Turnitin Originality Report		
Processed on: 20-Aug-2020 12:37 +08 ID: 1371673041 Word Count: 5568 Submitted: 1	Similarity Index 17%	Similarity by Source Internet Sources: N/A Publications: 15% Student Papers: 8%
The Role of Intellectual Capital on Public Universities Performance in Indonesia By Fivi Anggraini		
Yolanda Ramírez-Córcoles, Montserra intellectual capital disclosure: empirio Knowledge Management Research &	4% match (publicatio It Manzaneque-Lizano. cal evidence from Span Practice, 2017	ns) <u>"The relevance of</u> nish universities",
2% match (publications) <u>Yolanda Ramírez Córcoles, Jesús F. Sa</u> <u>"Intellectual capital in Spanish public</u> <u>needs", Journal of Intellectual Capita</u>	antos Peñalver, Ángel universities: stakehol l, 2011	<u>Tejada Ponce.</u> ders' information
2% match (publications) <u>Ivoni Bezhani. "Intellectual capital re</u> <u>Intellectual Capital, 2010</u>	<u>porting at UK universi</u>	<u>ties", Journal of</u>
1% match (student papers from 20-A Submitted to Symbiosis International	Aug-2019) I University on 2019-0	<u>8-20</u>
1% match (publications) James Mark Ngari. "chapter 11 Intelle Pharmaceutical Firms in Kenya", IGI	<u>ectual Capital and Bus</u> Global, 2017	iness Performance of
1% match (publications) Journal of Intellectual Capital, Volume	<u>e 11, Issue 4 (2010-1</u>	<u>1-08)</u>
1% match (student papers from 20-N Submitted to Universiti Malaysia Paha	May-2019) ang on 2019-05-20	
1% match (student papers from 19-J Submitted to Universitas Negeri Sem	un-2020) arang on 2020-06-19	
< 1% match (publications) Eric Kong. "Analyzing BSC and IC's us Journal of Intellectual Capital, 2010	sefulness in nonprofit	organizations",
< 1% match (student papers from 08 Submitted to National Institute of De	3-Sep-2016) velopment Administra	tion on 2016-09-08
< 1% match (publications) <u>Muslim Amin, Wan Khairuzzaman Wa</u> Daverson Andrew Selemani. "The imp practices on performance", The TQM	n Ismail, Siti Zaleha A pact of human resourc Journal, 2014	<u>bdul Rasid, Richard</u> e management
< 1% match (student papers from 15 Submitted to Higher Education Comm	5-Jul-2011) nission Pakistan on 20	<u>11-07-15</u>

< 1% match (student papers from 01-Sep-2014) Submitted to University of Mauritius on 2014-09-01
< 1% match (student papers from 23-Jan-2014) <u>Submitted to Higher Education Commission Pakistan on 2014-01-23</u>
< 1% match (student papers from 29-Apr-2020) Submitted to School of Business and Management ITB on 2020-04-29
< 1% match (publications) Ya-Hui Ling. "The influence of intellectual capital on organizational performance— Knowledge management as moderator", Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 2011
< 1% match (publications) <u>Wen-Ying Wang, Chingfu Chang. "Intellectual capital and performance in causal</u> models", Journal of Intellectual Capital, 2005
< 1% match (publications) <u>Yolanda Ramírez-Córcoles, Montserrat Manzaneque-Lizano.</u> "The relevance of <u>intellectual capital disclosure: empirical evidence from Spanish universities",</u> <u>Knowledge Management Research & Practice, 2013</u>
< 1% match (student papers from 14-Mar-2014) Submitted to University of Glamorgan on 2014-03-14
< 1% match (publications) Julian Lin. "Understanding the Beliefs and Intentions in Search and Purchase Functions in an E-Commerce Web Site", IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management, 2008
< 1% match (student papers from 09-Sep-2019) Submitted to University of Southampton on 2019-09-09
< 1% match (publications) <u>Yu-Shan Chen, Ming-Ji James Lin, Ching-Hsun Chang. "The Influence of</u> <u>Intellectual Capital on New Product Development Performance – The</u> <u>Manufacturing Companies of Taiwan as an Example", Total Quality Management &</u> <u>Business Excellence, 2006</u>
< 1% match (publications) <u>Maryam Jameelah Hashim, Syed Musa Alhabshi, Nor Irvoni Mohd Ishar. "Does</u> <u>Intellectual Capital Explain the Financial Performance of Malaysia MFIs?", Social</u> <u>and Management Research Journal, 2018</u>
< 1% match (publications) <u>Larry J. Menor, M. Murat Kristal, Eve D. Rosenzweig. "Examining the Influence of</u> <u>Operational Intellectual Capital on Capabilities and Performance", Manufacturing</u> <u>& Service Operations Management, 2007</u>
< 1% match (publications) Internet Research, Volume 23, Issue 1 (2013-01-29)
< 1% match (publications) Sakinah Mat Zin, Khamisah Abd Manaf. "chapter 11 Role of Intellectual Capital in Women Entrepreneurs' Business Performance", IGI Global, 2019
< 1% match (publications) José Maria Viedma Marti, Maria do Rosário Cabrita. "Entrepreneurial Excellence in the Knowledge Economy", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2012

< 1% match (publications) <u>Muhammad Nadeem, Christopher Gan, Cuong Nguyen. "Does intellectual ca</u> <u>efficiency improve firm performance in BRICS economies? A dynamic panel</u> <u>estimation", Measuring Business Excellence, 2017</u>	<u>apital</u>
< 1% match (publications) <u>Rohana Ngah, Abdul Razak Ibrahim. "The Influence of Intellectual Capital o</u> <u>Knowledge Sharing: Small and Medium Enterprises' Perspective",</u> <u>Communications of the IBIMA, 2011</u>	n
