



Plagiarism Checker X Originality Report

Similarity Found: 17%

Date: Saturday, February 15, 2020

Statistics: 425 words Plagiarized / 2568 Total words

Remarks: Low Plagiarism Detected - Your Document needs Optional Improvement.

RJ10(82), October 28, 2018 DOI <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmb.2018.10.010> THE EFFECT OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT CAPABILITIES BUSINESS STRESS ON THE PERFORMANCE OF ASIRAN ALL-DAY MEDIUM INDUSTRIES IN SOUTH KALIMANTAN PROVINCE Maskur *, Zainul Mohammad
Department of Management, Islamic University of Muhammad Arsyad Al Banjari
Kalimantan, Banjarmasin, South Kalimantan, Indonesia *E-mail:
maskursariman@yahoo.co

ABSTRACT This study aims to examine the direct influence dynamics, management capabilities, business stress on the performance of small and medium industries. This study was applied to the Sasirangan Small and Medium Industry (SMI) sector in South Kalimantan. The method used was a quantitative approach because the data obtained from the survey results was in the form of numbers analyzed using statistical to answer the research hypotheses.

The sample consisted of 83 respondents spread in the region in South Kalimantan; they were owners or managers of the Sasirangan SMI. They were determined by the purposive sampling technique. Data collection was done through observations, questionnaires, and direct interviews. Secondary data was obtained from the Provincial Government of South Kalimantan and related agencies. The data analysis involved Generalized Structural Component Analysis.

The results of hypothesis testing show that environmental dynamics, management capabilities, and business stress have a direct and positive effect on the performance of SMIs. The environmental dynamics encourage better performance of SMIs, the management capabilities of the SMI owners can directly improve the performance of SMIs, and the implementation of the business strategy carried out by SMIs can improve the performance of SMI. KEY WORDS: Environmental dynamics, management business stress, SMI performance. Globalization has made the business environment (external) as a determinant for the competitive advantage of a company.

The environment is seen as a dynamic whose changes are difficult to predict, yet can create opportunity as well as challenge for the company (Miles et al., 2000; Hashim et al., 2001; Nandak et al., 2010; Bastian and Much 2012; Mohd et al., 2013). The survival and success of a company depends on the ability to monitor and adapt to its business environment. According to Hashim et al.

(2001), power outside the company that affects performance is included in the dynamism variable, which identifies the uncertainty of environment. Environmental information in addition to uncertainty, can also be in the form of intensity of competition referred to as the hostility variable (Hashim et al., 2001). The business environment has a strong influence on the organization of the company, especially when the world of business is a borderless world; the change of hard technology to smart technology and other factors change affect the policies that will be taken by the company manager (Hunger, 2007; Brooks, 1997; Lumpkin 2005).

Facing increasing industrial competition due to change in the business environment has been forcing industries both in the manufacturing and service industries, to think of new ways to win the competition. The development of small and medium industries (SMIs) in regional and global markets must be based on continuous efforts to make them a strong business; the role of SMIs cannot be underestimated because they are a determining factor of most of the world economy (Stor 1994).

Change in the business environment requires specific ways to deal with because most of these changes are beyond the control of the company (Eff and Handrian, 2010) and RJ10(82), October 2008 can bring both opportunity and threats to the company (Lawrence and W 2010; Eff and Soeherman, 2010). For companies that can dynamically utilize the changes as a new opportunity the company will benefit but on the contrary, for companies that tend to be static changes will become a threat to survival. The external environment alone will give reciprocal influence to each other (Brook and Won, 2000; Lawrence and W 2010).

The survival and success of a company depends on the ability to monitor and adapt to its business environment (Boyd and Fulk, 1996), to give business strategies to realize the achievement of business objectives effectively (Bi and Malag 2012). A business environment that focuses on environmental dynamics can be conceptualized as a rapidly changing and discontinuous environment in demands, market, competitor, technology and regulation so information is often inaccurate or unavailable (Bastian and Muchlish, 2012). Furthermore Hashim et al.

(2001) identify the existence of environmental uncertainty and high intensity of competition that environmental dynamics encourage companies to behave as entrepreneurs

Mohd et al. (2013) argue that the external environment has a direct effect on the performance of the company without looking at the choices of the strategy carried out by the company; this can mean that the external environment can hinder and or directly support performance.

Research conducted by Isabela and W (1994) confirms a positive relationship between organizational performance and environmental dynamics. Bastian and Mu (2012) suggest that the results of research in manufacturing companies show a significant influence of environmental uncertainty on business performance. This is also in line with research conducted by Purnomo and Subroto (2016), which shows that a significant influence of environmental uncertainty on business performance. Entrepreneurial orientation and business strategies have a significant effect on company performance.

Entrepreneurial orientation of Sasirang S owners has been proven to be able to support business strategies; this means that entrepreneurial orientation directly affects the implementation of business strategies (Mask 2018). Miles et al. (2000) and Azadegan et al. (2013) state different opinions that there is no evidence of the direct influence of external environment on company performance. This study provides an opportunity to examine the direct effect of environmental dynamics on the performance of SMIs.

Based on findings from previous studies, environmental dynamics have a correlation with the performance of small and medium industries. Therefore, it is necessary to further test the relationship. T and Pavitt (1998) state that management capability is very important in small, medium, and large-scale industries, where each requires management activities to coordinate the capabilities or skills of the work and the coordination of resources.

The role of leaders or owners of the company to understand and carry out management functions is crucial to achieve the success of a business. Peters (1998) states that during the growth phase, a leader or manager requires management skills to develop a business. Management skills by an entrepreneur are used to manage the company in terms of market production, financial and human resources.

Ansoff (1990) reveals the ability of a business to include the ability to make plans, determine priorities or strategies, and correct strategies. Furthermore, Edward (1994) states that the level of business ability is related to the way one of the company's financial policy to determine the strategic actions to be taken. According to W and Kuan (2011), solid management is the key to success.

How small and medium industries sometimes face difficulties in developing the management skills needed to survive in a complex environment. The results of the empirical study show that most SMIs do not have management skills because of the low educational background. According to Suci (2009), most IKMs rely on experience and knowledge from parents. In general, only for the short term and the majority of businesses are run simply by owners or work to earn for their daily needs.

Some results of empirical studies confirm that management capabilities have a significant effect on business performance in small and medium industries (Chi et al., 2011; W and Kuan, 2011; Dani et al., 2013; Fening 2012). This is confirmed by Chi et al. (2011) explaining that management ability if supported by good strategy will improve the performance of small and medium businesses.

