

| | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|---------|
| | | | students and lecturers | |
| Reputation (η^2) | Good public perception toward a company, or not only perception viewed globally toward various issues as openness, quality and others, which can concluded as the perception based on company's actions. | Emotional Appeal (Y6) | The level of admiration and proudness of the society | Ordinal |
| | | | The level of attractiveness / interest of the society | Ordinal |
| | | Product and Service (Y7) | The level of attraction of education program | Ordinal |
| | | | The level of attractiveness of the services' provided | Ordinal |
| | | | The level of sustainability of Bachelor of Management Study Program | Ordinal |
| | | Vision and Leadership (Y9) | The level of accuracy in formulating vision | Ordinal |
| | | | The level of accuracy in implementing leadership | Ordinal |
| | | Workplace Environment (Y10) | The level of compatibility with the workplace environment | Ordinal |
| | | Social responsibility (Y11) | The level of activeness in devoting to the society | Ordinal |
| | | | The level of pro-activeness in terms of social responsibility in the | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---------|--|
| | | | society | |
|--|--|--|---------|--|

6b. Source and Types of Data / Information

Source of data / information in this research is based on the types of data needed. In this case, the data is classified into two, such as primary data and secondary data. Primary data is the data collected directly from the respondent through field survey using particular data collection method specifically designed for it. (Sekaran (2003: 221); Kuncoro (2003: 127); Zikmund (2000: 124).

6c. Analysis Design and Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis is tested by reviewing mean score of each variable being studied (Zikmund, 2000: 45). The logic of the calculation of lowest mean score is that when all the respondents choose number "1" as their answer, then its scored 1×300 (sample size), which is 300. Moreover, biggest mean score is when all the respondents choose number "5" as their answer, then its scored 5×300 (sample size), which is 1,500. Therefore, it can be classified that if variable tested has a mean score of 300 to 750, then the descriptive hypothesis is rejected, and if the score is in between 751 to 1,500, then the descriptive hypothesis is accepted. Meanwhile, hypothesis 2, 3, and 4 are tested using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), which is one of the multivariate techniques that study the series of relationship dependency between variables. This technique is generally implemented if one dependent variable is shifting to independent variable in the next dependency relationship. SEM consists of measurement equation and structural equation. Relationship between indicator variable with the other variable is considered as measurement equation, while the relationship between latent variable is known as structural equation.

7. Result of the Research

This research is recently at the point of instrument testing, which is validity and reliability test. The result can be seen at the table below.

Validity and Reliability Test's Result

(Pre-Test Data, n=30)

I. Validity Test's Instruments

1. Competitive Advantage Strategy (*Strategi Keunggulan Bersaing – SB*)

| Questionnaire Item | Validity Value (r_{hitung}) | Sig. Level | Value r_{kritis} | Conclusion of the Validity Test |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| SB1 | .590(**) | .001 | 0.361 | Valid |
| SB2 | .574(**) | .001 | 0.361 | Valid |
| SB3 | .612(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| SB4 | .559(**) | .001 | 0.361 | Valid |
| SB5 | .741(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| SB6 | .677(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| SB7 | .683(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| SB8 | .608(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| SB9 | .630(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| SB10 | .697(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| SB11 | .556(**) | .001 | 0.361 | Valid |
| SB12 | .572(**) | .001 | 0.361 | Valid |

*

Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source : Data processing using SPSS 17.00

2. Core Competence (*Kompetensi Inti – KI*)

| Questionnaire Item | Validity Value (r_{hitung}) | Sig. Level | Value r_{kritis} | Conclusion of the Validity Test |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| KI1 | .644(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| KI2 | .825(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| KI3 | .689(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| KI4 | .668(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| KI5 | .781(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| KI6 | .589(**) | .001 | 0.361 | Valid |
| KI7 | .692(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| KI8 | .708(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| KI9 | .761(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| KI10 | .766(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| KI11 | .786(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| KI12 | .772(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source : Data processing using SPSS 17.00

3. Value Innovation (*Inovasi Nilai – NI*)

| Questionnaire Item | Validity Value (<i>r_{hitung}</i>) | Sig. Level | Value <i>r_{kritis}</i> | Conclusion of the Validity Test |
|--------------------|--|------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| NI1 | .636(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| NI2 | .739(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| NI3 | .872(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| NI4 | .691(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| NI5 | .845(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| NI6 | .851(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| NI7 | .730(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| NI8 | .850(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| NI9 | .654(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| NI10 | .671(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source : Data processing using SPSS 17.00

