# Natural Environment Strategy Data Disclosure Instruments Study On Palm Oil Companies In Riau Province

Mashur Fadli<sup>1</sup>, Meyzi Heriyanto<sup>2\*</sup>, Yusmar Yusuf<sup>3</sup>, Isril<sup>4</sup>, Mandataris<sup>5</sup>, M.Y.Tiyas Tinov<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1,2,3,4,5,6</sup> Lecturer of the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Riau University \*Corresponding author Email: meyzi.heriyanto@lecturer.unri.ac.id

#### Abstract.

The goal of this research is to create and validate the scale. A total of 126 workers from a palm oil plant in Riau province were included in this investigation. Win step program is used to analyze data using the Rasch model. This is supported by research. In the unsatisfactory category, the Cronbach alpha value, which measures the overall interaction between people and items, is included. Furthermore, the importance of person reliability as a measure of the consistency of respondents' responses is categorized as extremely bad. In the meantime, item reliability as a measure of the instrument's quality falls into a distinct category. The standard items' average difficulty level is below the ability level of the palm oil mill's managers. As a result, palm oil mill management readily approves this natural environment plan instrument item.

Keywords: Reliability A Scale, Validate Item, palm oil, Rasch Models

## I. INTRODUCTION

The palm oil business plays a crucial role in Indonesia's macro-economy, serving as the country's greatest foreign exchange earner, the locomotive of the national economy, energy sovereignty, driving the people's economic sector, and labor absorption, among other things. The oil palm revolution is reflected in Indonesia's fast-developing oil palm plantations. Oil palm plantations may be found in 22 of Indonesia's 33 provinces. Sumatra and Kalimantan are the two main islands in Indonesia where oil palm plantations can be found. Around 90% of Indonesia's oil palm plantations are concentrated on two oil palm islands, which account for 95% of the country's crude palm oil (CPO) production. The rapid growth of Indonesia's palm oil sector has piqued the interest of the international community, particularly the world's largest producer of vegetable oil. Since 2006, Indonesia has been the world's top producer of palm oil. The palm oil sector began the year 2020 with hope because, in December 2019, the CIF Rotterdam CPO price reached USD 787/ton, up from USD 542/ton since August 2019. However, from January to May 2020, the price dropped. China's demand began to shrink owing to the influence of Covid-19, pressure on China's soybean supply because the trade war with America decreased with the soybean crop in Brazil, and oil prices fell to USD 27/barrel (USD 147/ton). tons). By May 2020, China had recovered from the epidemic and had ramped up imports of vegetable oil and vegetable oil to replenish depleted inventories, driving vegetable oil prices higher. The figures for Oil Palm Production, Consumption, and Export in 2020 are listed below.

description		Years 2020 To											Total
(In 1000 ton)	JAN	FEB	MA	APR	MEI	JUN	JUL	AGS	SEP	OK	NOV	DES	2020
			R							Т			
First Stock	4,59	4,51	4,04	3,38	3,37	3,53	3,94	3,61	4,36	5,34	6,081	5,82	4,596
	6	9	3	2	3	4	6	6	1	3		7	
Production	3,48	3,29	3,27	3,68	3,61	4,09	3,84	4,38	4,73	4,76	4,174	3,68	47,034
СРО	6	7	0	3	6	6	9	2	2	8		1	
ProductionC	320	308	307	361	353	407	376	422	457	467	409	362	4,549
РКО													
Import	4	3	-	-	-	6	3	5	4	7	5	5	44

Production	3,81	3,60	3,57	4,04	3,96	4,05	4,22	4,80	5,19	5,24	4,588	4,04	51,627
Subtotal	0	8	7	4	9	9	8	9	3	2		8	
Local													
Consumption													
Food Product	801	786	721	725	664	638	642	654	667	692	715	723	8,428
Industry													
Oleokimia	89	91	104	115	133	142	148	151	151	185	189	197	1,695
Biodiesel	604	670	686	563	583	551	638	576	630	599	547	580	7,226
Domestic	1,49	1,54	1,51	1,40	1,38	1,33	1,42	1,38	1,44	1,47	1,451	1,50	17,349
Subtotal	4	7	1	3	0	1	8	1	8	6		0	
Eksport													
СРО	699	524	644	611	515	675	656	510	518	506	579	733	7,171
Processed	1,24	1,66	1,64	1,59	1,46	1,60	1,96	1,71	1,76	1,95	2,210	2,27	21,103
СРО	6	1	3	9	0	9	1	9	6	6		4	
Lauric (PKO	121	107	128	129	142	150	182	124	159	154	263	172	1,831
and													
Processed													
PKO)													
Biodiesel	0	2	-	-	-	6	3		7	3		10	31
Oleokimia	328	244	312	311	312	327	326	331	313	408	339	320	3,871
Eksport	2,39	2,53	2,72	2,65	2,42	2,76	3,12	2,68	2,76	3,02	3.391	3,50	34,007
Subtotal	3	7	7	0	8	7	9	2	4	8		9	
Domestic	3,88	4,08	4,23	4,05	3,80	4,09	4,55	4,06	4,21	4,50	4,843	5,00	51,356
Subtotal and	7	4	8	3	8	8	7	4	2	4		8	
Eksport													
Last Stock	4,51	4,04	3,38	3,37	3,53	3,94	3,61	4,36	5,34	6,08	5,827	4,86	4,867
	9	3	2	3	4	6	6	1	3	1		7	

