

The Effect of Performance Management Practices and Company Size to Innovation and the Impact on Organizational Performance Case Study: Regional Public Hospitals at South Kalimantan Indonesia

Wahyu Sapto Rini

Student of Doctoral Program
University of Merdeka Malang, Indonesia
E-mail: rini-stiei-kayutangi-bjm.ac.id
Indonesia

Grahita Chandrarin

University of Merdeka Malang, Indonesia
E-mail: grahitac@unmer.ac.id
Indonesia

Prihat Assih

University of Merdeka Malang, Indonesia
E-mail: prihat.assih@unmer.ac.id
Indonesia

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the effect of performance management practices and company size on innovation and its impact on organizational performance in 12 regional public hospitals in South Kalimantan, Indonesia. This research contemplates that performance management practices in innovation so that it has impacts on improving organizational performance.

The population of the study is the managers of 12 regional public hospitals in South Kalimantan. The research sampled 241 respondents. Data analysis techniques use path analysis to support direct and indirect for organizational management.

The results of this study indicate that the implementation of management is related to organizational performance through direct development of 0,778 and an indirect effect of 1,406 relating to the direct involvement of management to the organization of greater improvement, the hypothesis which states that financial management planning supports organizational performance through innovation is proven in this research. The direct effect of management size on organizational performance is 0,095 and the indirect effect is 0,128, which means that the direct effect on organizational performance is smaller than the indirect effect, so the hypothesis that increases company size on organizational support is proven to support this research. The novelty in this study reveals the research that needs to be done to support innovation at regional public hospitals in South Kalimantan in terms of administration, facilities, and infrastructure as well as human resources.

Keyword's: implementation of performance management, company size, innovation, organizational performance

Introduction

Regional public hospitals are currently a Public Service Agency (BLU) which is an agency within the government that was formed to provide services to the community in the form of goods or services sold without prioritizing profits and in carrying out its activities based on the principles of efficiency and productivity. Regional public hospitals are public sector organizations that are not solely for profit (non-profit-oriented) but are organizations established to provide services to the public. Public demands on the quality of hospital health services have become a fundamental problem faced by some regional public hospitals in Indonesia and also in South Kalimantan. The theory underlying the thinking in this research is agency theory and goal-setting theory which states that several factors that cause an increase in organizational performance are clear goals and measurable results needed by

detailing short-term goals and long-term goals so that the focus is only on organizational functions and providing incentives can improve performance. Measuring performance in regional public hospitals by knowing the amount of work done, the level of achievement of targets whether service or product work, the efficiency of work units, quality or accuracy of work done, number of innovations or new ideas by work units, reputation work units, and work unit employee morale. Organizational performance increases with the practice of performance management (Verbeeten dan Spekle, 2013).

Innovation is defined as the application of new and significant products or process improvements (good and service), new marketing methods or organizational methods in business practices, workplace organizations or external relations (OECD, 2005). Measurement of innovation in the public sector is a new aspect. Innovation is important and needed by public sector organizations because it makes public sector organizations more efficient, effective in the use of resources and quality oriented to service delivery (O'Donnel, 2006). Based on Walker's research, Jeanes and Rowlands (2002) state that public sector organizations must be encouraged to innovate. Two important things emerge from public sector innovation, namely advancing the public interest and creating public value. Organizational performance increases with innovations in the public sector. The size of the company shows the company's activities that the company has (Sunarto, 2009). Company size in public sector organizations is an important determinant in performance management practices (Chenhall, 2003). Economic theory states that performance management practices will be more effective in small organizations. Company size is the scale used in determining the size of a company. Companies with large scale will tend to innovate more compared to companies with small scale. Based on agency theory, company size can be measured by the number of employees or labor, total assets, and sales volume. In this study, company size is measured by the number of employees, the type of hospital and the amount of budget for innovation.