< 1% match (publications) Subhash Abhayawansa, Mark Aleksanyan, John Bahtsevanoglou. "The use of intellectual capital information by sell-side analysts in company valuation", Accounting and Business Research, 2015	<u>of</u>
The Role of Intellectual Capital on Public Universities Performance in Indonesia ABSTRACT Intellectual capital is anticipated as the key factors that could contribute to universities performance and create value for globally competitive advantage. Accordingly, this study <u>investigates the</u> role of intellectual capital and its elements: namely human capital, structural capital and relational capital, on the public universities performance in Indonesia. A total gl 77 respondents representing from 8 top public universities in Indonesia were involved in the study. The <u>Partial</u> <u>Least Square (PLS)</u> was used to test the hypotheses. The result found that there is a significant relationship of Intellectual Capital (IC) and its elements on universities performance. Conclusively, it is wise to recommend to the university to invest in <u>intellectual capital</u> . Also, these elements should be used as a new model for measurement of the university or higher education institution performance so that it provides added value to strengthen their competitiveness ability. Keywords: <u>Human</u> capital, <u>intellectual capital</u> , relational capital, structural capital, universities performance <u>INTRODUCTION</u> Higher educations in Indonesia have grown rapidly since last decades. As reported by the Ministry of National Education, Republic of Indonesia (2013) not cited in reference, the amount of public and private higher education institutions in Indonesia increased about 18% and 5.39%, respectively from the year 2005 to 2011. The increment of higher education institutions in Indonesia has created a new paradigm that leads the university's orientation, i.e. not only have to be able to compete at the national level, but at the global level as well. Besides, the Indonesian higher education spectring new information that is necessary for stakeholders such as governments, funding agencies, researchers, students, eventual partners. Hence, the Indonesian government has determined the rank of a university in the list of the world ranking university a	

conducted concerning intellectual capital and organisation performances, however, specific studies focusing on the relationships between the variables of intellectual capital and university performance in the research literature is rare. Currently, only studies conducted by Lu (2012) in Taiwanese universities and Meihami and Karimi (2014) in Iraqi universities were revealed in the research literature. Similarly, in the case of Indonesia, the research on intellectual capital in universities is very scarce and is a piecemeal study. Puspitahati, Ulum, and Prasetyo (2011) studied on the intellectual capital reports of the university's official website that won the QS-Star framework, which was actually built for the items IC of European universities (Leitner, 2002). Also, another study reported by Ulum (2012), who utilised the items of intellectual capital based on the items published by Leitner (2002) and combined with the guidelines accreditation programme by the Indonesian 3 Universities Accreditation Institution (BAN-PT). Sadalia and Lubis (2015) also examined discriminant analysis of intellectual model (organisation culture and corporate governance) of a state university in Medan city, Indonesia; nonetheless, the sample is too limited to make a generalisation for Indonesian conditions. Conclusively, the previous studies in Indonesia are limited to a descriptive research, and have no framework and conceptualisation model developed comprehensively to examine the relationship between intellectual capital and universities performances. Thus, this study was <u>made to</u> examine the empirical effects of <u>intellectual capital e.g. human</u> <u>capital, structural capital, and relational capital on the performance of</u> public universities in Indonesia. The study would hopefully prove empirically a model to measure the performance of public universities in Indonesia and its relation with intellectual capital. LITERATURE REVIEW Performance is an important element in the university, which can be used as a measurement of the university achievement. Measuring university performance is made on the basis of academic excellence achieved. In line with the paradigm shift of higher education in the globalisation era, the university has to change the orientation from a "national, analogue, industrial economy" to one that is "global, digital and information-based" as stated by Hughes (2013). Facing these challenges, Indonesian universities should enhance their performances both in academics and management. Performances measurement has increasingly pushed a call for accountability in higher education. However, there are still few frameworks of universities performances measurements have been developed. Many performances measurement frameworks are originated from private sectors for purposely getting profits. An attempt has been made by Wang (2010), who claimed that the universities performance can be measured from education and research aspects, which are in line with the university roles and functions. Intellectual capital is the