

THE IMPACT OF GLOBALISATION ON THE PRIVATISATION POLICY OF SOME STATE ENTERPRISES IN INDONESIA

Yusa Djuyandi, Ratnia Solihah, Siti Witianti

Department of Political Science, Universitas Padjadjaran, Indonesia. Email: yusa.djuyandi@unpad.ac.id

Abstract: Globalisation is considered to have positively impacted some third world countries because it is believed to have the power to improve the life quality of citizens. However, anti-globalisation groups believe that the globalisation wave has made third world countries vulnerable to exploitation. In Indonesia in particular, globalisation has had both positive and negative impacts. One of the negative impacts is the growing global demand for the privatisation of state-owned enterprises. Consequently, this study employs a qualitative method, in which the data is obtained from observations and interviews. In addition, this study employs various secondary data, such as documents and news sources, as a supplement. The results of the study show that globalisation has suppressed the third world countries by weakening the role of the state in controlling the political economy and by giving more power to the market mechanism. In addition, privatisation and free trade system have not freed the third world countries from economic backwardness.

Keywords: Globalisation; Third world countries; Privatisation; Indonesia

1. Introduction

Globalisation, in the form of a movement towards greater integration by removing barriers and constraints, is an objective reality that emphasises that we are passengers on the same ship. However, the passengers of the ship hold its journey to the conditions that are very different, and globalisation works for one common goal, regardless of who the passengers are.

For some anti-globalisation and anti-capitalist groups, the analogy of globalisation as a ship with different passengers can be described as well-off passengers staying in a very luxurious cabin, which is equipped with internet facilities, mobile phones, and unrestricted access to communication networks. They can enjoy an abundance of nutritious and healthy food and can get a supply of clean water, obtain service or decent health care, and enjoy the culture. However, most of the other passengers on this ship travel in poor conditions like the slaves during the slave trade. The majority of such ships' passengers, which was around 85%, were in a crowded and dirty cabin, hungry, sick, and helpless. Globalisation supporters believe that without globalisation, the world would fail. If we want to improve the living standards of the poor of the world, the barriers between social democrats, classical liberals, and democratic conservatives should be removed and they should unite to improve global economic liberalism. The supporters of globalisation believe that it has positive impacts on the transformation of technology, information, and economy in third world countries. It is a light considered capable of improving human life and that has a more substantial economic impact because the public can choose a livelihood, buy the goods they want, and move freely.

On the one hand, globalisation is a product of liberal democracy that has a positive impact on some third world countries, particularly Indonesia; on the

<https://hamdardfoundation.org/hamdardIslamicus/>

other hand, it has a negative impact. As an ideology or movement, globalisation was born from fundamental values underlying free society and active individuals who set themselves. All individuals have equal rights and are free to use property without restrictions of caste, class, community, and gender.

First, we consider the positive aspect of economic globalisation for a third world country. Then, we consider how globalisation can strengthen international trade and the market economy, which is integrated into the world economy. Not only international trade and economic progress, but also the spread of liberal democracy is widely claimed as one of the effects of globalisation.

It cannot be denied that globalisation has a negative impact on countries, especially third world countries, including Indonesia. Globalisation was born from an understanding of liberal democracy, in which individuals are free to obtain and use rights, without much government interference in the political and economic sectors. In the end, globalisation has forced many third world countries to stop mobilising their own financial resources, and to sell some state-owned enterprises (SOEs) to the private sector (privatisation).

The emergence of such policies would harm third world countries greatly, because the economic development of the communities in these countries does not follow established rules and people still need the assistance of the government or government subsidies. Their situation is different from that of the developed countries, where the communities have developed and matured through democratic and economic processes. Therefore, the demand from several developed countries to privatise SOEs in third world countries is in a sense, polemical.

Thus, the problem in Indonesia is that the government is too quick to accept the demands of the developed countries to privatise SOEs. The actual implementation of these demands is still perceived as a major problem for the people of Indonesia; in the opinion of many societies, the privatisation of several SOEs is a hasty, careless, or improper action. According to most of the people who condemn the privatisation of SOEs, the government should retain the ownership of state assets; however, the privatisation of the SOEs shows that the government is not nationalistic (Pinori, 2015).

