PRESPEKTIVE SUSTAINABLE COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE IN PRODUCTION UNITS AT VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL IN INDONESIA

Istaryatiningtias[1*], Ihsana El Khuluqo[2], Kartini[3]

[1] Post Graduate, Muhammadiyah Prof DR University , Jakarta, INDONESIA
[2] post Graduate, Muhammadiyah Prof DR University,Jakarta. INDONESIA
[3] Post Graduate ,Muhammadiyah Prof DR University, Jakarta, INDONESIA

*Corresponding Author:

Ihsana_khuluqo@uhamka.ac.id

Abstract: This research is important to do because there is a problem faced by entrepreneurs and small industrial businesses in Indonesia until now is access to control of small businesses to the market. A market economy has emerged in Indonesia in the last five years in tandem with the government's efforts to make policy changes in response to dramatic changes. Reducing the role of government in "everything" has become a macro change agenda. The government's role in many respects tends to be reinvented towards regulatory and supervisory roles. The conditions as above cannot change immediately, but are still marked by various "interventions" even though on a small scale, all of which describe a transition period towards a "free market". With a combined qualitative and quantitative method (mixed methods) Sugiono 2015, the results of this study relate to the perspective of sustainable competitive advantage in the Production Unit in Vocational High Schools. the location of the Production Unit is very influential on the sustainability of the activities of the Production Unit. The Production Unit has sufficient capital by the school and investment partners in carrying out operational activities. Students are involved in the operational activities of the production unit and its developments. The production unit is well acquainted with the direction of market development and the consumers who are the sales targets and who are its competitors. The production unit knows very well the advantages possessed by the product of the production unit. Raw materials and labor are obtained at a fairly affordable cost and not too difficult.

Keywords: competitif, advantage,sustainable,vocational

---

1. Introduction

This gap in competition arises not only on the background of a lack of control over

resources (capital, human resources, technology, and so on), but also due to the lack of readiness of small businesses to enter the market. These small businesses generally enter the market without a sufficient understanding of the position of the products produced and the marketing strategies used. On the other hand, government policies in facilitating tend to concentrate on skills enrichment (reskilling) and institutional strengthening (strengthening) of small businesses.

The above statement encourages the Indonesian government to seek flexible policies, which on the one hand accelerate economic development and on the other hand equalize income distribution and narrow the gap between regions and groups. several things can be considered in order to get a flexible competition policy. First, the entrance to an industry is open, the concentration in the industry will decrease by itself due to the passage of time. Second, to avoid the difficulties of uncontrolled portfolio growth urge entrepreneurs to concentrate on their core business. Third, set contract rules for international businesses that are free from competition such as franchising, licensing, and distribution.

2. Literature Review

Importance of Literature Review in Research

the use of new technologies has increased the expectations of both stakeholders ((Ellerup Nielsen & Thomsen, 2018)) as well as managerial complexity across industries worldwide ((Rey-Martí & Ribeiro-Soriano, 2015)). The role of universities goes far beyond teaching and research. In each country, these institutions have important social and economic impacts ((Schlesinger et al., 2015)), provide knowledge transfer to business and create opportunities for entrepreneurship (Cattaneo et al., 2016). New challenges in the business world are related to the decline in public funding, increasing national and international competitiveness, increasing stakeholder expectations, and increasing demands for transparency and accountability (Agrey & Lampadan, 2014; Broekemier & Seshadri, 2000; El Nemar et al., 2018; Germeijs et al., 2012; Wu & Naidoo, 2016). In recent years there has been increasing internationalization, labor markets, and a growing demand for renewable innovations. (Hemsley-Brown et al., 2016; Plewa et al., 2016; Verčič, A. T., Verčič, D., & nidar, 2015)

the use of new technologies has increased the expectations of both stakeholders ((Ellerup Nielsen & Thomsen, 2018)) as well as managerial complexity across industries worldwide ((Rey-Martí & Ribeiro-Soriano, 2015)). The role of universities goes far beyond teaching and research. In each country, these institutions have important social and economic impacts

((Schlesinger et al., 2015)), provide knowledge transfer to business and create opportunities for entrepreneurship (Cattaneo et al., 2016). New challenges in the business world are related to the decline in public funding, increasing national and international competitiveness, increasing stakeholder expectations, and increasing demands for transparency and accountability (Agrey & Lampadan, 2014; Broekemier & Seshadri, 2000; El Nemar et al., 2018; Germeijs et al., 2012; Wu & Naidoo, 2016). In recent years there has been increasing internationalization, the labor market, and a growing demand for renewable innovations. (Hemsley-Brown et al., 2016; Plewa et al., 2016; Verčič, A. T., Verčič, D., & nidar, 2015)

.