most important strategic and significant assets towards organisational performance in various field and perspectives (Abadulai, Kwon, & Moon, 2012; Gruian, 2011; Hashim, Osman, & Alhabshi, 2015; Khalique, Shaari, Isa, & Samad, 2013; Vishnu & Gupta, 2014; Wang, Wang, & Liang, 2014). The university is an organisation, thus it provides the avenue for IC investigation since IC is so important to universities (Jones, Meadow, & Sicilia, 2009). Universities yield knowledge, also within scientific technical research such as the results of investigation, publication, or across teaching e.g. students trained and productive 4 relationships with the stakeholders (Ramírez & Gordillo, 2014). Universities organisations are, therefore, the best framework for the presentation of ideas associated with the intellectual capital theory (Paloma, Sánchez, & Elena, 2006). Public universities confront with the increased demand of government as owners and citizens as stakeholders for transparency regarding the use of these funds expose about the social and economic outcomes of universities, and they join forces with other research institutions, private or public organisations, or even participate in international research networks (Leitner, 2005). The academic community, as well as the universal

community, assumes that the intellectual capital of a university must obtain the highest levels of quality and does not require any kind of intervention. However, the reality falsifies this statement and today's universities are in slow progressing to innovate (Fazlagic, 2005). Public universities do not have owner structure like private organisations, and consequently, they do not need to produce the kind of annual reports required by commercial law, but they have to implement financial accounting systems (Leitner, 2005). There is a lack of literature that supports the impact of intellectual capital on performance in the education sector. However, studies reported by Lu (2012), and Meihami and Karami (2014) show that the intellectual capitals have a significant impact on universities performance. From a theoretical perspective, the resource based view theory assists a manager knowing that the resources of the organisation can be noticed as organisations' most essential asset, and at the same time he is also valuing those assets to increase organisation's performance. The above arguments support the statement that intellectual capital plays an important role to increase the organisational performances of universities. According to Bontis (1999) and Kong (2007), human capital, structural capital, and relational capital are the component of the IC framework for the non-profit organisation. In addition, other scholars in the non-profit management area have agreed that IC includes three primary interrelated non-financial elements such as Stewart (1997), Roos, Roos, Dragonetti, and Edvinsson (1997), Van Buren (1999), Bontis, (2001), Fletcher, Guthrie, Steane, Roos, and Pike (2003), and Grasenick and Low (2004). Intellectual capital of universities is represented as being formed by three basic and closely interrelated components e.g. human capital, structural capital and relational capital. The elements of a university's intellectual capital have been classified in varying ways, although certainly it is the tripartite classification that is most widely accepted in specialised literature (Benzhani, 2010; Córcoles et al., 2011; Leitner, 2005; Cañibano & Sánchez, 2009). 5 Human capital is defined as human capital associates to employee's knowledge, competencies, skill, capability and innovation; and various resource elements attitude and intellectual agility, tacit knowledge, talents of people, (Khalique, Shaari, Isa, & Agel, 2011). Many studies have shown the significant relationship between human capital and organisation performance (Abadulai et al., 2012; Ajisafe, Orifa, & Balagun, 2015; Jamal & Saif, 2011; Stiles & Kolvisaechan, 2003; Wang & Chang, 2005) as employees provide the guality of service while implementing internal processes, their capability would affect process efficiency, quality, and customers' satisfaction. Córcoles et al. (2011) indicated that the main purpose of the university is to produce and diffuse knowledge, with the university's most significant investment being academic research and human resources. The study (Lu, 2012; Amin, Ismail, Rasid, & Selamani, 2014) found that human resource such as recruitment, training, performance appraisal, career planning, employee participation, job definition, and compensation have a significant relationship with university performance. The second element of IC is structural capital, which is meaningful to the system and structure of an organisation. Structural capital is the valuable strategic assets of organisational which consists of hardware, software, databases, organisational structure, patents, trademarks, information systems, copyrights, company images, system policies and procedures, routines and others that employees use to support their business activities and processes, (Khalique et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2014). Generally, the structural capital of organisations comprises of infrastructure, system policies, and procedures, (Khalique, et al., 2011). According to Pablos (2004), Sharabati, Jawad, and Bontis, (2010), and Stevens (2011), structural capital mainly provides the environment that supports individuals to invest their human capital in creating the innovation and development, technology, quality management, creativity and organisational and leverage its knowledge to enhance organisational

