



Research Paper

Strategic Management for Public Sector Performance in Literature Review

Abu Bakar^{1*}, Syahwami², Mardansyah³, Nova Elsyra⁴,
Joko Sunaryo⁵, Daniel Saputra⁶

^{1,2,3,4,5,6}Institut Administrasi dan Kesehatan setih Setio
Muara Bungo, Indonesia
*Corresponding Author

ABSTRACT

Strategic management is not only applied to the private sector but has also been applied to the public sector. The application of strategic management in the two sectors is actually not that different, it's just that public sector institutions do not emphasize the organizational goal of making a profit but rather on service to the community. The strategic management stages begin with strategy formulation, strategy implementation and strategy evaluation. Implementing public sector strategic management is one of the best ways to achieve good governance. In an effort to realize better performance of government organizations in providing services to the public, implementing strategic management for public sector organizations is very important to improve the effectiveness of the performance of public sector organizations.

This requires public sector organizations to think strategically, be able to translate their input into effective strategies, and develop the rationale necessary to lay the foundation for implementing their strategies. The implementation of strategic management in public sector organizations is expected to help the organization realize its vision and mission. Although the orientation of the results to be achieved by implementing strategic management between the private sector and the public sector is slightly different, the two sectors certainly face different environmental conditions which become obstacles in the process of implementing strategic management. To overcome the obstacles that occur, one way is to use a SWOT (strength, weakness, opportunity, and threats) analysis approach. In this article, we will discuss conceptually from the theoretical aspect the application of strategic management in measuring the performance of public sector organizations, and will also discuss the obstacles. -constraints that occur in measuring the performance of public sector organizations.

Keywords: strategic management; Performance measurement; public sector

Received 07 June, 2024; Revised 19 June, 2024; Accepted 22 June, 2024 © The author(s) 2024.

Published with open access at www.questjournals.org

I. INTRODUCTION

Efforts to improve the performance of public sector organizations through the implementation of performance management are a necessity for these organizations to take strategic steps to improve the organization's performance.(H et al., 2022). The implementation of performance management began in 1999 with the launch of the concept of performance accountability in the good governance of government agencies with the publication of Presidential Instruction Number 7 of 1999 concerning Performance Accountability of Government Agencies (AKIP). However, until now, the performance of government agencies has not become the main focus in government governance in measuring the success of a program or activity carried out by a government agency.(Moussa et al., 2018). Government agency management still focuses on output performance rather than outcomes.(Cinquini et al., 2016). For this reason, it has become important for public sector organizations to implement strategic management to link the performance of public sector organizations with environmental conditions that continue to change.(Kombate et al., 2021).

Basically, strategic management is a new perspective that highlights the importance of organizations paying more attention to strategy formulation and environmental change. The right organizational strategy to adapt to a changing environment is very important for the successful achievement of organizational goals. Discussing strategic management tries to connect the organization and its environment, both internal and external environments which continue to experience change(Muravu, 2021).

Understanding strategic management according to Thomas Wheelen and David Hunger (2001) in (Pitt & Koufopoulos, 2017) is a series of managerial decisions and actions that determine a company's long-term performance. Whereas (David, 2016) states that strategic management is the art and science of formulating, implementing and evaluating cross-functional decisions that enable an organization to achieve its goals. Strategic management is a series of strategic decision making processes which include a framework for formulating, implementing and evaluating. This strategic management process includes long and short term plans to achieve predetermined targets

Public sector strategic management directs public sector organizations to carry out management planning by carefully considering supporting and inhibiting factors in achieving organizational goals that can influence the performance of public sector organizations. Thus, the focus of strategic management is to connect the organization with its environment, formulate strategies to adapt to the environment, and ensure that strategy implementation goes well. Organizations are also expected to be able to control the direction of achieving predetermined targets, so that public sector organizations are able to provide maximum performance (Khemesh, 2019).

According to (Jamison et al., 2020) In principle, strategic management is the ability of organizational management to adapt to the future, which is generally short and medium term. Strategy is important because it is a process for determining the direction that must be taken so that the organization's vision and mission can be achieved. Strategy can also provide a reasonable basis for decisions that will lead toward achieving organizational goals. Strategic decisions will increase the leader's ability to face change.