It does not mean the strengthening of government intervention in the economic sector, but due to several factors, the Indonesian people are not ready to compete with other nations, which incidentally are more advanced. Thus, the decision of the government to privatise quickly is considered less appropriate. According to many people, the privatisation by the government of several SOEs is similar to sacrificing the interests of ordinary people. Actually, the government is obliged to protect its citizens. Since the enactment of Law No. 19 of 2003 that regulates SOEs in carrying out their economic activities, SOEs must follow market mechanisms and be profit-oriented. The basis of the issuance of this policy is the 2002-2006 SOE (State Owned Corporations (*Badan Usaha Milik Negara/BUMN*)) Masterplan data, in which it was stated that the total assets of 145 SOEs in 2001 was around Rp. 800 trillion. The 2002-2006 SOE (SOE) Masterplan data contains details of 13 SOEs having a revenue growth of more than 18 percent per year (high sustainable growth category) and contributing 34

percent of revenue per year. Nineteen SOEs have a growth of 7-18 percent per year (sustainable growth category) and contribute 13 percent of the revenue, and 103 SOEs have a growth of less than 7 percent, and 8 percent only of revenue. Meanwhile, the financial performance of the SOEs in 1996 is as follows: 51.7 percent were classified as healthy and very healthy, while 27.5 percent were classified as unhealthy. In 1997, the profit generated from government capital amounting to Rp. 462 trillion was only Rp. 11.8 trillion (Return on investment / ROI = 2.55 percent) and had an ROA of 4 percent. Low ROI and ROA indicate that SOEs are ineffective and inefficient in using economic resources ([Bastian, 2000](#)). The government's efforts to improve the performance of SOEs include the privatisation of SOEs ([Avianti, 2006](#)).

The privatisation model that opens up greater opportunities for the private sector or the capital market to control the majority of the shares and the management of SOEs has led to polemics in most societies. According to some people, the government has given up its responsibility to consider the interests of the people. Some other problems that arose later were the conversion of several SOEs, such as Indosat, Aneka Timah, Aneka Tambang, and Bukit Asam, into private companies; the conversion of SOEs into private companies then led to a polemic about the orientation of companies that no longer prioritised public affairs, even though the establishment of SOEs was aimed at promoting the public interest by managing production branches that are important for the state and that affect the livelihoods of many people.

2. Theoretical Review

Globalization

Globalization was born as one of the manifestations of the liberal democratic system, where market power is more influential compared with the power of government. Individuals along with firms are entitled to exercise their rights and carry out their activities without much interference from the government. The economic field calls this free competition among individuals and companies in the control of production resources and markets.

Therefore, why are people concerned about globalisation? Before that, the writers will state the definitions of globalisation as given by some economists and political scientists. Anne Krueger as cited by [Wolf \(2007\)](#) first deputy managing director of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), defines globalisation as “a phenomenon in which economic agents in any part of the world are much more affected by events occurring elsewhere in the world.” However, there is another more precise definition concerning the process of globalisation, as expressed by ([Chang, 2016](#); [Fife & Lindsey, 2002](#); [Goodman & Gary, 1990](#); [Karim et al, 2017](#); [King, 2016](#)) “that globalization is a process of the integration of economic activities, cross-border, through the market.” Likewise, David Henderson as cited by [Wolf \(2007\)](#) defines globalisation as: “The free movement of goods, services, labor, and capital, thereby creating a single market in terms of inputs and outputs; and national treatment to foreign investors (as well as national citizens who work abroad) so that, in economic

<https://hamdardfoundation.org/hamdardIslamicus/>

terms, no foreigners.”

[Fife and Lindsey \(2002\)](#) defined globalisation as:

Three distinct but interrelated senses: First, to describe the economic phenomenon of increasing integration of markets across political boundaries (whether due to political or technological causes); second, to describe the strictly political phenomenon of falling government-imposed barriers to international flows of goods, services, and capital; and, finally, to describe the much broader political phenomenon of the spread of market-oriented policies in both the domestic and international spheres.

Since I contend that globalization in the first sense is primarily due to globalization in the second sense and that globalization in the second sense is primarily due to globalization in the third sense, I do not think that it is unduly confusing to use the same word to mean three different things.