3. Methodology

This research approach by Sugiaono in 2015 combined (Mixed Methods)., Combined research method is a research method that combines or combines quantitative methods and qualitative methods to be used together in a research activity, in order to obtain more comprehensive, valid data. , reliable and objective1 . The combination research method used in this research is a combination research method or sequential explanatory design (sequence of discovery). Combination research method model or sequential explanatory design is a combination research method that combines quantitative and qualitative research methods sequentially, where in the first stage the research is carried out with quantitative methods and in the second stage is carried out with qualitative methods. Qualitative methods play a role in obtaining measurable quantitative data that can be descriptive, comparative and associative, while quantitative methods play a role in proving, deepening, expanding, weakening and invalidating the quantitative data that have been obtained.

4. Result

Table 1. Respondent Profile

No	Aspect	Description
1	Gender	58% Female (29 people) 42% Male (21 persons)
2	Position	94% Educator (47 people) 7% Education Personnel (3 people)
3	Last Educational Qualification	58% Bachelor Degree (29 people) 42% Masters (21 people)
4	Types of Production Units	Hospitality, Workshop, Catering, Salon, Car Wash, Multimedia, Furniture, Light Vehicle Engineering (TKR), Motorcycle Engineering (Car wash with Robotic), Auto Tronic / Electric Engineering,

		Making Party Tents, Making Scout Tents , BISMEN, Making hydroponics, Autotronic Engineering, Network Information Systems and Applications, Business Center (Eight Mart), Mechanical Drawing Engineering and Welding Engineering, Agribusiness Fishery Products Processing, Audio Video Engineering, Engineering Drawing with Machines

Sumber: Hasil angket

Respondents' assessment of the Perspective of Sustainable Competitive Advantages in Production Units in SMK will be assessed using the following scoring table:

Table 2. Rating Category

No	Quantitative Score Range	Category	Score Range
1	X > Mi + 1,8 Sbi	Very good	X > 4,2
2	Mi + 0,6 SBi < X < Mi + 1,8 Sbi	Good	3,4 < X ≤ 4,2
3	Mi - 0,6 SBi < X < Mi + 0,6 Sbi	Enough	2,6 < X ≤ 3,4
4	Mi - 1,8 SBi < X < Mi – 0,6 Sbi	Less	1,8 < X ≤ 2,6
5	X < Mi - 1,8 Sbi	Very Less	X ≤ 1,8

Source: (Batubara & Ariani, 2016, page. 23)

Based on the results of student answers and referring to the response categories above, the respondents' responses to each indicator are as follows.

No	Component		Indicator	Value	Response Category
1	Production Unit Location	1.1	How important is the location position for the development of the existing production unit?	4,72	Very good
		1.2	What is the level of satisfaction with the current location?	4,18	Good
		1.3	What is the level of control over the location currently occupied?	4,16	Good
		1.4	How is the level of influence of the location on the development of the production unit?	4,24	Very good
			Average	**4,32**	**Very Good**
2	Production Unit Capital	2.1	Have the capital requirements for production units been met?	3,96	Good
		2.2	Are there any difficulties in meeting the capital requirements of the production unit?	3,32	Enough
		2.3	What is your attitude towards the	4,26	Very good

			involvement/participation of other parties to invest in order to meet capital needs?		
		2.4	Do production units have difficulty in partnering with institutions to meet production unit capital?	3,78	Good
			Average	**3,83**	**Good**
3	Students	3.1	To what extent is the role of students/students in the development of the Production Unit?	4,54	Very good
		3.2	To what extent have students received training in skills to improve the product quality of the Production Unit?	3,92	Good
		3.3	To what extent do students / students receive entrepreneurship / entrepreneurship training?	3,88	Baik
		3.4	How high is the influence of the cooperative relationship between schools and DU/DI on the high and low opportunities of students/students in carrying out internships in partner companies?	4,4	Very good
			Average	**4,19**	**Good**
4	Market Introduction and Development	4.1	Does the production unit always market its own products?	4,02	Good
		4.2	Does the production unit know exactly where the products of this production unit are marketed?	4,22	Very good
		4.3	Does the production unit know exactly who the consumers / customers of this production unit's products are?	4,24	Very good
		4.4	Does the production unit understand the reasons consumers use the product of this production unit?	4,14	Good
		4.5	Are the products of this production unit always oriented towards the export market?	3,1	Enough
		4.6	Does this production unit always follow the development of similar products in the market?	3,86	Good
			Average	**3.93**	**Good**
5	Product Introduction of Own Production Unit	5.1	Does the production unit understand what the product advantages of this production unit are?	4,46	Very good