performance. Structural capital cannot live without human capital. These assets must work in hand with structural capital. The mere creation of knowledge by individuals is useless without a structure to determine how that knowledge leads to better products. The consideration that characterises public university's operation direction, university's funds and the operating expenditure of the schools in teaching, research, education, and training, guidance and assistance, etc. These factors serve to strengthen internal organisational and energise research and teaching (Lu, 2012). The above arguments indicate that structural capital performs an essential role in confirming that education institutions have the academic excellence to offer future leaders. The last element of IC is relational capital, which represents an organisation's relations with its external stakeholders and the perceptions that they hold about the organisation, as well as the exchange of knowledge between the organisation and its external stakeholders (Cegarra- Navarro & Sánchez-Polo, 2010; Lopes-Costa & Munoz-Canavate, 2015; Wang et al., 2014). Similarly, relational capital is defined as an invisible asset based on developing, maintaining and nurturing high-quality relationships with any organisations, individuals or groups that influence business performance. Within this new economic model, it is clear that universities have begun to explore how to profit from the knowledge that they possess as educational institutions (Lu, 2012). Except for revenue enrolled students, university management has largely adopted efforts to leverage their knowledge into additional revenue through providing services for external schools such as training and studying. It is the quality of relational capital that translates into revenue for an organisation (Thursby & Kemp, 2002). If a university has a strong relationship with numerous customers, it is likely that the university will continue to be profitable. Based the above discussion, the study proposes the following hypothesis: H1: There is a relationship between intellectual capital and the public universities performance in Indonesia. H1a: There is a relationship between human capital and the public universities performance in Indonesia. H1b: There is a relationship between structural capital and the public universities performance in Indonesia. H1c: There is a relationship between relational capital and the public universities performance in Indonesia. RESEARCH METHOD A total of 177 respondents who are leaders of the universities and their faculties participated in this study. The respondents were taken from 8 (eight) Indonesian public universities, which are listed under the QS World University Rankings in the periods of the year 2014 and 2015. A questionnaires survey technique through online survey was used to obtain the data from the respondents from the listed universities. The respondents involved in the study were Rector, Vice Rector, Dean, Vice Dean and Head and Secretary of Departments and lecturers. They were purposely chosen since they know more about their institutions. From the demography data, a total of 122 respondents (68.9%), who participated in the study were male, while the rest were female. Despite it shows that majority of respondents were male, the responds are still representable for this study because this study does not aim to differentiate between the 7 respondents of genders. All the questionnaires were sent to all email addresses available in the sample universities. The compositions of the gender of the respondents were just known after they convey responses in questionnaires delivered through the online survey. The majority of the respondents aged between 40-49 years old (65 respondents or 36.7%) of the total number of respondents. Meanwhile, about 61.5% or 109 respondents were Ph.D. degree holders. Based the position held, 110 or 62.1% of the total respondents worked as lecturers, forming the biggest percentage or the highest number, followed by the heads of programmes (27 respondents or 15.3%) of the total number of respondents. There were 68 respondents (38.4%) with more than 8 years working experiences as either the university leaders or lecturers in universities. They are the respondents with a doctorate degree and are able to understand and answer all the research instruments as

