



THE EFFECT OF DISTINCTIVE CAPABILITY AND CONSUMER REQUIREMENT ON VALUE CREATION

Nurkardina Novalia¹, Alhadi Yan Putra², Ahmad Maulana³, Zahrudin Hodzay⁴

^{1,2,4}PGRI Palembang University, ³University, Sriwijaya University

Email: ¹nurkardina.novalia@gmail.com, ²alhadian.putra@univpgri-palembang.ac.id,

³maulanaahmad075@gmail.com, ⁴zahrudinhdzay@univpgri-palembang.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study aims to investigate the direct influence of distinctive capability and consumer requirements on value creation in private universities in the LLDIKTI Region II area. The method used is Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) to analyze the relationship between these variables. The results showed that distinctive capability and understanding of consumer needs play an important role in improving value creation in higher education. The college's distinctive capability has a positive impact on the institution's image and attractiveness in the eyes of prospective students and stakeholders. In addition, by meeting consumer demands, universities can create higher value through innovation, superior services, and unique benefits. The findings provide a strong foundation for universities to focus on developing special capabilities and meeting consumer needs to improve marketing performance. This research makes a valuable contribution to understanding the factors that influence college marketing and provides guidance for strategic decision-making in educational institutions.

Keywords: university; distinctive capability; consumer requirement; value creation

1. Introduction

The quality of human resources plays a crucial role in the development of a nation, and efforts to improve it through education are key to progress (Hariyadi, 2015). Investment in education is increasingly in demand, especially by business people, who see it as a profitable industry both financially and socially. Education provides an opportunity that is enough to attract the attention of business people to invest their capital in education, which is characterized by the emergence of new private educational institutions. Educational institutions are institutions engaged in noble industries that carry out dual missions, namely profit and social (Yildiz and Kara, 2017). Furthermore, Durkin et al. (2016) state that some practitioners in the world of education argue that education has become a good service business and does not recognize the term crisis. In fact, some countries make efforts to organize education to attract students from outside to increase the country's income.

Along with globalization, trade in the education service sector has also become increasingly important, driving intense competition on an international scale (Lovelock and Wright, 1999). Indonesia has responded to this global competition by regulating the national education system and the higher education system into legislation on the National Education System (Sisdiknas) Number 20 of 2003 which emphasizes equitable access, quality, relevance, and governance of education (Aisyah, 2017). Specifically for the implementation of higher education, it is based on Law No. 12/2012 which regulates the higher education system in Indonesia, including the order of higher education. Higher education is currently managed professionally with a focus on education quality and internal and external stakeholder satisfaction (Ginting and Haryati, 2012; Yeo, 2016).

Quality human resources are the main capital in the development of a nation, and efforts to improve them through education are the key to progress (Ningsih et al., 2022). The importance of the quality of human resources in nation building is closely related to students as the main stakeholders in the world of higher education. Students are the most interested in achieving the goals of higher education, and their satisfaction in the learning process is very important (Setiawan and Ayuningtyas, 2023). Student satisfaction includes aspects such as teaching quality, access to educational resources, and self-development opportunities (Elliott and Shin, 2002). Universities that are able to fulfill students' consumer requirements, such as the provision of a relevant curriculum, good academic support, and adequate facilities, will create a satisfying educational experience and increase the value provided to students.

Meanwhile, investment in education is increasingly in demand by businesses who understand that universities are places where quality human resources can be formed (Tomlinson, 2018). Universities that have distinctive capabilities in producing graduates who are ready to work and meet the needs of the labor market are the destination of business investment. Businesses also engage in partnership efforts with universities to develop programs that are in line with industry needs. This creates a win-win situation where universities get financial support and access to resources, while businesses get access to quality talent produced by universities (Ankrah and AL-Tabbaa, 2015).

Thus, in the context of higher education, professional management with a focus on educational quality, student satisfaction, and collaboration with businesses are key elements in achieving sustainable value creation. Universities that are able to integrate their distinctive capabilities with the needs of students and the demands of the job market will have an important role in creating quality human resources that contribute to nation building.

The importance of distinctive capability and consumer requirements in the world of higher education, which is currently very competitive, makes this research interested in further examining this relationship. Therefore, this research was conducted with the aim of knowing the direct effect of distinctive capability and consumer requirements on value creation in private universities in the context of LLDIKTI Region II. The results of this study are expected to provide valuable insights for universities in developing more effective marketing strategies, increasing student satisfaction, and strengthening their reputation in the competitive higher education market.