		5.2	Do consumers of production units know what the advantages of this product are?	4,14	Good
			Average	**4,3**	**Very Good**
6	Competitors and Competitor Products	6.1	Does the production unit understand who the competitors are?	4,16	Good
		6.2	Is the presence of competitors beneficial for the production unit?	4,22	Very good
		6.3	Does the production unit understand what the advantages of the products produced are compared to competing products?	4,24	Very good
		6.4	Does the production unit understand the strengths and weaknesses of competitors' products?	3,98	Good
		6.5	Is the product of this production unit of better quality?	4,26	Very good
			Average	**4,17**	**Good**
7	Input Cost Advantage	7.1	Do production units always depend on special raw materials?	3,78	Good
		7.2	Is the raw material that the production unit needs easy to obtain?	4,34	Very good
		7.3	Is labor in this production unit obtained easily?	3,8	Good
		7.4	Is the number of workers in accordance with the needs?	3,88	Good
		7.5	Is the unit of production highly dependent on certain means of production?	2,74	Enough
		7.6	Is the production unit always trying to find new and better means of production?	4,26	Very good
		7.7	Has the production unit used certain technologies to increase business productivity?	3,98	Good
		7.8	Is the technology or means of production easily owned by competitors?	3,04	Enough
			Average	**3,73**	**Good**
8	Product Distinctiveness	8.1	Does the production unit always try to create the uniqueness of the product here?	3,84	Good
		8.2	Are consumers quite satisfied with the characteristics of the products here?	4,2	Good
			Average	**4,02**	Good

5. Discussion

Based on table 4 above, it is known that the respondents' assessment of the Perspective of Sustainable Competitive Advantage in Production Units in Vocational Schools is as follows:

The response from respondents to the influence of the location of the production unit is 4.32, meaning very good. The indicator of the influence of the location of the production unit includes aspects, namely how important is the position of the location for the development of existing production units, how is the level of satisfaction with the current location, what is the level of control over the location currently occupied and how is the level of influence of the existence of the location on the development of the production unit,

The response of respondents to the production unit capital is worth 3.83, which means it is good. The production unit capital indicators cover aspects, namely whether the capital requirements for the production unit have been met, Are there any difficulties in meeting the capital needs of the production unit, What is your attitude towards the involvement/participation of other parties to invest in order to meet the capital requirements, and Is the production unit experiencing problems? difficulty in partnering with institutions to meet production unit capital

The response of the respondents to the student/student component is worth 4.19, which means it is good. The indicators of the student/student component include aspects of the extent to which the role of students/students in the development of the Production Unit, the extent to which students/students receive skills training to improve the product quality of the Production Unit, the extent to which students/students receive entrepreneurship/entrepreneurship training, and how high the influence of the relationship school cooperation with the business world and the industrial world on the high and low opportunities for students to carry out internships in partner companies.

The response of respondents to the components of market introduction and development is worth 3.93, which means it is good. The indicators for the introduction and development of the market include aspects of whether the production unit always markets its own products, does the production unit know exactly where the products of this production unit are marketed, does the production unit know exactly who the consumers / customers of this production unit's products are, do the production units understand the reasons for consumers? using the product of this production unit, whether the product of this production unit is always oriented to the export market and, whether this production

unit always follows the development of similar products in the market.

The response from respondents to the product introduction component of the production unit itself is worth 4.3, meaning very good. The indicator of the product introduction component of the production unit itself includes aspects of whether the production unit understands the advantages of the product from this production unit, does the consumer of the production unit know what the advantages of this product are.

The response of the respondents to the components of competitors and competitors' products is worth 4.17, which means good. The indicators of competitor components and competing products include aspects, whether the production unit understands who the competitors are, whether the presence of competitors is beneficial for the production unit, whether the production unit understands what the advantages of the product produced are compared to competing products, whether the production unit understands the shortcomings and weaknesses of the product. competitors, whether the product of this production unit is of better quality.

The response of respondents to the component of input cost advantage is worth 3.73, which means it is good. The indicators for the superiority of input costs include aspects of whether the production unit always depends on special raw materials, whether the raw materials needed by the production unit are easy to obtain, whether the workforce in this production unit is obtained easily, whether the number of workers is in accordance with the needs, whether the production unit is highly dependent on certain production tools, whether the production unit is always trying to find new and better production tools, whether the production unit has used certain technologies to increase business productivity, whether the technology or production equipment is easily owned by competitors.

