



ISSN 1648-2603 (print)
ISSN 2029-2872 (online)

VIEŠOJI POLITIKA IR ADMINISTRAVIMAS
PUBLIC POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION
2023, T. 22, Nr. 4 / 2023, Vol. 22, No 4, p. 405–417.

THE EFFECT OF DYNAMIC GOVERNANCE ON PUBLIC SERVICE INNOVATION THROUGH THE RECRUITMENT OF MANAGERS OF PUBLIC ORGANIZATIONS

Nawawi Natsir

*Department of Public Administration at the Faculty of Social and Political Science,
Tadulako University, Jl. Soekarno Hatta, Km.9, Palu, Provinsi Sulawesi Tengah
E-mail: nawawinatsir@untad.ac.id*

Rahmawati Halim

*Department of Public Administration at the Faculty of Social and Political Science,
Tadulako University, Jl. Soekarno Hatta, Km.9, Palu, Provinsi Sulawesi Tengah
E-mail: rahmawatihalim1972@gmail.com*

Mashuri H. Tahili

*Department of Public Administration at the Faculty of Social and Political Science,
Tadulako University, Jl. Soekarno Hatta, Km.9, Palu, Provinsi Sulawesi Tengah
E-mail: mashuritahili6@gmail.com*

DOI: 10.13165/VPA-23-22-4-02

Abstract. Dynamic governance has been seen as a pertinent strategy to foster public service innovation and the recruitment of public sector managers. This study proposes to explore the effect of dynamic governance on public service innovation through the recruitment of public sector managers as a moderating variable. The study employs a quantitative approach to analyze the research data, for the collection and analysis of which a survey strategy was used. The research includes 357 respondents selected via a disproportionate random sample technique based on Krejcie and Morgan's table, with a 0.05 margin of error. The research findings show that dynamic governance consists of two dimensions which positively and significantly affect public service innovation: dynamic capabilities and institutional cultures. Additionally, the recruitment of public organization managers has a positive and significant effect on public service innovation. Accordingly, the dynamic governance perspective is seen as a relevant way to support dynamic performance, continuity, and change in local governance. Further, it may also improve the effectiveness of the recruitment of public organization managers in human resources management, and deliver better innovation in the future.

Keywords: *dynamic governance; dynamic capabilities; institutional cultures; recruitment; public organization managers; public service innovations.*

Reikšminiai žodžiai: *dinamiškas valdymas; dinamiški pajėgumai; institucinė kultūra; įdarbinimas; viešųjų organizacijų vadovai; viešųjų paslaugų naujovės.*

Introduction

The recruitment of public organization managers is necessary in order to create high-quality public service, and it should be conducted based on capability and a strong institutional culture in order to achieve optimal public sector service performance (Horton 2008). Recruitment becomes a social need in the sense of selecting the most suitable public officials (Leisink and Steijn 2008), and should use a merit-based system to determine the best criteria rather than one that involves patronage (Edenborough 2005). Additionally, recruitment in the dynamic public administration environment can promote good governance (Egeberg et al. 2017).

Recruiting public organization managers is seen a key driver towards better performance in public organizations (Cohen and Mehta 2017; Mizrahi et al. 2009). The success of bureaucratic organizations in achieving the highest performance is predominantly determined by the merit-based recruitment of public leaders who have individual capabilities, legitimate authority, and leadership power, and who align with the organizational culture (Lundvall and Nielsen 2007; Nielsen et al. 2017).

The dynamic governance perspective has four major areas of creating public service innovation: political leadership, public policy harmonization, the merit system, and the anti-corruption movement (Kasim 2013). However, as evidence has shown, the recruitment of public organization managers is not preceded by job analysis (Ashraf 2017); recruitment remains problematic in public organizations, and politicization continues to occur (Bach and Veit 2018; Neo and Chen 2007). The involvement in recruitment of people who are systematically educated is lacking (Crothall et al. 1997), and this is currently supplanted by patronage (Jreisat 2018), rent-seeking, and individual-serving behavior (Veronesi, Kirkpatrick, and Altanlar 2019).

