Public Policy:
Jurnal Aplikasi Kebijakan Publik dan Bisnis

Innovation Public Service in Maluku Province

Zainal Abidin Rengifurwarin[1]
Julia Th. Patty[2]

[1,2] Universitas Pattimura, Ambon, Maluku, Indonesia
rengifurwarin58@gmail.com

Abstract

This research aims to analyse and explain the condition of public service quality, the ability to implement public service innovation strategies, as well as the development of individual employee human resource capacity factors, system/ institutional support factors and community role factors at the Maluku Provincial Revenue Agency (BPDP). The problem faced in this research is formulated: how is the implementation of public service innovation strategies, and what are the supporting determinants and inhibitors of public service innovation at BPDP Maluku? This research is descriptive quantitative, by examining 62 respondents, through the distribution of questionnaires. The data analysis technique is non-parametric statistics, using a 5-point Likers scale. The findings of this research illustrate that variable X: the implementation of public service innovation strategies is in sufficient condition (50%), influenced by variable deteminan factors: the ability of individual employee human resources, system/ institutional support factors, as well as factors of community participation that are not optimal (40%). The implication of these findings is that if you want to improve the quality of public services, you need the ability to implement public service innovation strategies determined by individual employee ability factors, system/ institutional support factors, and community participation factors.

Keywords : Service Quality, Service Innovation Strategy

Introduction

Quality public service is a significant concern for the government (Mukarom, Zainal & Laksana, (2016); Priansa, (2018), yet the perception of poor governance in public service delivery persists among the public (Dwiyanto, 2015). Local governments continually strive to meet demands for quality goods and administrative services. Government officials' awareness to provide assistance to the public is crucial, often equated with quality and modern services (Mukarom, Zainal & Laksana, (2016), extending beyond business organizations to government agencies (Sinambela, 2007). Research by Irmawati et al., (2022) highlights public service transparency, service transformation (Herizal et al., 2020) service performance (Selanno & Wance, 2021) and information technology utilization (Ekram et al., 2022).

Long and convoluted service processes have an impact on low service quality, requiring changes or breakthroughs to create service innovations in all regions in Indonesia, including the Maluku region. One way to deal with changes and developments in the organisational environment, both internal and external, is to innovate public services (Rengifurwarin, 2001). Efforts to improve the quality of public services by each Local Government (Pemda) in Indonesia must be taken in the establishment of a public service innovation strategy.

This is in accordance with Government Regulation (PP) No. 38 of 2017 concerning the Regional Innovation mandating that each Provincial Government and Regency/City Government are expected to be able to make innovations regarding regional governance, public services or other regional innovations in accordance with Government Affairs as the authority of the region. Maluku Governor Instruction No. 1 Year 2017 on the implementation of the One Agency One Innovation Movement in order to accelerate the improvement of the quality of public services in Maluku Province has been stipulated since 29 March 2017, as a response to the PP above.

The Maluku Province Regional Revenue Agency encounters challenges in enhancing regional revenue collection efficiency amid the geographical and socio-economic diversity. To address this, sustainable strategies are needed to boost citizen participation and tax compliance. Digital transformation and new technologies are key to improve transparency and accountability, yet barriers like limited infrastructure and digital literacy persist. The study aims to identify factors influencing public service effectiveness in Maluku and to provide

strategic recommendations, focusing on digital capacity enhancement, innovation and inclusive service models.

Research on digitization and innovation of public services in Maluku Province is limited, especially compared to urban areas with advanced infrastructure. This gap overlooks the unique challenges of Maluku's geographical and socio-economic landscape. Additionally, existing studies tend to prioritize technology implementation over socio-cultural factors, hindering effective adoption. Evaluations of public service innovation's impact on tax compliance and citizen involvement in island regions are also inadequate. Understanding how Maluku's geography, socio-economics, and local culture influence public service innovation is crucial in increasing local income and community engagement.

Since the issuance of the Maluku Governor's Instruction nearly 8 years ago, there has been limited progress in public service innovations, with only 35 regional innovations identified in the region. Notably, 7 regions are lack of regional innovations. Among those with innovations are Central Maluku Regency leads with 16, followed by West Seram Regency with 4, and Ambon City with 4, while Tual City has 1 innovation. However, several regions, including Southeast Maluku Regency, East Part Regency, Tanimbar Islands Regency, Southwest Regency, Aru Islands Regency, Buru Regency, and South Buru Regency, have not implemented any regional innovations yet. This phenomenon warrants further investigation, making it a focal point of this research. Therefore, the problems faced in this research are formulated: (1) How is the public service innovation strategy? and (2) What are the supporting and inhibiting determinants of the implementation of the public service innovation strategy at BPDP Maluku? The purposes of this research are to analyse and explain the description of how the implementation of the service innovation strategy, as well as the supporting and inhibiting determinants at BPDP Maluku.

