



Daftar Pustaka

- Adler, P. S., & Borys, B. 1996. Two Types of Bureaucracy: Enabling and Coercive. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(1): 61.
- Alford, J., Douglas, S., Geuijen, K., & Hart, P. 't. 2017. *Ventures in public value management: Introduction to the symposium*. Taylor & Francis. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14719037.2016.1192160>.
- Alford, J., & Greve, C. 2017. Strategy in the Public and Private Sectors: Similarities, Differences and Changes. *Administrative Sciences*, 7(4): 35.
- Antonsen, M., & Jorgensen, T. B. 1997. The “Publicness” of Public Organizations. *Public Administration*, 75(2): 337–357.
- Ashkanasy, N. M., Wilderom, C. P. M., & Peterson, M. F. 2004. *Handbook of Organizational Culture and Climate* (1 ed.). California: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Astley, W. G., & Sachdeva, P. S. 1984. Structural Sources of Intraorganizational Power: A Theoretical Synthesis. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(1): 104–113.
- Attride-Stirling, J. 2001. Thematic networks: An analytic tool for qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, 1(3): 385–405.
- Azed, A. B. 2001. Mereposisi Hubungan Yudikatif Dengan Eksekutif Dan Legislatif Dalam Konteks Amandemen UUD 1945. *Jurnal Hukum dan Pembangunan*, 31(1): 1–5.
- Bahn-Walkowiak, B., & Wilts, H. 2017. The institutional dimension of resource efficiency in a multi-level governance system—Implications for policy mix design. *Energy Research and Social Science*, 33(February): 163–172.
- Bappenas. 2019. *Ringkasan Eksekutif: Visi Indonesia 2045*. https://www.bappenas.go.id/files/Visi Indonesia 2045/Ringkasan Eksekutif Visi Indonesia 2045_Final.pdf.
- Barney, J. B. 2005. Should strategic management research engage public policy debates? *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(6): 945–948.
- Barney, J. B. 2007. *Gaining and Sustaining Competitive Advantage* (3rd ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Bennet, R. 2010. *Decentralizing Authority in Post-Suharto Indonesia: The Big Bang Theory, 1998-2010*. Princeton University.
- Bernier, L., & Hafsi, T. 2007. The Changing Nature of Public Entrepreneurship. *Public Administration Review*, 67(3): 488–503.
- Bezes, P. 2018. Exploring the Legacies of New Public Management in Europe. *The Palgrave Handbook of Public Administration and Management in Europe*. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-37-55269-3_48.
- Borrás, S., & Edquist, C. 2013. The Choice of Innovation Policy Instruments. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 80(8): 1513–1522.
- Bouckaert, G., Peters, B. G., & Verhoest, K. 2010. *The Coordination of Public Sector Organizations: Shifting Patterns of Public Management*. Hounds mills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bouma, J. A., Verbraak, M., Dietz, F., & Brouwer, R. 2019. Policy Mix: Mess or



