Business & Social Science
IJRBS

Research in Business & Social Science

IJRBS VOL 10 NO 6 ISSN: 2147-4478

Available online at www.ssbfnct.com
Journal homepage: <https://www.ssbfnct.com/ojs/index.php/ijrbs>

Determining the key success factors in the organization of BP. Tapera

Dedy Dewanto Soeprapto

Faculty Economic & Business, Esa Unggul University, Jalan Arjuna Utara No 9, Kebon Jeruk, Jakarta Barat 11510, Jakarta, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 12 June 2021

Received in rev. form 15 July 2021

Accepted 22 July 2021

Keywords:

Opportunities, Threats, Key Success Factors, BP Tapera, MBR, JHT

JEL Classification:

O15

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to determine the Key Success Factors in the operationalization of BP. Tapera (Public Housing Savings Implementing Agency), so that solutions to the challenges faced by institutions in the future will be found, as well as ways to achieve successful performance. As results of external analysis research, showing several key success factors, including: high economic growth, large population, implementation of mandatory Tapera membership, high yielding Tapera fund accumulation, transparent and accountable Tapera administration principles, culture of mutual cooperation and humanity, availability of adequate office/branch services, availability of integrated IT, Decrease Termination of Employment, Employment Increase, Price Stability, Equitable Development Results, Participant Awareness and Trust, Employer Support, Land Bank Availability. As a follow-up study, BP. Tapera must immediately develop and perform strategies to implement these key success factors.

© 2021 by the authors. Licensee SSBFNET, Istanbul, Turkey. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Introduction

In Indonesia, the purpose of the Social Security Program is to fulfill the basic needs of a decent life for all participants and their families. There are 3 types of Social Security Programs that have been running, namely: Health Social Security Program organized by BPJS Kesehatan and operated since January 1, 2014, Employment Social Security Program organized by BPJS Ketenagakerjaan and operated since July 1 2015, and the newly launched Tapera program, organized by BP. Tapera since 2020.

The aim of the Tapera program is to raise and provide long-term low-cost funds for financing affordable housing. This is intended to immediately address the problem of housing finance, statistics show a housing backlog of 13 million units at the end of 2015 and 7.6 million units at the end of 2019. The government provides Tapera Benefits for Low-Income Communities (MBR) which do not own a house to be able to own a house, while for non-MBR, the benefits are in the form of old-age savings and home improvement financing. Participation in the Tapera Program is mandatory for every worker with income above the minimum wage and is 18 (eighteen) years old or married at the time of registration. The two main functions of the Tapera program are as a source of housing finance and old-age savings (in the form of savings plus investment). The principle of implementing the Tapera program is mutual cooperation, where only MBR receive housing finance assistance, while non-MBR who are actively saving are only entitled to receive old-age savings. Another economic role of the availability of housing finance funds is to provide a multiplier effect on industrial growth related to the housing industry as many as 170 industries.

With a population of 268 million people, the deciles of the Indonesian people are divided into 10 groups, deciles 1 to 4, namely those with an income of 1.2 million; 1.8 million; 2.2 million and 2.6 million belong to the category of groups who have difficulty finding houses. In this case, the Government provides budget allocations for special housing programs through the management by the Ministry of Social Affairs for the poorest community groups. The target of the Tapera Program is a group of people who can afford to pay in installments, but still have to be given assistance (in the form of a down payment of Rp. 4 million, an interest rate of 5%, and free of VAT). The community groups which are the 5-8 decile group are those who earn Rp. 3.1 million - 5.2 million per month. As for the decile group above with an income of Rp. 7 million - Rp. 13.9 million per month, the benefits provided are only in the

* Corresponding author. ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1600-5565

form of old-age savings. Over time, the decile and income categories will change continuously. The principles of managing the Tapera program are the same as other social security programs, namely: mutual cooperation, prudence, benefits, affordability and convenience, non-profit, independence, sustainability, justice, accountability, portability, openness, and trust funds. So that the most important thing in management here is professionalism and accountability.

The government provides this Tapera benefit for Low-Income Communities (MBR) who do not have a house to own a house, and for non-MBR, the benefits are in the form of old-age savings and home improvement financing. Most of the non-MBR will get benefits in the form of old age savings when the maturity comes, namely at the time of retirement. With public funds deposited here, careful and accountable management of the Tapera program is very important. BP.Tapera is obliged to guarantee the availability of cheap long-term credit funds for MBR and old-age savings with good investment returns for non MBR. Therefore, research on the key success factors is very important, to find solutions to the challenges faced in its operations in the future as well as ways to achieve successful performance. Furthermore, based on the key success factors, then the next is BP. Tapera can immediately formulate strategies (consisting of vision, mission, objectives, strategies, policies), and implementation of strategies (programs, budgets and procedures), including others. So the hope that at the beginning of its operations BP. Tapera can run successfully will be achieved, and concerns about the emergence of the state's fiscal burden, due to performance failures can be mitigated.

Literature Review

Basic Model of Strategic Management and Environmental Scanning

Based on Wheelen & Hunger (2006), Strategic Management can be defined as a series of managerial decisions and actions that determine the company's long-term performance. Several stages in the Strategic Management Model consist of stages of external and internal environmental research, stages of strategy formulation (strategic planning or long-term planning), stages of strategy implementation, and stages of evaluation and control. The advantages of Strategic Management include: having a clear vision, focusing on what is important, and increasing understanding of rapidly changing environments. The 4 (four) elements in the basic Management Model are as shown in the figure below.

Figure 1: Basic Model of Strategic Management

Environmental Scanning is a process for monitoring, evaluating and disseminating information originating from the external and internal environment to the leaders within the company. The purpose of environmental scanning is to identify the strategic factors, both external and internal elements that will determine the company's future. The External Environment is the result of an analysis of the Social Environment (economic, regulatory, technological, and socio-cultural factors) and the Industrial Environment (Duty Environment) that originates from outside the organization and generates opportunities and threats. The internal environment is the result of an analysis of the resources, capabilities, and competencies that come from within the company that produces Strengths and Weaknesses. These variables consist of Approaches in Internal Analysis that can use the theory of Business Models (Abraham, 2003; Maney, 2003), Resource Based View (Brady & Capell, 2004; Verdin & Williamson, 1994), Resource and Functional Capability Scanning (Schein, 1999; Sorenson, 2002), and Value Chain Analysis (Galbraith, 1991; Porter, 1988).