There are several gaps from previous studies — some confirm that management skills are not significant for business performance (Nurhayati, 2004; Suci, 2009; Nur, 2014; Urisc and Mu, 2005), while others confirm that management skills have a positive and significant influence on business performance (Mok 2007; Latief, 2008; Yahya et al., 2010; Mahmud, 2011). Further studies to examine the effect of management capabilities on performance of small and medium industries must be carried out.

The literature study of strategic planning and performance shows that companies proactively investing time in developing strategies have high levels of performance than companies that are proactive but do not develop strategies (Covin and Slevin, 1991). In line with this, Jiao et al. (2013) explain that the superior position in competition can be realized if the company is able to capture the opportunities offered by the business environment; in other words, it can reduce the impact of the formulation of strategies, and then use them as a strong force to implement strategies.

Su rachman (2002) further explains that the analysis and diagnosis of a company's external environment must be done synergistically as well as be used as input in the preparation of strategies to create sustainable performance. Porter (2005) explains that the concept of contingency emphasizes alignment of strategies with the business environment as a determinant of survival or performance of a company.

Zhi and Jintong (2012) argue that companies implementing business strategies in their business activities will be able to overcome the business uncertainty. The results of this empirical study also confirm that business strategies have a significant effect on the performance of small and medium enterprises (Parnell, 2010; Hashim et al., 2001; Mohd et al., 2013; Hsu, 2012; Li and T 2013); yet, X et al. (2008), Zhi and Jintong (2012) have found that business strategies have no significant effect on performance.

The different results of the previous studies have motivated the researcher to further test whether business strategies have an influence on the performance of small and medium industries. CONCEPTUAMERK Hashim et al. (2001) explore the role of business strategies on performance and produce a contingency model. The model proposed by Hashim et al. (2001) offers a mediating role for environmental factors in the relationship of business strategies and performance, as well as the role of business strategies that directly affect performance.

In the present study, the model shows the role of environmental dynamics as an independent variable that affects the performance of SMIs. Based on these findings, the researcher examines the effect of environmental dynamics on the performance of SMIs, which simultaneously compares the findings of previous studies, especially Has et al. (2001) in small and medium enterprises in Malaysia. In addition, this study will also examine the effect of management capabilities as investigated by Chi et al.

(2011) and W and Kuan (2011) on performance. This study is the synergism of the previous conceptual framework by Has et al. (2001), Miles et al. (2000), Nandak et al. (2010), Bastian and Muchlish (2012), which examined the dimensions of environmental dynamics and business performance, as well as the research by W and Kuan (2011), Chi et al. (2011), and Dani et al. (2013) about the influence of management capabilities on business performance.

The existing models are the basis for the formulation of a conceptual framework; yet not all models are followed. This study will test and examine the influence of environmental dynamics, management capabilities, and business strategies on the performance of SMIs. In accordance with the description on the background, theoretical basis, and previous research, the following conceptual framework is proposed.

RJ10(82), October 2010 Figure 1 – The Conceptual Framework Hypotheses: H1 : Environmental dynamics affect performance of SMIs ; H2 : Management capabilities affect performance of SMIs ; H3 : Business strategies affect performance of SMIs . METHODS OCH Study Sites . This study was conducted in three areas in South Kalimantan, namely Banjarmasin, Martapura and Banjar as they are the center for SMIs, are close to each other, and are home for many Sasirang SMI owners compared to other regions. This study aims to examine the influence of environmental dynamics, management capabilities, and business strategies on the performance of SMIs.

This study is experimental research, a kind of study conducted by identifying factors or events that arise from the object under study, then an investigation to explain the phenomenon of problems based on the interaction of the variables under study is conducted (Sugeng, 2008). The analytical method used is Generalized Structured Component Analysis (GSCA). This study employed primary data and secondary data.

Primary data was collected through questionnaires, interviews, and observations to respondents or managers of Sasirangan SMIs, while secondary data was obtained through related agency Research Design. This approach was a quantitative approach (positivism) because the data obtained from the survey in the form of numbers analyzed using statistics to answer questions and test hypotheses. The results of statistical tests are used to explain the position of the variables studied and predict the relationship of variables (Creswell, 2009).

Population and Sample . The population and sample in this study is elaborated in Table 1. Table 1 –

Plat an Sple of Sasgan S No City/Regey Popati Sam 1 Banrm 48 48 2 Martara 29 29 3
Banrbaru 6 6 Tota 8 3 83 T population in this study was 83 owners of Sasirang SMIs in the
cities/encies of South Kalimantan. T data came f q distr direct to all owners; these 83
owners were also samples in the study.

RJ10(82), Ocber 2 91 Measurement Scale . Based on the operationalization of the
research variables, the indicators **cannot be measured directly** (latent variables); the
variables need to be translated into manif variables.

T measurement results are related to the analysis as to provide underst of variables and
inter patt T measurem scale used in this study is a Lik scale. It g involves scale points and
deg of agreement. In this study, the alter were 1 to 5, in wh 1 means strly disag 2 means
disagree, 3 means neutr 4 means agree, and 5 means strly agree. Validity Test .

T validity measurement was done by do bivariat corr between each item score and tot
item score, with Pearson Corr Coeff T test of item validity a to f out the relationship
between independent vari (constructs) to their proxy (indicators) by corr the value of
items with tot values (Parsian and Dunning 2009). Questions or statements are
considered valid if the correlation coeff (r) is eq to or g than 0.3, because r w hich is less
than 0.3

represents small inf or a weak relationship (Cohen, 1992). If an indicator has items less
than 30, then the benchmark for item validi is correct r, with the following fula (Azwar
2013): In which r represent s the Pearson Corr Coeff : T results of the vali test f each
variable are completely presented in the following tables.

T 2 – Vy T Res o Inat of Envnm Dics (X Indato Ite Correted r Minum Criteri Note
Environmental Uncertainty X1 .1. 0 . 53 0 . 3 Val X1 .1. 0 . 57 0 . 3 Val X1 .1. 0.3 0 . 3 Val X1
.1. 0 . 38 0 . 3 Val Inty of Comtio X1 .2. 0.6 0 . 3 Val X1 .2. 0 . 56 0.3 Val X1 .2. 0.5 0 . 3 Val
X1 .2. 0 . 42 0 . 3 Val Environmental dynamics (X consists of two (2) indicators and eig (8)
items. All meet the minimum criteria of having corrected $r > 0.3$.

