

**THE INFLUENCE OF THE TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT AND
INNOVATION
ON THE ROLE OF CAPABILITIES TECHNOLOGY AND ITS IMPACT
ON PERFORMANSE AN EMPLOYEE
(SURVEY IN COLD STORAGE COMPANIES IN MACASSAR CITY)**

ARIMANSAH SAHABUDDIN¹, MUHAMMAD ASDAR², SYAMSUL ALAM³, JUSNI⁴

¹ *The Study in Phyloshopy of Doctor Program in Economic and Business Faculty
in Hasanuddin University, Macassar.*

And Lecturer Departement of Technichal, University Satate of Makassar (UNM), Macassar

²³⁴*Faculty of Economic and Business, University of Hasanuddin, Macassar.*

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to give a empirical evidence and find clarification on the phenomenon influence the application of the total quality management and innovation on the role of capabilities technology and its impact on performance an employee (Surveyin cold storage companies Makassar City). Methods used is research a survey data collection use kuisioneer to know evaluation by respondents employees cold storage companies in the city makassar to variables of the study . As for the kind of research this is deskriptif-verifikatif. The sample size of 260 had been taken by technique random proportional clusters of sampling of the population target about 1236 spread in three companies in the cold storage makassar. To test hypotheses proposed analysis equation used modeling structural or structural equation modeling (SEM) according to the model composed through model measurement and structural model a causal relation between variables. The implications of the research this is that capability technology is a dominant influence study compared to variable other productivity against employee performance .Variable next innovation having influence that are more dominant , good against technology capabilities and direct influence on productivity of employee performance and indirectly through technology capabilities compared to variable total quality management .

Keywords: Total quality management, innovation, technology capabilities, productivity employee performance.

BACKGROUND

Today has been developing a new trend in the system guidance the quality of food products , the processed products especially fishery products .The nucleus of the trend is used a system of new approach to product for quality supervision that are more oriented towards on the principle of detection and prevention of the disease in a premature manner (preventive measure). Talking about the quality of the outcome fisheries cannot be separated from management system applied to companies by using a cooling system (cold storage).The quality is one of an important part and need to get serious consideration for managers in running its strategy.In this era of

global competition now, will happen kecendrungan the process of development a better product, more sophisticated, and higher quality, but along with the declines in productivity fisheries, the predicate the state exporter fisheries earned indonesia changed into the state importers large enough when ini.terkait to this, fisheries industry have many problems.Starting from the quality of up to handling and industry his supporters, namely a mistake in handling provided through the process of cooling.An indication this is the cause of the problem in cold storage companies in south sulawesi.

With respect to the problems in cold storage companies which is in south sulawesi the lack of the means of production and uncertainty about when the technical culture .It takes an attempt innovation sustainable .Innovation is a the most important thing for industry both small , medium and was , especially for their the reliability of operational company .Another indication of arising particularly in relation to industry cold storage in south sulawesi is related with aspects of technology .With the advent of the

Worsened again with decreasing quality itself cannot be avoided. The process of respiration at the time of storage affect the composition of the chemical content, as of content of these products .Although treatment has been experiencing as the regulation of temperature low .Packaging of system also brings the influence of that product .Therefore need to be conducted research to systems technology used as the use of modified atmosphere storage (mas) in temperature packaging polyethylene storage space

Order to ensure that only products meet the specifications who have required to consumers , so should apply quality management company designed in the overall company activities .The concept of management is not currently is focused on production process just activity , but extends toward participation in integratif. In the development of the fisheries sector in south sulawesi , and facility it's very important , ranging from the preparation process at the distribution process fisheries obtained .The fisheries sector in south sulawesi be one of the main sectors because out of this sector foreign exchange enough bring and benefits and income for the ini.peranan cold storage as shelters / temporary storage , useful to keep the quality catch before

METHODELOGY

The study is done to obtain information about the effects of the total quality management and innovation on the role of technology capability and its impact on productivity employee performance at the cold storage in south sulawesi.In accordance with the purpose over hence the kind of research use is deskriptif-verifikatif, because this study aims to test answers problems that the truth temporary (hypothesis) according to the theory of certain or empirical data (sugiyono, 2008)

Therefore the methodology used is explanatory survey , for research it uses population sample / to explain the relationship between variables researched

science and technology cannot be ignored also that consumers to be more choose having standard technology suitable and hygienic .Cold storage companies in south sulawesi still use instrument , specifications and technology standard to the level of the ability human resource still have weakness and limited in the use of tools technology .For example in the use of technology cooling composition normal the air is 78 % ni

In addition the problem that is not less difficulties faced by the company cold storage in south sulawesi is a decline in employee performance who have also resulted in a decrease in productivity produced. For example by the use of technology improper but the results obtained only and income employees was down .For example in the time of the temperature was supposed to pendingan 7400 minutes (123 hours 20 minutes) and the coldest reached 30 degrees celsius .But the ability of storage the company does not able to achieve a specified standardization.

distributed , and is a means of supporting post in the process of handling arrest for selling price in market

Innovation affect the level of investment implications can increase of employee performance .Strategy innovation done in answer to every problem which faced by cold storage south sulawesi with the changes and growth with the market demands so that it can be taken appropriate action and corresponding to handle it .Referring to the discussion identification problems above , the research is restricted by some variable research which as follows: total quality management , innovation , the role of technology capabilities , and productivity of employee performance .

(sugiyono , 2008) .Seen from the time , but this study is cross sectional , namely information from some population (sample respondent) collected directly on the scene in empirical , with a view to know the opinion of the population to object being examined (current ,) 2006 .The analysis of the research is cold storage company in south sulawesi about three companies are located in industrial estate Makassar

The testing of hypotheses descriptive using a statistical technique rata-rata value terbobot weighted mean score (wms) .While in research verifikatifnya used the technique modeling and which will be used

as a tool the analysis (analysis) is the method structural equation modelling (shem) based variant

with the help of use of LISREL program

RESEARCH RESULT

A fishing development has been applied recently in south sulawesi , has proven it is a good enough supported by cold storage technology , especially in makassar which is shelters center and fishing products .But on the other hand inattention employees of a company cold storage on the quality of continuity processing and the fishing is still the obstacles and the lack of knowledge and technology mastery optimal , so it is not uncommon for of them had losses due to price relatively cheap and quality and quantity of goods do not reflect the market needs .This indicates the importance of management and technology mastery the fishing

(Structural Equation Modelling)

The analysis model used in this study is structural equation modeling (shem) based on two approaches model , the measurement model and structural model. Determination size proportions variance, each variable manifes (indicators) done through model measurements on every variable latent examined , in order to know the amount contributions each variable manives in forming variable latent .Followed by The results of test match model in the analysis shem can be explained as follows , :

- seen of the value of RMSEA (root mean square error of approximation) to model the treatment of 0,09431 shows a model that obtained meet the criteria in which expected value rmsea small (less than 0,9933) .