Review Of Literature

The Concept of Public Service Innovation

The term innovation has several quite diverse meanings put by a number of groups. At least, there are four meanings of innovation: 1) The process of thinking about and implementing an idea that has elements of novelty and usefulness or expediency (LAN, 2014), 2) Answers to all problems in the organisation (LAN, 2015), 3) New discoveries that

are different from existing or previously known ones (ideas, methods, or tools) (KBBI, 2002), and 4) An idea, practice, or object that is considered as something new by another individual or adoption unit.

In the public sector, Muluk Khairul, (2008) suggests that innovation is vital for enhancing efficiency and cutting costs due to limited resources and budget constraints. Additionally, it can elevate service quality and societal impact, particularly by addressing ineffective past policies. Deddy Mulyadi, (2018) further elaborate that innovation in public administration involves introducing novel and useful ideas to regulate and manage public affairs effectively.

Muhammad Awaluddin, (2016) emphasizes that making innovations for improvement is crucial. In public administration, innovation is aimed at addressing issues in governance practices and enhancing the performance of government organizations. At the local government level, regional innovation encompasses all forms of renewal in local governance affairs as stated in Law No. 32/2014: Article 386 Chapter XXI. These reforms aim to improve the performance of local governance, including in the role of government for local government administration, development implementation and public services. Acording in Deddy Mulyadi, (2018), mentions eight types of innovation: 1) process innovation, 2) method innovation, 3) organisational structure innovation, 4) relationship innovation, 5) strategy innovation, 6) mindset innovation, 7) product innovation, and 8) service innovation. According to Mulgan & Albury cited by Muluk (2004), there are five typologies in the innovation process: 1) product or service innovation, 2) service process innovation, 3) service method innovation, 4) service policy innovation, and 5) system innovation.

Types and Forms of Innovation

Ancok in Deddy Mulyadi, (2018) there are eight types of innovation, namely: 1) process innovation, 2) method innovation, 3) organisational structure innovation, 4) relationship innovation, 5) strategy innovation, 6) mindset innovation, 7) product innovation, and 8) service innovation. According to the thinking of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in its 2005 report: The Measurement of Scientific and Technological Activities, as cited by Doran, mentions three types of innovation: 1) product innovation, 2) process innovation, and 3) organisational innovation.

According to Windrum (2008), forms of innovation in the public sector include: Service innovation, service delivery innovation, administrative or organisational innovation, conceptual innovation, policy innovation, and systematic innovation. Meanwhile, according to Bekkers et al., (2011) the types of innovation in the public sector include: 1) Product or service innovation, 2) Technological innovation, 3) Process innovation, 4) Organisational and management innovation, 5) Conceptual innovation, 6) Governance innovation, and 7) Institutional innovation.

The government bureaucracy implements various forms of innovation in both general governance and public services. These forms include process innovation, program or product innovation, work relationship innovation, technological innovation, conceptual or policy innovation, method innovation, innovation related to organizational structure, and human resource development innovation (Deddy Mulyadi, n.d.). These innovations aim to enhance public service delivery. However, it's crucial to ensure that innovations in public administration comply with existing laws and regulations to avoid legal complications. Therefore, public administration innovations should be compatible with the prevailing system, meaning that the innovations should align with external regulations and systems without violating them.

In general, various forms of innovation that can be carried out within the government bureaucracy must have certain characteristics to be labelled as an innovation. The characteristics of innovation in government bureaucracy are: 1) The presence or absence of novelty in a change made, 2) The impact or benefit from a change initiative carried out by the government bureaucracy, 3) Whether or not the initiation of change provides a solution to the problems that exist or are faced at that time, 4) It must be sustainable (not dependent on the initiator/conceptor) and can be replicated, and 5) It has compatibility with the system outside itself and does not hit/violate the existing system (Deddy Mulyadi, 2018).

LAN RI (2014), suggests five types and criteria for innovation in public administration: 1) Process and type of innovation, with the presence or absence of novelty in a change, 2) Product and conceptual, whether or not there is a positive impact/benefit from a change initiative, 3) Technology and organisational structure, whether or not the change initiative is able to provide solutions to existing problems, 4) Human Resource Relationships, being sustainable (not dependent on the initiator) the conceptor and able to be replicated, and 5)

Unlimited other types/areas, having compatibility with systems outside itself, not bumping/violating existing systems.

The Importance of Innovation in Public Administration Practice

The interpretation of innovation's meaning, forms, and characteristics underscores its significance in public administration. As highlighted by LAN RI, (2015) innovation is crucial due to several factors: 1) Addressing service performance issues within public organizations, 2) Breaking away from bureaucratic inertia, 3) Addressing dynamic challenges faced by government bureaucracy, 4) Meeting global demands, and 5) Advancements in information technology.