T means that all items are valid, th us all can be included in the research process. T he
validit test results on the manag capabilities are shown in T 3 . T 3 – Vy T Res o Inat of
Managent Capabilies (X Indato Ite Correted r Minum Criteri Note Plaing . X2.1 0 . 48 0 . 3
Val X2.1 0 . 48 0 . 3 Val Organg X2.2 0.4 0 . 3 Val X2.2 0 . 48 0 . 3 Val Direting X2.3 0.5 0 .
3 Val X2.3 0 . 59 0.3 Val Monori X2.4 0.5 0 . 3 Val X2.4 0 . 55 0 .

3 Val Managem capabilities (X consist of f (4) indicators and eig (8) items. All meet the
minimum criter of having corr $r > 0.3$. T means that all items are valid, thus all can be

included in the research process. RJ10(82), October 2012. T4 validity test results on the business strategies are shown in T4.

T4 – Validity Test Results of Business Strategies (X) Indicators (Corrected Item Minimum Criteria Note) Low Cost Strategy X3.1 0.5 0.3 Valid X3.1 0.53 0.3 Valid X3.1 0.07 0.3 Not Valid X3.1 0.1 0.3 Valid
Differentiation Strategy X3.2 0.63 0.3 Valid X3.2 0.71 0.3 Valid X3.2 0.66 0.3 Valid X3.2 0.43 0.3 Valid
Focus Strategy X3.3 0.45 0.3 Valid X3.3 0.4 0.3 Valid X3.3 0.6 0.3 Valid Business strategies (X) consist of three (3) indicators and eleven (11) items.

From the eleven (11) items, one did not meet the minimum criteria of having $corr > 0.3$, i.e. the item was X3 (price cost efficiency on the Y1.1 indicator (low cost strategy). This one not-valid item is not included in the research process. T4 validity test results on the performance of SMIs are shown in T5. T5 – Validity Test Results of Performance (Y1) Indicators (Corrected Item Minimum Criteria Note) Sales Growth Y1.1 0.70 0.3 Valid Y1.1 0.70 0.3 Valid
Profit Growth Y1.2 0.5

0.3 Valid Y1.2 0.58 0.3 Valid Capital Growth Y1.3 0.4 0.3 Valid Y1.3 0.46 0.3 Valid Performance (Y1) consists of three (3) indicators and six (6) items. All meet the minimum criteria of having $corr > 0.3$. This means that all items are valid, thus all can be included in the research process.

T6 – Reliability Test Results of Environmental Dynamic (X1) Environmental Uncertainty (X1.1 0.71 Reliability Intensity of Competition (X1.2 0.74 Reliability Management Capabilities (X2) Planning (X2.1 0.65 Reliability Organizational (X2.2 0.63 Reliability Direction (X2.3 0.72 Reliability Monitoring (X2.4 0.67 Reliability Business Strategies (X3) Low Cost Strategy (X3.1 0.63 Reliability Differentiation Strategy (X3.2 0.79 Reliability Focus Strategy (X3.3 0.89 Reliability Performance (Y1) Sales Growth (Y1.1 0.

82 Reliability Profit Growth (Y1.2 0.73 Reliability Capital Growth (Y1.3 0.62 Reliability T6 shows that all indicators have an Alpha Cronbach greater than 0.6, so all variables are reliable and can be used as a data collection tool. RESULT AND DISCUSSION RJ10(82), October 2013
T7 shows that 53% are male (53%), the rest are female. Terence in number of big and small are as entrepreneurs owners characteristics and being responsible employees business).

here role in the future will increase among entrepreneurs SMIs, especially in the region Kalimantan. This is expected to inspire to an entrepreneur. T7 – Decision of Sasirang S/O Based on Sex No Sex Frequency Percentage (%) 1 Male 44 53.2 Female 39 47 Total 83 100 T8 – Decision of Sasirang S/O Based on Residence No Residence Frequency Percentage (%) 1 Banjar 48 57.8 2 Martapura 29 34.9 3 Banjarbaru 6 7.2 Total 83 100 T8 shows that the majority of owners live in Banjar (48 people or 57.8%), then 29 people or 34.9% and 6 people or 7.2% live in Martapura and Banjarbaru. T7 shows that most Sasirang SMIs are in Banjar as the business was originally started there.

In addition, Banjarmasin also has a strategic position for business because it is in the provincial capital. The other two locations, however, are not far from Banjarmasin. T 9 – Description of Sasirang SMI Owners' Education Level (Year) Freency Perc (%) Elementary 89.6 Junior High 27.32 Senior High 37.44 Diploma 2.4 S1 (university graduate) 78.4 S2 (post-graduate) 2.4 Total 83.10 T 9 shows that most ISM owners graduated from senior high school (37 people or 44.6%), junior high school (27 people or 32.5%), elementary school (8 people or 9.6%), while the remaining graduated from a Diploma program (2 people or 2.4%), S1 (7 people or 8.4%), and S2 (2 people or 2%).

This illustrates that the majority of owners graduated from high school and lower. Based on their position, as owners and managers, education is important for the development of their industry. The results of the interview provide an overview of the need for education and training programs for SMI entrepreneurs to improve their ability and insight in managing a business.

T 10 – Description of Sasirang SMI Owners' Age (Year) Freency Perc (%) 1 = 30 10 12 2 31 – 40 33 39.8 41 – 50 33 39.8 51 – 60 2 2.4 61 – 70 3 3.6 71 – 80 1 1.2 > 80 1 1.2 Total 83.10 T 10 shows that the most ISM owners are in the age range of 31 to 40 years (33 people or 39.8%) and 41 to 50 years (33 people or 39.8%). Only a small number of them are 51 to 60 years old (2 people or 2.4%), 61 to 70 years old (3 people or 3.6%), 71 to 80 years old (1 person or 1.2%), and 81 years or more (1 person or 1.2%). In general, most owners are 31 and 50 (79.6%); these people are the second generation continuing the family business and those who used to work as employees then open their own businesses.

This shows that the young generation is interested in developing the industry because it is one of the superior products of South Kalimantan. T 11 – Description of Sasirang SMI Owners' Business Age (Year) Freency Perc (%) 1 = 5 20 24.10 2 6 – 10 17 20.3 11 – 15 22 26.4 16 – 20 7 8.4 21 – 25 15 18.08 > 25 2 2.4 Total 83.10 T 11 shows that most owners run the business for 5 years, 6 to 10 years and 11 to 15 years (59 businesses or 71.08%).