2. Literature Review

The main focus today is on the quality of education and stakeholder satisfaction, both internal and external. Quality human resources are the main capital in the development of a nation, and education is considered the main key to achieving progress (Obi, 2015). Businesses are also increasingly understanding the importance of investing in education (Baihaqqy et al., 2020), seeing it as a financially and socially beneficial industry.

In higher education, students are the main stakeholders. The success of higher education in achieving its goals is highly dependent on student satisfaction. According to Marthalina (2018) improving the quality of higher education must be carried out by educational institutions and all related stakeholders, whether organized by the government or private institutions (Langrafe et al., 2020). This success includes the quality of teaching, access to educational resources, self-development opportunities, and various other aspects that affect students' educational experience. Universities that are able to meet students' demands and needs, such as relevant curricula, adequate academic support, and adequate facilities, will create a satisfying educational experience and increase the value provided to students.

In an effort to win the competition in the world of education, the main key is the ability of universities to provide superior value and understand the needs and conditions of students. Value creation should be based on the consumer's point of view, with efforts to create additional

benefits, improve consumer assessments of benefits, and influence consumer decisions in terms of payment and decision making (Mahajan, 2020). Therefore, value creation in education involves not only the process of value creation, but also intensive communication and the resulting positive quality image. Furthermore, Kotler and Keller (2016) explains that "value creation" is part of the concept of "Holistic Marketing", where "value creation" (creating new value offerings) is integrated with "value exploration" (identifying new value) and "value delivery" (utilizing capabilities and infrastructure to provide new value offerings).

The concept of value creation in education can be described in two key dimensions: customer focus and business domain. Customer focus refers to universities' efforts to increase the value of benefits provided to students (Setiawan and Ayuningtyas, 2023), such as relevant curriculum development and optimization of educational services. On the other hand, the business domain relates to the ability of universities to position themselves in competencies that create value for students and in improving the quality of their core capabilities (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020). This value creation is also strongly influenced by distinctive capabilities and consumer requirements (Lemon and Verhoef, 2016).

Business investment in education is increasing due to the understanding that universities have distinctive capabilities in producing graduates who are ready to work and meet the needs of the labor market. In the view of resource-based theory presented by Barney and Clark (2016), it is explained that distinctive capabilities are attributes of an organization that allow it to pursue strategies that are more effective and efficient than other organizations. The prevailing view of resource-based strategies is that resources and organizational capabilities are an important part of strategy formulation (Lubis, 2022). Or it can be said that Distinctive capability is a combination of resources and unique capabilities owned by the college, creating a competitive advantage and unique value for students. This includes special capabilities that identify organizational advantages and expand the creation of new benefits (Ciptagustia and Kusnendi, 2019).

On the other hand, consumer requirements refer to the expectations, wants, and needs of students that must be met by universities. Consumer requirements can cover various aspects, including product or service quality, price, availability, convenience, customer support, reliability, safety, innovation, and many other factors (Munawaroh and Simon, 2023). This reflects what consumers consider important in choosing or using a particular product or service, as well as how they expect the experience to be. Success in meeting students' demands will create positive value in their perception of higher education (Gray and Diloreto, 2016). According to, IFAC (2020) an in-depth understanding of the internal and external factors that influence consumer demands is essential in successful value creation. Thus, managing value creation performance is key to the survival and competitive advantage of universities in education.

This research develops a number of indicators to measure value creation on both dimensions, customer focus and business domain (Sjödin et al., 2020), which are in accordance with existing theories. These include management's efforts in enhancing value benefits, value optimization, curriculum renewal, as well as the college's position in competencies and business networks (Rowland et al., 2020). This study aims to examine the effect of the relationship between distinctive capability and consumer requirements in increasing value creation in private universities in LLDIKTI Region II. Furthermore, based on the explanation of the literature review above, a hypothesis can be formulated in this study, namely distinctive capability and consumer requirements have a significant effect on value creation.

