 ISSN 2579-7298

INFLUENCE OF INNOVATION STRATEGY MODEL TO IMPROVING ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE REGIONAL GOVERNMENT IN INDONESIA

Andri Mauladi[1], Agus Rahayu[2], Lili Adi Wibowo[3], Alfira Sofia[4]

[a] Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung West Java Indonesia
[1] andrimauladi@upi.edu, agusrahayu@upi.edu, liliadiwibowo@upi.edu, alfirasofia@upi.edu
* corresponding author

ARTICLE INFO

Article history
Received
Revised
Accepted

Keywords
Regional Government innovation strategy
variables in research.

ABSTRACT

This research is aimed at testing the innovation strategy model to improving organizational performance regional government in Indonesia The performance of the Regional Government organization is the overall achievement of the results that have been achieved and achieved in handling all activities carried out by the Regional Government in a certain period as well as a description of the achievement of the government's goals and objectives as an elaboration of the vision, mission and strategy The following agencies indicate the level of success or failure in implementing activities determined by the Regional Government in accordance with established programs and policies. And this research uses the Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling analysis technique (PLS-SEM), to model many variables in research.

1. Introduction (*Heading 1*) (bold, 11 pt)

Performance is the output/result of an activity/program that is to be or has been achieved in connection with the use of a budget with measurable quantity and quality (PP No. 8 of 2006) or the final result of an activity (Wheelen et al., 2018). Organizational performance in general is the level of achievement of organizational goals (Uluskan et al., 2017), performance in the organization itself is the answer to the success or failure of previously determined organizational goals, this is the ability of the organization to achieve its goals and objectives by using resources effectively and efficiently (Tseng, S.M. & Lee, P.S., 2014), compatibility between the resources owned and the strategic orientation of the organization (Masa'deh, R. et al., 2016) as well as ensuring long-term organizational sustainability will result in organizational performance the maximum (Suryani K. Ni. & E. H. J John, 2018).

The performance of the Regional Government organization is the overall achievement of the results that have been achieved and achieved in handling all activities carried out by the Regional Government in a certain period (Muhamad F., 2009) as well as a description of the achievement of the government's goals and objectives as an elaboration of the vision, mission and strategy The following agencies indicate the level of success or failure in implementing activities determined by

the Regional Government in accordance with established programs and policies. (Permenpan No. PER/09/M.PAN/5/2007).

Performance evaluation and measurement is carried out by the Central Government every fiscal year for Provincial, Regency/City Regional Governments, so that information on the success of implementing predetermined activities can be known and can be used as material for improvement in improving performance in the future.

The phenomenon of organizational performance problems must be quickly corrected and improved in order to gain trust from society and answer the demands of current developments, for this reason, according to Obeidat, et al., (2017) organizations must create ideas or innovations in solving performance problems for the better and add value to the organization . Innovation is generally described as the development or application of new ideas, knowledge and skills that can produce organizational capabilities and competitiveness (Kim D.Y., et al. 2012). Understanding innovation as success in introducing new things that have use value (Dasgupta M. & Gupta R.K., 2009), which is a process of thinking and implementing the results of thinking (Ancok, D. 2012). The choice of innovation made by the organization itself varies greatly depending on the condition of the organization and its response to environmental changes (Damanpour, 1996), to support the innovation process strategically it can be done through technological change (Daft, R.L. 2012), one of which is in Regional Government through digital innovation.

Digital innovation is the application of digital technology (Karimi & Walter, 2015), or utilizing cyber platforms as a tool for expanding the reach of government services to the public (PP No. 38 of 2017) can produce smarter devices, better data storage and retrieval and the dissemination of information is becoming widespread (White, 2017), besides that digital innovation can be described as the embedding of digital components in physical products (Yoo et all. 2010a). Digital innovation is implemented through e-government or digitalization programs (Nurrahman A., et al, 2021).