Source : Palm Oil Entrepreneurs Association, 2020

Due to the global impact of the pandemic crisis, Indonesia's palm oil export volume decreased in 2020, with a total export of 34.0 million tons, compared to total export of 37.39 million tons in 2019. China (-1.96 million tons), the European Union (-712.7 thousand tons), Bangladesh (-3.23.9 thousand tons), the Middle East (-280.7 thousand tons), and Africa (- 249.2 thousand tons) saw the biggest drops, while Pakistan nails (+275.7 thousand tons) and India nails (111.7 thousand tons) saw the biggest increases. Despite the decrease in export volume, the value of exports in 2020 was USD 22.97 billion, which was greater than the value of exports in 2019. In 2019, Indonesia's monthly trade balance was almost always negative, with a total deficit of USD 3.23 billion, however, in 2020, it was almost always positive, with a total value of USD 21.72 billion, except for January and April. Indonesia's trade balance in 2020 was USD 21.27 billion in excess, with palm oil exports accounting for USD 22.97 billion. These numbers illustrate that palm oil's contribution to foreign exchange was critical in keeping the national trade balance positive during the pandemic. (https://gapki.id/news/18768/releksi-industri-sawit-2020-prospek-2021) The palm oil industry in Indonesia has contributed to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly in terms of poverty reduction and economic inequality (Hasan & Hidayat, 2018; Purba, 2019; Purnomo et al., 2018).

In Indonesia, the palm oil industry is predicted to employ 17.5 million people and earn IDR 319 trillion in annual export revenue. According to the Indonesian Palm Oil Association (GAPKI), until February 2020, the palm oil business generated USD 3.5 billion in foreign money for Indonesia, despite the uncertain global economic environment following the coronavirus (COVID-19) epidemic. As a result, Indonesia's trade balance in 2020 will be USD 1.9 billion in surplus. This amount was calculated using USD 4 billion in non-oil and gas export receipts and USD 2.1 billion in foreign exchange expenditures on oil and gas imports (Sardjono, 2018). One of the sectors that are a part of the digital economy age is palm oil (Obado, 2008). Palm oil is one of the world's most widely used and manufactured oils. This less expensive, easier to manufacture, and very stable oil is utilized in a wide range of meals, cosmetics, and hygiene items, as well as as a biofuel or biodiesel source.

Palm oil is Indonesia's most important sector, accounting for 1.5–2.5 percent of the country's GDP. Vegetable oil production will increase by about 30% to 218.9 million tons by 2025. World vegetable oil growth is evenly spread at 2.36 percent per year, whereas CPO rises at 2.75 percent per year (Dirjenbun, 2015). The Indonesian palm oil sector has a bright future, with CPO retaining the world's largest supply of vegetable oil. Indonesia enjoys a competitive advantage in terms of CPO exports. In the downstream palm oil business, however, Indonesia lost to Malaysia. Since 1996, Malaysia has created a downstream palm oil business that generates high-value downstream palm oil products rather than exporting crude palm oil (Rasiah & Shahrin, 2006). If the palm oil sector has a VRIN, it will be able to generate a variety of products and potentially establish new markets (Kim & Mauborgne, 2004).

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

According to research from the World Economic Forum, the expansion of the palm oil business has a negative impact (2018). Palm oil has been the target of negative campaigns in the preceding decade since it is not environmentally friendly (Basiron & Simeh, 2005; Yasin et al., 2017). In Indonesia, oil palm plantations are deemed unsustainable (Hooijer et al., 2012; Murdiyarso, Hergoualc'H & Verchot, 2010), producing environmental harm (Alang Mahat, 2012; Mekhilef, Siga, & Saidur, 2011), deforestation, and biodiversity loss (Hooijer et al., 2012; Murdiyarso, Hergoualc'H & Ver (Fitzherbert et al., 2008; Vijay, Pimm, Jenkins, & Smith, 2016) The natural environment will be dominated by sustainable natural resource approaches in the coming decades (hart, 1995; hart & Dowell, 2011). This is due to the increasing scarcity of natural resources, which increases hurdles to resource exploitation from outside the country (Al-Majed, Adebayo, & Hossain, 2012). According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's (OECD) environmental outlook until 2050, emerging countries that are less able to manage and adapt would bear the brunt of the environmental consequences. Alternative ways to maximize competitive advantage, according to Oecd (2019), include innovative resource-based solutions. The OECD suggestions are based on the global business climate following the COVID-19 pandemic.

In the year 2020, the global economy is expected to contract (Fernandes, 2020). The Indonesian palm oil industry, on the other hand, is still thriving thanks to strong consumer demand for crude palm oil (CPO) as a food ingredient. According to Ramamurthy et al., companies must be able to recognize resource determinants, both from supply chain restrictions and through continuous innovation projects (2003). The firm's natural environment strategy, according to Barney (1991) and Sharma & Zeller (1997), influences resource-based innovation. Natural environment strategy can be measured by (1) changing business operations, (2) having autonomy in the manufacturing process, (3) being proactive in the natural environment, (4) managing environmental conservation, (5) conducting environmental inspections, and (6) sharing knowledge, according to Sharma & Vredenburg (1998). The ability to effectively solve natural environmental concerns through innovation, according to Amit and Schoemaker (1993), is crucial (Schienstock, 2009).

Businesses consider being able to innovate to be a strategic decision-making process (Feldman, 2014; Ireland, Covin, & Kuratko, 2009; Porter, 1996; Saleh & Wang, 1993; Sambamurthy et al., 2003; Teece, Pisano, & Shuen, 1997). Innovation is a viable solution to the natural environmental problems caused by Indonesia's palm oil industry. The natural environment had a key influence on economic activities during the Covid-19 pandemic, and it will continue to do so in the future, according to most experts. As a result, the palm oil industry faces competition to grow by exploiting natural resources. Innovation is the process of generating, cultivating, and implementing new ideas and practices in the workplace. The drive that exists within the business might aid in the creation of new ideas (Greenhalgh, Robert, Macfarlane, Bate, & Kyriakidou, 2004; Jenkins, 2014; Rogers, Singhal, & Quinlan, 2019). Market research can be used to evaluate market size and client preferences or wishes, according to Reguia (2014), so that firms can manufacture and supply items that fulfill the needs of customers and the market. An indicator that can be utilized to make a calculation.Development of new products,

improvement of the appearance and performance of existing products, production of specialty products, investment in research and development facilities to gain a competitive advantage, engineering marketing innovation and manufacturing process innovation are all examples of innovations. Rogers, 1983; Rogers et al., 2019) (Greenhalgh et al., 2004; Reguia, 2014; Rogers, 1983; Rogers et al., 2019).

