Architecture
Image Studies

Vol.6, Issue 4, pp.1106-1121, 2025
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/ais.v6i4.737

https://journals.ap2.pt/index.php/ais/index

The Impact of Participatory Inclusive Governance and Stakeholder Engagement in Fostering a Just Twin Transition

Disson Muhammad Fauzi[1]

Abstract

The objective of this report is to identify the cities leading the Twin Transition or with a strong potential to lead in the coming years, and the cities that other cities should connect to in order to develop green and digital technologies. 5 cities in Sumatera Island (Medan, Padang, Jambi, Palembang and Lampung, and Banten,) and 6 Cities in Java Island (Banten, Jakarta, Bandung, Semarang, Jogyakarta, Surabaya) are analyzed. The report provides high-end data visualizations and analytics to better leverage knowledge in these different ecosystems and the connections between them. The target audience of this report includes policy makers, practitioners, and global investors who aim to answer the following questions is 100 Respondents. At this verification stage, the focus is on developing a structural equation model whose hypotheses are tested using the Path Analysis approach. This Path analysis is a statistical method that builds on multiple regression to analyze the causal relationships between variables. It helps researchers understand how variables influence each other by identifying the pathways and effects, both direct and indirect, between them. Essentially, it helps break down correlations into more interpretable causal relationships.

Keywords: *Policy, Participatory, Stakeholder, Collaborative, Twin Transition.*

Introduction

The fulfillment of Indonesia's current energy needs is still dominated by fossil-based energy sources. The use of coal is still the highest contributor to the energy sources used by the State Electricity Company (PLN) to meet national energy needs. In 2022, the total energy consumption needed to meet national energy needs is 246 million TOE (Secretary General of the National Energy Council). The fulfillment of national energy consumption is still dominated by coal and fuel oil. Indonesia's energy production utilizes power plants with a capacity of 83.8 GW, both on-grid and off-grid (Secretary General of the National Energy Council). This energy production has resulted in the distribution of total CO2 emissions of 696.7 million tons of CO2 and has increased by 4.1% in one year (Institute for Essential Services Reform (IESR), 2023). The increase in the amount of emissions contributes to the large amount of world carbon emissions. The Global Carbon Project report states that Indonesia contributes 18.3% of the world's total carbon emissions (madaniberkelanjutan.id), 2023). Based on the report, the use of fossil fuels is the largest contributor to carbon emissions.

The commitment of world countries in achieving NZE is to keep the global temperature increase from reaching 2o Celsius (JETP Indonesia, 2023). The plan to achieve NZE targets Indonesia to reduce 64.5 million tons of CO2/year (Indonesia Research Institute for Decarbonization (IRID)). The Indonesian government targets to reduce carbon emissions from dependence on fossil fuels. The Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources (KESDM) has targeted Indonesia to become Net Zero Emission (NZE) by 2060 in the energy sector to reduce carbon emissions (JETP Indonesia, 2023). The Government of Indonesia and the International Partners Group (IPG) launched the Just Energy Transition Partnership Indonesia (JETP Indonesia) on the sidelines of the G20 Summit in Bali, Indonesia. The Government of Indonesia and IPG have agreed to develop a Comprehensive Investment and Policy Plan (CIPP) to help Indonesia achieve its energy transition targets and policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in electricity sector. JETP is an energy transition financing package with a financing cost of US$20 billion used to achieve the NZE target in 2060 (detik Finance, 2023). JETP contains guidelines and strategies carried out by Indonesia in supporting energy transition efforts in an effort to achieve NZE 2060 (Siagian et al.,

[1] Universitas Nasional, Jakarta, Indonesia, Email: Taxdisson@gmail.com

2023). However, the implementation of JETP is still not generally known by the public and how efforts can be made to achieve the NZE target in 2060 (JETP Indonesia, 2023). This study attempts to analyze how the implementation of the Just Energy Transition Partnership Indonesia (JETP) is to achieve the Net Zero Emissions target in 2060 (JETP Indonesia, 2023). The purpose of this study is to determine the implementation of the results of the Just Energy Transitions Partnership Indonesia collaboration in an effort to achieve the Net Zero Emissions goal in 2060 (JETP Indonesia, 2023).

Composites consist of a matrix as a binder and a filler as a composite filler. There is a research conducted by Nurudin. A., (2011) where in his research aims to determine how much tensile strength and bending strength of composites reinforced with waru bark fiber (Hibiscus Tiliaceus) with a polyester matrix with alkali treatment and variations in fiber orientation so that the right utilization of its strength properties is obtained. The maximum bending strength price obtained was 189.78 N / mm2 in the fiber angle orientation direction 00/00/450 / -450/00/00 with 5% NaOH alkali treatment. The lowest bending strength results were in the fiber angle orientation direction 00/450/00/00 / -450/00 without alkali treatment of 144.43 N / mm2. Based on the research explained above, it turns out that there has been no research on optimizing the bending strength of polyester composites reinforced with waru bark fiber with rice husk filler. Based on that, the researcher chose the title of optimizing the bending strength of polyester composites reinforced with waru bark fiber with rice husk filler using the response surface method. Where the response surface method has several advantages, namely minimizing observations by using experimental designs and optimization using estimates of the resulting response equations, producing contour plots and surface plots where both plots can explain the relationship between factor interactions and the resulting responses so that the factor level that provides the optimum response can be found.

Literature Review

Policy

Governance as Theory: Five Propositions." Stoker (1998) stated that, namely:

Governance refers to institutions and actors from within and beyond government. (But there is a divorce between the complex reality of decision-making associated with governance and the normative codes used to explain and justify government).

Governance identifies the blurring of boundaries and responsibilities for tackling social and economic issues. This shift in responsibility goes beyond the public-private dimension to include notions of communitarianism and social capital. (However, blurring of responsibilities can lead to blame avoidance or scapegoating).

