

# Driving Indonesia's Public Service Innovation Through Leadership Model

**Andri Putra Kesmawan<sup>1</sup>**

**Agus Pramusinto<sup>2</sup>**

**Bevaola Kusumasari<sup>3</sup>**

**Dewi Haryani Susilastuti<sup>4</sup>**

## Abstract

This study analyzes how the leadership model encourages public service innovation in Indonesia. So far, experts have reviewed the leadership and innovation as limited to the leader capacities, leadership styles and leader determinants towards innovation. However, the leadership model of the innovation process has not been systematically identified and has not been seen in detail when and how the model of the leadership has relations with the innovation process. Therefore, the purpose of this research is to identify and explore a successful leadership model delivering innovation so that innovation can be applied in public organizations. This research used a descriptive qualitative approach. This research took an example of innovation cases in the provincial Government, a special region of Yogyakarta. The location was chosen based on the bureaucracy leadership level of Sub-district, District, and province. The results stated that types of innovation in five public organizations with different processes present a different leadership model. It formed important findings based on the background of three, namely 1) collaborative efforts among stakeholders; 2) Single Fighter: Manage yourself; and 3) Top-down: interest bases. Leader models tend to differ on the bureaucratic leadership level of provincial, district level, and sub-district levels.

## Keywords:

leadership model, public sector innovation, collaborative innovation

## Introduction

This study analyzes how the leadership model of public service innovation in Indonesia. Specifically, what kind of leadership creates innovation. This study is important

---

<sup>1</sup> Department of Public Policy and Management, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Universitas Gadjah Mada  
Email: andri.putra.k@mail.ugm.ac.id

<sup>2</sup> Department of Public Policy and Management, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Universitas Gadjah Mada

<sup>3</sup> Department of Public Policy and Management, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Universitas Gadjah Mada

<sup>4</sup> Department of Public Policy and Management, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Universitas Gadjah Mada

because there are many studies that discuss the relationship between leadership factors and innovation (Aminbeidokhti, Nikabadi, & Hoseini, 2016; Jung, Chow, & Wu, 2003). However, the study of leadership models in the innovation process tends to be still limited, including focusing on when and how, and on what conditions of innovation leadership can trigger innovation. The study of leadership on innovation that has been conducted so far looks more at capacity/leadership skills in innovation (Lewis & Ricard, 2018), leadership innovation (Ricard et al., 2017) influence of leadership innovation process (Oke, Munshi, & Walumbwa, 2009) and the existence of leadership transformative innovation (D. I. Jung et al., 2003; S. Kim & Yoon, 2015).

Another problematic which also contributes the urgency to lift this topic is the fact that leadership considered having a strong effect as a propel of innovation (Lewis, Ricard, & Klijn, 2018), it is in line with a research conducted by Lele et al. (2018) it reveals that the success of innovation is due to the commitment of the leader. However, the leadership model in the innovation process has not been systematically identified. A similar study was conducted by Denti & Hermin (2012) which began to lead the innovation leadership model as it provides support to teams and individuals who seek to innovate (leaders as facilitators) and leaders who manage and are directly involved in managing resources (finance, funds, time, and knowledge) in innovation (leader as manager). However, Denti has not provided a detailed description of when and how the leadership model has a connection with the innovation process.

In line with the research conducted by Denti. Somech, A (2006) revealed that leaders who are too strict in supervising their subordinates, do not provide enough autonomy to be creative, and close new ideas are the leader who can hamper the creativity and innovation. The study of leadership inhibits creativity and innovation which also carried out by (Schyns & Schilling, 2013; Shaw, Erickson, & Harvey, 2011). All of them are still unable to show what kind of leadership model creates innovation in public sector organizations.

Research that has been carried out and published on innovation leadership has been developing very fast, but the study of leadership models in the innovation process has not been identified in detail. Gabris, Golembiewski, & Ihrke (2001) showed that the criteria for the needed leaders are leaders who have good vision and mission and leaders whose credibility can be maintained. Hansen (2011) analyzed the relationship between leadership

and the adoption of innovations related to NPM among 262 public managers in Denmark. This opinion is supported by Jung & Lee (2016) who confirmed the positive relationship between facilitative leadership and the dissemination of innovation in South Korea. In addition, staff recognition of transformative leadership has a major contribution to the climate of innovation that occurs within the organization (S. Kim & Yoon, 2015). Kim conducted studies on local government in South Korea. More complex, Lewis et al.(2018) revealed a framework that looks at the innovation capacity of organizational structures, networks, and leadership. According to Tung-Wen Sun et al. (2013) leadership becomes one of the determinants in the spread of innovation/diffusion of innovation besides politicians, external institutions and local authorities and related ministries. His study was conducted in Taiwan on one public service innovation. In accordance with Kim (2009) which conducted his research in South Korea explaining that quality human resources, good structures/systems and managing external influences also confirm the need for innovative leadership.