4. Reputation (*Reputasi* – *RI*)

| Questionnaire Item | Validity Value (<i>r_{hitung}</i>) | Sig. Level | Value <i>r_{kritis}</i> | Conclusion of the Validity Test |
|--------------------|--|------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| RI1 | .516(**) | .004 | 0.361 | Valid |
| RI2 | .530(**) | .003 | 0.361 | Valid |
| RI3 | .655(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| RI4 | .695(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| RI5 | .787(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| RI6 | .727(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| RI7 | .828(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| RI8 | .758(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| RI9 | .766(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| RI10 | .774(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| RI11 | .757(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |
| RI12 | .648(**) | .000 | 0.361 | Valid |

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source : Data processing using SPSS 17.00

According to Sugiyono (2010: 126), if the validity of every factor is positive with the value greater than 0.3, therefore, the factor is a strong construct. Or by implementing formulation provided by Sugiyono (2010: 126)

$$r = \frac{t}{\sqrt{df + t^2}}$$

The validity test's result for the research instruments shows a significance level $\alpha = 0,05$ and degree of freedom $(df) = N - 2 = 30 - 2 = 28$ with $r_{tabel} = r_{kritis} = 0,361$. Based on the validity test's result to 30 respondents with significant level of $\alpha = 0,05$ and all of the instrument items has value of $r_{hitung} > r_{kritis}$, therefore, it can be concluded that all the instrument's items in the research's variable are valid.

II. Reliability Test

Reliability test was conducted using Alpha Cronbach's test. Reliability coefficient category (Guilford, 1956: 145) are as follow:

- $0,80 < \text{Alpha Cronbach} < 1,00$ Higly reliable
- $0,60 < \text{Alpha Cronbach} < 0,80$ Very reliable
- $0,40 < \text{Alpha Cronbach} < 0,60$ Moderate reliability
- $0,20 < \text{Alpha Cronbach} < 0,40$ Low reliability
- $\text{Alpha Cronbach} < 0,20$ Very low reliability (not reliable).

Based on the calculation's result using SPSS 17.00, therefore, the reliability test's result to 30 respondents with significant level $\alpha = 0,05$; can be concluded that all of the research's variables are reliable as it is shown in the table 4 below.

Table 4. Reliability Test's Result

| No. | Variable | Calculated Reliability Value (Alpha Cronbach's) | Alpha Cronbach's | Conclusion of the Reliability Test |
|-----|--------------------------------|--|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1 | Competitive Advantage Strategy | 0,858 | $0,80 < \alpha < 0,10$ | Reliable |
| 2 | Core Competence | 0,916 | $0,80 < \alpha < 0,10$ | Reliable |
| 3 | Value Innovation | 0,914 | $0,80 < \alpha < 0,10$ | Reliable |
| 4 | Reputation | 0,905 | $0,80 < \alpha < 0,10$ | Reliable |

8. Conclusion

On the first step, the test's result of the research instruments is all valid and reliable. Furthermore, the next step is to do further collection data and processing it in accordance to the method and data analysis using SEM.

References

- Abidin, Suriati Binti Zainal, Sany Sanuri Bin Mokhtar, and Rushami Zien Bin Yusoff. 2011. A Systematic Analysis of Innovation Studies: A Proposed Framework on Relationship Between Innovation Process and Firm's Performance. *The Asian Journal of Technology Management Vol. 4 No. 2 (2011): 65-83.*
- Aji Dedi Mulawarman. 2011. *Mengembangkan Kompetensi Inti Dan Konsep Bisnis Koperasi: Digali Dari Realitas Masyarakat Indonesia.* Lembaga Riset Keuangan Syari'ah Universitas Cokroaminoto Yogyakarta.
- Ali Hanapiah Muhi. 2011. *Ancaman Globalisasi.* Mitra Wacana Media. Jakarta.
- Arowoshegbe, Amos O and F.E. Iyoha. 2010. The Management Imperatives of