Participatory

Bornby (1974) defines participation as an act of "taking part" which is an activity or statement to take part in an activity the intention of obtaining benefits (Webster, 1976). Meanwhile, in the sociology dictionary, participation is the involvement of a person in a group to take part in community activities, outside of their own work or profession (Theodorson, 1969). This participation is carried out as a result of social interaction between the individual concerned and other members of society (Raharjo, 1983). Beal (1964) stated that participation, especially participation that grows due to influence or because of the growth of external stimuli, is a symptom that can be indicated as an exogenous social change process. Who limits participation as an awareness to make every program successful according to each person's ability without sacrificing one's own interests. The prerequisite for the emergence of participation is a sense of responsibility in the policy-making process and its implementation. Gaventa and Valderama (in Arsito, 2004: 45), noted that there are three traditions of the concept of participation, especially when linked to the development of a democratic society, namely:

Political Participation, Political Participation is more oriented towards "influencing" and "placing people's representatives" in government institutions rather than active participation in the governance processes themselves. Social Participation, Social Participation is positioned as community involvement, especially those viewed as beneficiaries or parties outside the development process in consultation and decision-making in all stages of the development project cycle from needs evaluation to assessment, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of social participation is actually carried out to strengthen the learning process and social mobilization. In other words, the main purpose of the participation process social is not actually on public policy itself but community involvement in the world of public policy is more directed as a vehicle for learning and social mobilization.

Citizen Participation, Citizen Participation emphasizes direct citizen participation in decision-making in government institutions and processes. Citizen participation has shifted the concept of participation "from mere concern for 'receiving charity' or 'marginalized people' to a concern with various forms of citizen participation in policy-making and decision-making in various key circles that affect their lives".

Stakeholder

In Indonesia, disclosure of stakeholder engagement in local governments is still voluntary because there are no regulations requiring disclosure. Although voluntary, disclosure of stakeholder engagement is considered important as a means of two-way communication between government with the community and can also increase social acceptance by the community to achieve legitimacy (Kaur and Lodhia, 2014). Currently, many organizations are moving towards stakeholder engagement to increase trust, transparency, accountability and also better communication about organizational activities/programs (Burchell and Cook, 2006). The reasons why organizations involve stakeholders are to anticipate and understand emerging issues, promote productive collaboration with stakeholders, and improve decision-making and operational performance (Facility Reporting Project, 2007). If public sector organizations want to be successful in implementing stakeholder engagement, they need to assess the extent to which they involve stakeholders (Friedman and Miles, 2006).

Stakeholder engagement theory is an approach that emphasizes the involvement of all parties involved or "stakeholders" in an organization or project. This process aims to build positive, mutually beneficial relationships and ensure that the interests of all parties are considered and met.

Collaborative

Agranoff and McGuire (2003) define the concept of collaborative public management as the process of assisting and managing multi-organizational arrangements to solve problems that are not easily solved by one organization. Agranoff and McGuire (2003) emphasize that small entities such as collaborative public management, are beginning to occupy a more important strategic position as a point for gathering potential partners in the decision-making process. According to Agronoff and McGuire (2003), collaborative public management is a concept that describes the process of facilitating and operating in multi-organizational arrangements to solve problems that cannot be solved, or are easily solved, by a single organization. While collaborative public management defined by Bingham (2008) synthesizes several other previous definitions is a concept that describes the process of facilitating and operating in multi-organizational arrangements to solve problems that cannot be solved or are easily solved by a single organization, Rhodes argues that new public management is weak and its weakness lies in the disagreement between competition and direction at the core of the collaboration process (Rhodes, 2007). Brinkerhoff explains that the best decisions are those made collectively that provide objectivity in solving complex societal problems. Collaborative governance that brings together various stakeholders, government organizations, non-state organizations, and private organizations, to achieve positive, longitudinal, and objective solutions (Derick W. Brinkerhoff, 1999).

Twin Transition

Fostering a just twin transition, encompassing both digital and green transformations, requires a multifaceted approach that prioritizes inclusivity, equity, and sustainable development. It involves ensuring that the benefits of these transitions are shared widely while supporting those who may face negative impacts. This includes retraining workers, supporting vulnerable communities, and adapting policies to manage the societal shifts.

Methodology

The sample in this study were organization government in Indonesia. There are managers in each district and city, so the population in this study is 100 people. The sampling technique in this research is included in cluster sampling. The research method used in this research is quantitative methods. The research data collected was taken from managers at the in Indonesia. Data on The Impact of Governance Policy, Participatory Inclusive, Stakeholder Engagement, and Collaborative Governance of Fostering a Just Twin Transition in Indonesia, using a questionnaire instrument

At this verification stage, the focus is on developing a structural equation model whose hypotheses are tested using the Path Analysis approach. This Path analysis is a statistical method that builds on multiple regression to analyze the causal relationships between variables. It helps researchers understand how variables influence each other by identifying the pathways and effects, both direct and

indirect, between them. Essentially, it helps break down correlations into more interpretable causal relationships. Based on the results of research regarding, the following results were obtained The Impact of Governance Policy, Participatory Inclusive, Stakeholder Engagement, and Collaborative Governance of Fostering a Just Twin Transition in Indonesia

Result

Data Analysis

Accurate and trustworthy data that can be used later is required for data analysis. The research was carried out on a preselected sample and the author gathered data via distributing questionnaires. The indicator achievement analysis is computed by dividing responses then multiplying by dividing then multiplying the result. Alternatively, the analysis expressed: The process up used verify whether the practical study under investigation.

Each variable's average value, standard deviation, lowest average value, and maximum average value are all determined by descriptive testing. The average value of each indicator of the variables under study is explained in the descriptive test sub-chapter after the average.

Table 1. Test Description of Variables

Descriptive					
	n	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Governance Policy	100	2,72	3,88	3,30	,58
participatory inclusive	100	2,76	3,90	3,33	,57
stakeholder engagement,	100	2,72	3,78	3,25	,53
Collaborative Governance	100	2,65	3,66	3,16	,51
Fostering a Just Twin Transition	100	2,75	3,90	3,30	58
Valid n	100				

Source: Result of data from Questioner processing (2023)

Considering data by nothing following variable is 3.33 (quite good), Collaborative Governance 3.16 (quite good), and Fostering a Just Twin Transition gets a value of 3.30 (quite good), stakeholder engagement gets a value of 3.25 (quite good), participatory inclusion 3,33 (quite good), Governace Policy 3,30 (quite good) All of the variables in this study and have average value below of 3,40 (quite good), so according to Waskito (2020;92), all of the variables are worthy of further investigation because the data indicate issues that opportunity raise.

