

# Public Entrepreneurship:

## What, Why and How

Husain Syam\*  
Universitas Negeri Makassar  
Makassar, Indonesia  
\*husainsyam@unm.ac.id

Hamsu Abdul Gani  
Post Graduate Program  
Universitas Negeri Makassar  
Makassar, Indonesia  
hamsuabdulgani@unm.ac.id

Haedar Akib  
Department of Administration Science, Faculty of Social  
Science and Law  
Universitas Negeri Makassar  
Makassar, Indonesia  
haedarakib@unm.ac.id

Akbar Mukmin, Rede Roni Bare  
Department of Public Administration Post Graduate  
Program  
Universitas Negeri Makassar  
Makassar, Indonesia  
akbarmukmin1965@gmail.com, rederoni29@gmail.com

**Abstract**—The concept or perspective of public entrepreneurship based on creativity and innovation that has value for the public or citizens is the essence and orientation of capacity building and institutional building programs in organizations. This study uses a normative research method which is carried out by reviewing the contents of relevant references while exploring relevant data, information and knowledge as answers to questions about What, Why, Where, When, Who, and How (5W1H) application of the concept or perspective of public entrepreneurship in organizational governance was inspired by the idea of David Osborne with Ted Gaebler on Reinventing Government and David Osborne with Plastrik on the Banishing Bureaucracy which also marked a new era of reform or transformation of public organizations in various countries in the world, including Indonesia. “Entrepreneurship applied at the locus of public organizations” or public entrepreneurship in Indonesia is currently considered a new perspective in the context of change and development of public organizations. Therefore, this normative research article explains the answers to the rhetorical questions about the what, why and how of public entrepreneurship.

**Keywords**—public entrepreneurship, creativity and innovation, value for the public

### I. INTRODUCTION

The idea of Osborne and Gaebler [1] regarding the Reinventing Government which is clarified by a guidebook entitled Banishing Bureaucracy [2] is a new milestone in reforming public organizations in various countries in the world. This masterpiece has launched various organizations that have developed in the governance of the government bureaucracy and in the formulation of various creative-innovative steps that are of value to the public or citizens of the country they serve. The two books provide inspiration and new

nuances for the paradigm shift of public administration science - New Public Management / NPM [3] and steps for reform or transformation of public organizations in Indonesia that have increasingly focused their relevance momentum when a multi-dimensional crisis has occurred since mid-year. 1997 ago and continues today [4].

One of the ideas offered by these two works - as well as other masterpieces that were born before and after them - in colouring the discourse of changing the paradigm of public administration is the application of the concept of entrepreneurship in the locus of public organizations or - in this paper - called Public Entrepreneurship. Besides, this masterpiece stimulates the involvement of various components of government (governance) outside the state (public sector), especially the business world (private) and the community in the delivery of public services, including public asset management [4]. This is crystallized into the focus and locus of studies in Public Sector Management, namely governance at all levels of multi-dimensional development and community empowerment based on the resources available to support the provision of public services efficiently, effectively, economically, accountable and sustainable [5,6].

It is assumed that the governance of public sector organizations according to the perspective of public entrepreneurship [5,7–11] aims to provide value for the public [12–14]. This holy goal is by the opinion of [10] that opening up public spaces to public entrepreneurship and innovation at the local, regional, national and international levels is the key to increasing the degree and quality of the public asset and utility governance - for example, peace, safety, intelligence and health - available to citizens.

## II. METHODS

This type of normative research [1,2] and analytical descriptive is carried out by reviewing the contents of references that discuss the focus of public entrepreneurship at various loci, while exploring relevant data, information and knowledge as answers to the questions What, Why, Where, When, Who, and How (5W1H), based on "keywords" questions according to Rudyard Kipling [15] application of the concept or perspective of public entrepreneurship in organizational governance. The application of the public entrepreneurship perspective was inspired by the ideas of David Osborne with Ted Gaebler on Reinventing Government and David Osborne with Plastrik on the Banishing Bureaucracy which also marked a new era of reform or transformation of public organizations in various countries in the world, including Indonesia. The results are presented following the stages of an interactive model [4] which includes data collection, information and knowledge, data condensation, data verification and drawing conclusions.