The order of the topics to be discussed is as follows:

External Environment Analysis

External Environmental Analysis begins with a discussion of Societal Environmental Factors which consist of: Economy, Technology, Regulation, Socio-Cultural. After the Social Environment Analysis, we discuss the Task Environmental Factors which consist of elements: Threat of New Entrants, Bargaining Power of Buyers, Competition Between Existing Firms, Bargaining Power of Suppliers, Threat of Substitute Products or Services, Relative Strength of Other Stakeholders (Porter, 2008).

The discussion of the Social Environmental Analysis considers the current situation and conditions of the business environment in Indonesia, including the economy, laws and regulations, technology, and socio-culture. While, for the Task Environment Analysis, we will use Porter's Approach to Industrial Analysis (Porter, 1988). Then proceed with the making of the EFAS Table (External Factors Analysis Summary) in order to sharpen the analysis of external factors to determine the most important Strategic Factors for BP. Tapera and further measure BP. Tapera's response to these Strategic factors which are Opportunities and Threats from the Business Environment (Wheelen & Hunger, 2006)

Research and Methodology

Data and Method

The data for writing this research were obtained from:

- i. Primary data from the Ministry of Public Works and Public Housing and the Ministry of Finance's Annual Social Insurance/Security Report
- ii. Primary data from the DJSN, BPJS Ketenagakerjaan, BPJS Kesehatan, BPS, Bapertarum, Ministry of Finance, Bank BTN, Ministry of Informatics, Ministry of Cooperatives / UMKM, and others
- iii. Primary data comes from Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Cooperatives/MSMEs, Ministry of Information Technology.
- iv. Secondary data, derived from written objects, books, literature, newspapers, internet, magazines, and related research results.

Data collection methods are demonstrated in Table 1.

Table 1: Data collection methods

No.	Analysis Stage	Data and info required	Data Source	Means to collect data
1.	External Analysis	Societal analysis consists of trends in economics, technology, legislation and socioculturalism. There are six factors in industrial analysis, namely: Threat of New Entrants, Competition of Existing Insurance Companies, Threat of Substitution of Products or Services, Bargaining Position of Buyers, Bargaining Position of Suppliers and Influence of Other Stakeholders	newspapers, magazines, books, internet, Ministry of Finance insurance / social security reports, literature and research & discussion results	Collect relevant data sources on a regular basis and also hold discussions with competent resource persons as needed.

Findings

Opportunities and Threats

In accordance with the External Environmental Analysis above, which consists of Social Environmental Analysis and Industrial Environmental Analysis, we can conclude as follows:

Opportunities (Opportunities)

Economic growth is still in good condition.

Based on data from BPS (Central Statistics Agency), Indonesia's economic growth in 2018 was 5.17%, while in 2019 economic growth was 5.02%. Meanwhile, based on recorded data, government spending in 2018 was IDR 2,270.7 trillion, continuing to increase in 2019 to IDR 2310.2 trillion. Furthermore, GDP Expenditure statistics show a significant increase from year to year. Likewise, in terms of credit growth, based on data from Bank Indonesia, MSME credit growth until August 2019 was 13.3%, up from 2018 at 9.9%. Meanwhile, the KUR (Micro and Small Loans) program went well, lending increased from Rp. 120 trillion at the end of 2018, to Rp. 139.51 trillion at the end of 2019. For Bank BRI, SME loan growth in 2018 was 14.1% to Rp 843.6 trillion and in 2019 grew 8.44% to Rp 908.88 trillion. Bank Mandiri and BRI were the pioneers in reducing SME lending rates to below 10%. On the other hand, the Government as a competent party, always strives to encourage sustainable economic growth, through fiscal and monetary policies even though currently being hit by the global financial crisis, so that the potential for public purchasing power to pay contributions remains good.

High population and number of people working

Based on statistics, the population in 2019 was 267 million, an increase from the population in 2018 of 265 million. The total workforce in 2019 was 136.18 million people, of which 129.36 million people worked, so the potential total contribution would be large if many workers registered and participated in the Tapera program. If this goes well, then the Tapera program's objective of collecting and providing long-term low-cost funds can be met.

Membership requirements are mandatory

Based on Law Number 4 of 2016 concerning Tapera, the provisions regarding participation are as follows: every Worker and Independent Worker must participate as a participant, if they have a minimum income equal to the mandatory minimum wage.

Independent workers who have income below the minimum wage may join as Participants. In the age category Participants must have a minimum age of 20 years or have been married at the time of registration. Of course this is an opportunity to raise big funds.

High-yielding Tapera fund accumulation

High returns on fertilizing funds, as investment development is very important for non-MBR participants who receive JHT (Old Age Savings). In addition, due to the development of BP. Tapera's Initial Capital is not sufficient, so the results of fertilizing participant funds will also be used for operational costs for BP. Tapera and the Tapera Committee.

Principles of transparency and accountability

This principle is one of the Tapera Principles contained in Law Number 4 of 2016 concerning Tapera which is the basis for the implementation of this program. With the principles of transparency and accountability, the expected impact is a high level of trust from the community that the money collected is actually used for the best interests of the participants in the form of long-term low-cost housing loans for MBR and Old Age Savings for non-MBR. So that the desire of the community to become participants and diligently pay fees is high.

A culture that supports social security programs

Mutual cooperation is one of the Tapera Principles that strongly supports the understanding of middle and high income workers (Non MBR) on the importance of this program. Where non MBR will help MBR, by making regular contributions for JHT (Old Age Savings), which can be taken at retirement in the form of savings and development. Here, educational and persuasive counseling and socialization programs need to be carried out to all workers in the region in a sustainable and equitable manner.

Threats

Need big funds for service office operational costs

With a total of 6,793 urban villages and 72,944 villages and 81,253 urban villages spread across the archipelago, with data working as many as 129.36 million people out of a total workforce of 136.18 million people in 2019, it will require large funds to open a branch office in area. Because this Agency is new and has limited Initial Capital, it is therefore necessary to take strategic alliance steps with various parties, including: government agencies, BUMN and private sector, community groups/individuals who already have physical infrastructure in the region, so that they are able to provide services in good and affordable.