Governance Policy Variable Description Test

Governance Policy of government, Governance for (some) is about the potential for contracting, franchising and new forms of regulation. The results of information on respondents' perceptions of the Governance Policy are presented in Table 2

Table 2. Governance Policy (X_1)

No	Statement	Respondent Responses					Amount		
	Governance Policy (X1)	5	4	3	2	1	Mark	Average	Meaning
P1	Transparency	20	58	13	13		403	3,82	good
P2	Accountability	21	26	26	31		351	3,33	Pretty Good
P3	Participation	18	29	27	30		351	3,31	Pretty Good
P4	Responsiveness	22	30	30	22		366	3,47	Good
P5	Rule of Law	11	27	20	46		317	3,01	Pretty Good
P6	Consensus Orientation	12	23	15	54		307	2,92	Pretty Good

No	Statement	Respondent Responses					Amount		
	Governance Policy (X1)	5	4	3	2	1	Mark	Averag e	Meanin g
P 7	Equity	16	26	19	43		329	3,12	Pretty Good
P 8	Effectiveness	8	24	16	56		298	2,83	Pretty Good
P 9	Efficiency	20	30	26	28		356	3,38	Pretty Good
	Amount	148	279	189	222	0	3.078		
	Average	16,44	31	21	24,66	0	342,11		
	Deviation Standard	52,15						0,58	

Source: Result of data from Questioner processing (2023)

Information in table 2 the average value of Governance Policy of .3.30 is grouped as a fairly good variable. The standard deviation value is 0.58 so that the minimum average value is 2.72 (fairly good) and the maximum average value is 3.88 (good). Governance Policy variables are grouped as variables that have fairly good criteria towards good. The value of indicator P1. (Openness and accessibility of information, allowing citizens to understand how decisions are made and held accountable) of 3.82 (good) is the indicator with the highest average value.

3 (three) indicators obtained the lowest scores, namely:

1. Indicator P 8 (conjunction with various governance metrics and frameworks, evaluate the quality of governance in different countries and regions) with an average value of 2.83 (quite good)
2. Indicator P6 (reaching agreements and compromises) with an average value of 2.92 (quite good)
3. Indicator P 5 (individuals and institutions, including the government) with an average value of 3.01 (quite good)

An explanation of the causes of the 3 (three) indicators obtaining the lowest average scores and their solutions will be presented in the sub-chapter discussing the description of Governance Policy variables.

Test Description of Participatory Inclusive Variables

Participatory inclusive is an emphasis the active involvement of all parties in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of programs. This means giving individuals the opportunity to express their ideas, opinions, and needs.

Table 3. Description of Participatory inclusive Variables

No		Respondent Response					Amount		
	Participatory inclusive (X2)	5	4	3	2	1	Mark	Average	Meaning
P10	Community Development	20	61	13	10		403	3,84	good
P11	Public Policy Planning	21	27	27	29		352	3,36	Pretty Good
P12	Project Development	18	30	28	28		350	3,34	Pretty Good
P13	Decision Making Process	22	30	29	23		363	3,46	Good
P14	Program Evaluation	12	28	20	44		320	3,06	Pretty Good
	Amount	83	176	97	134	0	1.778	3,412	
	Average Score	16,66	35,2	19,4	26,8	0	355,6		Pretty Good
	Deviation Standard	72,00						0,57	

Source: Result of data from Questioner processing (2023)

The average value of the participatory inclusive variable is 3.1.3. (quite good). The standard deviation value is 0.57 so that the minimum 2.76 (quite good) maximum 3.90 (good). The participatory inclusive variable is in a position between quite good to good.

Indicator P 10. Community Development obtained an average value of 3.84 (good) and is the indicator that obtained the highest average value.

There is a Participatory Inclusive variable indicator that obtained the lowest average value, namely: Indicator P14. Program Evaluation Result Report (5W + 1H) with an average value of 3.06 (quite good).

The cause of the indicator obtaining the lowest value and its solution are explained in the sub-chapter discussing the description of the Participatory Inclusive variable

Test Description of stakeholder engagement Variable

Stakeholder Engagement to increase trust, transparency, accountability and also better communication about organizational activities/programs. If public sector organizations want to be successful in implementing stakeholder engagement, they need to assess the extent to which they involve stakeholders Stakeholder engagement theory is an approach that emphasizes the involvement of all parties involved or "stakeholders" in an organization or project. This process aims to build positive, mutually beneficial relationships and ensure that the interests of all parties are considered and met.

Table 4. Stakeholder Engagement (X3)

No	Statement	Respondent Response					Amount		
	Stakeholder Engagement (X3)	5	4	3	2	1	Mark	Average	Meaning
P15	Satisfaction	16	26	19	43		329	3,12	Pretty Good
P16	Collaboration	18	30	28	28		350	3,34	Pretty Good
P17	Utization	22	30	29	23		363	3,46	Pretty Good
P18	Effectiveness	20	30	26	28	0	356	3,38	Pretty Good
	Amount	76	116	99	132	0	1.398		
	Average	19	29	24,75	33		349,5	3,33	
	Deviation Standard	62,15						0,58	

Source: Result of data from Questioner processing (2023)

Information in table 4.1.4 the average value of Stakeholder Engagement of .3.33 is grouped as a fairly good variable. The standard deviation value is 0.58 so that the minimum average value is 2.72 (fairly good) and the maximum average value is 3.46 (good). The Stakeholder Engagement variable is grouped as a variable that has fairly good criteria towards good the value of indicator P 17. Utilization of 3.46 (fairly good) is the indicator with the highest average value.

The indicator that obtained the lowest value is: Indicator P 15 (Satisfaction) with an average value of 3.12 (fairly good)

An explanation of the cause of the indicator obtaining the lowest average value and its solution will be presented in the sub-chapter discussing the description of the Stakeholder Engagement variable.