Meanwhile, innovation studies conducted in Indonesia on various innovation issues often talk about technological innovation (Wibawati, 2017) to support public service activities that are packaged in incremental innovations (Faried et al., 2016; Irawady & Rufaidah, 2016; Suhardi, Adellina, Wulandari, Sembiring, & Hasugian, 2017). The same thing was conducted by (Sihombing, 2016) who still discussed the existence of a leader in presenting an innovation. Based on these studies, it still is seen how a leader contributes to the application of public service innovation, but still limited discussion about the criteria of leaders as determinants in adopting innovation.

The results of Irawady and Rufaidah (2016) for example, they conducted research related to innovation in the Police Department in one of the cities in Indonesia and found five important factors in the innovation of new public services, those are 1) service concept, 2) availability of client interface, 3) service delivery, 4) the latest technology, and 5) the latest value system. Well-packaged innovations are easily implemented and conducted by the community. Then Faried et al. (2016) examined the matter of digitizing the innovation of the maternal and postnatal care system (DigiMAPS). The system consists of an electronic medical record for maternal and child health (*KIA*) also for a tele-consulting facility called Tele-Obgyn. Farried's focus is to identify the incremental innovation that occurred so that

the results could improve the quality of patient care, facilitate communication both in the internal sphere (primary health care) and external (stakeholders and follow-up), increase productivity, and reduce overall costs. Suhardi, Adellina et al. (2017) did the same thing showing technological innovations to control and maintain the sustainability of fuel oil supply throughout the country. Suhardi believes that good inventory control can maintain the continuity of the fuel supply for citizens, which then it can be a value in gas station services so that CPSS technology innovation (*cyber-physical social system*) is expected to control supply issues. It implements the role of the leader in creating innovation impacts when it implements (Sihombing, 2016). Sihombing revealed the same factor, that is leadership in a case study in Central Tapanuli government that, the government's efforts to improve public services towards good local governance, which is policies are decided by leaders who support innovation and reform in the bureaucracy.

In addition to the problematic theory and contestation of arguments above, the empirical problem of the innovation public sector organization in Indonesia is bureaucracy reformation. One of the supporting factors that emerge the innovation actions in government organizations is the change in demands to improve service quality from the external environment and stakeholders and also driven by policies implemented by the central government through the program agenda to accelerate bureaucratic reform. One of the agendas of bureaucratic reform is carried out through the "public service innovation" program (Ridlowi & Himam, 2018). Providing the rules of one organization and one innovation. The expected target to be achieved from this program is the ideals of world-class government (World Class Government) which is expected to be realized in 2025 (Imanuddin, 2016).

The interesting thing is the increasing number of participants from 2019 compared to previous years. In 2018, there were 2826 innovations, in 2017 there were 3054, in 2016 there were 2476 innovations and in 2015 there were 1.184. It means that the interest of public organizations to innovate public services is high (Kemenpan-RB, 2019). Therefore, it provides public service by presenting innovations in government as a necessity to improve performance and the quality of public services so that people feel the existence of the country. On the international scale, Indonesia's innovation index ranks in 85 (University,

INSEAD, & WIPO, 2018), while it ranks second lowest (14 out of 15 countries) in Southeast Asian countries and Oceania.

This research has at least a few main arguments so that it can be concluded that first, previous studies stated that there was a leader involvement, leader criteria, leadership style, leader capacity, and leader determinants of innovation in public sector organizations. However, research on what leadership models create innovation, and how leaders participate in the process of preparing innovations at various levels of bureaucratic leadership, including what types of innovations have not been systematically identified. To fill the existing research vacuum, this research discusses the public service innovation leadership model in Indonesia.

To see how the public service innovation leadership model in Indonesia, this study took an example of an innovation case in Yogyakarta Special Province. Based on Sinovik data, D.I Yogyakarta is one of the provinces creating many innovations. Noted from 2014-2019 there were 29 innovations that were proven to pass in 99 best innovations every year. Meanwhile, this research took 5 innovations that would be seen as a model of leadership in presenting innovation. The five innovations were selected based on the level of bureaucratic leadership/ variations in leadership levels (Sub-district, District / City and Province).