Thus can be said that the measurement result conformity absolute shows a model that obtained meet the criteria goodness of fit on the size RMSEA

1. Measurement TQM model

A measurement tqm depends on the magnitude of the contribution of masing-masing dimensions or factors that forms varibel latent or konstruk .But variable manives of tqm be to focus on customers , benchmarking , and pelatihan.bahwa from 9 indicator build tqm , there are several variables manives having kontribu dominant

The construct reliability of the 9 dimensions of forming tqm 0,8881 that reflects the construct that it is reliable , where its score was from that in recommend that 0,7 so the entire items indicators (variable manives) of the tqm having

The quality and the development of technology mastery for employees of a company of cold storage is vital to improve the quality of fish processing results orientated on demand market and the sustainability of effort based on professionalism in running the business .Pertaining to the development of the quality and mastery of technology , hence of crucial importance to describe characteristics of respondents , : the length of them work , age , education , reason be employees , the perception on training and technology mastery , as well as market information

measurement value construct reliability to determine the degree of indicators in forming variable latent .But the magnitude of construct reliability accepted is between 0,5-0,7 (hair et al , 2006; 777-778) .Followed by measurement the level of model (goodness role of fit) based on several criteria size of (role model goodness-of-fit)

- seen of the value of GFI (goodness of fit index) to model the treatment of 0,6681 shows a model that obtained enough to fulfill criteria , where expected value gfi approaching 1 (& gt; 0,90)

and size of GFI, so that model empirical obtained is in line with the theoretical models.

build the motivation achievement , namely : X2 (conformity information) , X1 (conformity products) , and X5 (in the effectiveness of) . But X2 is an indicator of forward looking, while X7 is an indicator of the risk taking , then X2 is an indicator of the tough

degrees conformity worthy to build tqm , while the things from some indicators having value t count smaller than 1,96 that can be explained that variabel-variabel has a significant degree low in forming tqm next variance extracted value

of 0,5728 on top of the recommended with 0,5 , shows that the information contained in 9

2. Measurement innovation model

Shows an indicator of stages of development (x11) dominated the value of other indicators in building product innovations and is an indicator of variable innovation .Thus it can be said that dimensions stages of development having role bigger among dimensions product innovation .The contribution can be explained through an assessment construct reliability and variance extracted for each an indicator of variable innovation .

Value construct reliability from 9 indicators innovation greater than the approach

3. Measurement Technology Capability model

Model capabilities considered measurement technology through contributing indicator can form capabilities variable technology .But the value of masing-masing an indicator of intent variable entrepreneurship , that the of the technology capabilities based on the value of the track of 3 dimension , namely: production capabilities , investment capabilities , innovation and capabilities .The three dimensions each consisting of three indicators , having the contribution of value on technology capabilities .But indicators that have the highest score is the ability to receive the order (y5). The construct reliability of the three indicators in forming technology capability, where the ability to

4. Measurement Productivity Employee Performance Model

Employee productivity performance is measured using two dimensions dimension where by each consisting of four indicators .Two dimensions which measure on behavior economic picture above indicates that there are indicators that have the contribution of the influence that the dominant performance against productivity , namely indicators the use of raw materials , that indicator of eighth in measuring productivity performance having value construct reliability greater than the value of being recommended ,

HYPOTHESIS TESTING

First Hypothesis Testing, Effect of TQM, and Innovation to capabilities technology

indicators can be represented to explain variable tqm.

recommended, so that it can be said a whole an indicator having degree conformity in forming innovation .One of T count of a whole indicators shows a value that greater than the T critical 1,96 , so that it can be said that a whole an indicator having level significance in forming innovation . Next value variance extracted of 0,5340 greater than the approach recommended that is 0.5 which it is made clear that the information contained in the ninth indicators can represented in clarifying innovation .

receive the order (y5) having value that question the dominant of .Overall an indicator of technology capabilities of the contributions larger than the in recommend that 0,7 which means that into nine an indicator having degrees in forming capabilities of technology , while the things from each indicators larger than 1,96 shows that the whole items an indicator having significant influence in shaping technology capabilities .Then based on variance extracted of 0.5138 shows on top of the recommended with 0,5 so that it can be said that the information contained in every indicators can be represented to explain technology capabilities

namely \$ 0.7 .That it could be indicators that eighth of having two dimensions of the requirements to the level of conformity in forming variable konstruk productivity performance .Next value variance extracted worth 0,5607 exceeds the value of being recommended , namely 0.5 so that can be said that indicators to eight from two dimensions to variable construct productivity performance represented in forming variable latent economic behavior

1. High technology and low capabilities influenced by tqm of 0,0094 or 0,009 %.Technology capabilities will translate through dimentions,

- namely y1 (conformity) products, y2 (conformity) information, y3 (conformity hope), y4 (standards of service), y5 (the effectiveness), y6 (the desire), y7 (empowerment) employees, y8 (utilization) time, and y9 (willingness employees).Thus the higher tqm, but indicated can improve capability technology built over y1, y2, y3, y4, y5, y6, y7, y8, and y9.But the influence of each TQM dimensions or variable capabilities manives of technology are: 0,006, 0,006, 0,006, 0,005, 0,007, 0,006, 0,006, 0,006, and 0,006.This indicates that the variable tqm having influence an insignificant.
2. High technology and low capabilities influenced by innovation of 0,6420 or 64,2 % .Technology capabilities will translate through dimensi-dimensinya , namely y1 (discovery) facilities , y2 (conformity specification) products , y3 (standard time) , y4 (the availability of financial sources) , y5 (order acceptance) , y6 (the utilization of technology) , y7 (ability to adapt) , y8 (ability) innovation , and y9 (the use of a source of information) .Thus the higher innovation , but indicated can improve kapabilitas technology built over y1 , y2 , y3 , y4 , y5 , y6 , y7 , y8 , and y9 .But the influence of total innovation masing-masing dimensions or variable capabilities manives of technology are: 0,430 , 0,437 , 0,379 , 0,327 , 0,482 , 0,398 , 0,443 , 0,385 , and 0,405 .
 3. Coefficient variation explain the variable tqm and innovation capabilities of technology .How major was in 0,4129 or 41,3 % where the rest is error variant of 0,5871 or 59 % is how major caused by other variables not examined in this research
 4. Seen from the impact on technology capabilities, variable innovation having influence most dominant capabilities of technology, by 0,642 or 40,96 % and followed variable tqm by the influence of 0,0094 or 0,009 %
 5. Views based on its impact on technology dimensions capabilities, variable TQM the biggest contribution in y5 or level keterimaan order, and followed by y7 or ability to adapt, while other planes indication received the same influence of changes innovation
 6. Based on the statistics coefficient t count, variable tqm have no influence significant variable innovation than on variables technology capabilities.Value t count the variable of the tqm 0,16 smaller than the table of t 1,960 on $\alpha : 0,05$ where degree of freedom: 260.The next coefficient the value t count innovation capabilities variable of technology are: 8,44 greater than the table: t 1,960 on $\alpha : 0,05$ and degree of freedom: 260

Second Hypothesis Testing, Effect of TQM, and Innovation to capabilities technology