## III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Observing the foreground, urgency and significance, direction and purpose as well as the essence and value orientation of the application of the concept of public entrepreneurship based on the results of searching relevant data, information and knowledge, then presented answers to rhetorical questions based on "keywords" questions according to Rudyard Kipling [15], with the 5W+1H formula, namely What, Why, Who, When, Where, and How strategies or ways of applying the concept or perspective of public entrepreneurship in governance. manage public organizations. It is understood that the public entrepreneurship perspective was inspired by the ideas of David Osborne with Ted Gaebler on Reinventing Government and David Osborne with Plastrik on the Banishing Bureaucracy thus marking a new era of reform or transformation of public organizations in Indonesia.

Observing the foreground of urgency and significance, direction and purpose, as well as the essence and value orientation of the application of the concept of public entrepreneurship, the answers to the rhetorical questions of the title of this paper, are presented based on the "keyword" questions according to Rudyard Kipling [15], with the 5W + 1H formula, namely What, Why, Who, When, Where and How strategy or how.

First, what is meant by public entrepreneurship based on creativity and innovation? Its answer is entrepreneurship at the locus of the public organization according to Kearney et al. [16] which refers to public sector organizations or institutions (state-owned) and state civil servants who think creatively and act innovatively in carrying out planned and systematic activities in the context of change and creation, value (utility) for self, group, organization and public served. Public entrepreneurship or "public sector entrepreneurship" [17] as a form of public sector strategic management innovation [18] is an important idea and instrument for organizing a

transformative agenda to produce an aspired citizen condition by providing vision, leadership. and creating value for the public through multi-actor and multi-sector collaborative partnerships to increase the quantity, quality and sustainability of multi-dimensional development investments. According to several experts [4,10,11,17–19], public sector entrepreneurship plays an important role in initiating, shaping and accelerating a transformative development agenda driven by entrepreneurial groups. Public sector entrepreneurship plays a role in transformative development that not only produces physical results but also in developing mental attitudes. The term so far, public sector entrepreneurship has become a tool for "changing mindsets" [20], "changing mindsets and *dzikir* patterns" [21], or "mental revolution" [22].

According to Muhammad [17], there are three important public sector entrepreneurial agendas, namely: 1) the way the state/government plays a role in carrying out the transformative agenda, especially as a risk-taking initiator, enabler and accelerator. Entrepreneurship in the public sector creates confidence through investment-friendly policies, creating enabling culture and increasing capacity building; 2) Public sector entrepreneurship prevents abuse of authority and maintains public accountability mechanisms to create trust and governance; 3) Entrepreneurship in the public sector guarantees the creation of a creative-innovative culture in a society that is directed at improving and sustaining the quality of life together.

This definition of public entrepreneurship implies keywords that characterize multi-actors (entrepreneurs), multi-sector activities and their performance at the individual and institutional level. Public entrepreneurship emphasizes the performance of actors in utilizing money and opportunities, the ability to turn potential into valuable competencies, turning challenges (threats) into opportunities and money (real and not real/digital) and changing the motto or life principle of the millennial generation, from the "principle of independence or die "becomes" the creative-innovative principle or die" [21,23]. The word die in the industrial revolution era or the era of society 5.0 according to Akib [23] does not mean real death, but can mean being marginalized, alienated, marginalized, abandoned, "seconded", forgotten, or defeated when competing.

According to experts [4,5,7,19,24,25] the performance of public entrepreneurship It is seen when the bureaucratic, political, policy and executive multi-actors [26] can observe the potential or opportunities that can be transformed quickly, precisely, synergistically and sustainably into valuable (beneficial) competencies for the public. The typology of public entrepreneurs according to Robert and King is that policy entrepreneur is an actor outside the formal position of government who introduces and facilitates the implementation of new ideas to the public sector. Bureaucratic entrepreneurs are actors who occupy non-leadership positions in government who introduce and implement creative-innovative ideas. Executive entrepreneurs are actors who because of their leadership positions in government agencies and departments

can generate and implement new (creative-innovative) ideas of value to the public. Meanwhile, the political entrepreneur is an actor who because of his position in a political institution can introduce and implement new ideas or change the system and working mechanism of political institutions.