## III. METHODS

An instrument capable of describing self-determination that has been analyzed and declared valid (Planinic et al., 2019; Stout et al., 2012). One of them is the RASCH Model analysis, which may be used to examine the instrument's validity. The quality of the instruments offered in the model is determined by factors such as unidimensionality, Wright map analysis, item analysis, participant ability analysis, and instrument analysis (Fisher, 2007; Planinic et al., 2019; Sumintono, 2018). The self-determination disclosure instrument is the subject of investigation. The RASCH Model gives information about the instrument's scale structure.

## Unidimensionalitas

The instrument's unidimensionality analysis determines how many traits or dimensions it measures. On contrasts 1 to 5, Output Table 23 is used to calculate the value of Raw variance explained by measures and unexplained variance. Raw variance can be described by a 20 percent measure, proving measurement unidimensionality. (Note: typical interpretation criteria are: sufficient if 20-40%, good if 40-60%, and very good if over 60%) and if the Unexplained variation in contrast 1 to 5 of the residues is less than 15% each. The raw variance explained by the action was 31.4 percent, including the adequate category, according to the data analysis. In the meantime, the unexplained variance in contrast of 1 to 5 residues was 16.8%, 16.5 percent, 12.7 percent, 12.0%, and 10.6%, respectively. The unexplained variance in contrasts 1 and 2 appears to be underestimating the natural environment strategy variable. Meanwhile, the unexplained variation in contrasts 3– 5 is less than 15% in each case, indicating that the instrument employed to quantify natural environment strategy factors in oil palm enterprises is accurate.

## **Correct Map Analysis (Person-Item Map)**

Referring to Table 1 of the Output Table. The natural environment strategy map is known to be variable, ranging from -1 to 4 logit. Their ability level is usually between 0 and 3 SD. The average logit for the natural environment approach is +0.73, which is higher than the average logit item of 0.00 (see Table 17 Order of Measure in the appendix). This signifies that the average skill of palm oil mill managers exceeds the standard items' average level of difficulty. In the meanwhile, item difficulty maps range from -1 to 1 logit. The difficulty level of the four items ranges from -1SD to 1SD, except for two items, the numbers P2 and P5, which are both over +0SD. As a result, item difficulty levels P2 and P5 are outliers. The standard questions have an average difficulty level that is below the skill level of palm oil mill managers. As a result, the palm oil mill managers can quickly approve the components of the Natural Environment Strategy instrument.

## **Point Analysis**

The level of difficulty (item measure), level of item fit (item fit), and item bias detection are all part of this item analysis.

## 1. Item Difficulty Level

Measurement (Table 13) The level of difficulty of the questions can be determined using questions. According to the table, the SD value is 0.53. The level of difficulty of the questions can be categorized into four categories using this SD value and the average logit value: extremely difficult (greater than +1 SD), tough (0.0 logit +1 SD), easy (0.0 logit -1 SD), and very easy (0.0 logit -1 SD) (less than -1 SD). As a result, the extremely difficult category has a score restriction of more than 0.53, the tough category has a score restriction of -0.53 to less than 0.00, and the very easy category has a score restriction of ess than -0.53. More information can be found in the list of difficulty levels below.

ENTRY TOT	AL T	OTAL		MOD	EL  INFIT   (	OUTFIT  PTN	MEASUR-	AL EXAC	T MATCH	 0/  Itam
INUMBER SCORE	COU		IEAS	JKE S	E. IVINSQ ZS	ID/MINSQ Z	SIDCOR	K. EAP. $ $	JDS% EAP	70 Item
-					++	+	+	+	-	
	2	472	126	.89	.10 1.20 1.5 1	1.16 1.3 .68	.49  36.5	46.8  p2		
	5	509	126	.44	.12 .60 -3.3	.67 -2.6 .25	.45  55.6	51.7  p5		
	4	539	126	.00	.13 1.22 1.4	1.08 .6 .43	.40  44.4	55.8  p4		
	1	554	126	28	.14 .82 -1.1	.83 -1.1  .31	.38  54.8	56.1  p1		
	6	556	126	32	.14 1.01 .1 1	1.08 .6 .36	.37  53.2	56.0 p6		
	3	574	126	73	.16 .77 -1.5	.79 -1.4 .28	.34 56.3	63.3 p3		
					++	+	+	+	-	
	MEA	AN 53	34.0 1	26.0	.00 .13 .94	5 .944	50.1	54.9	Ĺ	
	S.	D. 3	4.1	.0 .5	3 .02 .22 1.	7 .18 1.3	7.3	5.0		
					•		•			

Table 1. Tingkat Kesukaran

It is known that there is one item in the very tough category, namely item number P2, by looking at the logit value of each item in Table 1 above, sequentially depending on the level of difficulty (from the most difficult item to the easiest one). There are two items in the tough category, notably the numbers P5 and P4. P1 and P5 are the two items in the easy category. Number P3 is a very easy category.