1. The percentage of the direct effect of each variable latent determined the results of the square of the coefficients lane .While how major masing-masing variable latent against dimension of the productivity employee performance obtained through between the result of the variable latent with the dimensions technology the capabilities
2. High and low employee performance influenced by TQM of 0,0757 or 0,573 % .Translated by productivity employee performance through dimensions, namely z1 (the use of raw materials) , z2 (the skill) , z3 (conformity) time , z4 (quality standards) products , z5 (understanding employment guidelines) , z6 (work), z7 (working results were) , and z8 (timing) .Thus the higher TQM , but indicated can increase productivity employee performance built through z1 , z2 , z3 , z4 , z5 , z6 , z7 , and z8 .But the influence of total tqm each dimensions or variable manives of all of our productivity employee performance is: 0,030 , 0,028 , 0,026 , 0,027 , 0,021 , 0,027 , 0,020 , and 0,027 .This indicates that the variable tqm having influence less significant
3. High performance and low productivity of employees affected by innovation worth 0,9867 % or 98.7 .Translated by productivity performance through dimensions employees , namely z1 (use of raw materials) , z2 (the level of skills) , z3 (conformity time) , z4 (standards of quality product) , z5 (understanding) guidelines for employment , z6 (working results) , z7 (on the work that competes) , and z8 (punctuality) .Thus getting higher innovation , then indicated can increase productivity employee performance built through z1 , z2 , z3 , z4 , z5 , z6 , z7 , and z8 .As for the size of the total influence against

each innovation dimension or variable manives performance from productivity of employees is: 0,385 , 0,365 , 0,335 , 0,355 , 0,276 , 0,355 , 0,266 , and 0,345

4. An coefficient variation explain how major jointly variable tqm and innovation against productivity of employee performance .How major secara-bersama-sama is as much as 0,7687 or 76,9 % where error the rest is a variant of 0,2313 or 23,13 % are how major caused by other variables that is not examined in this research
5. Seen from the total their influence on productivity employee performance , variable innovation having influence most dominant employee performance against productivity , by 0,9867 or 97,36 % and followed variable tqm by the influence of 0,0757 or 0,573 %
6. Views based on the impact in dimension productivity employee performance , variable tqm the biggest contribution in z1 (

Third Hypothesis Testing, Effect of TQM, and Innovation to capabilities technology

1. The percentage of a direct impact of the technology capabilities determined the results of the square of the coefficients lane .While the capabilities variable influence technology on dimension of the productivity employee performance obtained through result of between the capabilities coefficient variable technology with the productivity the dimensions employee performance
2. High and low employee performance influenced by technology capabilities of 0,9867 or 97,36 % .Productivity employee performance will translate through dimensions , namely z1 (the use of raw materials) , z2 (the skill) , z3 (conformity) time , z4 (quality standards) products , z5 (understanding employment guidelines) , z6 (work), z7 (working results were) , and z8 (timing) .Thus the higher technology capabilities , but indicated can increase productivity employee performance built through z1 , z2 , z3 , z4 , z5 , z6 , z7 , and z8 .But the total capabilities influence technology on dimension productivity each variable employee performance is: 0,442 , 0,452 , 0,458 , 0,452 , 0,478 , 0,452 , 0,484 , and 0,458 this indicates that capabilities variable technology is very significant

the use of raw materials) .Then variable innovation has the largest contribution to increased productivity employee performance , especially in dimension z1 (the use of raw materials) , z2 (the skill) , z4 (quality standards) products , and z6 (work). While dimensions indicated received the same influence of changes innovation

7. Based on statistics the coefficient lane t count , variable tqm and innovation having significant influence on variables productivity employee performance .Value t count on diagrams track for variable tqm worth 2,99 larger than the value of t table worth 1,960 on α : 0.05 and degree of freedom: 260.Next to a coefficient lane t count the value to variable innovation performance against employee productivity is 10,57 larger than the value of t table: 1,960 on α : 0.05 and degree of freedom: 260

impact on productivity employee performance

3. Views based on the impact in dimension productivity employee performance, variable technology capabilities the biggest contribution in z7 (working results were) , followed by z5 (understanding employment guidelines) .While the other dimensions of the performance indicated productivity technology received the influence of changes capabilities same technology.
4. Based on the statistics coefficient t count, variable capabilities technology is significant influence on variables productivity employee performance.The diagram t count on track for the technology 8,08 capabilities of greater than the table of t 1,960 on α : 0,05 and degree of freedom: 260

Fourth Hypothesis Testing, Effect of TQM, and Innovation to capabilities technology by Technology Capability

1. The percentage of indirect effect of the tqm and innovation determined based on the summation rank two of the each coefficient. While the indirect effect variable tqm and innovation through technology capabilities obtained through summation result of , both between the variable coefficient tqm and capabilities kapabilitas technology with

- technology and productivity employee performance as well as through summation result of , both between the variable the innovation and technology capabilities with technology and productivity employee performance
2. Coefficient variation explain how major indirectly by variable tqm and innovation productivity performance against them through technology capability. The contribution indirect effect tqm productivity performance against them through technology are capabilities 0,0049 or 27,48 % and the rest of 72,52 influenced by other variables that is not at all. Then the contribution indirect effect innovation productivity performance against them through technology are capabilities 0,3365 or 68,68 % and the rest of 31,32 % influenced by other variables that is not at all
 3. Contributions indirect effect in variable tqm and innovation against productivity employee performance indicated by r2 value of 0,93 or 93 % and the rest 0,07 or 7 % begins variable which does not examined in this research
 4. From both variables tqm and innovation having indirect effect on the productivity of employee performance through technology capabilities .A variable that has the contribution of indirect effect most dominant is variable innovation

According to the analysis mentioned above , thus it can be said that the variable innovation having influence the most significant good against technology capabilities , and to productivity employee performance directly or indirectly by technology capabilities

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Conclusions

Based on the analysis and synthesis problems presented above

1. There is the of technological innovation capabilities , instead there is no influence the quality of technology management capabilities .In another sense that: the innovations in cold storage bebarapa company will have an impact on the technology capabilities built over some dimensions , namely: y1 (discovery) facilities, y2 (conformity specification products), y3 (standard time) , y4(the availability of financial sources), y5 (order acceptance) , y6(the utilization of technology), y7 (ability to adapt), y8 (ability) innovation , and y9 (the use of a source of information).
2. There is the total quality management and innovation employee performance against productivity .Based on how

major contribution of both the variables , variables most dominating their influence on productivity karyawan performance is variable innovation than the total quality management

3. There is the technology on capabilities productivity employee performance .The contribution of technology on influence capabilities productivity employee performance is more dominated than other variables , the innovation and tqm
4. There is the indirect total quality management and innovation employee performance against productivity. Based on how major contribution of both the variables, variables most dominating not to influence langsungnya productivity employee performance is variable innovation than the total quality management

B. Recommendations

Based on the research done mentioned above, and allow to make some suggestions research , namely :

1. Because unit analysis examined in the research is scale companies medium, then possible to do research in advanced in a

large scale companies by inserting variables review more

2. The development of total quality management less contributing to the development of capabilities in an appeal technology innovation , then the company

should keep trying to build capabilities human resources through the development of innovation among employees and companies leaders as capital in increases the excellence of compete