Public entrepreneurship emphasizes the use of opportunities and resources that are owned to be created to be of value or benefit to the public [27]. This view strengthens the understanding of experts that entrepreneurship (public) based at the same time means valuable creativity and innovation. Thus, there are general characteristics of public entrepreneurship performance at the level of individual analysis, namely: based on creativity and innovation that is of value to the public; the ability to construct, create or change (potential becomes competence, weakness and threat becomes strength and opportunity/money, old conventional principles become contextual new principles); the ability to subordinate individual interests (private) under the public interest; think globally and act locally at various levels; think and act one step ahead of others or the community; support the direction of changes in mindset, *dzikir* patterns, mental revolution [20–22]; able to make decisions carefully, quickly and precisely; able to take moderate risks; and so on.

Meanwhile, the general characteristics of public entrepreneurship at the institutional level are based on ten (10) generic principles of "entrepreneurship the bureaucracy" [1,17], namely: 1) decentralization of stakeholder authority; 2) All clients or stakeholders are given excellent service that satisfies them as internal and external customers; 3) using a price (value) based market mechanism for the public; 4) focused on the acquisition of money (profit, profit, benefit, positive externalities); 5) prevent problems or costs, both economic and social costs; 6) based on vision and mission goals, or directed by goals and not by rigid rules or procedures; 7) empowering citizens as public elements or supporting the "7-P partnership model" [4,28]; 8) instilling a spirit of "coopetition" or competition that results in cooperation; 9) catalyze all sectors or stakeholder elements; and 10) performance measurement of agents (institutions, individuals) focused on outputs and their impact, not on inputs.

Second, why need to actualize a public entrepreneurial perspective? The answer is by the meaning inherent in Mr Ir. Soekarno [29] stated that this nation must be built by prioritizing character building because this character development can make Indonesia a great, advanced, victorious and dignified nation. Although Bung Karno did not specifically state the development of entrepreneurial character in the public sector, it is understood that the character of entrepreneurship based on creativity and innovation that is valuable to the public is a priority that needs to be instilled or developed in every individual Indonesian citizen, especially for the millennial generation.

Creativity and innovation are one of the greatest assets in the workplace, the mission of each activity and the center or key factor for organizational success [30]. Creativity and

innovation are the essence and orientation of human resource development [8]. Creativity and innovation characterize the development and competitiveness of individuals, groups, organizations and communities in a sustainable manner [4,21,31–34]. Creativity and innovation are ingredients in public service, product development, goods and services, strategies and processes and behaviours that are better, unique, new, original, different or useful. Thus, the goal of developing creativity and innovation as a basis for entrepreneurship is to create value for the public, such as productivity, effectiveness, capability, accessibility, acceptability, accountability, integrity, responsibility, responsiveness, popularity, electability and so on as modern values of sector administration and management. public [23].

The concept or perspective of entrepreneurship in public organizations is important to be included in the mindset and mindset of actors and organizational stakeholders and is used to change the orientation of actors to be more anticipatory, creative, innovative and able to take advantage of opportunities. This is by the research results and opinions of [8,33,35] that entrepreneurship is often conceived as innovation, creativity, the establishment of new organizations or activities, or some kind of novelty. According to Slaughter and Leslie [35], under this conceptualization, entrepreneurship occurs in markets, firms, government and universities.

Third, when is the right time to apply the concept or perspective of public entrepreneurship? The dimension of time is right when Bung Karno proclaimed the independence of the Indonesian nation from colonialism, but because the State of Indonesia is currently participating in the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) agreement in the era of the industrial revolution or society 5.0, the urgency and significance of the timing of its implementation is increasingly felt. The application of a public entrepreneurial perspective is very important because currently, the position of competitiveness of the Indonesian public bureaucracy in various aspects is still lower than that of ASEAN countries, such as Malaysia, Thailand, Singapore [36–38]. At this time, the Makassar State University (UNM) which was chaired by Prof. Dr Husain Syam, M.TP., together with his academic community "confirmed" UNM's forward steps based on its vision of "education and entrepreneurship." Likewise, the focus of UNM's "Principal Scientific Development" agreed at the current meeting of the Indonesian State Higher Education Rectors' Council is "Entrepreneurship and Administrative Sciences (Public, Business).