#### 2. Item Suitability Level

Take measurements to ensure that each respondent does not have any illusions about the item's appropriateness with the model (item fit), which explains whether the item is functioning appropriately. The data in Table 10 can be used to assess these items: The mean square OUTFIT (MNSQ), the OUTFIT Z-standard (ZSTD), and point correlation are all examples of item fit order (PT MEASURE CORR). According to Booner et al. (2014), the criteria for determining item suitability (item fit) or item inconsistencies (outliers or misfits) are as follows: (1) The MNSQ OUTFIT value should be larger than 0.5 and less than 1.5, with the closer to 1 the better; (2) the ZSTD OUTFIT value should be greater than -2.0 and less than +2.0, with the closer to 1 the better. **Table 2.** Tingkat Kesesuaian Butir Item

ENTR	Y T	OTAL	TOT	AL MODEL  INFIT   OUTFIT  PTMEASUR-AL EXACT MATCH
NUM	BER	SCOR	E CO	UNT MEASURE S.E.  MNSQ ZSTD MNSQ ZSTD CORR. EXP.  OBS% EXP%  Item
				++++++
4	539	126	.00	.13 1.22 1.4 1.08 .6 A .43 .40  44.4 55.8  p4
2	472	126	.89	.10 1.20 1.5 1.16 1.3 B.68 .49  36.5 46.8  p2
6	556	126	32	.14 1.01 .1 1.08 .6 C .36 .37  53.2 56.0  p6
1	554	126	28	.14 .82 -1.1 .83 -1.1 c .31 .38 54.8 56.1 p1
3	574	126	73	.16 .77 -1.5 .79 -1.4 b .28 .34 56.3 63.3 p3
5	509	126	.44	.12 .60 -3.3 .67 -2.6 a.25 .45  55.6 51.7  p5
				+++++
MEA	N 5.	34.0 1	26.0	.00 .13 .945 .944 .50.1 54.9
S.D.	34.1	0.	.53	.02 .22 1.7 .18 1.3    7.3 5.0

Based on criterion 1, the six items have an MNSQ OUTFIT value larger than 0.5 and less than 1.5, with values of 1.08 (P4), 1.16 (P2), 1.08 (P6), 0.82 (P1), 0.77 (P3), and 0.60 (P4), respectively (P5). Only one number does not match the second standard, which is 5 with an OUTFIT ZSTD value of -2.6. Meanwhile, based on the third criterion, two items have a PT MEASURE CORR value of higher than 0.4 but less than 0.85. While the four pieces (6, 1, 3, and 5) have a PT MEASURE CORR value of 0.25 or less than 0.4, they are classified as ensembles. According to Booner et al. (2014), four of the six natural environment strategy components were found to be inappropriate. As a result, as many as two components of the natural environment strategy were certified fit in the sense that they functioned normally, were easily understood by palm oil sector managers, and could measure what should be measured in this case, the natural environment strategy.

#### https://ijersc.org

## 3. Diagnostic Rating Scale

On a scale of 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, this diagnosis was used to see if the participants grasped the distinctions in the answer choices. If the average and Andrich threshold values in Table 3.2 demonstrated conformity and both increased in the alternatives, respondents grasped the differences in answers. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 are the correct answers.

Table 3	. Rating	Scale	Diagnostic
I abie e	• Itating	Deale	Diagnostie

CATEGORY OBSERVED OBSVD SAMPLE INFIT OUTFIT   ANDRICH  CATEGORY
LABEL SCORE COUNT % AVRGE EXPECT   MNSQ MNSQ   THRESHOLD   MEASURE
+++++++++
1 1 3 0  .00 .30  .80 .6/   NONE  (-3.18) 1
2 2 36 5  .46 .67  .82 .68   -2.01   -1.15   2
3 3 60 8  .97 1.12  .85 .76   .38   .01   3
4 4 336 44  1.76 1.64  1.04 1.13  35   1.16   4
5 5 321 42  2.18 2.25  1.09 1.06   1.98  ( 3.16)  5

Table 3 illustrates the applicability of the alternative levels 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, as well as the growth potential. The results of the analysis suggest that the Natural Environment Strategy instrument's level is highly correlated with the manager's palm oil mill's condition.