Collaborative Governance Variable Description Test

Collaborative governance that brings together various stakeholders, government organizations, non-state organizations, and private organizations, to achieve positive, longitudinal, and objective

solutions. Collaborative Governance as a way of managing government that directly involves stakeholders outside the government or state, oriented towards consensus and deliberation in a collective decision-making process aimed at creating or implementing public policies and public programs. This is a process in which stakeholders involved with all sectors create efficient and effective solutions to public problems that go beyond what any organization can achieve alone. As a result, the main goal of the collaborative governance process is to produce more informed and more involved citizens, more inclusive participants in decision-making, more

Table 5. Collaborative Governance (Y)

No	Statement	Respondent Response					Amount		
	Collaborative Governance (Y)	5	4	3	2	1	Mark	Average	Meaning
P 19	Face-to-face dialogue	11	27	20	46		317	3,01	Pretty Good
P 20	Building Trust	21	26	26	31		351	3,33	Pretty Good
P 21	Commitment to The Process	18	29	27	30		351	3,31	Pretty Good
P 22	Mutual Understanding	22	30	30	22		366	3,47	Pretty Good
P 23	Intermediate Result	20	58	13	13		403	3,82	good
	Amount	91	160	116	142	0	1.790	3,42	
	Average	18,2	32	23,2	28,4	0	358	3,42	
	Deviation Standard	57,15						0,58	

Source: Result of data from Questioner processing (2023)

Information in table 5 the average value of Collaborative Governance of .3.42 is grouped as a fairly good variable. The standard deviation value is 0.58 so that the minimum average value is 2.72 (fairly good) and the maximum average value is 3.82 (good). Collaborative Governance variables are grouped as variables that have fairly good criteria towards good

The value of indicator P 23. (Intermediate Result) of 3.82 (good) is the indicator with the highest average value. There is an indicator that gets the lowest value, namely: Indicator P 19 (Face-to-face dialogue) with an average value of 2.84 (fairly good).

An explanation of the cause of the indicator getting the lowest average value and its solution will be presented in the sub-chapter discussing the description of the Collaborative Governance variable.

Test of Fostering a Just Twin Transition Variable Description

Fostering a just twin transition, encompassing both digital and green transformations, requires a multifaceted approach that prioritizes inclusivity, equity, and sustainable development. It involves ensuring that the benefits of these transitions are shared widely while supporting those who may face negative impacts

Table 6. Fostering a Just Twin Transition (Z)

No	Statement	Respondent Response					Amount		
	Fostering a Just Twin Transition (Z)	5	4	3	2	1	Mark	Average	Meaning
P 24	Strengthening resilience and open strategic autonomy	18	30	28	28		350	3,34	Pretty Good
P 25	Stepping up green and digital diplomacy	22	30	29	23		363	3,46	Pretty Good

No	Statement	Respondent Response					Amount		
	Fostering a Just Twin Transition (Z)	5	4	3	2	1	Mark	Average	Meaning
P26	Strategically managing supply of critical materials and commodities	20	30	26	28	0	356	3,38	Pretty Good
P27	Strengthening economic and social cohesion	21	27	27	29		352	3,36	Pretty Good
P28	Adapting education and training systems	18	30	28	28		350	3,34	Pretty Good
P29	Mobilising additional future-proof investment	22	30	29	23		363	3,46	Pretty Good
P30	Developing monitoring frameworks	12	28	20	44		320	3,06	Pretty Good
P31	Ensuring a future-proof regulatory framework for the Single Market	22	30	30	22		366	3,47	Pretty Good
P32	Promoting robust cybersecurity and secure data sharing framework	11	27	20	46		317	3,01	Pretty Good
	Amount	156	232	237	281	0	3.137	3,32	
	Average	17,33	25,77	26,33	31,22	0	348,5	3,32	
	Deviation Standar	52,15						0,58	

Source: Result of data from Questioner processing (2023)

Information in table 4.1.6 the average value of Fostering a Just Twin Transition of .3.32 is grouped as a fairly good variable. The standard deviation value is 0.58 so that the minimum average value is 2.72 (fairly good) and the maximum average value is 3.46 (fairly good). The Fostering a Just Twin Transition variable is grouped as a variable that has fairly good criteria for good

The value of indicator P 31 (Ensuring a future-proof regulatory framework for the Single Market) is 3.47 (fairly good) and P 25. (Stepping up green and digital diplomacy) is 3.46 (fairly good), which is the indicator with the highest average value.

Some indicators get the lowest value, namely: Indicator P 32 (Promoting robust cybersecurity and secure data sharing framework) with an average value of 3.01 (fairly good) An explanation of the cause of the indicator getting the lowest average value and its solution will be presented in the sub-chapter discussing the description of the Fostering a Just Twin Transition variable

Validity and Reliability Test

Validity Test

The validity can be known by looking at the correlation coefficient (r) between the item score and the total score. A questionnaire is declared valid if the questions on the questionnaire can reveal something that will be measured for the questionnaire (Ghozali, 2011). According to Sugiyono (2013:124) stated that items that have a positive correlation with the criterion (total score) and a high correlation also indicate that the item has high validity. The minimum requirement to be considered a valid instrument item is the validity index value ≥ 0.3 and if the Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficient ≤ r critical. Therefore, all questions that have a correlation level below r critical or 0.3 must be corrected because they are considered invalid. Based on the results of data processing, the following validity test results were obtained:

Table 7. Validity Test

Variable	No Item	$R_{account}$	R_{critis}	Conclusion
Governance Policy (X1)	X1.1	0.825	0.300	Valid
	X1.2	0.553	0.300	Valid
	X1.3	0.835	0.300	Valid
	X1.4	0.736	0.300	Valid
	X1.5	0.381	0.300	Valid
	X1.6	0.508	0.300	Valid
	X1.7	0.571	0.300	Valid
	X1.8	0.550	0.300	Valid
	X1.9	0.703	0.300	Valid
participatory inclusive (X2)	X2.1	0.863	0.300	Valid
	X2.2	0.740	0.300	Valid
	X2.3	0.889	0.300	Valid
	X2.4	0.426	0.300	Valid
	X2.5	0.883	0.300	Valid
Stakeholder Engagement (X3)	X3.1	0.673	0.300	Valid
	X3.2	0.904	0.300	Valid
	X3.3	0.818	0.300	Valid
	X3.4	0.719	0.300	Valid
Collaborative Governance (Y)	Y.1	0.871	0.300	Valid
	Y.2	0.623	0.300	Valid
	Y.3	0.913	0.300	Valid
	Y.4	0.575	0.300	Valid
	Y.5	0.933	0.300	Valid
Fostering a Just Twin Transition (Z)	Z.1	0.731	0.300	Valid
	Z.2	0.362	0.300	Valid
	Z.3	0.393	0.300	Valid
	Z.4	0.538	0.300	Valid
	Z.5	0.735	0.300	Valid
	Z.6	0.513	0.300	Valid
	Z.7	0.889	0.300	Valid
	Z.8	0.783	0.300	Valid
	Z.9	0.617	0.300	Valid

Source: Result of data from Questioner processing (2023)

The validity test show that all question items in the five variables have a calculated r value greater than the critical value of 0.300, so it can be concluded that all question items in each variable can be declared valid.