Digitalization refers to the use of digital technology used by organizations to improve their performance (Kuusito, M., 2017), and is supported by the development of digital infrastructure, cheap and affordable prices for access facilities (Rahmatsyah, H.T. et al., 2022). Digitalization is considered one of the main drivers of change (Zdraveski D. & Janeska M., 2021), a means of progress (Rabonju C. & Babucea A., 2020), and is used to provide equal access to services, information and knowledge based on technology digital for all communities (Nikolina I.I., et al, 2020) which can significantly increase organizational activities leading to efficient use of resources, costs, technological, social and economic progress of the organization concerned, as well as creating new opportunities to make public services more accessible (Roja A. & Boc M., 2021).

Regency/City Regional Governments in Indonesia, especially in the Provinces of West Java, Central Java and East Java, can make breakthroughs to improve and achieve their performance according to predetermined targets by making improvements and accelerating problem solving through the "Digital Innovation Strategy Model and Implementation of Digitalization of Public Services in Improving the Performance of Regency/City Regional Government Organizations in Indonesia."

Based on the research background that has been described, the formulation of the problem to be studied in this research is as follows:

1. What is the description of the Internal Environment, External Environment, Digital Innovation, Digitalization of Public Services and Performance of Regency/City Regional Government Organizations in Indonesia?

2. Do external environmental factors influence digital innovation?

3. Do Internal Environmental factors influence Digital Innovation?

4. Do external environmental factors influence the digitalization of public services?

5. Do Internal Environmental factors influence the Digitalization of Public Services?

6. Does Digital Innovation influence the Performance of Regency/City Regional Government Organizations in Indonesia?

7. Does Digital Innovation mediated by the Digitalization of Public Services have an effect on the Performance of Regency/City Regional Government Organizations in Indonesia?

8. Does Digital Innovation influence the Digitalization of Public Services?

9. Does the digitalization of public services affect the performance of district/city regional government organizations in Indonesia?.

2. Method

This research uses an explanatory research method, namely a method that aims to explain variables through statistical testing in order to obtain explanations of variables (Saunders, et.al, 2009). The approach used is a quantitative approach which can be interpreted as a research method based on the philosophy of positivism, used to research certain populations or samples, collecting data using research instruments, statistical data analysis, with the aim of testing predetermined hypotheses (Sugiyono, 2017).

The research method used is a survey method through data collection by distributing questionnaires offline or online via the Google Forms feature which presents questions/statements and answer choices that can be chosen by respondents. The time for carrying out the research uses cross sectional, because the data is collected, processed, analyzed and then conclusions drawn in one time period.

Population is a generalized area consisting of objects or subjects that have certain qualities and characteristics determined by researchers to be studied and then conclusions drawn (Sugiyono, 2017). In this study, the population size is certain, namely 100 Regency/City Regional Governments in Indonesia, consisting of:

Table .1 Details of Research Population

No.	Name of Province	Total of District/City
1	West Java	27
2	Central Java	35
3	East Java	38
Total		100

3. Results and Discussion

Descriptive analysis is statistics used to analyze data by describing or describing the data that has been collected as it is without intending to make general conclusions or generalizations (Sugyono, 2017).

Descriptive analysis refers to each variable studied and compiled in the form of a questionnaire, namely variable X1 (External Environment), variable X2 (Internal Environment), variable Y1 (Digital Innovation), variable Y2 (Digitalization of Public Services) and variable Y3 (Performance of Government Organizations Region), the statements in the questionnaire have a large number of weights so that it is easier to interpret the variables studied, score categorization is carried out on respondent responses with scores between 1-7 as in Table 3.8, then processed to find out the total score and determine the ideal score, using the formula :

Ideal score = Highest Score x Number of Respondents

Based on data processing, it can be seen that the total score of respondents' responses to the X1.1 Regulation dimension is 2373 or 40.70% with an ideal total score of 2800. The highest value for the indicator of the X1.1 Regulation dimension is the indicator for Government Regulation No. 38 of 2017 in formulating the implementation of Regional Innovation with a total score of 603 or 25.41%. Government Regulation no. 38 of 2017 concerning Regional Innovation is the most dominant

indicator influencing the regulatory dimensions. This is appropriate and appropriate as the basis and guideline for implementing digital innovation in Regional Government.

Based on data processing, it can be seen that the total score of respondents' responses to the X1.2 Information Technology dimension is 1720 or 29.50% with an ideal total score of 2100. The highest value for the indicator of the X1.2 Information Technology dimension is an indicator of the impact of information technology which is increasingly developing and advanced for district/city regional governments with a total score of 577 or 33.55%, this shows that the impact of information technology plays an important role in bringing about changes and developments in the technology used in regional governments.