## 4. Individual Ability Analysis.

Table 4.Person Measure

FNTRV	тот				MOI	 DEL   INE	IT   OU	TEIT P		 2-AI  FXA	CT MATCH
NUMBER	SCO	RE CO	DUNT	ME	ASUR	E S.E.  M	NSQ ZS	TD MNS	Q ZSTD	CORR. EX	XP.  OBS% EXP%
						Pers	on	,			
	ŀ					+	+	+	+	+	
		1	29	6	3.74	1.08 1.15	.5 1.43	.7 27	.21  83.3	83.7 01	
		2	29	6	3.74	1.08 1.15	.5 1.43	.7 27	.21  83.3	83.7 02	
		33	29	6	3.74	1.08 .89	.2 .69	.0 .37	.21  83.3	83.7  33	
		51	29	6	3.74	1.08 .89	.2 .69	.0 .37	.21  83.3	83.7 51	
		69	29	6	3.74	1.08 .89	.2 .69	.0 .37	.21  83.3	83.7  69	
		107	29	6	3.74	1.08 .89	.2 .69	.0 .37	.21  83.3	83.7 107	
		7	28	6	2.87	.82 .49	6 .44	8  .89	.27  83.3	68.7  07	
		10	28	6	2.87	.82 .94	.2 .92	.1  .11	.27  50.0	68.7  10	
		12	28	6	2.87	.82 .86	.0 .78	1  .29	.27  50.0	68.7  12	
		46	28	6	2.87	.82 .94	.2 .92	.1  .11	.27  50.0	68.7  46	
		47	28	6	2.87	.82 .94	.2 .92	.1  .11	.27  50.0	68.7  47	
		91	28	6	2.87	.82 .94	.2  .92	.1  .11	.27  50.0	68.7 91	
		99	28	6	2.87	.82 .86	.0 .78	1  .29	.27  50.0	68.7  99	
		101	28	6	2.87	.82 .86	.0 .78	1  .29	.27  50.0	68.7 101	
		13	27	6	2.31	.70 .94	.2  .99	.2 18	.31  50.0	60.4  13	
		14	27	6	2.31	.70 1.18	.5 1.23	.5 63	.31  16.7	60.4 14	
		17	27	6	2.31	.70 1.02	.3 1.09	.4 35	.31  50.0	60.4 17	
		25	27	6	2.31	.70 .58	5 .74	2  .38	.31  83.3	60.4  25	
		26	27	6	2.31	.70 1.15	.4  .95	.2  .73	.31  50.0	60.4  26	
		31	27	6	2.31	.70 2.06	1.4 2.24	1.6 20	5 .31  33.3	3 60.4 31	
		34	27	6	2.31	.70 .83	.0 .78	1  .10	.31  50.0	60.4 34	
		50	27	6	2.31	.70 1.09	.4 1.03	.3 38	.31  16.7	60.4 50	
		54	27	6	2.31	.70 .94	.2  .99	.2 18	.31  50.0	60.4  54	
		61	27	6	2.31	.70 1.20	.5 1.24	.6 66	.31  16.7	60.4 61	
		62	27	6	2.31	.70 1.02	.3 1.09	.4 35	.31  50.0	60.4 62	
		63	27	6	2.31	.70 .64	3 .69	3  .35	.31  50.0	60.4  63	
		65	27	6	2.31	.70 1.18	.5 1.23	.5 63	.31  16.7	60.4 65	
		70	27	6	2.31	.70 .83	.0 .78	1  .10	.31  50.0	60.4 70	
		75	27	6	2.31	.70 .84	.0 .79	1  .08	.31  50.0	60.4 75	

https://ijersc.org

	85	27	6 2.31	.70 .477 .536  .66 .31 83.3 60.4  85
	87	27	6 2.31	.70 .399 .439 .83 .31 83.3 60.4  87
	88	27	6 2.31	.70 .722 .791  .18 .31  50.0 60.4  88
	104	27	6 2.31	
1	104	27	6 2.31	
	121	27		./0 .85 .0 ./81  .10 .51 50.0 00.4 110   70 272 1.0 1.06 1.4  75 .21 66.7 .60.4 121
1	121	27	6 2.31	.70 2.75 $1.9 1.90$ $1.4 $ $.75$ $.51 00.7$ $00.4 121 $
	122	$\frac{2}{27}$	6 2.31	70 103 2 10 4  -38 21 50 0 60 4 122
	125	27'	6 2 31	70 1.05 .5 1.10 .4 58 .51 50.0 00.4 125
1	125	27	6 2.31	70  58 - 5  74 - 2  38 31  83 3 60 4  126
	8	26	6 1 88	62 1 11 4 1 01 2  - 89 34  50 0 51 9  08
	9	26	6 1.88	.62 .761 .663 10 .34 83.3 51.9  09
Ì	18	26	6 1.88	.62 .428 .546 .40 .34 50.0 51.9  18
ĺ	35	26	6 1.88	.62 .95 .2 .90 .159 .34 50.0 51.9 35
i	36	26	6 1.88	.62 .409 .487 .49 .34 83.3 51.9 36
ĺ	38	26	6 1.88	.62 1.11 .4 1.01 .2 89 .34  50.0 51.9  38
	39	26	6 1.88	.62 .409 .487 .49 .34 83.3 51.9 39
ĺ	41	26	6 1.88	.62 .712 .683 .82 .34 50.0 51.9 41
	45	26	6 1.88	.62 .95 .2 .90 .159 .34 50.0 51.9 45
	49	26	6 1.88	.62 .87 .0 .82140 .34 50.0 51.9 49
	53	26	6 1.88	.62 1.27 .6 1.09 .4  .26 .34  50.0 51.9  53
	55	26	6 1.88	.62 .428 .546 .40 .34 50.0 51.9 55
	58	26	6 1.88	.62 1.79 1.1 1.37 .7  .88 .34  33.3 51.9  58
	59	26	6 1.88	.62 .91 .1 .91 .1 .63 .34 50.0 51.9 59
	64	26	6 1.88	.62 .634 .595 .93 .34 50.0 51.9 64
	66	26	6 1.88	.62 .428 .546 .40 .34 50.0 51.9 66
	71	26	6 1.88	.62 .752 .83 .0 29 .34 50.0 51.9 71
	/6	26	6 1.88 ( 1.99	.62 .95 $.2 .90$ $.1 59$ $.34 50.0$ $51.9 76 $
	/9 00	26	0 1.88 6 1.99	.62 .42 .42 .54 .54 .6 .40 .34 50.0 51.9 .79
	02	20	0 1.00 6 1.88	.02 .50 .05 .05 .05 .4 .22 .54 .500 .51.9 .62  .62  .62  .72  .11  .87  .12  .20  .34  .16 7  .51  0  .05  .16  .16  .16  .16  .16  .16  .16  .1
1	95 97	20	6 1 88	62 1.72 $1.1 1.87$ $1.5 57$ $.54 10.7$ $51.9 95 $
	100	26	6 1.88	62 86 0 81 -1 -38 34 50 0 51 9 100
ľ	108	26	6 1 88	
Ϊ	111	26	6 1.88	.62 .409 .487 .49 .34 83.3 51.9 111
i	113	26	6 1.88	.62 .712 .683 .82 .34 50.0 51.9 113
i	116	26	6 1.88	.62 .506 .634 .22 .34 50.0 51.9 116
İ	3	25	6 1.53	.56 .32 -1.2 .39 -1.0 .24 .37 66.7 52.9 03
Ì	6	25	6 1.53	.56 1.26 .6 1.05 .3 .83 .37 50.0 52.9 06
	15	25	6 1.53	.56 .85 .0 1.07 .3  .31 .37 66.7 52.9  15
	16	25	6 1.53	.56 .772 .781 .93 .37 33.3 52.9 16
	19	25	6 1.53	.56 1.27 .6 1.06 .3  .82 .37  50.0 52.9  19
	22	25	6 1.53	.56 1.04 .3 .83 .0 .13 .37 66.7 52.9 22
	28	25	6 1.53	.56 .566 .54637 .37 66.7 52.9 28
ļ	32	25	6 1.53	.56 1.53 .9 1.27 .6  .57 .37  16.7 52.9  32
ļ	43	25	6 1.53	.56 1.27 .6 1.06 .3  .82 .37  50.0 52.9  43
_	44	25	6 1.53	.56 .566 .546 37 .37 66.7 52.9 44
	48	25	6 1.53	.56 1.37 ./ 1.19 .5  ./0 .3/ 16./ 52.9  48
	52 57	25	0 1.33 6 1.52	.50 .21 -1.0 .20 -1.4 .01 .57/100.0 52.9 .52
	57	$\frac{25}{25}$	6 1 53	$56 1.05 \ 1.0 1.41 \ .6  \ .92 \ .57  \ 10.7 \ 52.9  \ 57  $
	68	$\frac{25}{25}$	6 1 53	56  38 -1 0  42 - 9  88 - 37  66 7 - 52 0  68
	73	25	6 1 53	56 1.03 3 1.27 6  - 02 37  33 3 52 9  73
	77	25	6 1.53	.56 1.09 .4 1.14 .4  - 06 .37  33 3 52 9  77
	78	25	6 1.53	.56 1.08 .3 1.27 .6  .58 .37  33.3 52.9  78
	81	25	6 1.53	.56 .21 -1.6 .26 -1.4 .61 .37 100.0 52.9 81
1	92	25	6 1.53	.56 1.37 .7 1.19 .5  .70 .37  16.7 52.9  92