3. Relation with the productivity of employee performance as one of the most important

asset for a company , by whom it prosecuted able to develop the personality that is oriented on aspects of entrepreneurship based on the ability of innovation and courage accept the risk of failure

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Akiyama Taro, Furukuwa Yuichi. 2006. *Innovation, Standardization, and Imitation in the Product Cycle Model*. Economics Bulletin. Vol. 6. No. 12.
2. Acemoglu, Daron .1998. *Why Do New Technologies Complement Skill? Directed Technical Change and Wage Inequality*. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, November.
3. Alfred A. Markus. 2011. *Management Strategy: Achieving Sustained Competitive Advantage*. McGraw Hill. International Edition, New York, Amerika.
4. Assink, M. 2006. *Inhibitors of Disruptive Innovation Capability: A Conceptual Model*. European Journal of Innovation Management, Vol.9. No. 2. pp. 215-233.
5. Arawati, Agus. 2004. *TQM as a Focus for Improving Overall Service Performance and Customer Satisfaction: an Empirical Study on a Public Service Sector in Malaysia, Total Quality Management & Business Excellence* Abingdon: Vol.15.Iss.5,6, p. 615-628.
6. Abernathy, W.J. & Clark, K.B. 1985. *Innovation Mapping The Winds of Creative Destruction*. Research Policy. Vol. 15. Pp. 3.
7. Aczel, Amir D, and Jayavel Sounderpandian. 2006. *Complete Business Statistics*. International Edition: McGrawHill.
8. Beamont, N.B. & Schroeder, R.M. 1997. *Technology, Manufacturing Performance, and Business Performance Amongst Australian Manufacturers, Technovation*. Vol. 17.6, pp. 297-307.
9. Bettis & Hitt (1995). *The New Competitive Landscape*. Competitiveness Review. 10. (2). Pp. 1-15.
10. Blocher, Edward J., Chen, Kung H., & Lin, Thomas W. 2005. *Cost Management: A Strategic Emphasis*. Mc.Graw Hill Companies, Inc, USA.
11. Bernardo Nugroho Yahya. 2002. *Business Process Reengineering: Concept, Causes and Effect*. Jurnal Teknik Industri Universitas Kristen Petra Surabaya, Vol.4. No.2. Des. Pp. 102-110.
12. Brue, Greg. 2002. *Six Sigma For Managers*. Mc Graw Hill Companies, Inc. USA.
13. Baiduon, S. 2003. *An Empirical Study of Critical Factors of TQM in Palestinian Organizations*. Logistic Information Management 16.2. Pp.156-171.
14. Bey, M.T., U. Nimran, dan Kertahadi. 1998. *Total Quality Control dan Pengaruh Motivasi Kerja Bagi Karyawan: Studi Evaluasi pada PT. Semen Gresik Persero*. Wacana. 1.2. Pp.236-251.
15. Bhat, V. and J. Cozzolino. 2005. *Total Quality: An Effective Management Tool*. www.casact.org. pp.101-123.
16. Boselie, P. and T. Van Der Wiele. 2001. *Employee Perceptions of HRM and TQM and The Effects on Satisfaction and Intention to Leave*. MSQ Special 'Service Excellence' ERIM Report Series Research Management. pp.1-13.
17. Baker, M. 2008. *Innovation for Sustainability Can We Meet The Challenge*. Business Respect, No.119.
18. C. Molan. 1997. *Manajemen Sumberdaya Manusia*. Prenhalindo. Jakarta.
19. Bhradwaj, Sundar G, P.R. Varandarajan, dan Jihn Fahy. 1993. *Sustaineble Competitive Advantage in Service Industries: A Conceptual Model and Research Proposition*. Journal of Marketing, Vol.57, Oktober. Pp 83-99.
20. Cascio F Wayne. 1995. *Managing Human Resources*. International Edition. Fourth Edition. McGraw Hill Inc.
21. Clutterbuck David dan Kernaghan Susan, 2003. *The Power of Empowerment: Release the Hidden Talents of Your Employees*. Kongan Page Limited.
22. Ciptono. W. S. 2006. *A Sequential Model of Innovation Strategy Company Non-Financial Performance Links*. Gadjah Mada

- International Journal of Business. 8. 2. pp. 137-178.
22. Chen, Ashok Gupta, Leon Hoshower. 2006. *Factor That Motivate Business Faculty to Conduct Research: an Expectancy Theory Analysis. Journal of Education for Business.* Vol. 81. No. 4. Pp. 179.
 23. Chiang Kuang Hou. 2003. *Learning Experience of Doctoral Student in UK Universities.* International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy. Vol. 23. No, 12.
 24. Chesbrough, H. W. 2007. *Why Companies Should Have Open Business Model.* MIT Sloan Management Review. Winter, Vol. 48.No. 2. pp. 22-28.
 25. Cristensen, C. M. 1997. *The Innovator's Dilemma: When New Technologies Cause Greats Firms to Fail.* Harper Business Essentials. New York.
 26. Cristensen, C. M., and Raynor. 2003. *The Innovator's Solution: Creating Sustaining Successful Growth,* Harvard Business School Press.
 27. Colgate, Mark. 1998. *Creating Sustainable Competitive Advantage Throught Marketing Information Technology: A Triangulation Methodology Within The Banking Industry.* International Journal of Bank Marketing, Vol. 16/2.
 28. Chung, Yi-Chan., Shiaw-Wen Tien., Chih-Hung Tsai., and., Lin-Lin Tang. 2007. "An empirical study of customer relationship management implementation in Taiwan's Machine Industry ", *Business and Public Affairs*, Vol. 1, Issue 1. p.1-12.
 29. Capon, Noel and Glazer, Rashi. 1987. *Marketing and Technology: A Strategic Coalignment.* Journal of Marketing, Vol. 51.
 30. Chase, R.B., Aquilano, N.J., & Jacobs, F.R. 2001. *Operation Management for Competitive Advantage.* Ninth Edition, The Mc Graw Hill/Irwin Series.
 31. Chen Li Yueh. 2004. *Examining the Effect of Organization Culture and Leadership Behaviors on Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Job Performance at Small and Middle-Sized Firms of Taiwan.* The Journal of American Academy of Business, Cambridge. pp. 432-438.
 32. Crosby, P.B., 1980. *Quality is Free-The Art of Making Quality Certain.* McGraw Hill, Book Company, New York.
 33. Cooper, R. Donald and Pamela S. Schindler. 2003. *Business Research Method.* Seventh Edition, McGraw Hill, New York.
 34. Drucker, P. 2002. *The Dicipline of Innovation.* Harvard Business Review. pp.5-10.
 35. Dipietro, RA, 1993. *TQM: Evaluation, Scope and Strategic Significance for Management Development.*Journal of Management Development, pp.11-18.
 36. Davilla, T., M, J. Epstein, and Shelton. 2006. *Making Innovation Work.* Upper Saddle River, New Jersey. Pearson Education Inc.
 37. Damanpour, F. 1996. *Organizational Complexity and Innovation : Developing and testing Multiple Contingency Models.* Management Science, Vol.42. No.5. Pp.693-716.
 38. Donnelly, James H., Gibson, James L., dan Ivancevich, John. 1994. *Fundamental of Management.* Texas Business Publication.
 39. Day, George. S and Robin, Wensley, 1988. *Assesing Advantage : A Framework Diagnosing Competitive Superiority.* Journal of Marketing. Vol. 52. April.
 40. Dale, B.G. 2005. *Developing, Introducing and Sustaining TQM.* <<http://www.blackwellpublishing.com>>. Pp. 1-33.
 41. Dessler, G. 1997. *Human Resource Management.* Seventh Edition, by Prentice Hall, Inc, New Jersey.
 42. Droge, Cornelia dan Shownee Vickery. 1994. *Source and Outcomes of Competitive Advantage: An Explanatory Study in The Furniture Industry.* Decision Sciences, Pp.669-689.
 43. Deming, W.E.1986. *Quality, Productivity, and Competitive Position.* MIT Press.
 44. Domingo, Rene T. 1994. *Global Competitiveness Throught Total Quality.* The Asian Manager, April.
 45. Drummond, H. 1992. *The Quality Movement – What Total Quality Management is Really All About.* London. Kogan Page Limited.
 46. Diosdad, Arnold. 2003. "Pengaruh Budaya Perusahaan Terhadap Keunggulan Bersaing". *Jurnal Sains Pemasaran Indonesia* Vol. II No. 3 (Desember). pp. 256-278.
 47. Dunning 2000. *The Eclectic Paradigm as an Envelope for Economics and Business*

