



Innovative Work Behaviour in Bureaucratic Organizations: The Effect of Leadership and Self Efficacy in the Ministry of Home Affairs

Sukma Nurmala^{1*}, Selly Dian Widyasari¹

¹Universitas Brawijaya. Veteran Street, Malang City, East Java. Indonesia
Corresponding author's email: sukmanurmala@ub.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine whether there is an influence of leadership and self-efficacy towards innovative work behaviour in the Ministry of Home Affairs. The sample of this research is 183 State Civil Apparatus who work in the Ministry of Home Affairs. This study uses three measuring tools, namely the Individual Innovative Behaviour scale by Kleysen & Street to measure the implementation of new ideas in the workplace, the global transformational leadership scale (GTL) scale by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter to measure leadership patterns that motivate subordinates to do things beyond what they have planned and the Indonesian adaptation of the general self-efficacy scale developed by Born, Schwarzer, & Jerusalem to measure the individual's belief that they able to control the situation. The data analysis used was parametric statistics with multiple linear regression test. The results of the data analysis of this study indicate that leadership and self-efficacy have a significant effect towards innovative work behaviour ($R^2 = 0.637$, Sig. = 0.000). In other words, the influence of the variation of the independent variable (leadership variable and self-efficacy variable) is able to explain 63.7% variation of dependent variable (innovative work behaviour) in the Ministry of Home Affairs. Based on the research findings, the authors recommend State Civil Apparatus to continuously develop innovative ideas on an ongoing basis while still referring to the plans that have been prepared to manage the situation that occurs and are also supported by leadership figures who have an innovative spirit to facilitate the creative ideas of their subordinates.

Keywords: *Innovative Work Behaviour; Leadership; Ministry of Home Affairs; Self-Efficacy*

1. INTRODUCTION

The rapid development of the information's flow in the form of technology brings significant changes in various aspects of human life, including in an organization. This requires organizations to move faster in adapting to the environment. Individual capacity to create and apply innovation in a workplace is an important factor in organizations, especially when individuals implement new ideas into the real world and realize an innovative outcomes [1]. Stoffers & Van Der Heijden, stated that innovative work behavior is defined as a development, introducing, and implementing new ideas that fits for the group or organizational performance. Innovative work behavior also refers to cognitive aspects, such as trust in superiors, paying attention to new ideas, vitality at work, and the development of learning processes [2]. Therefore, the author argues that initiative, creativity, and individual

ability to ensure the flow of innovation in the organization remains the determinant of success in all types of organizations, including in a government organization.

Ensuring the flow of innovation in a government organization is important in order to provide optimal public services, both in the form of increasing service effectiveness and efficiency. Referring to the Regulation of the Minister of PANRB No. 30/2014 which states that public service innovation is a breakthrough of public services, whether an original creative idea and/or adaptation/modification that provides benefits to the community, either directly or indirectly. In government organizations, innovation becomes an objective requirement to improve the better bureaucratic performance. Innovation is how an innovation can be built on an ongoing basis. Starting from the basic understanding of innovation, integrating it into the

system, and conducting continuous evaluation. The basis understanding of innovation starts from individuals (bureaucratic apparatus) with a culture of getting used to creative things and bringing up new ideas that can help bureaucratic performance become better and lead to improvements. However, innovation in bureaucratic organizations is strongly influenced by the leadership authority and it will be impossible to create an innovative culture to generate creative ideas if the leader does not have an innovation spirit [3].

Innovative work behavior expects workers to have a high achievement target, low dependence on standard procedures which is raised by transformational leaders. Transformational leaders dare to take risks to try a better approach to work, change existing procedures and systems for long-term benefits [4], are able to move their subordinates to look beyond their own interests for the best interests of their organization [5], is able to provide a constructive feedback to his subordinates, convince his subordinates to put an extra effort, and encourage his subordinates to think creatively on complex work problems [6]. Gumusluoglu & Ilsev found that leadership is an important factor in shaping innovative work behavior. The role of the leader in formulating and modifying the organizational climate is quite vital. Organizational climate is a shared perception of organizational policies and procedures which will then be implemented by leaders. Leaders shape the organizational climate with visible behavior over time which will then become the perception of subordinates. And then subordinates will be motivated to innovate only when they perceive the leader to adopt practices that encourage innovation [7].