**Table 1.**

**Public service innovation of Provincial Government of Yogyakarta Special Region**

No	Level of Leadership Bureaucracy	Unit of analysis	Name of Innovation
1	Province	Regional Library and Archives Services- Special Region of Yogyakarta 2019	Jogja Library For All Integrated Library System (Jolifa Shoes)
2	District/ City	BPKAD and Communication, Information and Encoding Communication Office - Yogyakarta 2019	e-SPTPD: Tax report is easier, faster and safer
3	Sub-district	UPT Puskesmas Gedangsari II – Mount Kidul 2019	AYUNDA SI MENIK MAKAN SEGO CETING” (an acronym of <i>Ayo Tunda Usia Menikah Mengawali Gerakan Semangat Gotong Royong Cegah Stunting</i> )
4	District/ City	Education, Youth, and Sports Office - Kulonprogo 2019	<i>Penguatan Pendidikan Karakter Kulon Progo (PendekarKU)</i>
5	District/ City	UPTD Office of Agriculture, Food-crops, Marine and Fisheries – Bantul regency 2019	<i>Sistem Penjemuran Karya Santoso (SIPERKASA)</i>

Source: <http://sinovik.menpan.go.id>

Based on the arguments outlined above, this research was focused on completing the research gap in the public service innovation leadership model in Indonesia. The main question is, What is the leadership model for public service innovation? The question proposed is focussed on identifying and analyzing the leadership model at the innovation process stage in public sector organizations measured by innovation process indicator Roger & Shoemaker (1983) namely the stages of initiation and implementation. The initiation stage covers setting and matching agenda while the implementation stages including redefining/restructuring/clarifying, and routinizing.

## **Methods**

This research used a qualitative approach. The choice of method used was a case study. This study took an example of a case of innovation in the Government of the Special Region of Yogyakarta, covering Kulonprogo District, Mount Kidul District, and Yogyakarta City. The research location was chosen based on the level of bureaucratic leadership, namely the Sub-district, District, and Province.

This study aims to analyze how the inception of the dynamics process of public service innovation in public organizations in Indonesia and to identify the model of leadership. The specific objectives of this study are:

- a. analyze the inception process of public service innovation, the process of innovation is at the stage of initiation to implementation so that it can be identified whether innovations that occur following these stages or through other stages based on the characteristics of innovation;
- b. analyze the public service innovation leadership models, seen at the level of bureaucratic leadership at the Provincial, Regency/City and District levels.

This research is also expected to be useful theoretically and empirically. Theoretically, it is expected that this research will give a positive contribution and strengthen the study of public service innovation, especially the affirmation of the inception process of public service innovation and on the development of a leadership model of public service innovation in Indonesia. Empirically, it is expected to enrich studies on public service innovation in various levels of bureaucratic leadership in Indonesia, especially in organizations that units of analysis.

The focus of this research lies in how the innovation process took place and how the leadership model was. The process of public service innovation is identifying the flow of the birth of public service innovation in several innovations that become the unit of analysis. The mechanism of the innovation process carried out, whether there are similarities or actually tends to differ between innovations. Meanwhile, the process of innovation according to Roger and Shoemaker (1983) starting from the initiation includes agenda-setting and matching, subsequently redefining/restructuring, clarifying and routines (Redefining/restructuring), clarifying and routines (Redefining/restructuring), clarifying (Routinizing). This research is also based on the assumption that there are differences in the leadership model of public service innovation in various innovations at the level of existing bureaucratic leadership. The involvement of leaders in the initiation and implementation stages can indicate the leadership model participatory or precisely destructive (Shaw et al., 2011) and the facilitator or manager (Denti & Hemlin, 2012).

The data used in this study were primary and secondary data. Primary data obtained through in-depth interviews and structured or not structured towards the actors involved in the innovation process, official decisions both published and unpublished and other related data issued by the organization running the innovation. The data used in this study were primary and secondary data. Therefore, it could give a complete picture of the process innovation of public service and how and when the leaders were involved in the innovation process that has been done by the organization. The selection of informants interviewed was chosen and determined intentionally (purposive sampling) and snowball sampling. The selected informants were people who understand the information about the problems studied in this study determined purposively. Meanwhile, to determine informants whose quality of information is still unknown, the snowball method was applied. Whereas the determination of key informants was based on the quality of the data/information provided during the interview. These interviews were conducted continuously, in an unspecified number. Interviews were considered sufficient after the data collected from research results was sufficient (Taylor, Bogdan, & DeVault, 2015). Meanwhile, the secondary data in the form of documentation studies were obtained in the form of data/documents, videos, images, and other forms.

The collected data were processed and analyzed using the NVIVO tool so that the overall data analysis process in the form of qualitative data interview transcripts could be obtained systematically (Welsh, 2002). Furthermore, data analysis was carried out together with data collection. The stages of the analysis were data collection, data reduction, data presentation, verification and conclusions. The mechanism is conducted continuously until the data sought is truly complete, so that it can describe an empirical reality (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

## **Results and Discussion**

### **Innovation Process**

Research about innovation in public sector organizations often reveals the definition of innovation (F Damanpour, 1988; Rogers & Shoemaker, 1983). Innovation is an idea, practice, or object that is considered new by humans or other adoption units (Rogers, 2003). In line with Roger and Damanpour (1984) argues that the concept of innovation is widely used and defined differently according to the characteristics of research. In general, industry-focused research emphasizes that innovation is a change in existing products and/or organizational processes that make these products more commercially valuable (product innovation and process innovation) (Globerman & Lybecker, 2014).

