Decision Making and Organisation in the Decision Making Process from Andreas Faludi's perspective

[1]**Ikfina Nurul Izzah**
Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia
*Email: ikfina.nurul07@gmail.com

[2]**Ujang Suyatman**
Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia
Email: ujang.suyatman@uinsgd.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This theme explores the complexity of decision-making and organizational structure in planning agencies. Decision-making in planning agencies requires a balance between a rational approach based on data and analysis, and a participatory approach that accommodates various social, economic, and political interests. Meanwhile, the organization of planning departments needs a clear structure to ensure well-distributed roles and responsibilities, enabling effective coordination both internally and externally. Additionally, planning agencies often face political pressures that influence processes and outcomes. Therefore, the ability to adapt to political interests while maintaining the integrity of the plan is a primary challenge. A balance between technical rationality and flexibility in addressing diverse interests is key to successful decision-making and to the effectiveness of organizational structure in responsive and sustainable planning.

Keywords: *Decision-making; organization; planning body.*

Introduction

Decision-making in planning agencies is a complex and dynamic process. Planning agencies, which are responsible for designing urban and regional development strategies, face a major challenge in balancing competing interests. Decisions made by these institutions affect many aspects of people's lives, including land use, transport and the

environment. Understanding the decision-making mechanisms within planning institutions is therefore crucial, especially in the quest for sustainable and inclusive development.

The decision-making process cannot be separated from in-depth rational analyses. Planners in planning institutions often use quantitative data, planning models, and statistical projections to support the decisions they make. While this data-driven approach is indispensable, limitations in data availability and accuracy often pose challenges. In addition, fully rational decisions are difficult to achieve due to uncertainties and unforeseen variables in the planning process.

In this context, Faludi in the book Planning Theory distinguishes between decision making and decision taking. Decision making refers to an analytical and evaluative process in which various alternatives are explored and analysed. Meanwhile, decision taking refers to concrete actions to implement the decisions that have been made. This distinction is important because it shows that while the decision-making process can be very rational and structured, the implementation of decisions can be hampered by various constraints, including resistance from the public or changes in political conditions.

In addition to flexibility, Faludi also highlighted the importance of professionalism in the organisation of planning departments. This professionalism includes not only technical expertise, but also the ability to facilitate dialogue between different stakeholders. Planners must be able to navigate different interests-from the demands of politicians to the expectations of the public-with a transparent and evidence-based approach. As such, planning departments should be organised in such a way that planners have sufficient autonomy to perform their functions, while remaining accountable to the public.

Furthermore, Faludi underlines that the organisational structure of the planning department should be designed to support a participatory and inclusive planning process. This is important to ensure that decisions do not only reflect the interests of a few but also consider the needs and aspirations of various community groups. An effective planning department should be able to integrate community feedback into planning and build strong partnerships with local communities and the private sector.

Planning department organisations also need to pay attention to the role of technology and data in supporting the planning process. Faludi noted that with the development of information technology, planning departments should be able to utilise data effectively to support analysis

and decision-making. However, the use of technology also requires specific expertise and an organisational structure that supports collaboration between data experts and planners. Therefore, technology integration must be carefully planned to increase efficiency without compromising the quality of planning.

In this context, Faludi offers a critical perspective on how optimal organisation can help face future planning challenges. This article aims to further examine how decisions are taken in planning institutions, as well as how the roles and relationships between planners and politicians influence the outcomes of those decisions and examines Faludi's theories on the organisation of planning departments and explores how those principles can be applied in various urban planning contexts.

With a better understanding of the structure and function of planning departments, we can develop more effective and adaptive organisational models in the face of modern planning challenges. In addition, this paper will also discuss alternative approaches that can improve the quality of decision-making, highlighting the importance of collaboration, transparency and public participation. It is hoped that a more holistic understanding of this process can provide insights into developing more effective, inclusive and sustainable planning strategies in the future.

Method

This research uses the library research method or literature study of Andreas Faludi's book and his theory. This method is relevant to be used by the author, with the aim of analysing written sources both from Faludi's main book, as well as other supporting sources, such as previous research journals, scientific articles, and policy documents related to the latest advances in educational planning. Through this method, the author will go through the stages of collecting literature, analysing existing theories, concepts and findings, and finally synthesising all the information obtained into arguments that are relevant to the theory of decision-making in education planning.