- Merit? *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy*, 8(1): 32–47.
- Bourgeois, L. J., & Eisenhardt, K. M. 1988. Strategic Decision Processes in High Velocity Environments: Four Cases in the Microcomputer Industry. *Management Science*, 34(7): 816–835.
- Boyd, B. K., Gove, S., & Hitt, M. A. 2005. Construct Measurement in Strategic Management Research: Illusion or Reality? *Strategic Management Journal*, 26(3): 239–257.
- Bozeman, B. 2004. *All Organizations are Public: Comparing Public and Private Organizations*. Beard Books.
- Bozeman, B., & Bretschneider, S. 1994. The “Publicness Puzzle” in Organization Theory: A Test of Alternative Explanations of Differences between Public and Private Organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 4: 197–223.
- Bryson, J., Sancino, A., Benington, J., & Sørensen, E. 2017. Towards a multi-actor theory of public value co-creation. *Public Management Review*, 19(5): 640–654.
- Carbone, M. 2008. Mission Impossible: the European Union and Policy Coherence for Development. *Journal of European Integration*, 30(3): 323–342.
- Caruana, A., Ewing, M. T., & Ramaseshan, B. 2002. Effects of some Environmental Challenges and Centralization on the Entrepreneurial Orientation and Performance of Public Sector Entities. *Service Industries Journal*, 22(2): 43–58.
- Casciaro, T., & Piskorski, M. J. 2005. Power Imbalance, Mutual Dependence, and Constraint Absorption: A Closer Look at Resource Dependence Theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(2): 167–199.
- Catalán, H. E. N. 2019. Reliability, Population Classification and Weighting in Multidimensional Poverty Measurement: A Monte Carlo Study. *Social Indicators Research*, 142(3): 887–910.
- Chen, C. C., Chen, X.-P., & Meindl, J. R. 1998. How can Cooperation be Fostered? The Cultural Effects of Individualism-Collectivism. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2): 285–304.
- Churchill, G. 1979. A Paradigm for Developing Better Measures of Marketing Constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16(1): 64–73.
- Cohen, J. 1960. A Coefficient of Agreement for Nominal Scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 20(1): 37–46.
- Coltman, T., Devinney, T. M., Midgley, D. F., & Venaik, S. 2008. Formative versus reflective measurement models: Two applications of formative measurement. *Journal of Business Research*, 61(12): 1250–1262.
- Costantini, V., Crespi, F., & Palma, A. 2017. Characterizing The Policy Mix and Its Impact on Eco-Innovation: A Patent Analysis of Energy-Efficient Technologies. *Research Policy*, 46(4): 799–819.
- Crawford, J. R., Garthwaite, P. H., & Slick, D. J. 2009. On percentile norms in neuropsychology: Proposed reporting standards and methods for quantifying the uncertainty over the percentile ranks of test scores. *Clinical Neuropsychologist*, 23(7): 1173–1195.



- Crawford, A. V., Green, S. B., Levy, R., Lo, W. J., Scott, L., et al. 2010. Evaluation of parallel analysis methods for determining the number of factors. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 70(6): 885–901.
- de Winter, J. C. F., Dodou, D., & Wieringa, P. A. 2009. Exploratory factor analysis with small sample sizes. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 44(2): 147–181.
- Decker, S. L. 2021. Don't Use a Bifactor Model Unless You Believe the True Structure Is Bifactor. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 39(1): 39–49.
- Dess, G. G., & Beard, D. W. 1984. Dimensions of Organizational Task Environments. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29(1): 52.
- DeVellis, R. F. 2017. *Scale Development: Theory and Applications* (4 ed.). California, USA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Di Francesco, M. 2001. Process not Outcomes in New Public Management? “Policy Coherence” in Australian Government. *The Drawing Board: Australian Review of Public Affairs*, 1(3): 103–116.
- Diercks, G. 2019. Lost in translation: How legacy limits the OECD in promoting new policy mixes for sustainability transitions. *Research Policy*, 48(10). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2018.09.002>.
- Dunleavy, P., Margetts, H., Bastow, S., & Tinkler, J. 2006. New public management is dead - Long live digital-era governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16(3): 467–494.
- Ebesutani, C., Reise, S. P., Chorpita, B. F., Ale, C., Regan, J., et al. 2012. The Revised Child Anxiety and Depression Scale-Short Version: Scale reduction via exploratory bifactor modeling of the broad anxiety factor. *Psychological Assessment*, 24(4): 833–845.
- Echeverri-Gent, J. 1992. Between Autonomy and Capture: Embedding Government Agencies in Their Societal Environment. *Policy Studies Journal*, 20(3): 342–364.
- Egger-Rainer, A. 2019. Enhancing validity through cognitive interviewing. A methodological example using the Epilepsy Monitoring Unit Comfort Questionnaire. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 75(1): 224–233.
- Elbanna, S., Kapoutsis, I., & Mellahi, K. 2017. Creativity and Propitiousness in Strategic Decision Making: The Role of Positive Politics and Macro-Economic Uncertainty. *Management Decision*, 55(10): 2218–2236.
- Field, A. 2018. *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics* (5 ed.). SAGE Publications, Ltd.
- Flanagan, K., Uyarra, E., & Laranja, M. 2011. Reconceptualising the “Policy Mix” for Innovation. *Research Policy*, 40(5): 702–713.
- Fredrickson, J. W. 1986. Research notes and communications: An exploratory approach to measuring perceptions of strategic decision process constructs. *Strategic Management Journal*, 7(5): 473–483.
- Frumkin, P., & Galaskiewicz, J. 2004. Institutional Isomorphism and Public Sector Organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 14(3): 283–307.
- Gelfand, M. J., Erez, M., & Aycan, Z. 2007. Cross-Cultural Organizational



- Behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58: 479–514.
- Gignac, G. E., & Kretzschmar, A. 2017. Evaluating dimensional distinctness with correlated-factor models: Limitations and suggestions. *Intelligence*, 62(April): 138–147.
- Grant, R. M. 1996. Toward a Knowledge-Based Theory of the Firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(Winter Special Issue): 109–122.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. 2014. *Multivariate Data Analysis* (7 ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hamann, P. M., Schiemann, F., Bellora, L., & Guenther, T. W. 2013. Exploring the Dimensions of Organizational Performance: A Construct Validity Study. *Organizational Research Methods*, 16(1): 67–87.
- Haning, M. T. 2018. Reformasi Birokrasi di Indonesia: Tinjauan Dari Perspektif Administrasi Publik. *Jurnal Analisis Kebijakan dan Pelayanan Publik*, 4(1): 25–37.
- Harkness, J. 2008. Language Translations. *Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Hekkert, M. P., Suurs, R. A. A., Negro, S. O., Kuhlmann, S., & Smits, R. E. H. M. 2007. Functions of Innovation Systems: A New Approach for Analysing Technological Change. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 74(4): 413–432.
- Hickson, D. J., Hinings, C. R., Lee, C. A., Schneck, R. E., & Pennings, J. M. 1971. A Strategic Contingencies' Theory of Intraorganizational Power. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16(2): 216.
- Hillman, A. J., Withers, M. C., & Collins, B. J. 2009. Resource Dependence Theory: A Review. *Journal of Management*, 35(6): 1404–1427.
- Hodgkinson, I. R., Hannibal, C., Keating, B. W., Chester Buxton, R., & Bateman, N. 2017. Toward a Public Service Management: Past, Present, and Future Directions. *Journal of Service Management*, 28(5): 998–1023.
- Hoebink, P., Deuss, M., Haas, H. De, & Wagemans, G. 2005. *The Coherence of EU Policies: perspectives from the North and the South*. Brussels.
- Hofstede, G. 2001. *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*. Sage Publications.
- Hudson, B., Hardy, B., Henwood, M., & Wistow, G. 1999. In Pursuit of Inter-Agency Collaboration In The Public Sector. *Public Management: An International Journal of Research and Theory*, 1(2): 235–260.
- Indarti, N., & Lukito-Budi, A. S. 2019. Studi Bibliometrik tentang Perkembangan Interaksi Konstruk Kemampuan Menyerap dan Usaha Kecil Menengah pada Tingkat Internasional dan Indonesia. In J. Hartono (Ed.), *Kajian Topik-Topik Mutakhir dan Agenda Riset ke Depan*: 51–90. Yogyakarta: Penerbit ANDI.
- Jones, T. 2002. Policy Coherence, Global Environmental Governance, and Poverty Reduction. *International Environmental Agreements*, 2(4): 389–401.
- Kearney, C., & Meynhardt, T. 2016. Directing Corporate Entrepreneurship Strategy in the Public Sector to Public Value: Antecedents, Components, and Outcomes. *International Public Management Journal*, 19(4): 543–572.



