Community Satisfaction Analysis towards Corporate Social Responsibility Program of PT Kilang Pertamina Internasional Dumai Unit

Mukhammad Fatkhullah[1], Syauqiy Ridlo Robbiy[2], Iwed Mulyani[3]

[1,2]*Department of Social Development and Welfare, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia*
[3]*Department of Communication, Relation & CSR, PT Kilang Pertamina Internasional Unit Dumai, Indonesia*
m.fatkhullah@mail.ugm.ac.id

Abstract

This study measures the Community Satisfaction Index towards the Corporate Social Responsibility Program of PT Kilang Pertamina Internasional Dumai Unit (RU II Dumai) in 2022. The unit of analysis for this study is the beneficiaries of the CSR program consisting of the Tuna Fishermen Community, Palas Jaya Cultivation Community, and the Natural Farmer Community. Researchers use guidelines from the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (PERMENPAN & RB) No. 14 of 2017 in compiling indicators to determine the value of the satisfaction index. The responses collected were then tabulated and analyzed using descriptive statistical analysis methods. The research results show that the Community Satisfaction Index for the Corporate Social Responsibility Program through 44 respondents is 3.39, or 84.68 after conversion. It can be concluded that the Community Satisfaction Index for the RU II Dumai CSR Program in 2022 is categorized as "Excellent" with an "A" grade. Based on data from the 14 processed elements, the lowest score for the element of response to input and suggestions from the public is 3.2 or 79.0 after conversion, which is in the range of 62.51-81.25 with a "B" grade. Therefore, companies need to increase responsiveness to input and suggestions from the community to develop CSR programs.

I. Introduction

The Corporate Social Responsibility Program is an initiative to show the company's concern for environmental conditions in the company's development area, including social aspects and community welfare (Samer, Rawan, & Omar, 2018). Therefore, CSR programs designed by companies are generally related to the economic empowerment of vulnerable communities (Fatkhullah, Habib, & Nisa, 2022).

RU II Dumai has the vision to become a competitive oil refinery in Southeast Asia. To realize this vision, RU II Dumai has a mission to conduct business in the field of petroleum and petrochemical processing which is managed professionally and competitively based on the 6 C Values (Clean, Competitive, Confident, Customer Focus, Commercial and Capable). These efforts aim to provide added value to shareholders, customers, workers, and the environment (PT Pertamina, 2022).

As a multinational company with a global vision, RU II Dumai aims to build harmonious and conducive business relations with stakeholders and plays a major role in increasing the Human Development Index (Mukherjee & Reed, 2004). This is done by harmonizing CSR programs with Sustainable Development Goals (Shayan, Mohabbati-Kalejahi, Alavi, & Zahed, 2022) as a standard of practice set by the United Nations to eradicate poverty (Jakunskien, 2021).

Implementation of the RU II Dumai CSR program aims to ensure that the needs of stakeholders can be met, especially the community living in the company's development area. So, the CSR program carried out by the company has a positive and indirect impact on the community. The increase in the value of the company's shares, the higher the company value, the higher it will be (Katharina, 2021). In the current economic development, manufacturing companies are required to be able to compete in the industrial world (Afiezan, 2020). The existence of the company can grow and be sustainable and the company gets a positive image from the wider community (Saleh, 2019). Apart from the Human Development Index, another benchmark often used to measure program impact is the Community Satisfaction Index (J. García-Madariaga & F. Rodríguez-Riverab, 2017).

The RU II Dumai CSR programs have been adapted to local potential. This is reflected in the planning stage involving the local community and government. This involvement aims to ensure that the implementation of CSR programs can be right on target and positively impact the community living in the company's development area. Because the CSR program has been carried out in recent years, an evaluation of the stages is necessary (Fatima & Elbanna, 2022), so that efforts to improve the community's economic welfare can run as expected (Habib, Nisa, Fatkhullah, Al Ursah, & Budita, 2022).

The word satisfaction comes from the Latin "satis," which means good enough and "facio," which means to do or make. In general, satisfaction is a person's pleasure or disappointment that arises from comparing performance or results against community expectations (Tjiptono & Chandra, 2011). The community will feel dissatisfied if the company's CSR performance is below expectations. Conversely, if performance exceeds expectations, people will feel satisfied (Kotler & Keller, 2007). This research intends to measure community satisfaction towards the CSR programs of PT Kilang Pertamina Internasional Dumai Unit (RU II Dumai) in 2022. The results of this study can be used as a reference in evaluations, thereby contributing to the improvement and development of CSR programs in general and RU II Dumai in particular.

