

PARTNERSHIP POLICY IN TOURISM DEVELOPMENT: STUDY OF PUBLIC, PRIVATE AND COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS IN TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN GREATER BANDUNG

Teddy Hikmat Fauzi
Abdul Rosid

ABSTRACT

The main focus of this research is the study of partnership policy in the field of tourism development. The purpose of this study is to describe the implementation of partnership policies between government, the private sector and the community. By using qualitative research approach, and by obtaining information source consisting of local governments, tourism/private business actors, the public, consumers or local tourists, especially in the Greater Bandung area, the results show that the need for partnerships in tourism development does not occur in this region. There is no inter-regional partnership in this tourist area because there is no need for reciprocity between regions in the Greater Bandung area.

Keywords: policy, partnership, tourism.

INTRODUCTION

The government requires a strategic partnership with the private sector and the community in the development of the tourism industry. This is because of the limitations of resources owned by the government both in the field of capital or capital, human resources or the field of management. Thus, the government must collaborate or partner with other actors, namely the private sector and the community. The community will become an integral part in the development of tourism, and can foster an attitude of ownership and a sense of responsibility as actors and determinants of tourism development primarily on a local scale as well as the private sector.

The need for partnerships involving state, private and social institutions at both the local and international levels becomes an urgent need for the government. In this position, state policy is very meaningful, not only as a regulative function in the country but also as a strategic function in international relations. Thus, the tourism development policy in one country cannot be analyzed without linking to the interests of partnerships between government, business and society. The institutional policy of partnership between the government, the public and the private sector, is a system that interacts with the boundaries and rules that have been agreed between the various partners. This partnership was developed within the framework of the needs and resources possessed by those who partnered. In the partnership model of the 3 parties, Bloomfield (2006) shows that the partnership is established because each party will benefit. Likewise, the overall relationship between the three parties will provide benefits for regional economic development. The relation of the three parties, Bloomfield (2006) shows that there are benefits for local economic growth resulting from government, private and community partnerships. In the partnership relationship above, each party has its own role and benefits.

In the partnership relationship between the government and the private sector, the government plays a role in formulating policies and rules as well as providing licensing services, and developing cooperation between regions which enables businesses in their respective regions to develop mutual investment. Meanwhile, from the private sector, the partnership will encourage the role of the private sector to provide a conducive environment for the region as an investment destination area, involving relevant departments (industry, labor, etc.), as well as the need for transparency in licensing relationships and added value that can be obtained from local economic activities.

In the partnership relationship between the government and the community (the community), the government plays a role in formulating policies which are in favor of the interests of the community, as well as carrying out public transparency and accountability. Whereas for the community itself, the partnership is an opportunity for the community to get business opportunities, and to gain space to negotiate with the government in obtaining justice and equality.

In Indonesia, the partnership policy in tourism development in-depth discussion of the issue of the Public and Private Sector Partnership in the field of tourism emerged in the tourism symposium in Yogyakarta in 2001. This activity was part of the annual East Asian Inter Regional Tourism Forum (EATOF) meeting. In general, the partnership policy in the field of tourism has been formulated by the government in the National Tourism Development Master Plan for 2010 - 2025. However, this policy has not been formulated more operationally including the scope of the scope of partnerships that can be carried out by the government, the mechanism and position of each actor involved, as well as implementation guidelines. In order to fill this gap, this research seeks to contribute to the formulation of partnership policies in the development of tourism in Indonesia.

PROBLEM FORMULATION

The description in the background of the above problems, it clearly shows the importance of a study of partnerships in tourism development, however the development of tourism is not easy. Ray Pine (2002) giving the right answer in developing tourism partnerships. Xu stated that the structure, nature, objectives, and scope of the partnership in the field of tourism differ from one region/country to another region or country.

Basically there is no standard model or formula to describe what is called partnership. This statement is clearly a challenge in the context of building partnerships in tourism development policies. This is related to the need to contextualize or adjust local-level socio-economic and cultural conditions for the development of partnership policy models or formulas in tourism development. Based on the problems and considerations above, the main problems in this study can be formulated as follows:

- 1) Why is a partnership policy between the government, the private sector and the community needed for tourism development?
- 2) Does the partnership policy lead to an equal partnership between the government, the private sector and the community?
- 3) What is the pattern of implementing the partnership policy between the government, private sector and the community in the tourism sector?

