



ADAPTIVE LEADERSHIP STRATEGIES FOR ADDRESSING EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE BARRIERS: A QUALITATIVE CASE STUDY OF KESBANGPOL MAJALENGKA REGENCY

Eli Dahlia^{1*}, Vina Andita Pratiwi², Idah Wahidah³

Emi Amelia⁴, Tia Aprilia Susnita⁵

Institut Budi Utomo Nasional Majalengka^{1,2,3,4,5}

elidahlia19041982@gmail.com^{1*}, vinaandita4@gmail.com², iwahidah123@gmail.com³

emiamelia912.ea@gmail.com⁴, tiasusnita@gmail.com⁵

Abstract

Purpose: This study explores how leaders at the National Unity and Politics Agency (Kesbangpol) of Majalengka Regency address employee performance barriers in a resource-constrained public-sector setting.

Research Methodology: A descriptive qualitative case-study design was used. Data were generated through 12 semi-structured interview sessions with six purposively selected informants, passive observation, and document review. The data were coded, condensed, displayed in a thematic matrix, and interpreted using the interactive analysis model of Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña. Source triangulation compared accounts across leadership levels with relevant organizational documents.

Results: Three interconnected barriers were identified: uneven digital competence, dual workloads arising from limited personnel, and declining motivation during budget rationalization. Leaders responded through adaptive task-direction and support, peer-learning pairs, short daily coordination briefings, and inclusive, family-oriented communication. Participants perceived these practices as reducing uncertainty, redistributing work, and supporting timely completion of reporting tasks.

Limitations: The single-case design, reliance on participant accounts, and bounded observation period limit transferability and preclude causal claims about performance improvement.

Contribution: The study develops a context-sensitive explanation of how situational and inclusive leadership practices can mobilize relational and learning resources when public organizations face simultaneous capability, workload, and motivational constraints.

Keywords: *adaptive leadership; employee performance; inclusive leadership; Kesbangpol; public-sector management; situational leadership*



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

1. INTRODUCTION

Public organizations are expected to sustain service continuity and administrative accountability even when staffing, budgets, and technical capability are constrained. This challenge is especially pronounced in agencies whose work combines routine administration with time-sensitive coordination of social and political conditions. Kesbangpol of Majalengka Regency is one such agency. Its operational responsibilities require employees to coordinate information, prepare reports, monitor developments, and respond to activities that may arise outside regular schedules. In this setting, employee performance is not solely an individual matter; it is shaped by how leaders interpret constraints, assign work, create opportunities to learn, and maintain collective motivation.

Digital transformation intensifies this leadership task. Public-sector digitalization involves organizational, cultural, and relational change rather than the mere replacement of paper processes with electronic systems (Mergel et al., 2019). Recent public-management research similarly distinguishes strategic leadership for digital transformation from operational leadership that guides employees and work processes (van Roekel et al., 2025). Where employees have uneven familiarity with reporting applications, a leader must combine task clarity with developmental support. Yet leadership research often examines these relationships through cross-sectional surveys that estimate the general association between a leadership style and performance. Such designs are useful, but they say less about the concrete practices leaders use when several obstacles occur together in a particular public organization.

The case examined here demonstrates this practical and theoretical problem. Preliminary field engagement identified three linked difficulties: some senior employees required assistance with web-based reporting; limited staff in strategic units had to combine administrative and field responsibilities; and work motivation was pressured by workload and budget rationalization. Treating these as isolated individual deficits would conceal their organizational interdependence. Digital competence affects reporting speed; workload affects employees' capacity to learn; and uncertainty about task distribution can weaken motivation. Leadership is therefore examined as an adaptive process through which the organization coordinates scarce human, informational, and relational resources.