1.1. The theory of the research: *dynamic governance, the recruitment of public managers, and public service innovation*

In the literature, dynamic governance is considered a critical factor for success in a rapidly globalizing and technologically advanced world (Neo and Chen 2007). This is an approach that considers the roles of actors involved in governance, the legal mechanisms available to promote regulatory goals, and the tools suitable for policymakers and other stakeholders to achieve the desired outcomes (Markell and Glicksman 2016).

On the other hand, recruitment in the public sector is viewed as problematic, the workforce in public organizations poses challenges, and the nature of the problem is not yet well defined (Collins 2008). Therefore, recruitment should prioritize merit and

neutrality, as these factors can impact the recruitment of public organization managers who are responsible for ensuring the development of public service quality (Boeckelman 2016). Previous research has found that public organizations that adopt a merit-based recruitment approach tend to have significantly lower levels of corruption in their operations (Egeberg et al. 2017). Selection and evaluation are also crucial aspects of human resource practices (Pfeffer 1998). Furthermore, recruiting skilled public organization managers can help to achieve efficiency and competitive advantage in public organizations (Ordanini and Silvestri 2008).

Further, dynamic capabilities can generate competitive advantages, result in the highest performance levels, and offer a greater likelihood of achieving the goals of the public organization (Ahmad et al. 2005; Yan and Gao 2016). These capabilities are developed through deliberative decisions, choices, planning, organized activities, and the deployment of expertise (Neo and Chen 2007). Moreover, a strong organizational culture is crucial for public organizations as it can enhance an organization's ability to be more efficient and effective at fulfilling their mission (Bergwerk 1988; Olejarski et al. 2019).

Empirically, in the public sector, the modern organization must put people-centered cultures into practice to achieve better performance (Black and Venture 2018; Breaugh 2017; dos Santos et al. 2017). Organizational culture can be perceived as the key to effective leadership and organizational development (Brown 2014). Meanwhile, institutional culture is closely related to recruitment in achieving high organizational effectiveness (Bergwerk 1988). It might also be meaningful for organizations to establish a people-centered culture (Black and Venture 2018; Vogel and Güttel 2012). Organizational culture becomes the core driver for effective leadership and organizational development (Brown 2014). Dynamic capabilities can influence an organization's ability to renew its competence in the face of a rapidly changing internal and external environment (Eisenhardt and Martin 2000).

Group work, socialization, informal standards, shared assumptions and beliefs, dispersed authority, and codependence are also significant factors in this regard (Olejniczak 2018). The relationship between institutional culture and recruitment has encountered substantive issues in fostering the performance of public organizations (Darnold and Rynes 2013; Rynes and Cable 2003). Furthermore, empirical evidence has demonstrated that the recruitment of public organization managers at the local government level should be based on open recruitment and merit-based selection. This includes recruitment, selection, and the presentation of information on organizational missions and job tasks in the recruitment process (Asseburg et al. 2018; Edenborough 2005), as well as the nature of the recruitment process itself (Cortázar et al. 2016).

2. Materials and method

In order to test the proposed hypotheses, a quantitative methodology was applied by conducting a survey of public personnel in the Government of Palu City, Indonesia. The total number of individuals surveyed was 4,868, consisting of 2,132 males and 2,736 females. The study used an exploratory survey, and the research sample was determined

using proportionate random sampling based on the demography of respondents and the educational attainment of public servants. The sample was determined using the Krejcie table, with a margin of error of 0.05 (Krejcie and Morgan 1970). The total research sample consisted of 357 respondents. To avoid sample bias, the researchers applied more than one sample to reduce the bias of conclusions drawn using structural equation modelling (SEM) analysis (Loehlin and Beaujean 2017).

The variable of the recruitment of public organization managers in human resource management consisted of 10 indicators: integrity, capability, skill, innovation, open recruitment, fair selection process, no political interest, prudence, meritocracy, and perceived competitiveness (Ban et al. 2003; Collins 2008; Egeberg et al. 2017; Neo and Chen 2007; Sparrow 2007). The dimension of public service innovation involved three dimensions: changing the organizational environment, changing the organization structure, and changing the products. These dimensions were evaluated according to ten indicators (Boyne and Gould-Williams 2003; Hodgkinson and Sadler-Smith 2018; Smith 1990).