This means that most of the Sasirang SMI owners in South Kalimantan Province are relatively new. Their business can be considered as start-up because during that short period of time, owners have had the ability to be responsive and adaptive to the dynamic change in the business environment. T 12 – Description of Sasirang SMI Owners' Business Status (Year) Freency Perc (%) 1 Person Owns 77 92.8 2 Rent 6 7.2

Total 83.10 T 12 shows that most Sasirang SMI owners already have their own work (77 people or 92.8%). There remain 6 people or 7.2% who still rent a place to run their business. The results of data collection confirm that most owners already have a house and they use their house as the work place. T 13 – Description of Sasirang SMI Owners' Number of Employees Freency Perc (%) 1 = 15 45 54.2 2 16 – 20 35 42.2 3 21 – 25 0 0 4 > 25 3 3.6 Total 83.10 T 13 shows 45 or 54.2% owners have around 15 employees, 35 or 42.2% owners have 16 to 20

employee and 3 or 3.6% owners have more than 25 employees. The number of employees is determined by the size of the business.

Sasirangan SMIs are classified as a labor-intensive industry because it requires a lot of labor and the production process is still done manually or handmade. The 13 – The Measurement Model of Environmental Uncertainty (X 1.1) Items Loading Weight Estimate SE CR Estimate SE CR X 1.1.1 0.8 0.0 85 * 0.4 0.0 12 * X 1.1.2 0.8 0.0 52 * 0.4 0.0 9.7 * X 1.1.3 0.6 0.0 54 * 0.4 0.0 11 * X 1.1.4 0.7 0.1 6.1 * 0.3 0.0 15 * Indicators measuring environmental uncertainty (X 1.1) competition (X 1.2).

is developed into RJ10(82), October 2015. The environmental uncertainty indicator (X) is measured by 4 (four) items, namely newcomers can enter sales volume in the market (X 1.1.1), products made by other companies become alternative choices for consumers (X 1.1.2), government regulations provide support for SMIs (X 1.1.3), and raw and material industries often cause price and quality problems (X 1.1.4).

The results of the measurement model for this indicator show all items are valid and significant at a 0.05. The item "products made by other companies become an alternative choice for consumers (X 1.1.2)" has the highest factor loading of 0.851; thus, it is considered as the best representation of environmental uncertainty. The contribution of other items seen from the loading factor is newcomers (X 1.1.1) of 0.817, material (X 1.1.4) of 0.723, and regulation (X 1.1.3) of 0.654. The 14 – The Measurement Model of Intensity of Competition (X 1.2) Items Loading Weight Estimate SE CR Estimate SE CR X 1.2.1 0.8 0.0 33 * 0.3 0.0

10 * X 1.2.2 0.7 0.0 14 * 0.3 0.0 36 * X 1.2.3 0.7 0.0 14 * 0.3 0.0 20 * X 1.2.4 0.6 0.0 47 * 0.2 0.0 12 * The second indicator as to measure environmental dynamics (X) is the intensity of competition (X measured by using 4 (four) items, namely the intensity of competition on product quality among the Sasirangan industry (X 1.2.1), various promotional strategies carried out by each Sasirangan industry (X 1.2.2

), the intensity of price competition among the Sasirangan industry (X 1.2.3), and product innovation carried out by each Sasirangan industry (X 1.2.4). The results of the measurement model show all items are valid and significant at a 0.05. The "intensity of product quality competition among the Sasirangan industry (X 1.2.1)" has the highest factor loading of 0.823; it is considered as the best representation of competition intensity.

The contribution of other items seen from the loading factor is promotional strategies (X 1.2.2) of 0.779, price competition (X 1.2.3) of 0.760, and product innovation (X 1.2.4) of 0.661. The two (2) indicators of environmental dynamics (X) are valid. Based on the loading factor the item that contributes the most to environmental uncertainty is on "products made by other

companies become an alter f consumers " (X 1.1.2) , with a loading value of 0.851.

For competition intensity, the item that contr the most is " the tight competition of product q among the Sasirang industr " (X 1.2.1) , with a loading value of 0.823. T variable of management capabilities (X is measured by f (4) indicators, namely planning (X 2.1) , organizing (X 2.2) , direct (X 2.3) , and monitoring (X 2.4) . Each indicator is developed into several items. T 15 – T Ment MI f Pning (X 2.1

) Ite Loing W Est SE CR Est SE CR X .2.1 0.8 0.0 43 * 0.6 0.0 21 * X .2.1 0.8 0.0 68 * 0.5 0.0 16 * T planning indicator is measured by 2 (t items, namely being able to plan a stry (X 2.1.1)) and making decisions without the help of others (X 2.1.2) . T results of the measurement model show that the items are valid and signif at a 0.05.

Both items are considered dominant in ref planning because the loading value is not much diff at 0.876 and 0.848. Tsecond ofmanagcapabilities 2) org using2 (titems,namely str employees 2.2.) bu reliable team 2.2.2).Tresults measuremmodel or indicator both are valid signif at 0.05. items considered in anizing because terent, at 0.858 and 0.865.

RJ10(82), Ocber 2 96 T 16 – T Ment MI f Orig (X 2.2) Ite Loing W Est SE CR Est SE CR X .2.2 0.8 0.0 35 * 0.5 0.0 12 * X .2.2 0.8 0.0 90 * 0.5 0.0 21 * T 17 – T Ment MI f Direct (X 2.3)) Ite Loing W Est SE CR Est SE CR X .2.3 0.8 0.0 37 * 0.5 0.0 23 * X .2.3 0.9 0.0 - 0.6 0.0 17 * T third indicator of manag capabilities (X2) is direct measured using 2 (t items, namely comm well with employe (X 2.3.1

) and completing the work on time (X 2.3.2) . T results of the measurement model show both items are valid and signif at a 0.05. T "completing the work on time (X 2. 3.2) " has the hig factor loading of 0.908; it is considered as the best representation of directing . T item "communicating well with employees (X2.3.1) " has a loading value of 0.875. T 18 – T Ment MI f Moorin (X .2.4) Ite Loing W Est SE CR Est SE CR X .2.4

0.8 0.0 12 * 0.5 0.0 18 * X .2.4 0.8 0.0 37 * 0.5 0.0 51 * T fourth indicator of manag capabilities (X is monitoring measured using 2 (t items, namely mak changes towards work in order to achieve better corporat g (X 2.4.1)) and being able to resolve conf that occur between the company and employees and with customers (X 2.4.2) .

T results of the measurement model show both items are valid and signif at a 0.05. Both items are considered dominant in ref org because the loading value is not much diff at 0.886 and 0.878. T four (4) indicators for management capabilities (X are valid.