This study addresses a contextual gap in public-sector human-capital research. First, studies of situational leadership commonly focus on outcome associations rather than on the practical sequence through which leaders diagnose readiness and tailor direction or support. Second, inclusive leadership research has established the importance of accessibility, openness, and employee voice (Randel et al., 2018), but its role in managing dual workloads and intergenerational digital learning in local government remains underexplored. Third, studies of public-sector digital transformation emphasize system adoption and organizational drivers, but less often connect digital capability gaps with day-to-day leadership routines in smaller local agencies.

Accordingly, the study asks: (1) What employee performance barriers are experienced at Kesbangpol Majalengka Regency? (2) How do leaders respond to these barriers in their daily management practices? and (3) How do participants interpret the contribution of these practices to work coordination, learning, and motivation? The study does not test causal effects or claim statistical generalization. Instead, it offers an analytically transferable account of leadership practices in a bounded public-sector case. Its contribution is a three-part

explanation: adaptive direction and support address capability uncertainty; inclusive coordination manages work-distribution uncertainty; and relational communication sustains motivation under resource pressure.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND PROPOSITION DEVELOPMENT

A. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Leadership as an adaptive and relational resource in public organizations

Situational leadership proposes that effective leadership depends on fitting directive and supportive behaviors to followers' competence and commitment in relation to a specific task. The central analytical value of this perspective is not a universal claim that one style is superior; it is the expectation that leaders diagnose task-specific readiness and vary their response. In public organizations, this is relevant because employees can be highly capable in substantive duties while needing support in newly digitized reporting procedures or unfamiliar cross-unit assignments. The present study uses situational leadership as a sensitizing lens: it guides attention to how leaders diagnose a barrier, choose a response, and adjust the balance between direction and support.

Inclusive leadership complements this lens. Inclusive leaders are visible, accessible, and available, and create conditions in which employees can speak up and contribute to decisions (Randel et al., 2018). Prior evidence indicates that inclusive leadership can strengthen voice and team performance through a caring ethical climate (Javed et al., 2017). In a constrained agency, inclusion has an operational meaning: employees closest to the work can clarify duplicated assignments, identify practical bottlenecks, and jointly develop feasible task allocations. Inclusive leadership should therefore be assessed not only as a favorable interpersonal style but as a mechanism for converting dispersed employee knowledge into coordinated action.

A third relevant lens concerns learning and digital capability. Organizational digital transformation requires more than technical infrastructure: employees must be supported to learn new routines, interpret changing digital workflows, and seek help without fear of embarrassment. Public managers have a significant role in building this capacity while also attending to public-value and accountability obligations (van Roekel et al., 2025). Peer learning is particularly relevant when formal training is scarce, because it allows situated assistance around a specific work task. Its value, however, depends on leadership practices that legitimize reciprocal help rather than defining a competence gap as an individual failure.

This interpretation is also supported by adjacent streams of research. Digital transformation is understood as a strategic organizational change with implications for structures, roles, and relationships (Vial, 2019; Cordella & Tempini, 2015). Public-sector change research shows that leaders influence change outcomes by communicating purpose, creating readiness, and enabling participation (Fernandez & Rainey, 2006; Kuipers et al., 2014; van der Voet, 2014). At the team level, leader inclusiveness and psychological safety shape whether employees feel able to ask questions, admit uncertainty, and offer work-relevant input (Nembhard & Edmondson, 2006; Edmondson, 1999). Employee voice is consequential because leadership behavior can determine whether operational concerns are expressed rather than withheld (Detert & Burris, 2007). Together, these studies justify examining mentoring, briefings, and accessible communication as connected practices rather than isolated interventions.

B. CONCEPTUAL PROPOSITION

The propositions below are not hypotheses for statistical testing. They provide an analytical frame for interpreting a qualitative case and for examining whether the evidence shows the proposed mechanisms in context.

Proposition 1. When leaders diagnose task-specific capability differences and combine clear direction with developmental support, employees are more able to engage with unfamiliar digital reporting tasks.

Proposition 2. When leaders create accessible, brief, and participatory coordination routines, employees can surface workload conflicts and negotiate task allocation before duplication or delay occurs.