Literature Review

Organizational Performance

Performance refers to something related to the activities of doing work which includes the results achieved (Outley, 1999, Bastian, 2001:239) provide the definition "Performance is a description of the level of achievement of an activity or program or policy in the form of goals, objectives, mission and vision organization contained in the formulation of a strategic scheme (strategy planning) of an organization. In general, performance is an achievement that can be achieved by an organization within a certain period. Performance is also a multidimensional construct; the measurement also varies depending on the complexity of the factors that shape performance. Some researchers argue that performance should be defined as the outcome of work itself (an outcome of work) because work results provide a strong link to the organization's strategic objectives, customer satisfaction and economic contribution (Verbeeten, 2008). Organizational performance is divided into qualitative performance and quantitative performance (Carter et al. 1992: 36). Quantitative performance refers to quantitative aspects such as the use of resources (budget or economic use), the amount of output produced and efficiency. Qualitative performance refers to operational quality such as accuracy (Carter et al. 1992) and also strategic capacities such as innovation and long-term effectiveness (Newberry and Pallot, 2004; Kaplan, 2001; Klot and Martin, 2000).

Innovation

Innovation is a complex concept (Walker et al. 2002). Innovation is defined as the awakening and application of new ideas, not just new product problems, new services or new processes and new ways to solve problems. Innovation is not a simple fact to generate ideas but includes the application, integration into system processes and monitoring results in the long run. Innovation cannot automatically produce good results, it represents both individual and collective achievements. Innovation is defined as the application of new and significant products or process improvements (good and service), new marketing methods or organizational methods in business practices, workplace organizations or external relations (OECD, 2005). In this definition, there are four types of innovation namely product innovation, process innovation, marketing innovation, and organizational innovation. Product innovation involves new or significantly increased goods or services, process innovation involves new or significantly improved production or delivery methods, marketing innovation involves new marketing methods that involve

significant changes in product or packaging design, product placement, product promotion or designation price, organizational innovation involves the introduction of new organizational methods in company business practices, workplace organizations or external relations.

Performance Management Practices

The latest effort to improve performance in the public sector is known as New Public Management (NPM). The impact of performance management practices on public sector organizations is influenced by institutional factors. Performance management practices (Hood,1995,1991) include setting goals to be achieved, allocating satisfaction rights, and measuring and evaluating performance (Heinrich, 2002; Ittner and Larcker, 2001, Otley, 1999). Besides, the use of incentives can improve organizational performance (Bonner and Sprinkle, 2002). Performance management practices consist of clear and measurable goals and incentives. Performance management practices can be defined as the process of setting goals, choosing strategies to achieve these goals, sharing authority in decision making and how to measure and evaluate performance (Verbeeten, 2008). Performance management practices are applied to improve organizational performance. Performance management practices can serve several political and managerial objectives (Propper and Wilson, 2003; de Bruijn, 2002; Kloot and Martin, 2000). These goals affect each other. The mission definition, clear goals help each employee understand what the organization wants. By measuring performance concerning clear organizational goals, politicians and public managers must be able to empower the public for what purpose public finances are used (transparency or accountability goals). Public sector organizations can use organizational performance measurements to improve performance (learning objectives). Performance measurement systems can be the basis for compensation of government officials (the purpose of assessing).

Company Size

Company size in public sector organizations is an important determinant in performance management practices (Chenhall,2003). Economy Theory believes that performance management practices will be more effective in small organizations (Dewatripont et al. 1999). Increasing size can positively influence the adoption of the use of performance management practices for company size in public sector organizations Indicators of company size are information about the number of employees serving in public sector organizations. In this study, the type of regional public hospitals is also one measure to assess the company and the budget required by the hospital to innovate. This type of classification is based on the number of available inpatient rooms, the availability of medical resources and also medical equipment to improve hospital services.

Research Framework and Hypothesis

The conceptual framework of this study is as follows:




Figure 1. Concept Research Model

Hypothesis formulation:

H1: Performance management practices affect innovation

H2: Company size influences innovation

- H3: Performance management practices influence organizational performance
H4: Company size influences organizational performance
H5: Innovation influences organizational performance
H6: Performance management practices influence organizational performance through innovation
H7: Company size influences organizational performance through innovation

This research is quantitative research with an explanatory research approach which is guided by a questionnaire. This research was conducted at regional public hospitals in South Kalimantan, totalling 12 hospitals spread across 10 municipalities. The population in this study is the manager of the regional public hospital in South Kalimantan, amounting to 276 people. The sample of this study was the population, but at the time of the study, 276 questionnaires were filled in and received by the researchers as many as 241 respondents. This study uses forty-three questionnaire items. Respondents' answers were then tabulated and then tested for validity and reliability to determine the level of validity of the questionnaire items against the variable to be measured.