LITERATURE REVIEW

A study from de Araujo and Bramwell (2002) examines partnerships in planning in regional tourism development in northern Brazil, in particular. In this study explored the influence of the socioeconomic and political context on the arrangement of partnerships in the development of regional tourism. The partnerships studied are between government organizations at various spatial scales and functional levels.

The study of partnerships in tourism has been carried out by Othman (2014) on the marketing alliance and networking between the National Tourism Organization (NTO) and private non-private organizations in Malaysia. The research presented at the International Tourism & Destination Management Conference, 2003 in China, examined comprehensively the inter-organizational alliances, partnerships and network relationships between the Malaysian Tourism Promotion Board with private and non-private organizations.

Another study on tourism partnerships was carried out by Supraptini and Djarismawati (2005) on developing partnership patterns in improving sanitation in food management in Bali's tourist areas. Pforr's (2006) research discusses the dynamics of tourism policy using a network approach. The focus of this study is to explain the influence of the complexity of the reputation, cooperation and communication of various actors in the process of formulating a policy (master plan) for tourism development. The intended actor network involved in this activity is the relationship between actors from the public-private sector and non-profit organizations. Hanqin Zhang et al. (2002) conducted research on the implementation of tourism policy in China from the perspective of tourism entrepreneurs. This study examines 3 problem formulations, namely:

- a. How is the implementation of tourism policy in China,
- b. Opportunities and obstacles faced by entrepreneurs with the implementation of tourism policies,
- c. Test the future of policy implementation in China.

The study of the government's partnership policy with the private and public sectors, was presented by Bovaird (2004). Sengupta (2006) examining partnerships in the housing sector by using a combination of partnership theory, urban regime theory and governance theory, the study shows concludes that the partnership implemented by the government has not been able to develop the housing sector to its full potential.

Other research on partnership in the Netherlands was carried out by Plochg et al., (2006) which convinced that partnership was the right approach to build synergy even in a society that was competing. The results of his research on partnerships in community-based health services, show the results that the partnership has been successful and sustainable in providing health services. In this partnership, community-based integrated services are developed. Partnership research in broader sector coverage was carried out in India by the Government of India Planning Commission (2004) in the Social sector. The research report is about a private public partnership strategy implemented through government projects in the social sector. The intended sectors are higher education, culture, health, family welfare, agriculture and cooperatives, environment and forests, rural and urban development, clean water and social justice.

Rüland (1993) developed a study of the relationship of local government with local associations. The study was conducted in the cities of Chiang Mai and Nakhon Sawan, Thailand. The results of Rulland's research on several types of local associations concluded that in Thailand, local associations lacked the function of supporting regional autonomy. The role that is still strongly played is financial support for religious activities or cultural activities.

The study of policy implementation has developed within the State Administration. There are several experts who have put forward the theory, among others, Edwards III (1980) implementation theory focuses on the explanation of 4 (four) factors or variables in the implementation of public policies: communications, resources, dispositions or attitudes and bureaucratic structure. Grindle (2017) implementation involves all factors, namely policy, legality and influential factors. Grindle (2017) considers 3 things at once, namely:

- a. Implementation variables consisting of policy objectives, action programs, projects and funding, and design for program delivery;
- b. Results variable (outcome) of policy implementation consisting of impacts on society and the changes that occur;
- c. Influencing variables consisting of policy content and implementation context.

Meanwhile, Sabatier and Mazmanian (1983) view the important role of implementation analysis as identifying variables that seek to achieve legal objectives. This variable can be divided into three broader categories:

1. Problems that might arise,
2. Ability to structure the implementation of legislation in the implementation process,
3. The direct effect of various political variables in achieving balance supports the achievement of legislation.

The implementation theory of Van Meter and Van Horn (1975) believes that policy implementation will succeed if the desired changes are relatively small, while agreement on the objectives, especially of those who operate the program in the field, is relatively high. This means that the path that connects policy and work performance is separated by a number of dimensions, namely:

- a. Policy standards and objectives,
- b. Resources,
- c. Communication between organizations and strengthening activities,
- d. Characteristics of implementing agencies,
- e. Economic, political and social conditions,
- f. The attitude of the implementers.