Results And Discussion

Andreas Faludi places decision-making at the core of the planning process, which involves rational steps such as goal setting, situation analysis, evaluation of alternatives, and selection of the best course of action. Planning is not only technical in nature, but also involves social and political dimensions, thus requiring a structured and logical

approach.

Organisations have an important role to play in supporting this process by providing a framework for coordinating, allocating resources, and managing the interests of different parties. However, Faludi acknowledged that conflicts between stakeholders often occur, making negotiation and dialogue essential to reach consensus in decision-making.

In addition, Faludi highlighted the challenges of uncertainty and complexity that often arise in planning. Therefore, a flexible and adaptive approach is required to adjust decisions to changing situations. Evaluation and learning from each stage of the process is also key to improving the effectiveness of future planning.

Decision-Making Process Concept

Roles exist for politicians and planners with the concept of *"masters* and *servants"*, which describes the power relationship between politicians (as political decision-makers) and planners (as technical professionals who implement decisions). This concept reflects the tensions or dynamics between two groups with different roles in planning. Politicians as *"masters"* are often perceived as having the authority and power to make final decisions that include planning policy. They have a mandate from the public to direct policy based on political considerations, ideology, or the needs of the wider community. (Priyowidodo and Indrayani 2018)..

Planners as *"servants"* are identified as more technical, providing advice, data, and recommendations based on their analyses. However, they usually do not have the final power to decide the policy. They function more as implementers of the decisions taken by politicians. (Kardiat 2022). This reflects the different but interdependent roles of politicians and planners in the planning process. However, Faludi may also highlight that this relationship is not always fair or ideal, and there is criticism of over-reliance on politicians in making planning decisions without considering the technical expertise of planners.

For example, politicians, in this case, have a role to play in determining education policy at the national or local level. They make decisions about the education budget, curriculum, education infrastructure and so on. Their decisions are influenced by political factors, community interests and socio-economic goals. For example, a politician might propose a policy to increase the education budget or introduce a new curriculum that a particular community or group wants. Education planners, then, are the experts who design and implement the

policies that have been decided by politicians. They design education programmes, plan the construction of school infrastructure and ensure the implementation of the education policies that have been passed.

In this case, planners do not make political decisions but work to implement the vision of politicians and governments. While this relationship represents a power differential, it is important to remember that good collaboration between politicians and planners is necessary for policies to translate effectively into practice. Planners do not just follow orders uncritically but can also provide input and suggestions that can improve politicians' decisions based on existing research and data. In other words, while politicians are the "employers" who direct policy, planners have an important role as implementers who can provide practical insights on how the policy can be implemented successfully on the ground. (Iskandar 2017).

Instrumental View of Planning

This view sees planning as a tool to achieve certain goals set by more powerful people, such as politicians or government officials. In this view, planners are only considered as implementers or technicians who follow instructions from politicians, without much consideration of social values or community needs. For example, if a city decides to build a new highway, planners will be given data and instructions on how to plan the road to be efficient and within budget. The focus is on efficiency, rationality, and optimising the use of resources. (Hardiansyah 2005).

Faludi criticised this view as he felt it was too limited and lacked consideration of the complexity of social life. According to him, planning is not just about achieving practical goals such as building roads, but should also consider deeper values, such as social justice, equality, and community welfare. Planners should not only execute policies set by politicians, but should also consider social, economic and environmental aspects in every decision. In Faludi's view, planners should have a more active role in facilitating community participation, resolving conflicts between different interests, and ensuring that policies are fair to all parties.

The instrumental view of planning focuses on the role of politicians or decision-makers who set goals and directions, while planners are only tasked with carrying out those decisions in an efficient manner, with the main goal of optimising resources. In this framework, efficiency becomes the dominant aspect of planning. However, Andreas Faludi criticises this view by emphasising that planners should be more than implementers.

According to Faludi, planners serve as a link between policies set by politicians and the communities affected by these policies. In the planning process, communities should be involved, considering social values and justice. In addition, Faludi argues that planners should be prepared to deal with uncertainties and conflicts of interest that may arise in the decision-making process, so that planners focus not only on efficiency, but also on the integration of community interests and social balance.

