

A Dark Labyrinth of Risk Governance and Culture: A Sustainability of Higher Education in Indonesia

Bernadetha Nadeak

Universitas Kristen Indonesia

* e-mail: bernadetha.nadeak@uki.ac.id

Abstract

This research aims to highlight the complexities between regulations and practices in higher education and to address the sustainability of organizations in Indonesia through risk governance and culture. Government regulations have transformed higher education governance, addressing changes that are not yet aligned with domestic and international competition. These drastic changes, described as a dark labyrinth, have altered the strategies of higher education institutions for sustainability and regulatory compliance, resulting in stagnant or even declining growth. Therefore, this study argues that calculating risk governance and culture creates attitudes and behaviours that enable institutions to survive, adapt, and thrive in complex environments. Using secondary sources, including books, articles, academic writings, and archival materials, this research explores the issues and develops an in-depth discussion. The findings show that risk governance and culture shape attitudes and behaviours among human resources and are crucial determinants of compliance in higher education management.

Keywords: *dark; labyrinth; risk; governance; culture;*

How to cite : Nadeak, B. (2026). A Dark Labyrinth of Risk Governance and Culture: A Sustainability of Higher Education in Indonesia. *Pedagoggi: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 26(1).
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24036/pedagogi.v26i1.2966>



Licensees may copy, distribute, display and perform the work and make derivative and remixes based on it only if they give the author or licensor the credits (attribution) in the manner specified by these. Licensees may copy, distribute, display, and perform the work and make derivative works and remixes based on it only for non-commercial purposes

INTRODUCTION

The sustainability of higher education institutions in Indonesia declined significantly from 2022 to 2024. According to data from (Statistik, 2024), the number of public and private universities in 2022 was 3,107, while in 2024 it was 2,937. The decline in the number of universities, according to (Bolton et al., 2020), suggests that universities and stakeholder engagement have not been able to address regulatory capitalism as a more sustainable governance mechanism. This argument is supported (Nauffal & Nader, 2022), who note that the abundance of regulations creates a mix of governance modes in higher education institutions as a risk-mitigation strategy for sustainability. Regulatory dynamics alone are insufficient to explain the existential vulnerability of higher education institutions, but they are influenced by the institution's ability to identify long-term strategic risks through governance (Surtiari & Hidayati, 2025). Therefore, I call the practice of higher education a dark labyrinth for stakeholders, because these risks are systemic and cannot be mitigated through an administrative approach alone, but rather through adaptive governance capabilities in creating an organizational culture.

Financial instability significantly threatens the sustainability of higher education institutions, particularly through inadequate risk governance. Studies such as (Boateng et al,

2024), (Gumus, 2018), and (Sagara & Yustini, 2019) indicate that reliance on tuition fees, limited revenue diversification, and underdeveloped financial risk governance contribute to the financial fragility of these institutions. This highlights that existing risk governance measures are insufficient for ensuring long-term sustainability. (2025) further argue that risk governance and culture in higher education often remain at an administrative level, rather than being integrated into strategic decision-making. Consequently, institutions tend to react to crises rather than proactively adapt to changing environments.

Furthermore, the decline in the number of higher education institutions in Indonesia is not merely a statistical phenomenon but also indicates structural gaps in risk governance, regulatory adaptation, and the institution's strategic capacity to respond to change. (Machado-Taylor & Mattias, 2022) note that higher education institutions require parameters within organizational governance to foster a positive culture and readiness for change. (Garcia Juanatey et al, 2025) note that European Higher Education defines governance and culture at the level of coordination between regulations, administrative culture, and political dynamics. Therefore, risk governance and culture in higher education institutions in Indonesia have not yet adopted a holistic approach to address regulatory changes and compete internationally.

Prior research confirms that the dynamics of risk governance and organizational culture in Indonesian higher education remain underexplored, especially regarding their role in declining institutional sustainability. While most studies focus on regulatory aspects as primary sustainability determinants, I contend that they overlook how the complexity of risk governance impedes institutions' ability to adapt to shifts in the strategic environment. This creates a 'dark labyrinth' that increases vulnerability. Therefore, this research aims to fill this gap by examining how risk governance, organizational culture, and regulation interact to shape institutional vulnerability, and by developing a framework to conceptualize this labyrinth and measure adaptive governance capability.