Bass states that transformational leaders are leaders who stimulate and inspire followers to achieve extraordinary goals, and then increase the leadership capacity of their followers themselves. Transformational leaders help their followers become leaders by responding to the needs of their followers, empowering, and aligning the goals of followers, leaders, groups, and organizations. A similar opinion was expressed [8] who stated that transformational leadership seeks to transform the organization towards change and improvement through stimulation, motivation, and inspiration. Bass B. M., states that transformational leaders motivate others to do more than they had planned, and sometimes even more than they thought possible. Transformational leaders empower followers and pay attention to the needs and personal development of each follower, and help followers to develop their leadership potential. Transformational leaders have four characteristics, namely charismatic, individualized consideration, inspired, and intellectual stimulation ([9].

The influence of the leadership here is one of the important external factors to consider in an organization. The culture of innovation starts from the leadership

becomes important, because it will have an influence on the bureaucratic apparatus under it. The result impact will be more beneficial when the culture of innovation becomes a leadership role model, then it will automatically be followed by other bureaucratic apparatus. Leaders can not be translated as the entity of power, but how leaders can be good examples for subordinates in bringing up creative ideas to improve bureaucratic performance and public services. This is in line with research conducted by several previous researchers, for example [10] which stated that to encourage workers to innovate in their work, it is necessary to consider the role of supervisors as leaders. It is necessary to approach the supervisor to convince workers to show creative behavior at work. In addition, [11] states that innovation in the government sector is followed by more public scrutiny and often occurs before the innovation is fully developed.

The ability to innovate here is related to the extent to which employees perceive less formal control over their activities and more opportunities for self-development and knowledge sharing [12]. In addition, Damanpour & Schneider underline the characteristics and willingness of leaders to continue to innovate in order to lead to innovative results and is reinforced by the arguments of Shanker, Bhanugopan, Van der Heijden, & Farrel that the public sector should encourage the development of innovative work behavior in leaders by creating a supportive work environment to improve organizational performance. On the other hand, the internal factor that influences individual behavior is self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is a concept in which an individual believes in the plans that have been drawn up and carries out procedures that are important for managing situations that occur [13], a constitutive ability that regulates cognitive, emotional, social and behavioral skills and refers to an important constituents of social learning theory of Bandura. Furthermore, Bandura states that the acquired knowledge which come from individual competence in performing certain tasks create perceptions of self-efficacy, in which motivation and abilities at the individual and collective levels, which affect performance, success, and the results or outcomes of a task.

Momeni, Ebrahimpour, & Ajirloo added that individuals who have a good self-efficacy show their understanding to be able to implement the tasks effectively. This is supported by the findings of [14] which states that employees who have high self-efficacy tend to generate, promote and implement new ideas. This is in line with the findings of Carmeli & Schaubroeck, in [15] which states that individuals who have high self-efficacy tend to make more efforts to improve work processes, perform challenging tasks, and practicing innovation to their work. Momeni, Ebrahimpour, & Ajirloo found that employee self-efficacy affects innovative work behavior. When employees have fair

perceptions of the salary, rewards, and organizational benefits; so they will display a broader conception of self-efficacy and innovative work behavior. Therefore, the role of superiors in providing procedural justice to subordinates is an important factor to increase the level of subordinate's innovation.

Finding out about the motivations that drive individuals to create innovation in the workplace can contribute to understanding about individual innovation behavior, organizational innovation, and organizational success. Therefore, the author focuses on research on innovative work behavior in bureaucratic organizations, its relation to the internal factors (self-efficacy) and the external factors (transformational leadership). In the future, the results of this research can be used to develop work programs that can improve innovative behavior in the workplace.

2. METHOD

2.1. Respondent

Respondents in this study were Aparatur Sipil Negara (ASN) who worked at the Ministry of Home Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia with a minimum work period of one year, had superiors (this was done because one of the independent variables in this study was the perception of leadership, so that participants must have a supervisor (leader), participant involvement is voluntary and willingness to be involved is evidenced by approval in the inform consent form. The scale is distributed online via Google Form. The sampling technique used is non-probability sampling with inclusion criteria. Number of samples $N = 183$ ASN employees (114 male, 69 female). The average age of the subject is 40 years with education background ranging from senior high school/equivalent to doctoral level.