2.1. *The measurement of hypotheses*

After conducting the pilot study, all data was analyzed using SPSS version 24. Furthermore, the research questionnaires were tested through SPSS to find the value of their reliability and validity, and were then distributed them to 357 respondents. A total of 350 questionnaires were returned, equating to a response rate of roughly 98 percent of the total sample. There were 7 questionnaires that were discarded because some respondents did not fully answer all of the questions, or left some blank. The respondents were asked to rate their level of perception based on a 6-point Likert scale that ranged from strongly agreeing to strongly disagreeing. Inferential statistical methods were used to test the hypotheses using structural equation modeling (Hair et al. 2016).

The reliability scale of the 39 items was assessed using the SPSS Windows version 24 and SEM Analysis. The reliability statistic value was assessed individually using Cronbach's Alpha, and the result was 0.910 (with $F_{\text{test}} = 9.596 > \alpha = 0.05$). After confirmatory factor analysis, we removed 14 cases based on the Mahalanobis distance. For this study, we used four variables: dynamic capabilities (measured using five items), institutional culture (measured using seven items), recruitment of public organizational managers (measured using eight items), and public service innovation (measured using five items). The results of the data analysis using AMOS software are presented in the following Table 1.

Table 1. *The statistical results of convergent, discriminant, and nomological validity*

Criteria	DC	IC	RPM	PSI
AVE	0.408	0.514	0.621	0.464
CR	0.860	0.941	0.675	0.558

Note: AVE – average variance extracted; CR – composite reliability; DC – dynamic capabilities; IC – institutional cultures; RPM – recruitment of public managers, PSI – public service innovation (significant at ** $p < 0.001$, * $p < 0.05$).

Table 1 confirms that all data had no any individual constructs and that there were no other violations of nomological validity. The analysis of the average variance extracted indicates that the dynamic capability variable was 0.408, institutional culture was 0.514, recruitment of public organization managers was 0.621, and public service innovation was significant at an alpha level of 0.05. Moreover, the composite reliability of dynamic capability was 0.860, institutional culture 0.941, recruitment of public organization managers 0.675, and public service innovation at 0.558. The goodness of fit indices of each variable showed the initial condition of using SEM analysis (Hair et al. 2016). The goodness of fit of the results is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Goodness of fit

Measurements	Absolute fit measure				Incremental fit measure		Parsimonious fit measure
	χ^2	CMIN/DF	GFI	RMSEA	NFI	CFI	AGFI
Criteria	>0.05	<5	≥ 0.90	<0.05	≥ 0.90	≥ 0.95	≥ 0.90
Obtained	725.787	2.824	0.969	0.072	0.903	0.962	0.935

Note: ** $p < 0.001$, * $p < 0.05$

According to the results of the analysis presented in Table 2, structural equation modeling provided a goodness of fit measurement for the data in this research. This is supported by the statistical analysis of the chi-square test, which found $\chi^2 = 725.787$, $DF = 257$, $p = 0.000$ and $CMIN/DF = 2.824$. The results were significant and the GFI and RMSEA values were 0.060 and 0.072, respectively, indicating appropriate goodness of fit. Additionally, the results showed that NFI and CFI were 0.903 and 0.962, respectively, meeting the minimum requirements. The parsimonious fit measure showed that the AGFI achieved 0.935, meaning that the data were relevant to the cutoff point of >0.90 . Further, the RMSEA was within margin, and the CMIN/DF was 2.824; according to theory, the smallest degree of freedom in the sample discrepancy function must be ≤ 2 (Hair et al. 2016). We argue that the model used in this study achieved goodness of fit, so that the SEM model can be used to test the research hypotheses. Based on the goodness of fit, there are five hypotheses proposed in this article, and the final data analysis confirmed that all of the variables of dynamic governance theory based on Neo and Chen (2007) indicate that all paths are statistically positive and significant, and thus accepted. The SEM analysis results are presented in the Table 3.