Next, the indicator value for the availability of hardware, software, internet/WiFi networks and other telecommunications media in various places received a score of 576 or 33.49% and the lowest indicator value was the creation of many service systems that use information technology in various fields, both services, education, health, financial transactions and others with a score of 567 or 32.97%.

Based on Figure 1 above, it can be concluded that the respondents' responses to the X1.2 Information Technology dimension are included in the good category because the value of this category is in the interval 1585.71-1842.86.., consist of : Descriptive Public Dimension (Society) the respondents' responses to the X1.3 Public (Society) dimension are included in the good category because the value of this category is in the interval 1585.71-1842.86. Internal Environment Variables are measured through dimensions X2.1 Leadership, X2.2 HR (Human Resources), X2.3 IT Infrastructure and X2.4 Finance. These variables and dimensions are conditions that can influence and exist within the Regency/City Regional Government in formulating organizational strategies. Descriptive Leadership Dimensions ,the value of the indicator of leadership's understanding of the use of digital technology in providing public services received a score of 611 or 33.35%, and the lowest value was the indicator of leadership's ability to communicate through various digital technology-based channels with a score of 609 or 33.24. %. The score interpretation criteria for the X2.1 Descriptive Dimensions of HR (Human Resources), Based on above, it can be seen that the total score of respondents' responses to the X2.2 HR (Human Resources) dimension is 1136 or 21.94% with an ideal score of 1400. The highest value of the X2.2 HR (Source) dimension indicator Human Power) is an indicator of employee skills regarding changes in digital technology developments with a total score of 572 or 50.35% and the lowest score is an indicator of employee operational technical capabilities regarding digital technology developments. Based on above regarding the continuum line of dimension .1057,14. Descriptive Dimensions of IT, Based on above regarding the continuum line of the X2.3 IT Infrastructure dimension, it can be concluded that the respondents' responses regarding the X2.3 IT Infrastructure dimension are included in the good category because the value of this category is in the interval 1057.14-1228.57.

Descriptive Financial Dimensions Based on above, it can be seen that the total score of respondents' responses to the Financial development of digital technology with a total score of 556 or 50.68% and the lowest score is the indicator of continuity of budget allocation which is the priority scale for the development of digital technology with a score of 541 or 49.32%. Digital Innovation Variables , The Digital Innovation Strategy variable is measured through dimensions Y1.1 Digital Transformation, Y1.2 Collaboration and Partnership, Y1.3. Local Empowerment, Y1.4 Human Capital Development and Y1.5 Citizen Engagement IT Infrastructure These variables and dimensions are conditions that can influence Regency/City Regional Governments in formulating organizational strategies to improve performance. Descriptive Digital Transformation,Transformation dimension is the leadership's decision to using digital technology in innovation in public services with full attention to data security with a total score of 592 or 50.21% and the lowest score is an indicator of the leadership's decision to exploit digital technology to improve public service processes through innovation with a score of 587 or 49. 79%. Descriptive Dimensions of Collaboration and Partnership, Based on the data above regarding the continuum line of the Y1.2 Collaboration and Partnership dimension, it can be concluded that the respondents' responses regarding the Y1.2 Collaboration and Partnership dimension are included in the good category because the value of this category is in the interval 1585.71-1842.86. Descriptive Dimensions of Local Empowerment, Based on the data above regarding the Y1.3 Local Empowerment dimension continuum line, it can be concluded that the respondents' responses regarding the Y1.3 Local Empowerment dimension are included in the good category because the

category value is in the interval 1057.14-1228.57. Descriptive Dimensions of Human Capital Development , Based on the data above regarding the continuum line in the Y1.4 Human Capital Development dimension, it can be concluded that the respondents' responses regarding the Y1.4 Human Capital Development dimension are included in the good category because the category value is in the interval 1057.14-1228.57