Decision Making dan Decision Taking

Decision making is a very important process in everyday life, both in personal and professional contexts. This process involves selecting action or step from several available alternatives to achieve a specific goal. For example, a person may need to decide what to eat for dinner, while a city planner must decide how to allocate the budget for an infrastructure project. Each decision has different impacts, so it is important to conduct proper analyses before taking a step. (Sola 2019).

The first step in decision-making is to identify the problem or goal to be achieved. This means recognising the situation that requires attention and understanding what is to be achieved. For example, if a city is facing traffic congestion, the goal could be to reduce congestion and improve people's mobility. Clearly understanding the problem will help in the subsequent process (Manalu 2020).

Then, once the problem or objective is identified, the next step is to gather relevant information. This includes data, facts and input from various sources that can help in evaluating options. In the context of urban planning, this information may include traffic data, community survey results, or environmental impact studies. The more information available, the better decisions can be made.

Once the information is gathered, the next process is to assess the alternatives. This means analysing the options based on certain criteria, such as how effective, efficient or sustainable they are. Urban planners, for example, should consider how each alternative will affect traffic, the environment and citizens' quality of life. Ultimately, this step aims to select the most suitable alternative to achieve the set objectives.

Once the best alternative is chosen, the decision needs to be implemented and evaluated. Implementation involves carrying out the steps that have been chosen, while evaluation takes place after the decision has been implemented to assess whether the results are as expected. If the objectives are achieved, the decision can be considered a

success. However, if the results are not satisfactory, then adjustments or revisions are necessary. In the context of planning, it is important to continuously involve the community in this process so that the decisions taken truly reflect their needs and expectations. (Maidiana 2021).

Decision taking is the process by which a person or group of people chooses a particular course of action after considering the various options available. It is the stage where a pre-thought-out decision is taken and implemented. For example, after a manager decides to introduce a new programme in the company, the next step is to take the decision to launch it and start implementing it.

The decision-making process usually involves several steps, including identifying the problem, gathering information, and evaluating alternatives. However, decision making is the final step of the process. At this stage, all the analyses and considerations that have gone before are used as the basis for making the final decision. This is where all the considerations are translated into concrete actions. Once a decision has been made, it is important to execute the action properly. This means that the decision must be implemented in an appropriate manner to achieve the desired goal. For example, if a city decides to repair a road, *decision taking* means contracting a construction company, planning a schedule, and starting the work. Without good implementation, the decision will not deliver the expected results (Zahroh 2019).

Decision taking also includes responsibility. When someone decides, they must be prepared to face the consequences of that decision. If the decision is successful, then positive results can be enjoyed. However, if the decision does not go well, the decision maker must be prepared to address any problems that may arise. This shows that the decision taken has a direct impact on the situation or problem at hand (Rifa'i 2019).

Overall, *decision taking* is an important part of the decision-making process. It is the moment where all the analyses and considerations turn into concrete actions. The success of a decision depends not only on the thinking, but also on how it is implemented in practice. Thus, *decision making* is a crucial step towards achieving desired goals and making positive changes.

Pros and Cons of *Decision Making* and *Decision Taking*

The decision-making process has the advantage of in-depth analysis, which allows for comprehensive evaluation of information and data, so that decisions are more fact-based. In addition, by involving various

stakeholders such as teachers, parents and students, decisions can reflect diverse perspectives and more holistic needs. It also serves to reduce risk, as each alternative can be carefully evaluated for potential risks and consequences, so that the decisions taken are more quality assured and avoid bad possibilities.

However, this decision-making process also has some drawbacks. One of them is the time it takes to complete the analysis, especially if it involves many people and complex data. This process can cause delays in decision implementation. In addition, overthinking or over-analysing can lead to confusion, where decisions are ultimately stalled and not made. Finally, when multiple stakeholders are involved, conflicts of interest often arise, which can make it difficult to reach consensus and slow down the decision-making process.

On the other hand, *decision making* has the advantage of faster action. Once a decision is made, immediate action can be taken to address a problem or fulfil an existing need, which allows for a faster response to urgent situations. The process is also more implementation-focused, which is critical to ensure decisions can have a real, immediate impact. In addition, with individuals or groups directly making decisions, accountability becomes clearer and easier to justify.