- Kemendagri.go.id. 2020. Inilah Daftar Pemda Peraih IGA 2020 Kategori Sangat Inovatif dan Terinovatif. *Berita Kemendagri*.
<https://www.kemendagri.go.id/berita/baca/30303/inilah-daftar-pemda-peraih-iga-2020-kategori-sangat-inovatif-dan-terinovatif>.
- Kim, Y. 2010. Stimulating Entrepreneurial Practices in The Public Sector: The Roles of Organizational Characteristics. *Administration and Society*, 42(7): 780–814.
- Kivimaa, P., & Kern, F. 2016. Creative Destruction or Mere Niche Support? Innovation Policy Mixes for Sustainability Transitions. *Research Policy*, 45(1): 205–217.
- Klein, P. G., Mahoney, J. T., McGahan, A. M., & Pitelis, C. N. 2010. Toward a Theory of Public Entrepreneurship. *European management review*, 7(1): 1–15.
- Kvale, S. 2007. *Qualitative Research Kit: Doing Interviews*. London, England: SAGE Publications, Ltd.
- Kyriazos, T. A., & Stalikas, A. 2018. Applied Psychometrics: The Steps of Scale Development and Standardization Process. *Psychology*, 09(11): 2531–2560.
- Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. 1977. The Measurement of Observer Agreement for Categorical Data. *Biometrics*, 33(1): 159.
- Lett, D., Hier, S., & Walby, K. 2012. Policy Legitimacy, Rhetorical Politics, and the Evaluation of City-Street Video Surveillance Monitoring Programs in Canada. *Canadian Review of Sociology*, 49(4): 328–349.
- Lindberg, M. B. 2019. The EU Emissions Trading System and Renewable Energy Policies: Friends or Foes in the European Policy Mix? *Politics and Governance*, 7(1): 105–123.
- Liu, Z. 2013. The research tax credit in the policy mix for innovation: the French case. *Journal of Innovation Economics*. cairn.info.
- Mack, W. R., Green, D., & Vedlitz, A. 2008. Innovation and Implementation in The Public Sector: An Examination of Public Entrepreneurship. *Review of Policy Research*, 25(3): 233–252.
- Mackenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Podsakoff, N. P. 2011. Construct Measurement and Validation Procedures in MIS and Behavioral Research: Integrating New and Existing Techniques. *MIS Quarterly*, 35(2): 293–334.
- Magro, E., Navarro, M., & Zabala-Iturriagagoitia, J. M. 2014. Coordination-mix: The hidden face of STI policy. *Review of Policy Research*, 31(5): 367–389.
- Magro, E., & Wilson, J. R. 2013. Complex innovation policy systems: Towards an evaluation mix. *Research Policy*, 42(9): 1647–1656.
- Malone, T. W., & Crowston, K. 1994. The Interdisciplinary Study of Coordination. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 26(1).
- Matsunaga, M. 2010. How to Factor-Analyze Your Data Right: Do's, Don'ts, and How-To's. *International Journal of Psychological research*, 3(1): 97–110.
- Matti, C., Consoli, D., & Uyarra, E. 2017. Multi level policy mixes and industry emergence: The case of wind energy in Spain. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, 35(4): 661–683.
- May, P. J., Sapotichne, J., & Workman, S. 2006. Policy Coherence and Policy Domains. *Policy Studies Journal*, 34(3): 381–403.



- Meissner, D., & Kergroach, S. 2019. Innovation policy mix: mapping and measurement. *Journal of Technology Transfer*.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-019-09767-4>.
- Meynhardt, T., Brieger, S. A., Strathoff, P., Anderer, S., Bäro, A., et al. 2017. Public Value Performance: What Does It Mean to Create Value in the Public Sector? *Public Sector Management in a Globalized World*: 135–160. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden.
- Meynhardt, T., & Diefenbach. 2012. What Drives Entrepreneurial Orientation in The Public Sector? Evidence from Germany's Federal Labor Agency. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22(4): 761–792.
- Miller, C. C. 2008. Decisional Comprehensiveness and Firm Performance: Towards a More Complete Understanding. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 21(5): 598–620.
- Mintzberg, H., Jorgensen, J., Dougherty, D., & Westley, F. 1996. Some Surprising Things about Collaboration: Knowing How People Connect Makes It Work Better. *Organizational Dynamics*, 25(1): 60–71.
- Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & Wood, D. J. 1997. Toward a Theory of Stakeholder Identification and Salience: Defining the Principle of Who and What Really Counts. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(4): 853–886.
- Molina-Azorin, J. F. 2018. Mixed Methods. *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Business and Management Research Methods: History and Traditions*: 102–118. 1 Oliver's Yard, 55 City Road London EC1Y 1SP: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Moore, G. C., & Benbasat, I. 1991. Development of an instrument to measure the perceptions of adopting an information technology innovation. *Information Systems*, 2(3): 192–222.
- Moore, M. H. 1995. *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Moore, M. H. 2014. Public Value Accounting: Establishing the Philosophical Basis. *Public Administration Review*, 74(4): 465–477.
- Morgado, F. F. R., Meireles, J. F. F., Neves, C. M., Amaral, A. C. S., & Ferreira, M. E. C. 2017. Scale development: Ten main limitations and recommendations to improve future research practices. *Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica*, 30(1): 1–20.
- Morris, M. H., & Jones, F. F. 1999. Entrepreneurship in Established Organizations: The Case of The Public Sector. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 24(1): 73–93.
- Morse, J. M., Mitcham, C., Hupcey, J. E., & Tason, M. C. 1996. Criteria for Concept Evaluation. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 24(2): 385–390.
- Nahm, A. Y., Rao, S. S., Solis-Galvan, L. E., & Ragu-Nathan, T. S. 2002. The Q-sort method: Assessing reliability and construct validity of questionnaire items at a pre-testing stage. *Journal of Modern Applied Statistical Methods*, 1(1): 114–125.
- Neuman, W. L. 2014. *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* (7 ed.). Essex, UK: Pearson Education Limited.
- Neville, B. A., Bell, S. J., & Whitwell, G. J. 2011. Stakeholder Salience Revisited:



- Refining, Redefining, and Refueling an Underdeveloped Conceptual Tool. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 102(3): 357–378.
- Newell, S. J., & Goldsmith, R. E. 2001. The Development of a Scale to Measure Perceived Corporate Credibility. *Journal of Business Research*, 52(3): 235–247.
- Nima, A. Al, Cloninger, K. M., Lucchese, F., Sikström, S., & Garcia, D. 2020. Validation of a general subjective well-being factor using Classical Test Theory. *PeerJ*, 8(6): e9193.
- Oliver, C. 1991. Strategic Responses to Institutional Processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 16(1): 145–179.
- Oliver, C. 1997. Sustainable Competitive Advantage: Combining Institutional and Resource-Based Views. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(9): 697–713.
- Oremus, M., Cosby, J. L., & Wolfson, C. 2005. A hybrid qualitative method for pretesting questionnaires: The example of a questionnaire to caregivers of Alzheimer disease patients. *Research in Nursing and Health*, 28(5): 419–430.
- Osborne, D. 1993. Reinventing Government. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 16(4).
- Osborne, S. P., Radnor, Z., & Nasi, G. 2013. A New Theory for Public Service Management? Toward a (Public) Service-Dominant Approach. *American Review of Public Administration*, 43(2): 135–158.
- Page, S. B., Stone, M. M., Bryson, J. M., & Crosby, B. C. 2015. Public Value Creation by Cross-Sector Collaborations: A Framework and Challenges of Assessment. *Public Administration*, 93(3): 715–732.
- Park, C., Lee, J., & Chung, C. 2015. Is “legitimized” policy always successful? Policy legitimacy and cultural policy in Korea. *Policy Sciences*, 48(3): 319–338.
- Pellathy, D. A., Mollenkopf, D. A., Stank, T. P., & Autry, C. W. 2019. Cross-Functional Integration: Concept Clarification and Scale Development. *Journal of Business Logistics*, 1–24.
- Peng, M. W. 2002. Towards an institution-based view of business strategy. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 19(2/3): 251–267.
- Peng, M. W., Sun, S. L., Pinkham, B., & Chen, H. 2009. The Institution-Based View as a Third Leg for a Strategy Tripod. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 23(3): 63–81.
- Perlesz, A., & Lindsay, J. 2003. Methodological triangulation in researching families: Making sense of dissonant data. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 6(1): 25–40.
- Peters, G. 2014. The alpha and the omega of scale reliability and validity: why and how to abandon Cronbach’s alpha and the route towards more comprehensive assessment of scale quality. *The European health psychologist*, 16(2): 56–69.
- Peterson, R. A. 2000. A Meta-Analysis of Variance Accounted for and Factor Loadings in Exploratory Factor Analysis. *Marketing Letters*, 11(3): 261–275.
- Pfeffer, J. 2003. Introduction to the Classic Edition. *The External Control of*



- Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective* (2nd ed.): xi–xxix. California: Stanford University Press.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. 1978. *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Pratama, A. B. 2019. The landscape of public service innovation in Indonesia. *Innovation & Management Review*, 17(1): 25–40.
- Prebble, M. 2018. Is “We” Singular? The Nature of Public Value. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 48(2): 103–118.
- Provan, K. G. 1980. Recognizing, Measuring, and Interpreting the Potential/Enacted Power Distinction in Organizational Research. *Academy of Management Review*, 5(4): 549–560.
- Raharjo, P. 2013. Analisis Manajemen Perubahan pada Penerapan e-Government di Kabupaten Sragen. *Pusdiklat BPS RI*.
- Ran, B., & Qi, H. 2017. Contingencies of Power Sharing in Collaborative Governance. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 48(8): 836–831.
- Reise, S. P., Moore, T. M., & Haviland, M. G. 2010. Bifactor Models and Rotations: Exploring the Extent to Which Multidimensional Data Yield Univocal Scale Scores. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 92(6): 544–559.
- Revelle, W. 2020. *psych: Procedures for Psychological, Psychometric, and Personality Research*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University. <https://cran.r-project.org/package=psych>.
- Roberts, N. C., & King, P. J. 1989. Public Entrepreneurship: A Typology. *Academy of Management Meetings*.
- Roberts, N. C., & King, P. J. 1991. Policy Entrepreneurs: Their Activity Structure and Function in the Policy Process. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 1(2): 147–175.
- Rodriguez, A., Reise, S. P., & Haviland, M. G. 2016. Evaluating bifactor models: Calculating and interpreting statistical indices. *Psychological Methods*, 21(2): 137–150.
- Rogge, K. S., & Dutschke, E. 2018. What makes them believe in the low-carbon energy transition? Exploring corporate perceptions of the credibility of climate policy mixes. *Environmental Science and Policy*. Elsevier.
- Rogge, K. S., & Reichardt, K. 2016. Policy mixes for sustainability transitions: An extended concept and framework for analysis. *Research Policy*, 45(8): 1620–1635.
- Rogge, K. S., & Schleich, J. 2018. Do Policy Mix Characteristics Matter for Low-Carbon Innovation? A Survey-Based Exploration of Renewable Power Generation Technologies in Germany. *Research Policy*, 47(9): 1639–1654.
- Roy, J. 2017. Digital government and service delivery: An examination of performance and prospects. *Canadian Public Administration*, 60(4): 538–561.
- Saunders, C. S. 1990. The Strategic Contingencies Theory of Power: Multiple Perspectives. *Journal of Management Studies*, 27(1): 1–18.
- Saunders, C. S. 2013. Strategic Contingencies Theory. *Encyclopedia of Management Theory*. SAGE Publications, Inc.



- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. 2009. *Research Methods for Business Students* (5 ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Söderholm, P., Hellsmark, H., Frishammar, J., Hansson, J., Mossberg, J., et al. 2019. Technological Development for Sustainability: The Role of Network Management in the Innovation Policy Mix. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*. Elsevier.
- Stazyk, E. C., & Goerdel, H. T. 2011. The Benefits of Bureaucracy: Public Managers' Perceptions of Political Support, Goal Ambiguity, and Organizational Effectiveness. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21(4): 645–672.
- Stebbins, C. R. A. 2014. What Is Exploration? *Exploratory Research in the Social Sciences*: 2–17. California, USA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Stoker, G. 2006. Public Value Management: A New Narrative for Networked Governance? *The American Review of Public Administration*, 36(1): 41–57.
- Su, N. 2018. Positivist Qualitative Methods. *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Business and Management Research Methods: History and Traditions*: 17–31. 1 Oliver's Yard, 55 City Road London EC1Y 1SP: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Suchman, M. C. 1995. Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3): 571–610.
- Suddaby, R. 2010. Editor's Comments: Construct Clarity in Theories of Management and Organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(3): 346–357.
- Supriyanto, E. E. 2017. Kebijakan Inovasi Teknologi Informasi (IT) Melalui Program Elektronik Goverment dalam Meningkatkan Kualitas Pelayanan Publik di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan : Kajian Ilmu Pemerintahan dan Politik Daerah*, 1(1): 141.
- Supriyanto, H. 2004. Pemisahan Fungsi Kekuasaan Eksekutif dan Yudikatif. *Jurnal Legislasi Indonesia*, 1(1): 1–155.
- Tayeb, M. 1994. Organizations and National Culture: Methodology Considered. *Organization Studies*, 15(3): 429–445.
- Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. 2006. A General Typology of Research Designs Featuring Mixed Methods. *Research in The Schools*, 13: 12–28.
- Thornton, S. C., Henneberg, S. C., & Naudé, P. 2014. Conceptualizing and Validating Organizational Networking as a Second-Order Formative Construct. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 43(6): 951–966.
- Toepoel, V. 2017. Online Survey Design. *The SAGE Handbook of Online Research Methods*: 184–202. 1 Oliver's Yard, 55 City Road London EC1Y 1SP: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Untoro, W., & Angriawan, A. 2016. Publicness and strategic planning of public institutions: Evidence from Indonesia. *Journal of Economics, Business & Accountancy Ventura*, 19(2): 155.
- Van De Ven, A. H., Delbecq, A. L., & Koenig Jr., R. 1976. Determinants of Coordination Modes within Organizations. *American Sociological Review*, 41(2): 322–338.
- Vitola, A. 2015. Innovation Policy Mix in a Multi-Level Context: The case of the