Table 3. Hypotheses measurement results

Hypotheses	β	p	Labelling
H1: RPM <--- Dynamic Capabilities (DC)	0.449	***	Accepted
H2: RPM <--- Institutional Cultures (IC)	0.303	***	Accepted
H3: PSI <--- RPM	0.152	0.017	Accepted
H4: PSI <--- Dynamic Capabilities (DC)	0.287	***	Accepted
H5: PSI <--- Institutional Cultures (IC)	0.366	***	Accepted

Note: β – standardized regression weight, * p – significance level (one-tailed)

3. Results and discussion

Empirically, there is a close relationship between dynamic capabilities and institutional culture regarding the competitive advantage of public organizations (Violinda and Jian 2016). The recruitment of public organization managers has become a matter of debate among public officials because public managers in public organizations have often been criticized for being bureaucratic, impersonal, reactive, or cautious conformists (Redman and Mathews 1997). Dynamic capabilities have received significant attention as a means of maintaining organizational performance and effectiveness, whether in public or private organizations (Teece 2007, 2018). It is believed that dynamic capabilities and knowledge management may help organizations achieve sustained competitive advantage (Prieto and Easterby-Smith 2006), enhance dynamic organizational performance (Rengkung 2018; Wu 2006), and develop human capital (Chatterji and Patro 2014; Schreyögg and Kliesch-Eberl 2007; Vogel and Güttel 2012). Institutional culture is viewed as another critical dimension that needs to be cultivated in order to achieve higher performance in the public sector. This research demonstrated that institutional culture may improve and enhance an organization's effectiveness in achieving its mission (Olejarski et al. 2019; Acar and Acar 2012; Adeinat and Abdulfatah 2019; Bergwerk 1988; Violinda and Jian 2016).

Meanwhile, recruiting the best candidates in public organizations is viewed as crucial, and job management effectiveness is determined by better recruitment (Hays and Sowa 2005). Dynamic capabilities also refer to the management process and organizational routines, including the three elements: coordination or integration (a static concept), learning as a dynamic concept that must be applied over time, and the recombination or transformation concepts (Yan and Gao 2016). Increasing structural clarity, transparency, and effectiveness has been introduced through dynamic governance (Heijne and Buck 2013). Scholars have found that dynamic capabilities have a strong correlation with the development of knowledge management, which can increase the competitive advantage of organizations (Prieto and Easterby-Smith 2006) and build innovation (Fallon-Byrne and Harney 2017; Hess 2008).

Moreover, recruitment is one of the strategies with which a merit-based system has been most closely linked when it comes to achieving a high level of political performance (Seligman 1964). The recruitment of public managers has become the norm in public organization and development (Neo and Chen, 2007), and may improve good governance (Bonsafia et al. 2016; Bowman and West 2006; Cortázar et al. 2016; Egeberg et al. 2017).

Conclusions

1. Dynamic governance has the benefit of increasing the effectiveness of a government, enabling it to achieve a high level of performance. Public organizations within local government have always faced a dynamic and unpredictable environment. The research hypotheses were confirmed by the results of structural equation modelling (SEM) analysis: dynamic capabilities have the most positive and significant effect on

the recruitment of public managers, with a path coefficient of $\beta = 0.449$ at $p = 0.01$. This is followed by institutional cultures, which have a path coefficient of $\beta = 0.303$ at $p = 0.01$. Furthermore, the recruitment of public organization managers has a positive and significant effect on the public service innovation, as indicated by the path coefficient of $\beta = 0.152$ at $p = 0.01$. Institutional cultures also have a positive and significant effect on public service innovation, with a path coefficient of $\beta = 0.366$ at $p = 0.01$. Finally, dynamic capabilities have a positive and significant effect on public service innovation, with a path coefficient of $\beta = 0.287$ at $p = 0.01$.