According to [Giddens \(1990\)](#) globalisation can be defined as “the intensification of worldwide social relations which link instant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa.” Meanwhile, according to [Albrow \(1990\)](#) globalisation is “... all those processes by which the peoples of the world are incorporated into a single world society.” Concerns about globalisation emerged because of the fact that globalisation will eliminate barriers and integrate economic activities, which can be characterised by the free movement of goods, services, labour, and capital. For a third world country, where the economy and the level of productivity is still low, the influx of good quality and low priced goods from the outside would be disastrous for the gross domestic product because the products from the country will not be sold. Besides, globalisation is also considered as undermining the economic and cultural system that is the hallmark of certain areas, for example, the economic system of kinship ([Djuyandi, 2019](#)).

Privatization

Privatisation has several meanings. Primarily, it is the process of transferring the ownership of a business, enterprise, agency, public service, or public property from the public sector (a government) to the private sector, either to a for-profit organisation or to a non-profit organisation. It may also mean the outsourcing by the government of services or functions to private firms, for example, revenue collection, law enforcement, and prison management ([Chowdhury, 2006](#)).

According to the supporters of privatisation, this shift from public to private management is so profound that it will produce a panoply of significant improvements: boost the efficiency and quality of remaining government activities, reduce taxes, and shrink the size of government. In the functions that are privatized, they argue, the profit-seeking behaviour of new, private sector managers will undoubtedly lead to cost-cutting and greater attention to customer satisfaction ([Goodman & Gary, 1990](#)).

Privatisation, as has emerged from public discussions, is not one clear and absolute economic proposition. Rather, it covers a wide range of different activities, all of which imply a transfer of the provision of goods and services

from the public sector to the private sector. For example, privatisation covers the sale of public assets to private owners, the simple cessation of government programs, the contracting out of services formerly provided by state organisations to private producers, and the entry by private producers into markets that were formerly public monopolies. Privatisation also means different things in different parts of the world—where both the fundamentals of the economy and the purpose served by privatisation may differ ([Goodman & Gary, 1990](#)).

According to Edwards, 6 privatisation would allow entrepreneurs to take on challenges at which federal bureaucracies are failing. “The United States is a land of huge talent and diversity. But to take full advantage of those assets, we should divest the government of activities that individuals and businesses can perform better by themselves.”

3. Research Methods

This study used a qualitative method. Data was obtained from primary and secondary sources. Primary data was derived from observation, which was then equipped with secondary data. Observations were done directly, in other words, they involved what the researchers saw and felt, and from the news conveyed by some national media. Secondary data were obtained from a literature review and media documentation.

Triangulation was used to conduct the validity test of the data in this study. To maintain the validity of the data or study, conducted the efforts based on the principles of triangulation. In this study, triangulation was conducted on data sources, and a variety of supporting references was used to prove the fact that data has been found by the author.

4. Results and Discussion

The way Globalisation Works

Globalisation is a terrible word with a vague meaning; globalisation was first used in the 1960s, and it became increasingly popular in the 1990s. For many of its supporters, it is an irresistible force, desirable and sweeping boundaries, overthrowing despotic governments, weakening taxation, freeing individuals, and enriching whatever it touches.

Meanwhile for many opponents, globalisation is an irresistible force, but it is not desirable. These opponents condemn the frills of globalisation, “neoliberal” and “corporation,” as the evil forces of globalisation that impoverish the masses, eviscerate and undermine democracy, impose American values, destroy the welfare state, destroy the environment, and worship greed.

Even though the adherents of globalisation consider it to have more advantages in certain things, in other things it is still more limited. Globalisation has been supported by technology, as an instrument for the integration of more advanced nations; however, for some people, globalisation is a global threat that has caused impoverishment and corporate domination, and threatened sovereignty. The growing concern among anti-globalisation groups is that globalisation will have a negative impact on the socio-political and economic order, and they are

<https://hamdardfoundation.org/hamdardIslamicus/>

not entirely wrong. However, they are also not entirely right. In some cases, globalisation has also brought positive effects since he departed from the fundamental values that underlie a free society and active in organising themselves, which he naturally will reduce the power of the monarchy or absolute rule.