https://ijersc.org

	94	25	6	1.53	.56 1.23 .6 1.03 .3 20 .37 33.3 52.9 94
	102	25	6	1.55	.56 .32 -1.2 .39 -1.0 .24 .37 66.7 52.9 102
1	103	23	6	1.53	.50 .38 -1.0 .429 .88 .37 .00.7 52.9 .103
_	105	25	6	1.53	.56 1.19 .5 1.35 .7 22 .37  33.3 52.9  105
ļ	117	25	6	1.53	.56 2.37 1.7 2.34 1.7  .05 .37  50.0 52.9  117
	118	25	6	1.53	.56 .21 -1.6 .26 -1.4 .61 .37/100.0 52.9 118
	4	24	6	1.24	.52 .87 .0 .762 .79 .40 50.0 48.1 04
	5	24	6	1.24	.52 .96 .2 .87 .0 .66 .40 50.0 48.1 05
	20	24	6	1.24	.52 .547 .576 .79 .40 50.0 48.1 20
	21	24	6	1.24	.52 2.54 2.0 2.54 1.9 06 .40  16.7 48.1  21
	23	24	6	1.24	.52 .576 .546 .24 .40 50.0 48.1 23
	27	24	6	1.24	.52 1.53 .9 1.65 1.1  .33 .40  33.3 48.1  27
	29	24	6	1.24	.52 2.12 1.6 1.70 1.1  .72 .40  33.3 48.1  29
	80	24	6	1.24	.52 1.61 1.0 1.80 1.2  .60 .40  33.3 48.1  80
	83	24	6	1.24	.52 2.28 1.7 1.76 1.2  .62 .40  33.3 48.1  83
Í	90	24	6	1.24	.52 1.15 .4 1.05 .3  .89 .40  16.7 48.1  90
Í	96	24	6	1.24	.52 1.16 .5 1.06 .3  .88 .40  16.7 48.1  96
ĺ	98	24	6	1.24	.52 1.14 .4 .94 .1  .50 .40  50.0 48.1  98
1	106	24	6	1.24	.52 1.39 .8 1.42 .8  .69 .40  16.7 48.1  106
i	124	24	6	1.24	.52 1.37 .7 1.23 .6  .00 .40  33.3 48.1  124
1	30	23	6	.99	.49 .92 .1 .99 .2 .75 .43 33.3 48.9 30
	42	23	6	.99	.49 .655 .576 .62 .43 66.7 48.9 42
	67	23	6	.99	
		23	6	99	
	120	23	6	.99	
i	11	22	6	77	
1	24	22	6	.,,	
	2 <del>1</del>   37	22	6	.,,	
	56	22	6	.//	
	1 74	22	6	. / /	
	/4	22	6	. / /	
	04	22	6	.// רר	46 00 2 00 2 40 45 50 0445 86
1	100	22	6	. / /	
	109	22	6	.//	
	112	22	0	.//	.40 .07 5 .74 5 .95 .45 .55.5 .44.5 .112
	119	22	0	.//	
_	40	21	6	.56	
	115	21	6	.36	.45 1.15 .5 1.16 .5  ./U .46  55.5 45.6  115
	114	20	6	.57	.44 .25 -2.1 .22 -2.0 .80 .47 66.7 42.6 114
	89		6	.18	.43 .734 .744  .69 .47  50.0 32.8  89
	MEA	N 25	5.4	6.0	1.81 .62 .96 .0 .94 .0 50.1 54.9
I	S.E	<b>)</b> . 2	.0	.0 .7	73 .14 .47 .7 .43 .7  20.7 9.1

Table 4: Person Measure provides information on individual capabilities. The SD value is 0.73, as determined by the table. When this SD value is coupled with the average logit value (mean) of 1.81, oil palm firm workers' abilities can be classified as high ability (higher than 1.81 + 0.73 = 2.53), medium ability (between 1.08 and 2.53), or low ability (less than 1.81 - 0.73 = 1.08). As a result, the logit value limit for high ability is greater than 2.53, the medium ability is 1.08-2.53, and the poor ability is less than 1.08. Looking at the logit value of each individual in Table 4 above, there are 126 people in total, with 14 people in the high ability category, 93 people in the medium ability category, and 19 people in the lowest ability category. poor aptitude.