The response of the respondents to the components of the uniqueness of the product is worth 4.2, which means good. Indicators of the product characteristics include aspects of whether the production unit always tries to create product uniqueness here and whether consumers are quite satisfied with the product characteristics here.

4. Conclusion

From the research conducted, several conclusions were obtained regarding the perspective of sustainable competitive advantage in the Production Unit in Vocational High Schools. Some of these conclusions, among others, the location of the Production Unit is very influential on the sustainability of the activities of the Production Unit. The Production Unit has sufficient capital by

the school and investment partners in carrying out operational activities. Students are involved in the operational activities of the production unit and its developments. The production unit is well acquainted with the direction of market development and the consumers who are the target of selling and who are its competitors. The production unit knows very well the advantages possessed by the products of the production unit. Raw materials and labor are obtained at a fairly affordable cost and not too difficult. In the process, it integrates management elements (planning, organizing, actuating, and controlling) which are applied in Vocational High Schools with a sustainable competitive advantage perspective on production units in Vocational High Schools. So that it can empower the community and reduce negative effects in the face of an increasingly competitive global world.

Suggestions for follow-up to build a network of cooperation with production units in various Vocational High Schools by involving the government and developing learning concepts that are in accordance with the development of science and technology, as well as improving product quality from production units to be able to compete in the wider market

References

Agrey, L., & Lampadan, N. (2014). Determinant Factors Contributing to Student Choice in Selecting a University. *Journal of Education and Human Development*, *3*(2), 391–404.

Alrwashdeh, M., Emeagwali, O. L., & Aljuhmani, H. Y. (2019). The effect of electronic word of mouth communication on purchase intention and brand image: An applicant smartphone brands in north Cyprus. *Management Science Letters*, *9*(4), 505–518. https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2019.1.011

Aoki, K., Obeng, E., Borders, A. L., & Lester, D. H. (2019). Can brand experience increase customer contribution: How to create effective sustainable touchpoints with customers? *Journal of Global Scholars of Marketing Science*, *29*(1), 51–62. https://doi.org/10.1080/21639159.2018.1551728

Boso, N., Story, V. M., & Cadogan, J. W. (2013). Entrepreneurial orientation, market orientation, network ties, and performance: Study of entrepreneurial firms in a developing economy. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *28*(6), 708–727. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2013.04.001

Boyle, M.-E. (2004). Walking Our Talk: Business Schools, Legitimacy, and Citizenship. *Business & Society*, *43*(1), 37–68. https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650303262638 Broekemier, G. M., & Seshadri, S. (2000). Differences in College Choice Criteria BetweenDeciding Students and Their Parents.

Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, *9*(3),
1–13. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J050v09n03_01 PLEASE

Bryan, K. A., & Lemus, J. (2017). The direction of innovation. *Journal of Economic Theory*, *172*, 247–272. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jet.2017.09.005

Castaño, M. S., Méndez, M. T., & Galindo, M. Á. (2015). The effect of social, cultural, and economic factors on entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Research*, *68*(7), 1496–1500. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.01.040

Cattaneo, M., Meoli, M., & Signori, A. (2016). Performance-based funding and university research productivity: the moderating effect of university legitimacy. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, *41*(1), 85–104. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-014-93

De Lucia, C., Balena, P., Stufano Melone, M. R., & Borri, D. (2016). Policy, entrepreneurship, creativity and sustainability: The case of 'Principi Attivi' ('Active Ingredients') in Apulia Region (southern Italy). *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *135*, 1461–1473. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.06.068

De Oliveira, J. A., Oliveira, O. J., Ometto, A. R., Ferraudo, A. S., & Salgado, M. H. (2016). Environmental Management System ISO 14001 factors for promoting the adoption of Cleaner Production practices. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *133*, 1384–1394. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.06.013

Dentchev, N., Baumgartner, R., Dieleman, H., Jóhannsdóttir, L., Jonker, J., Nyberg, T., Rauter, R., Rosano, M., Snihur, Y., Tang, X., & van Hoof, B. (2016). Embracing the variety of sustainable business models: social entrepreneurship, corporate intrapreneurship, creativity, innovation, and other approaches to sustainability challenges. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *113*(February), 1–4. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.10.130

El Nemar, S., Vrontis, D., & Thrassou, A. (2018). An innovative stakeholder framework for the Student-Choice Decision making process. *Journal of Business Research*, *November*, 0–1. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.11.053