expected in the study. Research Instruments Intellectual capital. Intellectual capital in university is a term used to cover all the organisation's non- intangible or non-physical assets, which include processes, capacity for innovation, patents, the tacit knowledge of its members and their capacities, talents, and skills, society's recognition, a network of collaborators and contacts, etc. The instrument to measure intellectual capital consists of human capital, structural capital and relational capital, which are adopted from (Córcoles et al., 2011). Human capital is the sum of the explicit and tacit knowledge of the university staff e.g. teacher, researcher, manager, administration and service staff acquired through formal and non- formal education and refresher processes included in their activities such as attitude, capabilities, skill and the innovative, and talent. A total of 12 item questions were delivered for human capital. Structural capital is the explicit knowledge relating to the internal process of dissemination, communication, and management of the scientific and technical knowledge at the university. A total of 13 item questions were delivered for structural capital. Relational capital is the extensive collection of economic, political and institutional relations developed and upheld between the university and its non-academic partners i.e. enterprises, non-profit organisations, local government and society in general. It also includes the perception other have of the university, its image, appeal, reliability, etc. A total of 16 item questions were delivered for relational capital. The measurement of instrument consisted of 1 to 5 Likert scales, where 1-scale is for "not at all important" and 5-scale says that "it is very important". 8 University performance. Griffin (2003) defined organisational performance reflects the ability of an organisation to fulfil its stakeholders' requirements and survive in the market. It also known as the outcome of the actions or activities carried out by the members of the organisation to measure how well an organisation has accomplished its objectives. It can be measured by the extent to which each of university functions is maintained toward the university goals. This study uses the university organisational performance measurement by Wang (2010). The measurement method was chosen because this method has a multidimensional performance measurement including aspects of academic and performance. The academic performance dimension can be further divided into research and educational dimensions. The management performance dimension can be further divided into financial and human resource dimension. Measurement of academic research performance consists of 12 questions, while 14 questions were used to measure the academic education performance. Measurement of financial management performance consists of 5 questions, while 10 questions were given to measure the human resources management performance. Similarly, the respondents were asked to evaluate their universities performances based on the given Likert Scale as mentioned earlier. Hypothesis Testing The Partial Least Square (PLS) approach with WarpPLS program version 3.0 was used to test the hypothesis. This approach has several advantages as stated by (Hair, Hult, Ringle, & Sartstedt, 2013) and Kock (2014). Firstly, SEM-PLS is suitable for this research model that uses variables that cannot be measured directly (latent variables) and has predicted measurement error. Secondly, analysis of SEM- PLS can simultaneously test multiple dependence and independence variables as used in this research model. Thirdly, component- based SEM-PLS can overcome complexity models with small sample sizes. RESULTS The SEM-PLS consisting of two sub-models of measurement is often called outer models and structural models or inner models. The first step in data analysis with SEM-PLS approach is validity and reliability test. Testing the validity with the reflective indicator was measured through convergent validity and validity discriminant. Testing reliability for reflective construct was measured by Cronbach alpha and composite reliability based on Kock (2014). Meanwhile, testing construct validity and reliability are not required for the formative 9 indicators. This

can be made by looking at the weight of indicator only. This indicator should 277 be statistically significant and multicollinearity of variance inflation factor (VIF) should be 278 smaller than 3.3. Table 1 summarises the results of validity and reliability testing for reflective 279 constructs. Overall, the results of measurement model (outer model) reflective constructs have 280 met the criteria, so that it can proceed to the inner model or structural models. The results of 281 this study show a loading range of 0.593 to 0.861 and agree with Hair et al., (2013), who stated 282 that the loading between 0.40-0.70 should be taken into consideration and retain for a newly 283 developed questionnaire. Based on criteria of each variable cross loading should be greater 284 than 0.70, hence it also met the criteria as discriminant validity in Table 2. 