Based on the loading f the item that contributes the most f directing is "completing the

work on time" (X 2.3.2) with a value of 0.908; for supervision, the item that contributes the most is "improving work in order to achieve better company" (X 2.4.1) with a value of 0.886; for planning, the item that contributes the most is "being able to plan a strategy" (X 2.1.1) with a value of 0.876; and for organization, the item that contributes the most is "building a reliable work team" (X 2.2.) with a value of 0.865.

Among the four indicators, the high contribution of management capabilities (X is direct and the weak is organization. Business strategies in this study are defined as the strategic effort undertaken by ISM entrepreneurs **to be able to** compete and achieve business goals. The indicators used to measure the strategies (X are Low Cost Strategy Indicator (X 3.1), Differentiated Strategy (X 3.2), and Focus Strategy (X 3.3). Each indicator is then developed into several items.

The 19 – The Measurement Model of the Low Cost Strategy (X 3.1) Item Loading Weights Estimated Standard Error CR Estimated Standard Error CR X3 .1.1 0.9 0.0 38 * 0.5 0.0 37 * X 3 .1.2 0.9 0.0 83 * 0.4 0.0 14 * X3 .1.3 0.3 0.0 20 * 0.1 0.0 22 * The low cost strategy is measured by 3 (three) items, namely maintaining the production continuity by maintaining the availability of raw material and support material (X 3.1.1), optimizing the existing tools and equipment (X 3.1.2), and making costs lower than competitors (X 3.1.3).

The results of the measurement model show all items valid and significant at a 0.05. The item "maintaining the continuity of production" (X 3.1.1) and "optimizing the existing tools and equipment (X 3.1.2) are considered dominant in reference to the low cost strategy as they have the high loading values, at 0.923 and 0.910. The item "making costs lower than competitors" (X 3.1.4) is the weak item with a loading value of 0.309. The 20 – The Measurement Model of the Differentiation Strategy (X 3.2

) Item Loading Weights Estimated Standard Error CR Estimated Standard Error CR X3 .2.1 0.8 0.0 79 * 0.3 0.0 8.1 * X3 .2.2 0.8 0.0 29 * 0.3 0.0 17 * X3 .2.3 0.8 0.0 13 * 0.2 0.0 18 * X3 .2.4 0.6 0.0 30 * 0.2 0.0 43 * The second indicator of business strategies (X3) is differentiated (X measured using 4 (four) items, namely developing a unique Sasirangan motif with distinctive characteristics for competing products (X 3.2.1), improving the quality to create a competitive advantage (X 3.2.2), making Sasirangan products based on market segment (upper middle or lower middle class) (X 3.2.3

), and making custom colors or motifs to provide better service for customers (X 3.2.4). The results of the measurement model show all items valid and significant at a 0.05. The item "improving quality of competitive advantage (X 3.2.2) has the high factor loading of 0.865; it is considered dominant in reference to the differentiated indicator. The loading values of other items are 0.830 for "develop a unique motif (X 3.2.1), 0.816 for "making products based on market segment (X 3.2.3), and 0.634 for "provide custom orders" (X 3.2.4). The 21 – The Measurement Model of the Focus Strategy (X 3.3) Item Loading Weights Estimated Standard Error CR Estimated Standard Error CR X3 .3.1 0.8 0.0 25 * 0.3 0.0 8.0 * X3 .3.2 0.9 0.0

56 * 0.3 0.0 14 * X3 .3.3 0.9 0.0 82 * 0.3 0.0 23 * The third indicator for business strategies (X is

the focus strategy (X) which is measured by 3 (three) items, namely selling only certain products (X 3.3.1), selling only to certain customers (X 3.3.2), and selling only to certain customer segments (X 3.3.3).

Test results of the measurement model for this indicator show all items are valid and significant at a 0.05. The item "selling only to certain customers (X 3.3.2)" has the highest loading value of 0.937; it is considered dominant in reference to the focus strategy. The loading value of other items is 0.925 for "selling to certain customer segments" (X 3.3.3) and 0.867 for "selling only certain products" (X 3.3.1). The three (3) indicators for business strategies (X) are valid.

Based on the loading factor, the item that contributes the most for the low cost strategy is "maintaining the production continuity by maintaining the availability of raw and support materials (X 3.1.1)" with a value of 0.923; for the differentiation strategy is "improving competitive advantage (X 3.2.2)" with a value of 0.865; and for the focus strategy is "selling only to certain customers (X 3.3.2)" with a value of 0.937.

Among the three (3) indicators, the highest contributor for business strategies (X) is the focus strategy and the weakest is differentiation. The performance of SMIs in this study is interrelated as the level of achievement of the company in a certain period; this is very decisive in the development of the company. The indicators used to measure performance (Y1) are sales growth (Y 1.1), profit growth (Y 1.2), and capital growth (Y 1.3).

Each indicator is developed into several items. The first indicator for sales growth (Y 1.1) is measured by 2 (two) items, namely an increase in sales (from year to year (Y 1.1.1)) and an increase in sales (turnover followed by an increase in production (Y 1.1.2)).

Test results of the measurement model show that all items are valid and significant at a 0.05. The two items are considered dominant in reference to sales growth as the estimated value is 0.928 and 0.917. The second indicator for profit growth (Y 1.2) is measured by 2 (two) items, namely an increase in profit (Y 1.2.1) and the increase in profit is higher than the increase in capital used (Y 1.2.2).

The second indicator for performance (Y1) is profit growth (Y 1.2) measured using 2 (two) items, namely an increase in profit (Y 1.2.1) and the increase in profit is higher than the increase in capital used (Y 1.2.2). Test measurement model results obtained for this indicator show all items are valid and significant at a 0.05.

The item "the increase in profit is higher than the increase in capital used" (Y 1.2.1) has the highest loading value of 0.914; it is considered dominant in reference to the profit growth indicator. The loading value of the other item (Y 1.2.2) is 0.862. The third indicator for capital growth (Y 1.3) is measured by 1 (one) item, namely an increase in capital (Y 1.3.1).

Est SE CR Y. 1.3 0.8 0.0 28 * 0.5 0.0 26 * Y .1.3 0.8 0.0 28 * 0.5 0.0 35 * T third indicator f perfnce (Y1) is capital g (Y 1.3

), which is measured using 2 (two) items, namely increasing the amount of capital fr year to year (Y 1.3.1) and the need f additional capital f business development (Y 1.3.2). T results of the measurement model show a items are va and sicant at a 0.05. Both items are considered dominant in ref capital growth considering the loading value s of 0.854 and 0.859. T items forming indicators perfnce (Y1) are valid.