2. The research revealed that there is a strong correlation between dynamic capabilities and institutional cultures, as indicated by the path coefficient of $\beta = 0.329$ at $p = 0.01$. Interestingly, this study found that dynamic capabilities are the strongest predictors of the recruitment of public organization managers, accounting for 44.9%. Meanwhile, institutional cultures predict 36.6% of variance in public service innovation. Then, institutional culture will predict at least 30.3% of the recruitment of public managers, and dynamic capabilities will predict 28.7% of public service innovation. Finally, at least 15.2% of the recruitment of public organization managers is predicted by public service innovation.
3. According to the research findings, it can be concluded that dynamic capabilities and institutional cultures have strong correlations for the recruitment of public organization managers and for service performance. Moreover, dynamic capabilities have a positive and significant effect on the recruitment of public organization managers. Likewise, recruitment based on merit is perceived as being highly effective toward public service innovation (PSI). Meanwhile, both dynamic capabilities and institutional culture have the strongest correlation toward the performance of public organizations.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to express their thanks to all participants and the Palu Government Municipality. This research has received no funding and is free from political affiliations and conflicts of interest.

References

1. Acar, A. Z., and Acar, P. 2012. "The effects of organizational culture and innovativeness on business performance in healthcare industry." *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 58: 683–692.
2. Adeinat, I. M., and Abdulfatah, F. H. 2019. "Organizational culture and knowledge management processes: Case study in a public university." *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems* 49 (1): 35–53.

3. Ahmad, J., Devarajan, S., Khemani, S., and Shah, S. 2005. "Decentralization and Service Delivery." World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3603. <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/606871468139500265/pdf/wps3603.pdf>
4. Ashraf, J. 2017. "Examining the public organization recruitment and selection, in relation to job analysis in Pakistan." *Cogent Social Sciences* 3 (1): 1309134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2017.1309134>
5. Asseburg, J., Homberg, F., and Vogel, R. 2018. "Recruitment messaging, environmental fit and public service motivation: Experimental evidence on intentions to apply for public organization jobs." *International Journal of Public Organization Management* 31 (6): 689–709.
6. Bach, T., and Veit, S. 2018. "The Determinants of Promotion to High Public Office in Germany: Partisan Loyalty, Political Craft, or Managerial Competencies?" *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 28 (2): 254–269.
7. Ban, C., Drahnak-Faller, A., and Towers, M. 2003. "Human Resource Challenges in Human Service and Community Development Organizations: Recruitment and Retention of Professional Staff." *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 23 (2): 133–153.
8. Bergwerk, J. 1988. "Recruitment and Selection for Company Culture." *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 3 (1): 9–15. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb004424>
9. Black, J., and Venture, K. L. 2018. "The Human Factor to Profitability: Leveraging People-Centered Cultures as Meaningful Organizations." *Public Integrity* 20 (5): 444–458.
10. Boeckelman, K. 2016. "Civil Service Law and Public Personnel Management." In *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*, 1–7. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_1170-1
11. Bonsafia, Y. H., Sangkala, Sulaiman, A., and Baharuddin. 2016. "Merit System Implementation in the Recruitment of Civil Servants Echelon II and Echelon III Government of Papua." *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications* 6 (12): 95–104.
12. Boyne, G., and Gould-Williams, J. 2003. "Planning and Performance in Public Organizations: An Empirical Analysis." *Public Management Review* 5 (1): 115–132. <https://doi.org/10.1080/146166702200002889>
13. Bowman, J. S., and West, J. P. 2006. *American Public Service: Radical Reform and the Merit System*. 1st ed. London: Routledge.
14. Breaugh, J. A. 2017. "The Contribution of Job Analysis to Recruitment." In *The Wiley Blackwell Handbook of the Psychology of Recruitment, Selection and Employee Retention*, edited by H. W. Goldstein, E. D. Pulakos, J. Passmore and C. Semedo, 12–28. UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
15. Brown, D. 2014. *Experiential Approach to Organization Development* 8th ed. USA: Pearson Education Limited.
16. Chatterji, A., and Patro, A. 2014. "Dynamic Capabilities and Managing Human Capital." *Academy of Management Perspectives* 28 (4): 395–408.