Reliability Test

Reliability testing is carried out to ensure whether the instrument used is reliable or not. The meaning of reliable is if the instrument is tested repeatedly, the results will be the same. According to Sugiyono (2014: 182), "reliability is the extent to which the results of measurements using the same object will produce the same data". Reliability testing uses the alpha Cronbach's method can be used simultaneously. If the alpha cronbhach value> 7.00 then it is reliable. Based on the results of data processing, the following reliability test results are obtained:

Table 8. Reliability Test

Variable	*Cronbach Alpha*	Critical Value	Conclusion
Governance Policy (X1)	0.800	0.700	Reliable
participatory inclusive (X2)	0.820	0.700	Reliable
Stakeholder Engagement (X3)	0.785	0.700	Reliable
Collaborative Governance (Y)	0.849	0.700	Reliable
Fostering a Just Twin Transition (Z)	0.798	0.700	Reliable

Source: Result of data from Questioner processing (2023)

It can be seen that all variables have a Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient value > 0.700, so it can be stated that all variables in this study are reliable.

Verification Analysis

The researcher employed Path analysis, which aimed to quantify the impact as well as its impact on addressing the problem formulation. Path analysis is a methodology employed in this investigation. In order to explain factors, the author use route analysis to ascertain the causal relationship. A component may examine two variables claim by Sugiyono (2013;70). To determine the intervening variable, path analysis make use of regression, correlation and pathway. The path analysis model according Ridwan and Kuncoro (2014;2), examines in order ascertain if group independent factors (exogeneous) have a direct or indirect impact. The purpose of is ascertain how governance policy, participatory inclusive Stakeholder Engagement and Collaborative Governance on, fosters a Just Twin Transition. The path analysis result, which include the following structure, are derived from the data processing results.

Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis examined how the independent variables of Governance Policy, participatory inclusive, and Stakeholder Engagement on the intervening variable of Collaborative Governance. The findings were as follows

Table 9. Path Analysis of Hypothesis 1

Coefficients[a]						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-2.637	.521		-5.062	.000
	Governance Policy	.186	.044	.263	4.273	.000
	participatory inclusive	.499	.059	.432	8.502	.000
	Stakeholder Engagement	.437	.063	.342	6.946	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Fostering a Just Twin Transition						

Source: Result of data from Questioner processing (2023)

The regression equation has the following meanings:

Governance Policy is 0.263, Governance Policy, Fostering a Just Twin Transition 0.263.

Participatory inclusive is 0.432, participatory inclusive, Fostering a Just Twin Transition 0.432.

Stakeholder Engagement is 0.342, Stakeholder Engagement variable is increased by one unit, Fostering a Just Twin Transition 0.342.

Hypothesis 2

Collaborative Governance on the dependent variable of Fostering a Just Twin Transition

Table 10. Path Analysis of Hypothesis 2

Coefficients[a]						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	6.874	.810		8.482	.000
	Collaborative Governance	1.276	.060	.902	21.144	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Fostering a Just Twin Transition						

Source: Result of Data Processing, 2023

Collaborative Governance, Collaborative Governance variable is increased by one unit, then on the, Fostering a Just Twin Transition

Hypothesis 3

Governance Policy, participatory inclusive, Stakeholder Engagement on the dependent variable of Fostering a Just Twin Transition

Table 11. Path Analysis of Hypothesis 3

Coefficients[a]						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.220	.789		1.546	.125
	Governance Policy	.383	.066	.383	5.802	.000
	participatory inclusive	.236	.089	.144	2.647	.009
	Stakeholder Engagement	.887	.095	.491	9.308	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Fostering a Just Twin Transition						

Source: Result of Data Processing 2021

Regression

Governance Policy is 0.383, which is positive. This Governance Policy, then Fostering a Just Twin Transition 0.383. participatory inclusive is 0.144, participatory inclusive, then Fostering a Just Twin Transition 0.144.

Stakeholder Engagement is 0.491, Stakeholder Engagement, then Fostering a Just Twin Transition 0.491.

Determination Coefficient

The symbol for the r^2. This Figure percentage of thetotal variance in value accounted for attribute to connection remaining amount factors. Derived from data processing outcomes, specifically

Table 12 Path Analysis of Hypothesis 1

Model Summary[b]				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.960[a]	.922	.920	1.03711
a. Predictors: (Constant), Governance Policy, participatory inclusive, Stakeholder Engagement				
b. Dependent Variable: Collaborative Governance				

Source: Result Of Data Processing 2021

Based on the table above, the results of the coefficient of determination on are shown in the rsqure value 0.922, this shows that 92.2% of the contribution of the influence of the independent variables on the intervening variable of Collaborative Governance, the remaining 7.8% is influenced by other variables outside this study.

Table 13. Path Analysis of Hypothesis 2

Model Summary[b]				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.902[a]	.814	.812	2.24489
a. Predictors: (Constant), Collaborative Governance				
b. Dependent Variable: Fostering a Just Twin Transition				

Source: Result of Processing Data, 2021

Based on the table above, coefficient determination on intervening variable on the dependent variable are shown in the rsqure value of 0.814, this shows that 81.4% contribution intervening of Collaborative Governance of, Fostering a Just Twin Transition while the remaining 15.9% is influenced by other variables outside this study.

Table 14 Path Analysis of Hypothesis 3

Model Summary[b]				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.954[a]	.911	.908	1.57157
a. Predictors: (Constant), Governance Policy, participatory, inclusive, Stakeholder Engagement				
b. Dependent Variable: Fostering a Just Twin Transition				

Source: result Processing Data, 2021

Based on the table above, coefficient determination on are shown in the R-squared value of 0.911, this shows that 91.1% of contribution of influence the independent variables on the dependent variable of Fostering a Just Twin Transition, the remaining 8.9% is influenced by other variables outside this study.

Hypothesis Test

The hypothesis generally reflects the problem in the research with the aim of encouraging someone to do research and it is also explained that in the hypothesis there are Ho and Ha. The hypothesis proposed and will be proven true in this study. Hypothesis testing in this study uses simultaneous hypothesis testing (F-test) and partial (t-test).