- Globalization. *AAU JMS* Vol. 1, No. 1.
- Awang, Mariah, Abd Hakim bin Mohammed, and Mohd Shahril A.R. 2011. Facility Management Competencies in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). *International Conference on Sociality and Economics Development*. Singapore.
- Bachrudin, Achmad dan Harapan Tobing, 2002, *Analisis Data Untuk Penelitian Survey Dengan menggunakan Lisrel-8*, Jurusan Statistika FMIPA UNPAD.
- Barron, David and Meredith Rolfe. 2011. *Measuring Reputation: Corporate Appeal, Political Influence and Regulation*. Oxford University. USA.
- Bennett, Daniel , Adam R. Lucchesi, and Richarda K. Vedder. 2010. *For-Profit Higher Education : growth, Innovation, and Regulation*. Center for College Affordability and Productivity. Washington.
- Bhatti, Waheed Akbar, Arshad Zaheer, and Kashif Ur Rehman. 2011. The effect of knowledge management practices on organizational performance: A conceptual. *African Journal of Business Management* Vol. 5(7), pp. 2847-2853, 4 April, 2011.
- Bollaert, Lucien, Sanja Brus, Bruno Curvalke, and Lee Harvey. 2007. *Em Bedding Quality Culture in Higher Education*. A Selection of Pappers From The 1st European Forum for Quality Assurance. ENQA. Europe.
- Burke, Ronald J, Graeme Martin, and Cary L. Cooper. 2011. *Corporate Reputations: Managing Opportunities and Threats*. Gower Publishing. USA.
- Virili, Francesco, Andrea Carignani. 2011. *Web Technologies And Value Innovation In The Italian Retail Banking Industry*. Global Co-Operation in the New Millennium The 9th European Conference on Information SystemsBled, Slovenia, June 27-29, 2011.
- Chen, Hai Ming and Wen Yen Chang. 2011. Core competence: What “core” you mean? - From a strategic human resource management. *African Journal of Business Management* Vol. 5(14), pp. 5738-5745, 18 July, 2011.
- Chirani, Ebrahim, Muhammad Taleghani, Nasim Esmailie Moghadam. 2012. Brand Performance and Brand Equity. *Interdisciplinary Journal Of Contemporary Research In Business*. London.
- Chun, Rosa. 2005. Corporate Reputation : Meaning and Measurement. *International Journal of Management Reviews*. USA.

Cravens and Nigel F. Pierce, 2003, *Strategic Marketing*, Seventh Edition, McGraw Hill, Irwin, Boston.

Daftar Tabel Data Pendidikan Perguruan Tinggi (Pt) Tahun 2009/2010.

Duju, Cristian and Horatiu Halmajan. 2011. The Effect of Organizational Readiness on CRM and Business Performance. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF COMPUTERS Issue 1, Volume 5, 2011.*

Dwi Suryanto Hidayat. 2008. *Strategi Membangun Kompetensi Organisasi Dalam Rangka Meningkatkan Kinerja Perguruan Tinggi Swasta (Pts) Di Jawa Tengah*. Penelitian Universitas Dipenogoro.

Eshlaghy, Abbas Toloie and Alireza Maatofi. 2011. Learning Orientation, Innovation and Performance: Evidence from Small-Sized Business Firms in Iran. *European Journal of Social Sciences* – Volume 19, Number 1.

Flat, Sylvia J and Staney J. Kowalczyk. 2011. Corporate Reputation Persistence and Its Diminishing Returns. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*. USA.

Hadari Nawawi (2005); *Manajemen Strategik*, Gadjah Mada Pers : Yogyakarta.

Henard, Fabrice and Deborah Roseveare. 2012. *An IMHE Guide for Higher Education Institutions*. OECD. Institut Management in Higher Education. IMHE. USA.

Hu, Ting-Chen and Chia-Ching Lin. 2011. The creation of pharmacists' core competence assessment scale. *African Journal of Business Management Vol.5 (11), pp. 4226-4231, 4 June, 2011.*

Hua, Loh Teck. 2011. Sustainable Competitive Advantage For Market Leadership Amongst The Private Higher Education Institutes In Malaysia. 2nd *International Conference On Business And Economic Research (2nd Icer 2011) Proceeding*. Selangor DE.

Hussain, M Farooq and Saqib Ilyas. 2011. Environment for innovation: Gaining competitive advantage. *African Journal of Business Management Vol. 5(4), pp. 1232-1235.*

Irani, Farhad Nezhad Haj Ali and Muhammad Reza Noruzi. 2011. Globalization and Challenges; What are the globalization's contemporary issues?. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*.