Based on the loading f the items that contr the most f sales g are "an increase in sales (t fr year to year" (Y 1.1.1) and "an increase in sales (t followed by an increase in production" (Y 1.1.2), as the loading value of these items is 0.928 and 0.917. T item that contributes the most for prof growth is "t increase in prof is hig than the increase in capital used" (Y 1.2.1) wit a loading value of 0.914.

T item that contributes the most for capital g is "t increase in prof is hig than the increase in capital used" (Y 1.3.) with a loading value of 0.859. Among the thr (3) indicators, the hig contr f perfnce (Y1) is prof growth and the weak is capital growth. The Results of Hypothesis Testing ? Based on empirical data analysis, hypothesis test was done using the GeSCA Prog T test results can be seen in T 25.

Environmental dynamics have a ignifpositive efon SMI ormGeSCA results T25 apath icient and of2.64* icant, sign). hese lts that ood dynamics es er perfnce SMIs.Environmental and intensity indicators RJ10(82), Ocber 2 99 forming dynamics be directly increase growth, profgrowth, and capital gr owth m of perfnce. T 25 – T Resu of Hothes T No The Relonship of Varia Dired Effect Est SE CR Note 1 Environ mental Dyna - > Perfo 0.0 0.0 2.6 * Sigfic 2 Manemt Capaiti - > Perfo 0.0

0.0 4.2 * Sigfic 3 Bus Strategies - > Perfoe 0.5 0.0 17 * Sigfic T study support s Bisbe and Mauenu (2012) by tak a sample of 267 respondents fr medium and larg companies in Spain. Data is ana us SPSS Macro. T ir fs indicate that environmental dynamics have a signif eff on org perf Furtherm the results of the present study a support the results of Jiao et al.

(2013) by tak a sample of 115 respondents. Data is analyzed using stral eq models (SEM). Jiao et al. (2013) conf that environmental dynamics have a signif impact on th e performance of new businesses; this study concludes that a dynamic abilit is mor eff f org changes at a hig deg of environmental dynamics. Bastian and Muchlish (2012) and Mohd et al.

(2013) show that environmental dynamics have a significant effect on organizational performance. Nandak et al. (2010) suggest that environmental dynamics affect business performance mediated by business strategies. The results of this study are contradictory to Azadegan et al. (2013), that environmental dynamics have no significant effect on performance. The results of this study support Nisj and W (1997) that complex environmental information can affect the performance of an organization. Furthermore, Mohd et al.

(2013) argue that the external environment has a direct effect on the performance of the company without looking at the choices of the strategies carried out by the company; this can mean that the external environment can hinder and/or directly support performance. Hashim et al. (2001) affirm that power outside the company in performance is a dynamism variable, which identifies the environmental uncertainty.

Environmental influences other than uncertainty can also take the form of competition intensity. Management capabilities have a significant positive effect on SMI performance. GeSCA results in table 25 show a path coefficient of 0.029* and CR of 4.28* (significant, positive sign). This indicates that management capabilities of SMI owners can directly improve performance. This suggests that the implementation of management capabilities, which include planning, organizing, directing, and monitoring, can be used directly to increase sales growth, profit growth, and capital growth as a function of SMI performance. The most dominant form of management capabilities is directly on completing the work on time. Therefore, the variable of SMI performance that contributes the most is sales growth through an increase in turnover from year to year.

The findings support the results of previous studies by Akun et al. (2008), taking a sample of 356 respondents from 112 companies, involving management and employees from various companies operating in Istanbul. Data is analyzed by a hierarchical regression and results show that emotional abilities have a significant and positive effect on financial performance and organizational effectiveness. Furthermore, Man and Wa (2008), taking a sample of 100 SMEs in the manufacturing sector in Malacca using structured questionnaires and interviews with SMEs on multiple regression and One-Way ANOVA analysis, reveal that management capabilities have a positive and significant effect on the performance of SMEs.

The findings of this study are also in line with Suci (2009) that management capabilities have a significant positive effect on performance; in other words, sufficient management capabilities can determine the success of SMI performance. The findings are also supported by several other studies such as W and Kuan (2011), Chi et al. (2011), Hsu (2012), Fening (2012), and Dani et al. (2013), that management skills directly affect performance.

The results of this study contradict the findings by Ursic and Mulej (2005), October 2005, that management capabilities directly have no significant effect on business performance. The results of this study support the theory of T and Pavitt (1998), that management capabilities are very important in small, medium, and large-scale industries, where each requires management activities to

coordinate the sk of work as well as coordination of resources of the company.

The role of the leaders or owners of the company is to understand and carry out management functions as the main thing to achieve success. Management is the achievement of organizational goals in an efficient and effective way through planning, organizing, directing, and controlling organizational resources (Daft 2006). Business strategies have a significant and direct positive effect on performance. The result of GeSCA in Table 25 shows a path coefficient of 0.571* and CR of 17.99* (significant).

This means that the implementation of the business strategy by SO can improve performance. It proves that the more appropriate the low cost strategy, differentiation strategy, and focus strategy, as indicators of business strategy, the more sales, profit, and capital growth will be. This further supports the theories of Pierce II and Robinson (2007) defining strategic management as a set of decisions and actions that result in the formulation and implementation of plans designed to achieve company goals. Jauck and Glueck (1988) assert that the focus of strategic management processes shapes the focus of decisions and actions that lead to the formulation of effective strategies to achieve organizational goals. This study supports the findings of Parnell (2010) who examines the relationship between members of strategic groups and performance of retailers in the United States in the complexity of strategy-performance relationship.

Parnell took a sample of 277 retail stores in the Midwestern city of the United States and uses a regression method for the data analysis; the findings indicate that business strategies have a positive significant effect on business performance in a relatively short period of time and high business performance results in positive profit in the long term. Acq (2013) also proves that business strategies affect the performance of business organizations. Some other research including Man and Wa (2008), Bordean et al.

(2010), Hsu (2012), Li and T (2013), and Mohd et al. (2) state that business strategies have a significant effect on performance. In contrast, Xiaoying et al. (2008) and Zhi and Jintong (2012) find that business strategies do not affect performance. CONCLUSION Environmental dynamics have a significant positive effect on SMI performance. This indicates that the dynamics of the environment encourage better SMI performance.