Simultaneous Hypothesis (F Test)

With ftable obtained from the 5% probability result, df 1 = 3 and df2 = 104-2 = 102, the ftable result is 2,694. Based on the results of data processing, the results of hypothesis testing with the f test are obtained as follows:

Based on the table above, the results of simultaneous hypothesis testing with the f test, on the influence of independent variables on intervening, obtained the f count result of 395.809 with a significance of 0.000, because the t count result of 395.809> ftable 2.694 and significance of 0.000 <0.05, then Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted, so it can be stated that overall the independent variables of Governance Policy, participatory inclusive, Stakeholder Engagement have a significant influence on the intervening variable Collaborative Governance

Based on the table above, the results of simultaneous hypothesis testing with the f test, on the influence of independent variables on the dependent, obtained the f count result of 340.123 with a significance of 0.000, because the t count result of 340.123> ftable 2.694 and significance of 0.000 <0.05, then Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted, so it can be stated that overall the independent variables of forensic audit, investigative audit and auditor professionalism have a significant influence on the dependent variable of good government governance.

Partial Hypothesis (T-Test)

The t-test is a partial coefficient test. This test is conducted to determine the effect of each of the independent variables in the model on the dependent variable, with the following decision-making criteria in the t-test:

t-count> t-table and the significance value is less than 0.05, then $H0$ is rejected and Ha is accepted. This indicates that there is a significant effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable.

t-count< t-table and the significance value is more than 0.05, then $H0$ is accepted and Ha is rejected.

This indicates that there is no significant effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable. With t-table obtained from the 5% probability result, df=104-2=102, the t-table result is 1.983. Based on the results of data processing, the results of hypothesis testing with the t-test are with ftable obtained from the 5% probability result, df=104-2=102, the t-table result is 1.983.

Path Coefficient Analysis (Direct and Indirect Effect)

Path Coefficient Between Variables

Path analysis uses regression analysis to estimate the causal relationship between variables (causal model) that has been previously determined based on theory.

This path model is called path analysis, where the error influence is obtained from the results, as follows:

The influence of X1, X2 and X3 on Y = √ (1-0.922) = 0.279

The influence of Y on Z = √ (1-0.814) = 0.431

The influence of X1, X2 and X3 on Z = √ (1-0.911) = 0.298

Interpretation of Direct, Indirect and Total Effects

The following are the interpretation results of the calculation of direct effects, indirect effects and total effects of Governance Policy (X1), participatory inclusive (X2) and Stakeholder Engagement (X3) on Fostering a Just Twin Transition, (Z) through Collaborative Governance (Y).

Conclusion

Based on the analysis results, governance policies are proven to have a positive and significant influence in strengthening Collaborative Governance, along with inclusive participation and stakeholder engagement, which both show significant contributions to the quality of cross-actor collaborative processes. Comparatively, inclusive participation emerged as the strongest driver for collaboration, followed by stakeholder engagement and governance policies; this finding is in line with the standardized coefficient estimates (β Governance Policy = 0.263; β Participatory Inclusive = 0.432; β Stakeholder Engagement = 0.342) and the very high explanatory power of the model (R^2 collaboration = 0.922). Improved Collaborative Governance quality then translates strongly into the achievement of Fostering a Just Twin Transition (JTT)—a just green-digital twin transition—with a very large direct effect (β = 0.902; R^2 = 0.814), confirming that face-to-face dialogue, trust, process commitment, and intermediate outcomes are key levers for JTT acceleration. Beyond the collaboration pathway, each of the governance, inclusive participation, and stakeholder engagement variables also had a direct impact on JTT (β=0.383; β=0.144; β=0.491), with stakeholder engagement having the largest influence, while inclusive participation tended to operate through collaboration mediation. Overall, the final model demonstrated very strong explanatory power for the outcome variable (R^2 JTT=0.911), implying that a combination of clear policy architecture, meaningful participation orchestration, and an accountable engagement framework are prerequisites for accelerating equitable and inclusive JTT. These findings encourage an agenda to address weaknesses in the collaboration process—particularly feedback and evaluation mechanisms—and to refine green-digital performance indicators to make policy impacts more measurable and sustainable.

References

[1] Alhaqbani A, et al, (2016) The impact of middle management commitment improvement initiatives in public organizations. Business Proses Management Journal, V, 22 N 5. https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/BPMJ-01-2016-0018/full/html. DOI: 10.1108/BPMJ-01-2016-0018.

[2] Alrowwad A., et al. (2020). Innovation and intellectual capital as intermediary variables among transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and organizational performance. https://www.emerald.com/insight/0262-1711.htm

[3] Ancok, D. (2012). Psikologi Kepemimpinan dan Inovasi. Jakarta: Erlangga.

[4] Anggara S. (2018). Kebijakan Publik. Pustaka setia. Bandung

[5] Anisah H.U. (2022). Manajemen dan Lingkungan Eksternal Organisasi. Media sains Indonesia.

[6] Anwar M. (2020) Manajemen Srategi Daya Saing dan Globalisasi. Sasanti Institute. Banyumas

[7] Ashaye R.O., & Irani Z., (2019) The role of stakeholders in the effective use of e-government resources in publik services. www.elsevier.com/locate/ijinfomgt

[8] Baesu Camelia (2021). Digitalization of public administration in Romania.

[9] Barney J.B & Hesterly W.S. (2019). Strategic Mangement & Competitive Advantage. Person Education. Newyork

[10] Barney, J. (1991), “Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage”, Journal of Management,Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 99-120.

[11] Bambang. Sudaryana,2016, Metode Penelitian, CV. Deepublish, Jogyakarta

[12] Bambang, Sudaryana 2022. Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif

[13] Bastian, I. 2005. Akuntasi Sektor Publik: Suatu Pengantar. Yogyakarta: Erlangga

[14] Black J. (2015). Decentring Regulation:Understanding The Role Of Regulation And Self-Regulation In A “Post-Regulatory”Wold.

[15] BPS (2024). Indeks Pembangunan Manusia 2023.