Table 1 Subject's Characteristic

Characteristic	Category	Amount	Percentage %
Gender	Man	114	62.3
	Woman	69	37.7
	Total	183	
Educational Background	Senior High School/ Equivalent	6	3.3
	S1	84	45.9
	S2	91	49.7
	S3	2	1.1
	Total	183	

2.2. Collecting Data

There are three instruments in this study. First, the Individual Innovative Behavior scale developed by Kleysen & Street and refers to 5 dimensions, namely opportunity exploration, generativity, formative investigation, championing, and application with a reliability value of 0.958. Second, the Global Transformational Leadership Scale (GTL) compiled by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, consists of 7 items, namely communicating vision, developing subordinates, providing support, empowering subordinates, being innovative, leading by example, and charismatic with a reliability value of 0.903. Third, the Indonesian Adaptation of the General Self-Efficacy Scale developed by [16] has a reliability value between 0.76 and 0.90 because it was developed in many countries, consisting of three dimensions, namely level/magnitude, generality, and strength.

2.3. Data Analysis

Data analysis used is parametric statistics with multiple linear regression test to see the effect of the two independent variables (X_1 , X_2) toward dependent variable (Y). Two independent variables are leadership (X_1) and self-efficacy (X_2), while the dependent variable is innovative work behavior (Y).

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This study involved 183 state civil apparatus (ASN) who work at the Ministry of Home Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia. An explanation of the respondent's demographics in this study is described in table 1:

Table 2 Variable's Description

	Mean	SD	N
Innovative Work Behavior	42.2842	7.47421	183
Transformational Leadership	21.9672	4.38141	183
Self efficacy	31.6940	4.45543	183

Based on table 2, it can be seen that the highest mean score is on the innovative behavior variable with a mean of 42.28, then followed by the self-efficacy variable with

a mean value of 31.69, and the lowest mean score is the transformational leadership variable with a mean value of 21.96.

Table 3 Multiple Correlation Test (R) and Determination Analysis (R2)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.798 ^a	.637	.633	4.52755

a. Predictors: (Constant), Self Efficacy, Leadership

b. Dependent Variable: Innovative Work Behavior

The contribution of the influence of the independent variable [leadership variable (X_1) and self-efficacy variable (X_2)] simultaneously affects toward innovative work behavior variable by 63.7% or the variation of the independent variable used in this model (leadership variable and self-efficacy variable) is able to explain 63.7% of the dependent variable variation (innovative work behavior), while the remaining 36.3% is influenced by other variables which is not included in this research model. The significance value obtained is $F = 0.000$ (<0.05), $R^2 = 0.637$ or 63.7%, and $R = 0.798$. Thus, the requirements to be able to interpret the value of the

coefficient of determination in multiple linear regression analysis already fulfilled and hypothesis is accepted.

Standard Error of the Estimate is a measure of the number of errors in the regression model in predicting the value of Y. From the regression results, the value is 4.52755. This shows that the number of errors in predicting innovative behavior is 4,52755. As a guideline, if the standard error of the estimate $<$ the standard deviation of Y, which is $4.52755 < 7.47421$, it can be concluded that the regression model is getting better at predicting the value of Y.

Table 4 F Test

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	6477.462	2	3238.731	157.997	.000 ^b
	Residual	3689.762	180	20.499		
	Total	10167.224	182			

a. Dependent Variable: Innovative Work Behavior

b. Predictors: (Constant), Self Efficacy, Leadership

F test is used to determine whether the independent variables (X_1, X_2) together have a significant effect on the dependent variable (Y). Based on the results of the F test (simultaneous test) of innovative work behavior, it was found that the results of the regression F test had a sig value. 0.000. Because the value of sig. less than 0.05 ($0.00 < 0.05$), then H_0 is rejected, which means that self-

efficacy and leadership simultaneously affect toward innovative work behavior in Aparatur Sipil Negara (ASN) who work at the Ministry of Home Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia.