In a famous fresco in the town hall of Siena in Italy, a medieval artist, Ambrogio Lorenzetti, depicts allegories of good and bad governments. In the allegory of the good government, public interest is the enthroned figure, along with wisdom, peace, justice, faith, generosity, magnanimity, and alignment. Where do these virtues come from? According to the history of a country that is strong and zealous about good works, these virtues arise from a combination of three forces, namely, regulatory competition, the internal representation (of constitutional democracy and the rule of law), and moral reform.

The combination of those three forces makes liberal democracy, the pioneer of globalisation which has superior values domestically, also the only system of government that in itself produces a harmonious and cooperative relationship between states. For Saxon liberal democracy, this understanding creates conducive conditions for international relations because the prosperity of a nation is not based on the size of the territory or population they control; the prosperity of a nation comes from a combination of internal economic development with international trade.

In some ways, globalisation that was born from the idea of liberal democracy and the liberal economy is not perfect because it is more reflective of the tastes or wishes of the majority rather than the minority, and it was more advantageous for the diligent man rather than the wise man. However, globalisation has also brought many points of progress for many countries because it brought the democratic values and basic freedoms that recognise and protect intellectual property rights, as well as the possibility of the establishment of state welfare. The reason why globalisation can bring more progress than others is the workings of globalisation itself which emphasise the rise of the market economy. With the existence of a dynamic market economy, a creative society that has spearheaded a change in the creation of energy from living things (human energy, and animals) to the creation of energy from lifeless things (wind, water, and fossil energy) has emerged. Besides that, this emphasis also provides the opportunity for each community to have its own market.

In addition to the work methods that emphasise the rise of the market economy, globalisation also emphasises the importance of corporatism, innovation, protection of intellectual property rights, and the emergence of financial markets. However, given that this also has the potential to have a negative impact, globalisation that emphasises a number of things also needs to emphasise moral principles and the rule of law by the state so that people do not only prioritise themselves, but do also respect the rights of other people.

Demands of Globalization on Third World Countries

The rapid development of the process of globalisation, which brought about liberalism and free trade, was inseparable from the destruction of the Eastern Bloc which began with the restructuring (perestroika) policy and glasnost of the Soviet Union, due to economic deficits and internal political upheaval. The collapse and political changes that hit the Soviet Union and its satellite states outside Eastern Europe opened up space for liberal politics and free trade. According to [Fukuyama \(1992\)](#) these conditions are affirmed as the “the end of history,” which is marked by the end of ideological evolution or the end of the competition between liberalism-capitalism and socialism-communism, which was won by neoliberalism. Consequently, Russia, China, and countries that were colonised by communists were no longer considered as threats; neoliberal ideology became the only political, economic, social, and cultural reference globally. In the process of the development of human civilisation, this kind of condition is unhealthy because there is only one dominant ideology, which is a reference for the interpretation of all things, and there is even a tendency to force this dominant ideology on developing countries. Through various development assistance from advanced industrial countries to developing countries, there is socialisation of neoliberal ideologies, even expansion of such ideologies to recipient countries.

Globalisation and development assistance has been used by developed countries to pressure third world countries very effectively and efficiently to reduce the role of the state in the field of the political economy and for the state to submit extensively to market mechanisms. The developed countries are assumed that the amount of government interference has constraints on development and welfare in the third world countries.

The concrete recommendations provided by developed countries are to achieve world prosperity; therefore, developing third world countries should emulate the steps of advanced industrial countries such as the United States and Western Europe: privatisation and free trade ([Nugroho, 2005](#)). Their hopes and dreams are free trade that takes place globally will create prosperity for the world community, which will be balanced flowing through regional boundaries.

However, the demand by developed countries for third world countries to privatise and implement free trade has been criticised by several political leaders, such as Mahathir Mohammad (as cited by [Nugroho, 2005](#)) who stated expressly that the West dominates the interpretation of the concept of globalisation. Western countries emphasise the meaning of capital movements more, and they are not too enthusiastic to discuss the movement of people ([Nugroho, 2005](#)). Even then, the suspicion for globalisation is growing because many developed countries and organisations take advantage of globalisation and development assistance, for example, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), to create the dependence of third world countries on developed countries.

For dependents, globalisation is a form of the modern world. Imperialism is a reality, while investment and assistance provided by developed countries can impose various demands on developing countries. The risk is, if third world

<https://hamdardfoundation.org/hamdardIslamicus/>

countries are reluctant to fulfil these demands, developed countries will attract investment and multinational companies, and collect debts. This, of course, has led to increasing unemployment, poverty, and declining foreign exchange.