17. Cohen, D. K., and Mehta, J. D. 2017. "Why Reform Sometimes Succeeds: Understanding the Conditions That Produce Reforms That Last." *American Educational Research Journal* 54 (4): 644–690.
18. Collins, B. K. 2008. "What's the Problem in Public organization Workforce Recruitment? A Multi-Sector Comparative Analysis of Managerial Perceptions." *International Journal of Public Administration* 31 (14): 1592–1608.
19. Cortázar, J. C., Fuenzalida, J., and Lafuente, M. 2016. *Merit-based Selection of Public Managers: Better Public organization Performance? An Exploratory Study*. Inter-American Development Bank. <https://publications.iadb.org/en/merit-based-selection-public-managers-better-public-sector-performance-exploratory-study>
20. Crothall, J., Callan, V., and Härtel, C. E. J. 1997. "Recruitment and Selection of Academic Staff: Perceptions of department heads and job applicants." *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 19 (2): 99–110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080970190202>
21. Darnold, T. C., and Rynes, S. L. 2013. "Recruitment and Job Choice Research: Same As It Ever Was?" In *Handbook of Psychology: Industrial And Organizational Psychology*, 2nd ed., Vol. 12, edited by N. W. Schmitt, S. Highhouse, and I. B. Weiner, 104–112. John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
22. Dos Santos, N. R., Pais, L., Cabo-Leitão, C., and Passmore, J. 2017. "Ethics in Recruitment and Selection." In *The Wiley Blackwell Handbook of the Psychology of Recruitment, Selection and Employee Retention*, 1st ed., edited by Harold W. Goldstein, Elaine D. Pulakos, Carla Semedo, Jonathan Passmore, 92–112. UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
23. Edenborough, R. 2005. *Assessment Methods in Recruitment, Selection & Performance: A manager's guide to psychometric testing, interviews and assessment centres*. London: Kogan Page.
24. Egeberg, M., Gornitzka, Å., and Trondal, J. 2017. "Merit-based recruitment boosts good governance: How do European Union agencies recruit their personnel?" *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 85 (2): 247–263. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852317691342>
25. Eisenhardt, K. M., and Martin, J. A. 2000. "Dynamic capabilities: What are they?" *Strategic Management Journal* 21 (10–11): 1105–1121.
26. Fallon-Byrne, L., and Harney, B. 2017. "Microfoundations of dynamic capabilities for innovation: A review and research agenda." *Irish Journal of Management* 36 (1): 21–31.
27. Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., and Sarstedt, M. 2016. *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)*. 2nd ed., Vol. 2. Los Angeles: SAGE Publication Inc.
28. Hays, S. W., and Sowa, J. E. 2005. "Staffing the Bureaucracy: Employee Recruitment and Selection." In *Handbook of Human Resource Management in Government*, 2nd ed., edited by S. E. Condrey. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
29. Heijne, S., and Buck, J. 2013. "Effective and inclusive decision-making and governance: The example of Steiner schools." *Social Sciences Directory* 2: 26–46.