METHODS

This study uses secondary sources, such as books, journals, and archived files. The research process is structured into four clear steps: problem formulation, data selection, analysis, and synthesis, each guiding the reader from source identification to theoretical conclusions (Creswell, 2009, pp. 52–55). The central research problem asks how risk governance, organizational culture, and higher education regulations shape the sustainability of higher education institutions in Indonesia. The data corpus, curated for completeness, comprises theoretical sources, regulations, institutional reports, and empirical literature. Literature is analysed using both inductive and deductive reasoning to synthesize insights and address research gaps. Throughout, accuracy and rigor are ensured by focusing on collecting sources based on criteria, applying analysis and synthesis techniques, and validating findings with conceptual triangulation and drawing theoretical implications. This systematic approach ensures the research remains analytical and critical, moving beyond simple quotations.

FINDING AND DISCUSSIONS

Risk Governance and Educational Management

(2024) describe Good University Governance (GUG) as a basic framework that enhances the quality, effectiveness, and accountability of higher education delivery. Wilkins and Gobby's thinking is supported (Rusdi et al, 2023), who state that GUG is positioned as a governance principle that emphasizes transparency, accountability, participation, and ethics as a normative foundation in the management of higher education institutions. In the context of increasingly complex global dynamics, implementing GUG requires visionary, adaptive leadership and the ability to formulate strategic innovations to ensure the sustainability of higher education

institutions. (Monazzam & Crawford, 2024) argue that, in addition to structural and administrative aspects, GUG must be intertwined with a healthy academic culture, which includes constructive social interactions and an organizational climate that fosters a sense of belonging and commitment among the academic community. Therefore, the successful implementation of GUG results from the interaction of various factors, including leadership, state policies, institutional capacity, and digital developments, which together determine the quality, relevance, and competitiveness of higher education institutions globally.

(Bolton et al, 2020) outlined that GUG integration is presented as a strategic mechanism involving academic program management, human resource management, financial management, and the provision of educational infrastructure. (Hassan et al, 2022) to highlight that, in the realm of quality assurance, GUG strengthens internal evaluation through reflective, sustainable mechanisms, while ensuring compliance with external accreditation criteria through transparent, accountable reporting. (Khairunnisa et al, 2025) argue that variations in governance and quality assurance approaches are influenced by the structure of the educational bureaucracy, the level of government intervention, accreditation mechanisms, and performance orientation. This comparative analysis indicates that the success of higher education governance depends on a combination of structural, normative, administrative, and organizational cultural factors. Therefore, good governance emphasizes that a comprehensive understanding of the GUG concept and its application is a prerequisite for enhancing institutional legitimacy, advancing academic quality, strengthening public trust, and enhancing the global competitiveness of higher education institutions. I agree with the above question that the effective implementation of GUG is not only an administrative necessity but also a key strategy for the development of sustainable, quality-oriented higher education.

(Islami, 2025) explains that school autonomy reforms create not only administrative decentralization but also conditions marked by depoliticization, corporatization, endogenous privatization, and disintermediation. These, in turn, create fiscal, ethical, and institutional risks. (Wilkins & Gobby, 2024), focusing on the British context, argue that academy programs and multi-academy trusts (MATs) shift public authority to new actors—such as CEOs, business sponsors, and trustees—who are then made responsible for managing risk, and are themselves sites of risk for both the state and the public. By contrast, (Foulcault, 2014, pp. 15–17) approaches risk not just as a byproduct of modernization but as a tool of governance that shapes subject behavior through calculation, monitoring, and self-regulation. In response, governments and non-governmental organizations promote governance professionalization by emphasizing business expertise and management competence as prerequisites for legitimacy. This process incrementally subordinates community participation and stakeholder representation to technical, competence-driven models. Therefore, I contend that risk operates as a rationality, shaping new identities for school leaders, trustees, and boards as prudent actors, and reinforcing neoliberal principles within education.