Need high IT costs for operations

The availability of an IT system is required in order to integrate services throughout the region with the head office, which requires large funds. Therefore, to be able to provide good service, it is necessary to take strategic alliance steps with various parties who have long had technological infrastructure in the region.

The number of jobs is limited and the number of unemployed is high

Statistical data for 2019 shows the number of people working as many as 129.36 million people out of a total workforce of 136.18 million people, so that the number of open unemployment is 5.01%. This does not include other unemployment conditions. With the Tapera Program which involves workers from the housing sector and its multiplier effect on workers in 170 related business sectors, it is hoped that it will be able to create jobs, so that unemployment is reduced and productivity and the economy are high.

Layoffs still high, along with potential for bad loans

The increase in JHT claims due to termination of employment for BPJS Ketenagakerjaan (Employment Social Security Implementing Agency), shows the number of layoffs is increasing. The amount of claims in 2019 was Rp. 26.6 trillion, while the value of claims in 2018 was Rp. 24 trillion, all of which were dominated by JHT claims of 90%. In line with this, the management of BP. Tapera must be cautious about the risk of housing non-performing loans, which are MBR facilities for the income category Decile 5 to 8. The role of the Remedial and Repossession Function is an important part of the duties of the Fund Utilization Section.

High inflation and cost of living

Real inflation is higher in the consumer demand market, this can be seen in the increase in prices of basic foodstuffs from time to time, although Statistics show inflation in 2019 at 2.72%, while inflation in 2018 was at 3.13%. So in reality, the cost of living is high. In this Tapera program, the determination of mortgage interest for MBR workers who take mortgages is very low, namely 5%. Therefore, the expected impact is a decrease in inflation and the emergence of price stability.

Inequality of development results

Based on BPS (Central Statistics Agency) data, the Gini coefficient in 2011 to 2015 was constant at 0.41, while in 2016 the coefficient was 0.395 and in 2017 it was 0.392. For 2018 the Gini coefficient is 3.89 and in 2019 it is 3.82. This shows the need for solutions from the government for equitable development, one of which is the Tapera Program which aims to meet the needs of a decent living for all residents for the availability of cheap and affordable houses.

Low public awareness and trust

Statistics show that the number of BPJS Ketenagakerjaan participants is still small compared to the total population, including 19.2 million people (14.2%) in 2015, 48 million participants in 2016, 44.9 million participants (37.1%) in 2017. Furthermore, the number of participants was 50.5 million in 2018 and as many as 55.2 million participants in 2019. This shows the low interest of the working community regarding the importance of this employment Social Security program. This also shows the low level of public awareness and trust. The Tapera program is symmetrical to the Employment Social Security program, so it is necessary to have outreach and socialization efforts to all regions. The working community needs to be convinced that the application of the Tapera program is carried out in a transparent and accountable manner.

Employer's objections/complaints

One of the obstacles to the success of the Tapera Program is the objections or complaints of the Employers. It is necessary to deliberation and consensus to determine the portion of the contribution that is the obligation of each Worker and Employer. Employers need to be convinced that by fulfilling the basic needs of a decent life for workers, in the form of housing, it will improve the welfare of workers, which in turn increases the loyalty and productivity of workers. Based on the data, it can be seen that 97.3% of Indonesian workers work in the MSME sector, if the groups targeted by the Tapera program are satisfied, their productivity will increase, so that the economy will increase significantly. So that in turn GDP increases, then per capita income also increases and is accompanied by an increase in the welfare of the population.

Land prices continue to skyrocket

Currently the average increase in land prices is already high between 10% to 15%, even in some areas land prices have increased by 20% to 30% per year.

Synthesis of External Factors - EFAS (Opportunities and Threats)

Creating an EFAS Table (Summary of External Factor Analysis) is a method for grouping external factors from the business environment into categories of opportunities and threats, to further analyze the ranking of the organization's management in response to these external factors.

Table 2: EFAS of Program Tapera

No	External Factors	Weight	Rating	Weighted Score	Information
Opportunity					
1	Economic Growth	0.15	4	0.6	Still quite high
2	Total Population/Worker	0.10	4	0.4	Quite High at 267 millions
3	Membership requirements are mandatory	0.10	2.5	0.25	Large potential funds
4	High-yield fund raising	0.05	3.5	0.175	Selection of instruments with high returns and measurable risk
5	Principles of transparency and Accountability in operation	0.05	3	0.15	Participants have more trust and confidence
6	A supportive mutual cooperation culture	0.05	3	0.15	The culture of mutual cooperation and humanity, while investing
Threats					
1	It takes big costs for service office Operations	0.10	3	0.3	Use a combination of initial capital and strategic alliances to collect contributions
2	Need high IT costs for operations	0.05	3	0.15	Use initial capital and create alliance synergy strategies
3	Layoffs are still high, along with the potential for bad loans	0.05	3	0.15	Effective remedial and repossession departments to deal with potential failures
4	Limited work and high unemployment rate	0.05	2.5	0.125	Solutions from Tapera Program with multiplier effects on other industries
5	High inflation and cost of living	0.05	2.5	0.125	Contribution to low price stabilization through 5% interest rate
6	Inequality of development Results	0.05	2.25	0.1125	Equitable solutions in the housing sector through the Tapera program
7	Low public awareness and trust	0.05	2	0.10	The need for persuasive socialization and counseling
8	Employer objections / complaints	0.05	2.5	0.125	Convinced that meeting the needs of a decent living for workers will increase productivity
9	Land prices continue to Skyrocket	0.05	2.5	0.125	Creating a land bank and synergizing assets belonging to various parties
Total Scores		1.00		3.0375	

Key Success Factors

In every industry there are usually variables - key success factors - which every company management must understand in order to achieve success. Key success factors are variables that can significantly affect the overall competitive position of companies in a particular industry and are very important in determining a company's ability to succeed in that industry. Based on the analysis of the Societal Environment and the analysis of the Industrial Environment above, the key success factors that can be identified are as follows:

Table 3: Industry Matrix

No	Key Success Factors	Weight	Indonesia's Rating	Indonesia's Score	Singapura's Rating	Singapura's Score
1	Economic Growth	0.15	4	0.6	4	0.6
2	Total Population/Worker	0.10	4	0.4	4	0.4
3	Membership Requirements are Mandatory	0.10	2.5	0.25	4.5	0.45
4	High-yield fund raising	0.05	3.5	0.175	3	0.15
5	Principles of transparency and Accountability	0.05	3	0.15	4.5	0.225
6	Culture that supports social security programs	0.05	3	0.15	4.5	0.225
7	Availability of sufficient number of Service Offices	0.10	3	0.3	4.5	0.45
8	Availability of integrated IT	0.05	3	0.15	4.5	0.225
9	Layoffs are down, credit is smooth	0.05	3	0.15	4	0.2
10	Jobs available	0.05	2.5	0.125	4	0.2
11	Price stability	0.05	2.5	0.125	4.5	0.225
12	Equitable development Results	0.05	2.25	0.1125	2	0.1
13	Participants' awareness and trust	0.05	2	0.10	4.5	0.225
14	Employer Support	0.05	2.5	0.125	4.5	0.225
15	Land bank	0.05	2.5	0.125	4	0.2
	Total	<u>1.00</u>		<u>3.0375</u>		<u>4.10</u>

In Industry Matrix groups the key success factors in a particular industry. In table 3 above, the matrix assigns a weight to each factor, based on how important that factor is to success in the industry. The matrix also shows how well competitors (Singapore) in the industry respond to each factor. The tabulation can be seen in table 3 above. The explanation for determining the rating for each factor is as follows:

High economic growth

Indonesia's economic growth projection is 5.17% in 2018 and 5.02% in 2019 while Singapore's is 3.3% in 2018 and 1% in 2019. Singapore is also feeling the impact of the global economic slowdown and China. However, compared to Indonesia, Singapore's per capita income is already above USD 65,641, while Indonesia's is in the range of USD 4,174.9.

Large Population

The total population in Indonesia in 2019 was 267 million, while Singapore was 5.704 million. Of course, Indonesia has a greater opportunity to raise funds for the Tapera program, but it must also be used to provide housing that has a backlog of 7.6 million in 2019. Meanwhile, Singapore with a population of 5.704 million people does not need to provide housing as much as Indonesia. Singapore enjoys a Per Capita Income that is far above Indonesia, so its welfare is high.

Implementation of mandatory Tapera membership

Indonesia and Singapore both require every worker to participate in the Social Security program, but the success rate is different, especially for BPJS Ketenagakerjaan whose membership is still 14.2% in 2015 and 37.1% in 2017, while in Singapore almost all workers participate in the Social Security program.

High yielding Tapera fund accumulation

The results of the fertilization of BPJS Ketenagakerjaan funds are still quite high in the range of 8-10%, while the Return on Investment Services in Singapore is lower.

The principle of transparency and accountability in operation

The principle of transparent and accountable implementation is very positive, but the reality is that only 14.2% in 2015 and 37.1% in 2017 of workers who became BPJS Ketenagakerjaan participants. So it is necessary to conduct outreach and socialization to all regions, by providing easy access to information on services such as seeing the fertilization of funds and the results of their investments. Singapore has implemented a housing program since 1968, namely cash withdrawals for flats sold by the Housing and Development Board. This was to overcome Singapore's small land area and slum dwellings that year. The Singapore Social Security Program is growing rapidly and is successful, with additional Social Security programs such as tuition fees and investments in Government business shares.

Culture of Mutual cooperation and humanity

Cultural mutual cooperation is the principle of Tapera in Law No. 4 of 2016 concerning Tapera, but in practice this noble culture of the heritage of the Indonesian ancestors still needs to be instilled and continuously nurtured in the community, especially workers. This is evident from the number of BPJS Ketenagakerjaan participants, which was only 14.2% of Indonesian Workers in 2015. Educational and persuasive extension and socialization programs to all regions are very important to be carried out periodically and continuously. Meanwhile, in Singapore, workers' obedience to government programs is very high.

Availability of adequate office/branch services

At the beginning of the establishment of BP. Tapera, there are not many branch offices opening in the regions. This is due to the limited initial capital from the Government, and the collection of workers' contributions is still at an early stage. So that a strategic alliance is needed with various parties, both government and private institutions, as well as community groups/individuals. Meanwhile, Singapore, with its small area and long experience in the Social Security program, has certainly provided service offices that are spread out and close to the location of workers.

Availability of integrated IT

Just like opening a branch office, of course the IT system is an infrastructure attached to the physical branch office. So that strategic alliances are also needed with various parties, both government and private institutions, as well as community groups/individuals. Meanwhile, Singapore with a limited area, of course, already has a complete and evenly distributed IT infrastructure network close to the location of workers.

Decrease Termination of Employment

Singapore recorded layoffs of less than 400 people in 2015 and as many as 5440 people in the fourth quarter of 2016 and 4800 people in the first quarter of 2017, much lower than what happened in Indonesia as many as 87,094 people in 2015 and as many as 12,274 people in 2016, 9,822 people in 2017. Meanwhile, the leadership of the KSPI labor union claimed that there were layoffs of 20,000-25,000 workers in 2017.

Employment Increase

Based on BPS data, the open unemployment rate in 2019 was 5.01%, while Singapore in the same year had an unemployment rate of 2.3%.

Price stability

Indonesia had an inflation rate of 3.13% in 2018 and 2.72% in 2019, while Singapore is currently in the inflation rate 0.44% in 2018 and 0.57% at 2019.

Equitable Development Results

Based on internet data, Singapore is ranked first in Southeast Asia in the Gini coefficient value of 0.452 in year 2019, while Indonesia according to the data source has a Gini coefficient of 0.382. (www.regiladoputri.wordpress.com).

Participants' awareness and trust

Awareness and trust of BPJS Ketenagakerjaan participants is still low, namely the participation rate of 14.2% in 2015 and 37.1% in 2017. Meanwhile in Singapore, almost all of its workers participate in the mandatory Social Security program.

Employer Support

Employer support in Indonesia still has not shown 100% readiness with the phenomenon of public testing of Law No. 4 of 2016 concerning Tapera by Apindo (Indonesian Employers Association), although it has not been implemented. The entrepreneur reasoned

that there was already a lot of burden on Health and Labor Social Security, plus increased production costs in terms of electricity and the cost of imported raw materials. But in the end they supported the Tapera program. Meanwhile, in Singapore, the Social Security program is supported by the Employer where the payment of contributions has reached 35.5% of the employee's monthly salary, which is 20% of the Employee's salary and the remaining 15.5% of the Employer.