According to (Widyanty et al., 2020), strategic decisions pay attention to the scope of organizational activities, adjustments to organizational activities and their environment, allocation and reallocation of key resources within the organization, values, expectations and goals of influential strategies, as well as the implications of operational changes throughout the organization. So it can be said that strategic management is a process that at every stage requires participation from all parties and accountability from the leader. Thus strategic management includes establishing a framework for implementing these various processes.

II. DISCUSSION

A. Coverage of Public Sector Organizations

(Eldor & Harpaz, 2019) provides an understanding of the public sector as everything related to the public interest and the provision of goods or services to the public which are paid for through taxes or other state revenues regulated by law. The wide scope of the public sector means that its implementation is often handed over to the market, with regulation and supervision remaining in the hands of the government. So, in its development, the public sector experienced various changes which caused a bias towards the private sector.

The assumption that public sector organizations are definitely non-profit is incorrect because there are public sector organizations that are quasi non-profit, that is, their main goal is to improve the welfare of society but have a profit motive for the sustainability of the organization and can contribute to state or regional income. So that public sector organizations are not only social organizations or non-profit organizations, and also not only government organizations (Cinquini et al., 2016). Public organizations are organizations related to the public interest and the provision of goods or services to the public which are paid for through taxes or other state revenues regulated by law. Public sector organizations are needed to ensure that public services can be provided to the community fairly and equally, as well as to ensure that public services are provided in accordance with community needs.

(Robinson, 2015), puts forward several reasons for the need for strategic change which also provides clues about the benefits of strategic management for public and non-profit organizations as follows:

1. New or developing organizations must think about prioritized goals and objectives.
2. The need to maintain financing stability requires new strategies to find new sources of financing.
3. The desire to develop services, as resources become more available, encourages managers to make changes to policies, procedures, and perhaps even the priorities of the consumers they serve.
4. Expansion of roles due to public pressure, to answer their needs.
5. Leadership changes are usually accompanied by a new vision that requires executives to understand and adapt to new policies.
6. Juridical demands in planning that allow changes to procedures if there is pressure from the government to obtain the necessary assistance.
7. Demands for integration between departments, bureaus, fields, sections, sections, etc. very often occur in government organizations which require adjustments to missions, goals and various procedures.
8. Coordination of actions that require changes in internal policies.
9. Political threats require executives to adapt their organizational policies to these demands.

B. Dimensions of Public Sector Organizational Performance Measurement

Performance is the keyword that dominates all discussions about NPM (Yang & Hsu, 2019). As stated (Muravu, 2021), performance is a broad concept that includes various meanings, for different audiences and in different contexts. As a result, the design of performance indicators for private and public sector organizations becomes difficult. Despite technical obstacles in operationalizing an abstract concept, a common set of performance indicators may be needed to answer questions about different dimensions of performance. The task of performance measurement in public sector organizations is very complex.

There are two reasons commonly used to explain the differences in performance measurement between public and private organizations. First, because private organizations are considered to adhere to bottom-line profit requirements, performance measurement is a comparable and straightforward technical procedure. Second, there are certain social and political pressures on public sector organizational agents.

According to (Hammerschmid et al., 2019). The public sector performance measurement system is a system that aims to help public managers assess the achievement of a strategy through financial and non-financial measuring tools. The performance measurement system can be used as a tool for organizational control, because performance measurement is strengthened by establishing a reward and punishment system. Further stated (Moussa et al., 2018) that measuring the performance of public sector organizations is carried out to fulfill three purposes. First, to help improve government performance, performance measures are intended to help the government focus on the goals and objectives of work unit programs. This is expected to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of public sector organizations in providing services to the public. Second, for resource allocation and decision making. Third, to realize public accountability and improve institutional communication.

Whereas (Rafiq et al., 2020), suggests that research in the service sector suggests that there are 2 main categories in performance measurement, one category relates to final results or outcomes and the other relates to determining factors. Outcomes are divided into financial performance and competitiveness. Meanwhile, the determining factors are further divided into several categories, namely service quality, flexibility, innovation and resource utilization.

C. Objectives of Public Sector Organizational Performance Measurement

Performance measurement is a tool for assessing organizational success, which in the context of public sector organizations will be used to gain support and legitimacy from the public. The public will judge the success of the organization through the organization's ability to provide relatively cheap and high-quality public services. So performance measurement is very important to assess the accountability of organizations and leaders in producing better public services. (Ateş et al., 2020), suggests that according to the traditional view, performance measurement has three important objectives, namely: ensuring the achievement of goals or objectives, evaluating, controlling and improving procedures and processes, and to compare and assess the performance of different organizations, teams and individuals.