- Baltic Sea Region Countries. *Science and Public Policy*, 42(3): 401–414.
- Vries, H. De, Bekkers, V., & Tummers, L. 2016. Innovation in The Public Sector: A Systematic Review and Future Research Agenda. *Public Administration*, 94(1): 146–166.
- Wallner, J. 2008. Legitimacy and Public Policy: Seeing Beyond Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Performance. *Policy Studies Journal*, 36(3): 421–443.
- Walwyn, D. R., & Naidoo, S. 2019. Policy mixes and overcoming challenges to innovation in developing countries: Insights from a mixed methods study of South Africa's manufacturing sector. *African Journal of Science, Technology, Innovation and Development*.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/20421338.2019.1610250>.
- Wetterberg, A., & Brinkerhoff, D. W. 2016. The Political Economy of Public Reform Adoption: Patterns in Twenty Indonesian Districts. *International Public Management Journal*, 19(4): 476–512.
- Wibowo, A. 2012. Partial and Total Disaggregation Framework of A Second-Order Construct of Organisational Culture. *Jurnal Siasat Bisnis*, 16(1): 59–69.
- Wiesel, F., & Modell, S. 2014. From New Public Management to New Public Governance? Hybridization and Implications for Public Sector Consumerism. *Financial Accountability and Management*, 30(2): 175–205.
- Wijayanti, L. 2012. Implementasi Inovasi Kebijakan Pembangunan Berkelanjutan di Kota Surakarta: Relokasi PKL di Taman Monumen Banjarsari ke Pasar Klitikan Notoharjo. *Jurnal Pembangunan Wilayah & Kota*, 8(2): 126.
- Willem, A., & Buelens, M. 2007. Knowledge Sharing in Public Sector Organizations: The Effect of Organizational Characteristics on Interdepartmental Knowledge Sharing. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 17(4): 581–606.
- Willis, G. B. 2015. Research synthesis: The practice of cross-cultural cognitive interviewing. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 79(S1): 359–395.
- Wolf, C., & Floyd, S. W. 2017. Strategic Planning Research: Toward a Theory-Driven Agenda. *Journal of Management*, 43(6): 1754–1788.
- Wolff, H. G., & Preising, K. 2005. Exploring item and higher order factor structure with the Schmid-Leiman solution: Syntax codes for SPSS and SAS. *Behavior Research Methods*, 37(1): 48–58.
- Woolthuis, R. K., Lankhuizen, M., & Gilsing, V. 2005. A system failure framework for innovation policy design. *Technovation*, 25(6): 609–619.
- Worthington, R. L., & Whittaker, T. A. 2006. Scale Development Research: A Content Analysis and Recommendations for Best Practices. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 34(6): 806–838.
- Wylie, R. 2021. *Public Value Management: Institutional Design and Decision for the Common Good*.
- Yeung, J. H. Y., Selen, W., Zhang, M., & Huo, B. 2009. The Effects of Trust and Coercive Power on Supplier Integration. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 120(1): 66–78.
- Zhou, Y. 2019. A Mixed Methods Model of Scale Development and Validation Analysis. *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research and Perspectives*,



17(1): 38–47.

Zinbarg, R. E., Revelle, W., Yovel, I., & Li, W. 2005. Cronbach's, α Revelle's β and McDonald's ω H: Their relations with each other and two alternative conceptualizations of reliability. *Psychometrika*, 70(1): 123–133.