Rationale for partnership basically is in the argument about the role and position of the state in relations, state, and society. This explanation of relations is the most classic discussion in social science knowledge. This is clearly seen because this concept has been long discussed (Mayo, 1997). There are at least 3 thoughts that have been explained, namely:

- a. Market perspectives (market systems) that can be traced in classical economic theory from Adam Smith (1723-1790) to New Public Management in the work of Osborne and Gaebler (2010). In this perspective stems from a strict separation or no relationship at all between the state and society (both in private and community form) to the view that directs the involvement of the state in market affairs expressed by Keynes (1883-1946), in Staniland, (1985) and changes in state management to operate like private companies.
- b. The perspective of democracy can be traced in democratic administration theory from Max Weber (Ostrom, 1973) to New Public Services in the work of Denhardt and Denhardt (2003). There are 4 typologies of interorganization relations, namely: a. competition, b. cooperatives, c. coordination d. collaboration. According to Jamal and Getz (1995) what is needed in a partnership is collaboration rather than cooperation in the short term.

The substance of collaboration in partnerships is not entirely easy to explain its limitations. Collaboration has included a network of relationships between government, private (companies) and NGOs that have different types of collaboration activities with other interorganizational activities that are market driven and hierarchical control mechanisms (Lawrence et al, 2002). Ahmad (2018) in the study of Shanghai cooperation organizations, shows that partnership is a new model of cooperation. This model is different from strategic alliances. The concept of partnership has a different meaning, it bases the balance of power between participants. With this approach, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization creates partnerships rather than expanding organizations. One of the partnership models of government, private and community relations was put forward by Savas (2000). Based on the type and nature of goods, Savas (2000) distinguishes the provision of public goods can be done through privatization where the government involves the private sector and the community.

RESEARCH METHOD

Based on the proposed framework, this study uses a qualitative approach in examining tourism partnership policies. Qualitative research is used because it can reveal real events on the ground and can also reveal hidden values from this research. This qualitative approach is often used in social research, also called the naturalistic approach (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). This study intentionally examines the specifics, details and depth of various problems by seeking as much information as possible in order to reveal the phenomena that form the basis for the selection of research approaches. Because this research uses a qualitative approach in describing various phenomena, the researcher does not use statistical procedures but rather inductively where the researcher is the main tool.

A qualitative approach is expected to direct this research to obtain ontological answers, namely about the meaning and urgency of partnerships for the government in carrying out its functions in the constellation of social change that occurs around it. In this question, efforts can be made to separate clearly the various administrative actions that are close together or coincide with partnerships, such as coordination, cooperation, cooperation, and so on. This research will also question the importance and strategic partnership of all actors involved (state, private and civil society), especially in the perspective of the government as a policy maker. In addition to the ontological aspects, this study also points to epistemological aspects, namely to get answers about methodological limits for a joint activity called partnership or partnership for the government. This methodological limit is important for policy formulation, because partnership as a government policy must be clear in terms of model, system, position in administration as well as measurement of output and output for the government, private sector and society.

This research also directs to the axiological aspects to get answers about the benefits of partnership as an act of government administration towards improving government performance in carrying out development and community service tasks. This study discusses partnership policy in developing tourism. The main focus is the study of partnership policy in the field of tourism development.

The purpose of this study is to describe and analyze the need for a tourism partnership policy and its implementation as well as the impacts arising from the existence of a partnership policy between the government, the private sector and the community. In line with the objectives of the study, this study uses a qualitative approach in examining tourism partnership policies.

Qualitative research is used because it can reveal real events in the field and also can reveal the hidden values of this research. Sources of information for this study consisted of the Regional Government, tourism/private business actors, community, consumers or local and international tourists. This research was conducted at a tourism location in Greater Bandung or the coverage area of Bandung Regency, Bandung City and West Bandung Regency. In the framework of data collection there are three processes of activities carried out by researchers, namely the process of entering the research site, when in the research location, collecting data (in-depth interview, observation, documentation).