According to (Fuertes et al., 2020) The objectives of measuring the performance of public sector organizations are as follows:

1. Knowing the level of achievement of organizational goals
2. Providing employee learning facilities
3. Improve performance in the next period
4. Give consideration Which systematic in making decision to give rewards and punishment
5. Motivate employees
6. Creating public accountability

In general, the objectives of the performance measurement system according to (Pitt & Koufopoulos, 2017) are as follows:

1. Communicate strategies better by using top down and bottom up methods.
2. Measuring financial and non-financial performance in a balanced manner so that progress can be traced to strategy achievements.
3. Accommodate understanding of the interests of middle and lower level managers and motivate them to achieve goal congruence.
4. As tool For reach satisfaction based on approach individual and collective rational abilities.

D. Obstacles and Challenges in Measuring the Performance of Public Sector Organizations

Performance measurement is the process of recording and measuring the achievement of implementing activities towards achieving goals through the results displayed in the form of products, services or processes. Most private organizations use profit as a measure of their performance. However, this is not the case with

public organizations, because profit is not the main goal, but organizations focus more on increasing the achievement of people's welfare. Apart from that, the output of public organizations is generally intangible and indirect, or according to (Parwoto & Halim, 2020), due to the multidimensional nature of the performance of public sector organizations, there is no single indicator that can be used to show performance comprehensively. This means that financial measures alone are not enough to measure the performance of public sector organizations, it is necessary to develop non-financial performance measures.

As stated by (Telabah et al., 2018), that the range of measurements used in public sector organizations must include financial and non-financial. Performance measures are used by the legislature to determine the feasibility of service costs (cost of service) that will be charged to the public who use public services. So the government has an obligation to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of public services or provide many services at low costs (do more with less). The public certainly does not want to continue to be levied, but there will be no improvement in the quality of service they receive.

(H et al., 2022)(Maros et al., 2023), stated several obstacles to measuring the performance of public sector organizations, including:

1. The performance of public sector organizations cannot be assessed solely based on financial ratios, because the organization's goal is not to maximize profits.
2. Output in the form of services is usually qualitative, intangible and *indirect* so it's hard to measure
3. There is no direct relationship between input and output (discretionary cost center) because it is difficult to set standards as a benchmark for productivity.
4. It does not operate based on market forces so there is no independent comparison and requires instruments to replace market mechanisms in measuring performance.
5. Measuring heterogeneous public satisfaction from the services of public sector organizations is not easy to do.

Public services are carried out using a certain budget and community groups using services must compete for limited resources. The market solution to this situation is to introduce the principle of user payment for the service chosen so that the user of the service is the person who actually pays for the service. (Gębczyńska & Brajer-Marczak, 2020).

E. Strengthen Management Strategic with Measurement Performance Public Sector Organizations

In 1992, David Osborne and Ted Gaebler published their bestseller, *Reinventing Government*, which provided a broad overview of a number of strategies that they believed could improve the performance of public organizations. (Ammons & Roenigk, 2015). Then in 2000 with *The Reinventor Fieldbook. Tools for Transforming Your Government* Appeared, together with Peter Plastrik, he offered an elaboration instrument from the previous idea. One of the performance measurement instruments is if a public organization defines its products and services and then indicators are created to measure its output (Lisbon et al., 2016). The results of product determination and performance indicators can be used as a basis for planning and control cycles that can improve organizational performance.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Gębczyńska & Brajer-Marczak, 2020) stated that the function of measuring the performance of public sector organizations is as follows:

1. *Transparency*: organizations can make it clear what products they offer, how to analyze the input-output, including costs
2. *Learning*: an organization becomes one step ahead if it uses performance measurement to learn, the transparency created teaches the organization what its strengths are and where the opportunities for development are.
3. *Appraising*: assessment-based performance can be said to be the functioning of the organization
4. *Sanctioning*: assessment can be followed by positive sanctions if the performance turns out to be good, and negative sanctions if the performance is bad

The main idea of performance measurement is that public organizations formulate the performance under consideration and make indications of how this performance can be measured, by establishing performance indicators. According to (Mohd Derus & Abdul-Aziz, 2016), government performance is difficult to measure because the outcome as the final impact is very dependent on many factors. For example, the time period for achievements carried out and the resulting impacts may be too long.