- Theories of MNE Activity*. International Business Review, 9. 163-190
48. Droussiotis, Annbel. 2004. *The Profile of High Performing Employees in Cyprus*. The Journal of Business in Developing Nations. Vol.8.
 49. Dessler, G. 2005. *Human Resource Management*. Tenth Edition. London: Prentice Hall International Inc.
 50. Edquist, C. 1997. *Systems of Innovation: Technologies, Institutions and Organization*. Winter, London.
 51. Evans, James R, and William M. Lindsay, 1996. *The Management and Control of Quality*, 3th edition. West Publishing Company. Minneapolis.
 52. Eisenmann, T., G. Parker, and M.W. Van Alstyne. 2006. *Strategies for Two-Sided Markets*. Harvard Business Review. Pp. 92-101.
 53. Ellitan, L. 2001. *Adopsi Teknologi Pada Industri Manufaktur di Jawa Timur*. Makalah Finalis Pemilihan Peneliti Muda Indonesia. LIPI. Jakarta. Agustus.
 54. Ellitan, L. Jantan, M & Dahlan N. 2001. *Technology Management and Firm's Performance*. The Fourth Asian of Academy Management Conference Proceedings. Vol.1. No. 1. Pp. 357-362. November, Johor Bahru.
 55. Ferdows, K., De Meyer, A. 1990. *Lasting Improvement in Manufacturing performance: in Search of a New Theory*. Journal of Operation Management. 9 .2. 168-184.
 56. Feigenbaum, AV. 1988. *Total Quality Development in The 1990s- An International Perspective in Chase*. R.I (ed), Total Quality Management: An IFS Briefing, IFS Publication, pp.3-9.
 57. Fromm, E. 1975. *Man of himself*. New York: Fawcett Premier.
 58. Flaherty, M.T. 1996. *Global Operation Management*. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc.
 59. Ferdinand, Augusty. 2000. *Structural Equation Modelling dalam Penelitian Manajemen*. Seri Pustaka Kunci. No. 2. Semarang : Program Magister Manajemen UNDIP`
 60. Goetsch, D.D. & S. Davis. 1994. *Introduction to Total Quality: Quality, Productivity, Competitiveness*. Englewood, Cliff, N.J.; Prentice Hall International, Inc.
 61. Gaynor, Gerard H. 1996. *Handbook of Technology Management*. Mc Graw Hill Companies, Inc.
 62. Grunert G. Klaus. 2000. *Advanced Marketing*. (8), Fall. Handout.
 63. Goetsch, David L and Davis, Stanley B. 2002. *Manajemen Mutu Total*. Edisi kedua. Penerbit PT Prenhalindo. Jakarta.
 64. Gordon, I. 2006. *Relationship Demarketing: Managing Wasteful or Worthless Customer Relationships*. Ivey Business Journal, March/April. pp.1-4.
 65. Gomes, Faustino Cardoso. 1985. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Penerbit Andi Offset Yogyakarta.
 66. Gatignon, Hubert and Xueieb, Jean-Marc. 1997. *Strategic Orientation of the Firm and New Product Performance*. *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 34.
 67. Gaspersz, V. 2005. *Total Quality Management*. PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama, Jakarta.
 68. Ghobadian, A., Galler, D.N. 1997. *TQM and Organizational Size*. International Journal of Operation and Production Management, Vol. 17. No.2. Pp. 121-163.
 69. Goetsch, David L., and Davis B. Stanley. 2000. *Quality Management: Introduction to Total Quality Management for Production, Processing, and Services*. Third Edition, Prentice Hall Inc, New Jersey.
 70. Gilad Aharonovitz and Elizabeth Kabura Nyaga, 2008. *Values and Economic Performance: Theory and some Evidence from Kenya*. Working Paper Series WP-2008. (18). School of Economic Sciences. Washington State University.
 71. Goetsch, David L., and Davis B. Stanley. 2010. *Quality Management for Organization Excellent*. Introduction to Total Quality. Sixth Edition, Pearson International Edition.
 72. Gera, Surendra & Wulong Gu. 2004. *The Effect of Organizational Innovation and Information Technology on Firm Performance*. International Productivity Monitor. No. 9. Fall.
 73. Hair, F.J., Anderson, William C. Black. Barry J. Babin, Rolph E. Anderson., Ronald L. Tatham. 2006. *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Sixth Edition. Pearson International Edition.
 74. Hattori, Tamio, 1986. *Technology Transfer and Management Systems*. The Developing Economies, XXIV-4.