Dwiyanto, Agus, (2006) emphasizes the significance of innovation in public administration for several reasons. Firstly, rapid changes at various levels require adjustments in regional development strategies. Secondly, traditional approaches are insufficient, necessitating effective systems and skilled human resources. Thirdly, creative breakthroughs rooted in science, technology, arts, and culture are essential for enhancing competitiveness across sectors amidst environmental challenges. Finally, sustainable principles must be prioritized in advanced development for long-term effectiveness.

Strategies and Methods of Innovation in Improving Public Services in the Region

Improving the quality of services within government bureaucracy is a challenging task. Despite various assessments by international institutions, Indonesia has yet to achieve good governance (Effendi, (2005);Firdaus L. N., (2014); Djoko B, 2008). The bureaucracy struggles to deliver efficient, fair, responsive, and accountable public services (SIDA, 2007; Firdaus L. N., (2014); Nugroho, (2009). Rather than serving the public, the bureaucracy often exhibits a controlling mindset (Effendi, (2008); Dwiyanto, Agus, (2006). This situation calls for the government to adopt more innovative service strategies or methods

The perspective expressed aligns with Laur's, (1989) view that optimizing public service quality necessitates adopting innovative programs visible in individuals' and communities' lives (Rolunan, 2009). This implies creating a new social structure to achieve the desired goal of enhancing public service quality. (Deddy Mulyadi, 2018) note that while innovation is relatively new in public administration literature, its significance has grown since

the emergence of New Public Management. Innovation is now recognized as crucial for improving public service quality

Kelman, (2005) explains that historically, innovation in public administration received little attention due to the dominance of Weberian principles. Max Weber's bureaucratic model emphasized clear rules, hierarchy, specialization, and stability, downplaying the need for innovation within government bureaucracies. However, with the rise of New Public Management (NPM) and Reinventing Government paradigms (Osborne & Gaebler, 1995), as well as the New Public Service (NPS) model proposed by Denhardt & Denhardt, (2003) innovation gained prominence. Supporters of these reform movements began to prioritize innovation in public administration. Presently, there's an increasing recognition of innovation's importance in improving public services, with experts introducing various innovative concepts and methods in the field.

Some of these innovation strategies or methods even require public participation in the public service process. By Deddy Mulyadi, n.d., these innovation strategies or methods include: 1) citizen charter, 2) service quality management system, 3) e-government (e-gov), and 4) public-private partnership. Specifically, the service quality management system as one of the public service innovation strategies become the focus of this research. The service quality management system, by Deming, is called "Total Quality Management" (TQM) or Integrated Quality Management. TQM is a new paradigm of management that seeks to maximise organisational competitiveness through continuous improvement of the quality of goods, services, people, and the organisational environment. TQM is achieved by paying attention to things, such as: customer-focused, obsession with quality, scientific approach, long-term commitment, teamwork, continuous system improvement, education, and training (Tjiptono, 1997). Gaspersz, (1997) states that service quality must pay attention to measures: timeliness of service, accuracy of service, politeness and friendliness, responsibility, proficiency and easiness of getting service. In Indonesia, it is known as Service Excellence.

Determinants of Supporters and Barriers to Public Service Innovation

Public service innovation within local government bureaucracies today must be actively developed by bureaucratic staff to effectively enhance service quality and performance. Therefore, the establishment of an innovation system by local government

bureaucracies and its implementation requires serious attention from competent leaders. Innovation involves various dimensions that need to be understood and utilized to assess actual conditions. According to Terziovski, (2007) an institution's innovation capability is determined by several factors known as dimensions of innovation capability. These dimensions include; 1) Vision and strategy, 2) Gluing the competence base, 3) Strengthening information and organisational intelligence, 4) Market and customer orientation, 5) Creativity and idea management, 6) Organisational systems and structures, and 7) Technology management.

Another thought, by Muttaqin, (2011) that, a bureaucracy that can innovate in public services, if some of the following factors are considered in an effort to build a government bureaucracy. These factors interact with each other and are integrated in creating an innovative government bureaucracy. These factors are at the level of individual government bureaucratic apparatus, institutions, systems and society with their indicators. At the individual level, the indicators are knowledge abilities and competencies possessed; at the institutional level, the indicators are leadership, resources, decision making, and management information systems; for the system level, the indicators are regulatory framework and supporting policies; and at the level of society, the indicators are: knowledge, control, cooperation, and pro-activity. If the public service bureaucracy wants to make an innovation in public services, then there are two important things that must be considered, namely creativity and climate of competition.