Land Bank Availability

Land ownership is very important and must be planned well. Land prices continue to skyrocket per year evenly in various cities in Indonesia, with an increase rate of up to 10-30%. For this reason, it is necessary to carry out procurement planning actions in the 5-year program and to synergize the assets of government agencies to be used as public housing land. Meanwhile, Singapore adheres to a flat construction pattern which is a tall dwelling, so the presence of land is not a major problem.

Discussions

Results on the EFAS table shows the total BP. Tapera's weighted score is 3.0375. As is well known, this table uses a weighted score range of 1 to 5, with a middle score of 3. The results of the total weighted score of 3.0375 indicate that the BP. Tapera's response rating to strategic factors in the external environment is only moderate, meaning that the prognosis results are only average in current conditions. So that in order to be successful in its task, BP Tapera must improve its ability to take opportunities in the external environment, along with its ability to cope with threats.

On Key Success Factor Table, we use a weighted score scale between 1-5, with the middle value is 3, which is the average. The score is generated by multiplying the weight by the rating, where 1 is bad and 5 is very good. With Indonesia's score of 3.0375 (the average number), this shows that there is still much work to be done in responding to the key strategic factors for success in the Tapera Social Security program. Compared to Indonesia, Singapore gets a high score of 4.10 because the implementation of the Housing Guarantee program there has been successful and is followed consistently by almost all workers in Singapore.

The score results in the EFAS table show the number 3.0375, it can be concluded that in the prognosis according to current conditions, the performance of BP. Tapera has only average grades. Therefore BP. Tapera must immediately formulate strategies (vision, mission, goals, strategies, policies), and implement strategies (programs, budgets and procedures), to achieve long-term successful performance. So that solutions to overcome threats and weaknesses can be found and implemented immediately.

Based on the Key Success Factor table, the implementation of Social Security in the housing sector in Singapore (score 4.10) is higher than that of Indonesia (score 3.0375). Therefore, it is necessary to make improvements to implement the points in the Key Success Factors.

Based on the research results above, we have obtained Opportunity and Threats from business environment for BP. Tapera, as follows:

Opportunities:

- i. Economic Growth is still in good condition.
- ii. High population and number of people working
- iii. Membership requirements are mandatory
- iv. High-yielding Tapera fund accumulation
- v. Principles of transparency and accountability
- vi. A culture that supports social security programs

Threats:

- i. Need big funds for service office operational costs
- ii. Need high IT costs for operations
- iii. Layoffs still high, along with potential for bad loans
- iv. The number of jobs is limited and the number of unemployed is high
- v. High inflation and cost of living
- vi. Inequality of development results
- vii. Low public awareness and trust
- viii. Employer's objections/complaints
- ix. Land prices continue to skyrocket

Key Success Factors:

- i. High Economic growth
- ii. Large Population/Workers
- iii. Implementation of mandatory Tapera membership
- iv. High yielding Tapera fund accumulation

- v. Transparent and accountable Tapera administration principles.
- vi. Culture of mutual cooperation and humanity
- vii. Availability of adequate office/branch service.
- viii. Availability of integrated IT
- ix. Decrease Termination of Employment
- x. Employment Increase
- xi. Price stability
- xii. Equitable Development Results
- xiii. Participants' awareness and trust
- xiv. Employer Support
- xv. Land Bank Availability

Conclusion

From the research it can be concluded that to achieve long-term successful performance, BP.Tapera must immediately develop and apply strategies to implement the key success factors. The strategy must be adapted to BP.Tapera's internal conditions, related to its strengths and weaknesses. Thus at the beginning of the operation BP.Tapera, we has been able to identify the key success factors first, then develop an implementation strategy. So that we can properly plan for the success of BP.Tapera's performance, where we can avoid operational failures that cause BP. Tapera becomes the state's fiscal burden.

In addition, the theoretical contribution to this research is the implementation of strategic management model theory and Key Success Factor theory in the Tapera program which is a social security program in the housing sector.

This research that conducted on BP. Tapera has some limitations. The first limitation is that this research does not use the 2020/2021 time setting, a time period in which the worldwide corona pandemic occurs and all countries experience a drastic decline in economic growth. Therefore, research that takes the time span of the pandemic, related to social security programs in the housing sector needs to be carried out.

The second limitation is the question that arises whether the research findings apply to other fields, where the context of this research uses the Tapera Program which is a Social Security Program in the housing sector. So that the same research needs to be done on the Social Security Program in other fields.

The third limitation is the need for expanded research results, not just stopping at analysis of External Factors (Opportunities & Threats) and Key Success Factors, so that further research needs to be carried out related to making implementation strategies in achieving key success factors, so that the successful of BP. Tapera's performance in the long term will be achieved.

References

- Abraham, S. (2003). Experiencing Strategic Conversations about the Central Forces of Our Time. *Strategy & Leadership*, Vol.31, No.2, pp.61-62
- Alese, O.D. (2011). The Role of Women's Creativity and Innovations in the Nigerian Informal Sector of Oke Ogun Zone. *International Education Studies*, 4(3), 213- 223. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v4n3p213>
- Amabile, T.M. (1996). *Creativity in context: Update to the social psychology of creativity*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Amabile. (1988). A model of creativity and innovation in organizations. In B.M. Staw & L.L. Cummings (Eds.). *Research in organization behavior*. (Vol.10, pp.123-167). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Baker, W.E., & Sinkula, J.M. (1999). The synergistic effect of market orientation and learning orientation on organizational performance. *Journal of Academy Marketing Science*, 27 (24), 411-27.
- Baker, W.E., & Sinkula, J.M. (2002). Market orientation, learning orientation and product innovation: delving into the organization's black box. *Journal of Market Focus Management*, 5 (1), 5-23.
- Barney, J.B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17, 99-120 . <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108>
- Barney, J.B. (2002). *Gaining and sustaining competitive advantage* (pp. 314-315. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bass, B. (1985). Leadership: Good, better, best. *Organizational Dynamics*, 14 (3), 26-40. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616\(85\)90028-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(85)90028-2)
- Bass, B.M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass & Bass (2008). *The Bass Handbook of Leadership*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Brady, D., & Capell, K. (2004). GE Breaks the Mold to Spur Innovation. *Business Week*, April 26, pp.88-89.
- Burns, T., & Stalker, G.M. (1961). *The Management of Innovation*. Tavistock, London.
- Burpitt, W.J., & Bigoness, W.J. (1997). Leadership and innovations among teams: the impact of empowerment. *Small Group Research*, 28, 414-423. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496497283005>
- Bradach, J., & Eccles, R. (1989). Price, authority, and trust. In W.R. Scott & J. Blake (Eds.). *Annual Review of sociology* (Vol.15, pp.97-118). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