Proposition 3. When leaders legitimize peer mentoring and non-punitive help-seeking, informal learning can convert distributed digital capability into a shared operational resource.

Proposition 4. When leaders use respectful and culturally resonant communication while acknowledging resource constraints, employees are more likely to maintain psychological connection to the organization; this proposition concerns participant perceptions, not measured motivational effects.

Table 1: Informant Profile and Contribution to the Analysis

Role	Number	Primary contribution
Agency head	1	Leadership rationale, strategic response, and communication approach
Secretary	1	Managerial coordination, staffing, and reporting arrangements
Division heads	2	Unit workload, field-administration interaction, and task allocation
Operational staff	2	Experience of digital learning, briefings, workload, and leadership support

Source: Prepared by the authors from interviews, observations, and internal documents.

METHOD**Research design and case context**

This research employed a descriptive qualitative case-study design. The design was selected because the research questions concern how leadership practices are enacted and interpreted within a naturally occurring organizational setting (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The case was Kesbangpol of Majalengka Regency, West Java, Indonesia. The agency's context is appropriate for examining adaptive leadership because its work combines formal administrative obligations, field-related coordination, and the need to respond to changing local socio-political conditions. The study treats the agency as a bounded case and does not claim that its findings represent all Indonesian local-government organizations.

Informants and data sources

Purposive sampling was used to recruit informants with direct knowledge of leadership practices, operational constraints, and their consequences for work. Six informants participated:

the agency head, the secretary, two division heads, and two operational staff members. The inclusion of multiple hierarchical positions was intended to capture both leadership intent and staff experience. For confidentiality, the manuscript uses role-based descriptions and does not disclose personal identifiers. Data generation concluded after the sixth informant because subsequent accounts repeated the central categories of digital capability, workload, coordination, mentoring, and motivation. This is interpreted as adequate information power for this focused case, rather than as a numerical rule for qualitative saturation.

Data collection

Data were generated through 12 semi-structured interview sessions, two with each informant. Interviews lasted approximately 45–60 minutes and explored: perceived performance barriers; changes in work routines; leadership responses; coordination practices; learning support; and the perceived consequences of these practices. Interviews were complemented by passive participatory observation of daily work activities, leadership directives, staff interaction, and morning coordination briefings. The researcher did not participate in agency operations. Observation notes were recorded systematically after each observation. Documentary sources included employee performance targets (SKP), attendance records, activity reports, and minutes from daily coordination meetings. The integration of interviews, observations, and documents provided a basis for checking convergence and divergence among sources.

Data analysis and trustworthiness

Analysis followed the interactive model of data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification (Miles et al., 2020). First, interview and observation material was read repeatedly and condensed into meaning units relevant to barriers, leadership responses, and perceived consequences. Second, initial codes were compared across participants and grouped into categories. Third, categories were organized in a matrix that linked raw evidence with interpreted themes. Finally, provisional interpretations were checked against documentary evidence and accounts from participants occupying different roles. This procedure did not seek a count of opinions; it sought an explanation that was coherent across data sources while preserving differences in position and experience. The process drew on the reflexive logic of thematic analysis, in which codes are developed and refined in relation to the research question rather than treated as self-evident facts (Braun & Clarke, 2021).

Trustworthiness was pursued through source triangulation, transparent role-based anonymization, and the preservation of an evidence-to-theme chain in the analysis matrix. These procedures are consistent with the credibility, dependability, and transferability criteria associated with naturalistic inquiry (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The study also distinguishes participant perceptions from independently measured performance outcomes. This distinction is important because a qualitative case can explain how practices are experienced and enacted, but cannot establish that the practices caused subsequent performance change. Transferability is supported by thick contextual description; readers should judge the applicability of the findings to comparable settings.