### 5. Instrument Analysis

The data from the Statistical Summary Table was utilized to analyze the instruments. The following information is known based on the table:

Table 5. Summary Statistic
SUMMARY 126 MEASURED PERSON
TOTAL MODEL INFIT OUTFIT
SCORE COUNT MEASURE S.E. MNSQ ZSTD MNSQ ZSTD
MEAN 25.4 6.0 1.81 .62 .96 .0 .94 .0
S.D. 2.0 .0 .73 .14 .47 .7 .43 .7
MAX. 29.0 6.0 3.74 1.08 2.73 2.0 2.54 1.9
MIN. 19.0 6.0 .18 .43 .21 -2.1 .22 -2.0
DEAL DMSE 69 TOLIE SD 26 SEDADATION 29 DEDSON DELIADILITY 12
KEAL KINSE .00 I KUE SD .20 SEPARATION .30 PERSON KELIADILITY .13    MODEL DMSE .64 TOLIE SD .25 SEDADATION .54 DEDSON DELIADILITY .22
MODEL RMSE .04 IROE SD .55 SEFARATION .54 FERSON RELIABILITT .25     S E OF DEDSON MEAN = 06
PERSON RAW SCORE-TO-MEASURE CORRELATION = 96
CRONBACH ALPHA (KR-20) PERSON RAW SCORE "TEST" RELIABILITY = $10$
SUMMARY OF 6 MEASURED ITEM
TOTAL MODEL INFIT OUTFIT
SCORE COUNT MEASURE S.E. MNSQ ZSTD MNSQ ZSTD
MEAN 534.0 126.0 .00 .13 .945 .944
S.D. 34.1 .0 .53 .02 .22 1.7 .18 1.3
MAX. 574.0 126.0 .89 .16 1.22 1.5 1.16 1.3
MIN. 472.0 126.073 .10 .60 -3.3 .67 -2.6
DEAL DAGE 14 TOLIE CD 51 CEDADATION 2.74 ITEM DELIADILITY 02
KEAL KINSE .14 IKUE SD .51 SEPAKATION 5.74 HEM KELIABILITY .93
V ODEL RIVISE .15 IRUE SD .51 SEPARATION 5.65 ITEM RELIABILITY .94
$  0.1.01^{\text{TTEWEWEWEWEWEWEWEWEWEWEWEWEWEWEWEWEWEWE$

The average score of all participants in working on instrument items to provide data on natural environment tactics is shown in the Person Measure. People with mean scores higher than the item mean (where the average item is 0.00 logit) have abilities that are normally stronger than the difficulty of the instrument items. The Cronbach Alpha rating for the overall interaction of people and items is 0.10, which includes the unsatisfactory category. In addition, the Person Reliability rating is 0.13, which indicates the consistency of respondents' responses, including those in the very low category. While the items' reliability as a measure of the quality of the instrument items classed as special categories is 0.93.INFIT MNSQ and OUTFIT MNSQ, both in the Person and Item tables, are other data in Table 5 that can be used. The average values of INFIT MNSQ and OUTFIT MNSQ and OUTFIT MNSQ and OUTFIT MNSQ are 0.96 and 0.94, respectively, according to the Person table. Meanwhile, according to the Item table, the average values of INFIT MNSQ and OUTFIT MNSQ are 0.94 and 0.94, respectively. The conditions are that the value should be as close to 1 as possible because 1 is the optimum number. As a result, the typical person and item are near to meeting the ideal standard. The average score for each person is 0.0, even though it is related to INFIT ZSTD and OUTFIT ZSTD. The INFIT ZSTD and OUTFIT ZSTD values for items are respectively -0.5 and -0.4. The optimum ZSTD value is zero, or as near to zero as possible. As a result, the quality of people and commodities might be regarded to be good.

The latter is concerned with the separation or grouping of individuals and goods. Individual separation displays how well the natural environment strategy instrument's set of items spreads across the logit ability range. Because the things in the instrument can reach persons with high levels of ability to those with poor skills,

the bigger the individual separation, the better the instrument is prepared. Item split, on the other hand, reflects how evenly the measured sample is distributed along a linear interval scale. The better the measurement, the higher the grain separation. This index can also be used to determine how meaningful the concept being measured is. The separation for individuals is 0.38 and for goods is 3.74, according to Table 5's result. The higher the separation value, the higher the person's and instrument's overall quality. The formula  $H=(4 \times divides) + 1/3$  is used to calculate values more precisely. As a result, the split value for individuals is 0.87, rounded to 1, and the split value for items is 5.32, rounded to 5. This means that participants in the study have a range of talents that can be divided into four categories. Meanwhile, the complexity of the questions is separated into five categories, with the easiest group being the easiest and the most difficult group is the most difficult.