However, in this study (innovation in public organizations), the concept of innovation is considered as a response to environmental changes or a means of bringing change in an organization (Fariborz Damanpour & Evan, 1984). Innovation at the organizational level involves the implementation of new technical ideas or new administrative ideas. Adopting new ideas in the organization is expected to produce organizational changes that affect the organization's performance. Regardless of the time when the adoption is applied in the population of the organization concerned.

Specifically, Roger (2003) classifies the characteristics of innovation in 5 (five) ways, namely: 1) relative advantages; 2) conformity; 3) complexity; 4) possible try; and 5) probability of being observed.

- a. relative advantage is a condition where innovations are made good or not from innovations made before. The benchmarks are how someone who wants to adopt the innovation can feel the impact of both satisfaction and dissatisfaction.



- b. compatibility of innovation which is born to adjust the society condition, culture, and the values contained based on the needs.
- c. complexity related to how complex the innovations presented. The more complicated, the more difficult to understand and adopt and vice versa.
- d. the innovation possibility of trialability can be tested in the actual environment so that it can be seen the advantages and disadvantages.
- e. the possibility of being observability enables innovation to be witnessed by others.

Besides the characteristics of innovation, Roger (2003) also played a role in popularizing the development of innovation/diffusion of innovation in 1964 through his book entitled *Diffusion of Innovations*. Rogers defines the diffusion of innovation as a social process that communicates information about new ideas that are viewed subjectively. It slowly develops the meaning of innovation through a process of social construction. The diffusion theory of innovation explains how an idea and new ideas are communicated to a *culture*. That this theory focuses on how a new concept or idea can and may be adopted by a particular social or cultural group.

It based the diffusion of innovation introduced by Roger on 19th-century theory by a French scientist, Gabriel Tarde. In his book entitled "*The Laws of Imitation*" (1930), Tarde put forward the S curve theory of the adoption of innovation, and the importance of interpersonal communication. The curve explains that an innovation carried out by someone is considered through the time dimension. In the curve, there are two axes, the axis that explains the level of adoption and the axis that explains the time dimension. This is where figures from the Diffusion of Innovation theory such as Everett M. Rogers emerged with his great work *Diffusion of Innovation* (1961). Examples of the practice of diffusion of innovation in public organizations applied in the United Kingdom which examined 405 local governments questioning the level of environmental capacity and when the environment became too complex or dynamic for innovation to occur under (Ri. M. R. M. Walker, Berry, & Avellaneda, 2015).

This study used the concept of Roger & Shoemaker (1983) about stages of the innovation process in an organization which is divided into two stages namely initiation and implementation. The initiation stage includes the setting and matching agenda. Agenda setting identifying important problems experienced in an organization and innovating as

one of the efforts to overcome these problems. The urge to innovate is also because there is a very big difference between what is done in current conditions and what is expected. Meanwhile, the stages of the matching innovation process are more on adjusting the concepts of innovation with existing problems. If the innovations offered are appropriate and answer the problems occur, then that innovation is ready to adopt. On the contrary, if the innovations are not appropriate to them the problems occur as the rejection arises from individuals and organizations, even though the implementation stage.

The next stage is implementation, which is defined as all events, actions, and decisions involved in utilizing innovation. There are three stages of implementation, namely redefining/restructuring, clarifying and routinizing. The stages of redefining/restructuring related to the adjustment of innovation and organization when an innovation begins to be implemented. The adjustment can be made by innovation itself, which means that innovation is redefined according to organizational conditions. However, organizations can also be restructured according to the needs of innovation. Gradually innovation starts to be applied in organizations that need a good understanding of implementing it, so it does not make innovation an obstacle in doing work (Clarifying). Finally, innovation has become an integral part of the organization and routines conducted by individuals within the organization (*Routinizing*).

There are three important findings related to the innovation process created based on background, as follows:

a. Collaborative efforts between stakeholders

Indication of an effort to collaborate among agencies (stakeholders) was found during in-depth interviews. The process of the emergence of innovation is still based on problems that occur in the community. The issue was followed by presenting innovations in public organizations where the problem was found. Each stakeholder had a role and responsibility for the implementation of this innovation. Therefore, collaborative between stakeholders was binding for the continued implementation of innovation.

b. Single Fighter: Manage yourself

Ideas made for this innovation arise from individuals when they see a problem that exists in a particular environment. Innovations created by certain individuals. These individuals compile, manage, and even implement in public organizations.

c. Top-down: Base of interest

This innovation is created only to meet the demands that one organization has for one innovation. Thus, the achievement of its implementation is not maximally limited to competitions such as Sinovic (public service innovation competition).