The number of informants was evaluated in relation to the narrow study aim, participant specificity, and depth of the two interview rounds rather than by applying a universal numerical threshold. Methodological research distinguishes code saturation from meaning saturation and

cautions that adequate qualitative sample size depends on study design and information richness (Hennink et al., 2017). The present design is therefore appropriate for a focused explanatory case, while its limits are acknowledged in the conclusion.

The analytic process was iterative rather than strictly linear. During data condensation, statements about difficulties with reporting applications, field assignments, coordination, and motivation were retained when they helped answer the research questions. Statements unrelated to the relationship between leadership practices and employee performance barriers were not carried forward into the thematic matrix. The researchers then compared whether a proposed category appeared in more than one type of evidence. For example, the digital capability category was supported by a staff interview, observation of assistance during document uploading, and the leadership response described by the secretary. This cross-source comparison reduced the risk of treating a single account as a case-wide conclusion.

Negative or limiting evidence was also considered in interpretation. The daily briefing did not eliminate the underlying shortage of personnel, and mentoring did not demonstrate that all digital skill differences had disappeared. Likewise, participant accounts of motivation did not constitute a direct measure of employee engagement or performance. Rather than omitting these limits, the analysis treats them as boundaries on the claim. The resulting interpretation is deliberately modest: the practices provided workable mechanisms for coordinating around constraints, while the structural constraints themselves remained. This approach aligns with qualitative quality criteria that emphasize credibility, dependability, and transparent linkage between data and claims (Nowell et al., 2017).

The research team maintained a role-sensitive stance in reading the material. Accounts from the agency head and secretary were useful for understanding the intended rationale of leadership practices, whereas accounts from division heads and operational staff were particularly important for assessing how those practices were experienced in daily work. Documentary sources served a different function: they did not prove the subjective meaning of leadership, but they corroborated the existence of coordination routines and the organizational relevance of reporting responsibilities. The analysis therefore did not privilege one source uncritically; it used each source according to what it could reasonably support.

Table 2: Evidence-to-Theme Analytical Chain

Evidence pattern	Initial codes	Category	Interpretive theme
Senior staff sought assistance to use web-based reporting applications.	Difficulty with application; help-seeking; changing workflow	Digital capability gap	Adaptive support for task-specific capability
Staff combined administrative and field duties before political activities.	Overlapping work; limited staffing; time pressure	Dual workload	Inclusive coordination of scarce human resources
Junior staff assisted senior colleagues in small work groups.	Peer assistance; mentoring; non-punitive learning	Peer-learning practice	Distributed capability as an operational resource
Briefings allowed staff to discuss	Employee input; accessible leader;	Participatory communication	Relational support under resource pressure

Evidence pattern	Initial codes	Category	Interpretive theme
allocation and leaders used family-oriented communication.	psychological connection		

Source: Prepared by the authors from interviews, observations, and internal documents

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. RESULTS

Digital capability as a task-specific performance barrier

The first theme concerns uneven capability in digital reporting tasks. Participants did not describe senior employees as generally unable to perform their jobs. Rather, the difficulty was task-specific: changing web-based workflows required some employees to request assistance when uploading activity reports. One staff participant explained, "The most significant challenge was the transition from manual systems to web-based reporting applications. Those of us who are older found it somewhat overwhelming to keep up with the constantly changing digital data-entry workflows" (Staff Member A, interview, April 12, 2026). Observation notes from April 15, 2026 similarly recorded occasions in which senior staff consulted younger colleagues while preparing uploads.

This finding matters because it frames the issue as a transition in work practice rather than a fixed personal deficit. Employees' established administrative knowledge remained valuable, while a newly required digital routine created an immediate support need. The agency head did not respond primarily through reprimand or withdrawal of responsibility. Instead, leadership initiated small working groups in which digitally proficient junior staff directly assisted senior colleagues. The secretary explained, "We did not immediately reprimand employees who struggled with technology. Leadership directed the formation of small working groups, where young, IT-literate staff directly assisted their senior colleagues in completing reporting tasks" (Office Secretary, interview, April 28, 2026).