Descriptive Dimensions of Citizen Engagement, Based on the data above regarding the Y1.5 Citizen Engagement dimension continuum line, it can be concluded that the respondents' responses regarding the Y1.5 Citizen Engagement dimension are included in the good category because the category value is in the interval 1585.71-1842.86. Variables for Digitalization of Public Services ,These data show that the most dominant dimension influencing the Public Service Digitalization variable (Y2) is the Digital Service Integration dimension, thus nine priority digital services, including education, health, social assistance, population administration, integrated state financial transactions for payment gateways, apparatus services integrated country, public service portal services, until one Indonesian data has been understood, planned and implemented by Regency/City Regional Governments in Indonesia. Descriptive Dimensions of National Digital Service Integration , Digital Service Integration, it can be concluded that the respondents' responses regarding the Y2.1 National Digital Service Integration dimension are included in the good category because the value of this category is in the interval 2114.29-2457.14. Descriptive Dimensions of Public Service Application Integration Based on the data above regarding the continuum line in the Y2.2 Public Service Application Integration dimension, it can be concluded that the respondents' responses regarding the Y2.2 Public Service Application Integration dimension are included in the good category because the category value is in the interval 2114.29-2457 .14 Descriptive Dimensions of ICT Asset Management ,Based on the data above regarding the continuum line of the Y2.3 ICT Asset Management dimension, it can be concluded that the respondents' responses regarding the Y2.3 ICT Asset Management dimension are included in the good category because the category value is in the interval 2114.29-2457.14 Regional Government Organizational Performance Variables Based on the data, it can be seen that the Y3.1 IKM (Community Satisfaction Index) dimension has a minimum value of 71.82, a maximum value of 95.94, a mean value of 86.19, and a standard deviation value of 3.86.

As stated, the output results from the smart PLS program, the lambda estimate is the same as the estimated value of the standardized regression parameters (standardized regression weight) or called the path coefficient, knowing that the value of the path coefficient will take into account how large the value of the direct structural influence is. and whether the indirect or total influence of the predictor variable on the predictor can be determined or known

The results of the estimated parameter value λ, there are exogenous variables, intervening variables or endogenous variables all show coefficients greater than 0.6 and significant at $\alpha = 0.05$, this condition shows that the dimensions or indicators (measured variables) are valid factors and reliable for each latent variable or construct.

The evaluation is carried out first through testing the measurement model of each variable. Based on the measurement results, the variable model includes the External Environment (X1) and Internal Environment (X2) as exogenous variable indicators, while Digital Innovation (Y1) and Digitalization of Public Services (Y2) as intervening variable indicators and Regional Government Organizational Performance (Y3) are endogenous variable indicators also take into account the statistical values and frequency distribution of each variable. The implementation of the evaluation process can be described as follows:

The shows that the dimensions used to measure the External Environmental variable (X1) have a loading factor value greater than 0.6, so it can be concluded that these three dimensions produce a composite reliability of more than 0.70, so that these three dimensions can be concluded as valid and valid. reliable. From the calculation results above, the Regulatory dimension (X1.1) is the most dominant dimension of the External Environment variable (X1) with a loading factor value of 0.956.

The shows that the dimensions used to measure the Internal Environment variable (X2) have a loading factor value greater than 0.6, so it can be concluded that these four dimensions produce a composite reliability of more than 0.70, so that these four dimensions can be concluded as valid and valid. reliable. From the calculation results above, the Information Technology Infrastructure dimension (X2.3) is the most dominant dimension of the Internal Environment variable (X2) with a

loading factor value of 0.956. 3. Digital Innovation Variable Measurement Model (Y1) The measurement of the Digital Innovation variable (Y1) uses 5 (five) dimensions, namely Digital Transformation (Y1.1), Collaboration and Partnerships (Y1.2), Local Empowerment (Y1.3), Human Capital Development (Y1.4), and Citizen Engagement (Y1.5). Based on the calculation results of the Partial Least Square (PLS) measurement model, the measurement model that fits the data is the final model, as shown in Table 7 below:

Table 2 Measurement Model for Digital Innovation Variable Dimensions (Y1)

Dimension	Valuer (Loading Factor)	Standar Error	t statistic	*p-values*	AVE	Composite Reliability
Y1.1 <- Digital Innovation (Y1)	0,968	0,008	114,056	0,000		
Y1.2 <- Digital Innovation (Y1)	0,979	0,005	204,469	0,000		
Y1.3 <- Digital Innovation (Y1)	0,965	0,008	116,055	0,000	0,945	0,988
Y1.4 <- Digital Innovation (Y1)	0,982	0,005	188,458	0,000		
Y1.5 < Digital Innovation - (Y1)	0,966	0,018	54,502	0,000		

Table 7 shows that the dimensions used to measure the Digital Innovation variable (Y1) have a loading factor value greater than 0.6, so it can be concluded that the five dimensions produce a composite reliability of more than 0.70, so the five dimensions can be concluded as valid and valid. reliable.