- Brockmand, B., & Morgan, F.(2003). The role of existing knowledge in new product innovativeness and performance. *Decision Science*, 32 (2), 385-419.
- Burns, T., & Stalker, George M. (1961). *The management of innovation*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Bycio, P., Allen, J.S., & Hackett, R.D. (1995). 1995: Further assessment of Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 468-478.
- Chakrabarti, A.K. (1974). The role of champion in product innovation. *California Management Review*, 17, 58-62. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41164561>
- Chen, C.J., Huang, J.W., & Hsiao, Y.C.(2010). Knowledge management and innovativeness: the role of organizational climate and structure. *International Journal of Manpower*, 31 (8), 848-870.
- Cohen, W.M. & Levinthal, D.A. (1990). Absorptive capacity: A new Perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35, 128-152.
- Coleman, J.S.(1988). Social Capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, 95-120. <https://doi.org/10.1086/228943>
- Coleman, J.S. (1990). *Foundations of social theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- CNN Money, 2013. (online <http://www.money.cnn.com/news/companies.html>).
- Damanpour, F., & Evan, W.M. (1984). Organizational innovation and performance: the problem of 'organizational lag'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29 (3): 392-409.
- Damanpour, F.(1996). Organizational complexity and innovation: developing and testing multiple contingency models. *Management Science*, 42 (5), 693-716. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.42.5.693>
- Damanpour, F., & Gopalakhrisnan, S. (1998). Theories of organizational structure and innovation adoption: the role of environmental change. *Journal of Engineering Technical Managerial*, 15 (1), 1-24.
- Damanpour, F.(1991). Organizational innovation: a meta-analysis of effects of determinants and moderators. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34 (3), 550- 90. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256406>
- Day, G.S.(1994). The capabilities of the market-driven organizations. *Journal of Marketing*, 58 (4), 37-52. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1251915>
- Davenport, T.H., & Prusak, L.(1998). *Working knowledge: How organizations manage what they know*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Dess, G.G., & Picken, J.C. (2000). Changing roles: Leadership in the 21st century. *Organizational Dynamics*, 28 (3), 18-34. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616\(00\)88447-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616(00)88447-8)
- Dewar, R.D., & Dutton, J.E.(1986). The adoption of radical and incremental innovations: an empirical analysis. *Managerial Science*, 32(11), 1422-33.
- Dickson, P.R.(1996). The static and dynamic mechanics of competition: a comment on Hunt and Morgan's comparative advantage theory. *Journal of Marketing*, 60 (4), 102-6.
- DTI (2003). *Competing in the global economy: the innovation challenge*. The Stationary Office.
- Dovey, K. (2009). The role of trust in innovation. *The Learning Organization*, 16 (4), 311-325. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09696470910960400>
- Drucker, P. (1993). *Post-Capitalist Society*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Eisenbach, R., Watson, K., & Pillai, R.(1999). Transformational leadership in the context of organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change*, 12, 80-88.
- Eisenhardt, K.M., & Martin, J.A.(2000). Dynamic Capabilities: What are they? *Strategic Management Journal*, 21, 1105-1121.
- Epple, D.L., Argote, L., & Murphy, K.(1996). An empirical investigation of the Micro structure of knowledge acquisition and transfer through learning by doing. *Operational Research*, 44, 77-86.
- Freeman, C.(1989). *The Economics of Industrial Innovation*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Galbraith, J.R. (1991). Strategy and Organization Planning, in *The Strategy Process: Concepts, Contexts, and Cases*, 2nd ed., edited by H. Mintzberg and J.B. Quinn. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, pp. 315-324.
- Glynn, M.A. (1996). Innovative genius: a framework for relating individual and organizational intelligences to innovation. *Academy of Management Review*, 21, 1081-1111. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259165>
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership*. Boston: Business School Publishing.
- Gopalakrishnan, S., & Damanpour, F.(1997). A review of innovation research in economics, sociology and technology management. *Omega* 25(1), 15-28. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-0483\(96\)00043-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-0483(96)00043-6)
- Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L., Black, W.C.(1999). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (6th Ed). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Hage, J. (1980). *Theories of organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Hage, J.(1999). Organizational innovation and organizational change. *Annual Review Sociology*, 25, 597-622. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.25.1.597>
- Hall, L.A., & Bagchi-sen, S. (2002). A study of R & D, innovation, and business performance in the Canadian biotechnology industry. *Technovation*, 22, 231-244.
- Hall, R. (1992). The strategic analysis of intangible resources. *Strategic Management Journal*, 13 (2), 135-144. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250130205>