II. Research Method

This study uses a descriptive quantitative approach. The object of the study on the Community Satisfaction Index is the beneficiary community of the company's CSR program, as seen in table 1. The data that has been collected is then presented in the form of numbers (Sugiyono, 2011), tables and is described based on a framework (Diniati, Rafikasari, Habib, & Fahmi, 2021). In this sense, data is categorized based on several predetermined indicators. The data sources in this study refer to sources where data can be obtained (Arikunto, 2011), which consist of primary data in the form of completed questionnaires and secondary data in the form of company reports. This secondary data is used to enrich and deepen data analysis (Serra, Martins, & Cunha, 2018). To obtain the intended data, researchers used field research (Creswell, 2014).

Table 1. The study Object of Community Satisfaction Analysis of RU II Dumai CSR Programs

No	Initiatives	Program Description	Benefit recipients
1	Agriculture on Peatlands	Peatland farming through planting crops; fruit processing and fish feed manufacture; development of drip irrigation systems; assistance in marketing plant products through Organic Plant Stalls (Fatkhullah, Mulyani, & Imawan, 2021).	**12 People (Alam Tani Community)**
2	Palas Jaya Aquaculture	Construction of 4 rock ponds for freshwater fish farming; development of freshwater fish farming through various pieces of training; organic fish feed production training; integration of solar panels-based aquaponic systems; crystal ice innovation and product diversification; and socialization of cultivation villages and cooperatives (Mulyani, Raditya, & Fatkhullah, 2021).	**17 People (Palas Jaya Community)**
3	**Tuna Fisherman Community**	**Rejuvenation and procurement of fishing equipment; integration of solar panel-based fish finder systems; development of quail cultivation; development of magot cultivation demonstration plots as alternative fish feed; and socialization of cultivation villages and cooperatives (Sitorus, Fatkhullah, & Julastri, 2022).**	**15 people (Tuna Fishermen Community)**

Source: (PT Kilang Pertamina Internasional Unit II Dumai, 2022)

The population in this study is the beneficiary community of RU II Dumai's CSR programs. The sampling technique in this research is purposive sampling. This technique performs sampling by determining specific criteria (Sugiyono, 2008). Purposive sampling, also known as an assessment or expert sample, is a non-probability sample (Fauzy, 2019).

Several instruments are generally used in the analysis of community satisfaction. The instrument in this study refers to the satisfaction survey regulated by the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (PERMENPAN & RB) No. 14 in 2017, which contains 9 elements as assessment indicators, including (1) requirements; (2) system; mechanisms and procedures; (3) turnaround time; (4) fees/tariffs; (5) product and service specifications; (6) executing competency; (7) executor's behavior; (8) handling complaints, suggestions and input; and (9) facilities and infrastructure.

However, the 9 assessment indicators listed in PERMENPAN & RB have yet to be able to answer the problems in this study. This is because the 9 elements only include values within the scope of public service. These elements were then developed into 14 indicators to suit the research objectives to measure community satisfaction towards the RU II Dumai CSR

program, which consists of (1) program suitability with community needs; (2) administrative requirements to access CSR funds; (3) community engagement in planning process; (4) access and clarity of information related to CSR program; (5) programs contribution in solving community's problems; (6) suitability of implementation with the initial plan; (7) the accuracy of implementation according to the schedule; (8) the amount of program funding; (9) the capacity of the facilitator in assisting; (10) the company's response to suggestions and input from the community; (11) facilities provided through the program; (12) outreach to vulnerable groups; (13) the impact of the program on community sustainability; and (14) the community's ability to be independent in the future.

This study's development of assessment indicators aims to obtain more comprehensive data. In addition, these indicators have been adapted to the framework of the organizational stages, which includes the planning (input), implementation (process), and results (output) stages (Hendrawan & Purnaningsih, 2009). In the results (output) section, one descriptive question is added to capture community aspirations for future CSR program development.

Questionnaires filled in by respondents are then tabulated and analyzed using descriptive statistical methods. The analysis aims to provide an overall picture of community satisfaction with the RU II Dumai CSR program. Data processing uses a model according to PERMENPAN & RB guidelines. The value of the Community Satisfaction Index (SMI) is determined by comparing the average results of each indicator with the weighting value according to the following formula:

$$X \ average \ value = \frac{value \ of \ indicator}{number \ of \ indicator} = \frac{1}{14} = 0,071$$

Meanwhile, to obtain the SMI value, the average value approach is used with the following formula:

$$SMI = \sum (average \ value \ X \ 0.071)$$

To get an SMI value that ranges from 25–100, the SMI that has been calculated is then multiplied by the base value of 25 so that it can be categorized, as shown in Table 2.