### **Innovation Leadership**

The relation between public sector innovation and leadership continues to develop well (Lewis et al., 2018). Many studies on leadership specifically Ricard et al. (2017) summarize the important leadership types in innovation into 5 things, they are transactional, transformational, interpersonal, entrepreneur, and networking governance. This type is photographed and explored in four ways: 1) the nature of leadership (the role of the leader and its legitimacy); 2) leader's activities (the type of activity that is most important to do); 3) strategic direction (how to achieve it); and 4) how innovation is seen.

The concept of leadership in other literature (Yukl, 2002) stated that leadership is the process by which a person gives influence on certain groups. Today, much contemporary leadership literature on innovation refers to transformational and transactional leadership theories (Waldman & Bass, 1991). Transformational leadership is a theory of leadership style (Oke, Munshi, & Walumbwa 2009) where transformational leaders exert influence by "expanding and increasing the goals of their subordinates and giving them the confidence to do things beyond their expectations (Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002). Transformational leadership has the responsibility to interpret clearly the vision for the organization so that its followers accept as a form of a leader's credibility. According to Avolio (Avolio, 2007) the main function of a transformational leader is to provide services as a catalyst of change, but at the same time as a controller of change. In contrast, transactional leaders exert influence through the contract exchange of gifts and correction actions (Howell & Avolio, 1993).

Several studies have communicated leadership as a behaviour that is positively related to individual and team innovation, providing support and encouragement (Krause, 2004; Rosing, Frese, & Bausch, 2011), and even leaders are too strict in supervising their subordinates, which do not provide sufficient autonomy to be creative, closes new ideas den (2006), can hamper creativity and innovation. The study of leadership inhibits creativity and innovation conducted by (Schyns & Schilling, 2013; Shaw et al., 2011). It is similar to a

participatory and directive leadership pattern (Bell, Chan, & Nel, 2014). In fact, the role of a leader in innovation as a catalyst and facilitator is not as an all-knowing ruler (Nonaka & Kenney, 1995) without intensive discussion in formulating innovation in his organization.

According to Mumford et al.(2002) leaders in innovation must have professional expertise both in technical and substance as well as the ability to analyze complex information from various sources of information. In addition, he has the motivation to practice that ability. The size of motivation arises depending on the existed challenges and opportunities. The leaders' involvement in innovation is not only in the support, commitment, ability to manage the organization and its environment and provide flexibility for each individual to create ideas and innovations (West et al., 2003), but a leader is also important to be involved in creating conditions to continue stability so that the following innovation can be implemented (Mumford & Licuanan, 2004).

The construct of leadership in innovation is related to organizational and contextual factors to play a direct and indirect role in providing the idea of innovation (Crossan & Apaydin, 2010). Leaders can take direct action to manage and bring innovation, a leader can also do it all by positioning themselves as managers. In more depth, if explored further about the integration of leaders in the innovation process, it can be concluded into two important points namely first, the leader creates a conducive environment, encourages and provides motivation from within to deliver innovation among the team/ staff/ subordinates. Second, leaders who directly manage the strategic objectives of innovation by managing resources, finance, facilities, and others (Denti & Hemlin, 2012). Give reward, flexibility, and autonomy to individuals in the team to be creative and innovate. Both of these important things can be done at once by the leader depending on the developing situation. Both of these important things can be done at once by the leader depending on the developing situation. It was stated by Denti et al (2012) as leaders who provide support to teams and individuals who seek innovation (leaders as a facilitator) and leaders who manage and are directly involved in managing resources (financial, funding, time and knowledge) in innovation (leaders as managers).

Therefore, from various level of leadership and various kinds of leadership innovation tends to be a facilitative leader who has a greater chance of creating innovation

starting from an idea, evaluation, and promotion (Basadur, 2004), and planning fighting for and securing funds for implementation (Scott & Bruce, 1994).

Innovation in public sector organizations, especially in the government environment has become a relatively normal practice and is part of the necessity to further improve the performance of services to the public/community. It must be because innovation is actually not "friendly" to public sector organizations because it is too bureaucratic, so it seems difficult to innovate. Innovation is even easier to implement in private sector organizations (Borins, 2001). Therefore, many embraces the idea that innovation can contribute to improving the quality of public services in the public sector and to improve the problem-solving capacity of government organizations in facing challenges that are developing in the community (F Damanpour & Schneider, 2009) has an innovation capacity (Lewis & Ricard, 2018) which is a condition that supports and provides the infrastructure for innovation.