- Iwu, Ronald Chibuike and Egwouonwu. 2011. Corporate Reputation & Firm Performance : *empirical Literature Evidence. International Journal of Business and Management. IJBM. Nigeria.*
- Jahanshahi, Ashgar Afshar, Khaled Nawaser, Seyed Mohammad Sadeq Khaksar, and Amin Reza Kamalian. 2011. The Relationship between Government Policy and the Growth of Entrepreneurship in the Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises of India. *Journal of Technology Management & Innovation.*
- Kim, W. Chan and Renee Mauborgne. 2008. *Blue Ocean Strategy.* Harvad Business School Press.
- Knight, Jane. 2011. Education Hubs: A Fad, a Brand, an Innovation?. *Journal of Studies in International Education.* Sage.
- Kotler, Philip & Kevin Lane Keller. 2009. *A Framework for Marketing Management.* 4e Edition. Prentice Hall International Inc.: New Jersey.
- Lie, Anita. 2012. *Membedah Industri Pendidikan Tinggi.* Artikel. <http://www.kompas.com/kompascetak/0406/17/PendDN/1072326.htm>.
- Macdonald, Katharine. 2011. Special Issue: Innovation and the Evolution of Human Behavior. *Faculty of Archeology, University of Leiden, Leiden, THE NETHERLANDS; k.macdonald@arch.leidenuniv.nl*
- Malmarugan, Devanathan and Hari Sankaran. 2007. Refferal Marketing – An Innovative Approach in Management Education. *Innovation Marketing.* India.
- Margono Slamet. 2012. *Manajemen Dosen Berbasis Kompetensi.* Institut Pertanian Bogor. Bogor.
- McDonough, Michele. 2011. *9 Key Elements of Successful Collaboration.* Artikel. USA.
- McLaughlin, Stephen. 2011. *It's Innovation...But Is it the Right Sort of Innovation ?.* Value innovation Institut.
- Meek, Lynn V and Mary Louise Kearney. 2009. Higher Education, Research and Innovation: Changing Dynamics. *Report on the UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research and Knowledge.* English.
- Misselina, Henry Hariany, dan Risyana. 2011. *Analisis Swot : Visi dan Misi dalam Pendidikan.* Alfabeta. Bandung.

- Mohaghar, Ali, Rohollah Ghasemi, and Behzad Abdullahi. 2011. Canonical Correlation Analysis between Supply Chain Relationship Quality and Cooperative Strategy: A Case Study in the Iranian Automotive Industry. *European Journal of Social Sciences*.
- Momeni. Mansour, Abbas Monavarian, Esmail Shaabani, and Rohollah Ghasemi. 2011. A Conceptual Model for Knowledge Management Process Capabilities and Core Competencies by SEM the Case of Iranian Automotive Industry. *European Journal of Social Sciences – Volume 22, Number 4 (2011)*.
- Moore, Charles C. 2011. *Revitalizing the Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower*. Mississippi.
- Muhammad. 2012. *Inovasi dalam Pendidikan*. Universitas Indonesia. Jakarta.
- Mustaffa, Normah, Wan Amizah Wan Mahmud, Fauziah Ahmad, Chang Peng Kee, and Maizatul Haizan Mahbob. 2011. Diffusion of Innovations: The Adoption of Facebook among Youth in Malaysia. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, Vol. 16(3), 2011.
- Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 66 Tahun 2010.
- Rahma Fadillah Sopha. 2011. *Konsep Kolaborasi dalam Kegiatan Promosi Kesehatan*. Artikel November 3.
- Report of an Expert Panel, May. 2011. *Core Competencies of Interprofessional Collaboration Practice*. American Association of Colleges of Nursing,
- Romaniello, Vito, Paolo Renna, and Vincenzo Cinque. 2011. A Continuous Improvement and Monitoring Performance System: Monitor - Analysis - Action – Review (MAAR) Charts. *IBIMA Business Review*.
- Shamma, Hamed M. 2012. Toward a Comprehensive Understanding of Corporate Reputation: Concept, Measurement and Implications. *International Journal of Business and Management*. IJBM. Egypt.
- Spraul, Katharina. 2007. Students As Active Partners: Higher Education Management in Germany. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, Volume 12(3).
- Strain, Mike. 2011. Create a Winning Strategy for the Recovery. *Managing Construction Risks*. PCI Journal.

- Tavitiyaman, Pimtong, Hailin Qu, and Hanging Qiu Zhang. 2011. The impact of industry force factors on resource competitive strategies and hotel performance. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. Hongkong.
- Totok Amin Soefianto. 2013. *PTS Harus Memiliki Program Unggulan*. Universitas Paramadina. Jakarta.
- Trustrum, L.B and Wee, S. L 2007. *Relationship Marketing Strategy in Higher Education*. Asia Pacific University. Malaysia.
- Uddin, Muhammad Belal and Bilkis Akhter. 2011. Strategic Alliance And Competitiveness:Theoretical Framework. *Journal of Arts Science & Commerce*.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), 2012. *Perkembangan Peringkat Human Development Indonesia*. HDR, Jakarta.
- WHO. 2012. *Health Education: Theoretical, Concept, Effective Strategies and Core Competencies*. World Health Organization. PBB. USA.
- Zikmund William G.2003, *Business Research Methods*, Sixth Edition, The Dryden Press, Philadelphia.