Table 5 T Test

Model		Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficient		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.
1	(Constant)	-1.797	2.509		-.716	.475
	Leadership	.314	.085	.184	3.678	.000
	Self Efficacy	1.173	.084	.699	13.958	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Innovative Work Behavior

Multiple linear regression equation for two predictors, that is $Y = -1.797 + 0.314 \text{ leadership} + 1.173 \text{ self efficacy}$. The equation can be explained as follows:

- A constant of -1.797; it means that if leadership (X_1) and self efficacy (X_2) value is 0, then innovative work behavior (Y) value is -1.797
- The regression coefficient of leadership variable (X_1) is 0.314; This means that if the other independent variables have a fixed value and leadership has an increase of 1%, then innovative work behavior (Y) will increase by 0.314. The positive coefficient means that there is a positive relationship between leadership (X_1) and innovative work behavior (Y). This finding can be interpreted

that the higher leadership, the higher innovative work behavior (Y).

- The regression coefficient of self-efficacy (X_2) is 1.173; This means that if the other independent variables have a fixed value and self-efficacy increases by 1%, then innovative work behavior (Y) will increase by 1.173. The positive coefficient means that there is a positive relationship between self-efficacy (X_2) and innovative work behavior (Y), the higher self-efficacy, the higher innovative work behavior (Y).

The author also arranges the distribution of variable categorization as follows:

Table 6 Description of the results of descriptive statistics of three variables

	leadership	self efficacy	innovative work behavior
Min	7	10	14
Max	28	40	56
Mean	17.5	25	35
SD	3.5	5	7

Table 7 The results of the distribution of the frequency of leadership variable

leadership	category	amount	percent	description
$X < \mu - 1\sigma$	$X < 14$	4	2,2 %	low
$\mu - 1\sigma < \mu + 1\sigma$	$14 < X < 21$	75	41 %	average
$X > \mu + 1\sigma$	$X > 21$	104	56,8 %	high

Table 7 shows that most employees rate high leadership (56.8%), and only a very few rate low leadership (2.2%). Based on table 7, it is known that the leader has been assessed as transformational by his subordinates or is interpreted as having accommodated his employees to innovate, but there is a possibility that in organizational system does not support existing human resources. Author argue that there is potential for limited

employee space, so author suggest agencies to create an innovation program or provide space for workers to provide innovation. Furthermore, the agency provides rewards based on the innovations made by the employee. Leadership can also be followed up through leadership mapping which contains the optimality of a leader in leading his subordinates.

Table 8 The results of the distribution of the frequency of self-efficacy

self-efficacy	category	amount	percent	description
$X < \mu - 1\sigma$	$X < 20$	0	0 %	low
$\mu - 1\sigma < \mu + 1\sigma$	$20 < X < 30$	104	56,83%	average
$X > \mu + 1\sigma$	$X > 30$	79	43,17%	high

Table 8 shows that most employees have moderate confidence in their work plan that they have prepared and carry out important procedures to manage their work situation (56.83%), and the rest have high confidence in

their work that plan they have prepared and carry out important procedures for manage their work situation (43.17%).

Table 9 The results of the distribution of the frequency of innovative work behaviour

innovative work behavior	category	amount	percent	description
$X < \mu - 1\sigma$	$X < 28$	5	2,74%	low
$\mu - 1\sigma < \mu + 1\sigma$	$28 < X < 42$	113	61,74%	average
$X > \mu + 1\sigma$	$X > 42$	65	35,52%	high

Table 9 shows that most employees have moderate innovative work behavior (61.74%), employees who have high innovative work behavior (35.52%), and the rest have low innovative work behavior (2.74%).

The results of this study indicate that leadership and self-efficacy have an influence on the innovative work behavior. This finding supports previous research which found that innovative behavior is formed from leadership that is able to modify the organizational climate, so that subordinates will be encouraged to innovate when they are able to perceive that their superiors have practiced behaviors that encourage innovation or novelty [17]. In addition, transformational leaders must also generate innovative work behavior from their subordinates if they want their subordinates to have high achievement targets such as by take risks to try a better approach at work and change existing procedures and systems for the benefit of the organization in the long term (Pearce & Ensley, 2004), so that it is hoped that the creation of new business models, management techniques, strategies, and the new organizational structures can be created outside of what already exists in the organization [13].