[16] Certo S., (2010) Strategic Management. New York. McGraw Hill

[17] Ciriello F.R., et al (2018)) Digital Inovation. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-018-0559-8

[18] Cumming, B. S. (1998). Innovation overview and future challenges. European Journal of Innovation Management, 1(1), 21-30. https://doi.org/

[19] Crawford J., et al (2020) View of covid-19:20 countries higher education intra-period digital pedagogy responses. Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching. www.journals.sfu.ca/jalt/index.php/jalt/article/view/191/163
[20] Daft, Richard L. 2012. Manajemen, Edisi 6. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
[21] Damanpour, F., & M. Schneider. 2009. Characteristics of Innovation and Innovation Adoption in Public Organizations: Assessing the Role of Managers. Journal of public administration research and theory.
[22] Damanpour, F. (1996), "Organizational complexity and innovation: developing and testing multiplecontingency models", Management Science, Vol. 42 No. 5,
[23] Damanpour, F. & Gopalakrishnan, S. (1998). Theories of organizational structure and innovation adoption: The role of environment change. Journal of Engineering and Technology Management.
[24] Damanpour Fariborz, Schneider Marguerite (2009). Phases of the adoption of innovation inorganizations: effects of environment, organization and top managers.
[25] Dasgupta, M. & Gupta, R. K. (2009). Innovation in organizations: A review of the role of organizational learning and knowledge management. Global Business Review.
[26] David R.Fred & David R. Forest (2017). Strategic Mangement. Person Education Limited. England
[27] Doucek P., et al (2022) Management and Digitalization. DOI: 10.35011/IDIMT-2022-35
[28] Dhewanto W., et.al. (2020). Manajemen Inovasi. Andi. Yogyakarta
[29] Ewurah Mahama S.K., (2017) The Concept Of e-Government: ICT Policy Guidelines for the Policy Makers of Ghana. www.scirp.org/journal/jis
[30] Ficman R.G., et al (2014) Digital innovation as a fundamental and powerful concept in the information system curriculum MIS Quarterly.
[31] Fink A.,et al (2005) The future secorecard: combining external and internal scenarios to create strategic foresight. www.emeraldinsight.com/0025-1747.htm
[32] Gartner (2015) IT Glossary-Bimodal IT. www.gartner.com/it-glossary/bimodal
[33] Ghozali I (2005). Struktural Equation Modeling. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro. Semarang.
[34] Glueck W.F & Jauch R.L (1998) Manajemen Strategis dan Kebijakan Perusahaan. Erlangga. Jakarta
[35] Gurlek, M. et al. (2020). "Understanding the relationships among knowledge-oriented leadership, knowledge management capacity, innovation performance and organizational performance". www.emerald.com/insight/0368-492X.htm
[36] Gupta, P.D., Guha, S. and Krishnaswami, S.S. (2013). "Firm growth and its determinants", Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship, Vol. 2 No. 15
[37] Gobble M.MA., (2018) Digitalization, Digitization, and Innovation. https://doi.org/10.1080/08956308.2018.1471280
[38] Ghozali, Imam, Hengky Latan. 2015. Konsep, Teknik, Aplikasi Menggunakan Smart PLS 3.0 Untuk Penelitian Empiris. BP Undip. Semarang.
[39] Hair, J.F. Risher, J.J.,Sarstedt, M.andRingle, C.M.(2019), "When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM",European Business Review, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 2-24.
[40] Hair, J.F., Hult, G.T.M., Ringle, C.M. and Sarstedt, M. (2017a), A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM), Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
[41] Hanelt A et al (2020) Digital M&A, digital innovation, and firm performance: an empirical investigation. https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tjis20
[42] Hariandja E.T.M (2005). Manajemen sumberdaya manusia. PT Gramedia Widisarana Indonesia. Jakarta
[43] Henderson, R.M. dan Clark, K.B. (1990). Architectural Innovation: The Reconfiguration of Existing Product Technologies and the Failure of Established Firms. Administrative Science Quarterly Journal 35.
[44] Khin S & Ho CF Theresa (2018). Digital technology, digital capability and organizational performance a mediating role of digital innovation. www.emeraldinsight.com/1757-2223.htm
[45] Kock, N. (2016). Hypothesis testing with confidence intervals and P values in PLS-SEM. International Journal of e-Collaboration, 12(3), 1-6.
[46] Koop C. & Martin L. (2015). What is Regulation? An Interdisciplinary Concept Analysis. Regulation & Governance
[47] Kuusisto M. (2017) Organizational Effects Of digitalization: a literature review. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOTB-20-03-2017-B003
[48] Liando, Saerang, E, P, D, & Elim, I. (2014). Analisis Kinerja Keuangan Pemerintah Kabupaten Kepulauan Sangihe Menggunakan Metode Value for Money". ISSN 2303-1174, Jur-nal Emba, Vol. 2 No.3, September 2014, Hal.1686-1694.
[49] Lopez, Susana P, & Alegre, Joaquin. 2012. Information Tecnology Competency, Knowledge Processes and Firm. Industrial Management & Data Systems
[50] Mahmudi (2010). Manajemen Kinerja Sektor Publik. UPP STIMYKPN. Yogyakarta
[51] Mahsun, M. (2006). Pengukuran Kinerja Sektor Publik. Yogyakarta: BPFE Yogyakarta.
[52] Mangkunegara A.P., (2001). Manajemen sumberdaya manusia. PT Remaja Rosdakarya. Bandung.
[53] Mart-ınez-P-erez, A., Garcıa-Villaverde, P.M. and Elche, D. (2016), "The mediating effect of ambidextrous knowledge strategy between social capital and innovation of cultural tourism clusters firms", International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, Vol. 28 No. 7.
[54] Masa'deh, R., Obeidat, B.Y. and Tarhini, A. (2016), "A Jordanian empirical study of the associations among transformational leadership, transactional leadership, knowledge sharing, job performance, and