Ellerup Nielsen, A., & Thomsen, C. (2018). Reviewing corporate social responsibility communication: a legitimacy perspective. *Corporate Communications*, *23*(4), 492–511. https://doi.org/10.1108/CCIJ-04-2018-0042

Fabrigar, L. R., Porter, R. D., & Norris, M. E. (2010). Some things you should know about structural equation modeling but never thought to ask. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *20*(2), 221–225. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2010.03.003

Germeijs, V., Luyckx, K., Notelaers, G., Goossens, L., & Verschueren, K. (2012). Choosing a

major in higher education: Profiles of students' decision-making process. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *37*(3), 229–239. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2011.12.002 Hemsley-Brown, J., Melewar, T. C., Nguyen, B., & Wilson, E. J. (2016). Exploring brand identity, meaning, image, and reputation (BIMIR) in higher education: A special section. *Journal of Business Research*, *69*(8), 3019–3022. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.01.016

Iñigo, E. A., & Albareda, L. (2016). Understanding sustainable innovation as a complex adaptive system: A systemic approach to the firm. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *126*, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.03.036

Joseph F, H. J., William C, B., Barry J, B., & Rolph E, A. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. *7*, 1–761.

Kim, D. J., Ferrin, D. L., & Raghav Rao, H. (2009). Trust and satisfaction, two stepping stones for successful e-commerce relationships: A longitudinal exploration. *Information Systems Research*, *20*(2), 237–257. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.1080.0188

Kim, J., Sun, Y., Kim, K. H., & Kang, S. (2019). Sustainability and customer equity:Evaluation of citing networks and contributions. *Journal of Global Fashion Marketing*, *10*(3), 267–274. https://doi.org/10.1080/20932685.2019.1611464

Lemon, B. K. N., & Roland, T. (2001). *Consider th6 issues facing a typical brand manager, product manager*. 20–26.

Plewa, C., Ho, J., Conduit, J., & Karpen, I. O. (2016). Reputation in higher education: A fuzzy set analysis of resource configurations. *Journal of Business Research*, *69*(8), 3087–3095. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.01.024

Powell, A., Grosvold, J., & Millington, A. (2015). Business School Legitimacy. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*.

Rantala, T., Ukko, J., Saunila, M., & Havukainen, J. (2018). The effect of sustainability in the adoption of technological, service, and business model innovations. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *172*, 46–55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.10.009

Rey-Martí, A., & Ribeiro-Soriano, D. (2015). The New Spirit of Strategy for Competitive Management: Editorial. *Journal of Promotion Management*, *21*(4), 413–415. https://doi.org/10.1080/10496491.2015.1050944

Roland, T., Katherine, N., & Valarie, A. (2001). Where should the next marketing dollar go ? *Marketing Management*, *10*(3), 24–28.

Schlesinger, W., Cervera, A., & Iniesta, M. Á. (2015). Key Elements in Building Relationships

in the Higher Education Services Context. *Journal of Promotion Management*, *21*(4), 475–491. https://doi.org/10.1080/10496491.2015.1051403

Severo, E. A., De Guimarães, J. C. F., Dorion, E. C. H., & Nodari, C. H. (2015). Cleaner production, environmental sustainability and organizational performance: An empirical study in the Brazilian metal-mechanic industry. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *96*, 118–125. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.06.027

Silajdžić, I., Kurtagić, S. M., & Vučijak, B. (2015). Green entrepreneurship in transition economies: A case study of Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *88*, 376–384. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.07.004

Van Hoof, B., & Thiell, M. (2015). Anchor company contribution to cleaner production dissemination: Experience from a Mexican sustainable supply programme. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *86*, 245–255. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.08.021

Verčič, A. T., Verčič, D., & Žnidar, K. (2015). Exploring academic reputation – is it a multidimensional construct? *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, *21*(2), 100–176. https://doi.org/10.1108/CCIJ-02-2015-0009

Vogel, V., Evanschitzky, H., & Ramaseshan, B. (2008). Customer equity drivers and future sales. *Journal of Marketing*, *72*(6), 98–108. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.72.6.98

Wang, H., Ko, E., Woodside, A., & Yu, J. (2020). SNS marketing activities as a sustainable competitive advantage and traditional market equity. *Journal of Business Research*, *August 2019*, 0–1. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.06.005

Wu, T., & Naidoo, V. (2016). International marketing of higher education. In *International Marketing of Higher Education*. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-54291-5