Fourth, where the locus or place and level of analysis are appropriate to apply a public entrepreneurial perspective? Following the focus described, the locus or "nursery" from the perspective of public entrepreneurship based on creativity and innovation that is valuable to the public is at all loci of organizations/institutions that carry out creative and innovative services to create value (benefits) for the public or citizens at the level. central and regional.

Without neglecting the differences in the locus of the public sector and the private sector, the analysis perspective regarding the focus and locus of public entrepreneurship refers to the views of experts [6,9,16,39] that there are at least four loci. or the level of analysis in understanding public entrepreneurship and its relationship with private entrepreneurial behaviour, namely: 1) game rules, 2) new public organizations, creative, innovative and valuable management of public resources, 4) Spillovers from private action to the public domain.

Fifth, who actors play a role in realizing a public entrepreneurial perspective? The answer is individuals and institutions or organizational entities that have values, traits, character, talents, potentials, competencies or characters capable of carrying out and realizing the characteristics of public entrepreneurial performance, as stated above. In other words, public entrepreneurial actors are individuals or institutions who think creatively and act innovatively to create value for the public or citizens.

Sixth, how are SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, time-bound) strategies in applying a public entrepreneurial perspective? Many appropriate ways can be chosen in disseminating creativity and innovation as the basis of public entrepreneurship, ranging from radical ways to subtle and subtle ways. In principle, whatever strategy is implemented has the same goal so that change and renewal can occur in individuals (people), groups, organizations or public entities.

There are four classic strategies to introduce creativity and innovation as the basis for public sector entrepreneurship, namely the minority influence strategy, participatory strategy, eclectic strategy and power coercion strategy [40-42]. Several experts [43-47] agree that there are eleven generic strategies (abbreviated as 11-C) which are applied by individuals or institutions to continue to exist, develop and be competitive (Connection, Concurrency, Comprehension, Communication, Conceptualization, Collaboration, Compromise, Collective Intelligence, Critical Thinking, Creativity and Coopetition - a competition that results in cooperation). The mastery and application of creative-innovative strategies are what strengthens the life principle of the millennial generation in the era of the industrial revolution or the era of society 5.0, namely the principle of "creative-innovative, or dead" so that it doesn't die.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Public entrepreneurship focuses on the performance of public entities or institutions (organizations) and the performance of individual actors capable of making change, renewal and development, adaptation, innovation, risk management, value creation for the public and so on. The concept or perspective of entrepreneurship at the locus of public organizations can accelerate creativity and innovation of value to the public (citizens). The typology of public entrepreneurial actors (policy entrepreneurs, bureaucratic entrepreneurs, executive entrepreneurs and political