Table 1. SMI interval value, SMI conversion interval, CSR grade, CSR performance Categorizations

SMI Interval Value	SMI Conversion	Grade	Performance
1,00 – 1,75	25 – 43,75	D	Bad
1,76 – 2,50	43,76 – 62,50	C	Poor
2,51 – 3,25	62,51 – 81,25	B	Good
3,26 – 4,00	81,26 – 100,00	A	Excellent

Source: PERMENPAN & RB (2017)

Based on table 2, the best value ranges from 81.26 to 100.00 with an "A" grade and "Excellent" assessment criteria, while a "B" quality value ranges from 62.5 to 81.25 with "Good" assessment criteria. The "C" quality value ranges from 42.76 to 62.50 with the "Poor" assessment criteria, while the "D" quality value ranges from 25 to 43.75 with the "Bad" assessment criteria.

III. Discussion

3.1 Overview and Characteristics of Respondents

Respondents, totaling 44 people, have different backgrounds. It is necessary to know the characteristics of the respondents to provide an overview of the survey conducted, as shown in Table 3.

Table 2. Characteristics of Respondents

No	Characteristics	Criteria	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Gender	Male	40	90,91
		Female	4	9,09
2	Age	≤ 30 y.o	3	6,82
		31 – 40 y.o	21	47,73
		41 – 49 y.o	10	22,73
		≥ 50 y.o	10	22,73
3	Education Level	Elementary School	14	31,82
		Junior High School	11	25,00
		Senior High School	18	40,91
		Universities	1	2,27
4	Occupation	Farmer	9	20,45
		Fisherman	15	34,09
		Labourer	13	29,55
		Employee	4	9,09
		Others	3	6,82

Source: Questionnaire number 3-6

Based on gender, the majority of respondents were male, with a ratio of 9:1. In terms of age, the 31-40 years old age range occupied the highest percentage (47.73%) after the 41-49 years old age range and more than or equal to 50 years old age range (22.73%), and less than or equal to 30 years old age range (6.82%). In terms of education, the majority of respondents were senior high school graduates or equivalent (40.91%), followed by elementary school graduates (31.82%) and junior high school graduates (23.00%), where the smallest number was in the category of undergraduate education level (2, 27%). In terms of profession, the respondents consist of fishermen (34.09%), laborers (29.55%), farmers (20.45%), as well as self-employed and other occupations with a percentage of 9.09% and 6.62%, respectively. From this general description, the beneficiary of the RU II Dumai CSR program is the head of the family, on which all family members depend on him and are in the productive age range. Nevertheless, the beneficiary group is a group with relatively low education, coming from low-income professions such as fishermen (Fatkhullah, Widasari, & Habib, 2022), laborers and farmers. By assisting the head of the family, RU II Dumai helps maintain the viability of a family system (Supriyanto, Razaq, Purwatiningtyas, & Ariyanto, 2022), especially for families who come from vulnerable and marginalized professions (Permatasari & Sugiharti, 2016).

3.2 Community Satisfaction towards the CSR Program Planning Stage

Community satisfaction towards the RU II Dumai CSR program planning stage is measured through four indicators: (1) program suitability with community needs; (2) administrative requirements to access CSR funds; (3) community involvement in the planning process; and (4) information clarity.

Table 3. Program Suitability with Community Needs

No	Responses	Score	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very suitable	4	17	39
2	Quite suitable	3	23	52
3	Unsuitable	2	4	9
4	Very unsuitable	1	0	0
	Total		**44**	**100**

Source: Questionnaire number 7

Based on the research, the community's responses regarding the program's suitability with community needs are shown in table 4. At least 52% of respondents considered that the RU II Dumai CSR program was entirely in line with community needs. These results can be achieved because the company designed a program based on the social mapping. As we know, social mapping can help companies to map community needs (El-Said, Aziz, Mirzaei, & Smith, 2022). Analysis of this indicator shows that the average value is 3.3, with a conversion value of 82.4.

Table 4. Requirements for accessing CSR funds

No	Responses	Score	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very easy	4	15	34
2	Easy	3	29	66
3	Difficult	2	0	0
4	Very difficult	1	0	0
Total			**44**	**100**

Source: Questionnaire number 8

The same average value was found in community responses regarding the requirements for accessing CSR funds, as shown in Table 5. Most respondents (66%) considered that the requirements for accessing RU II Dumai CSR funds were relatively easy to fulfill. Analysis of this indicator shows a conversion value of 83.5.