285 286 287 288 Table 1 Conclusions from the results of the validity and reliability (outer /measurement model) testing Construct Validity Loading Range AVE Reliability Composite Cronbach Reliability Alpha Full Collinearity VIF Rule of thumb > 0.5 > 0.5 > 0.7 > 0.7 < 3.3 Intellectual Capital (IC) Human Capital (HC) Structural Capital (SC) Relational Capital (RC) University Performance Academic Research (PR) Academic Education (PE) Management Financial (PF) Management Human Resources (PH) 0.622-0.782 0.640-0.794 0.599-0.798 0.674-0.809 0.583-0.861 0.794-0.839 0.593-0.753 0.510 0.838 0.510 0.912 0.513 0.904 0.551 0.936 0.548 0.856 0.663 0.908 0.503 0.901 0.757 0.892 0.879 0.925 0.789 0.873 0.876 2.107 1.994 1.713 1.841 1.469 2.288 2.044 Table 2 Result of discriminant validity University Performance Construct Human Structural Relational Academic Academic Financial Capital Capital Capital Research Education Management Human Resources Management Intellectual Capital Human Capital Structural Capital Relational Capital University Performance Academic Research Academic Education Management Financial Management Human Resources 0.714 0.644 0.588 0.714 0.548 0.209 0.260 0.132 0.205 0.216 0.230 0.074 0.214 0.716 0.251 0.742 0.285 0.390 0.194 0.596 0.243 0.532 0.740 0.453 0.815 0.440 0.672 0.709 301 The formative construct of the WarpPLS program just looked at the significance of weight 302 indicators with criteria p value less than 0.05 and VIF (variance inflation factor) of less than 303 3.3 (Kock, 2014) are presented in Table 3. 304 305 Table 3 306 Results of formative construct testing Constructs P value VIF Rule of thumb < 0.05 < 3.3 307 308 309 310 311 312 313 314 315 316 Intellectual Capital lv_HC lv_SC lv_RC University Performance Iv_PR Iv_PE Iv_PF Iv_PH <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 2.052 1.921 1.639 1.658 1.336 2.200 1.976 Convergent validity testing for each construct indicated that there are several indicators that should be dropped. Indicators dropped since they are not fulfilling the test criteria of convergent validity and value AVE (average variance extracted) with terms of greater than 0.05. The number of indicator questions given to the respondent before the convergent validity testing were 82 items questions, as summarised in Table 4 and Table 5. After testing, the eventual number of valid and reliable indicators was 55 that can be used to test the hypothesis as indicated in Table 6. The indicators do not fulfill the test criteria convergent validity and value AVE (average variance extracted) was 27 of the 82 indicators used to measure latent variables. Table 4 Item questions for variables of intellectual capital Intellectual Item questions Capital <u>Human capital Typology of university</u> staff (historical data on the increase and decrease of staffing number, staff age structure, type of contracts, etc. (HC1) Teaching and research staff academic and qualifications (HC2) Mobility of teacher and researcher (HC3) Scientific productivity (books) (HC4) Teaching and research professional qualifications (HC5) Mobility of graduate students (HC6) Efficiency of human capital (HC7) Teaching capacities and competence (HC8) Structural Capital Relational capital Research capacities and competence (HC9) Capacity for teamwork (HC10) Leadership capacity (HC11) Training activities (HC12) Installations and material resources supporting pedagogical gualification and innovation (SC13) Installations

and material resources supporting research and development (SC14) The institution's assessment and qualification processes (SC15) Organisational structure (SC16) Teaching management and organisation (internal communication of result, periodical exchange with foreign teachers, teaching incentives, etc.) (SC17) Research management and organisation (internal communication of results, efficient management of research projects, research incentives, these reads, etc.) (SC18) Organisation of scientific, cultural and social events (SC19) Productivity of the administration, academic and support services (SC20) Organisation culture and values (SC21) Efforts innovation and improvement (expenditure on innovation, staffing level, etc.) (SC22) Management quality (SC23) Information system (document processes, database, ITC use, etc.) (SC24) Technological capacity (total expenditure on technology, availability, and use of computer programmes, intranet/internet use, etc.) (SC25) Effectiveness of graduate teaching (average duration of studies, dropout rate, graduation rate, etc.) (RC26) Student satisfaction (RC27) Graduate employability (RC28) Relations with students (capacity of response to student's needs, permanent relations with graduates, etc.) (RC29) Relations with the business world (spin- off, R&D contracts and project, etc.) (RC30) Relations with society in general (institutional representation in external organisations, collaboration in national and international projects, etc.) (RC31) Applications and dissemination of research (dissemination of result, social appropriateness of research). (RC32) Relations with media (RC33) University image (RC34) <u>Collaborations and contacts with public private organisations</u> (RC35) Collaboration with order universities (RC36) Strategic links (RC37) Relations with quality institutions (RC38) The regional, national, and international reputation of the university (RC39) Social and cultural commitment (RC40) Environmental responsibility (RC41) Source: Ramírez and Gordillo (2014) Table 5 Item questions for university performances University Item questions performances Academic Research Performance Number of researchers / FTE (Full Time Equivalent) by Ph.D. students, academic staff (PR48) Number of researchers from sponsors (PR49) Number of successful research grant applications (PR50) Number of Strategic Partnerships (PR51) Number of publications by research unit (PR52) Number of doctorate