3. Research Methods

This research focuses on testing the variables of distinctive capabilities, customer requirements and value creation in the context of private universities in the Higher Education

Service Institution Region II in 2023. Data for this study were obtained from secondary sources, such as the Forlap Dikti website and scientific publications, as well as primary data collected through questionnaire instruments. The dimensions that become indicators in this research variable include special capabilities considering the dimensions of tangible resources, intangible resources and organizational capabilities. Consumer requirement variables are based on the fulfillment of demands for higher education quality, demands for employment opportunities and demands for campus location. Finally, the constructs that will be used as a measuring tool for value creation are based on customer focus and business domain. Primary data collection was conducted through surveys and questionnaires distributed directly to respondents, including rectorate officials, public relations officials, and students at private universities in the region. This study took a sample of 95 active universities in the region, taking into account that most of the universities are located in the provincial capitals of Bandar Lampung City and Palembang City, which are the main research objects. This data will be used to analyze the influence of various factors on the value creation of universities in the face of intense competition in higher education.

To identify the correlation between distinctive capabilities and consumer requirements on value creation, a quantitative approach is needed. Specifically, Partial Least Squares (PLS) method is used as an analytical tool. The use of PLS-SEM allows this research to measure and analyze the relationship between complex variables in the conceptual framework that has been described. This study also combines confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and structural equation modeling (SEM). CFA aims to statistically test the ability of the factorial model to reproduce the data obtained and the reliability and validity of the measurement scale. SEM analyzes the correlations proposed in the theoretical model, identifies the significance and degree of relationship between variables and the significance of the overall model. Based on the objectives to be achieved in this study and the use of information obtained in the form of Likert scales, the technique applied is appropriate. SEM can be shown as a combination of factor analysis, regression analysis, and path analysis (Gunarto, 2013; Hair, et.al, 2014). In this study, a two-step technique was used to analyze the data. The first step was to check construct validity, reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity. In the second step, a structural model was developed to test the hypotheses. The SEM equation model built in this study based on the formulation of the problem and theoretical and empirical studies is shown in equation 1.

$$VC = \beta_0 + \beta_1 DC + \beta_2 CR + e \quad (1)$$

Where VC is value creation as the dependent variable. As well as independent variables consisting of DC or distinctive capabilities and CR, namely consumer requirements. Meanwhile, $\beta_{0,1,2}$ shows the coefficient of the independent variable constant. Finally, “e” is the standard error in the research model.

4. Research Findings and Discussion

Based on the data processing steps with the PLS-SEM method which consists of two main steps, this study presents the results of the measurement model evaluation which is very relevant and important to understand the validity and reliability of the constructs used as a critical step by ensuring that the measuring instrument used is appropriate and reliable. The first step that has been done is to check the internal consistency of the construct and convergent validity. This was followed by testing discriminant validity using cross loading and Fornell Lacker Criteria.

The results of this evaluation show that all constructs have strong internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha and CR values exceeding the recommended thresholds of $\alpha > 0.60$ and $CR > 0.70$, the results of which are shown in Table 1. In addition, we also evaluated the

convergent validity of our construct measures. Convergent validity is examined through Outer Loading (OL) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE). The evaluation results in Table 1 show that all constructs have good convergent validity, with OL values exceeding 0.50 and AVE greater than 0.50. Then the measurement model evaluation results obtained are very satisfactory outer loading, AVE, CR, and Cronbach's Alpha values for the SEM-PLS model. In other words, the criteria for internal consistency and convergent validity are met.

Table 3 Convergent Validity and Construct Reliability

| Item Description | Outer Loading | AVE | CR | Cronbach's Alpha |
|------------------|---------------|-------|-------|------------------|
| DC11 | 0.722 | 0.553 | 0.917 | 0.898 |
| DC12 | 0.775 | | | |
| DC13 | 0.810 | | | |
| DC21 | 0.688 | | | |
| DC22 | 0.778 | | | |
| DC23 | 0.787 | | | |
| DC31 | 0.657 | | | |
| DC32 | 0.696 | | | |
| DC33 | 0.762 | | | |
| CR11 | 0.822 | | | |
| CR12 | 0.815 | | | |
| CR13 | 0.810 | | | |
| CR21 | 0.850 | | | |
| CR22 | 0.852 | | | |
| CR23 | 0.798 | | | |
| CR31 | 0.845 | | | |
| CR32 | 0.744 | | | |
| CR33 | 0.684 | | | |
| VC11 | 0.802 | 0.626 | 0.909 | 0.88 |
| VC12 | 0.792 | | | |
| VC13 | 0.821 | | | |
| VC21 | 0.826 | | | |
| VC22 | 0.779 | | | |
| VC23 | 0.724 | | | |

Source: SEM-PLS estimation output (2023)

Furthermore, Discriminant validity testing is measured by the value of cross loading and Fornell Lacker Criteria ($\sqrt{AVE Y_i} > \text{Correlation } Y_i, Y_j$). In Table 4, it can be seen that each row of the matrix produced construct \sqrt{AVE} values that have a value greater than the correlation values of two different constructs. It is also concluded that the discriminant validity of the SEM-PLS model is met.