Data analysis techniques in this study are descriptive analysis and path analysis. Following is the path analysis application on research variables, namely the practice of performance management and company size on organizational performance through innovation. Hypothesis testing using multiple linear regression models, testing of the model using the coefficient of determination (R^2) is needed to measure how far the model's ability to explain endogenous variables is determined $KD=R^2 \times 100\%$. Individual significance test (t-test) shows how far the influence of one exogenous variable in explaining endogenous variables if other exogenous variables are not taken into account or are considered constant. The significance of path analysis is based on the value of t arithmetic and t table, i.e. if the value of t arithmetic $>$ t table, then H_a is accepted and H_0 is rejected, meaning that the independent variable has a significant impact on the dependent variable. If t arithmetic $<$ t table, then H_a is rejected and H_0 is accepted, meaning that the independent variable does not have a significant impact on the dependent variable. The significance is based on the probability value or p-value, i.e. if the value of $p > 0.05$, then H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected, meaning that it is not significant. If the value of $p \leq 0.05$, then H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted, meaning that it is significant.

Results

Based on the results of the validity test showed that all research variables (performance management practices, company size, innovation, and organizational performance) count $>$ r-table of 0.126 so that all questionnaires are said to be valid. The reliability test results of all constructs or variables of this study have been shown as a reliable measurement, this means that all items of questions used to measure each construct are reliable. Cronbach's Alpha value of each construct is very good above 0.6.

Descriptive test results of performance management practices and company size on organizational performance through innovation are as follows.

Table 1. Statistik Description Test

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Performance Management Practices	92.49	13.245	53	115
Company Size	12.38	2.303	8	15
Innovation	40.14	6.114	23	50
Organizational Performance	27.58	3.995	15	35
Valid N (list wise)				

Based on the results of research that became observations indicate that the standard deviation of all variables below the average means that the practice of performance management, company size, innovation can improve organizational performance.

The path analysis results are as follows:

Model 1

Table 2. Sub Structure Test Results 1

Variable	Regression Coefficient	Value t	Value p
Performance Management Practices	0,834	23,503	0,000*
Company Size	0,045	1,256	0,210*
R	0,845		
R square (R2)	0,713		
Value p	0,000		




Figure 2. Sub Structure 1

The first hypothesis stating that performance management practices affect innovation can be seen from the variable of performance management practices having a coefficient value of 0.834 and a significance value of 0.000 < 0.05, which means that the variable of performance management practices influences the proven innovation in this study. The second hypothesis which states that company size affects innovation can be seen from the variable company size has a coefficient value of 0.045 and a significance value of 0.210 > 0.05 which means that the company size variable has an effect on innovation not proven in this study. Based on the value of R square is 0.713 this shows that the contribution or contribution of the influence of the variable performance management practices and company size variables to innovation amounted to 71.3% while the remaining 28.7% is the contribution of other variables not included in the study. Meanwhile, the value of e1 can be found using the formula $e1 = \sqrt{1-0.713} = 0.287$.

Model 2

Table 3. Sub Structure Test Results 2

Variable	Regression Coefficient	Value t	Value p
Performance Management Practices	0,778	19,701	0,000*
Company Size	0,095	2,414	0,017*
R	0,803		
R square (R2)	0,645		
Value p	0,000		




Figure 2. Sub Structure 2

The third hypothesis which states that performance management practices affect organizational performance can be seen from the variables of performance management practices having a coefficient value of 0.778 and a significance value of $0.000 < 0.05$, which means that performance management practice variables affect organizational performance as evidenced in this study. The fourth hypothesis which states the size of the company affect the performance of the organization can be seen from the variable company size has a coefficient value of 0.095 and a significance value of $0.017 < 0.05$ which means that the variable size of the company influences the organizational performance as evidenced in this study. Based on the value of R square is 0.645 this shows that the contribution or contribution of the influence of the variable performance management practices and company size variables to organizational performance is 64.5% while the remaining 35.5% is the contribution of other variables not included in the study. While the value of e_2 can be found by the formula $e_2 = \sqrt{1 - 0.645} = 0.335$.