75. Harrison, N & Samson, D. 1997. *International Best Practice in The Adoption and Management of New Technology, Department Industry, Science and Tourism*. Australia.
76. Handoko, V. Rudi, & Didit Darmawan. 2004. *Pengaruh Kinerja Wiraniaga dan Karakter Demografinya terhadap Kinerja Pasar Perusahaan*. Jurnal Ilmu-ilmu Sosial dan Humaniora, Edisi Juli, Vol.8. No.1, Pp 63-72.
77. Hurley, Robert. F and Hult G, Thomas, M. 1998. *Inovation, Market Orientation, and Organizational Learning: An Integration and Empirical Examination*. Journal of Marketing.
78. Hamel, G. 2002. *Innovation Now*. Fast Company. December
79. Hadjimanolis, Athanasios. 2000. *An Investigation of Innovation antecedents in Small Firms in the Context of a Small Developing Country*. R&D Management. Vol.30.
80. Hardjosoedarmo, S. 2004. *Total Quality Management*. Andi, Yogyakarta.
81. Huang, F, and Yao, T. 2002. *Relationships of TQM Philosophy, Methods and Performance: A Survey in Taiwan*. Industrial Management & Data Systems. 102. 4 : Pp. 226-234.
82. Hadjimanolis, Athanasios, Keith Dickson. 2000. *Innovation Strategies of SMEs in Cyprus, A Small Developing Country*. International Small Business Journal. 18. 4, Pp. 62-79.
83. Hasibuan, M. 2003. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
84. Husen Umar. 2000. *Riset Sumber Daya Manusia dalam Organisasi*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama, Jakarta.
85. Handoko T, Hani. 2000. *Manajemen Personalia dan Sumberdaya Manusia*. Edisi 2. BPF- Yogyakarta.
86. Hertz, H.S. 2007. *Malcolm Baldrige Criteria for Performance Excellence*. IQAF, Gaithersburg.
87. Higgins, J.M. 1995. *Innovation: The Core Competence*. Planning Review. Vol.23. No.6, pp.32-50.
88. Hessel Nogi S. Tangkilisan. 2003. *Manajemen Modern untuk Sektor Publik*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Balairung & Co.
89. Holland, S., and B.B. Lazo. 2004. *The Global Pharmaceutical Industry*. Manchester Business School.
90. IQAF. 2007. *Malcolm Baldrige Criteria for Performance Excellence*. Indonesian Quality Award Foundation. Jakarta.
91. Irwin, J.G. & Hoffman, J.J., Geiger, S.W. 1998. *The Effect of Technological adoption on organizational performance*. International Journal of Organization Analysis. Vol. 6 (1). Pp. 50-64.
92. Imai, Masaaki. 2001. *Kaizen (Ky'zen), Kunci Sukses Jepang Dalam Persaingan*. Seri Manajemen Operasi. No. 6: PPM.
93. Imai, Masaaki. 1999. *Gemba Kaizen*. Jakarta : CV. Teruna Grafica
94. Ishikawa, Kaoru. 1985. *What is Total Quality Control?* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall International Inc.
95. Jeaning, Peter. 1997. *The Performance and Competitive Advantage of Small Firms: A Management Perspective*. International Small Business Journal. Vol.15. edisi.2. Pp. 63-75.
96. Johnne, A. 1999. *Successful Market Innovation*. European Journal of Innovation Management, Vol.2.No.1, pp.6-11.
97. John D, Politis. 2005. *QFD, Organizational Creativity & Productivity*. International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management. Vol. 22. No.1.
98. Jones, Nory B Thomas R Kochtanek. 2004. *Success Factors in The Implementation of Colloborative Technology and Productivity Improvement in a Small Business: An Exploratory Study*. Journal of Organizational and End User Computing. Jan-Mar. 16.1.ABI/INFORM Global.Pp.1
99. Joreskoq, Karl and Dag Sorbom. 2004. *LISREL8: Structural Equation Modelling with The SIMPLIS Command Language*. Chicago: Scientific Software International.
100. Jabnoun, N. and K. Sedrani. 2005. *TQM, Culture, and Performance in UAE Manufacturing Firms*, Quality Management Journal. 12 (4):8-20.
101. Juran, J.M. 1989. *Juran on Leadership for Quality, The Free Press, Mc Milan, Inc. E. Nugroho (penterjemah)*. 1995. Kepemimpinan Mutu. Pustaka Binaman Pressindo, Jakarta.
102. Juran, J.M., Gyra, F.M.. 1993., *Quality Planning and Analysis*, 3rd ed. McGraw Hill Book Company, Singapore.

103. Krajewski, L. J., & Ritzman, L.P. 2002. *Operation Management: Strategy and Analysis*. Sixth Edition. Prentice Hall International, Inc.
104. Kaynak, H. 2003. *The Relationship between TQM Practices & Their effect on Firm Performance*. Journal of Operation Management. Pp. 405-435.
105. Kekale, T. 1999. *The Effects of Organizational Culture on Successes and Failures Implementation of Some Total Quality Management Approach*. Bristol Business School Teaching and Research Review. Issues 1:1-15.
106. Kujala, J. and P. Ullrank. 2004. *Total Quality Management as a Cultural Phenomenon*. <<http://www.asq.org/pp.43-55>>.
107. Knight, D.J. 2001. *Making Friends with Disruptive Technology : An Interview with Clayton M. Cristensen*. Strategy & Leadership. MCB University Press 1087-8572, Pp.10-15.
108. Kim, Linsu. 1999. *Building Technological Capability for Industrialization: Analytical Frameworks and Korea's Experience*. Industrial and Corporate Change. Vol.8. No.1.
109. Kim, W.C, and R. Mauborgne. 1999. *Strategy, value Innovation, and The Knowledge Economy*. MIT Sloan Management Review, Spring, Vol. 40. No.3., Pp.41-53.
110. Li, Ling X. 2000. *An Analysis of Sources of Competitiveness and Performance of Chinese Manufacturer*. International Journal of Operation and Production Management. Vol. 20. No. 3.
111. Lee, Hyun-Hwa., Ann Marie Fiore., and., Jihyun Kim. 2006. *The role of the technology acceptance model in explaining effects of image interactivity technology on customer responses* “, International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management, Vol. 34, No. 8 p. 621-644
112. Lukas, Bryan. A and Ferrel, O. C. 2000. *The Effect of Market Orientation on Product Innovation*. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science. Vol. 28, Spring.
113. Li, Tiger and Calantone, Roger J. 1998. *The Impact of Market Knowledge Competence on New Product Advantage: Conceptualization and Empirical Examination*. Journal of Marketing. Vol. 62, Oktober.
114. Lall V. Verman. 1978. *Standardization, A New Discipline*. Affiliated East-West Press PVT.LTD. New Delhi.
115. Lengnick-Hall, C.A. 1992. *Innovation and Competitive Advantage: What We Know and What We Need to Learn*. Journal of Management, 18, 2, 399-429.
116. Lusch, R.F., S.L Vargo, and A.J. Malter. 2006. *Marketing as Service-Exchange: Taking a Leadership Role in Global Marketing Management*. Organizational Dynamics. Vol.35.No.3, pp.267-278.
117. Lee, G.L., Oakes, L. 1995. *The “Pros” and “Cons” of Total Quality Management for Small Firms in Manufacturing: Some Experience Down The Supply Chain*. Total Quality Management. Vol. 6. No.4, pp. 413-426.
118. Lakhe, R.R. and R.P. Moharty. 1995. *Understanding TQM in Service System*. International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management, Vol.9, Pp 139-153.
119. Lee, S.F., Roberts, Paul., Lau, W.S., & Leung, Ruth. 1999. *Survey on Deming's TQM Philosophies Implementation in Hongkong*. Managerial Auditing Journal, MCB University Press, Vol. 12. No. 8., Pp. 395-399.
120. Li, Ling X, 2000. *An Analysis of Sources of Competitiveness and Performance of Chinese Manufacturers*. International Journal of Operation and Production Management, Vol.20. No.3.
121. Mahmudi, 2005. *Manajemen Kinerja Sektor Publik*. Akademi Manajemen Perusahaan YPKN, Yogyakarta.
122. Mehta, M. 2006. *Growth By Design How Good Design Drives Company Growth*. Ivey Business Journal, January/February, Pp.1-5.
123. Malthis, Robert L. dan John H. Jackson. 2001. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Edisi Pertama. Jilid 2. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
124. Marquis, D.G. 2003. *The Anatomy is Successful Innovations*. Innovation. November.
125. Metri, B.A. 2005. *TQM Critical Success Factors for Construction Firms*. Management. 10. 2: Pp. 61-72.
126. Mathis R.L dan Jackson J.H, 2002, *Manajemen Sumber daya Manusia*, Salemba Empat, Jakarta.