Environmental uncertainty and competition intensity as indicators of environmental dynamics can be used directly to increase sales growth, profit growth, and capital growth as indicators of SMI performance. Management capabilities have a significant positive effect on SMI performance. This indicates that the management capabilities of the SO can directly improve SMI performance.

This finding suggests that management capabilities, which include planning, organizing, directing, and monitoring, can be used directly to increase sales, profit, and capital growth as indicators of SMI performance. Business strategies have a significant and direct positive effect on SMI performance; this means that the business strategies carried out by SMI organizations can improve the SMI performance. This proves that

appropriate implementation of low cost strategies, different and focus strategies, as indicators of business strategies, will further increase sales growth, profit growth, and capital growth as indicators of SME performance. Recommendation? Further studies are advised to include more areas as the study site and more respondents considering that the SME actors are increasing and spread throughout the cities and regions in South Kalimantan; RJ10(82), October 2011. Owners of Sasirang S should improve management capabilities as these will help to formulate the right business strategy in such a dynamic environment; Owners of Sasirang S should improve the quality of Sasirang products, by choosing good raw and coloring materials as well as innovative motifs so the products can be accepted by local and international market or consumer. REFERENCE 1. Ansoff I. 1990.

1. New Corporate Strategy, McGraw-Hill, New York. 2. Akgun, Ali E., Halit Keskin and John Byrne. 2008. "The Moderating Role of Environmental Dynamism Between Firm Emotional Capability and Performance" *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 21, No. 2, Emerald Group Publishing Limited organizational capabilities or competencies, pp. 230 - 252. 3. Azwar, S.,

2013, *Penyusunan Skripsi Psikologi*, Edisi 2, Cetak IV, Pustaka Pelajar Yogyakarta. 4. Bastian, Alvin, Much Muna 2012. "Perceived Environment Uncertainty, Business Strategy, Performance Measurement Systems and Organizational Performance" *Procedia - Social and Behavioural Science* No.65, pp.787 - 792. 5. Bastian, Alvin, Much Muna 2012.

"Perceived Environment Uncertainty, Business Strategy, Performance Measurement Systems and Organizational Performance" *Procedia - Social and Behavioural Science* No.65, pp.787 - 792. 6. Bisbea, Josep, Malag Ricardo. 2012. "Using Strategic Performance Measurement System for Strategy Formulation: Does It Work in Dynamic Environments?", *Managing Accounting Research* No.23, pp.296 - 311. 7. Brook Ian dan Jamie Won. 2000. *The Business Environment: Challenge and Change* 2nd edition. Prentice-Hall: Harlow. 8. Boyd, B.K. and Fulk J., 1996.

Executive Search and Perceived Uncertainty *Academy of Management Journal* Vol. 22, pp.1 - 21. 9. Chi, Kuang Hsin, Huery Ren Yeh, and Yu Ling Chen. 2011. "The Mediating Effect of Knowledge Management on Customer Order and Job Performance of Salespeople". 10. Cohen, J., 1992, *Statistical Power Analysis*, *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp.98 - 101, Sage Publications, Inc. 11.

Cresswell, John W 2009, *Research Design Qualitative Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*. 1st Edition, Sage Publication Inc., Calif. 12. Dani, Idrus, M.S., Nimran, Umar, Sudiro, Achmad, 2013. "Business Strategy Role as Mediation of Management Capability and Order of Entry on Business Performance (A Study on Micro and Small Scale Seafood Business in Talar District South Sulawesi Province). *Journal of Management Research* ISSN 1941 - 899x, Vol.5, No.1. 13. Edward, M.

1994, Non Government Org Performance and Accountability - Beyond the Mag Bullet, East London 14. Effer Sujo and Bonnie Soeherman. 2010. Seni Perang Sun Zi dan Sistem Peng Manajemen: Filosof dan Aplik . PT Gram Jaka. 15. Effer Sujo dan Arthur Handrian. 2010. Saling Peran antara Budgeting, Dinamik Lingkan Bisnis, dan Konf Inter Studi Interif . Manajemen dan Bisnis, Vol 9 No 2 hal 161 - 187. 16. Fening Fred Appiah.

2012, "Impact of Quality Managem Practices on the Perf and Growth of Small and Medium Sized Enter (Smes) in Ghana", Int Journal of Business and Social Science Vol. 3 No. 13; July 2012. 17. Hashim M K, S. A. W and M. Sulaiman. 20 "T Environment as Mediator Between Business Strateg - Performance Relationship: A Study of Malays SMEs", 46 th ICSB W Conf – j 17 - 20 2001, T T RJ10(82), Ocber 2 102 18. Hung J. David., and W T I. (2003). Manajemen Stratis, Penerbit Andi, Yogart Inf Nomor 25 T XX. 19. Hsu, Shu Hung 2012.

" Effects of Competitive Straty, Knowledg Manement and E - Business Adoption on Perfance". T Journal of Human Resource and Adult Learning, Vol. 8, Num. 2. 20. Jauch L.R, and Glueck W 1988, Business Policy and Stratic Managem McGrw Hill, New York. 21. Jiao, Hao, Ilan Alon , Chun K Koo and Yu Cui. 2013. "W Should Org Chang be Im T Moderating Eff of Environmental Dynamism Between Dynamic Capabilities a New Venture Perfance ", Journal of Eng and Ty Managem Vol.30, pp.188 - 205. 22. Lumpk G.T and Dess, G.G., 1996, Clarif the Entr Or Construct and Link it to Perf , Academy of Management Review., Vol 21. No. pp.135 - 172. 23.

Lumpk Marlyn L. T 2005, Strc Managem Creating Competitive Advantag Published by MCGraw - Hilwin. 24. Lawrence, Anne T and James W 2011. Business and Society: Stak Ethics, Public Policy . McGr Hill: New York 25. Li, Yan and T Chuan - Hoo 2013." Busines Straty and CIO Character T Impact on Org Perf Journal of Business Research Vol.66, pp.248 - 259. 26. Mask . 2018.

T Inf of Entrepreneurial Orion on Business Straty and Perf of Mediu - Small Scale Sasirangan Industries in South Kalimantan Province. Russian Journal of Ag and Socioeconomic Sciences. pp. 208 - 216. Crossref DOI: 10.18551/rj - 02.23 27. Mahmud, Ariati Anomsari. 2011. Analisis pengaruh orientasi k , kpuan manaj dan stri bisnis dalam peningk k perusahaan (studi pada usaha k meneng di k usaha Barito semarang Jurnal semantic 28.