The evidence supports Proposition 1 and Proposition 3 at the level of process. Leaders recognized that the relevant readiness difference concerned a particular task and created a form of developmental support. The peer-learning arrangement also made capability available at the point of work, rather than waiting for a formal training program. Participants perceived the arrangement as reducing reluctance to ask for help and enabling reporting work to continue. The finding does not establish the magnitude of any productivity improvement, but it shows how a leadership response can transform a localized skill difference into an opportunity for reciprocal learning.

Dual workload and the need for participatory coordination

The second theme concerns workload accumulation in units with limited personnel. Division-level informants described periods before political events in which field monitoring responsibilities increased while administrative reporting continued. The head of the Ideology Division stated: "Staffing in our division is very limited, yet the frequency of field monitoring activities rises sharply as election stages approach. Consequently, individuals are forced to

handle both administrative and field duties simultaneously" (interview, April 22, 2026). This account indicates a structural constraint rather than a lack of employee commitment.

Leadership responded with short daily tactical briefings and opportunities for staff to contribute to task allocation. An operational staff participant described the practice as follows: "Every morning before heading out to the field, we always hold a 10-minute briefing. The Head of the Office allows us to provide input on task allocation to prevent work from piling up on just one person" (Operational Staff Member B, interview, May 5, 2026). Attendance sheets and meeting minutes provided documentary support that these coordination sessions were routinely held during the observation period.

The analytical significance of the briefing is not its duration but its timing and accessibility. A brief, recurring forum allows workload conflicts to be raised before employees depart for field activities or duplicate administrative tasks. It also turns employees' operational knowledge into an input for leader decision-making. Thus, the evidence supports Proposition 2: inclusive coordination served as a practical mechanism for identifying overlap and redistributing scarce attention. It should not be interpreted as a complete solution to staffing shortages; participants still reported pressure during peak periods. Instead, the routine reduced uncertainty about who would perform which task and provided a basis for more transparent allocation.

Relational communication and perceived motivational support

The third theme concerns motivation amid workload pressure and budget rationalization. Participants described a risk that repeated deadlines, field work, and resource limitations could weaken enthusiasm. The response reported by informants combined formal direction with an informal, persuasive communication style. The agency head stated: "A family-like approach using local language and sitting together has proven to be more effective in dissolving employee psychological barriers than rigid formal instructions" (interview, May 10, 2026). The phrase does not imply that formal rules were abandoned. Rather, it describes a complementary relational practice through which leaders made space for discussion, acknowledgment, and encouragement.

This theme supports Proposition 4 cautiously. Participants associated approachable communication with a stronger sense of belonging and greater willingness to continue working through constraints. The data do not include a validated motivation scale, absenteeism trend, or pre-post performance measure; consequently, the appropriate claim is that relational communication was perceived as motivational support. This restraint is substantively important. In public management, leaders must not use informal warmth as a substitute for fair workload design, adequate capability development, or accountable procedures. In this case, the relational approach was meaningful because it operated alongside mentoring and daily coordination rather than replacing them.

Table 3: Themes, Leadership Practices, and Bounded Interpretations

Performance barrier	Observed leadership practice	Participant-perceived contribution	Bounded interpretation
Uneven digital reporting capability	Peer-learning pairs and mentoring	Lowered reluctance to ask for help; continued report completion	Shows a learning mechanism; does not measure

Performance barrier	Observed leadership practice	Participant-perceived contribution	Bounded interpretation
Dual workload and limited personnel	Daily tactical briefing and participatory allocation	Earlier identification of overlap and clearer assignment	productivity gain Supports coordination; does not remove structural staffing shortage
Motivational pressure amid budget rationalization	Accessible, persuasive, family-oriented communication	Sense of being heard and organizational connection	Reports perceived support; does not demonstrate causal motivational effect

Source: Prepared by the authors from interviews, observations, and internal documents.