127. Musselwhite, W. Cristhoper. 1990. *Time Based Innovation: The New Competitive Advantage*. Training and Development journal, Pp. 53-56.
128. Muluk, M.K. 2003. *Manajemen Pengetahuan: Kebingungan Praktek dan Peta Kajian*. Usahawan 04 Th. XXXII April 2003.
129. Model, Svenn. 2009. *Bundling Management Control Innovations : A Field Study of Organizational Experimenting With TQM & The Balanced Scorecard*. Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal. Vol. 22. No.1.
130. Mulyadi. 2001. *Balanced Scorecard: Alat Manajemen Kontemporer untuk Pelipatganda Kinerja Keuangan Perusahaan*. Salemba Empat, Jakarta.
131. Moore, Rita., and, Mary Jo Jackson (2007), " *End-user computing strategy : an examination of its impact on end user satisfaction* ", Academy of strategic Management Journal, Vol. 6 p.69
132. Nasution, M.N. 2005. *Manajemen Mutu Terpadu*. Edisi Kedua. Penerbit Ghalia Indonesia.
133. Nazir, Mohammad, 2005. *Metode Penelitian*. Cetakan Keempat, Jakarta. Ghalia Indonesia.
134. Narver, John.C, and Slater, Stanley. F. 1990. *The Effect of Market Orientation on Business Profitability*. Journal of Marketing, Oktober
135. Otim, Samuel., and, Varun Grover. 2006. *An empirical study on web-based service and customer loyalty* ", European Journal of Information System, Vol. 15 p. 527-541
136. Ogbonna, E., Harris, L.C. 2000. *Leadership Style, Organizational Culture and Performance: Empirical Evidence From UK Companies*. Journal of Human Resource Management. Vol 11 No 4 Agustus 2000: pp.766-788.
137. Phillips, P.A. 2000. *The Strategic Planning/Finance Interface: Does Sophistication Really Matter?* Management Decision. Vol 38/8: pp.541-549
138. Parncharoen, C, A Girardi, L. Entrek. 2005. *The Impact of Culture Values on The Succesful Implementation of Total Quality Management : A Comparison Between The Australian and Thai Models*. <http://www.blake.montclair.edu>. pp. 597-605. Maret 2006.
139. Prajogo, D.I., and Brown, A. 2004. *The Relationship Between TQM Practice and Quality Performance and The Role of Formal TQM Programs : An Australian Empirical Study*. Quality Management Journal. 11.4 : Pp. 31-42.
140. Porter, Michael. E. 1993. *Keunggulan Bersaing , Menciptakan dan Mempertahankan Kinerja Unggul*. Erlangga, Jakarta.
141. Porter, Michael, E. 1999. *Competitive Strategy*. The Freepress. New York. Pp 20.
142. Prujit, Hans. 2003. *Performance and Quality of Work Life*. Journal of Organizational Change Management. Vol. 13. Pp. 389-400.
143. Radenakers, Martin. 2005. *Corporate Universities: Driving Force of Knowledge Innovation*. Journal of Workplace Learning, ABI/INFORM Global, Pp. 130
144. Roth, H., & W.J. Morse .1983. " *Let's Help Measure and Report Quality Costs* ". Management Accounting, 65.
145. Render, Barry dan Jay Haizer. 2001. *Prinsip-prinsip Manajemen Operasi*. Edisi Pertama. Salemba Empat. Jakarta.
146. Render, Barry and Jay Heizer. 2004. *Operation Management*. International Edition, Pearson Education Inc. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.
147. Render, B., Haizer, J. 2005. *Operation Management: Flexible Version*. Seventh Edition. Pearson Education, Inc., Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.
148. Robbins, Stephen P. 2001. *Organizational Behavior*. Nine Edition, San Diego University: Prentice Hall Inc.
149. Robbins, Stephen P. & Timothy A. Judge. 2007. *Organizational Behavior*, 12th, New Jersey: Pearson Educational Inc.
150. Ross, J.E. 1994. *Total Quality Management*. London: Kogan Page Ltd.
151. Rizzoni, A. 1991. *Technological Innovation and Small Firms Taxonomy*. International Small Business Journal, 9, 3, Pp. 31-42.
152. Ramanathan K, 1993. *Industrial Technology Indicators Manual*. UNDP-UNESCO Project, Indonesian Institute of Science (LIPI).
153. Rosenberg, Nathan. 1982. *Inside the Black Box; Technology and Economics*. New York, Cambridge University Press, 247.
154. Raynor, E.M and C.M Cristensen. 2003. *Innovating for Growth: Now IS the Time*. Ivey Business Journal, Sept/Okt, pp.1-9.