Regarding the need for innovation capacity, several authors have elaborated on what is needed in effective innovation in the public sector. However, it is necessary to take into account the multi-level character of the innovation process that is the individual, organizational and / or inter-organizational level (networking) (Crossan & Apaydin, 2010). Hartley and Rashman (2018) added the capacity of organizational innovation and the capacity of innovation between organizations encourage the presence of public service innovation besides an individual capacity (Bhatti, Olsen, & Pedersen, 2011; Gil, Rodrigo-Moya, & Morcillo-Bellido, 2018). Individual capacity can be in the form of capacity to conduct, understand, study and identify problems in the organizational environment and be translated in the form of innovation (Lewis et al., 2018). In line with this opinion, (Y. Kim, 2010) shows that the capacity of individuals is formed based on organizational characteristics, for example, organizations can facilitate individual behaviour to develop innovation. Therefore, the character of the organization may need to "slack ", the larger the organization, the more leeway/slack so that more opportunities to give birth to ideas/innovative ideas for individuals (R. M. Walker, 2006). Even individuals can meet and communicate well with each other without the burden of formal responsibilities and rules to make innovation emerge mainly in local government organizations (Considine, Lewis, & Alexander, 2009).

Correspondingly, Meijer (2014) added the role of individuals in the innovation process in the public sector. Talented individuals in organizations play a significant role in public service innovation (Maranto & Wolf, 2013; Scholten, 2011). Likewise with Gieske (2016) argues that the birth of innovation comes from the capacity of innovation owned by the leader. The ability to understand the organization's environment, absorb new information, learn and how to change insights within the organization.

## **Conclusion**

There were various kinds of innovation in five public organizations with different processes and different leadership models. Important findings related to the innovation process created based on three backgrounds, there were 1) Collaborative efforts between stakeholders; 2) Single Fighter: Manage yourself; and 3) Top-down: Base of interest. The leader model tends to be different at the level of bureaucratic leadership, namely the provincial level, district level, and sub-district level.

## **References**

- Aminbeidokhti, A., Nikabadi, M. S., & Hoseini, A. M. (2016). The role of transformational leadership and knowledge management processes on the rate of organisational innovation. *International Journal of Knowledge Management Studies*, 7(3–4), 270–287. doi: 10.1504/IJKMS.2016.082345
- Avolio, B. J. (2007). Promoting More Integrative Strategies for Leadership Theory-Building. *American Psychologist*, 62, 25–33. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.25
- Basadur, M. (2004). Leading others to think innovatively together: Creative leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(1), 103–121. doi: 10.1016/J.LEAQUA.2003.12.007
- Bell, C., Chan, M., & Nel, P. (2014). The impact of participative and directive leadership on organisational culture: An organisational development perspective. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(23), 1970–1985. doi: 10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n23p1970
- Bhatti, Y., Olsen, A. L., & Pedersen, L. H. (2011). Administrative Professionals and the Diffusion of Innovations: The Case of Citizen Service Centres. *Public Administration*, 89(2), 577–594. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9299.2010.01882.x
- Borins, S. (2001). Encouraging innovation in the public sector. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*,

- 2(3), 310–319. doi: 10.1108/14691930110400128
- Considine, M., Lewis, J. M., & Alexander, D. (2009). *Networks, Innovation and Public Policy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK. 40
- Crossan, M. M., & Apaydin, M. (2010). A multi-dimensional framework of organizational innovation: A systematic review of the literature. *Journal of Management Studies*, 47(6), 1154–1191. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.2009.00880.x
- Damanpour, F. (1988). Innovation Type, Radicalness, and the Adoption Process. *Communication Research*, 15(5), 545–567. doi: 10.1177/009365088015005003
- Damanpour, F., & Schneider, M. (2009). Characteristics of innovation and innovation adoption in public organizations: Assessing the role of managers. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19(3), 495–522. doi: 10.1093/jopart/mun021
- Damanpour, Fariborz, & Evan, W. M. (1984). Organizational Innovation and Performance: The Problem of “Organizational Lag.” *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29(3), 392. doi: 10.2307/2393031
- Denti, L., & Hemlin, S. (2012). Leadership and innovation in organizations: A systematic review of factors that mediate or moderate the relationship. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 16(03), 1240007. doi: 10.1142/S1363919612400075
- Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of Transformational Leadership on Follower Development and Performance: A Field Experiment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(4), 735–744. doi: 10.2307/3069307
- Fariied, A., Sutiono, A. B., Djuwantono, T., Arifin, M. Z., Wirakusumah, F. F., Yuniarto, S. A., ... Jayadi, Y. T. (2016). Mother and children health reporting system: Innovative information system application in the rural West Bandung Area, Indonesia, by using multimodal communications systems. In *Proceedings - 2015 4th International Conference on Instrumentation, Communications, Information Technology and Biomedical Engineering, ICICI-BME 2015* (pp. 202–207). Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICICI-BME.2015.7401299>
- Gabris, G. T., Golembiewski, R. T., & Ihrke, D. M. (2001). Leadership Credibility, Board Relations, and Administrative Innovation at the Local Government Level. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 11(1), 89–108. doi: 10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a003496