B. DISCUSSION

The findings extend the situational leadership lens by showing that adaptation can be observed as a sequence of diagnosis, response, and resource mobilization. The digital competence gap was not treated as a generalized characteristic of senior staff; it was interpreted as a task-specific challenge associated with a changing reporting system. The leadership response combined task direction—ensuring that reporting obligations were completed—with supportive behavior—creating peer-learning pairs. This is consistent with the premise that leadership effectiveness depends on matching behavior to the demands of a specific task rather than applying a single fixed style. It also resonates with public-sector digital transformation research, which emphasizes that leadership must guide employees through organizational changes accompanying new technologies (Mergel et al., 2019; van Roekel et al., 2025).

The study further clarifies the role of inclusive leadership under staffing constraints. Prior research conceptualizes inclusive leadership as visible, accessible, and available, and links it to employee voice and a climate in which people can contribute (Randel et al., 2018; Javed et al., 2017). In the present case, these relational qualities were translated into a specific operational routine: the daily tactical briefing. The briefing enabled staff to identify clashes between field and administrative duties before work was assigned. This indicates that inclusive leadership can be understood not only as a climate-building practice but also as a micro-coordination capability. When resources are scarce, the value of inclusion lies partly in increasing the quality and timeliness of information available for allocation decisions.

Peer mentoring emerged as the bridge between adaptive and inclusive leadership. It was adaptive because support was matched to a defined capability requirement; it was inclusive because assistance was organized in a non-punitive manner that acknowledged the value of both junior and senior employees. This finding is relevant for human-capital management in public organizations, where formal training may be limited by timing, cost, or availability. Peer learning should not replace systematic capability development, but it can provide an immediate, task-embedded response while formal development is being planned. A practical implication is that managers should make peer-learning roles explicit, allocate time for assistance, and prevent mentoring from becoming an unrecognized additional burden for junior employees.

The relational communication theme adds a boundary condition to the interpretation. The family-oriented approach was valued by participants because it appeared alongside concrete coordination and learning practices. Without those practices, warmth alone could be experienced as symbolic rather than supportive. The finding therefore refines the interpretation of leadership under budget rationalization: communication can sustain psychological connection when it honestly recognizes constraints, invites employee input, and is paired with observable action. This interpretation is compatible with research that places psychological safety at the center of inclusive leadership and employee involvement (Carmeli et al., 2010). For public organizations, culturally resonant communication must remain compatible with procedural fairness, role clarity, and formal accountability, especially because change recipients may respond differently to the same organizational intervention (Oreg et al., 2011).

The study makes three contributions. Theoretically, it integrates situational and inclusive leadership around a common problem: how leaders mobilize human and relational resources when capability, workload, and motivation constraints interact. Empirically, it offers a detailed local-government case from Indonesia, a setting underrepresented in the international public-sector leadership literature. Practically, it identifies a low-cost package of actions: diagnose task-specific barriers, establish peer-learning arrangements, hold short allocation-focused briefings, and use respectful communication that permits employees to surface difficulty. The package should be adapted, not copied mechanically, because the appropriate balance of direction, participation, and support depends on organizational mandate, employee readiness, and available resources.

The case also has implications for how employee performance is interpreted in qualitative public-management research. Performance is often discussed as though it were a stable individual attribute. The evidence in this study instead suggests that performance barriers are relational and situational. A staff member who can complete a substantive assignment may encounter delay when a reporting application changes; a division that performs effectively during routine periods may experience overload before a political event; and employees who remain committed can still experience motivational strain when resource pressure persists. Leadership matters because it influences whether these conditions are named, shared, and addressed collectively. This interpretation is compatible with research that treats digital transformation as organizational change and not merely technology implementation (Mergel et al., 2019).