- 155.Rios, Peres Joze. 2006. *Communication & Information Technologies To Viable Organization*. The International Journal of System & Cybernetics. Vol. 35. No. 7/8.
- 156.Schilling, M.A. 2005. *Strategic Management of Technological Innovation*. New York:Mc graw-Hill.
- 157.Seng, O.Y. 2002. *Implementing Total Productive Maintenance (TPM) in an Industrial Manufacturing Organization: An Operational Strategy Study*, MA Thesis, University Science of Malaysia.
- 158.Song, Michael. 2005. *Marketing and Technology Resource Complementarity*. Strategic Management Journal. Pp. 259-276.
- 159.Sharif, Nawas M. 1986. *Technology Policy Formulation and Planning: A Reference Manual*. Asian Pacific Centre for Transfer Technology, Bangalore, India.
- 160.Simanjuntak, P.J. 1995. *Peningkatan Produktivitas dan Mutu Pelayanan Sektor Pemerintah*. Jakarta: Dewan Produktivitas Nasional.
- 161.Sim, K.L. 2001. *An Empirical Examination of Successive Incremental Improvement Techniques and Investment in Manufacturing Strategy*. International Journal of Operation and Production Management. Vol. 21 (3). Pp. 1-19.
- 162.Shouqing, W. 2009. *Improving Productivity by Management*. School of Building and Real Estate. The National University of Singapore.
- 163.Stephen, George. 1994. *Total Quality Management*. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- 164.Srismith, K. 2005. *Quality Culture and Integrated Communication, The Annual Meeting of The Australian and New Zealand Communication Association*. Crithurch, New Zealand. Pp. 1-15.
- 165.Supratiningrum & Zulaikha. 2004. *Pengaruh Total Quality Management Terhadap Kinerja Manajerial dengan Sistem Pengukuran Kinerja dan Sistem Penghargaan (Reward) sebagai Variabel Moderating*, Jurnal Riset Akuntansi Indonesia, Vol.4.No.1, Januari, hal. 25-36.
- 166.Stoner, James A.F, Edward Freeman dan Daniel R Gilbert. 1995. *Management*. Sixth edition, New York: Prentice Hall Inc.
- 167.Sugiyono, 2008. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R & D*, Penerbit Alfabeta, Bandung.
- 168.Sekaran, Uma. 2006. *Research Method for Business*. Metode Penelitian untuk Bisnis. Edisi 4. Terjemahan. Penerbit Salemba Empat.
- 169.Tjiptono, F dan A. Diana. 2003. *Total Quality Management*. Edisi Revisi, Andi, Yogyakarta.
- 170.Thoby Mutis & V. Gaspers. 2004. *Nuansa Menuju Perbaikan Kualitas dan Produktivitas*. Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas Trisakti.
- 171.Timpe, D.A. 2000. *Produktivitas: Seri Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: Alex Media Komputindo.
- 172.Terziovski, M., D. Samson, and D. Dow. 2003. *The Business Value of Quality Management Systems Certification: Evidence from Australia and New Zealand*. Journal of Operation Management. 17 : Pp. 393-409.
- 173.Tohardi, Ahmad, 2002. *Pemahaman Praktis Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Edisi I, Bandung: CV. Mandar Maju.
- 174.Tidd,I., Bassant, I, and K. Pavitt. 2001. *Managing Innovation: Integrating Technological, Market, and Organizational Change*. 2th Ed, Wiley, Chichester.
- 175.Thomke, S, and E. Von Hippel. 2002. *Customer Innovations : A New York to Create Value*. Harvard Business Review, April.pp.5-11.
- 176.Timpe, A Dale. 1989. *The Art and Science of Business Management Productivity*. Kent Publishing, New York.
- 177.Timpe, A. Dale. 2006. *Kinerja*. PT Elex Media Kompetindo.Jakarta
- 178.Tenner, Arthur R, Detoro, Irving J, 1993, *Total Quality Management*. Addison-Wesley, Publishing Company, USA.
- 179.Telles, G. and Godhar, P. 1996. ‘*Firt to market, firt to fail? : Real Causes of Enduring Market leadership*,” Sloan Management Review, pp. 65-75.
- 180.United Nations – Economics and Social Commision for Asia and Pacific (UNESCAP), 2006. *Technology Atlas Project*, Bangalore, India.
- 181.Vanny, Iwan. 2002. *Pilihan Strategi Unggulan Perusahaan Industri Manufaktur Kecil dan Menengah (IMKM)*. Studi Kasus beberapa perusahaan IMKM di Jawa Timur. Usahawan. No. 07. Th XXXI. Juli.
- 182.Veloso, Francisco. 2000. *The Automotive Supply Chain: Global trend and Asian*

- Perspective*. Working Paper for The Project of International Competitiveness of Asian Economies: A Cross – Country Study, MIT, Cambridge.
183. Voss, Glen. B and Voss, Zannie, Giraud. 2000. *Strategic Orientation and Firm Performance in an Artistic Environment*. Journal of Marketing, Vol.64.
184. Valikanges, L. and M. Gilbert. 2005. *Boundary-Setting Strategies for Escaping Innovation Traps*. IT Sloan Management Review. Spring. Vol. 46. No. 3, Pp.58-65.
185. Vinod, Kumar & Franck Choine, Danuta de Grosbis, Uma Kumar. 2009. *Impact of TQM on Company's Performance*. International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management. Vol. 26. Pp. 23-37.
186. V. Talavera, Ma Gloria. 2004. *Development and Validation of TQM Construct*. The Philippine Experience. Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business. Vol. 6. No. 3. September. Pp. 355-380.
187. Werther, William B, dan Keith Davis. 2000. *Management Human Resources and Personnel Management*. New York: Mc Graw Hill International, Fifth Edition.
188. Wright, Gavin. 1997. *Towards A More Historical Approach To Technological Change*. The Economic Journal, 107. September.
189. Wilkinson, A. M Marchington, J. Goodman and P. Ackers. 1992. *Total Quality Management and Employee Involvement*. Human Resource Management Journal. 2. 4: Pp. 1-20.
190. Wahyono. 2002. *Orientasi Pasar dan Inovasi: Pengaruhnya Terhadap Kinerja Pemasaran*. Jurnal Sains Pemasaran Indonesia. Vol. 1. No.1. Prog. Magister Manajemen UNDIP.
191. World Business Council for Sustainable (WBC). 2000. *The Business Case for Sustainable Development: Making a Difference Toward The Johannesburg Summit 2002 and Beyond*.
192. Williams, R. and D. Edge. 1996. *The Social Shaping of Technology*. Research Policy. Vol. 25, No. 6, September, Hal. 865-871.
193. Washio, Hiroaki. 1986. *The Provision of Manuals and Japanese Private Technology Transfer*. The Developing Economies, XXIV-4, December.
194. Wind, Jerry and Mahajan, Vijay. 1997. *Issues and Opportunities in New Product Development: An Introduction to the Special Issues*. Journal of Marketing Research. Vol. 34, February.
195. Wuryanti, Wahyu. 2010. *Standarisasi Pedoman Pengukuran Produktivitas Tenaga Kerja Untuk Pekerjaan Konstruksi Bangunan Gedung*. Prosiding PPI Standarisasi. Banjarmasin. Agustus.
196. Wanen, H, Schmidt V. dan Finnigan J.P. 1992. *The Race Without a Finish Line*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
197. Yamit, Zulian, 2003. *Manajemen Kualitas Produk & Jasa*. Penerbit Ekonisia Yogyakarta.
198. Yuwono, S., dkk. 2002. *Petunjuk Praktis Penyusunan Balanced Scorecard: Menuju Organisasi yang Berfokus Pada Strategi*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama, Jakarta.
199. Zahra, Shaker A. 1993. *New Product Innovation in Established Companies: Associations with Industry and Strategy Variables*. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice. Pp. 47-69.
200. Zehir, Cemal. 2006. *Identifying Organizational Capabilities As Predictor of Growth and Business Performance*. The Business Review, Cambridge.
201. Zahra, Shaker A., and Das, Shidarta R. 1993. *Innovation Strategy and Financial Performance in Manufacturing Companies: An Empirical Study*. Production and Operation Management, 2, 1, 15-3.
202. Zakon, Alan. 1989. *The Two Sides of The Innovation Equation*. Management Review. 19-21.
203. Zeira, Joseph. 1998. *Workers, Machines and Economic Growth*. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, November.
204. Zangwill, Williard I. 1993. *Lightning Strategies for Innovation*. Mac Millan Inc.
205. Zahra, S.A., dan S. R. Dass. 1993. *Innovation Strategy and Financial Performance in Manufacturing Companies: An Empirical Study*. Production and Operation Management 2 (I) (Winter): 15-37.