Table 4 Cross Loading and Furnell Lacker Criteria Results

| Cross Loading | | | |
|------------------|----------------|--------|--------|
| Item Description | DC | CR | VC |
| DC11 | (0.722) | -0.032 | -0.098 |
| DC12 | (0.775) | -0.046 | -0.272 |
| DC13 | (0.810) | 0.020 | -0.046 |
| DC21 | (0.688) | -0.043 | -0.013 |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| DC22 | (0.778) | -0.072 | -0.020 |
| DC23 | (0.787) | 0.078 | -0.077 |
| DC31 | (0.657) | 0.001 | 0.205 |
| DC32 | (0.696) | -0.050 | 0.222 |
| DC33 | (0.762) | 0.133 | 0.149 |
| CR11 | 0.108 | (0.822) | -0.109 |
| CR12 | -0.025 | (0.815) | 0.000 |
| CR13 | 0.092 | (0.810) | -0.144 |
| CR21 | -0.111 | (0.850) | 0.085 |
| CR22 | -0.055 | (0.852) | 0.076 |
| CR23 | 0.045 | (0.798) | -0.046 |
| CR31 | 0.065 | (0.845) | -0.077 |
| CR32 | -0.043 | (0.744) | 0.148 |
| CR33 | -0.089 | (0.684) | 0.088 |
| VC11 | 0.246 | -0.039 | (0.802) |
| VC12 | 0.376 | 0.047 | (0.792) |
| VC13 | -0.198 | -0.017 | (0.821) |
| VC21 | -0.047 | -0.051 | (0.826) |
| VC22 | -0.229 | 0.041 | (0.779) |
| VC23 | -0.161 | 0.025 | (0.724) |
| Fornell Lacker Criteria | | | |
| DC | (0.743) | 0.145 | 0.725 |
| CR | 0.145 | (0.804) | 0.218 |
| VC | 0.725 | 0.218 | (0.791) |

Source: SEM-PLS estimation output (2023)

The second step in data processing with the SEM PLS method is the evaluation of the structural model consisting of the coefficient of determination analysis and path diagram analysis or path equation. The results of the path diagram measurement model formulation obtained from processing with the SEM PLS method are shown in Figure 1 and summarized in Table 3 and Equation 2.

Table 5 Analysis of the Effect of Exogenous Constructs on Endogenous Constructs Based on Path Diagram

| Hypothesis Path | Estimation | P-value | Result |
|---------------------------|------------|---------|-------------|
| H ₁ : DC -> VC | 0.716 | <0.001* | Significant |
| H ₂ : CR -> VC | 0.118 | 0.047* | Significant |

Note: * denotes the two-tail statistical significance at 5%.

Source: SEM-PLS estimation output (2023)

From the results of processing the path diagram, the research model can be formulated into an equation, which in this case is presented in equation 2.

$$VC = 0.716 DC + 0.118 CR + e , \quad R^2 = 0.550 \quad (2)$$

The results of the coefficient of determination (R-Square, R²) of the first model obtained 0.550, means that the diversity of endogenous constructs of value creation that can be explained by the exogenous constructs of distinctive capabilities and consumer requirements

simultaneously is 55.0% and the remaining 45.0% is explained by other constructs that are not included in which is represented by structural error.

The hypothesis results shown in Table 3 show the results of hypothesis testing in the direct relationship of several constructs. From the formulated hypotheses, all hypotheses are significant with p-value <0.05. In the structural equation, the test found that there is a direct effect of distinctive capabilities as shown by the positive coefficient value of 0.176 which is significant. In addition, the results also show that there is a positive and significant direct influence of consumer requirements on value creation with a coefficient of 0.118.