entrepreneurs) is believed to be a trigger for efforts to increase the competence and performance of actors and the performance of learning organizations in the public sector. Therefore, it is suggested to public organization stakeholders that this public entrepreneurial perspective "colours" the realization of capacity building and institutional building programs and inspires and motivates changes in mindset, remembrance/*dzikir* patterns and mental revolution of the state civil apparatus at all types and levels of public organizations. The aim is that the essence or basic value and value orientation of implementing a public entrepreneurial perspective based on creativity and value innovation for the public or citizens can shape individual and institutional characters that are more anticipatory, constructive, productive, collaborative and synergistic. Hopefully.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Thank you to Universitas Negeri Makassar (UNM) and Universitas Brawijaya (UB) for facilitating us in publishing literature review articles.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] D. Osborne and T. Gaebler, *Reinventing Government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming government*, 1992.
- [2] D. Osborne and P. Plastrik, *Banishing Bureaucracy: The Five Strategies for Reinventing Government*. ERIC, 1997.
- [3] P. Dunleavy and C. Hood, "From old public administration to new public management," *Public money Manag.*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 9–16, 1994.
- [4] H. Syam, T. Lamangida, J. Madubun, Norwawati, and H. Akib, "Public entrepreneurship perspective in the management of the Limboto Lake In Gorontalo Regency, Indonesia," *Acad. Entrep. J.*, vol. 24, no. 4, 2018.
- [5] P. Windrum and P. M. Koch, *Innovation in public sector services: entrepreneurship, creativity and management*. Edward Elgar Publishing, 2008.
- [6] L. Kaboolian, "The new public management: Challenging the boundaries of the management vs. administration debate," *Public Adm. Rev.*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 189–193, 1998.
- [7] D. Bartlett and P. Dibben, "Public sector innovation and entrepreneurship: Case studies from local government," *Local Gov. Stud.*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 107–121, 2002.
- [8] S. Dharma and H. Akib, "Kewirausahaan Sekolah Berbasis Kreativitas dan Inovasi," *J. Pendidik. dan Kebudayaan*, Ed. Khusus, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 102–117, 2009.
- [9] P. G. Klein, J. T. Mahoney, A. M. McGahan, and C. N. Pitelis, "Toward a theory of public entrepreneurship," *Eur. Manag. Rev.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 1–15, 2010.
- [10] E. Ostrom, "Unlocking public entrepreneurship and public economies," *Wider Discussion Papers//World Institute for Development Economics (Unu-Wider)*, 2005.
- [11] J. Schnellenbach, "Public entrepreneurship and the economics of reform," *J. Institutional Econ.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 183–202, 2007.
- [12] J. Benington and M. H. Moore, *Public value: Theory and practice*. Macmillan International Higher Education, 2010.
- [13] J. M. Bryson, B. C. Crosby, and L. Bloomberg, "Public value governance: Moving beyond traditional public administration and the new public management," *Public Adm. Rev.*, vol. 74, no. 4, pp. 445–456, 2014, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12238>.