However, *decision making* is not without its drawbacks. Without in-depth analyses, the decision made risks being poor, as it could be based on assumptions or incomplete information, which could lead to failure. In addition, if a decision is made without involving relevant stakeholders, the decision may not reflect their needs or desires, which may reduce support for the decision. Another drawback of decision taking is that if decisions are made in a hurry, responsibility for the consequences that arise can be difficult to determine, as the decision may not have gone through an adequate reflection process.

Difference and Relevance between Decision Making and Decision Taking

Decision making focuses more on the analytical and evaluative process that precedes the choice, while *decision taking* focuses more on the practical action and implementation of the decision. *Decision making* involves more discussion and evaluation among stakeholders, while *decision taking* is the stage where concrete decisions are taken and implemented. Both are interrelated and important in the context of planning. A good and collaborative *decision-making* process can lead to better decisions, which in turn can increase the effectiveness and success

of *decision making*. Faludi emphasises that in order to achieve the desired results in planning, it is important for planners and politicians to understand and integrate these two aspects in harmony (Prihatin 2018).

Acceptence Risk and Analysis Risk

Politicians, as final decision-makers, often must accept risks in various aspects when deciding on policies. They not only make decisions based on technical analyses provided by planners, but also must consider the political, social and economic risks that may accompany them. *Acceptance of risks* means politicians must be prepared to deal with the various uncertainties and consequences that may arise from the policies they choose. In the real world, many planning decisions are complex and involve many factors that are difficult to predict.

Politicians are expected to understand the consequences of decisions. This means that the policies taken may have significant social, economic or environmental impacts. Therefore, politicians must consider all consequences despite uncertainties. In addition, politicians are also expected to be publicly accountable. When a policy is adopted and does not go well, they must be prepared to be criticised or even rejected if the results are not as expected. Every decision taken can affect a politician's reputation or the chances of being re-elected. Thus, accepting risks also includes politicians' readiness to take steps that are unpopular with the public but will provide long-term benefits.

Faludi emphasises the importance of this *acceptance of risks* because planning does not always present ideal options. The decisions taken are often fraught with uncertainty and have long-term effects. In this context, politicians must make bold decisions, which often require them to balance risk with the interests of society, available resources and long-term impact. *Acceptance of risks* is the ability and readiness of a politician to make decisions despite the inherent risks, in order to achieve goals that are believed to be important to society. (Lucas 1962).

Analysis of risk in the context of planners means evaluating the various risks that may arise from any planned policy or project. The role of planners in analysing risks is very important so that decision makers, in this case politicians, can understand all the possible impacts of the decisions they make. With clear and in-depth risk analysis, politicians can make better choices and are more prepared to accept risks because they already know the possible impacts and ways of mitigation that can be applied.

The relationship between *acceptance risk* and *risk analysis* is that

planners provide a strong information base through risk analysis so that politicians can accept the risk with a better understanding. This means that the planner is the one who helps look at the risk objectively, while the politician is the one who makes the final decision based on the risk. *Analysis of risk* by planners allows politicians to make more informed decisions and take more responsible steps, especially in the face of uncertainties that often exist in large plans.

Good collaboration between politicians and planners requires clear rules, roles and responsibilities so that each party can contribute their expertise and make decisions that benefit society. Without clear rules for collaboration, there can be conflict or tension due to their different interests and perspectives.

Politicians may want policies that provide political advantage or quick responses, while planners may emphasise the need for a more cautious or analytical approach. *Rules for their collaboration* are rules or guidelines governing the division of roles and responsibilities that clarify what is the responsibility of politicians such as setting policy and what is the responsibility of planners to analyse data and provide technical recommendations. Then establish clear communication procedures so that politicians and planners can share information effectively and quickly. This is important so that planning can understand politicians' priorities and politicians can understand the results of risk analyses made by planners.

Consultation and approval mechanisms in some planning policies may need to consult politicians first, especially if the policy requires a large budget or has a wide impact on the community point with a clear mechanism politicians can give direction while planning can ensure the proposed plan is in accordance with the policy to be achieved. Politicians accept risk and planners analyse risk, these rules of collaboration set out how they work together in the face of uncertainty. For example, if the planner's analysis shows high risk politicians may have to reconsider or adjust their decision. Conflict of interest arrangements if there are differing views these rules will help how to reach an agreement or compromise that benefits the overall planning objectives.