Table 5. Community Engagement in the Planning Process

No	Responses	Score	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very satisfied	4	18	41
2	Satisfied	3	25	57
3	Dissatisfied	2	1	2
4	Very dissatisfied	1	0	0
Total			**44**	**100**

Source: Questionnaire number 9

The community's response to community involvement in the CSR program planning process is shown in table 6. Most respondents (98%) considered that the community had been involved in the CSR program planning stage of RU II Dumai. Involving the community in the CSR program planning process is essential to ensure the community remains engaged even when the company is no longer involved (Adema, Muluka, & Oteki, 2016). Analysis of this indicator shows an average value of 3.4 with a conversion value of 84.7.

Table 6. Access and Clarity of Information Related to the CSR Program

No	Responses	Score	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very satisfied	4	20	45
2	Satisfied	3	21	48
3	Dissatisfied	2	3	7
4	Very dissatisfied	1	0	0
Total			**44**	**100**

Source: Questionnaire number 10

For information clarity, the community's responses are shown in table 7. The majority of respondents (64%) considered that the information submitted by the company regarding CSR programs was clear enough and relatively easy to access. Analysis of this indicator shows that the average value is 3.4, with a conversion value of 84.7.

3.3 Community Satisfaction towards the Implementation Stage of the CSR Program

Community satisfaction towards the implementation stage of the RU II Dumai CSR program is measured through seven indicators: (1) the program's contribution to solving community problems; (2) the suitability of implementation with the initial plan; (3) the timeliness of program implementation; (4) the amount of program funding; (5) the capacity of the facilitator in assisting; (6) the company's response to suggestions and input from the community; and (7) facilities or infrastructure provided to support program implementation.

Table 7. The Program's Contribution to Solving Community Problems

No	Responses	Score	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very significant	4	21	48
2	Significant	3	20	45
3	Insignificant	2	3	7
4	Very insignificant	1	0	0
Total			**44**	**100**

Source: Questionnaire number 11

Based on the research, the community's responses to whether the program can solve societal problems are shown in table 8. The majority of respondents (93%) answered that the RU II Dumai CSR program was able to solve community social problems. These results can be achieved because the company designed a program based on the social mapping. As we know, social mapping can help companies map various community problems so that the designed CSR program can simultaneously solve these problems (El-Said, Aziz, Mirzaei, & Smith, 2022). Analysis of this indicator shows that the average value is 3.4, with a conversion value of 85.2.

Table 8. The Program's Suitability of Implementation with the Initial Plan

No	Responses	Score	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very suitable	4	21	48
2	Quite suitable	3	22	50
3	Unsuitable	2	1	2
4	Very unsuitable	1	0	0
Total			**44**	**100**

Source: Questionnaire number 12

In the context of the suitability of the implementation with the initial design, the community's responses are shown in table 9. Most respondents (98%) considered implementing Dumai's CSR RU II under the initial design. Analysis of this indicator shows that the average value is 3.5, with a conversion value of 86.4.

Table 9. The accuracy of implementation according to the schedule

No	Responses	Score	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very accurate	4	22	50
2	Accurate	3	21	48
3	Inaccurate	2	1	2
4	Very inaccurate	1	0	0
Total			44	100

Source: Questionnaire number 13

For the timeliness of implementation based on the schedule, the community's responses are shown in table 10. Half of all respondents considered that RU II Dumai was very compliant with the schedule in carrying out the CSR program. Analysis of this indicator shows that the average value is 3.5, with a conversion value of 86.9.

Table 10. The Amount of Program Funding

No	Responses	Score	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very satisfied	4	22	50
2	Satisfied	3	21	48
3	Dissatisfied	2	1	2
4	Very dissatisfied	1	0	0
Total			44	100

Source: Questionnaire number 14

In terms of funding, the community's response is shown in table 11. Most respondents (95%) were at least satisfied with the amount of funding provided by RU II Dumai as one of the CSR efforts. Analysis of this indicator shows that the average value is 3.5, with a conversion value of 86.9.

Table 11. The Capacity of the Facilitator to Assist

No	Responses	Score	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very capable	4	24	55
2	Capable	3	20	45
3	Incapable	2	0	0
4	Very incapable	1	0	0
Total			44	100

Source: Questionnaire number 15

As for the ability of the facilitator to assist the community, the community's responses are shown in table 12. Overall, there were no significant complaints against the facilitator in assisting the community. This can be seen from the absence of a community that chose a negative response. In community development, the role of the facilitator is to eliminate various obstacles in program implementation (Díaz-Puente, Gallego, Vidueira, & Fernández, 2014). Therefore, the facilitator is required to have good communication and problem-solving

skills. Analysis of this indicator results in an average value of 3.5 with a conversion value of 88.6.