## **IV. CONCLUSION**

There is one (one) item in the natural environment strategy instrument that is deemed inappropriate since it is too difficult for most participants to agree on. As a result, 5 items are sufficient for use in the environmental strategy data instrument. All participants have access to the whole scale of response options, which range from 1 to 5. Also included in the unsatisfactory category is the Cronbach Alpha value, which measures the overall interaction between people and items furthermore, Person Reliability's value as a measure of the consistency of respondents' answers are categorized as very bad. Item Reliability, on the other hand, is a unique indicator of the quality of the items on the instrument. The average difficulty level of standard items is below the ability level of palm oil mill managers. The palm oil mill's managers might accept the instrument plan for natural environment items in this method.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Al-Majed, A. A., Adebayo, A. R., & Hossain, M. E. (2012). A sustainable approach to controlling oil spills. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 113, 213-227
- [2] Alang Mahat, S. (2012). The Palm Oil Industry From The Perspective of Sustainable Development: A Case Study of Malaysian Palm Oil Industry. Ritsumeikan Asia PacificUniversity Japan
- [3] Amit, R., & Schoemaker, P. J. H. (1993). Strategic assets and organizational rent. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14(1), 33–46
- [4] Basiron, Y., & Simeh, M. A. (2005). Vision 2020 The Palm Oil Phenomenon. *Oil Palm Industry Economic Journal.*
- [5] Boone, W. J., Yale, M. S., & Staver, J. R. (2014). Rasch analysis in the human sciences. In Rasch Analysis in the Human Sciences. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-6857-4
- [6] Feldman, M. P. (2014). The character of innovative places: entrepreneurial strategy, economic development, and prosperity. Small Business Economics, 43(1), 9–20
- [7] Fernandes, N. (2020). Economic Effects of Coronavirus Outbreak (COVID-19) on the World Economy. SSRN Electronic Journal.
- [8] Fisher, W. P. (2007). Rating Scale Instrument Quality Criteria. Rasch Measurement Transactions
- [9] Fitzherbert, E. B., Struebig, M. J., Morel, A., Danielsen, F., Brühl, C. A., Donald, P. F., & Phalan, B. (2008). How will oil palm expansion affect biodiversity? Trends in Ecology and Evolution
- [10] Greenhalgh, T., Robert, G., Macfarlane, F., Bate, P., & Kyriakidou, O. (2004). Diffusion of innovations in service organizations: Systematic review and recommendations. Milbank Quarterly, 82(4), 581-629
- [11] Hart, S. (1995). a Natural-Resource-Based Firm. Academy of Management.
- [12] Hart, S. L., & Dowell, G. (2011). A natural-resource-based view of the firm: Fifteen years after. Journal of Management, 37(5).
- [13] Hasan, M. F., & Nur Hidayat, A. (2018). Sustainable development from perspective economic and social: The case study of Indonesia palm industry. Economic and Social Development: Book of Proceedings
- [14] Hooijer, A., Page, S., Jauhiainen, J., Lee, W. A., Lu, X. X., Idris, A., & Anshari, G. (2012). Subsidence and carbon loss in drained tropical peatlands. Biogeosciences, 9, 1053–1071
- [15] Https://gapki.id/news/18768/refleksi-industri-sawit-2020-prospek-2021

- [16] Ireland, R. D., Covin, J. G., & Kuratko, D. F. (2009). Conceptualizing corporate entrepreneurship strategy. Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice, 33(1), 19–46
- [17] Jenkins, M. (2014). Innovate or imitate? The role of collective beliefs in competencies in competing firms. Long Range Planning 47(4), 173-185.
- [18] Mekhilef, S., Siga, S., & Saidur, R. (2011). A review on palm oil biodiesel as a source of renewable fuel. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 15(4), 1937-1949
- [19] Murdiyarso, D., Hergoualc'H, K., & Verchot, L. V. (2010). Opportunities for reducing greenhouse gas emissions in tropical peatlands. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America
- [20] OECD. (2019). Global Material Resources Outlook to 2060: Economic Drivers and Environmental Consequences.
  In Global Material Resources Outlook to 2060: Economic Drivers and Environmental Consequences
- [21] Porter,M.E.(1996).What Is Strategy? Harvard Business Review, 74(6), 61–78. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2008.0355
- [22] Purnomo, M., Permana, E., Qosasi, A., Febrian, A. F., & Miftahuddin, A. (2019). Entrepreneurial Orientation in Micro and Small Enterprises of Traditional Food Centers in Bandung, West Java. Binus Business Review, 10(3)
- [23] Rogers, E. M., Singhal, A., & Quinlan, M. M. (2019). Diffusion of innovations. In An Integrated Approach to Communication Theory and Research, Third Edition
- [24] Saleh, S. D., & Wang, C. K. (1993). The management of innovation: strategy, structure, and organizational climate. IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management, 40(1), 14–21
- [25] Sambamurthy, Bharadwaj, & Grover. (2003). Shaping Agility through Digital Options: Reconceptualizing the Role of Information Technology in Contemporary Firms. MIS Quarterly, 27(2), 237
- [26] Sardjono, M. (2018). Semester I 2018, Indonesian Palm Oil Market Under Pressure. Indonesian Palm Oil Association (GAPKI IPOA).
- [27] Schienstock, G. (2009). Organizational Capabilities: Some reflections on the concept. Research Unit for Technology, Science and Innovation Studies (TaSTI).
- [28] Sharma, M., & Zeller, M. (1997). Repayment performance in group-based credit programs in Bangladesh: An empirical analysis. World Development, 25(10), 1731
- [29] Sharma, S., & Vredenburg, H. (1998). Proactive corporate environmental strategy and the development of competitively valuable organizational capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19(8), 729-753
- [30] Sumintono, B. (2018). Rasch Model Measurements as Tools in Assessment for Learning. https://doi.org/10.2991/icei-17.2018.11
- [31] Teece, D. D., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. Strategic Management Journal, 18(7), 509-533
- [32] World Economic Forum. (2018). Insight report: Readiness for the future of production Report 2018. In World Economic Forum
- [33] Vijay, V., Pimm, S. L., Jenkins, C. N., & Smith, S. J. (2016). The impacts of oil palm on recent dforestation and biodiversity loss. PLoS ONE