Model 3

Table 4. Sub Structure Test Results 3

Variable	Regression Coefficient	Value t	Value p
Innovation	0,753	17,684	0,000*
R	0,753		
R square (R2)	0,567		
Value p	0,000		




Figure 3. Sub Structure 3

The fifth hypothesis which states that innovation influences organizational performance can be seen from the innovation variable having a coefficient value of 0.753 and a significance value of $0.000 < 0.05$, which means that the innovation variable influences organizational performance is evident in this study. Based on the value of R square is 0.753 this shows that the contribution or contribution of the influence of innovation variables on organizational performance by 75.3% while the remaining 24.7% is the contribution of other variables not included in the study. While the value of e_3 can be found by the formula $e_3 = \sqrt{1 - 0,753} = 0.247$.

Model 4

Of the three sub structural models, 1,2,3 are combined into one so that the following model is obtained.




Figure 4. Structure Research Model

The sixth hypothesis which states that performance management practices affect organizational performance through innovation is known to the direct effect given by the variable performance management practices on organizational performance by 0.778. While the indirect effect of performance management variables through innovation on organizational performance is the multiplication between the beta value of the performance management practice variable on the innovation variable with the innovation beta value on the organizational performance variable ($0.834 \times 0.753 = 0.628$) so that the total effect value ($0.778 + 0.628 = 1.406$). Based on the calculation results, it is known that the value of the direct effect of performance management practice variables on organizational performance variables is smaller than the indirect effect of performance management practice variables on organizational performance through innovation. The hypothesis which states that performance management practices affect organizational performance through innovation is proven in this study.

The seventh hypothesis which states that company size affects organizational performance through innovation is known to the direct effect given by the company size variable on organizational performance by 0.095. While the indirect effect of company size variables on organizational performance is the multiplication of the beta value of company size on the innovation variable with the innovation beta value on organizational performance ($0.045 \times 0.753 = 0.033$). Obtained a total effect value ($0.95 + 0.033 = 0.128$). Based on the calculation results, it is known that the value of the direct effect of company size variables on organizational performance variables is smaller than the indirect effect of company size variables on organizational performance through innovation. The hypothesis that company size influences organizational performance through innovation is proven in this study.

Conclusion and Discussion

This study aims to describe and analyze the effect of performance management practices and company size on innovation and its impact on organizational performance. This research was carried out in 12 regional public hospitals in South Kalimantan. The results of the descriptive analysis explained that the hospital that became the observation of the research used the practice of performance management properly and correctly in accordance with organizational goals, this means that every regional public hospital in South Kalimantan had carried out the mission and vision of the hospital as outlined in clear and measurable organizational goals. Likewise, the application of incentives in the regional public hospitals that were the observations of this study, although not all hospitals apply incentives in their operational activities. The number of employees from the hospitals that were observed in this study did not affect the innovations carried out because the innovations carried out on average regional public hospitals depend on the availability of funds and the budget for innovation.

Based on the results of the path analysis it can be concluded that the performance management practices affect innovation, which means that the more optimal the organization implements performance management practices in accordance with clear and measurable organizational goals in accordance with the organization's vision and mission, it will affect the opportunities for innovation in the organization. The size of the organization which is the size of the company consisting of the number of employees, the type of hospital and the available budget is not the only reason for innovation, which means the size of the company in this study does not influence the organization to innovate. This research is in line with Verbeeten's research (2008) which shows that public sector organizations face a trade-off between achieving short-term goals such as efficiency, quantity produced and long-term goals such as quality of determination, innovation, and enthusiasm for work. It can be concluded that research in performance management practices influences innovation. Performance management practices and company size affect organizational performance. Following the Goal Setting theory that performance management practices will help organizations improve the performance of their organizations. The results of this study are in line with research by Spekle (2013) which states that performance management practices will help managers to achieve targeted outputs in performance. So that performance management practices affect organizational performance. Performance management practices make the organization focus on what must be achieved following the goals set by the organization. Likewise, the size of the company, the size of the organization will affect organizational performance. The results of this study are in line with research by Verbeeten (2008) which states that company size influences organizations to implement performance management practices and have an impact on organizational performance.

Innovation affects organizational performance which means that the more organizations implement innovation optimally, organizational performance can improve. The results of this study are in line with research by Walker (2006), Hadjimanolis (2000) and Droge and Vickrey (1994) which state that the application of innovation in organizations which is appropriate following the needs of the organization influences the organization's performance improvement.