- Hansen, F. (2001). The Value-Based Management Commitment. *Business Finance*, 2-5.
- Hansen, M.T. (2002). Knowledge networks: Explaining effective knowledge sharing in multiunit companies. *Organization Science*, 13, 232 -248. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.13.3.232.2771>
- Hauschildt, J., & Kirchmann, E. (2001). Teamwork for innovation—the troika of promoters. *R & D Management*, 31, 41-49. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9310.00195>
- Hitt, M.A., Ireland, R.D., & Hoskisson, R.E. (2001). *Strategic Management Competitiveness and Globalization*. Cincinnati: South-Western College Publishing.
- Hofstede, Geerts (1997). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind* (rev.edn). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hollander, E.P., & Julian, J.W. (1969). Contemporary trends in the analysis of leadership processes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 71, 387-397. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0027347>
- Howell, J.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 891-902.
- Huber, G.P. (1991). Organizational learning: the contributing processes and the literatures. *Organization Science*, 2, 88-115. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2.1.88>
- Hurley, R.F., & Hult, G.T. (1998). Innovation, market orientation, and organizational learning: an integration and empirical examination. *Journal of Marketing*, 62, 42-45.
- Ireland, R.D., & Hitt, M.A. (1999). Achieving and maintaining strategic competitiveness in the 21st century: The role of strategic leadership. *Academy of Management Executive*, 13 (1), 43-47.
- Jarrar, Y.F., & Zairi, M. (2001). Future Trends in Benchmarking for Competitive Advantage: A Global Survey. *Total Quality Management*, 12, 906-12.
- Jimenez, Daniel, & Valle, R.S. (2011). Innovation, organizational learning, and performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 64, 408-417.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R.L. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: John Wiley.
- Kenney, R.A., Balsovich, J., & Shaver, P.R. (1994). Implicit Leadership theories: Prototypes for new leaders. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 15, 409-437.
- Kluyver, C.A., & Pearce II, J.A. (2003). *A view from the Top*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall
- Kogut, B., & Zander, U. (1992). Knowledge of the firm, Combination capabilities, and the replication of technology. *Organization Science*, 3, 383-397.
- Koh, W.L., Steers, R.M., & Terborg, J.R. (1995). The effects of transformational leadership on teacher attitudes and student performance in Singapore. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 319-333.
- Koontz, H., & Bradspies, R.W. (1972). Managing through Feedforward Control. *Business Horizons*, 6, 25-36.
- Kouzes, J.M., & Posner, B.Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kreitner, R., & Kinicki, A. (2010). *Organizational Behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lado, A., & Zhang, M.J. (1998). Expert systems, knowledge development and utilization and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 24, 489-509.
- Leonard-Barton, D. (1999). *Wellsprings of knowledge: building and sustaining the sources of innovation*. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Press.
- Lewis, J., & Weigert, A. (1985). Trust as a social reality. *Social Forces*, 63, 967- 985. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2578601>
- Llorens-Montes, F.J., Ruiz-Moreno, A., Garcia-Morales, V.J. (2005). Influence of support leadership and teamwork cohesion on organizational learning, innovation and performance: an empirical examination. *Technovation*, 25 (10), 1159-1172.
- Maney, K. (2003). Dell Business Model Turns to Muscle as Rivals Struggle. *USA Today*, January 20, pp.1B-2B
- Mayer, R.C., & Davis, J.H. (1999). The effect of the Performance Appraisal System on Trust for Management: A field Quasi – Experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84 (1), 123-136.
- M. Arndt (2003). Zimmer: Growing Older Gracefully. *Business Week*, 82-84
- Miles, R.E., & Snow, C.C. (1978). *Organizational strategy, structure, and process*. New York: McGraw-Hill. <https://doi.org/10.2307/257544>
- Miller, D., & Friesen, P. (1982). Innovation in conservative and entrepreneurial firms: two models of strategic momentum. *Strategic Management Journal*, 3(1), 1-25.
- Mizik, N., & Jacobson, R. (2003). Trading off between value creation and value appropriation: the financial implications of shifts in strategic emphasis. *Journal of Marketing*, 67, 63-76.
- Montgomery, C.A. (1995). *Resource-based and Evolutionary Theories of the Firm*. Boston: Kluwer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-2201-0>
- Morales, G., Montes, L., & Jover, A.J. (2008). The Effects of Transformational Leadership on Organizational Performance through Knowledge and Innovation. *British Journal of Management*, 9, 299-319.
- Morales, G., Victor, J.G., Montes, F.J.L., & Jover, A.J.V. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of organizational innovation and organizational learning in entrepreneurship. *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 106 (1), 21-42.

- Morgan, R., & Strong, C. (2003). Business performance and dimensions of strategic orientation. *Journal of Business Research*, 56, 163-176.
- Mudrajad (2006). *Strategi bagaimana meraih keunggulan kompetitif*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Mumford, M., & Gustafson, S. (1988). Creativity syndrome: Integration, application, and innovation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103, 27-43.
- Nadler, D.A., & Tushman, M.L. (1990). Beyond the charismatic leader: Leadership and organizational change. *California Management Review*, 32 (2), 77-97.
- Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1996). A theory of organizational knowledge creation company. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 11, 833-846.
- Northouse, P.G. (2007). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Penrose, E.T. (1959). *The Theory of the Growth of the Firm*. New York: Wiley.
- Pierce, J.L., & Delbecq, A.L. (1977). Organizational structure, individual attitude and innovation. *Academy of Management Review*, 2, 26-37.
- Porter, M.E. (1980). *Competitive Strategy*. New York: The Free Press.
- Porter, M.E. (1990). *The competitive advantage of nations*. New York: The Free Press. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-11336-1>.
- Porter, M.E. (1998). Clusters and the New Economics of Competition. *Harvard Business Review*, December 1998, pp.77-90
- Price, A.D.F., Ganiev, B.V., & Newson, E. (2003). Changing strategic management practice within the UK construction industry. *Strategic Change*, 12, 7, 347.
- Pritchard, R., & Karasick, B. (1973). The effects of organizational climate on managerial job performance and satisfaction. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 9, 126-146.
- Quinn, J.B. (1979). Technological innovation, entrepreneurship, and strategy. *Sloan Management Review*, 20, 19-30.
- Ristow, A.M., Amos, T.L., Staude, G.E. (1999). Transformational leadership and Organizational Effectiveness in the Administration of Cricket in South Africa. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 3, 1-5.
- Robbins, S.P., & Coulter, M. (2005). *Management*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Roberts, E.B., & Fusfeld, A.R. (1981). Staffing the innovative technology-based organization. *Sloan Management Review*, 22, 19-34.
- Roger, E.M. (1995). *Diffusion of innovations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Rousseau, D.M. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452231594>
- Ruppel, C.P., & Harrington, S.J. (2000). The relationship of communication, ethical work climate, and trust to commitment and innovation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 25 (4), 313.
- Russel, B., & Branch, T. (1979). *Second Wind: The Memories of an Opinionated Man*. New York: Random House.
- Sanchez, R., & Heene, A. (2004). *The New Strategic Management: Organization, Competition, and Competence*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Sarri, K.K., Bakouros, I.L., Petridou, E. (2010). Entrepreneur training for creativity and innovation. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 34, 270-288.
- Satriago, H. (2010). *Examining The Follower's Influence on Leaders' Performance: A "Reverse" Pygmalion Perspective*. Dissertation. University of Indonesia.
- Schein, E.H. (1999). *The Corporate Culture Survival Guide*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schroeder, R., Van de Ven, A., Scudder, G., & Polley, D. (1989). The development of innovation ideas. In A. Van de Ven, H. Angle, & M. Poole (Eds.). *Research on the management of innovation: The Minnesota Studies*, 107-134. New York: Harper & Row.
- Schumpeter, J.A. (1934). *The theory of economic development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Schumpeter, J.A. (1942). *Capitalism, socialism and democracy*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Scott, S.G. (1994). Determinants of Innovative Behavior: A Path Model of Individual Innovation in the Workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37 (3), 580-607. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256701>
- Scott, S.G., & Bruce, R.A. (1994). Determinants of Innovative Behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37 (3), 580-607. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t25372-000>
- Shane, S.A., Venkataraman, S., & MacMillan, I.C. (1994). The effects of cultural differences on new technology championing behavior within firms. *The Journal of High Technology Management Research*, 5, 163-181.
- Shenhar, A.J. (1993). From low to high-tech project management. *R & D Management*, 23 (3), 199-214. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9310.1993.tb00823.x>
- Sinkula, J.M. (1994). Market information processing and organizational learning. *Journal of Marketing*, 58 (1), 35-45. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1252249>
- Simpson, M., & Kondouli, D. (2000). A Practical Approach to Benchmarking in Three Service Industries. *Total Quality Management*, 12, S623-S630.
- Simpson, P.M., Sigauw, J.A., & Enz, C.A. (2006). Innovation orientation outcomes: the good and the bad. *Journal Business Review*, 59, 1133-41