From the calculation results above, the Human Capital Development dimension (Y1.4) is the most dominant dimension of the Digital Innovation variable (Y1) with a loading factor value of 0.982.

3. Public Service Digitalization Variable Measurement Model (Y2)

The shows that the dimensions used to measure the variable Digitalization of Public Services (Y2) have a loading factor value greater than 0.6, so it can be concluded that these three dimensions produce a composite reliability of more than 0.70, so these three dimensions can be concluded as valid and reliable.

From the calculation results above, the Public Service Application Integration dimension (Y2.2) is the most dominant dimension of the Public Service Digitalization variable (Y2) with a loading factor value of 0.988.

4. Regional Government Organizational Performance Variable Measurement Model (Y3)

The measurement of the Regional Government Organizational Performance variable (Y3) uses 4 (four) dimensions, namely AKIP (Accountability for Performance of Government Agencies) (Y3.1), IRB (Bureaucratic Reform Index) (Y3.2), IPM (Human Development Index) (Y3 .3), and IKM (Community Satisfaction Index) (Y3.4).

The shows that the dimensions used to measure the Regional Government Organizational Performance variable (Y3) have a loading factor value greater than 0.6, so it can be concluded that these four dimensions produce a composite reliability of more than 0.70, so that these four

dimensions can be concluded valid and reliable. From the calculation results above, the IKM (Community Satisfaction Index) dimension (Y3.4) is the most dominant dimension of the Regional Government Organizational Performance variable (Y3) with a loading factor value of 0.917.

After evaluating the measurement model (outer model) is fulfilled, the structural model (inner model) is then evaluated. Convergent validity is said to be good when each item has an Average Variance Extracted (AVE) greater than or equal to 0.50 (Hair et al., 2014). Table 11 presents the results of data processing using Smart PLS software and obtained an AVE value above 0.5.

Inner Model Equations

Inner Model	Path Cooficient	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistics (|O/STDEV|)	P Values	Model Equation
Digitalisazion Of Public Service (Y2) -> Performance of Local Government Organization(Y3)	-0,068	0,262	0,259	0,796	$Y3 = -0{,}068\ Y2 + \zeta_1$
Digital Innovation (Y1) -> Digitalisazion Of Public Service (Y2)	0,777	0,082	9,511	0,000	$Y2 = 0{,}777\ Y1 + \zeta_2$
Digital Innovation (Y1) -> Performance of Local Government Organization (Y3)	0,454	0,254	1,786	0,075	$Y3 = 0{,}454\ Y1 + \zeta_3$
External Environment (X1) -> Digitalisazion Of Public Service (Y2)	-0,421	0,093	4,537	0,000	$Y2 = -0{,}421\ X1 + \zeta_4$
External Environment (X1) -> Digital Innovation (Y1)	0,166	0,135	1,231	0,219	$Y1 = 0{,}166\ X1 + \zeta_5$
Internal Environment (X2) -> Digitalisazion Of Public Service (Y2)	0,562	0,119	4,722	0,000	$Y2 = 0{,}562\ X2 + \zeta_6$
Internal Environmenty (X2) -> Digital Innovation (Y1)	0,756	0,131	5,754	0,000	$Y1 = 0{,}756\ X2 + \zeta_7$

The research results show that respondents' responses to the External Environment are included in the good category and the External Environment variable is measured through the dimensions X1.1 Regulation, X1.2 Information Technology and X1.3 Public (Society), the research results as in Figure 4.14 show that the dimensions are The most dominant influence on the External Environment is the Regulatory dimension.