Innovation can mediate the effect of performance management practices and company size on organizational performance, which means that the optimal application of performance management practices and company size can improve organizational performance if supported by innovation in public organizations, especially for regional public hospitals in South Kalimantan. This is supported by the results of statistics stating the value of the relationship of the direct effect of performance management practices and company size on organizational performance is smaller than the value of the indirect relationship of performance management tactics and company size on organizational performance through innovation, the hypothesis that the practice of performance management and company size is influential on organizational performance through innovation has proven in this study.

References

- Anthony, R.N. and Young, D.W. 2003, *Manajemen Control in Non-profit Organizations*, McGraw-Hill/Irwin, New York, NY.
- Bastian, Indra. 2001. *Akuntansi Sektor Publik di Indonesia*. Edisi Pertama. Yogyakarta: BPF.
- Bastian, Indra, 2006. *Akuntansi Sektor Publik, Suatu Pengantar*. Penerbit Erlangga.
- Bevan, G. and C. Hood. 2006. 'What's Measured is What Matters: Targets and Gaming in the English Public Health Care System. *Public Administration*, Vol. 84, No. 3, pp. 517-38.
- Bonner, S.E. and Sprinkle, G.B. 2002. The effects of monetary incentive on effort and task performance: theories, evidence, and a framework for research, *Accounting, Organizations and Society Journal*, Vol. 27, pp. 303-345.
- Bourne & Sekaran. 2013. *Edisi 5, Research Methods for Business A Skill Building Approach*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bruns, W.J. and Waterhouse, J.H. 1975. Budgetary control and organizational structure. *Journal of Accounting Research*, Vol. 33, pp. 177-203.
- Brickley, J., Smith, C. and Zimmerman, J. 1995, The economics of organizational architecture, *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 19-31
- Burgess, S and M. Hatto. 2003. The Role of incentives in the public sector, issues and evidence. *University of Bristol and CEPR*. Vol.7 No.1, pp.20
- Carter, N., Klein, R., Day, P. 1992. How Organisations measure success: the use of performance indicators in Government. *Routledge*. New York. USA
- Cavalluzzo, K.S., and Ittner, C.D. 2004. Implementing performance measurement innovations: Evidence From Government. *Accounting, Organizations and Society Journal*. Vol. 29 No. 3-4, pp. 243-267
- Chandrarin, Grahita. 2017. *Metode Riset Akuntansi Pendekatan Kuantitatif*. Jakarta: Salemba Empat
- Chen, S., dan R. Strange. 1998. The Determinants of Capital Structure: Evidence from Chinese Listed Companies. *Economic Change and Restructuring*. Vol. 38, pp. 11-35
- Chenhall, R.H. 2003. Management control system design within its organizational context: findings from contingency-based research and directions of the future, *Accounting, Organizations and Society Journal*, Vol. 28 No. 2-3, pp. 127-168.
- Chenhall, R.H. 2005. Integrative strategic performance measurement systems, strategic alignment of manufacturing, learning and strategic outcome: an exploratory study *Accounting, Organizations and Society Journal*, Vol. 30, pp. 395-422.