The study should therefore not be read as an endorsement of informal solutions alone. Peer mentoring and family-oriented communication were useful in the present case because they were linked to concrete work routines: the mentoring occurred around actual reporting tasks, and the communication was embedded in daily coordination. A responsible implementation requires safeguards. Leaders should monitor whether mentoring time is recognized in work allocation, whether employees have access to formal training when needed, and whether decisions in informal briefings are documented sufficiently to preserve accountability. These safeguards are particularly important in public organizations, where responsiveness to employees must coexist with procedural fairness and transparent administration.

An additional contribution is the distinction between resource constraints and leadership failure. Limited personnel and budget rationalization are organizational conditions that a unit

leader may not be able to remove. Nevertheless, leaders retain discretion over how visible those conditions become, how tasks are prioritized, and whether employees can contribute local knowledge to immediate solutions. The present findings indicate that short, recurring briefings can act as a low-cost coordination infrastructure. Such routines are likely to be most valuable where work conditions change quickly and employees are required to move between field responsibilities and administrative reporting. Their value lies in preventing avoidable duplication, not in demanding that employees absorb unlimited workload.

The evidence also adds nuance to intergenerational discussions of digital competence. The reported difficulty was associated with adaptation to changing applications, but the analysis does not attribute it to age as a deterministic cause. Senior employees may possess institutional memory, substantive expertise, and stakeholder knowledge that are valuable to the agency; junior employees may be more familiar with a particular platform. The peer-learning practice created a reciprocal relationship in which digital know-how could be shared without devaluing other forms of experience. This provides a more constructive frame for leadership than a deficit narrative and is consistent with inclusive leadership's emphasis on belongingness and value for uniqueness (Randel et al., 2018).

For policy and management practice, four actions follow. First, agencies should map task-specific capability needs before assigning generic digital training. Second, leaders should institutionalize short coordination routines during high-demand periods, with clear records of agreed allocations. Third, peer mentoring should be supported with explicit role expectations, recognition, and time allowances. Fourth, leaders should communicate constraints candidly while ensuring that relational communication is accompanied by fair workload decisions. These recommendations are proportionate to the evidence: they derive from an in-depth case and should be piloted and evaluated in other local-government contexts rather than treated as universal prescriptions.

Finally, the findings suggest a future research agenda. Comparative studies could examine whether the same adaptive practices operate differently in agencies with larger staff complements, stronger digital infrastructure, or more formalized human-resource systems. Longitudinal designs could connect changes in mentoring and coordination routines to documentary indicators such as report timeliness, backlog, absenteeism, or service-quality assessments. Mixed-methods work could test whether psychological safety, employee voice, or role clarity mediate relationships between inclusive leadership and work outcomes. Such research would retain the contextual insight of the present case while extending its explanatory reach.

CONCLUSION

This study examined how leadership at Kesbangpol Majalengka Regency addressed employee performance barriers in a resource-constrained public-sector setting. The analysis identified three interconnected barriers: uneven digital competence in web-based reporting, dual workload associated with limited personnel, and motivational pressure during budget rationalization. Leaders responded through a combination of situational task support, peer mentoring, daily participatory briefings, and relational communication. The evidence indicates that these practices were experienced as mechanisms that reduced uncertainty, enabled help-seeking, improved coordination of assignments, and supported organizational connection.

The study's principal contribution is a context-sensitive explanation of adaptive leadership as resource mobilization. Effective leadership in this case did not consist of a single leadership style. It consisted of aligning support with a specific task, turning distributed employee capability into a shared learning resource, and creating brief forums where operational knowledge could shape allocation decisions. The findings are transferable analytically to comparable public organizations facing simultaneous digital-transition and staffing constraints, but they are not statistically generalizable.

Several limitations should guide interpretation. The study is based on one agency, six informants, a bounded observation period, and participants' accounts. It did not independently measure employee performance, motivation, or the long-term effectiveness of the leadership practices. Future studies could use multi-site comparative designs, include documentary performance indicators over time, examine mentoring burdens and gender or generation dynamics, and test whether psychological safety mediates the relationship between inclusive coordination and employee voice in local government.