From the creative process, the bureaucratic apparatus will be able to produce many innovations in the public service bureaucracy. The creativity of the government bureaucracy apparatus is a fundamental and important requirement for the creation of innovations in the government bureaucracy. The process of the birth of this creativity can emerge if there are nuances or conditions of competition in the body of public organisations. The existence of spirit of competition or competition itself can trigger the emergence of a process of creativity in the government bureaucratic apparatus, which ultimately leads to the birth of forms of innovation in the government bureaucracy (Deddy Mulyadi, 2018). Therefore, the factors that influence the ability to implement quality public service innovations in research consist of: 1) Individual factors: HR capabilities/competencies and creativity, 2) System/institutional

factors: strengthening information systems and supporting policies, 3) Community factors: knowledge and control.

Method

This research was conducted at BPDP Maluku, employing a descriptive quantitative research approach to analyze and depict the quality of public services, public service innovation strategies, and the determinants influencing them at BPDP Maluku. The study utilized a survey method aided by descriptive quantitative techniques to analyze collected data by presenting and explaining data pertaining to the three concepts under investigation. The research population comprised stakeholders directly involved with the data and information concerning the issues faced at BPDP Maluku. The sample for this research consisted of leaders and all employees at BPDP Maluku, selected using purposive sampling techniques. This technique targeted leaders and staff at BPDP Maluku, totaling 37 individuals, as well as community representatives, with every 5 people from one sub-district of five sub-districts in Ambon City, who have interacted with BPDP Maluku, totaling 25 individuals. Thus, the total number of respondents for the research amounted to 62 people.

Data collection involved various methods including observation, questionnaire distribution, interviews, and document review. The research questionnaire measured the dependent variable, public service innovation strategy (Y), and independent variables (X): individual factors (X1), system/institutional factors (X2), and community factors (X3). Likert's Summated Rating (LSR) was employed, where respondents rated each item from strongly agree to strongly disagree, scored from 4 to 1 respectively

Descriptive statistical analysis was employed to summarize and describe the data numerically and graphically, including calculating averages and standard deviations and presenting them in tables or graphs for clarity. Additionally, inferential statistical analysis techniques were utilized to explore the contribution of independent and intermediate variables to the dependent variable, even without formulating hypotheses

Research Findings

Innovation Strategy of Public Service

The public service innovation strategy refers to the steps and methods adopted to enhance the quality of public services within a public organization like BPDP Maluku. These strategies are developed by competent leaders and their staff to achieve improved service quality. In the case of BPDP Maluku, two public service innovation strategies are recognized. First, Sama Thukel Innovation (Public Service-based Innovation in the Ease of Motor Vehicle Tax Payment), with examples of Samsat Mall, and Drive Thru. Second, Baraci Sagu (Innovation in Retribution Design Talks While Drinking Guraka). In order to see the ability of officials to implement public service innovation strategies at BPDP Maluku, six indicators were used: Service timeliness (Y1), Service accuracy (Y2), Courtesy in service (Y3), Service responsibility (Y4), Service completeness (Y5), and Service easiness (Y6). Description of the public service innovation strategy variable, stated as follows.

To see the strategy of implementing public service innovation, using six steps and their respective sub-indicators. Service Timelines is measured by having service time provisions, written service time provisions, timely service delivery. Service Accuracy is measured by accurate service requirement information for citizens in need, accurate service requirements fulfilled by service recipients, and service officers accurately check service requirements by service recipients. Politeness in Service is measured through officers' politeness in serving the dealing public, officers' friendliness in serving the dealing public, and officers' smile in serving the dealing public. Service Responsibility by officers is measured by officers knowledge the limits of their service duties, officers ability to master their service duties, and officers ability to complete their service duties. Availability of Service Support Equipmen is measured by availability of adequate service equipment, availability of adequate service facilities are available, and availability of adequate service support furniture. Easiness of Service, measured by the service system easiness for the community, short service procedures for the community, and good service methods for the community. Of the six sub-indicators regarding the implementation of public service innovation strategies at BPDP Maluku, questions were asked to respondents, and responses can be seen in the following diagram.