Self-efficacy also plays an important role in implementing the assigned tasks effectively. In line with the findings of Zahra, Ahmad, and Waheed that employees who have high self-efficacy tend to generate, evaluate and implement new ideas. Previous findings also found that individuals who have high self-efficacy tend to put more effort into improving work processes, performing challenging tasks, and practicing innovation at work (Carmeli & Schaubroeck, Hsiao, Chang, Tu, & Chen), the important thing is that they are mainly used to be fully engaged in work as well as to overcome work challenges independently based on Michael, Hou, & Fan. Another finding that supports this research is that employee self-efficacy influences innovative work behavior. The research findings of Momeni, Ebrahimpour, & Ajirlo show that when employees have fair perceptions of salaries, rewards, and organizational benefits; then they will display a broader conception of self-efficacy and innovative work behavior. Therefore, providing justice to their subordinates as an important factor in increasing the level of employee innovation.

4. CONCLUSION

There are two conclusions that can be drawn in this study. First, leadership and self efficacy have an influence toward the innovative work behavior in the ASN who works at the Ministry of Home Affairs of the

Republic of Indonesia. Second, the form of innovation in each type of organization will be different. Government agencies that have high formalization and centralization, of course, should influence workers in showing their innovative work behavior. Leadership factors can increase the innovative behavior of workers. In the future, it is necessary to map out leaders who can support the innovative work behavior of their subordinates. This can be done by carrying out a competency assessment which is then followed up with a leadership development program. Furthermore, government agencies need to provide facilities for workers to be able to apply their innovative thinking. This can be done, for example, by creating an innovation competition program.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I can not express enough thanks to Badan Penelitian dan Pengabdian Masyarakat (BPPM) of the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Brawijaya which has funded and facilitated the author in this research process. My completion of this study could not have been accomplished without the support of the Director General of Regional Autonomy of the Ministry of Home Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia, all structural officials, and JFU within the Directorate General of Regional Autonomy of the Ministry of Home Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia, especially for providing this opportunity and permission to the author to retrieve the data.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bandura, A. (1995). *Self-efficacy in changing societies*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- [2] Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: the exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- [3] Bandura, A. (2018). Toward a psychology of human agency: pathways and reflections. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 13 (2), 130-136.
- [4] Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectation*. New York: The Free Press.
- [5] Bass, B. M. (1990). *From Transactional to Transformational Leadership: Learning to Share the Vision*. *Organizational Dynamic*, Elsevier Vol 3 No 1.

- [6] Born, A., *Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995)*. Indonesian Adaptation of the General Self-Efficacy Scale. Website. <http://userpage.fu-berlin.de/~health/indonesse.htm>
- [7] Carmeli, A. & Spreitzer, G.M. (2009). Trust, connectivity, and thriving: implications for innovative behaviors at work. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 43 (3), 169-191.
- [8] 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.
- [9] Gumusluoglu & Ilsev (2009). Transformational Leadership and Organizational Innovation: The Roles of Internal and External Support for Innovation. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*. 26 (3), 264-277.
- [10] Hsiao, H.C., Chang, J.C., Ling Tu, Y., & Chen, S.C. (2011). The impact of self-efficacy on innovative work behavior for teachers. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*. 1(1), 31-36.
- [11] Kleysen, R. F., & Street, C. T. (2001). Toward a multi-dimensional measure of individual innovative behaviour. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*.
- [12] Momeni, M., Ebrahimpour, H., & Ajirloo, M.B. (2014). The effect of employees' self-efficacy on innovative work behavior at social security organization employees in Ardabil province. *Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*. 3(8), 29-32.
- [13] Pearce, C.L. & Ensley, M.D. (2004). A reciprocal and longitudinal investigation of the innovation process: the central role of shared vision in product and process innovation teams (PPITs). *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 25 (2). <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.235>.
- [14] Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviours and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviours. *The leadership quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(90\)90009-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-7)
- [15] Shanker, R., Bhanugopan, R., Van der Heijden, B.I. and Farrell, M. (2017). Organizational climate for innovation and organizational performance: the mediating effect of innovative work behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 100, 67-77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2017.02.004>
- [16] Stoffers, J.M.M., & Van Der Heijden, B.I.J.M (2009). Towards an HRM Model predicting Organisational Performance by Enhancing Innovative Work Behaviour: A Study among Dutch SMEs in the Province of Limburg. Maastricht School of Management, Open University of the Netherlands, University of Twente.
- [17] Zahra, T.T., Ahmad, H.M., & Waheed, A. (2017). Impact of Ethical Leadership on Innovative Work Behavior: Mediating Role of Self-Efficacy. *Journal of Behavioral Sciences*. 27 (1), 93-107.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