The results of research on respondents' responses to dimension X1.1 Regulations are based on being in the good category. The research results show that the most dominant indicator influencing the regulatory dimension is the indicator of the statement of Government Regulation No. 38 of 2017 in formulating the implementation of Regional Innovation.

The research results as in Figure 4.20 show that respondents' responses to the Internal Environment (X2) are included in the good category and the Internal Environment variable is measured through the dimensions X2.1 Leadership, X2.2 HR (Human Resources), X2.3 IT Infrastructure and X2. 4 Finance, research results as in Figure 4.19 show that the most dominant dimension influencing the Internal Environment is the Leadership dimension, this reinforces that Leadership is an important factor to consider internally to encourage organizational change and effectiveness and shows that top management support and governance or Strong management is

essential to avoid some of the challenges. Leadership is the ability to influence a group towards achieving goals. A person can carry out a leadership role solely because of his position in the organization (Robbin P. Stephen, 2003). Leaders can influence followers because they have five basic powers, namely reward-based power, conservative power, legitimacy-based power, appointment-based authority and expertise-based power (Stoner & Freeman, 2006).

The research results of respondents' responses to the X2.1 Leadership dimension based are included in the good category. The research results are based on the indicator that most dominantly influences the X2.1 Leadership dimension, namely the indicator of leadership's statement of response and support for the development of digital technology in the District/City local government environment.

The research results as in Figure 4 show that the respondents' responses to the Digital Innovation variable (Y1) are included in the good category and the Digital Innovation variable is measured through the dimensions Y1.1 Digital Transformation, Y1.2 Collaboration and Partnership, Y1.3. Local Empowerment, Y1.4 Human Capital Development and Y1.5 Citizen Engagement IT Infrastructure, research results as in Figure 2.25 show that the most dominant dimension influencing the Digital Innovation variable is the Collaboration and Partnership dimension, thus collaboration between government institutions, the private sector, and non-governmental organizations have been implemented and well established, resulting in more innovative and effective public services. Collaboration and partnerships strengthen collaboration between government institutions, the private sector and non-government organizations to produce more innovative and effective public services. The research results of respondents' responses to the Y1.2 Collaboration and Partnership dimension based on Figure 4.12 are included in the good category. The research results are based on Table 4.9, the indicator that most dominantly influences the Y1.2 Collaboration and Partnership dimension, namely the indicator of the statement of the leader's decision to collaborate between local governments, the private sector and non-governmental organizations to produce more innovative and effective innovations.

The research results as well as respondents' responses to the Public Service Digitalization variable (Y2) are included in the good category and the Public Service Digitalization variable is measured through the dimensions Y2.1 Digital Service Integration, Y2.1 Public Service Application Integration, and Y2.3 ICT Asset Management, research results as in Figure 4.32 shows that the most dominant dimension influencing the Digitalization of Public Services is the Digital Service Integration dimension.

The integration of national digital services was designed by the government to establish nine priority digital services, including education, health, social assistance, population administration, integrated state financial transactions for payment gateways, integrated state apparatus services, public service portal services, and one Indonesian data. The research results of respondents' responses to dimension Y2.1 National Digital Service Integration are included in the good category. The research results are based on Table 4.13, the indicator that most dominantly influences the Y2.1 dimension of National Digital Service Integration, namely the statement indicator of the effectiveness of the national digital service integration program.

The Regional Government Organizational Performance variable is measured through the dimensions Y3.1 IKM (Human Development Index), Y3.2 AKIP (Government Organizational Performance Accountability), Y3.3 IPM (Human Development Index), Y3.4 IRB (Bureaucratic Reform Index). The results of the research show that based on Table 4.16 all data on the variable dimensions of Regional Government Organizational Performance are good data, while the dimension that obtained the highest average value is the Y3.1 IKM (Community Satisfaction Index) dimension, thus the IKM dimension is the most dominant dimension. influences the Regional Government Organizational Performance variable, this indicates that the public services that have been carried out and implemented by Regency/City Regional Governments in Indonesia have met the needs and expectations of the community as service users and are in accordance with the ultimate goal of the performance evaluation process, namely providing better services. better, more efficient and more effective based on community needs. Community satisfaction can be used as a reference for the success or failure of program implementation at a public service institution (government organization) (LKj Sukabumi District 2020).