5. Discussion

Based on the presentation of the research results above, there are several important findings in this study. It was found that distinctive capabilities have a significant direct effect on value creation. This result indicates that the higher the distinctive capabilities of an entity or organization, the greater the contribution in creating added value or value creation. Distinctive capabilities include unique capabilities that differentiate an organization from its competitors (Arraya, 2022). In this context, when an organization is able to optimize its distinctive capabilities, this can have a positive impact on its ability to create innovative and competitive added value. Based on these results, universities need to focus more efforts on developing and promoting the aspects that make them unique and more attractive to prospective students and stakeholders. The results found are in line with the results of research Lemon & Verhoef (2016) and Rajapathirana & Hui (2018) which state that value creation is also strongly influenced by distinctive capabilities and consumer requirements. It is also intended that special capabilities identify organizational strengths and expand the creation of new benefits (Ciptagustia and Kusnendi, 2019).

Other findings show that consumer requirements have a positive and significant direct influence on value creation. The positive coefficient indicates that a good understanding of consumer demands and needs enables an entity or organization to create added value. This result illustrates that when an organization effectively understands consumer demands, it tends to be able to create added value that is better and relevant to consumer expectations (Porter, 2011; Grundy, 2012). Thus, it is important for universities to continuously monitor and respond to market needs by offering programs, services, or additional benefits that match stakeholder expectations. These findings support the assertion that success in meeting students' demands will create positive value in their perception of the college (Gray and Diloreto, 2016).

These results noted the importance of paying attention to distinctive capabilities and understanding consumer demands in the context of creating added value. Distinctive capabilities help organizations differentiate themselves from competitors, while a deep understanding of consumer demands ensures that the value created is relevant and meets market needs. In developing a business or marketing strategy, organizations should consider these factors in order to create strong and sustainable added value. This can also help organizations to maintain a competitive advantage and increase competitiveness in the market.

6. Conclusion

The result of this study is that distinctive capabilities and understanding of consumer needs play an important role in achieving good marketing performance in the context of higher education. This indicates that the distinctive capabilities possessed by universities have a positive impact on marketing performance, strengthening the image and attractiveness of the institution in the eyes of prospective students and stakeholders. In addition, by meeting consumer demands, universities can generate higher value through innovation, superior services, and unique benefits. These results provide a strong foundation for universities to focus on developing specialized capabilities and meeting consumer needs in an effort to improve

their marketing performance. As such, this study makes a valuable contribution to understanding the factors that influence higher education marketing and provides guidance for strategic decision-making in educational institutions. This research was funded by a competitive research grant from the fundamental research scheme funded by the Ministry of Education and Culture

References

- Aisyah. (2017). Strategi dan Upaya menghadapi Tantangan Globalisasi melalui Pendidikan. *Nuansa*, 10(2), 100–107.
- Ankrah, S., & AL-Tabbaa, O. (2015). Universities-industry collaboration: A systematic review. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 31(3), 387–408. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2015.02.003>
- Arraya, M. (2022). The relationship between distinctive capabilities system, learning orientation, leadership and performance. *European Journal of Management Studies*, 27(2), 205–227. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ejms-11-2021-0109>
- Azis, A. (2014). Kompetensi Guru Dalam Penggunaan Media Dengan Mutu Pendidikan. *Jurnal Pelopor Pendidikan*, 5(1), 49–58.
- Baihaqqy, M. R. I., Disman, Nugraha, & Sari, M. (2020). The correlation between education level and understanding of financial literacy and its effect on investment decisions in capital markets. *Journal of Education and E-Learning Research*, 7(3), 306–313. <https://doi.org/10.20448/JOURNAL.509.2020.73.306.313>
- Barney, J. B., & Clark, D. N. (2007). *Resource-Based View Theory: Creating and Sustaining Competitive Advantage*. Oxford University Press Inc.
- Ciptagustia, A., & Kusnendi, K. (2019). *Distinctive Capabilities: Can it be a source of competitive advantage?* 65(Icebef 2018), 99–102. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icebef-18.2019.24>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, 24(2), 97–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791>
- Durkin, M., Howcroft, B., & Fairless, C. (2016). Product development in higher education marketing. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 30(3), 354–369. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-11-2014-0150>
- Elliott, K. M., & Shin, D. (2002). Student Satisfaction: An alternative approach to assessing this important concept. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 24(2), 197–209. <https://doi.org/10.1080/136008002200001351>
- Ginting, R., & Haryati, T. (2012). Kepemimpinan dan Konteks Peningkatan Mutu Pendidikan. *Jurnal Ilmiah CIVIS*, II(2), 1–17.
- Gray, J. A., & Diloreto, M. (2016). *The Effects of Student Engagement, Student Satisfaction, and Perceived Learning in Online Learning Environments*. II(1).
- Grundy, T. (2006). Rethinking and reinventing Michael Porter’s five forces model. *Strategic Change*, 15(5), 213–229. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jsc.764>
- Gunarto, M. (2013). *Membangun Model Persamaan Struktural (SEM) dengan Program Lisrel*. Tunas Gemilang Press.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2014). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. In *Pearson Education Limited*. Pearson Education Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1038/259433b0>
- Hariyadi, S. (2015). Kajian peran guru sebagai penentu mutu pendidikan di indonesia. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Reformasi Pendidikan Dalam Memasuki Asean Economic Community 2015*, 31/05/2015, 30–31.
- IFAC. (2020). Understanding value creation. *International Federation of Accountants (IFAC)*,