- Smith, K.G., Collins, C.J., & Clark, K.D. (2005). Existing knowledge, knowledge creation capability, and the rate of new product introduction in high-technology firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 346-357.
- Sorenson, J.B. (2002). The Strength of Corporate Culture and the Reliability of Firm Performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, March, pp.70-91.
- Spector, P.E.(1981). *Research design*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publication. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412985673>
- Starkey, K., & McKinlay, A. (1988). *Organisational Innovation*. Avebury: Aldershot.
- Stata, R. (1989). Organizational Learning: the key to management innovation. *Sloan Management Review*, 30 (3), 63-74. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02985739>
- Stewart, T.A. (1997). *Intellectual Capital: the New Wealth of Organization*. New York: Doubleday/ Currency.
- Stoker, J.I., Looise, J.C., Fisscher, O.A.M., & De Jong, R.D.(2001). Leadership and innovation: relations between leadership, individual characteristics and the functioning of R & D teams. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12, 1141-1151.
- Sugiyono, Prof, Dr. (2009). *Metode Penelitian Bisnis*. Bandung: CV.Alfabeta.
- The Incredible Shrinking Country. *Economist*, November, 2004, 45-46
- Teece, D.J. (1984). Economic Analysis and Strategic Management. *California Management Review*, 26 (3), 87-110.
- Teece, D.J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18 (7), 509-533. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41165082>
- Thesmar, D., & Thoenig, M.(2000). Creative destruction and firm organization choice. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 1201 - 1237. <https://doi.org/10.1162/003355300555051>
- Thomas, C.W. (1994). Learning from scenarios: imagining the years ahead. *Planning Review*, 22 (2), 6-10. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb054462>
- Thompson, J. (1967). *Organizations in action*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Thompson, V.A. (1965). Bureaucracy and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 10 (1), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2391646>
- Tsai, W., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital and value creation: The role of intrafirm networks. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41 (4), 464-476. <https://doi.org/10.5465/257085>
- Tuomi, I.(1999). *Corporate Knowledge: Practice of Intelligent Organization*. Helsinki, Finland: Metaxis, pp. 21.
- Tushman, M.L., & Nadler, D.A. (1986). Organizing for innovation. *California Managerial Review*, 28 (3), 74-92. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41165203>
- Tushman, M.L., & O'Reilly, C.A. (1997). *Winning through innovation*. Boston: Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb054591>
- Utterback, J.M. (1994). *Mastering the dynamic of innovation: how companies can seize opportunities in the face of technological change*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Uzzi, B.(1997). Social structure and competition in interfirm networks: The paradox of embeddedness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 35-67. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393931>
- Van de Ven, A.H.(1986). Central problems in the management of innovation. *Management Science*, 32, 590-607. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.32.5.590>
- Van de Ven, A.H.(1993). Managing the process of organizational innovation. In G.P. Huber and W.H. Glick (Eds.). *Organizational change and redesign: Ideas and insights for improving performance* (pp. 269-294). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Verdin, P.J., & Williamson, P.J. (1994). Core Competencies, Competitive Advantage and Market Analysis: Forging the Links, in *Competence-Based Competition*, edited by G. Hamel and A. Heene. New York: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 83-84.
- Wagner, J.A. (1995). Studies of individualism - collectivism: Effect on cooperation in groups. *Academy of Management*, 38, 152-172.
- Waldman, D., & Bass, B. (1991). Transformational leadership at different phases of the innovation process. *Journal of High Technology Management Research*, 2, 169 -180.
- Wernerfelt (1984). A Resource Based View of the Firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 5 (2), 171-180. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250050207>
- Wheelen, T.L., & Hunger, J.D. (2006). *Strategic Management and Business Policy*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Woodman, R., Sawyer, J., & Griffin, R. (1993). Toward a theory of organizational creativity. *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 293-321.
- Wolfe, R.A. (1994). Organizational innovation: review, critique and suggested research directions. *Journal of Management Studies*, 31 (3), 405-31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.1994.tb00624.x>
- Wright, R.E., Palmer, J.C., & Perking, D.(2005). Types of product innovations An small business performance in hostile & benign environments. *Journal Small Business Strategy*, 15 (2), 33-44. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02756661211281462>
- Xu, Q., Chen, J., Xie, Z., Liu, J., Zheng, G., & Wang, Y. (2007). Total Innovation Management: a novel paradigm of innovation management in the 21st century. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 32, 9-25.

Zelmer-Bruhn, M.E. (2003). Interruptive events and team knowledge acquisition. *Management Science*, 49 (4), 514-528.
<https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.49.4.514.14423>

Publisher's Note: SSBFNET stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

© 2021 by the authors. Licensee SSBFNET, Istanbul, Turkey. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science (2147-4478) by SSBFNET is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.