In applying the lessons of this case, managers should retain this balance: supportive relationships can enable adaptation, but sustainable performance ultimately requires transparent priorities, adequate capability development, and fair distribution of work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The study used role-based anonymization and does not report names or other direct personal identifiers. Before submission, the corresponding author must confirm that all interview participants provided informed consent and that the study complied with the applicable institutional and organizational ethics requirements. This statement must be amended to reflect the authors' verified approval or exemption record. Thankyou for kesbangpol Majalengka.

The authors should state the verified source of financial support for this study, or declare that the research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

The authors should confirm the absence or presence of any financial, professional, or personal interests that could be perceived as influencing the research.

DECLARATION ON THE USE OF AI-ASSISTED TECHNOLOGIES

The authors should disclose any AI-assisted technologies used in manuscript preparation, including the tool name, purpose, and the portions of the manuscript affected. The authors remain responsible for the accuracy, originality, and integrity of all submitted content, including text, references, tables, and interpretations.

REFERENCES

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). Thematic analysis: A practical guide. SAGE Publications.
- Carmeli, A., Reiter-Palmon, R., & Ziv, E. (2010). Inclusive leadership and employee involvement in creative tasks in the workplace: The mediating role of psychological safety. *Creativity Research Journal*, 22(3), 250–260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2010.504654>

- Cordella, A., & Tempini, N. (2015). E-government and organizational change: Reappraising the role of ICT and bureaucracy in public service delivery. *Government Information Quarterly*, 32(3), 279–286. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2015.03.005>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Detert, J. R., & Burris, E. R. (2007). Leadership behavior and employee voice: Is the door really open? *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4), 869–884. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.26279183>
- Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999>
- Fernandez, S., & Rainey, H. G. (2006). Managing successful organizational change in the public sector. *Public Administration Review*, 66(2), 168–176. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00570.x>
- Hennink, M. M., Kaiser, B. N., & Marconi, V. C. (2017). Code saturation versus meaning saturation: How many interviews are enough? *Qualitative Health Research*, 27(4), 591–608. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732316665344>
- Kuipers, B. S., Higgs, M., Kickert, W., Tummers, L., Grandia, J., & Van der Voet, J. (2014). The management of change in public organizations: A literature review. *Public Administration*, 92(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12040>
- Javed, B., Naqvi, S. M. M. R., Khan, A. K., Arjoon, S., & Tayyeb, H. H. (2017). Impact of inclusive leadership on innovative work behavior: The role of psychological safety. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 25(1), 117–136. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2017.3>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications.
- Mergel, I., Edelmann, N., & Haug, N. (2019). Defining digital transformation: Results from expert interviews. *Government Information Quarterly*, 36(4), 101385. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2019.06.002>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2020). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847>
- Nembhard, I. M., & Edmondson, A. C. (2006). Making it safe: The effects of leader inclusiveness and professional status on psychological safety and improvement efforts in health care teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(7), 941–966. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.413>
- Oreg, S., Vakola, M., & Armenakis, A. (2011). Change recipients' reactions to organizational change: A 60-year review of quantitative studies. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 47(4), 461–524. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886310396550>
- Randel, A. E., Galvin, B. M., Shore, L. M., Ehrhart, K. H., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., & Kedharnath, U. (2018). Inclusive leadership: Realizing positive outcomes through belongingness and being valued for uniqueness. *Human Resource Management Review*, 28(2), 190–203. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.07.002>
- van der Voet, J. (2014). The effectiveness and specificity of change management in a public organization: Transformational leadership and a bureaucratic organizational structure.

European Management Journal, 32(3), 373–382.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2013.10.001>

Vial, G. (2019). Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 28(2), 118–144.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2019.01.003>

van Roekel, H., Branderhorst, M., Tummers, L., & Meijer, A. (2025). Digital transformation leadership: A public value-centered measurement scale. *Government Information Quarterly*, 42(4), 102091. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2025.102091>