So what can be measured then is the direct impact (output), for example: the number of decisions issued by the court, the number of patients treated by doctors, the number of graduates produced by universities and so on. This is why many performance measurement systems focus on output. The process is as follows: production and services are defined, the organization sets production targets, output is measured and the results are reported

periodically.(Kattel et al., 2018), stated various positive impacts of measuring the performance of public organizations which ultimately have implications for strengthening strategic management as follows:

1. Performance measurement leads to transparency

Performance measurement provides an organization with insight into key products, costs, and also how the organization's activities or certain parts of the organization contribute to output. Transparency can lead to various forms of rationalization, and may trigger internal discussions about how various activities can improve organizational performance. There are also clear guidelines for how to assess new structures or procedures, especially how they can contribute to improving organizational performance. The rationalization and development processes can begin simultaneously over time as the organization can measure the existence of its outputs(Ateh et al., 2020)

2. Performance measurement is an incentive for output

Initially, performance measurement has an impact on output, and then this will ultimately contribute to organizational performance. Several research results that illustrate the relationship between the introduction of performance measurement and increased output have been carried out, for example in a city government,(Sofyani et al., 2018)and at higher education institutions,(Sofyani et al., 2019).

3. Performance measurement is an elegant way to create accountability.

As the tasks of public organizations become increasingly complex, so does the discourse of autonomy important And when autonomy given, the implication is accountability, taking responsibility for one's performance. Information about performance is systematically measured and calculated so that it adds up ability a number of certain period. Information is also easy to communicate, and information can be provided periodically every year. According to(Mungai, 2017), performance measurement is very important for public organizations because: it can help improve the quality of resource allocation and other managerial decisions, it can facilitate fact-based management for the future by providing a basic focus for planning, monitoring and exercising control to planning. Apart from this, performance measurement is also very important to increase accountability by making accountability explicit and providing evidence of success or failure, as well as being able to provide a systematic basis for assessing and motivating staff.

Meanwhile, according to(Gębczyńska & Brajer-Marczak, 2020), performance measurement can be useful for the following:

1. Provides an understanding of the measures used to assess management performance.
2. Provide direction to achieve predetermined performance targets.
3. Monitor and evaluate performance achievements, and compare them with performance targets and take corrective action to improve performance.
4. As a basis for providing rewards and punishment objectively for achievements measured in accordance with the agreed performance measurement system.
5. As a communication tool between subordinates and leaders in order to improve organizational performance.
6. Helps identify whether customer satisfaction has been met
7. Helps understand the process of government agency activities.
8. Ensure that decision making is carried out objectively

The existence of public sector organizations cannot be separated from a particular mission, in fact the critical success factor for public sector organizations is how they achieve the mission they carry out, for example how to achieve a level of efficiency or manage public funds to be accountable, as well as creating customer satisfaction. One strategy for realizing an organization's mission is to utilize an integrated quality management (Total Quality Management/ TQM) approach. According to(Kalia et al., 2021), TQM is an approach in running an organizational business that tries to increase the competitiveness of the organization and its environment, which to achieve this must focus on customers, have a high obsession with quality, use a scientific approach in decision making and problem solving, have a long-term commitment and require cooperation .

TQM is management that creates and develops a set of values and beliefs that can make everyone know that quality for consumers is the most important demand, and its implementation requires good and integrated cooperation. Or in another, more comprehensive formulation, TQM is also understood as an integrated and dedicated commitment to quality through continuous process improvement by all members of the organization. TQM is often referred to as management based on facts and data because it works based on data and facts.

In a case study in the United Kingdom,(Management et al., 2020)suggests that there is a rationale for

using a performance measurement system as a management tool to implement strategy. Indicators are used to formulate a community strategy and to measure how the strategy has been well realized. Not only in the private sector, quality-of-life reporting is also an integral part of the more strategic use of performance measurement in the public sector. The concept of strategic management must therefore embody general management principles and practices carried out as an effort to formulate strategy and its implementation in the organization. Although strategic management is not a panacea for solving various problems faced by organizations and is also not a guarantee of the organization's success in achieving its goals, at least it will open the way to a better direction.