conferred (PR53) Exploitation of IP (PR54) Number of successful entrepreneurs (start-up companies) (PR55) Number of citations publications that have been published in journals with high impact (PR56) Membership of research council or editorship of journal (PR57) Award various reasons (PR58) Research ranking or research assessment by peer review (PR59) Academic Education Performance Total revenues undergraduate program (bachelors and post graduate, master and Ph.D.) and international student admission (PE60) Number of degree programmes (PE61) Number of students per degree programme (PE62) Number of honour degrees (PE63) Number of permanent academic staff (PE64) Ratio of full-time students/academic staff (PE 65) Percentage of students who progressed after the first year of study (PE66) Percentage of students who dropped out due to various reasons (PE67) Average contact hours per week to increase the performance of students (PE68) Students' evaluation in measuring their satisfaction level through surveys (PE69) Average time for completing bachelors, research and non-research masters programmes/students graduated on time for bachelors, research and non-research masters programmes (PE70) Percentage/rate of graduation as a result of university's educational services (PE71) Number of diplomas issued (PE72) Total acceptance of employment of graduates (PE73) Financial Management Performance Total amount of research income (PF74) Share in third-party funding and share in governmental funding to university (PF75) Income from tuition fees and other services (PF76) Annual surplus/deficit as the percentage of income from accounts (PF77) Annual expenditure on facilities, library and sports facilities etc. (PF78) Human Resources Management Performance Percentage of full-

time recruitment (PH79) Percentage of English speaking employees (PH80) Number of Ph.D. students (PH81) Number of Professors (PH82) Number of assistant professors with or without Ph.D. (PH83) Number of lecturers (PH84) Number of support staff (PH85) Academic to non-academic staff ratio (PH86) Annual expenditure on training and development (PH87) Source: Wang (2010) Table 6 Summary Indicators Dropped Latent Variables Early Drop Drop Drop Finally I II III Total Intellectual Capital (IC) Human Capital (HC) Structural Capital (SC) Relational Capital (RC) University Performance Academic Research (PR) Academic Educational (PE) Financial Management (PF) 12 3 13 3 16 4 12 - 14 5 5 - 4 - - - 3 - - - 3 1 - - 7 3 7 - 9 - 5 10 9 12 5 5 Human Resources Management (PH) 10 Total 82 1 - 16 10 - 1 1 27 9 55 Results of hypothesis 1 testing Assessing the structural models with PLS is started by looking at the value of <u>R-Squares for</u> any <u>endogenous latent</u> variables as the predictive power of the model structural. Figure 1 shows the result of the structural model with the value of standardized path coefficient of intellectual capital to university performance was 0.35. This value is significant at a p-value less than 0.001. The value of R2 was found to be 0.12. Also, the value of R2 (R-Square) of 0.12 is considered weak (Chin, 1998). This result means that only 12% of the performance university (PU) variances can be explained by the variance of intellectual capital (IC). According to Chin (1998), R-Square can be grouped into three categories of weak (0.19), moderate (0.33) and large (0.67). 367 368 369 Figure 1. The result of structural model for hypothesis 1 testing Table 7 shows results of correlation coefficient value of intellectual capital (IC) to the university performance (PU) is approximately 0.349 (rounded to the image output becomes 0.35) and significant at 0.001. The output shows that the hypothesis is accepted. This means that the intellectual capital significantly influences university performance. In other words, it can be said the higher the transparency of the publication of intellectual capital of an organisation, the higher the university performance. Evaluation the PLS model with WarpPLS can give effect size, in which the f-squared effect size was conducted to determine the model goodness (Cohen, 1988). Effect size is calculated as the absolute value of the individual contribution of each predictor on the latent variables R-Squared value criterion variables. Effect size can be grouped into three categories of weak (0.02), medium (0.15) and large (0.35). Table 7 Output path coefficients for hypothesis 1 Path coefficients Standard Errors Effect Sizes Path coefficients values pvalues Result of hypothesis IC ? PU 0.064 0.122 0.349 < 0.001 H1 Supported The result of effect size estimation of the intellectual capital value on university performance was 0.122 and categorized into medium effect size group. This means that the effect of intellectual capital has an important influence in the organisation based on practical point of view by (Cohen, 1988). 387 388 Results of hypothesis 1a testing The value of standardized path coefficient of human capital to university performance was 0.27 and significant at a p-value less than 0.001 (Figure 2). The obtained value R2 is 0.07 and it falls into a relatively weak group R2 based on Chin (1998). Table 8 shows the output of correlation coefficient values track human capital (HC) on university performance (PU) was approximately 0.272 (rounded to the output image to be 0.27) and significant at 0.001. The output shows that the hypothesis H1a is accepted. Thus, human capital (HC) significantly influences the university performance (PU). 