The Indonesian Government's response to the demands of privatization

Strong governments and strong businesspersons are needed and are necessary for globalisation, where businesspersons are required to carry out global-scale economic activities, across regional and regional boundaries. Due to advances in telecommunications and transportation technology, businessperson's space and moving speed are accelerating. The process of globalisation runs quickly, and simultaneously, the barriers of space and time become relative.

The process of globalisation has also accelerated the pace of privatisation in the economic spheres of many countries; economic activities are increasingly under private control and ownership. Formerly, the state owned and controlled business entities; then, many of these business entities were turned into private property, or experienced the privatisation process. Privatisation is not only a phenomenon in capitalist-liberal countries, but it has also become a global trend, including in China which politically adheres to communism still; the privatisation process in China has developed rapidly.

The demand for the acceleration of privatisation in many countries is not only due to the direct impact of economic liberalisation and globalisation processes, but it is also because SOEs tend to be less efficient and effective. Bureaucratic barriers create high costs and incur losses; the government which has control of easy power is also tempted to misuse it by colluding in wrongdoing and engaging in corruption. Hence, privatisation is believed to be a way out.

Although there is a change in economic actors from the state to the community, the role of the state and government remains strategic and important, especially as relations between countries are still based on the framework of the state and government. International cooperation in various fields is still tied to the state and the government; amid increasing community roles in global economic relations and cooperation, the state has neither faded nor receded.

There are growing demands for the privatisation of SOEs in third world countries, including in Indonesia. The demand for the privatisation of SOEs has also raised the question "how far privatization is needed, and whether the privatisation of several SOEs will be able to improve the quality of services and management?" All of that must be seen from the motive of the demands for privatisation that are desired by many developed countries, and the question is whether developed countries really want to help developing countries or just want to take advantage of the privatisation.

In Indonesia, the debate about privatisation itself often collides with polaristic, pro-private (private), or prostate (public) choices, while the supporters of privatisation like to propose "efficiency and effectiveness" as the main reason. Meanwhile, according to the people who reject privatisation, it is important for the government to protect national interests. For the Indonesian government, the response to privatisation should be done in a precise manner, in the sense that privatisation can benefit the community.

<https://hamdardfoundation.org/hamdardIslamicus/>

The privatisation of some SOEs by the government which diverts most of the ownership shares to the private sector raises doubts and big questions, regarding whether public interests can be protected better through privatisation or precisely the existence of privatisation benefits the private sector only, where the private sector can seek huge profits. So far, the government's response to privatisation has been very extensive, but the privatisation of a number of SOEs by the government has logical political and economic consequences. The privatisation of SOEs that are carried out without due care has a negative impact on people's lives because it will be difficult for the people to get cheap and quality public services.

Several strategic SOEs such as Indosat and Aneka Tambang have been privatised. They also raise the issue of state sovereignty. For example, in the management of natural resources, the Indonesian 1945 Constitution explains that the state has sovereignty over the natural resources found in the state; however, if the management of natural resources has been given to the private sector, how will the state create prosperity. Therefore, the pressure on the government to restore state sovereignty by buying back a number of strategic SOEs that have been sold is natural. In many cases in some countries, privatisation that is not accompanied by the role of the state in it will benefit the owners of capital only. Privatisation without considering aspects of economic and political sovereignty has prompted much protest from workers. Worker unions and economic observers have demanded an end to the privatisation of SOEs. Government must not pawn state assets and the interests of the people to investors. The most important thing that the government must do is to improve the existing management system. This consideration is rational because in some matters, privatisation without clear regulations from the government and consideration of the interests of the people, political aspects, and state sovereignty, will be very dangerous for the future interests of the nation.

5. Conclusion

Globalisation as a process of integration of economic activities, cross-border, through the market, which was born from the liberal or neoliberal and supported by the technological base is an instrument for more advanced integration. It is able to bring more progress because the workings of globalisation itself emphasise the economic revival of the market and the protection of individual rights without much interference from the government.

Globalisation pressurises third world countries to reduce the state's role in the political economy, and submit to the market mechanism. Concrete recommendations are provided to achieve the prosperity of the world; the third world countries are doing their best to imitate the steps of advanced industrial countries, namely, privatisation and free trade.