Table 12. The Company's Response to Suggestions and Input from the Community

No	Responses	Score	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very satisfied	4	16	**36**
2	Satisfied	3	20	**45**
3	Dissatisfied	2	7	**16**
4	Very dissatisfied	1	1	**2**
Total			**44**	**100**

Source: Questionnaire number 16

On the other hand, some respondents were dissatisfied with the company's response to input and suggestions, as shown in Table 13. Nevertheless, most of the respondents considered the attitude of the company as a whole entirely satisfactory. Analysis of this indicator shows that the average value is 3.2, with a conversion value of 79.

Table 13. Facilities or Infrastructure Provided to Support Program Implementation

No	Responses	Score	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very satisfied	4	21	**48**
2	Satisfied	3	23	**52**
3	Dissatisfied	2	0	**0**
4	Very dissatisfied	1	0	**0**
Total			**44**	**100**

Source: Questionnaire number 17

In terms of the facilities and infrastructure provided, the community's responses are shown in table 14. So far, there has been no negative response regarding the facilities and infrastructure provided by the company to support the implementation of CSR programs. The majority of respondents (52%) were satisfied with the facilities and infrastructure provided by the company. Although empowerment programs aim to increase community capacity, infrastructure development can also impact community welfare (Asfar, Zauhar, Rochmah, & Hermawan, 2021). Analysis of this indicator shows that the average value is 3.5, with a conversion value of 86.9.

3.4 Community Satisfaction towards CSR Program Results

Community satisfaction through program results is measured through three indicators: (1) outreach to vulnerable groups, (2) the impact of the program on community sustainability, and (3) the community's ability to be independent in the future.

Table 14. Outreach to Vulnerable Groups

No	Responses	Score	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very accurate	4	21	**48**
2	Accurate	3	21	**48**
3	Inaccurate	2	2	**4**
4	Very inaccurate	1	0	**0**
Total			**44**	**100**

Source: Questionnaire number 18

Based on the research, the community's responses to whether the program can reach vulnerable groups are shown in table 15. The majority of respondents (96%) gave positive answers. This means that the RU II Dumai CSR program has been on target in the context of the beneficiary profile. Programs that are not on target, whether from the government or companies, can trigger social jealousy or even latent conflict in the community (F. & Nulhaqim, 2021). Analysis of this indicator shows that the average value is 3.4, with a conversion value of 85.8.

Table 15. The Impact of the Program on Community Sustainability

No	Responses	Score	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very satisfied	4	21	48
2	Satisfied	3	20	45
3	Dissatisfied	2	0	0
4	Very dissatisfied	1	3	7
Total			**44**	**100**

Source: Questionnaire number 19

Meanwhile, community responses regarding the program's impact on sustainability are shown in table 16. Most respondents (48%) considered that the RU II Dumai CSR program had a major impact on sustainability. A good CSR program should impact the sustainability of the community, the environment, and the company's business (Abad-Segura, Cortés-García, & Belmonte-Ureña, 2019). Analysis of this indicator shows that the average value is 3.3, with a conversion value of 83.5.

Table 16. The Community's Ability to be Independent in the Future

No	Responses	Score	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very capable	4	26	59
2	Capable	3	15	34
3	Incapable	2	3	7
4	Very incapable	1	0	0
Total			**44**	**100**

Source: Questionnaire number 20

In the end, the CSR program is expected to empower the community (W, Kunyanti, & Mujiono, 2021). Community responses to the scenario that, in the future, the company will no longer provide financial support to them are shown in table 17. Most respondents (59%) are aware of this fact and are very optimistic about being independent without financial support from the company. Analysis of this indicator shows that the average value is 3.1, with a conversion value of 88.1.

3.5 Community Satisfaction Index (SMI) towards the RU II Dumai CSR Programs

The questionnaire distributed to 44 respondents contained 15 questions consisting of 14 questions with scaled answers and 1 descriptive question. Table 18 shows the results of statistical tests for each indicator which can be seen through the average value, X average value, conversion value, grade, and the company's CSR Performance.