398 399 400 Figure 2. Results of structural model for hypothesis 1a testing The result of estimated effect size value of human capital (HC) on university performance (PU) is 0.074. This result falls into relatively weak group effect size and indicates that the effect of human capital disclosure has less important influence from a practical point of view (Cohen, 1988). Table 8 Output path coefficients for hypothesis 1a Path Standard Effect coefficients Errors Sizes Path coefficients values pvalues Result Hypothesis HC ? PU 0.067 0.074 0.272 < 0.001 H1a Supported Results of hypothesis 1b testing The value of standardized path

coefficient of structural capital (SC) to university performance (PU) was equal to 0.237 (rounded to 0.24) and significant at a p-value less than 0.001 (Figure 3). The R2 value is found to be 0.06 is categorised as the outcome in a relatively weak group R2 based on Chin (1998). 413 Figure 3. Results of structural model for hypothesis 1b testing 414 Table 9 shows path coefficient values of structural relationship capital (SC) on university performance (PU) was approximately 0.237 (rounded to the output image becomes 0.24) and significant at 0.001. The output shows that the hypothesis H1b is acceptable. The estimated value of effect sizes of structural capital (SC) on university performance (PU) was 0.056 and falls into relative weak group effect size. This indicates that the effect of structural capital has less important influence from a practical point of view Cohen (1988). 422 Table 9 423 Output path coefficients for hypothesis 1b Path Standard Effect Path p-values Result coefficients Errors Sizes coefficients Hypothesis values SC ? PU 0.068 0.056 0.237 < 0.001 H1b Supported 428 429 Results of hypothesis 1c testing The value of standardized path coefficient of relational capital (RC) to university performance (PU) was 0.31 and significant at a p-value less than 0.001. The obtained value R2 was 0.09 as indicated in Figure 4. 430 431 432 433 Figure 4. Result of structural model for hypothesis 1c testing Table 10 shows the path coefficient values of relational relationship capital (RC) to the university performance (PU) was approximately 0.306 (rounded to the output image becomes 0.31) and significant at 0.001. The output shows that the hypothesis H1c is acceptable. Thus, relational capital significantly affects the university performance. The estimated value of the effect size of the university performance to relational capital is 0.094 and falls into a relatively weak group effect size. This indicates that the influence of relational capital is less important than from practical point of view (Cohen, 1988). Table 10 Output path coefficients for hypothesis 1c Path Standard Effect Path p-values Result coefficients Errors Sizes coefficients Hypothesis values RC ? PU 0.065 0.094 0.306 < 0.001 H1c Supported 445 446 447 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS 448 449 The research had explored the effects of intellectual capital as well as the elements of human 450 capital, structural capital and relational capital on the performance of public universities in 451 Indonesia. This study has successfully proven that intellectual capital is one of the important 452 factors that affect the performance of the university through the modern management of the 453 elements of intellectual capital such as human capital, structural capital and relational capital 454 at public universities in Indonesia. This finding is consistent with Gruian (2011), Lu (2012), 455 Khalique et al. (2013), Meihami and Karami (2014), and Hashim et al. (2015), who stated that 456 it is important for organization to provide appropriate information on their intellectual capital, 457 so that the information can be more effective and relevant, and give impact to universities 458 performance. This study also found that there is a relationship between human capital and the 459 performance of public universities. This finding is also supported by the previous studies as 460 reported by Khan (2010), Jamal & Saif, (2011), Lu (2012), Amin et al., (2014), and Stefani and 461 Cerasela (2015) not cited in references who mentioned that aspiration to be an excellent 462 university only can be achieved by strongly support by excellent human capital included 463 academic and professional staff. Particularly in Indonesia, an achievement to becoming a 464 World Class University is very important as it is the aspiration in the globalisation era. Thus, 465 this study also proved that structural capital gave significant effects on university's 466 performance. This result also supports the findings of previous researchers such as Wang and 467 Chang (2005), Sharabati et al. (2010), Khalique et al. (2011), Wang et al., (2014), and Hashim 468 et al. (2015), who indicated that structural capital is the most significant investments in a 469 university. Relational capital is a component of intellectual capital that significantly 470 contributes to the universities' performance in Indonesia.