However, globalisation itself has drawbacks because of its demands in the form of privatisation and free trade, and because globalisation has not been able to fully free the third world countries from economic backwardness. If the role of the government is abolished completely then the ordinary citizens will become

victims of the capital owners. In the case of Indonesia, privatisation was initially perceived as necessary; however, it brought new problems.

REFERENCES

- Albrow, M. (1990). *Globalization, knowledge and society*. Martin Albrow and E. King (eds.). London: Sage.
- Avianti, I. (2006). Privatisasi, Penegakan Good Corporate Governance, dan Kinerja SOE. *KINERJA: Journal of Business and Economics*, 10(1), 57-65.
- Bastian, I. (2000). *Privatisasi di Indonesia: Teori dan Implementasi*. Jakarta: Salemba Empat
- Chang, J. (2016). Globalization and Curriculum: Inferring from Bernstein's Code Theory,' *International Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences*, 2(2), 52-57.
- Chowdhury, F. L. (2006). *Corrupt bureaucracy and privatisation of tax enforcement in bangladesh*. Dhaka: Pathak Shamabesh.
- Edwards, C. (2016). 'Options for federal privatization and reform lessons from abroad. *Policy Analysis*, 794, 1-60, Washington, DC: Cato Institute.
- Fife, B.L., & Lindsey, B. (2002). *Against the dead hand: the uncertain struggle for global capitalism*. New Jersey, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The End of history and the last man*. New York: The Free Press.
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Goodman, J. B., & Gary, W. L. (1990). *Does Privatization Serve the Public Interest?* Available at: <https://hbr.org/1991/11/does-privatization-serve-the-public-interest> (accessed 01 April 2017).
- Karim, M. H., Elyas, K. M., Mahmood, S. N., & Hossein, A. (2017). Evaluation of human resources re-engineering and knowledge management processes on the economy of sirjan free trade zone (iran). *International Journal of Business and Economic Affairs* 2(2), 127-134.
- King, J. M. (2016). Dubai Wins: A Content Analysis of Global Media Coverage of the 2020 World Exposition Bidding Process Using Nation Branding Theory. *International Journal of Business and Administrative Studies*, 2(6), 201-211.
- Kokanuch, A. (2018). Readiness of Trade Business and Border Trade Entrepreneurs to Green Economy: Thailand. *International Journal of Business and Administrative Studies* 4(2), 60-67.
- Malinda. M. (2018). Effectiveness of entrepreneurship and innovation learning methods. case study at universitas kristen maranatha, bandung, Indonesia. *International Journal of Business and Administrative Studies* 4(3), 122-128.
- Nugroho, H. (2005). *Globalisasi dan Tantangan Daya Saing Indonesia*. Jakarta: LIPI Press.
- Osra, O. A. (2017). Urban Transformation and Sociocultural Changes in King Abdullah Economic City (KAEC) 2005-2020: Key Research Challenges. *Journal of Advances in Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(3), 135-151.
- Oudat M. S., Ahmad, N., & Yazis, M. (2016). The impact of macroeconomic variables and global events on banking system: evidence from jordanian banking system. *Journal of Administrative and Business Studies*, 2(1), 35-47.
- Pinori, J. J. (2015). Keberadaan Privatisasi SOE di Indonesia. *Lex et Societatis*, 3(7), 171-178.
- Roeksiripat, K. (2016). Informal economy: Case study of street vendors in Bangkok. *International Journal of Business and Administrative Studies*, 2(2), 29-36.

- Thanasripanitchai, S. (2017). Daily Activities Management Information System of Koglam-Sangaram Village: The Self-Sufficiency Economy Village Model of Pid-Thong-Lang-Pha Project. *International Journal of Business and Economic Affairs*, 2(1), 59-66.
- Wolf, M. (2007). *Globalisasi Jalan Menuju Kesejahteraan*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- Yoshino, N., & Alekhina, V. (2016). Impact of Oil Price Fluctuations on An Energy-Exporting Economy: Evidence from Russia. *Journal of Administrative and Business Studies*, 2(4), 156-166.
- Djuyandi, Y. (2019). *Pengantar Ilmu Politik*. Depok: Rajawali Pers.