Data analysis is performed namely data reduction, data presentation, drawing conclusions or verification. Checking or checking the validity of the data findings in qualitative research to obtain naturalistic conclusions based on the criteria developed by Lincoln and Guba (1985), namely: the degree of trust (credibility), transferability, dependability and confirmability. For the purposes of the degree of trust, triangulation, member checking and peer discussion are used (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Triangulation used in this study includes: data sources and methods. Intersection as an empirical issue depends on the similarity between the context of the sender and receiver. To make the transfer, this research will seek and gather empirical events about the similarity of context. Thus, researchers are responsible for providing sufficient descriptive data. This is done by "compiling a detailed description (thick description)". With this technique the results of the study can be seen as carefully as possible which illustrates the context in which the research is conducted with reference to the research problem.

Dependence is a criterion for assessing whether the research process is quality or not. The way to determine that the research process can be maintained is by dependability audits by internal and external auditors to review the activities of the researchers. The dependence of the auditor is the guide, while for the external auditor are peers, examiners, tourism stakeholders and related agencies. Certainty is a criterion for assessing the quality of research results with an emphasis on tracking data and information as well as interpretations that are supported by material available in audit trail tracking. To fulfill the tracking and tracking of this audit, the researcher prepares the necessary materials such as data/materials, the results of the analysis, and notes about the process of conducting the research. To guarantee the objectivity and quality of the research, starting from the data and information obtained, the results of the analysis and the meaning of the results of the study are confirmed again at the tourism stakeholders, relevant agencies as well as the supervisor of the dissertation.

DISCUSSION

This research analyzes partnership policy in tourism development. Analysis of the policy of partnership includes the policy itself to find patterns of implementation and the impact of the policy. Bandung Raya is a term for a region consisting of three regional governments that are close together. The three regions are Bandung Regency, Bandung City and West Bandung Regency. Tourism in these three regions is supported by the geographical position of the region/region with mountainous contours that give the region an advantage with natural scenery and cool, fresh air. At that time, the Greater Bandung area had a unique tourist development for each region. Bandung City, building excellence as a city with all the facilities and services that support tourist visits. In this city available hotels, restaurants and various shopping centers. The city also built its image as a city of Education. Meanwhile, Bandung Regency and West Bandung Regency, build excellence as agro-tourism based tourism areas with natural, air and fruit and flower agriculture advantages. This research initially investigated tourism partnership patterns based on regional or regional approaches. However, in the field assessment, it was found that there was no partnership pattern regarding the Greater Bandung area. Therefore, this study then conducted a field search with three stages, namely:

- a. The pattern of partnerships between local governments, the private sector and the community involving the three regional governments in Greater Bandung.
- b. When the partnership pattern point a above is not found, then it is followed by a partnership pattern between the regional government, the private sector and the community that involves two local governments in Bandung Raya.
- c. When the partnership pattern b point is not found, then it is followed by a partnership pattern between the regional government, the private sector and the community that only exists in one local government in Bandung Raya.
- d. When no partnership pattern c point is found, then it is followed by a partnership pattern between one government and the private sector, or the government and the community, or the private sector and the community.

In the study it was found that the pattern of regional partnerships involving the three tourism actors (government, private and community) apparently did not exist in Bandung Raya. Likewise, the pattern of tourism development partnerships involving 2 regions in Greater Bandung also does not exist. Therefore, the following description of the pattern of tourism partnerships in Greater Bandung is taken purposively from each region that illustrates the patterns that occur between Government and Private, Government and Community, Private and Community, and Government, Private and Community.

The tourism partnership policy issued by the Bandung City government is still not entirely a top priority given to third parties, because the Bandung City Government has a Bandung City Tourism Promotion Board which is authorized to manage several strategic tourism objects, in addition to that the partnership in its development often has different perceptions between government, private sector and society, except for tourism which does require its own expertise and must be managed by people who are experts in their fields. This special interest tour is not just anyone can do it or manage tourist attraction because for its management it takes skilled skills, not only skills in management but also skills in the field.

Policies issued by the Bandung Regency Government in partnership often do not work well and there are always a number of problems that arise, among them are different perceptions about the concept of partnership between government, private and community, or even between one local government and other local governments.

