

CONTENTS

AUTHORIZATION	ii
DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF FIGURES	xii
ABSTRACT	xiii
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Research Background	1
1.1.1. Indonesia's Mining Industry: Growth and Saturation	2
1.1.2. Global Demand for Indonesian Mineral and Coal Commodities	5
1.1.3. The Role of Geotechnical Engineering in Mining Safety and Productivity	6
1.1.4. Global Benchmark: Geotechnical Laboratories as Independent Businesses	8
1.1.5. Regulatory Pressure and Technical Demands	10
1.1.6. Gaps in Commercial Geotechnical Laboratory Availability	10
1.1.7. PT Studio Mineral Batubara: Geotechnical Expertise in Mining Consultancy	11
1.1.8. Strategic Purpose of the Spin-Off	12
1.2. Problem Formulation	14
1.3. Research Question	16
1.4. Research Objectives	17
1.5. Research Benefits	18
1.5.1. Practical Benefits	19
1.5.2. Academic Benefits	20
1.6. Data Analysis	21
1.7. Writing Systematics	23
1.7.1. Chapter I: Introduction	24

1.7.2.	Chapter II: Literature Review	24
1.7.3.	Chapter III: Research Methodology	24
1.7.4.	Chapter IV: Results and Discussion.....	25
1.7.5.	Chapter V: Conclusion.....	25
CHAPTER II	LITERATURE REVIEW	26
2.1.	Strategy	26
2.2.	Corporate Strategy	27
2.3.	Diversification Strategy	29
2.3.1.	Types and Motives of Diversification.....	29
2.3.2.	Diversification and Performance.....	30
2.3.3.	Diversification in the Indonesian Context.....	31
2.4.	Corporate Restructuring: Spin-off.....	31
2.4.1.	Definition and Rationale of Spin-offs	32
2.4.2.	Motivations for Spin-offs.....	32
2.4.3.	Typologies and Incubation Models.....	33
2.4.4.	Spin-offs in Emerging Economies	34
2.4.5.	Relevance to PT Studio Mineral Batubara.....	34
2.5.	Strategic Value Creation for Standalone Business Units.....	35
2.6.	Industry Attractiveness and Competitive Position (GE–McKinsey)	40
2.6.1.	GE–McKinsey Nine-Cell Matrix	41
2.6.2.	Indicators of Industry Attractiveness	42
2.6.3.	Indicators of Business Strength.....	44
2.7.	Multi-Criteria Strategic Assessment	46
2.8.	Parenting Advantage & Parenting Fit	48
2.8.1.	The Bottom-Up View of the Corporation	48
2.8.2.	Value Destruction and the Risks of Misfit.....	49
2.8.3.	Parenting Fit and the Basis of Corporate Contribution.....	49
2.8.4.	Parenting Advantage as a Corporate-Level Objective	50
2.8.5.	The Ashridge Parenting Matrix.....	50
2.8.6.	Implications for the Geotechnical Laboratory Spin-off.....	52
2.9.	Conceptual Framework of the Study.....	52

2.10. Review of Previous Studies	53
2.11. Summary of Theoretical Frameworks.....	55
CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHOD AND COMPANY PROFILE.....	59
3.1. Research Design.....	59
3.2. Data Collection Method	63
3.2.1. Primary Qualitative Evidence	64
3.2.2. Secondary Documentary Evidence	65
3.2.3. Sampling, Access, and Ethics	65
3.2.4. Sequencing and Integration of Methods	66
3.2.5. Quality Safeguards	66
3.2.6. Ethical Considerations	67
3.3. Research Instrument Design	68
3.3.1. Semi-Structured Interview Guide and Focus Group Protocol	68
3.3.2. Document Review Worksheet and Factor-Rating Questionnaire ...	69
3.3.3. DCF Assumption Template	69
3.3.4. Construct Operationalization	70
3.3.5. Quality Safeguards in Instrument Design	71
3.3.6. Administration and Ethical Procedures.....	71
3.3.7. Expected Outputs	72
3.4. Data Analysis Method.....	72
3.4.1. Qualitative Strand: Coding and Triangulation	73
3.4.2. Strategic Scoring of Internal and External Factors	74
3.4.3. IFE/EFE Scoring	75
3.4.4. GE–McKinsey Portfolio Positioning	75
3.4.5. DCF Valuation	76
3.4.6. Sensitivity and Scenario Analysis.....	79
3.1.1. Integration and Audit Trail.....	80
3.5. Company Profile	81
3.5.1. Mission Vision And Values of PT Studio Mineral Batubara.....	81
3.5.2. Company Structures and Business Model	83
3.5.3. Organizational Structure	83

3.5.4. Business Model	85
CHAPTER IV RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	89
4.1. Overview of Data and Analytical Flow	89
4.2. Qualitative Analysis of the Spin-Off Interviews and Questionnaire Data .	91
4.2.1. Data Familiarization and Coding Approach	91
4.2.2. Strategic Rationale for the Spin-Off	94
4.2.3. Organizational and Market Readiness	98
4.2.4. Perceived Risks and Challenges.....	104
4.2.5. Stakeholder Expectations for the New Lab.....	110
4.2.6. Conclusion	115
4.3. Translating Qualitative Insights into Strategic Evaluation Criteria	119
4.4. Quantitative Strategic Positioning.....	122
4.4.1. Internal Factor Evaluation (IFE)	122
4.4.2. External Factor Evaluation (EFE)	126
4.5. Financial Feasibility Analysis: Inputs, Assumptions, and Results	134
4.5.1. Structure and Logic of the Financial Model	134
4.5.2. Revenue Inputs and Growth Assumptions.....	135
4.5.3. Operating Cost Assumptions	136
4.5.4. Capital Expenditure and Depreciation Assumptions	137
4.5.5. Discount Rate and Cost of Capital	138
4.5.6. Cash Flow Results and Investment Indicators	140
4.5.7. Interpretation of Financial Outcomes.....	141
4.5.8. Sensitivity Analysis.....	142
4.6. External Stakeholder Perspectives and Industry-Based Competitive Assessment.....	144
4.6.1. Perceived Service Value and Market Readiness.....	144
4.6.2. Independent Credibility and Professional Image	146
4.6.3. Perceived Risks and Transition Concerns.....	147
4.6.4. Expectations for Capability Enhancement and Differentiation	147
4.6.5. Synthesis: External Validation of Competitive Position.....	148
4.7. GE–McKinsey Matrix Positioning.....	149

4.7.1.	Interpretation of Strategic Position	150
4.7.2.	Strategic Implications for the Spin-Off Decision.....	151
4.8.	Parenting Advantage and Corporate Fit Assessment.....	152
4.8.1.	Evidence of Parenting Value Creation.....	153
4.8.2.	Emerging Parenting Misfit and Strategic Tensions	154
4.8.3.	Interpretation of Ashridge Parenting Matrix Positioning	156
4.8.4.	Strategic Implication: Heartland Shift and Spin-Off Logic	159
4.9.	Summary of Triangulated Findings	160
CHAPTER V CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION		163
5.1.	Conclusion	163
5.1.1.	Internal Capability and Value Creation Readiness of the Geotechnical Laboratory (RQ1).....	163
5.1.2.	Competitive Position Relative to Industry Opportunities and Risks (RQ2)	164
5.1.3.	Strategic Viability of the Spin-Off Relative to Alternative Organizational Options (RQ3)	166
5.2.	Strategic Recommendations.....	167
REFERENCES.....		169