firm performance: a structural equation modelling approach", Journal of Management Development, Vol. 35 No. 5.
[55] Mergel, I., (2019). Defining digital transformation. Government Information Quarterly. DOI:0.016/j.giq.2019.06.002.
[56] Mergel, I. (2019) Digital service teams in government. Government Information Quarterly. www.elsevier.com/locate/govinf. doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2019.07.001
[57] Migdadi M.M (2019). Knowledge management processes, innovation capability and organizational performance. https://www.emerald.com/insight/1741-0401.htm
[58] Morales, V.J.G., et al. (2011). Transformational leadership influence on organizational performance through organizational learning and innovation. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.03.005
[59] Muhammad F., (2008) Reinventing Local Government: Pengalaman dari Daerah. Jakarta: Gramedia.
[60] Mutalib, M. (2020). Effect of Innovation Capability on Human Capital and Organizational Performance. International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology Vol. 29, No. 04, (2020).
[61] Mutie Alexander (2018) Effect of Teknological Innovations On Organizational Performance Of Government Agencies In Kenya. A Research Project Report Partial Fulfillment Of The Requirements For The Award Of The Degree Of Master Business.
[62] Nesta. (2014). Innovation in the public sector: how can public organisation better create, improve and adapt. London: Nesta.
[63] Nikolina I.I et al (2020). Assessment of digitalization of public management and administration at the level of territoial communities. https://doi.org/10.33271/nvngu/2020-5/150
[64] Nurahman A. et al (2021) Pemanfaatan wbsite sebagai bentuk digitalisasi pelayanan publik di Kabupaten Garut. http://ejournal.ipdn.ac.id/JTKP, ISSN : 2722-1717
[65] Obeidat, B.Y., Tarhini, A., Masa'deh, R. and Aqqad, N.A. (2017), "The impact of intellectual capital on innovation via the mediating role of knowledge management: a structural equation modelling approach", International Journal of Knowledge Management Studies, Vol. 8 Nos ¾.
[66] Obeidat, A.M. and Otibi, G. (2015), "The impact of knowledge sharing tools on levels of organizationallearning (field study on Jordanian commercial banks)", Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences, Vol. 9 No. 5.
[67] Osborne, Stephen P. & Kerry Brown. 2005. Managing Change and Innovation in Public Service Organizations. New York: Routledge.
[68] Pasolong H, (2019). Teori Adminisrasi Publik. Alfa Beta. Bandung.
[69] Pearce II J.A & Robinson R.B. (2009). Formulation Implementation and Control Competitive Strategi. Mic Graw Hill. Newyork.
[70] Peters T. And Waterman R. Jr (1982) In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-run Companies, Harper & Row, New York.
[71] Porter, M.E (1996) What is strategy? Harvad Business Review.
[72] Prieto, I. M, & Revilla, E. (2006). Learning capability and business performance: A non-financial and financial assessment. The Learning Orga-nization,
[73] Purwanto E.A., et al (2016) Pelayanan Publik: Modul Pelatihan Dasar Calon PNS. Lembaga Admnistrasi Negara
[74] Priadana S.M dan Sunarsi D, (2021). Metode Peneltian Kuantitatif. Pascal books. Tangerang Selatan.
[75] Rabanjo C & Babucea A.G (2020) Digital services in Romania-Present and Perspective, Annals of the Constantin Brancusi. University of Targu Jiu, Economy Series.
[76] Saputra N. (2020). Manajemen Bisnis Kotemporer. Diandra Kreatif. Yogyakarta.
[77] Saunders M. et.al., (2009). Research Methodes for Businnes Students. Pearson Education Limited. England.
[78] Sciarelli, M., Gheith, M. H., & Tani, M. (2020). The relationship between soft and hard quality management practices, innovation and organizational performance in higher education. The TQM Journal, 32(6)
[79] Sembiring M., (2018) Budaya & Kinerja organisasi. Fokus Media. Bandung
[80] Sembiring J.N., & Fatihudin D. (2019) Manajemen Strategi dari Teori ke Praktek. Qiara Media. Pasuruan
[81] Sinambela L.P., (2006) Reformasi Pelayanan Publik: Teori Kebijakan dan Implementasi. PT Bumi Aksara. Jakarta
[82] Sitkin, S.B. (1996), "Learning through failure", in Cohen, M. and Sproull, L. (Eds), Organizational Learning, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
[83] Smriti, N. and Das, N. (2018), "The impact of intellectual capital on firm performance: a study of Indian firms listed in COSPI", Journal of Intellectual Capital, Vol. 19
[84] Soomro, BA, et al (2020). Strategic factors and significance of organizational innovation and organizational learning in organizational performance. https://www.emerald.com/insight/1460-1060.htm
[85] Sugiyono (2020). Statistif untuk Penelitian. Alfabeta. Bandung
[86] Sugiyono (2017). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D. Alfabeta. Bandung.
[87] Suryani K.N. & Foeh John E.H.J. (2018). Kinerja Organisasi. Deepublish. Sleman
[88] Susanthi R.P.,(2017) Analisis Lingkungan Internal dan Eksternal dalam Mencapai Tujuan Perusahaan. Jurnal Elektronik. ISSN : 2598-8107
[89] Stoner and Freeman (2006) Pengantar Managemen. Salemba Empat. Jakarta
[90] Tampubolon H, (2016). Strategi Manajemen Sumberdaya Manusia dan Perannya dalam Pengembangan Keunggulan Bersaing. Papas Sinar Sinanti. Jakarta

[91] Taufikqurokhman (2016) Manajemen Strategi. FISIP Univ. Moestopo
[92] Teguh J.M., et al (2022). The impact of digital organizational culture and digital capability on organizational performance through digital innovation mediation in teh COVID-19. https://doi.org/10.17576/pengurusan-2022-66-08
[93] Tseng, S.M. & Lee, P.S. (2014), "The effect of knowledge management capability and dynamic capability on organizational performance", Journal of Enterprise Information Management, Vol.27 No. 2.
[94] Uluskan, M., Godfrey, A.B. and Joines, J.A. (2017), "Integration of Six Sigma to traditional quality management theory: an empirical study on organisational performance", Total Quality Management and Business Excellence, Vol. 28
[95] Vaezi S.K (2008) Measurement and Evaluating Framworks in Elektronic Government Quality Management. Inproceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Theory and Practice of Electronic Governance Cairo Egypt.
[96] Zein M.H.M Harry dan Septiani Sisca (2024). Digitalisasi Pemerintah Daerah (Katalis untuk Integrasi dan Optimasi Good Governance). Sada Kurnia Pustaka. Banten 2024
[97] Windrum, P. (2008). Innovation and entrepreneurship in public services. Dalam P. Windrum & P. Koch (Ed.). Innovation in public sector services; entrepreneurship, creativity and management. Cheltenham: Edward Elga
[98] Wheelen L.T., et al. (2018). Strategic Management and Business Policy. Person Education Limited. United Kingdom.