(Walter, 2020) explains that the use of risk as a rationality of governance not only shifts the locus of responsibility from the state to the individual but also creates an increasingly exclusive, technocratic governance configuration. In (Surtiari & Hidayati's, 2025) research differs from Walter's, arguing that risk rationality creates a condition in which only actors with certain technical competencies are deemed worthy of participating in governance, thereby eliminating forms of public participation previously seen as essential to democratic governance. Therefore, the governmentality approach opens up new understandings of how risk operates not only as an analytical category but as a political force that shapes the practices, identities, and structures of contemporary educational governance. This thinking is supported by (Kalogiannidis et al, 2023), who assert that effective governance is built through strong political leadership, cross-institutional collaboration, and public risk awareness strengthened by education and information systems. I emphasize that governance is not only responsible for creating policy frameworks but also must

develop financial assurance mechanisms, including the efficient management of national and community resources within the sustainable development agenda.

Risk Culture and Educational Management

(Gavari-Starkie et al, 2021) examine the Japanese education system as a worthy international model for strengthening urban resilience because it has successfully institutionalized Disaster Resilience Education (DRE) holistically—across formal, non-formal, and informal education—and linked it to national and local disaster governance. Theoretically, education is positioned as a “human infrastructure” that complements the physical engineering of cities, given that urban vulnerability increases due to population density, system interconnectivity, and accelerating climate change. Therefore, citizens’ abilities to absorb shocks, adapt, and recover need to be built early through the integration of knowledge (local hazards), training (simulation/evacuation), and soft skills (critical thinking, problem-solving, and collaboration). (Elmagrhi & Ntim, 2023) argue that education—not merely an instrument of knowledge transfer—acts as a governmentality mechanism that produces risk-ready citizens and fosters a culture of resilient socio-cognitive capital. Therefore, competency-based resilience: resilience is not the result of accumulating “facts,” but rather the result of repeated practice that establishes practical cognitive schemes such as evacuation heuristics, mental mapping of safe routes, and meaningful drills that can be activated under conditions of uncertainty.

Research by (Rusdi et al, 2023) demonstrates that successful risk management in educational institutions primarily depends on strategic leadership and systemic processes, rather than on financial resources alone. Even with limited means, institutions can progress through interventions such as standardizing assessment tools, using integrated risk registers, running case workshops, forming cross-unit teams for ongoing evaluation, and conducting tabletop scenario exercises. Building on this, (Nurjanah, 2025) finds that leadership must shift from merely managing administration to orchestrating digital transformation. Educational leaders should combine digital literacy, strategic responsiveness, and technology integration into pedagogy. As such, leadership must focus on designing flexible, quality-driven learning ecosystems, rather than simply adopting tools. Persistent gaps in digital skills, organizational resistance, and underprepared structures mean that technology use in schools remains sporadic, often leading policies to misalign with contemporary learning needs.

(Halimah et al, 2024) proposed that organizational readiness and the quality of professional relationships serve as moderating variables determining the effectiveness of distributive transformational leadership in a digital context. (Boateng et al, 2024) proposed the formulation of an adaptive educational management model as a strategic response to digital disruption: a flexible organizational structure (enabling decentralization of decisions), embedded ICT integration in learning strategies and administrative coordination, a digital monitoring and evaluation system based on performance indicators, and strengthening human resource competencies through targeted training in technological competencies and digital methodologies. Therefore, transformational and distributive leadership are most effective when combined with adaptive governance—namely, clarity of vision, data-driven governance, and ethical commitment—so that technological decisions do not negate values, privacy, and equality (Wiryadinata, 2023b). Therefore, the risk culture for achieving successful digital transformation lies in aligning three elements: leadership vision, technological readiness, and organizational commitment to sustainable change in the modern education ecosystem. This study emphasizes the need for universities to develop comprehensive training plans with clear objectives, measurable achievement standards, and training formats that are responsive to the real needs of administrative staff. In addition to training, the article highlights the importance of an adaptive governance model that emphasizes decentralization, accountability, and collaboration. Administrative staff need to be

empowered to play an active role in policy formulation, performance monitoring, and the development of strategic networks with external stakeholders.