4. Conclusion

Regency/City Regional Governments in Indonesia always strive to ensure that the performance achieved continues to increase in each year's activity budget, for this reason this research can be used as a reference as an effort to improve performance. From the results of the calculations and analysis carried out in the previous chapter regarding "Digital Innovation Strategy Model and Implementation of Public Service Digitalization in Improving the Performance of Regional Government Organizations in Indonesia", it can be concluded: Description of the External Environment is included in the good category with the most dominant dimension influencing it being the regulatory dimension, the Internal Environment is included in the good category with the most dominant dimension influencing it being the Leadership dimension, Digital Innovation is included in the good category with the most dominant dimension influencing it being the Collaboration dimension and Partnership, Digitalization of Public Services is included in the good category with the most dominant dimension influencing it being the digital service integration dimension, while for the Regional Government Organizational Performance variables using ratio data, where the data used for all dimensions has a limited distribution and all data is good data with The dimension that obtained the highest average value was the IKM (Community Satisfaction Index) dimension. There is a positive and significant influence of the Internal Environment on Digital Innovation, this indicates that the Internal Environment is effective in influencing Digital Innovation, the better the condition of the Internal Environment, the better and better the development and progress of Digital Innovation will be in Regency/City Regional Governments in Indonesia . 4. There is a negative and significant influence from the External Environment on the Digitalization of Public Services, this indicates that the External Environment is effective in influencing the digitalization of public services, even though the condition of the External Environment is decreasing, the implementation of Digitalization of Public Services in Regency/City Regional Governments in Indonesia will be getting better and increase. 5. There is a positive and significant influence of the Internal Environment on the Digitalization of Public Services, this indicates that the Internal Environment is effective in influencing the Digitalization of Public Services, the better the condition of the Internal Environment, the greater the implementation of Digitalization of Public Services in Regency/City Regional Governments in Indonesia. There is a negative but not significant effect of Digital Innovation through Digitalization of Public Services on the Performance of Regional Government Organizations, this indicates that Digital Innovation is not effective in influencing the Performance of Regional Government Organizations through Digitalization of Public Services, no matter how good the results of Digital Innovation through Digitalization of Public Services will be meaningless and have no effect on improving the performance of Regency/City Regional Government Organizations in Indonesia. There is a positive and significant influence of Digital Innovation on the Digitalization of Public Services, this indicates that Digital Innovation is effective in influencing the Digitalization of Public Services, the more advanced the development of Digital Innovation, the more it will improve the implementation of Digitalization of Regency/City Regional Government Public Services in Indonesia. There is a negative but not significant influence from the Digitalization of Public Services on the Performance of Regional Government Organizations, this indicates that the Digitalization of Public Services is not effective in influencing the Performance of Regional Government Organizations, even though the conditions for implementing the Digitalization of Public Services are running well, it will be meaningless and have no effect towards improving the performance of Regency/City Regional Government Organizations in Indonesia.

