maintaining structure, clarity of authority, and stability, its weaknesses in dealing with uncertainty and its limitations in accommodating public participation make it necessary to be complemented by a more adaptive paradigm. Thus, the ideal governance in the modern era is not a total replacement of the classical model, but a synthesis that combines structural stability with innovation, collaboration and a high capacity for adaptation.

REFERENCES

- Al-Thani, G. (2025). Beyond Consultation: Rethinking Stakeholder Engagement in Qatar's Public Education Policymaking. *Education Sciences*, 15(6). <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15060769>

- Alibašić, H. (2025). Administrative Legacy of Ibn Khaldûn : A Comparative Study of Historical Influences in Contemporary Governance Practices. *Institutiones Administrationis*, 5(1), 25–49. <https://doi.org/10.54201/iajas.142>
- Binza, P. S., Matshabaphala, M. J. D., Matshiliza, N., & Maimela, K. (2012). March 2012 Electronic copy available at : <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2186347> Chief Editor and Chairperson of the Editorial Committee : Prof . M . J Mafunisa The Journal of Public Administration is accredited with the South African Department of Higher Educa. *SA Journal of Public Administration*, 47(1), 311–329.
- Bobkier, R., Kovler, K., Tsapalov, A., & Czech, E. K. (2025). "Fusion of Horizons": Part III. Rethinking radon Risk: Scientific advances and regulatory implications (since 1990s). *Journal of Environmental Radioactivity*, 286(April), 107707. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvrad.2025.107707>
- Ćorović, D., Korać, S. T., & Milinković, M. (2025). Revisiting the Contested Case of Belgrade Waterfront Transformation: From Unethical Urban Governance to Landscape Degradation. *Land*, 14(5). <https://doi.org/10.3390/land14050988>
- Elatmani, M., & El, K. (2025). The Modernization of Public Administration in Morocco through New Public Management: A Theoretical Perspective. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 17(2), 109–119. <https://doi.org/10.7176/ejbm/17-2-10>
- Faleiros Júnior, J. L. de M. (2025). Electronic, performance and digital government: which is the better conceptual model for Public Administration in the 21st century? *Brazilian Journal of Law, Technology and Innovation*, 3(1), 161–183. <https://doi.org/10.59224/bjlti.v3i1.161-183>
- Hergüner, B. (2024). Digital Public Administration: Revisiting Identity Crisis for the Adaptation of New Technologies. *Yönetim ve Ekonomi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 22(3), 91–103. <https://doi.org/10.11611/yead.1367412>
- Hind, V. K. (2025). Justice as fairness in governance: Revisiting John Rawls in the context of public policy and administrative ethics. *International Journal of Political Science and Governance*, 7(5), 237–242. <https://doi.org/10.33545/26646021.2025.v7.i5c.547>
- Jalonen, H. (2025). A complexity theory perspective on politico-administrative systems: Insights from a systematic literature review. *International Public Management Journal*, 28(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2024.2333382>
- Komarudin, I., Duerawee, A., Prio, A., & Santoso, A. (2025). The Digital Education based on Public Innovation in Developing a Sustainable Agribusiness Ecosystem. *Journal Governance Society*, 2(1), 38–47.
- Kumar Singh Asst Professor, S., & Kumar Singh, S. (2025). Revisiting Theories of Punishment in the 21st Century: A Critical Analysis of Retribution, Deterrence, Rehabilitation, and Restorative Justice in Contemporary Legal Systems. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(5), 136–144. www.theinfinite.in
- Michaud, G. (2025). Leveraging pluralist epistemology to advance public policy studies at the university level. *Public Administration and Policy*, August. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PAP-02-2024-0023>
- Ramaul, L., Ritala, P., Kostis, A., & Aaltonen, P. (2025). Rethinking How We Theorize AI in Organization and Management: A Problematising Review of Rationality and Anthropomorphism. *Journal of Management Studies*.

- <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.13246>
- Richardson, H. S. (2004). Thinking about conflicts of desire. *Practical Conflicts: New Philosophical Essays*, 1990, 92–117. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511616402.005>
- Rintia, R., Sentosa, I., & Yudithia, Y. (2025). Evaluation of the Ministry of Social Affairs Policy on Social Protection Programs in Indonesia. *Journal Governance Society*, 2(1), 24–37.
- Romualdo, V., & Wilkins, A. (2025). Rethinking educational federalism: using assemblage theory to analyse policy travel and transformation in Argentina. *Journal of Education Policy*, 00(00), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2025.2537170>
- Rubaii, N. (2016). *The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB) The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB) Education: Reimagining How We Teach What We Teach Education: Reimagining How We Teach What We Teach*. https://orb.binghamton.edu/public_admin_fac/9
- Runya, X., Qigui, S., & Wei, S. (2015). The third wave of public administration: the New Public Governance. *Canadian Social Science*, 11(7), 11–21. <https://doi.org/10.3968/7354>
- Salazar M. D., Jhagroe, S., & Pineda, P. (2025). (De)colonial public administration education? A comparative study of North-South curricular differences. *Teaching Public Administration*, 0(0), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01447394251364253>
- Syarifudin, F., Nurhasanah, H., Nurmayanti, S., Alwasi, M. J., & Al-farabi, N. U. (2025). *Ibn Khaldun 's Thought on Leadership and Economic Governance : Relevance to Sustainable Development*. 1(1), 46–60.
- Testa, F., Di Minin, A., Tosi, D., Cucino, V., Ontano, G., Russo, M. V., Dahlmann, F., Banerjee, S. B., Thorpe, A. S., Figge, F., Shapira, P., Unter, K. M. M., Walls, J., Darnall, N., McCarthy, A., Ferri, P., Holland, C., & Cricchio, J. (2025). The Biodiversity Moonshot: A Spark for a Transformative Change or a New Business-Case Facade? *Business Ethics, the Environment and Responsibility*, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.70013>
- Vlahos, N. (2025). *Revisiting Critical Democratization : Situating Power , Place , and Participation in Capitalist Democracy*. 1–16.