(Van Nguyen et al, 2025) discuss the urgency of enhancing university governance capacity by strengthening administrative staff's competencies, particularly in Vietnam's ongoing higher education transformation toward institutional autonomy and increased regional competitiveness. Effective university governance is strongly influenced by administrative staff's ability to perform strategic functions, including vision and mission planning, human resource management, financial management, developing the institution's core values, and building productive internal and external relationships. (Fuad et al, 2025) observe that obstacles such as a lack of professional training, regulatory asymmetry, rigid bureaucratic institutions, and limited administrative experience further reinforce the need for comprehensive reform through strengthening cultural capacity. Therefore, strengthening the culture through structured training is considered a core solution, encompassing mastery of university strategy development, autonomous governance, HR policy design, financial competency, and the ability to build partnerships with industry and social organizations. This study also highlights the need for universities to periodically evaluate the effectiveness of training and adjust policies in line with changing dynamics. Improvements in the legal and governance framework that require transparency and accountability are also seen as crucial to reducing bureaucratic obstacles and regulatory inconsistencies. I agree with (Wiryadinata, 2023a) that the pressures of globalization, regional competition, and quality demands mean that administrative staff capacity is seen as determining universities' success in managing autonomy, maintaining the quality of academic services, and increasing institutional competitiveness.

A Dark Labyrinth of Risk Governance and Culture in Sustaining Higher Education

(Lei Feng, 2025) points out that universities need to shift risk management from the administrative to the strategic realm so that risk mapping does not stop at compliance checklists but rather guides core institutional choices (study program portfolios, financing models, and partnership schemes). On the other hand, Gnawali, (2025) argues that the principles of Good University Governance—transparency, accountability, participation, and ethics—must be operationalized through tangible tools, such as integrated risk registers across units, data-driven performance indicators, and reflective, iterative evaluation mechanisms. Therefore, this approach shifts the organizational logic from “reactive to crisis” to “proactive to uncertainty,” so that structural vulnerabilities—such as reliance on UKT (Student Service Fees), bureaucratic rigidity, and regulatory asymmetry—are managed as strategic hypotheses that are continuously tested, not merely anomalies to be covered up. Thus, governance is no longer seen as a compliance burden, but as managerial capital to maintain legitimacy, improve academic quality, and expand the institution's global competitiveness.

(Amuya & Kariuki, 2024) highlight that strengthening a risk culture means turning values into organizational habits that can be trained, monitored, and adjusted. A “risk-ready” culture not only acknowledges uncertainty but also creates actionable initiatives such as financial scenario simulations, quality assurance exercises, and tabletop exercises for digital and learning service disruptions. (Hassan et al, 2022) argue that transformational-distributive leadership serves as an “orchestrator,” combining vision, technology readiness, and ethical commitment. This ensures that digital decisions—from LMSs to learning analytics—are evaluated for privacy, equity, and quality. Low-cost interventions such as standardized tools, workshops, and cross-unit teams strengthen risk management even with limited resources when structured training, clear metrics, and consistent feedback are in place. These practices not only reduce the administrative “skills gap” but also build ownership of the university's strategic goals, making collaborative culture key to resilience against external shocks.

To navigate the rapidly changing regulatory environment, institutions must develop meta-governance capabilities: the coordinated management of principles, rules, and customs across

multiple levels (country, institution, unit). This coordination must avoid becoming an exclusive technocratic exercise. (Khairunisa, 2025) clarify that institutional autonomy—when supported by a mature risk architecture—means shifting accountability from procedural controls to delivering public-value performance, not simply deregulation. (Lei Feng2025) further supports this by highlighting risk-based budgeting, integrated performance contracts, and collaborative stakeholder relationships as mechanisms for risk mitigation. Here, risk is reframed not as a danger to eliminate, but as a guide for prudent decision-making and responsible leadership among campus actors. My central argument is that this shift in perspective transforms compliance from a primary goal into a byproduct of governance that emphasizes integrity and adaptability, thereby reducing the problem of excessive rules that undermine institutional capability.

Integrating risk governance and risk culture within a sustainable organizational learning ecosystem enhances higher education in Indonesia. This ecosystem comprises a few key elements. First, strategic coherence is established when risk mapping is incorporated into planning, budgeting, and quality assurance cycles, ensuring that all academic and financial decisions are guided by explicit risk rationales. Second, Gnawali comments that adaptive capability is developed as institutions preserve institutional memory through case repositories, lessons-learned audits, and collective reflection, which supports more effective crisis management. Third, equity and public trust are advanced through mechanisms that facilitate meaningful participation, transparent reporting, and adherence to ethical standards, thereby ensuring that risk optimization does not undermine access, quality, or safety in education. The integration of these elements transforms the "dark labyrinth" into a "roadmap" that enables universities to survive, adapt, and grow amid demographic changes, technological disruption, and global competition. This framework offers both conceptual and operational foundations for enhancing the sustainability of Indonesian higher education by reinforcing risk governance and culture.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the sustainability of higher education in Indonesia depends on the strategic integration of risk governance and risk culture into all institutional processes. The main conclusion is that robust and effectively integrated risk governance and risk culture are essential, as they provide universities with a clear, actionable framework for survival, transformation, and sustained competitiveness. This integration ensures that institutional decisions are informed by systematic risk assessment, adaptability, and a proactive response to uncertainty, thereby building the strategic resilience necessary for Indonesian higher education to advance.