III. CONCLUSION

The existence of public sector organizations cannot be separated from a particular mission, in fact the critical success factor for public sector organizations is largely determined by how they achieve the mission they carry out. Performance measurement has many positive impacts in public sector organizations, which ultimately has implications for strengthening strategic management, namely: bringing transparency, providing incentives for output, and being an elegant way to create accountability. However, it cannot be avoided that measuring organizational performance on the other hand can have a number of negative impacts, namely encouraging game playing, increasing internal bureaucracy, hindering innovation, hindering ambition, killing professionalism, and killing the accountability system.

Performance measurement is very important for public organizations because it can help improve the quality of resource allocation and other managerial decisions, can facilitate management based on data and facts for the future by providing a basis for planning, as well as monitoring and controlling planning. Apart from this, performance measurement is also very important to increase accountability by making accountability explicit and providing evidence of success or failure, as well as being able to provide a systematic basis for assessing and motivating staff.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1]. Ammons, D.N., & Roenigk, D.J. (2015). Performance management in local government: Is practice influenced by doctrine? *Public Performance and Management Review*, 38(3), 514–541. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2015.1006461>
- [2]. Ateh, MY, Berman, E., & Prasojo, E. (2020). Intergovernmental Strategies Advancing Performance Management Use. *Public Performance and Management Review*, 43(5), 993–1024. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2020.1736588>
- [3]. Ateş, N.Y., Tarakci, M., Porck, J.P., van Knippenberg, D., & Groenen, P.J.F. (2020). The Dark Side of Visionary Leadership in Strategy Implementation: Strategic Alignment, Strategic Consensus, and Commitment. *Journal of Management*, 46(5), 637–665. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318811567>
- [4]. Cinquini, L., Mauro, S. G., & Pianezzi, D. (2016). The illusion of New Public Management? An analysis of performance-based budgeting in the public sector. *Proceedings of Pragmatic Constructivism*, 6(1), 14–25. <https://www.propracon.com/article/view/25144>
- [5]. David, R.F. (2016). *Strategic Management*. Book I, 12–30.
- [6]. Eldor, L., & Harpaz, I. (2019). The Nature of Learning Climate in Public Administration: A Cross-Sectorial Examination of Its Relationship With Employee Job Involvement, Proactivity, and Creativity. *American Review of Public Administration*, 49(4), 425–440. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074018804667>
- [7]. Fuertes, G., Alfaro, M., Vargas, M., Gutierrez, S., Ternero, R., & Sabattin, J. (2020). Conceptual Framework for the Strategic Management: A Literature Review - Descriptive. *Journal of Engineering (United Kingdom)*, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/6253013>
- [8]. Gębczyńska, A., & Brajer-Marczak, R. (2020). Review of Selected Performance Measurement Models Used in Public Administration. *Administrative Sciences*, 10(4), 99. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci10040099>
- [9]. H, HE, Sarjon, D., Zefriyenni, Z., & Nanik, I. (2022). Lawas Utara Regency Indonesia. 90–103. <https://doi.org/10.24818/amp/2022.38-05>
- [10]. Hammerschmid, G., Van de Walle, S., Andrews, R., & Mostafa, A.M.S. (2019). New Public Management reforms in Europe and their effects: findings from a 20-country top executive survey. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 85(3), 399–418. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852317751632>
- [11]. Jamison, E., Simpson, J., Kumar, P., Kemp, A., Awate, K., & Manning, K. (2020). STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT Adapted by Reed Kennedy. <https://doi.org/10.21061/strategicmanagement>
- [12]. Kalia, P., Kaushal, R., Singla, M., & Parkash, J. (2021). Determining the role of service quality, trust and commitment to customer loyalty for telecom service users: a PLS-SEM approach. *TQM Journal*, 33(7), 377–396. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TQM-04-2021-0108>
- [13]. Kattel, R., Cepilovs, A., Lember, V., & Tõnurist, P. (2018). Indicators for public sector innovations: Theoretical frameworks and practical applications. *Halduskultuur*, 19(1), 77–104. <https://doi.org/10.32994/ac.v19i1.208>
- [14]. Khemesh, S. (2019). STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT / Basic concepts Basic concepts. March.
- [15]. Kombate, B., Emmanuel, M., & Richard, K. K. (2021). The Implications of the Strategic Implementation Style and Middle Management Effort in Public Organizations Strategic Management Implementation and Its Organizational Performance. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 11(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jpag.v11i1.18150>
- [16]. Lisbon, D., Allin, D., Cleek, C., Roop, L., Brimacombe, M., Downes, C., & Pingleton, S. K. (2016). Improved Knowledge, Attitudes, and Behaviors After Implementation of TeamSTEPS Training in an Academic Emergency Department: A Pilot Report. *American Journal of Medical Quality*, 31(1), 86–90. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1062860614545123>
- [17]. Management, MP, Student, E., University, DI, & Padang, N. (2020). June 2020.
- [18]. Maros, A., Sunaryo, J., Albady, SA, & Bakar, A. (2023). Perceptions Of Community Satisfaction With The Performance Of Bungo District Government Services. 11(12), 167–173.
- [19]. Mohd Derus, M., & Abdul-Aziz, AR (2016). Critical technical competencies of public sector project managers in developing countries. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 24(2), 587–604.
- [20]. Moussa, M., McMurray, A., & Muenjohn, N. (2018). Innovation in public sector organizations. *Cogent Business and Management*,