Table 17. Community Satisfaction Index Measurement

	No	Indicators	Av. Value	X Av. Value (0,071)	Conversion Value	Grade	Performance
Planning	Q1	Program suitability with community needs	3,3	0,23	82,4	A	Excellent
	Q2	Administrative requirements to access CSR funds	3,3	0,24	83,5	A	Excellent
	Q3	Community engagement in the planning process	3,4	0,24	84,7	A	Excellent
	Q4	Access and clarity of information related to the CSR program	3,4	0,24	84,7	A	Excellent
Implementation	Q5	Program's contribution to solving community's problems	3,4	0,24	85,2	A	Excellent
	Q6	Suitability of implementation with the initial plan	3,5	0,25	86,4	A	Excellent
	Q7	The accuracy of implementation according to the schedule	3,5	0,25	86,9	A	Excellent
	Q8	The amount of program funding.	3,5	0,25	86,9	A	Excellent
	Q9	the capacity of the facilitator to assist the community	3,5	0,25	88,6	A	Excellent
	Q10	The company's response to suggestions and input from the community	3,2	0,22	79,0	B	Good
	Q11	Facilities provided through the program	3,5	0,25	86,9	A	Excellent
Results	Q12	Outreach to vulnerable groups	3,4	0,24	85,8	A	Excellent
	P13	The impact of the program on community sustainability	3,3	0,24	83,5	A	Excellent
	P14	The community's ability to be independent in the future	3,5	0,25	88,1	A	Excellent

Source: Field data processing (2022)

Based on table 18, thirteen indicators show excellent performance. Only the 10th indicator, regarding the company's response to suggestions and input from the community, shows good performance with a "B" grade. Even though it is still in a relatively positive grade, as a reference in conducting evaluations, companies need to increase their responsiveness to community input and suggestions in carrying out their CSR programs.

To measure the results of the Community Satisfaction Index towards the CSR program, the average value for each indicator is accumulated as follows:

$$SMI = \sum (average \text{ } value \text{ } X \text{ } 0.071)$$

$$SMI = 0{,}23 + 0{,}24 + 0{,}24 + 0{,}24 + 0{,}24 + 0{,}25 + 0{,}25 + 0{,}25 + 0{,}25 + 0{,}22 + 0{,}25$$
$$+ 0{,}24 + 0{,}24 + 0{,}25$$
$$SMI = 3{,}39$$

As the only open question in the questionnaire, the 15th question is aimed at capturing community aspirations in efforts to develop or improve CSR programs. Thus, the implementation of the CSR program is executed using a bottom-up method, which is developed by the community to achieve certain goals within the community (Carrera, 2022).

Table 18. Community Suggestions and Recommendations for the RU II Dumai CSR Program

NO	Community suggestions and recommendations	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Conduct more training	9	**20,5**
2	Provision of equipment to support community empowerment program	3	**6,8**
3	Product marketing assistance	18	**40,9**
4	Conduct more frequent monitoring of the community	12	**27,3**
5	**Others**	**2**	**4,5**

Source: Questionnaire number 21

Table 19 shows that 40.9% of respondents need marketing assistance to develop their businesses. This results from company intervention, which needs to pay more attention to marketing aspects. MSMEs can only take place if the problems in marketing can be solved (Bakhri & Futiah, 2020). On the other hand, 27.3% of respondents hope companies can monitor the community more often to show their achievements. Thus, companies can understand what types of training they need for business development (20.3%), procurement of supporting equipment (6.8%), and other types of supporting assistance (4.5%).

IV. Conclusion

Through 14 questions given to 44 research samples which include the Tuna Fisherman Community, Palas Jaya Community, and Alam Tani Community, it can be concluded that:
1. The Community Satisfaction Index (SMI) towards the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Program implemented by PT Kilang Pertamina Internasional Dumai Unit (RU II Dumai) as a whole is 3.39, with a conversion value of 84.68. Based on these values, the CSR performance of RU II Dumai is "Excellent" with an "A" grade. From the three sample groups consisting of the Tuna Fisherman Community, Palas Jaya Community, and Alam Tani Community, each received an SMI score of 86.15, 82.80, and 85.50, with an "Excellent" performance score and an "A" grade.
2. Analysis of 13 indicators shows "excellent" performance. Only the 10th indicator, regarding the company's response to suggestions and input from the community, shows an SMI value of 3.2 or 79 after conversion. According to this indicator, RU II Dumai CSR performance is "good" with a "B" grade. Even though it is still in a relatively positive grade, as a reference in conducting evaluations, companies need to increase their responsiveness to community input and suggestions in carrying out their CSR programs.

References

Abad-Segura, E., Cortés-García, F. J., & Belmonte-Ureña, L. J. (2019). The Sustainable Approach to Corporate Social Responsibility: A Global Analysis and Future Trends. *Sustainability, 11*(5382). doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/su11195382

Adema, C. L., Muluka, K. O., & Oteki, E. B. (2016). Community Participation in Corporate Social Responsibility Projects: The Case of Mumias Sugar Company, Kenya. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM), 18*(8), 70-86. doi: https://doi.org/10.9790/487X-1808017086

Afiezan, A., et.al. (2020). The Effect of Free Cash Flow, Company Size, Profitability and Liquidity on Debt Policy for Manufacturing Companies Listed on IDX in 2016-2019 Periods. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal) Vol 3 (4): 4005-4018.