REFERENCES

- Amuya, L. O., & Kariuki, P. M. (2024). Measuring the adoption of Enterprise Security Risk Management in Kenya's higher education using the ASIS ESRM Maturity Model. *Security Journal*, 37(4), 1301–1321. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41284-024-00418-4>
- Boateng, P. A., Pepra-Mensah, J., Gyabea, A., Boateng, C. A., Akonor, E. F., & Adei, S. (2024). The Role of Governance in Managing University Finances During Turbulent Times. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 14(1), 2036–2050. <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v14-i1/20286>
- Bolton, D., Landells, T., & Roberts, B. (2020). Sustainable Governance and Responsive Regulation: The Higher Education Sector and Maritime Industry in Australia. In *Journal of Sustainability Research* (Vol. 2, Number 3, pp. 1–41). Hapres Limited. <https://doi.org/10.20900/jsr20200023>
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Elmagrhi, M. H., & Ntim, C. G. (2023). Non-financial reporting in non-profit organisations: the case of risk and governance disclosures in UK higher education institutions. *Accounting Forum*, 47(2), 223–248. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01559982.2022.2148854>

- Feng, L. (2025). Cultivating Awareness and Responsibility: Emergency Culture in College English Curricula. *Journal of Higher Education Research*, 6(5), 569–573. <https://doi.org/10.32629/jher.v6i5.4569>
- Foucault, M. (2014). *Religion and Culture* (J. R. Carrette, Ed.). Routledge.
- Fuad, I. A., Cheumar, M., Pramono, S., & Muhammedi, S. (2025). The Governance and Culture in Islamic Banking Enterprise Risk Management: A Systematic Literature Review. *AKTIVA: Journal of Accountancy and Management*, 3(2), 102–118. <https://doi.org/10.24260/aktiva.v3i2.5050>
- García-Juanatey, A., Jordana, J., & Sancho, D. (2025). Multi-level governance in higher education quality assurance: Agencification and policy coordination in Spain. *Review of Policy Research*, 42(3), 530–551. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ropr.12624>
- Gavari-Starkie, E., Casado-Claro, M. F., & Navarro-González, I. (2021). The Japanese Educational System as an International Model for Urban Resilience. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(11), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18115794>
- Gnawali, S. D. (2025). Higher Education in Nepal: Adapting to Change. *The Harvest*, 4(1), 104–123. <https://doi.org/10.3126/harvest.v4i1.75358>
- Gümüş, S. (2018). State level higher education boards in the USA and reform suggestions for Turkey: Governance, quality assurance, and finance. *Egitim ve Bilim*, 43(193), 45–61. <https://doi.org/10.15390/EB.2018.7476>
- Halimah, H., Syafruddin, S., & Earlyanti, N. I. (2024). The Role of Innovative Leadership in Driving Educational Management Transformation. *Qalamuna: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial, Dan Agama*, 16(1), 207–218. <https://doi.org/10.37680/qalamuna.v16i1.4745>
- Hassan, M. K., Abdulkarim, M. E., & Ismael, H. R. (2022). Risk governance: exploring the role of organisational culture. *Journal of Accounting and Organizational Change*, 18(1), 77–99. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JAOC-01-2021-0003>
- Islami, P. (2025). Good University Governance In Higher Education: A Systematic Literature Review And Research Agenda. *Jurnal Maneksi*, 14(1), 129–139. <https://doi.org/10.31959/jm.v14i1.2753>
- Kalogiannidis, S., Kalfas, D., Chatzitheodoridis, F., & Lekkas, E. (2023). Role of Governance in Developing Disaster Resiliency and Its Impact on Economic Sustainability. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 16(3), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm16030151>
- Khairunisa, T., Herdo, R. L., Mufid, Z. I., Santika, C. D., Anggraini, M., & Aryani, F. (2025). Good University Governance dan Kinerja Perguruan Tinggi. *Journal of Student Research*, 3(4), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.55606/jsr.v3i1.3535>
- Machado-Taylor, M. D. L., & Matias, P. (2022). Governance in Higher Education Institutions: A Glimse from the US. *International Journal of Film and Media Arts*, 7(3), 64–77. <https://doi.org/10.24140/ijfma.v7.n3.05>
- Monazzam, A., & Crawford, J. (2024). The role of enterprise risk management in enabling organisational resilience: a case study of the Swedish mining industry. *Journal of Management Control*, 35(1), 59–108. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00187-024-00370-9>
- Nauffal, D., & Nader, J. (2022). Organizational cultures of higher education institutions operating amid turbulence and an unstable environment: the Lebanese case. *Higher Education*, 84(2), 343–371. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-021-00771-y>