- Chin, W.W. 1998. The partial least squares approach for structural equation modeling, in Marcoulides, G.A. (Ed.), *Methodology for business and management. Modern methods for business research*. pp. 295-336. Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Choi, J.N., & Chang, J.Y. 2009. Innovation implementation in the public sector. An integration of institutional and collective dynamics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 245-253.
- De Bruijn, H. 2002. Performance measurement in the public sector: strategies to cope with the risks of performance measurement, *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, Vol. 15 Nos 7, pp. 578-594.
- De Lancer Julnes, P. and Holzer, M. 2001. Promoting the utilization of performance measures in public organizations: an empirical study of factors affecting adoption and implementation, *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 61 No. 6, pp. 693-708.
- Dewatripont, M., Jewitt, I. and Tirole, J. 1999. The economics of career concern, part II: application to missions and accountability of government agencies, *Review of Economic Studies*, Vol. 66, pp. 199-217.
- Dixit, A. 1997. Power of incentives in private versus public organizations, *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, Vol. 87, pp. 378-382.
- Droge, C. & Vickrey, Shawnee. 1994. Source and Outcomes of Competitive Advantage: An Exploratory Study in The Furniture Industry. *Journal of The Decision Sciences Institute*. Vol. 25 No. 5-6, pp. 669-689.
- Dunk, A.S. and Lysons, A.F. 1997. An analysis of departmental effectiveness, participative budgetary control processes and environmental dimensionality within the competing values framework: a public sector study, *Financial Accountability and Management*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 1-15.
- Fontana. 2009. *Innovate We Can! Manajemen inovasi dan Penciptaan Nilai*. PT. Gramedia Widiasarana Indonesia, Jakarta
- Gray, A. and Jenkins, B. 1995. From public administration to public management; reassessing a revolution?, *Public Administration*. Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 75-99.
- Grelling, D. 2005. Performance Measurement In Public Sector, The German Experience, *International Journal Of Productivity and Performance Management*, Vol. 54 No.7, pp. 551-567
- Gupta, P.P., Dirsmith, M.W. and Fogarty, T.J. 1994. Coordination and control in a government agency: contingency and institutional theory perspectives on GAO audits, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 39, pp. 264-284.
- Guthrie, J., dan R. Petty. 2000. Intellectual capital: Australian annual reporting practices. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 1469-1930.
- Hadjimanolis, Athanasios, 2000, *An Investigation of Innovation Antecedents in Small Firms in the Context of Small Developing Country*, *R&D Management*, Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 235-245.
- Hair, J.F. Jr, Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L. and Black, W.C. 1998. *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 5th ed., Prentice-Hall International, London.
- Han, Jin, K., Kim, N., and Srivastava, R.K. 1998. Market Orientation and Organizational Performance: Is Innovation a Missing Link? *Journal of Marketing*. Vol 62, pp. 30-45
- Heinrich, C. 2002, Outcomes-based performance management in the public sector: implication for government accountability and effectiveness. *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 62 No. 6, pp. 712-25.
- Hood, C. 1995. The New Public Management in the 1980s: variations on a theme, Accounting, *Organizations and Society Journal*. Vol. 20. H.93-109.
- Hyndman, N. and Eden, R. 2000. A study of the coordination of mission, objectives and targets in UK executive agencies, *Management Accounting Research*, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 175-191.

- Ittner, C.D. and Larcker, D.F. 2001. Assessing empirical research in managerial accounting: a value-based management perspective, *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, Vol. 32, No. 1-3, pp. 349-410.
- Jenkins, G.D. Jr, Mitra, A., Gupta, N. and Shaw, J.D. 1998. Are financial incentives related to performance? A meta-analytic review of empirical research, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 83 No. 5, pp. 777-87.
- Kaplan, Robert, S., & Norton, David, P. 2001. *The Strategy Focused Organization: How Balanced Scorecard Companies Thrive in the New Business Environment*, Massachusetts, Harvard Business School Press
- Klout, L., And Martin, J. 2000. Strategic Performance Management: A Balanced Approach To Performance Management Issues In Local Government. *Management Accounting Research*. Vol. 11 No.2, pp 231-251.
- Kravchuk, R.S. and Schack, R.W. 1996. Designing Effective Performance-Measurement Systems under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993. *Public Administration Review* 348-358.
- Lapsley, I 1999. Accounting and the new public management: instruments of substantive efficiency or rationalizing modernity?, *Financial Accountability and Management*, Vol. 15 Nos 3-4, pp. 201-7.
- Latham, G.P. 2004. The motivational benefits of goal-setting, *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 126-9.
- Lawless, M.W., and Anderson, P.C. 1996. Generating Technological Change: Effect of innovation and Loyal rivalry on Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*. 39, pp. 1185-1217.
- Locke, E.A. 2004. Linking goals to monetary incentives, *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 130-3.
- Locke, E.A. and Latham, G.P. 1990. *A Theory of Goal Setting and Task Performance*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood-Cliffs, NJ.
- Mahmudi, 2005. *Manajemen Kinerja Sektor Publik*. Yogyakarta : UPP AMPYKPN.
- Mahsun, Moh. 2006. *Pengukuran Kinerja Sektor Publik*. Yogyakarta BPFE, UGM
- Mardiasmo. 2012. *Akuntansi Sektor Publik*. Yogyakarta, Andi Offset
- Merchant, K.A. and Van der Stede, W.A. 2003. *Management Control Systems: Pearson Education*, Harlow
- Merchant, K.A. and Van der Stede, W.A. 2007. *Management Control Systems: Performance Measurement, Evaluation and Incentives*, 2nd ed., Prentice-Hall, Harlow.
- Merchant, K.A., Van der Stede, W.A. and Zheng, L. 2003. Disciplinary constraints on the advancement of knowledge: the case of organizational incentive systems, *Accounting, Organizations and Society Journal*, Vol. 28 No. 2- 3, pp. 251-286.
- Mulyadi dan Setiawan, J. 2007. *Sistem Perencanaan dan Pengendalian Manajemen*. Cetakan ke 2. Yogyakarta: Aditya Media.
- Newberry, S. 2002. Intended or unintended consequences? Resource erosion in New Zealand's government departments, *Financial Accountability and Management*, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 309-330.
- Newberry, S. and Pallot, J. 2004. Freedom or coercion? NPM incentives in New Zealand central government departments, *Management Accounting Research*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 247-266.
- Newberry, S. and Pallot, J. 2005. A wolf in sheep's clothing? Wider consequences of the financial management system of the New Zealand central government, *Financial Accountability and Management*, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 263-277.
- Newberry, S. and Pallot, J. 2006. New Zealand's financial management system: implications for democracy, *Public Money and Management*, Vol. 26 No. 4, pp. 221-8.