The Organization of Planning Department

Faludi discusses the organisation of planning departments in the context of how decision-making processes are designed and how planners fit into the wider bureaucratic system. Faludi discussed the importance of a clear departmental structure to ensure that planning can be implemented

effectively. A good structure allows the planning team to function optimally in supporting public policies and coordinating projects involving various stakeholders.

An organisational structure must have functions to perform its duties. The main function of this department is to develop and implement strategic plans related to urban planning, environment, infrastructure, and various public policies. They also have the responsibility to conduct research, collect data, and ensure that the plans are in line with the needs of the community. Therefore, Faludi strongly highlights the importance of this function in planning.

The planning department must liaise with the various divisions and stakeholders, both internal and external, involved in the planning of the city or region. This coordination involves communication techniques, cross-field collaboration, and role distribution. Coordination among team members is essential for information to flow efficiently. For example, the department responsible for research should communicate with the implementation department to ensure that the data generated can be implemented properly.

The planning department needs to liaise with other departments (such as environment, transport, or housing), and involve the community and other stakeholders who will be affected by the plan.

Faludi emphasised the importance of this coordination to make planning outcomes more effective and acceptable to various parties. Faludi highlighted that planning is often not fully objective due to political pressure. Influential parties, such as government officials or interest groups, can influence the direction of planning decisions to suit a particular political agenda. In this discussion, Faludi also describes the influence of senior officials or directors. The main influence is influence in decision-making where they have the power and authority to set goals, determine priorities, and decide on planning strategies to be taken. They also have authority over the allocation of financial, time and labour resources. This authority can affect the success or failure of a plan depending on how efficiently the resources are allocated.

However, according to Faludi there are still shortcomings and limitations to the current planning organisation structure. The shortcomings criticised by Faludi include limitations on flexibility and innovation. Too rigid a structure makes it difficult to implement innovative ideas such as social or economic change. Faludi also noted that centralisation of power still occurs, which limits the input of the team, leading to unbalanced and overly subjective plans.

Planning is often done in a *top-down* manner, without involving enough input from communities or other stakeholders who will be affected. In such a system, the needs and aspirations of communities can be overlooked, which in turn can reduce the effectiveness and legitimacy of the plan. Faludi also criticised how the current system sometimes relies on limited data or less evidence-based approaches. This can be a big problem, especially when planning is done without adequate research. As a result, decisions made may not be in line with the real conditions and needs on the ground.

Complicated bureaucracy and lengthy procedures in decision-making often hamper the smooth running of the planning process. Faludi sees that overly bureaucratic arrangements often lead to decisions being executed late, which can reduce the effectiveness and relevance of planning. In conventional planning structures, Faludi may highlight the tendency to look at certain aspects separately, such as economic, environmental, and social, without sufficient coordination. This creates fragmentation in planning, which ultimately results in decisions that are less holistic and do not consider all relevant aspects. (Setiawan and Fathun 2021).

Current planning structures often focus on short-term outcomes due to pressure from certain parties or time and resource constraints. This ignores the long-term vision that is critical for sustainability. In essence, Faludi wants to point out that for planning to be more effective, there needs to be structural reforms that allow for flexibility, wider participation, and better inter-faceted coordination.

Conclusion

Decision-making in planning combines a rational approach based on data and analyses with a participatory approach that involves input from various stakeholders. This process is often complex as it must consider a wide range of social, economic and political interests. Meanwhile, the organisation of planning departments requires a clear structure to ensure effective coordination, both internal and external, and to cope with political pressures that can influence decisions. A balance between technical rationality and flexibility in the face of social and political challenges is key to successful planning decision-making and organisation.

References

Hardiansyah, Elkana Catur. 2005. "Peran Perencana Dalam Era Demokratisasi Perencanaan: Kasus Perencanaan Jalan Dago Lembang." *Jurnal Perencanaan Wilayah Dan Kota* 16(2):41–63.

Iskandar, Dadi Junaedi. 2017. "Pentingnya Partisipasi Dan Peranan Kelembagaan Politik Dalam Proses Pembuatan Kebijakan Publik." *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi: Media Pengembangan Ilmu Dan Praktek Administrasi* 14(1):17–35. doi: 10.31113/jia.v14i1.2.

Kardiat, Yosar. 2022. "Organisasi Sebagai Arena Kekuasaan Politik." *Jurnal Pallangga Praja (JPP)* 4(1):45–50. doi: 10.61076/jpp.v4i1.2639.