References

[1.] Alhaq bani 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.] Bambang,Sudaryana (2016) Metode Penelitian . Teori dan Konsep, CV. Deepublish, Jogyakarta
[10.] Bambang,Sudaryana,(2022) Metode Penelitian Kunatitatif dan Kualitatif, CV. Deepublish, Jogyakarta
[11.] Barney J.B & Hesterly W.S. (2019). Strategic Mangement & Competitive Advantage. Person Education. Newyork
[12.] Barney, J. (1991), "Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage", Journal of Management,Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 99-120.
[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.] Lopez, Susana P, & Alegre, Joaquin. 2012. Information Tecnology Competency, Knowledge Processes and Firm. Industrial Management & Data Systems
[36.] Mahmudi (2010). Manajemen Kinerja Sektor Publik. UPP STIMYKPN. Yogyakarta
[37.] Mahsun, M. (2006). Pengukuran Kinerja Sektor Publik. Yogyakarta: BPFE Yogyakarta.
[38.] Mangkunegara A.P., (2001). Manajemen sumberdaya manusia. PT Remaja Rosdakarya. Bandung.
[39.] 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.
[40.] 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.
[41.] Mergel, I., (2019). Defining digital transformation. Government Information Quarterly. DOI:0.016/j.giq.2019.06.002.
[42.] Mergel, I. (2019) Digital service teams in government. Government Information Quarterly. www.elsevier.com/locate/govinf. doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2019.07.00
[43.] Migdadi M.M (2019). Knowledge management processes, innovation capability and organizational performance. https://www.emerald.com/insight/1741-0401.htm
[44.] 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
[45.] Muhammad F., (2008) Reinventing Local Government: Pengalaman dari Daerah. Jakarta: Gramedia.
[46.] Rabanjo C & Babucea A.G (2020) Digital services in Romania-Present and Perspective, Annals of the Constantin Brancusi. University of Targu Jiu, Economy Series.
[47.] Rachmatsyah Herry T. et al (2022) Public service digitalization in Bogor City.
[48.] Rachmad E.Yoesoep dkk (2024). Layanan dan Tata Kelola E-Government (Teori, Konsep dan Penerapan. Green Pustaka Indonesia. Yogyakarta.
[49.] Rahim R.A., & Radjab E., (2017). Manajemen Strategi. Lembaga Perpustakaan dan Penerbitan UMMI Makasar
[50.] Rehman, UU., et al (2020). Nexus of knowledge-oriented leadership, knowledge management, innovation and organizational performance in higher education. https://www.emerald.com/insight/1463-7154.htm
[51.] Riyanto, (2009). Manajemen Keuangan Teori, Konsep, dan Aplikasi. Yogyakarta
[52.] Robbins P. Stephen (2006). Prilaku Organisasi. Gramedia. Indonesia.
[53.] Robbins P Stephens (1994). Teori Organisasi. Arcan. Indonesia
[54.] Rogers E.M., (2003). Diffusion of innovations. Fres Pres . New York.
[55.] Roja A & Boc M (2021) Revista Transilvana de Stiinte Administrative (Transylvanian Journal Of Admnistrative Sciences)
[56.] Saputra N. (2020). Manajemen Bisnis Kotemporer. Diandra Kreatif. Yogyakarta.
[57.] Saunders M. et.al., (2009). Research Methodes for Businnes Students. Pearson Education Limited. England.
[58.] 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)
[59.] Sembiring M., (2018) Budaya & Kinerja organisasi. Fokus Media. Bandung
[60.] Sembiring J.N., & Fatihudin D. (2019) Manajemen Strategi dari Teori ke Praktek. Qiara Media. Pasuruan
[61.] Sinambela L.P., (2006) Reformasi Pelayanan Publik: Teori Kebijakan dan Implementasi. PT Bumi Aksara. Jakarta
[62.] Sitkin, S.B. (1996), "Learning through failure", in Cohen, M. and Sproull, L. (Eds), Organizational Learning, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
[63.] 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
[64.] 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
[65.] Sugiyono (2020). Statistif untuk Penelitian. Alfabeta. Bandung
[66.] .....Sugiyono (2017). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D. Alfabeta. Bandung.
[67.] Suryani K.N. & Foeh John E.H.J. (2018). Kinerja Organisasi. Deepublish. Sleman
[68.] Susanthi R.P.,(2017) Analisis Lingkungan Internal dan Eksternal dalam Mencapai Tujuan Perusahaan. Jurnal Elektronik. ISSN : 2598-8107
[69.] Stoner and Freeman (2006) Pengantar Managemen. Salemba Empat. Jakarta
[70.] Tampubolon H, (2016). Strategi Manajemen Sumberdaya Manusia dan Perannya dalam Pengembangan Keunggulan Bersaing. Papas Sinar Sinanti. Jakarta
[71.] Taufikqurokhman (2016) Manajemen Strategi. FISIP Univ. Moestopo
[72.] 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
[73.] 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.

[74.] 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

[75.] 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.

[76.] Varadarajan, R. (2018), "Innovation, innovation strategy, and strategic innovation, innovation and strategy", Review of Marketing Research, Vol. 15 https://www. emerald.com/insight/search?q=Rajan%20Varadarajan.

[77.] Zein M.H.M Harry dan Septiani Sisca (2024). Digitalisasi Pemerintah Daerah (Katalis untuk Integrasi dan Optimasi Good Governance). Sada Kurnia Pustaka. Banten 2024