- 1–13. www.ifac.org
- Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). *Marketing Management, 15th Edition*. Pearson Education, Inc.
- Langrafe, T. de F., Barakat, S. R., Stocker, F., & Boaventura, J. M. G. (2020). A stakeholder theory approach to creating value in higher education institutions. *Bottom Line*, 33(4), 297–313. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BL-03-2020-0021>
- Lemon, K. N., & Verhoef, P. C. (2016). Understanding customer experience throughout the customer journey. *Journal of Marketing*, 80(6), 69–96. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.15.0420>
- Lovelock, C. H., & Wright, L. (1999). *Principles of Service Marketing and Management*. In *Upper Saddle River, New Jersey*.
- Lubis, N. W. (2022). Resource Based View (RBV) in Improving Company Strategic Capacity. *Research Horizon*, 2(6), 587–596. <https://doi.org/10.54518/rh.2.6.2022.587-596>
- Mahajan, G. (2020). What Is Customer Value and How Can You Create It? *Journal of Creating Value*, 6(1), 119–121. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2394964320903557>
- Marthalina. (2018). Analisis Kualitas Pelayanan Akademik dan Kepuasan Mahasiswa di IPDN Kampus Jakarta. *Jurnal MSDM*, 5(1), 1–18.
- Munawaroh, M., & Simon, Z. Z. (2023). The Influence of Store Atmosphere, Service Quality, Product Quality, and Price on Customer Satisfaction. *Research of Business and Management*, 1(1), 35–44. <https://doi.org/10.58777/rbm.v1i1.21>
- Ningsih, A. R., Mentari, S., Julyanto, R., & Safrudin, S. (2022). The Development of Educational Human Resources through Indonesia's Education System. *Interdisciplinary Social Studies*, 1(4), 334–345. <https://doi.org/10.55324/iss.v1i4.70>
- Obi, J. N. (2015). Effective Human Resources Management Practices As the Key To Organizational Performance. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 3(1), 1–26.
- Porter, M. E. (2008). The five competitive forces that shape strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, 86(1).
- Rajapathirana, R. P. J., & Hui, Y. (2018). Relationship between innovation capability, innovation type, and firm performance. *Journal of Innovation and Knowledge*, 3(1), 44–55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2017.06.002>
- Rowland, R., Ogwuike, K., & Charles, P. O. (2020). Impact of Value Creation on Consumer Behavior and Perception. *Core Analytique*, August. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Ogwuike-Kevin/publication/343416507_IMPACT_OF_VALUE_CREATION_ON_CONSUMER_BEHAVIOR_AND_PERCEPTION/links/5f291e6a92851cd302d8677d/IMPACT-OF-VALUE-CREATION-ON-CONSUMER-BEHAVIOR-AND-PERCEPTION.pdf
- Setiawan, S., & Ayuningtyas, J. D. (2023). the Influence of Academic Service Quality on Student Satisfaction At Pusmanu Pekalongan Polytechnic. *Applied Accounting and Management Review (AAMAR)*, 1(2), 18. <https://doi.org/10.32497/aamar.v1i2.4172>
- Sjödin, D., Parida, V., Jovanovic, M., & Visnjic, I. (2020). Value Creation and Value Capture Alignment in Business Model Innovation: A Process View on Outcome-Based Business Models. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 37(2), 158–183. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12516>
- Tomlinson, M. (2018). Conceptions of the value of higher education in a measured market. *Higher Education*, 75(4), 711–727. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-017-0165-6>
- Yeo, S. C. A. C.-M. (2016). International Journal of Educational Management. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 30(5), 1–13. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-09-2014-0129>