- 5(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2018.1475047>
- [21]. Mungai, AN (2017). E-Government Strategy Implementation and Performance of the Public Sector in Kenya. *International Academic Journal of Human Resource and Business Administration*, 2(3), 301–338. http://www.iajournals.org/articles/iajhrba_v2_i3_301_338.pdf
- [22]. Muravu, N. (2021). Strategic Performance Measurement and Management in the Public Sector: Indispensable Role of Performance Measures. *Journal of Business and Management*, 23(1), 48–73. <https://doi.org/10.9790/487X-2301024873>
- [23]. Parwoto, P., & Halim, A. (2020). The Effects of Organizational and Political Factors on the Development of Performance Measurement System (PMS) of Local Government Institutions. *Journal of Accounting and Investment*, 21(2). <https://doi.org/10.18196/jai.2102146>
- [24]. Pitt, M., & Koufopoulos, D. (2017). Essentials of Strategic Management. In *Essentials of Strategic Management*. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526435736>
- [25]. Rafiq, M., Zhang, XP, Yuan, J., Naz, S., & Maqbool, S. (2020). Impact of a balanced scorecard as a strategic management system tool to improve sustainable development: Measuring the mediation of organizational performance through PLS-Smart. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 12(4), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12041365>
- [26]. Robinson, M. (2015). From Old Public Administration to the New Public Service Implications for Public Sector Reform in Developing Countries. *UNDP Global Center for Public Service Excellence*, 1–20. [http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/capacity-development/English/Singapore Centre/PS-Reform_Paper.pdf](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/capacity-development/English/Singapore%20Centre/PS-Reform_Paper.pdf)
- [27]. Sofyani, H., Akbar, R., & Ferrer, RC (2018). 20 years of performance measurement system (PMS) implementation in Indonesian local government: Why is their performance still poor? *Asian Journal of Business and Accounting*, 11(1), 151–184. <https://doi.org/10.22452/ajba.vol11no1.6>
- [28]. Sofyani, H., Nazaruddin, I., Putri, CM, & Fathmaningrum, ES (2019). Exploring Performance Measurement System for Lecturers (Pmsl): Comparison Among Three Models in Indonesia, Singapore and Turkey. *Journal of Accounting and Finance Review*, 9(3), 269. <https://doi.org/10.22219/jrak.v9i3.9639>
- [29]. Telabah, IWS, Hermanto, H., & Handajani, L. (2018). Implementation of Performance Accountability System For Government Institutions (SAKIP): Determinants and Consequences in Local Government. *International Business and Accounting Research Journal*, 2(2), 87. <https://doi.org/10.15294/ibarj.v2i2.36>
- [30]. Widyanty, W., Daito, A., Riyanto, S., & Nusraningrum, D. (2020). Human Resource Management Strategy and Safety Culture as Competitive Advantages in Order to Improve Construction Company Performance. *Business and Entrepreneurial Review*, 20(2), 123. <https://doi.org/10.25105/ber.v20i2.8014>
- [31]. Yang, C.-L., & Hsu, H.-K. (2019). Optimized New Product Development Strategy. *The International Journal of Organizational Innovation*, 12(1), 110–121. <http://www.ijoi-online.org/>