- Gieske, H. H., van Buuren, A. M. W., & Bekkers, V. V. J. J. M. (2016). Conceptualizing public innovative capacity: A framework for assessment. *Innovation Journal*, 21(1), 1–25.
- Gil, A. J., Rodrigo-Moya, B., & Morcillo-Bellido, J. (2018). The effect of leadership in the development of innovation capacity. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 39(6), 694–711. doi: 10.1108/LODJ-12-2017-0399
- Globerman, S., & Lybecker, K. M. (2014). *The Benefits of Incremental Innovation: Focus on The Pharmaceutical Industry*. Retrieved from <https://www.fraserinstitute.org/sites/default/files/benefits-of-incremental-innovation.pdf>
- Hansen, M. B. (2011). Antecedents of organizational innovation: the diffusion of new public management into danish local government. *Public Administration*, 89(2), 285–306. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9299.2010.01855.x
- Hartley, J., & Rashman, L. (2018). Innovation and inter-organizational learning in the context of public service reform. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 84(2), 231–248. doi: 10.1177/0020852318762309
- Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Locus of Control, and Support for Innovation: Key Predictors of Consolidated-Business-Unit Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(6), 891–902. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.78.6.891
- Imanuddin, M. (2016). Inovasi pelayanan publik: percepatan peningkatan kualitas pelayanan publik. *Kemepan-RB*. Retrieved from <http://sinovik.menpan.go.id/index.php%0A/site/article/223>
- Irawady, M. F. ., & Rufaidah, P. (2016). The impact of new service innovation on public satisfaction. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 15(Special Issue 3), 260–274.
- Jung, C. S., & Lee, G. (2016). Organizational Climate, Leadership, Organization Size, and Aspiration for Innovation in Government Agencies. *Public Performance and Management Review*, 39(4), 757–782. doi: 10.1080/15309576.2015.1137764
- Jung, D. I., Chow, C., & Wu, A. (2003). The role of transformational leadership in enhancing organizational innovation: Hypotheses and some preliminary findings. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14(4–5), 525–544. doi: 10.1016/S1048-9843(03)00050-X
- Kemenpan-RB. (2019). Kementerian Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara dan Reformasi



- Birokrasi - Beranda. Retrieved February 7, 2019, from <https://www.menpan.go.id/site/>
- Kim, S. E., & Lee, J. W. (2009). The impact of management capacity on government innovation in Korea: An empirical study. *International Public Management Journal*, 12(3), 345–369. doi: 10.1080/10967490903103334
- Kim, S., & Yoon, G. (2015). An innovation-driven culture in local government: Do senior manager's transformational leadership and the climate for creativity matter? *Public Personnel Management*, 44(2), 147–168. doi: 10.1177/0091026014568896
- Kim, Y. (2010). Stimulating Entrepreneurial Practices in the Public Sector. *Administration & Society*, 42(7), 780–814. doi: 10.1177/0095399710377432
- Krause, D. E. (2004). Influence-based leadership as a determinant of the inclination to innovate and of innovation-related behaviors: An empirical investigation. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(1), 79–102. doi: 10.1016/J.LEAQUA.2003.12.006
- Lele, G., Pramusinto, A., Kusumasari, B., & Purwoko, B. (2018). *Determinan inovasi pelayanan publik: kajian data panel inovasi di indonesia 2014-2017*. Yogyakarta.
- Lewis, J. M., & Ricard, L. M. (2018). *Innovation capacity in the public sector: Structures, networks and leadership*. Melbourne. Retrieved from [www.lipse.org](http://www.lipse.org)
- Lewis, J. M., Ricard, L. M., & Klijn, E. H. (2018). How innovation drivers, networking and leadership shape public sector innovation capacity. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 84(2), 288–307. doi: 10.1177/0020852317694085
- Maranto, R., & Wolf, P. J. (2013). Cops, Teachers, and the Art of the Impossible: Explaining the Lack of Diffusion of Innovations That Make Impossible Jobs Possible. *Public Administration Review*, 73(2), 230–240. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6210.2012.02626.x
- Meijer, A. J. (2014). From Hero-Innovators to Distributed Heroism: An in-depth analysis of the role of individuals in public sector innovation. *Public Management Review*, 16(2), 199–216. doi: 10.1080/14719037.2013.806575
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications. Retrieved from <https://www.worldcat.org/title/qualitative-data-analysis-an-expanded-sourcebook/oclc/29256112>
- Mumford, M. D., & Licuanan, B. (2004). Leading for innovation: Conclusions, issues, and directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(1), 163–171. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.12.010
- Mumford, M. D., Scott, G. M., Gaddis, B., & Strange, J. M. (2002). Leading creative people:

- Orchestrating expertise and relationships. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(6), 705–750. doi: 10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00158-3
- Nonaka, I., & Kenney, M. (1995). Towards a new theory of innovation management. *IEEE Engineering Management Review*, 23(2), 2–9.
- Oke, A., Munshi, N., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2009). The Influence of Leadership on Innovation Processes and Activities. *Organizational Dynamics*, 38(1), 64–72. doi: 10.1016/j.orgdyn.2008.10.005
- Ricard, L. M., Klijn, E. H., Lewis, J. M., & Ysa, T. (2017). Assessing public leadership styles for innovation: a comparison of Copenhagen, Rotterdam and Barcelona. *Public Management Review*, 19(2), 134–156. doi: 10.1080/14719037.2016.1148192
- Ridlowi, R., & Himam, F. (2018). Inovasi pada Organisasi Pemerintah: Tahapan dan Dinamika. *Gadjah Mada Journal of Psychology (GamaJoP)*, 2(1), 22. doi: 10.22146/gamajop.31866
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press. Retrieved from <https://www.amazon.com/Diffusion-Innovations-5th-Everett-Rogers/dp/0743222091>
- Rogers, E. M., & Shoemaker, F. (1983). *Diffusion of innovation: a cross-cultural approach*. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-014-3885-4>
- Rosing, K., Frese, M., & Bausch, A. (2011). Explaining the heterogeneity of the leadership-innovation relationship: Ambidextrous leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(5), 956–974. doi: 10.1016/J.LEAQUA.2011.07.014
- Scholten, P. (2011). *Daring Leadership. A study of water governance on the edge of innovation and democracy*. Retrieved from [http://watergovernance.s3.amazonaws.com/files/Peter\\_Scholten\\_-\\_Daring\\_Leadership.pdf](http://watergovernance.s3.amazonaws.com/files/Peter_Scholten_-_Daring_Leadership.pdf)
- Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. (2013). How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), 138–158. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.09.001
- Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of Innovative Behavior: A Path Model of Individual Innovation in the Workplace. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 580–607.
- Shaw, J. B., Erickson, A., & Harvey, M. (2011). A method for measuring destructive

- leadership and identifying types of destructive leaders in organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(4), 575–590. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.05.001
- Sihombing, T. (2016). *Public service innovation and reform towards good local governance*. *Global Journal of Politics and Law Research* (Vol. 4). Retrieved from <http://www.eajournals.org/journals/global-journal-of-politics-and-law-research-gjplr/vol-4-issue-1-february-2016/public-service-innovation-and-reform-towards-good-local-governance/>
- Somech, A. (2006). The Effects of Leadership Style and Team Process on Performance and Innovation in Functionally Heterogeneous Teams. *Journal of Management*, 32(1), 132–157. doi: 10.1177/0149206305277799
- Suhardi, Adellina, A. R., Wulandari, M., Sembiring, J., & Hasugian, L. P. (2017). Service innovation for a sustainable fuel supply using cyber physical social system technology. In *2017 6th International Conference on Electrical Engineering and Informatics (ICEEI)* (pp. 1–7). IEEE. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICEEI.2017.8312424>
- Taylor, S. J., Bogdan, R., & DeVault, M. L. (2015). *Introduction to qualitative research methods : a guidebook and resource* (4th ed.). Wiley.
- Tung-Wen Sun, M., Shih, M., Hsu, K., & Chen, J. (2013). Service innovation and policy diffusion: an exploratory study of the Bookstart program in Taiwan. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 26(5), 361–374. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-05-2013-0067>
- University, C., INSEAD, & WIPO. (2018). *Global Innovation Index 2018: Energizing the World with Innovation*. (S. Dutta, B. Lanvin, & S. Wunsch-Vincent, Eds.) (11th ed.). Itacha, Fontainebleau, ang Geneva. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/November 25, 2016>
- Waldman, D. A., & Bass, B. M. (1991). Transformational leadership at different phases of the innovation process. *The Journal of High Technology Management Research*, 2(2), 169–180. doi: 10.1016/1047-8310(91)90002-6
- Walker, R. M. (2006). Innovation type and diffusion: An empirical analysis of local government. *Public Administration*, 84(2), 311–335. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9299.2006.00004.x
- Walker, Ri. M. R. M., Berry, F. S., & Avellaneda, C. N. (2015). Limits on innovativeness in local government: Examining capacity, complexity, and dynamism in organizational task environments. *Public Administration*, 93(3), 663–683. doi: 10.1111/padm.12159

- Welsh, E. (2002). *Dealing with Data: Using NVivo in the Qualitative Data Analysis Process*. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* (Vol. 3).
- West, M. A., Borrill, C. S., Dawson, J. F., Brodbeck, F., Shapiro, D. A., & Haward, B. (2003). Leadership clarity and team innovation in health care. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(4–5), 393–410. doi: 10.1016/S1048-9843(03)00044-4
- Wibawati, T. A. (2017). *Inovasi Organisasi Badan Usaha Milik Desa Studi di Desa Panggungharjo, Kecamatan Sewon, Kabupaten Bantul*. Retrieved from [http://lib.ugm.ac.id/ind/?page\\_id=248](http://lib.ugm.ac.id/ind/?page_id=248)