The needs of tourism development are carried out by various regions that have links, both in terms of geographical conditions, regional needs, social and economic. Greater Bandung area which consists of the City of Bandung, Bandung Regency and West Bandung Regency will cooperate with each other in the field of tourism in order to optimize the tourism potential of each region. The City Government of Bandung, in this case the Department of Tourism, wants to collaborate with other regions in Greater Bandung in terms of integrated tourism promotion. It is intended that the promotion of tourism to other regions in an integrated manner. The Bandung Tourism Office, the Bandung Tourism Office and the Bandung District Tourism Office work together to promote the tourism objects of each region together to other regions. So that tourists will be able to visit both attractions in the city of Bandung, Bandung regency and West Bandung regency.

The fundamental reason for the desire to cooperate in the promotion of tourism is to increase tourist arrivals in Greater Bandung. Bandung City Government, in this case the Department of Tourism, also wants to collaborate with West Java Province in relation to tour packages. The intended tour package is the existence of package tours. For example if there is a tourist visit from outside West Java also directed to Bandung Regency and West Bandung Regency. When there are tourists who travel to West Java created a tourist route by including the West Bandung Regency as a tourist destination. So that tourists will also be able to travel in Bandung Regency and West Bandung regency. The reason for the cooperation in terms of tourism routes by the Bandung City Tourism Office and West Java Province is to increase tourist arrivals in Bandung Regency and West Bandung Regency.

The problem faced in developing tourism partnership policy is the existence of a very complicated government system in the Greater Bandung area. The lack of synergy between government employees and the private sector makes the development of cooperation in the field of tourism between the government and the private sector less able to run well. In the case of 'trivial' cooperation between the government and the private sector is difficult to do. For example, the distribution of questionnaires by the Department of Tourism to all attractions in Bandung Raya could not work properly. The questionnaire is expected to be a secondary data on the development of tourism in Greater Bandung, which has been distributed to all tourism objects. The questionnaire is not returned to the Department of Tourism to be processed and analyzed. This makes the difficulty of cooperation between the Government and the private sector towards the development of tourism in Bandung Raya.

CONCLUSION

This study aims to get answers to four formulations of problems related to partnership policy formulation in tourism development. The four problem formulation concerns about the reasons for the need for government, private and community partnership policies in tourism development, the position of the partners, the pattern of partnership implementation, the impact of the partnership. The study shows that there is no partnership between the three regions in tourism development. Likewise, there is no partnership between the regional government, the private sector and the community which includes the development of tourism in the three regions. This shows that the need for partnerships in tourism development does not exist in this region.

The absence of partnerships between regions in the tourism area is caused because there is no mutual need between the regions and tourism actors in the Greater Bandung area. The partnership was found to be still limited to their respective regions. The results of more in-depth research in each region, found that there are patterns of partnership that occur in a variety of ways and are not controlled in a partnership policy. At least, four partnership patterns can be found, namely (1) government and private (2) government and local communities, and (3) government, private and community.

The findings of this study indicate that the three partnership patterns have 2 different characteristics in terms of initiatives or needs. In partnership with the government and the community, it was found that the needs came from the community intended to develop "public archeology". The results of this study indicate that the impact of tourism development with a partnership pattern initiated by the public-private sector and government as supporters, shows a high level of success both in the form of events and attractions. This is indicated by the high level of income outside the costs incurred by the government budget. The results of this study indicate that there is no government, private and community partnership policy based on parallel collaborative relationships. The relationship is still dominative from domination by the government and or on the other hand, domination by the public or private. Nevertheless, in the development of tourism in Greater Bandung, partnerships between the government, private sector and/or community have emerged which can be used as a basis for further development.

The results showed that there was no partnership between the three regions in tourism development. Likewise, there is no partnership between the regional government, the private sector and the community which includes the development of tourism in the three regions. This shows that the need for partnerships in tourism development does not exist in this region. The absence of partnerships between regions in the tourism area is caused because there is no mutual need between the regions and tourism actors in the Greater Bandung area. The partnership was found to be still limited to their respective regions. For this reason, it is necessary to conduct a trial of partnership policy in the development of tourism in Greater Bandung.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, I. (2018). Shanghai Cooperation Organization: China, Russia, and Regionalism in Central Asia. In *Initiatives of Regional Integration in Asia in Comparative Perspective* (pp. 119-135). Springer, Dordrecht.