30. Hess, A. M. 2008. "Essays on dynamic capabilities: The role of intellectual human capital in firm innovation" (PhD diss., Georgia Institute of Technology).
31. Hodgkinson, G. P., and Sadler-Smith, E. 2018. "The Dynamics of Intuition and Analysis in Managerial and Organizational Decision Making." *Academy of Management Perspectives* 32 (4): 473–492. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2016.0140>
32. Horton, S. 2008. "History and Persistence of an Idea and an Ideal." In *Motivation in Public Management: The Call of Public Service*, Vol. 1, edited by J. Perry and A. Hondeghem, 17–32. UK: Oxford University Press.
33. Jreisat, J. E. 2018. "Public Administration Reform in Jordan: Concepts and Practices." *International Journal of Public Administration* 41 (10): 781–791. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2017.1387991>
34. Kasim, A. 2013. "Bureaucratic Reform and Dynamic Goernance for Combating Corruption: The Challenge for Indonesia." *Bisnis & Birokrasi Journal* 20 (1): <https://doi.org/10.20476/jbb.v20i1.1862>
35. Krejcie, R. V., and Morgan, D. W. 1970. "Determining Sample Size for Research Activities." *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 30 (3): 607–610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308>
36. Leisink, P., and Steijn, B. 2008. "Recruitment, Attraction, and Selection." In *Motivation in Public Management: The Call of Public Service*, 1st ed., edited by J. Perry and A. Hondeghem, 118–135. UK: Oxford University Press, Inc.
37. Loehlin, J. C., and Beaujean, A. A. 2017. *Latent Variable Models: An Introduction to Factor, Path, and Structural Equation Analysis*. 6th ed. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis.
38. Lundvall, B., and Nielsen, P. 2007. "Knowledge management and innovation performance." *International Journal of Manpower* 28 (3/4): 207–223. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437720710755218>
39. Markell, D., and Glicksman, R. 2016. "Dynamic Governance in Theory and Application, Part I." *Arizona Law Review* 58 (3): 563–632. <https://ir.law.fsu.edu/articles/601>
40. Mizrahi, S., Vigoda-Gadot, E., and Cohen, N. 2009. "Trust, Participation, and Performance in Public Administration." *Public Performance & Management Review* 33 (1): 7–33.
41. Neo, B. S., and Chen, G. 2007. *Dynamic governance: Embedding culture, capabilities and change in Singapore*. Singapore: World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd.
42. Nielsen, K., Nielsen, M. B., Ogbonnaya, C., Käsälä, M., Saari, E., and Isaksson, K. 2017. "Workplace resources to improve both employee well-being and performance: A systematic review and meta-analysis." *Work & Stress* 31 (2): 101–120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2017.1304463>
43. Olejarski, A. M., Potter, M., and Morrison, R. L. 2019. "Organizational Learning in the Public Sector: Culture, Politics, and Performance." *Public Integrity* 21 (1): 69–85.
44. Ordanini, A., and Silvestri, G. 2008. "Recruitment and selection services: Efficiency and competitive reasons in the outsourcing of HR practices." *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 19 (2): 372–391. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190701799960>

45. Pfeffer, J. 1998. *The Human Equation: Building Profits by Putting People First*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
46. Prieto, I. M., and Easterby-Smith, M. 2006. “Dynamic capabilities and the role of organizational knowledge: An exploration.” *European Journal of Information Systems* 15 (5): 500–510.
47. Redman, T., and Mathews, B. P. 1997. “What do recruiters want in a public organization manager?” *Public Personnel Management* 26 (2): 245–256.
48. Rengkung, L. R. 2018. “Modelling of Dynamic Capabilities: A System Dynamics Approach.” *Academy of Strategic Management Journal* 17 (5).
49. Rynes, S. L., and Cable, D. M. 2003. “Recruitment Research in the Twenty-First Century.” In *Handbook of Psychology: Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1st ed., Vol. 12, edited by W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen and R. Klimoski, 55–76. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
50. Schreyögg, G., and Kliesch-Eberl, M. 2007. “How Dynamic Can Organizational Capabilities Be? Towards a Dual-Process Model of Capability Dynamization.” *Strategic Management Journal* 28 (9): 913–933.
51. Seligman, L. G. 1964. “Political Change: Legislative Elites and Parties in Oregon.” *Western Political Quarterly* 17 (2): 177–187. <https://doi.org/10.1177/106591296401700201>
52. Smith, C. W. 1998. “Corporate Risk Management: Theory and Practice.” SSRN Scholarly Paper 6414. <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=6414>
53. Sparrow, P. R. 2007. “Globalization of HR at function level: Four UK-based case studies of the international recruitment and selection process.” *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 18 (5): 845–867. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190701249164>
54. Teece, D. J. 2007. “Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance.” *Strategic Management Journal* 28 (13): 1319–1350. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640>
55. Teece, D. J. 2018. “Business models and dynamic capabilities.” *Long Range Planning* 51 (1): 40–49.
56. Veronesi, G., Kirkpatrick, I., and Altanlar, A. 2019. “Are Public organization Managers a “Bureaucratic Burden”? The Case of English Public Hospitals.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 29 (2): 193–209. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muy072>
57. Violinda, Q., and Jian, S. 2016. “Dynamic Capabilities, Organizational Culture and Competitive Advantage: Evidence from Agriculture Cooperatives in China.” *Asia-Pacific Management and Business Application* 4 (3): 137–154. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.apmba.2016.004.03.4>
58. Vogel, R., and Güttel, W. H. 2012. “The Dynamic Capability View in Strategic Management: A Bibliometric Review.” *International Journal of Management Reviews* 15 (4): 426–446. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12000>
59. Wu, L.-Y. 2006. “Resources, Dynamic Capabilities and Performance in a Dynamic Environment: Perceptions in Taiwanese IT Enterprises.” *Information & Management* 43 (4): 447–454. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2005.11.001>