Man, Mand Mok Kim and W Syed Azi. 2008. "T Relationship Between Distinctive Capabilities, Innovativen Stry T and th e Perform of Small and Med Size Enter (SMEs) on Mala Manuf Sector", T Journal of American Academy of Business vol.13. 29. Mohd, W

Subhi Idr Raed A. Momani. 2013.

"Impact of Environmental D on Mark Straty Comprehensiveness and Organizational Perf
Int Journal of Business an Managem Vol.8 No.9. 30. Miles M.P., Jeff G. Covin and Michael
Heeley B. 2000. "T Relati between Environmental Dynamis and Small Firm Structure,
Strateg and Perf Journal of Mark T and Practice, Spring pp.63 - 74. 31. Nandak M. K.,
Abby Ghobadian and Nicholas O'Reg 2010.

"Business - leve Straty and Perf T Moderating Eff of Environment and Struct Managem
Decision Vol 48 No 6, Emer Group Publishing Limited, pp.907 - 939. 32. Nisj Karhi dan W
(1997), Manajemen Strik, Penerbit CV. Mandar Maju. 33. Nur, Nof 2014.
Entrepreneurship Oret Or Strateg Managem Capabilities On Business Perfance;Study At
Small And Medium Enter Printing In Kendari .

Int Journal of Business and Managem Invention. Volume 3 Issue 12 34. Parnell, John A.,
2010. "Stratic Clarity, Business Strateg and Perf Journal of Straty and Managem Vol 3, No
4, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp.304 - 324. 35. Parsian, N., Dunning T., 2009,
Developing and Validating a Quest to Measure Spiritually: A Psychometr Process, Global
Journal of Health and Science, Vol. 1, No. 1, h.2 - 1 1. 36. Peter R.D.,

1998. Entrepreneurship, Fourth Editon, McGr Hill Companies, Inc, NY . 37. Pearce II J.A.,
and Robinson Jr. R.B. 2007. Strateg Managem Formulation, Im and Contr 10 th ed. McGr
- Hill, Boston. 38. Port E.M., 2005, Competitive Straty, Collier Macmillan. Release: 1998
RJ10(82), Ocber 2 103 39. Purnama, Chamdan and Subroto W 2016.Competition
Intensity, Uncert Environmental on the use of Infation Ty and its Im on Business Perf
Small and Medium Enter International Review of Management and Mark Vol.

6(4): 984 - 992 40. Surachman, Sumawihardj 2002, Mengan Keungg Barsaing Usaha Kecil
dan Meneng Untuk Mencapai Posisi Pasar Yang Kuat dan Berkan dalam Era Global, Mak
Kuliah Kenangan dan Apresiasi, UNPAD, Bandung. 41. Sug 2008, Metode Penelitian
Bisnis, Cetaan Ke - dua Belas, Penerbit Alf Bandung 42. Storey, D.J.,

1994, Undestanding T Small Business Sector, London, Routledg Straties f Building a Hig
- Prof Business, Publishing AMACOM 43. Suci, Rahayu Puj 2009, Peningk Kinerja melalui
Or Kewirausahaan, Kemam Manajemen, dan Strati Bisnis, Jurnal Manajemen dan
Kewirausahaan. Vol.11, No.1, Maret 2009, 46 - 58 44. T J., Bessant, J. and Pavitt, K., 1998,
Managing Innovation - Int Tical, Mark and Org Change, Hohn wiley and Sons,
Chichester. 45.

Usric, Dusk and Mulej, Matj 2005. "T and Practice of manag Concepts: Slovan E T Journal

of Manement Development; ABI/ Complete, p p . 856. 46. W Peng W and Kuan, Yew W, 2011. "Supply Chain Managem Knowledg Managem Capability, and T Linkes Towards Firm Perf Business Process Managem Journal, vol 17, Num 6, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp.910 - 964. 47. X, Dong Liu Qianq and Yin Dezhi. 2008.

"Business Perf Business Straty, and Infion System Strateg Alignment: An Empirical Study on Chinese Firm T Journal of Human Resource and Adult Learning Vol.8, Num. 2. 48. Zhi, T and Jintong Tang, 2012" Entrepreneurial orientat and S perfance in China's changing environment: T moderating eff of straties". Spring Science Business Media .

INTERNET SOURCES:

<https://wacana.ub.ac.id/index.php/wacana/article/download/525/380>
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/328766353_THE_EFFECT_OF_ENVIRONMENTAL_DYNAMICS_MANAGEMENT_CAPABILITIES_AND_BUSINESS_STRATEGIES_ON_THE_PERFORMANCE_OF_SASIRANGAN_SMALL_AND_MEDIUM_INDUSTRIES_IN_SOUTH_KALIMANTAN_PROVINCE
<http://uregina.ca/~gingrich/ch10.pdf>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Joseph_Stiglitz
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330444513_Integrated_Financial_Management_Information_System_and_Supply_Chain_Effectiveness
<https://study.com/academy/lesson/what-is-an-external-environment-in-business-definition-types-factors.html>
https://www.bing.com/aclick?Id=e3ttB1onWOwB1sPwIpcQIpSTVUCUw4GKRLb0AN0dIjP1WDX7Jeryi1PEob08uHE3RmLn4gCUi6sjOsJ5mh38S9xRF_ATmfhLxiR2Man8tyEYL2ZvWHGCV3xYAet8Kz-cj_OAS2bTHLzWlhbE9xUhMwP5ppiPQ&u=aHR0cHMIM2EIMmYIMmZmcmVlbGFuY2V4cGVydC5uZXQIMmZzdGFydCUyZmhvbWUIM2Z0JTNkYmluZzE&rlid=c9737cd7450510ff54d222903bbf1af2
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/37367442_Can_Anyone_Be_The_One_Evidence_on_Mate_Selection_from_Speed_Dating
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281421680_The_Relationship_Between_Distinctive_Capabilities_Innovativeness_Strategy_Types_And_The_Performance_Of_Small_And_Medium-Size_Enterprises_SMEs_Of_Malaysian_Manufacturing_Sector
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/16065786_The_role_of_arousal_in_memory_for_conversation
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242153816_AN_ANALYSIS_OF_ISLAMIC_ETHICS_IN_SMALL_AND_MEDIUM_ENTERPRISES_SMEs
http://sdmimd.ac.in/SDMRCMS/articles/A_Casual_Nexus.pdf

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0735633117738281>

<https://keydifferences.com/difference-between-population-and-sample.html>

<https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/34704037.pdf>

<https://tr.scribd.com/doc/192680050/Complete-course-on-refrigeration>