Lucas, Arthur W. 1962. *Planning Theory*. Vol. 7.

Maidiana. 2021. "Pembuatan Keputusan Dalam Proses Manajemen Dan Aspek Manajemen." *Ability: Journal of Education and Social Analysis* 2(3):83–92. doi: 10.51178/jesa.v2i3.222.

Manalu, Dialusi. 2020. "Langkah-Langkah Dalam Pengambilan Keputusan." *OSF Preprints* 9.

Prihatin, Khristina Sri. 2018. "Penerapan Decision Making Untuk Meningkatkan Hasil Belajar Pada Mata Pelajaran Akuntansi." *Progress: Jurnal Pendidikan, Akuntansi Dan Keuangan* 1(1):52–65. doi: 10.47080/progress.v1i1.129.

Priyowidodo, G., and Indrayani. 2018. *Pengambilan Keputusan Dan Strategi Pemasaran Politik*. Depok: PT RajaGrafindo Persada.

Rifa'i, Ahmad. 2019. "Proses Pengambilan Keputusan." *Research Gate* 1–12.

Setiawan, Asep, and Laode Muhamad Fathun. 2021. "Pendekatan Birokrasi Dalam Pengambilan Keputusan Untuk Kebijakan Luar Negeri." *Journal of Diplomacy and International Studies* 4:11–19.

Sola, Ermi. 2019. "Decision Making: Sebuah Telaah Awal." *Idaarah: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan* 2(2):208. doi: 10.24252/idaarah.v2i2.7004.

Zahroh, Aminatuz. 2019. "Strategi Pengambilan Keputusan Personal Dan Bersama Di Pesantren." *Tarbiyatuna : Jurnal Pendidikan Islam* 12(1):1–19.

Hardiansyah, Elkana Catur. 2005. "Peran Perencana Dalam Era Demokratisasi Perencanaan: Kasus Perencanaan Jalan Dago Lembang." *Jurnal Perencanaan Wilayah Dan Kota* 16(2):41–63.
Iskandar, Dadi Junaedi. 2017. "Pentingnya Partisipasi Dan Peranan Kelembagaan Politik Dalam Proses Pembuatan Kebijakan Publik." *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi: Media Pengembangan Ilmu Dan Praktek Administrasi*

14(1):17–35. doi: 10.31113/jia.v14i1.2.

Kardiat, Yosar. 2022. "Organisasi Sebagai Arena Kekuasaan Politik." *Jurnal Pallangga Praja (JPP)* 4(1):45–50. doi: 10.61076/jpp.v4i1.2639.

Lucas, Arthur W. 1962. *Planning Theory*. Vol. 7.

Maidiana. 2021. "Pembuatan Keputusan Dalam Proses Manajemen Dan Aspek Manajemen." *Ability: Journal of Education and Social Analysis* 2(3):83–92. doi: 10.51178/jesa.v2i3.222.

Manalu, Dialusi. 2020. "Langkah-Langkah Dalam Pengambilan Keputusan." *OSF Preprints* 9.

Prihatin, Khristina Sri. 2018. "Penerapan Decision Making Untuk Meningkatkan Hasil Belajar Pada Mata Pelajaran Akuntansi." *Progress: Jurnal Pendidikan, Akuntansi Dan Keuangan* 1(1):52–65. doi: 10.47080/progress.v1i1.129.

Priyowidodo, G., and Indrayani. 2018. *Pengambilan Keputusan Dan Strategi Pemasaran Politik*. Depok: PT RajaGrafindo Persada.

Rifa'i, Ahmad. 2019. "Proses Pengambilan Keputusan." *Research Gate* 1–12.

Setiawan, Asep, and Laode Muhamad Fathun. 2021. "Pendekatan Birokrasi Dalam Pengambilan Keputusan Untuk Kebijakan Luar Negeri." *Journal of Diplomacy and International Studies* 4:11–19.

Sola, Ermi. 2019. "Decision Making: Sebuah Telaah Awal." *Idaarah: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan* 2(2):208. doi: 10.24252/idaarah.v2i2.7004.

Zahroh, Aminatuz. 2019. "Strategi Pengambilan Keputusan Personal Dan Bersama Di Pesantren." *Tarbiyatuna : Jurnal Pendidikan Islam* 12(1):1–19.