- Nordiawan, Deddi. 2009. *Akuntansi Pemerintahan*. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
- Osborne, David, and Ted Gaebler. 1992. *Reinventing Government: How The Entrepreneur Spirit is Transforming The Public Service*, terjemahan : Mewirusahaakan Birokrasi Mentransformasikan Semangat Wirausaha ke Dalam Sektor Publik. Alih Bahasa Abdul Rosyid dan Ramelan. Jakarta :Pustaka Binaman Pressindo.
- O'Donnell, O. 2006. *Innovation in the Irish Public Sector*. CPMR Discussion Paper. Retrieved from <http://edoc.vifapol.de/>
- Otley, D. 1999. Performance Management: a Framework for Management Control Systems Research, *Management Accounting Research*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 363-382.
- Otley, D. and Pollanen, R.M. 2000. Budgetary Criteria in Performance Evaluation a Critical Appraisal Using New Evidence, Accounting, *Organizations and Society Journal*, Vol. 25 Nos 4-5, pp. 483-496.
- Propper, C. and Wilson, D. 2003. The Use and Usefulness of Performance Measures in the Public Sector, *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 250-265
- Rakhmat, Jalaluddin. 2005. *Psikologi Komunikasi Edisi Revisi*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya
- Rangan, V.K. 2004. Lofty Missions, Down-to-earth Plans, *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 82 No. 3, pp. 112-9.
- Rodgers, R. and Hunter, J.E. 1991. Impact of Management by Objectives on Organizational Productivity, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 76 No. 2, pp. 322-36.
- Rogers, E.M., 2003. *Diffusion of Innovation 5th edition*. Free Press. New York
- Rolland F. Spekle, 2013. The Use of Performance Measurement System in the Public Sector: Effects on Performance. *Management Accounting Reseach*. Vol. 25, pp. 131-146
- Roste, R. (2004). *Studies of Innovation in the Public Sector , a literature review*. PUBLIN research project. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/>
- Sanusi, Anwar. 2011. *Metodologi Penelitian Bisnis*, Salemba Empat
- Setiyadi. 2007. *Pengaruh Company Size, Profitability, dan Institutional Ownership terhadap CSR Disclousure*. Jurnal Ekonomi. Bandung: Universitas Padjajaran.
- Sunarto dan Budi, Agus Prasetyo. 2009. Pengaruh Leverage, Ukuran Dan Pertumbuhan Perusahaan Terhadap Profitabilitas. *Telaah Manajemen*. Vol 6 Edisi 1, hal 86 -103.
- United Nations, 2005. *Innovations in the Public Sector: Compendium of Best Practices*. UNDESA. New York.
- Verbeeten, Frank, H.M, 2008. Performance Management Practices in Public Sector Organizations. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*. Vol. 21. No. 3, pp. 427-454.
- Walker, R. M., Jeanes, E., and Rowlands, R. 2002. Measuring Innovation – Applying the Literature-based Innovation Output Indicator to Public Services. *Public Administration*. Vol. 80 No. 1, pp. 201-214.
- Walker, R. 2006. Innovation Type and Diffusion: An Empirical Analysis of Local Government. *Public Administration*. Vol. 84 No. 2, pp. 311-35.