60. Yan, G., and Gao, E. 2016. "Dynamic Capabilities Enhancing Path: A Perspective on Human Resource Policy." Paper presented at the 6th International Conference on Management, Education, Information and Control (MEICI 2016).

N. Natsir, R. Halim, M.H. Tahili

DINAMIŠKO VALDYMO POVEIKIS VIEŠŪJŲ PASLAUGŲ NAUJOVĖMS ĮDARBINANT VIEŠŪJŲ ORGANIZACIJŲ VADOVUS

Anotacija. *Dinamiškas valdymas buvo laikomas tinkama strategija viešųjų paslaugų naujovėms reklamuoti ir viešojo sektoriaus vadovams įdarbinti. Šio tyrimo tikslas – iš-tirti dinamiško valdymo poveikį viešųjų paslaugų naujovėms moderuojamu kintamuoju pasirinkus įstaigų vadovus. Tyrimo duomenys rinkti ir analizuoti taikant apklausos strategiją, taip pat analizei pasitelktas ir kiekybinis metodas. Tyrime 357 respondentams taikyta neproporcingos atsitiktinės imties metodika, pagrįsta Krejcie ir Morgan lentele su 0,05 paklaida. Tyrimo rezultatai parodė, kad dinamiškas valdymas susideda iš dviejų dimensijų – dinamiškų pajėgumų ir institucinės kultūros. Abi jos teigiamai ir reikšmingai veikia viešųjų paslaugų inovacijas. Be to, viešųjų organizacijų vadovų įdarbinimas teigiamai ir reikšmingai veikia viešųjų paslaugų naujoves. Atitinkamai, dinamiška valdy-mo perspektyva buvo vertinama kaip tinkamas būdas palaikyti dinamišką vietos valdymo veiklą, tęstinumą ir pokyčius. Tai gali pagerinti viešųjų organizacijų vadovų įdarbinimo veiksmingumą žmoniškųjų išteklių valdymo srityje ir pasiūlyti daugiau naujovių ateityje.*

Nawawi Natsir, PhD, associate professor at the Department of Public Administration Science, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Tadulako University.
E-mail: nawawinatsir@untad.ac.id

Rahmawati Halim, PhD, associate professor at the Department of Public Administration Science, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Tadulako University.
E-mail: rahmawatihalim1972@gmail.com

Mashuri H. Tahili, PhD,* associate professor at the Department of Public Administration Science, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Tadulako University.
E-mail: mashuritahili6@gmail.com

Nawawi Natsir – mokslų daktaras, Tadulako universiteto Socialinių ir politikos mokslų fakulteto Viešojo administravimo katedros docentas (Indonezija)
E. paštas nawawinatsir@untad.ac.id

Ramawati Halim – mokslų daktaras, Tadulako universiteto Socialinių ir politikos mokslų fakulteto Viešojo administravimo katedros docentas (Indonezija)

E. paštas rahmawatihalim1972@gmail.com

Mashuri H. Tahili – mokslų daktaras, Tadulako universiteto Socialinių ir politikos mokslų fakulteto Viešojo administravimo katedros docentas (Indonezija)

E. paštas mashuritahili6@gmail.com