Arikunto, S. (2011). *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik.* Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Asfar, A., Zauhar, S., Rochmah, S., & Hermawan, H. (2021). The Infrastructure Development Compatibility to Enhance Community Welfare. *Journal of Public Administration Studies, 6*(1), 23-27. doi: https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.jpas.2021.006.01.4

Bakhri, S., & Futiah, V. (2020). Pendampingan dan Pengembangan Manajemen Pemasaran Produk UMKM Melalui Teknologi Digital di Masa Pandemi Covid-19. *Jurnal Loyalitas Sosial, 2*(2), 59-70. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.32493/JLS.v2i2.p59-70

Carrera, L. (2022). Corporate social responsibility. A strategy for social and territorial sustainability. *International Journal of Corporate Social Responsibility, 7*(7). doi: https://doi.org/10.1186/s40991-022-00074-0

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches.* California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Díaz-Puente, J. M., Gallego, F. J., Vidueira, P., & Fernández, M. J. (2014). Facilitation in Community Development. Twenty-Five Years of Experience in Rural Territories in Cuenca, Spain. *European Planning Studies, 22*(11), 2231-2247. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2013.830695

Diniati, B. T., Rafikasari, E. F., Habib, M. A., & Fahmi, M. F. (2021). *Metode Penelitian Sosial, Ekonomi, dan Bisnis (Pendekatan Kualitatif dan Kuantitatif).* Tulungagung: Biru Atma Jaya.

El-Said, O., Aziz, H., Mirzaei, M., & Smith, M. (2022). Mapping corporate social responsibility practices at the international level: systematic review and content analysis approach. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal, 13*(4), 803-825. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/SAMPJ-08-2021-0332

F., K. F., & Nulhaqim, S. A. (2021). Analisis Konflik Distribusi Bantuan Sosial Covid-19 dan Strategi Penyelesaian Konflik di Kota Bandung. *Jurnal Kolaborasi Resolusi Konflik, 3*(1), 65-74. doi: https://doi.org/10.24198/jkrk.v3i1.31974

Fatima, T., & Elbanna, S. (2022). Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Implementation: A Review and a Research Agenda Towards an Integrative Framework. *J Bus Ethics*. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-022-05047-8

Fatkhullah, M., Habib, M. A., & Nisa, K. K. (2022). Identifikasi dan Manajemen Risiko untuk Mereduksi Kerentanan Pada Masyarakat. *Ekonomi, Keuangan, Investasi dan Syariah (Ekuitas), 3*(4), 856-867. Retrieved from https://ejurnal.seminar-id.com/index.php/ekuitas/article/view/1529

Fatkhullah, M., Mulyani, I., & Imawan, B. (2021). Strategi Pengembangan Masyarakat Petani Lahan Gambut melalui Program Tanggung Jawab Sosial Perusahaan: Analisis Pendekatan Penghidupan Berkelanjutan. *Journal of Social Development Studies, 2*(2), 15-29. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.22146/jsds.2186

Fatkhullah, M., Widasari, F. D., & Habib, M. A. (2022). Konsumerisme Masyarakat Nelayan: Studi pada Komunitas Istri Nelayan Pulau Messah, Nusa Tenggara Timur. *MADANI Jurnal Politik dan Sosial Kemasyarakatan, 14*(3), 453-471. Retrieved from http://e-jurnal.unisda.ac.id/index.php/MADANI/article/view/3726

Fauzy, A. (2019). *Metode Sampling.* Banten: Universitas Terbuka.

Habib, M. A., Nisa, K. K., Fatkhullah, M., Al Ursah, C. R., & Budita, A. K. (2022). *SOSIOLOGI EKONOMI: Kajian Teoretis dan Contoh Penerapan.* Tulungagung: Akademia Pustaka.