- Bloomfield, P. (2006). The challenging business of long-term public-private partnerships: Reflections on local experience. *Public Administration Review*, 66(3), 400-411.
- Bovaird, T. (2004). Public-private partnerships: from contested concepts to prevalent practice. *International review of administrative sciences*, 70(2), 199-215.
- de Araujo, L. M., & Bramwell, B. (2002). *Partenariados y turismo regional en Brasil*. *Annals of Tourism Research en Español*, 4(2), 411-441.
- Denhardt, R. B., & Denhardt, J. V. (2003). The new public service: An approach to reform. *International Review of Public Administration*, 8(1), 3-10.
- Edgell Sr, D. L. (1990). *International tourism policy*. Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Edwards III, G. C. (1980). *Implementing Public Policy*. Washington: Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Government of India Planning Commission, (2004). *Public Private Partnership*. Report of the PPP Sub Group on Social Sector, India.
- Grindle, M. S. (2017). *Politics and policy implementation in the Third World* (Vol. 4880). Princeton University Press.
- Hanqin Zhang, Q., Chong, K., & Jenkins, C. L. (2002). Tourism policy implementation in mainland China: an enterprise perspective. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 14(1), 38-42.
- Jamal, T. B., & Getz, D. (1995). Collaboration theory and community tourism planning. *Annals of tourism research*, 22(1), 186-204.
- Lawrence, T. B., Hardy, C., & Phillips, N. (2002). Institutional effects of interorganizational collaboration: The emergence of proto-institutions. *Academy of management journal*, 45(1), 281-290.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Establishing trustworthiness. *Naturalistic inquiry*, 289, 331.
- Mayo, M. (1997). Partnerships for regeneration and community development: some opportunities, challenges and constraints. *Critical Social Policy*, 17(52), 3-26.
- Mazmanian, D. A., & Sabatier, P. A. (1983). *Implementation and public policy*. Scott Foresman.
- Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*. Reading, Mass: Addison..
- Osborne, S. P. (Ed.). (2010). *The new public governance: Emerging perspectives on the theory and practice of public governance*. Routledge.
- Ostrom, E. (1973). *Community organization and the provision of police services* (No. 1). Sage Publications (CA).
- Ostrom, V. (1973). *The intellectual crisis in public administration*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama
- Othman, N. A., Wee, H., & Hassan, R. (2014). How did Malaysia Manage its Position as Top 10 World Tourist Destinations in UNWTO Ranking in 2012?. *Journal of Spatial and Organizational Dynamics*, 2(1), 41-50.
- Pforr, C. (2006). Tourism policy in the making: An Australian network study. *Annals of tourism research*, 33(1), 87-108.
- Pine, R. (2002). China's hotel industry: serving a massive market. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 43(3), 61-70.
- Plochg, T., Delnoij, D. M., Hoogedoorn, N. P., & Klazinga, N. S. (2006). Collaborating while competing? The sustainability of community-based integrated care initiatives through a health partnership. *BMC Health Services Research*, 6(1), 37.
- Rüland, J. (1993). *Local associations and municipal government in Thailand* (Vol. 14). Arnold-Bergstraesser-Institut.
- Sabatier, P. A., & Mazmanian, D. (1983). *Policy implementation*. Encyclopedia of Policy Sciences. New York: Marcel Dekker
- Savas, E. S. (2000). *Privatization and public-private partnerships*. New York: CQ Press
- Sengupta, U. (2006). Government intervention and public-private partnerships in housing delivery in Kolkata. *Habitat International*, 30(3), 448-461.
- Staniland, M. (1985). *What is political economy? A study of social theory and underdevelopment* (No. 04; HB73, S8).
- Supraptini, S., & Djarismawati, D. (2005). Sanitasi makanan di daerah obyek wisata Bali tahun 2003. *Jurnal Ekologi Kesehatan*, 4(3).
- Van Meter, D. S., & Van Horn, C. E. (1975). The policy implementation process: A conceptual framework. *Administration & Society*, 6(4), 445-488.

Teddy Hikmat Fauzi
Business Administration Department
Faculty of Social and Political Science,
Pasundan University Bandung, Indonesia
Email: teddyfauzi@unpas.ac.id

Abdul Rosid
Business Administration Department
Faculty of Social and Political Science,
Pasundan University Bandung, Indonesia