- [14] T. Meynhardt, "Public value inside: What is public value creation?," *Intl J. Public Adm.*, vol. 32, no. 3-4, pp. 192-219, 2009.
- [15] R. Kipling, *The Man Who Would Be King: Selected Stories of Rudyard Kipling*. Penguin UK, 2011.
- [16] C. Kearney, R. D. Hisrich, and F. W. Roche, "Change management through entrepreneurship in public sector enterprises," *J. Dev. Entrep.*, vol. 15, no. 04, pp. 415-437, 2010.
- [17] F. Muhammad, *Reinventing Local Government, Pengalaman dari Daerah*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Elex Media Komputindo, 2013.
- [18] J. G. A. Van Mierlo, "Public entrepreneurship as innovative management strategy in the public sector: a public choice-approach," 1996.
- [19] D. W. Kirchheimer, "Public Entrepreneurship & Subnational Government," *Polity*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 119-142, 1989.
- [20] A. Amiruddin, *Tri Konsepsi sebagai Grand Strategy Pembangunan Sulawesi Selatan*. Makassar, Indonesia: Pemerintah Provinsi Sulawesi Selatan, 1990.
- [21] H. Akib, "Kreativitas dalam organisasi," Univ. Indones. Jakarta, 2005.
- [22] J. Widodo, "Revolusi mental," Kompas, Jakarta, Indonesia, 2014.
- [23] H. Akib, "Reaktualisasi Karakter Wirausaha bagi Generasi Millennial di Era Revolusi Industri (Masyarakat) 5.0," Pusat Penerbit STIA Trinitas Ambon, Ambon, 2019.
- [24] C. J. Bellone and G. F. Goerl, "Reconciling public entrepreneurship and democracy," *Public Adm. Rev.*, pp. 130-134, 1992.
- [25] H. Syam, H. Akib, A. A. Patonangi, and M. Guntur, "Principal Entrepreneurship Competence Based on Creativity and Innovation in the Context of Learning Organizations in Indonesia," *J. Entrep. Educ.*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 1-13, 2018.
- [26] N. C. Roberts and P. King, "Public entrepreneurship: a typology," *Dudley Knox Library, Monterey, California USA*, 1989.
- [27] G. E. Stockley, *Introduction: The Emerging Field of Non-Market Entrepreneurship*. 2009.
- [28] D. Daraba, H. Akib, M. S. Saggaf, A. Cahaya, and R. Salam, "Basic Public Service Partnership Model Based on Gender Perspective in Makassar City, Indonesia," *J. Leg. Ethical Regul. Issues*, 2018.
- [29] R. Gunawan, "Pembelajaran Nilai-Nilai Pahlawan Kemerdekaan Soekarno dalam Rangka Mengembalikan Karakter Bangsa Indonesia," *E-Journal WIDYA Non-Eksakta*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2013.
- [30] J. Kilby, "Creativity is one of the greatest assets in the workplace," *San Antonio Bus. J.*, vol. 15, pp. 25, 2001.
- [31] H. Akib, "Mencermati heuristik transformasi organisasi: Mereaktualisasi perilaku kreatif manusia melalui pendekatan knowledge management," *J. Manaj. Usahaw. Indones.*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 225-244, 2011.
- [32] C. M. Ford and D. A. Gioia, "Factors influencing creativity in the domain of managerial decision making," *J. Manage.*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 705-732, 2000.
- [33] A. Syam, H. Akib, M. Yunus, and S. Hasbiah, "Determinants of entrepreneurship motivation for students at the educational institution and education personnel in Indonesia," *J. Entrep. Educ.*, 2018.
- [34] H. Syam, *Kewirausahaan: Langkah Praktis Menuju Sukses*. Makassar, Indonesia: Cetakan Pertama. Badan Penerbit UNM, Makassar, 2007.
- [35] S. Slaughter and L. L. Leslie, *Academic Capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. ERIC, 1997.
- [36] M. A. S. Rahman, "Daya Saing Tenaga Kerja Indonesia Dalam Menghadapi Masyarakat Ekonomi ASEAN (MEA)," *eJournal Ilmu Hub. Int.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 117-130, 2015.
- [37] M. M. Ridhwan, G. Wicaksono, L. Nurliana, P. Bary, F. T. Suryani, and R. Satyanugroho, "Analisis Daya Saing dan Strategi Industri Nasional Di Era Masyarakat Ekonomi Asean dan Perdagangan Bebas," *Work. Pap. Bank Indones*, 2015.
- [38] A. Prianto, "Urgensi Penguatan Budaya Wirausaha untuk Meningkatkan Daya Saing Indonesia di Era Mea," *J. Econ.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 89-106, 2015.
- [39] C. Kearney, R. D. Hisrich, and F. Roche, "Public and private sector entrepreneurship: similarities, differences or a combination?," *J. Small Bus. Enterp. Dev.*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 26-46, 2009.
- [40] H. Shipton, M. A. West, J. Dawson, K. Birdi, and M. Patterson, "HRM as a predictor of innovation," *Hum. Resour. Manag. J.*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 3-27, 2006.
- [41] M. A. West, "A measure of role innovation at work.," *Br. J. Soc. Psychol.*, 1987.
- [42] H. Akib, "Snapshot Daya Saing Indonesia Dalam Memasuki Era ASEAN Economic Community (AEC)," in *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Himpunan Sarjana Ilmu-ilmu Sosial*, 2016, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 274-282.
- [43] M. Aras, H. Syam, H. Haris, M. Jasruddin, and H. Akib, "The Analysis of Mix Marketing System Toward The Performance of Convection Business in Makassar," 2018.
- [44] T. J. Gandomani, Z. Tavakoli, M. Z. Nafchi, and M. N. Sarpiri, "Adapting Scrum Process with 7C Knowledge Management Model," in *2019 5th Conference on Knowledge-Based Engineering and Innovation (KBEL)*, 2019, pp. 56-59, doi: 10.1109/KBEL.2019.8735008.
- [45] H. Oinas-Kukkonen and H. Oinas, "The 7C model for organizational knowledge creation and management," 2004.
- [46] T. Raisanen and H. Oinas-Kukkonen, "A system architecture for the 7C knowledge environment," *Front. Artif. Intell. Appl.*, vol. 166, pp. 217, 2008.
- [47] J. Tropman and L. P. Wooten, "The 7C approach to conceptualizing administration: Executive leadership in the 21st century." Taylor & Francis, 2013.