Respondents' Reaction to Innovation Strategy of Public Service

No	Indicators of Public Service Strategy	Answers			
1	**Timeliness of Service**	**SS**	**ST**	**KS**	**TS**
	Have Service Time Provisions	32 (52%)	30 (48%)	0	0
	Written Terms of Service	32 (52%)	30 (48%)	0	0
	Timely Service Delivery	25 (41%)	29 (46%)	6 (10%)	2 (3%)
2	**Service Accuracy**	**SS**	**ST**	**KS**	**TS**
	There is information about service requirements	30 (48%)	28 (42%)	2 (3%)	2 (3%)
	Accurate Fulfilment of service requirements	30 (48%)	28 (42%)	2 (3%)	2 (3%)
	Accuracy of officers checking service requirements	32 (52%)	30 (48%)	0	0
3	**Politeness in Service**	**SS**	**ST**	**KS**	**TS**
	Officers are polite in providing services	32 (52%)	30 (48%)	0	0
	Officers are friendly in providing services	25 (41%)	29 (46%)	6 (10%)	2 (3%)
	Officers smile when serving	25 (41%)	29 (46%)	6 (10%)	2 (3%)
4	**Responsible Service**	**SS**	**ST**	**KS**	**TS**
	Officers know the limits of their service duties	31 (51%)	26 (41%)	3 (5%)	2 (3%)
	Officers master the limits of service tasks	31 (51%)	26 (41%)	3 (5%)	2 (3%)
	Officers can complete service tasks	31 (51%)	26 (41%)	3 (5%)	2 (3%)
5	**Service Completeness**	**SS**	**ST**	**KS**	**TS**
	Service equipment availability	32 (52%)	30 (48%)	0	0
	Availability of service support facilities	32 (52%)	30 (48%)	0	0
	Availability of service furniture	32 (52%)	30 (48%)	0	0
6	**Ease of Service**	**SS**	**ST**	**KS**	**TS**
	The service system is easy for the community	32 (52%)	30 (48%)	0	0
	Short service procedures	32 (52%)	30 (48%)	0	0
	Good service methods	32 (52%)	30 (48%)	0	0

Source; Data processing results, (2023)

Data on the condition of the implementation of public service innovation strategies by officers at BPDP Maluku are shown as follows. First, on Timeliness of Service, 32 people (52%) answered strongly agree that this agency has a provision of service time to citizens, and 30 people (48%) answered agree. About the written service time provisions, 32 people (52%) answered strongly agree, and 30 people (48%) said agree. About providing services on time, 25 people (41%) answered strongly agree, 20 people (33%) answered agree, 9 people (14%) answered less agree, and 8 people (12%) answered disagree.

Second, on Service Accuracy, as many as 30 people (48%) answered strongly agree that there was information about accurate service requirements, 28 people (42%) answered agree, 2 people (3%) answered disagree, and the rest answered disagree (2 people, 3%). About the terms of service accurately fulfilled by service recipients, 30 people (48%) answered strongly agree, 28 people (42%) answered agree, 2 people (3%)answered less agree, and only 2 people (3%) answered disagree. About the accuracy of officers checking

the terms of service provided by citizens dealing, 32 people (52%) answered strongly agree, and 30 (33%) said agree.

Third, on Politeness in service, as many as 32 people (52%) said tnat they strongly agreed about officers' politeness in serving the community, and the rest 30 people (48%) said that they agreed. About officers friendliness serving the community, 25 people (41%) answered strongly agree that the officers were polite, 29 people (46%) answered agree, 6 people (10%) answered less agree, and the rest 2 people (3%) answered disagree. About smiling-faced officers in providing services, 32 people (52%) answered strongly agree that the officers smiled during the service, 29 people (46%) answered agree, 6 people (10%)answered less agree, and only 2 people (3%) answered strongly disagree.

Fourth, on Responsible in Service, 31 people (51%) answered that they strongly agree that officers know the limits of their service duties, 26 people (41%) answered agree, answered less agree 3 people (5%), and answered disagree 2 people (3%). Service officers know the limits of their duties, 31 people (51%) answered strongly agree, 26 people (41%) answered agree, 3 people (5%) answered disagree, and only 2 people (3%) answered disagree. About service officers completing their service duties, 31 people (51%) answered strongly agree, 26 people (41%) answered agree, 3 people (5%) answered disagree, and only 2 people (3%) responded strongly disagree.

Fifth, on Completeness of Service, as many as 32 people (52%) responded strongly agree if it was said that service equipment was available, and the rest 30 people (48%) responded agree. About availability service support facilities to the community, 32 people (52%) responded strongly agree that the facility is available, and 30 people (48%) responded agree. About availability service furniture, 32 people (52%) responded strongly agree that the furniture is available, and 30 people (48%) responded agree. About the ease of Service, 32 people (52%) responded strongly agree that the service system for citizens is easy, and 30 people (48%) responded agree. About short service procedures for the community, 32 people (52%) responded strongly agree, and 30 people (48%) responded agree. About good service methods, 32 people (52%) responded strongly agree that the method is good, and 30 people (48%) responded agree.

The Determinats of Public Service Innovation

Determinants that affect the ability to implement public service innovation strategies here are interpreted as factors that are considered to have a dominant influence in supporting or hindering the ability to implement public service innovation strategies consisting of three factors: (a) Individual employee factors (X1): (1) HR capabilities/competencies, (2) Creativity; (b) System/institutional factors (X2): (1) Strengthening information systems, (2) Supporting policies, and (c) Community factors (X3): (1) Knowledge, and (2) Control. A description of these three determinant factors and their sub-indicators can be shown sequentially as follows.