- Nurjanah, N. (2025). Transformation of Learning Leadership in the Digital Era: A Qualitative Analysis Based on Literature Studies on Adaptive Educational Management Models. *Journal of Dialogos*, 2(4), 27–39. <https://doi.org/10.62872/k2vs8p48>
- Rusdi, M., Sartika, D., Putra, I., & Sari, N. (2023). Quality Governance Design Good University Governance In The Education Sector: a Literature Review of Concepts Performance Models and Audit Practices From a Risk Management Perspective. *International Journal Of Humanities Education and Social Sciences (IJHESS)*, 3(3), 1646–1658. <https://doi.org/10.55227/ijhess.v3i3.682>
- Sagara, Y., & Yustini, S. (2019). Studi Fenomenologis Tentang Implementasi Tata Kelola Perguruan Tinggi Badan Hukum di Indonesia. *Akuntabilitas*, 12(2), 249–258. <https://doi.org/10.15408/akt.v12i2.13226>
- Statistik, B. P. (2024). *Jumlah Perguruan Tinggi1, Dosen, dan Mahasiswa2 (Negeri dan Swasta) di Bawah Kementerian Pendidikan Tinggi, Sains, dan Teknologi Menurut Provinsi, 2024 - Tabel Statistik - Badan Pusat Statistik Indonesia*. Badan Pusat Statistik Online. <https://www.bps.go.id/id/statistics-table/3/Y21kVGRHNXZVMEI3S3pCRllyMHJRbnB1WkVZemR6MDkjMw==/jumlah-perguruan-tinggi1-dosen-dan-mahasiswa2-negeri-dan-swasta-di-bawah-kementerian-pendidikan-kebudayaan-ri-set-dan-teknologi-menurut-provinsi-2022.html?year=2024>
- Surtiari, G. A. K., & Hidayati, D. (2025). Considering Risk Culture to Strengthen Disaster Risk Governance in Indonesia. In *Sustainable Development Goals Series* (Vol. 7, pp. 31–43). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-96-4182-6_3
- Van Nguyen, D., Truong, D. T., Van Mai, T., Van Tran, D., & Ho, Q. M. (2025). Improving university governance capacity for administrative staff: A case of Vietnam. *Multidisciplinary Science Journal*, 7(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.31893/multiscience.2025027>
- Walter, S. (2020). How can supervisors and banks promote a culture of strong governance and ethical behaviour? *Journal of Risk Management in Financial Institutions*, 13(2), 145–154. <https://doi.org/10.69554/rlsr2317>
- Wilkins, A., & Gobby, B. (2024). Objects and subjects of risk: a governmentality approach to education governance. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 22(5), 915–928. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2022.2114073>
- Wiryadinata, H. (2023a). A Shifting Capital of Religious Education in the Digitalization Era. *Jurnal Ilmiah Religiosity Entity Humanity (JIREH)*, 5(2), 140–154. <https://doi.org/10.37364/jireh.v5i2.161>
- Wiryadinata, H. (2023b). Philosophy of Nemui Nyimah as an Indonesian pedagogic value of theology for disability. *KURIOS (Jurnal Teologi Dan Pendidikan Agama Kristen)*, 9(3), 597–611. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.30995/kur.v9i3.764>