Hendrawan, M. F., & Purnaningsih, N. (2009). Evaluasi Program Jakarta Green and Clean Sebagai Implementasi CSR PT. Unilever Evaluasi Program Jakarta Green and Clean Sebagai Implementasi CSR PT. Unilever. *Jurnal Penyuluhan, 5*(2). doi: https://doi.org/10.25015/penyuluhan.v5i2.11417

J. García-Madariaga, & F. Rodríguez-Riverab. (2017). Corporate social responsibility, customer satisfaction, corporate reputation, and firms' market value: Evidence from the automobile industry. *Spanish Journal of Marketing - ESIC, 21*(1), 39-53. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sjme.2017.05.003

Jakunskien, E. (2021). Assessment of the Impact of Social Responsibility on Poverty. *Sustainability, 13*(9395). doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/su13169395

Katharina, N., et.al. (2021). Influence Capital Structure, Liquidity, Size the Company, Debt Policy and Profitability towards Corporate Value on Property Company, Real Estate and Building Construction Listed on the Stock Exchange Indonesia Period 2016-2019. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal) Vol 4 (2): 2241-2256.

Kementerian Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara dan Reformasi Birokrasi. (2017, May 9). *Pedoman Penyusunan Survei Kepuasan Masyarakat Unit Penyelenggara Pelayanan Publik.* Retrieved from Database Peraturan Republik Indonesia: https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Home/Details/132600/permen-pan-rb-no-14-tahun-2017

Kotler, P., & Keller. (2007). *Manajemen Pemasaran, Jilid I, Edisi Kedua belas.* Jakarta: PT. Indeks.

Mukherjee, A., & Reed, D. (2004). *Corporate Social Responsibility and Human Development: Towards a New Agenda and Beyond.* International Secretariat for Human Development and Democratic Governance.

Mulyani, I., Raditya, L., & Fatkhullah, M. (2021). Indeks Kepuasan Masyarakat terhadap Program Tanggung Jawab Sosial dan Lingkungan PT Kilang Pertamina Internasional Refinery Unit II Dumai. *Jess: Jurnal Education Social Science, 1*(1), 114-125. doi: https://doi.org/10.21274/jess.v1i1.5362

Permatasari, S. I., & Sugiharti, L. (2016). The Impact of Indonesian Migrant Workers' Remittances on The Distribution of Household Income: Analysis of The Socio-Economic Balance System In 2008. *JIET (Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi Terapan), 1*(2), 116-128. doi: https://doi.org/10.20473/jiet.v1i2.3299

PT Kilang Pertamina Internasional Unit II Dumai. (2022). *Laporan Implementasi Program TJSL.* Dumai: PT Kilang Pertamina Internasional Unit II Dumai.

PT Pertamina. (2022, December 15). *Refinery Unit II Dumai.* Retrieved from PT Pertamina (Persero): https://www.pertamina.com/id/refinery-unit-ii-dumai

Saleh, A., Dalimunthe, A.H., and Lubis, F.H. (2019). Development of Banking CSR Model for Community Empowerment Slum Area in Medan City. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal) Vol 2 (3): 39-50.

Samer, A., Rawan, M., & Omar, L. (2018). The Role of Corporate Social Responsibility in Local the Role of Corporate Social Responsibility in Local Ahli Bank. *International*

Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 8(5), 197–212. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v8-i5/4095

Serra, F. A., Martins, F. S., & Cunha, J. A. (2018). Secondary Data in Research – Uses and Opportunities. *Revista Ibero Americana de Estratégia, 17*(4), 1-4. doi: https://doi.org/10.5585/%20ijsm.v17i4.2723

Shayan, N. F., Mohabbati-Kalejahi, N., Alavi, S., & Zahed, M. A. (2022). Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) as a Framework for Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). *Sustainability, 14*(1222). doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031222

Sitorus, S. H., Fatkhullah, M., & Julastri, R. (2022). Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Nelayan; Peran Dan Kontribusi Dinas Perikanan Dan Kelautan Kabupaten Rokan Hilir. *Jurnal Masyarakat Madani, 7*(1).

Sugiyono. (2008). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D.* Bandung: ALFABETA.

Sugiyono. (2011). *Metode Penelitian KOMBINASI (Mixed Methods).* Bandung: ALFABETA.

Supriyanto, A., Razaq, J. A., Purwatiningtyas, & Ariyanto, A. (2022). Keputusan Pemberian Bantuan Sosial Program Keluarga Harapan Menggunakan Metode AHP dan SAW. *Matrik: Jurnal Manajemen, Teknik Informatika, dan Rekayasa Komputer, 21*(3), 639-652. doi: https://doi.org/10.30812/matrik.v21i3.1806

Tjiptono, F., & Chandra, G. (2011). *Service, Quality and Satisfaction.* Yogyakarta: ANDI.

W, R. W., Kunyanti, S. A., & Mujiono, M. (2021). Community Empowerment-based Corporate Social Responsibility Program in Panglima Raja Village. *International Journal on Social Science, Economics and Art, 11*(1), 12-19. doi: https://doi.org/10.35335/ijosea.v10i1.2