Regarding the Individual Employee Factor, three aspects are considered: the competence of human resources, the level of work creativity, and employee innovation. This factor is examined to determine whether it supports or hinders public service innovation strategies at BPDP Maluku. Similarly, the System/Institutional Factor is evaluated to understand its influence on public service innovation at the agency. Three aspects that are analyzed are strengthening the information system, policy design, and supportive leadership policies. These factors are assessed to gauge their role in facilitating or obstructing public service innovation strategies at the research location

Respondents' Reaction of The Determinants of Public Service Innovation

No	Determinants of Public Service Innovation	Answers			
1	**Individual Factor**	SS	ST	KS	TS
	Ability / competence of human Resources of employees	32 (52%)	30 (48%)	0	0
	The level of creativity of employees	25 (41%)	29 (46%)	6 (10%)	2 (3%)
	Innovation owned by employees	25 (41%)	29 (46%)	6 (10%)	2 (3%)
2	**Institution Factor**	SS	ST	KS	TS
	Information System Strengthening	31 (51%)	28 (42%)	2 (3%)	2 (3%)
	Policy design	31 (51%)	28 (42%)	2 (3%)	2 (3%)
	Supportive leadership policies	25 (41%)	29 (46%)	6 (10%)	2 (3%)
3	**Community Presence and Role Factor**	SS	ST	KS	TS
	Institutional system	32 (52%)	30 (48%)	0	0
	Community control over innovation strategies	25 (41%)	29 (46%)	6 (10%)	2 (3%)
	Constructive input for strategy implementation	25 (41%)	29 (46%)	6 (10%)	2 (3%)

Source; Data processing results, (2023)

The data above provide an overview of respondents' responses regarding the determinant factors that influence the condition of public service innovation at BPDP Maluku which is explained as follows: First, about Individual Employee Factors, a total of 32 people

(52%) responded strongly agree that each individual employee has the required HR competencies, and 30 other people (48%) responded agree that employees have the required HR competencies at BPDP Maluku. About the creativity of the employees, 25 people (41%) answered strongly agree, and 29 people (46%) responded agree, 6 people (10%) answered disagree, the rest answered disagree (2 people, 3%). About service innovations made by employees, as many as 25 people (41%) responded strongly agree, 29 people (46%) responded agree, 6 people (10%) said less agree, and only 2 people (3%) answered disagree.

Second, on System/Institutional Factors, 31 people (51%) responded strongly agree that there is a strengthening of information systems to support public service innovation in this agency, 28 people (42%) said they agreed, 2 people (3%) said they less agreed, and 2 people (3%) also disagreed. Regarding the existence of a public service innovation design at this agency, 31 people (51%) responded strongly agree, 28 people (42%) agreed, 2 people (3%) said they less agreed, and 2 people (3%) disagreed. Regarding policies on the implementation of public service innovations in this agency, 25 people (41%) answered strongly agree, while 29 people (46%) answered agree, on the other hand 6 people (10%) answered less agree, 2 people (3%) responded disagree.

Third, Community Factors, 32 people (52%) answered strongly agree that community members have knowledge about public service innovations at this agency, and 30 people (48%) answered agree. About the existence of community control in following the implementation of public service innovations at this agency, 25 people (41%) responded strongly agree, 29 people (46%) responded agree, 6 people (10%) responded disagree, and 2 people (3%) responded disagree . Regarding the existence of constructive input from citizens on the innovations implemented, 25 people (41%) responded strongly agree, while 29 people (46%) responded agree, 6 people (10%) responded disagree, and those who responded disagree were 2 people (3%).

The results of the data analysis that have been displayed above provide an overview of the application of the ability to implement public service innovation strategies by the organising apparatus at BPDP Maluku. The dependent variable/variable Y is in fairly good condition, especially in the form of: (a) Service timeliness, (b) Service responsibility, (c) Service completeness, and (d) Service convenience. While the other two aspects are in poor

condition, namely: (a) Accuracy of service, and (b) Politeness in service. Regarding the determinant factor (independent variable/variable x) in this study, it has sufficient influence on the public service innovation strategy. The influence of the three determinant factors studied, namely individual employee factors, system/institutional factors, and community factors on the public service innovation strategy, and subsequently affect the variable quality of public services by the organising apparatus at BPDP Maluku. However, it must be recognised that the level of influence is not yet fully dominant the influence of the three determinants as expected.

The data analysis results provided above offer an overview of the implementation of public service innovation strategies by the organizing apparatus at BPDP Maluku. The dependent variable (y) is relatively favorable, especially in terms of service timeliness, responsibility, completeness, and convenience. However, two aspects, namely service accuracy and politeness, are in poor condition. Regarding the determinant factors (independent variable/variable x) in this study, they exert a significant influence on the public service innovation strategy. However, it is noteworthy that while the individual employee factors, system/institutional factors, and community factors influence public service innovation strategy and subsequently impact the quality of public services at BPDP Maluku, their influence is not fully dominant yet as anticipated.

The findings suggest a progress in selecting a service innovation strategy to enhance the quality of the Agency's public services, even it is not fully optimized. This is attributed to three factors: insufficient individual employee capacity, as well as system/institutional factors, particularly the absence of institutionalization through top-down policy efforts. Despite the promising prospects, with initiatives such as the Sama Thukel and Beraci Sago Innovations, there remains a need for formal policy support to fully institutionalize these innovations.

The research findings echo (Deddy Mulyadi, 2018) and other experts, highlighting the challenge of improving service quality within local government bureaucracy. They emphasize the complexity of bureaucratic renewal efforts amidst the current concerning state of government operations. International assessments, such as those by Effendi, (2005), Firdaus L. N., (2014), and Djoko B (2008), underscore Indonesia's ongoing struggle to achieve good governance.

The bureaucracy in our country struggles to provide efficient, fair, responsive, and accountable services to the public (SIDA, 2007; Azza, 2008; Nugroho, (2009). Instead, it often exhibits a mindset of control rather than service (Effendi, (2008); Dwiyanto, Agus, (2006), necessitating a shift towards more innovative service strategies. According to (Terziovski, 2007) an institution's innovation capability is determined by various factors, including vision and strategy, competency base, information strengthening, market orientation, creativity, organizational systems and technology management. Muttaqin, (2011) suggests that for a bureaucracy to innovate in public services, factors such as individual, institutional, systemic, and societal levels must be considered and integrated.

The perspective presented aligns with Leuer's viewpoint as referenced in Rolunan (2009), suggesting that enhancing the quality of public services requires adopting innovative programs resonating with the lives of individuals and communities. Thereby forming a new social structure to achieve this goal. Innovation is relatively new in public administration literature, as previously mentioned.

In recent times, especially with the emergence of New Public Management, there has been a growing focus on innovation in public administration as a means to enhance the quality of public services. The historical lack of attention to innovation in public administration can be attributed to the dominance of Weberian thinking, where bureaucracy prioritized clear rules, hierarchy, specialization, and stability. In this context, innovation was deemed less necessary for government bureaucracies, as noted by Kelman, (2005).

The theoretical implication of this research highlights that enhancing the quality of public services in a public organization is integral to achieving good governance in public service delivery. It underscores the importance of developing individual employee capabilities for innovation, supported by conducive organizational systems. This involves establishing effective information systems, designing necessary innovations, and implementing supportive leadership policies. Additionally, active community involvement in monitoring and evaluating public service innovations is crucial. Moreover, the commitment of the organization's personnel to implement innovative service strategies is essential for adapting to changing demands while upholding principles of good governance, such as timeliness, accuracy, politeness, responsibility, completeness, and ease of service delivery

Conclusions

The data analysis reveals that the organizational apparatus demonstrates proficiency in selecting and implementing existing service innovation strategies, particularly in ensuring timeliness, responsibility, completeness, and ease of service provision to citizens. However, there are shortcomings in two areas, namely the accuracy of service and the courtesy of service providers, notably the lack of friendliness towards citizens dealing with the Agency

The results of data analysis show that the conditions of the 3 (three) determinants of public service innovation factors, which are studied through this research, two of them are in fairly good condition, namely: (1) Individual employee factors in terms of human resource capabilities, but there is insuficient level of creativity and public service innovation owned by all employees, (2) System/institutional factors have a sufficient influence to support service innovation, including the development of information systems, making 2 (two) public service innovation designs, but there is no policy set from superior leaders for the application of the two innovations owned, (3) The community factor, is in a less supportive condition, seen from the level of knowledge of existing service innovations that are still limited, including limited control and input from the community.

Based on the conclusions mentioned above, it can be summarized that the quality of public services at BPDP Maluku has improved in a fairly positive manner. This improvement is attributed to the enhancement of individual employee capacity, the development of a supportive organizational system, and the implementation of a decent public service innovation strategy. However, community participation for feedback and control has not been fully utilized. Overall, there are opportunities for further enhancing the quality of public services in the future

References

Bekkers, V., Edelenbos, J., & Steijn, B. (2011). Innovation in the Public Sector Linking Capacity and Leadership. In *Governance and Public Management*.

Deddy Mulyadi, H. T. G. M. N. A. (2018). *Administrasi Publik untuk Pelayanan Publik: (Konsep & Praktik Administrasi dalam Penyusunan SOP, Standar Pelayanan, Etika Pelayanan, Inovasi untuk Kinerja Organisasi*. https://opac.perpusnas.go.id/DetailOpac.aspx?id=985777

Denhardt, R. B., & Denhardt, J. V. (2003). The New Public Service: An Approach to Reform. *International Review of Public Administration*, *8*(1), 3–10. https://doi.org/10.1080/12294659.2003.10805013

Dwiyanto;, A. (2015). *Manajemen Pelayanan Publik: Peduli, Inklusif, dan Kolaboratif Edisi Kedua*. //eperpus.kemenag.go.id%2Fweb%2Findex.php%3Fp%3Dshow_detail%26id%3D44 404

Dwiyanto, Agus, D. (2006). Reformasi Birokrasi Publik di Indonesia. Yogyakarta: UGM press. In *Jurnal Ilmiah Civis*.

Effendy, Sofian. (2005 & 2008). Membangun Budaya Birokrasi untuk *Good Governance*. Materi Lokakarya Nasional Reformasi Birokrasi, Jakarta: Kantor Menteri Negara (PAN) Republik Indonesia.

Ekram, I., Tuanaya, W., & Wance, M. (2022). Pemanfaatan Teknologi Informasi dalam Pelayanan Publik Kantor Manunggal Satu Atap Provinsi Maluku. *Journal of Governance and Social Policy*, *3*(1). https://doi.org/10.24815/gaspol.v3i1.26209

Firdaus L. N. (2014). *Perspektif Ketahanan Nasional untuk Mewujudkan Good Governance dalam Kancah Otonomi Daerah; Pelayanan Publik*. 238.

Gaspersz, Vincent. (1997). Manajemen Kualitas Penerapan Konsep-Konsep Kualitas Dalam Manajemen Bisnis Total. In *Manajemen Pemasaran*.

Herizal, H., Mukhrijal, M., & Wance, M. (2020). Pendekatan Akuntabilitas Pelayanan Publik Dalam Mengikuti Perubahan Paradigma Baru Administrasi Publik. *Journal of Governance and Social Policy*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.24815/gaspol.v1i1.17327

Irmawati, I., Wijaya, A. A. M., & Basir, Muh. A. (2022). Transparansi Pelayanan Publik dalam Administrasi Kependudukan di Kantor Kelurahan Labalawa Kecamatan Betoambari Kota Baubau. *Journal of Government Science Studies*, *1*(2). https://doi.org/10.30598/jgssvol1issue2page50-57

Kelman, H. C. (2005). *The Policy Context of Torture: A Social-Psychological Analysis* (Vol. 87).

Muhammad Awaluddin. (2016). *Digital EntrepreneurSHIFT #UKMIndonesiaGoesDigital*. //library.poltekapp.ac.id//index.php?p=show_detail&id=3508

Mukarom, Zainal & Laksana, M. W. (2016). *Membangun Kinerja Pelayanan Publik Menuju Clean Government and Good Governance*. Pustaka Setia.

Muluk. Khairul. (2008). *Kunci Sukses Inovasi Pemerintahan Daeralt*. https://rb.gy/ykcev5

Muttaqin, A. (2011). Inovasi Birokrasi Sebagai Syarat Pelayanan Publik. In *Jurnal Ilmiah Administrasi Publik dan Pembangunan* (Vol. 2, Issue 1).

Nugroho, Purwanto. (2009). Standar Pelayanan Publik Terhadap Kinerja Lembaga Ombusman Daerah (LOD) di Yogyakarta. Skripsi, Universitas Mahummadiyah, Yorgyakarta, https://etd.umy.ac.id/id/eprint/26660/

Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1995). Reinventing Government. New York, NY. *Journal of Leisure* , *27*(3).

Paul Windrum. (2008). Innovation in Public Sector Services: Entrepreneurship, Creativity and Management, Edward Elgar Publishing.

Priansa, D. J. (2018). *Manajemen Organisasi Publik: Mengembangkan Organisasi Modern Berorientasi Publik*. //fia.ub.ac.id%2Fkatalog%2Findex.php%3Fp%3Dshow_detail%26id%3D9031%26keywords%3D

Rengifurwarin, Z. (2001). *Manajemen Pelayanan Untuk Rakyat - Referensi Maluku*. https://referensimaluku.id/2022/07/21/manajemen-pelayanan-untuk-rakyat/

Rolunan, Hermanto. (2009). Inovasi Program Dalam Peningkatan Kinerja Pelayanan Publik

Selanno, H., & Wance, M. (2021). Performance of Inspectorate in Supervision of Government Administration in Buru Selatan Regency. *Sosiohumaniora*, *23*(2). https://doi.org/10.24198/sosiohumaniora.v23i2.30296

Sinambela, L. P. (2007). *Reformasi Pelayanan Publik; Teori, Kebijakan dan Implementasi*. PT. Bumi Aksara.

Terziovski, M. (2007). Building Innovation Capability in Organizations:An International Cross-Case Perspective. *World Scientific Books*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.1142/P492

Tjiptono, F. (1997). *Prinsip-Prinsip Total Quality Service (TQS)*. //catalog.umj.ac.id%2Findex.php%3Fp%3Dshow_detail%26id%3D49231%26keywords%3D