
Assessment in Choosing Higher Education: A Case of Indonesia

Dedy Ansari Harahap^{1,2,3}, Dita Amanah^{1,3}

¹Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia

²Universitas Islam Sumatera Utara, Faculty of Economics, Medan, Indonesia

³Universitas Negeri Medan, Faculty of Economics, Medan, Indonesia

Abstract -The decision of students to continue their studies is a decision after making considerations that are adjusted to the circumstances of a number of college choices. The purpose of this study is to examine the decisions of students to choose universities in Indonesia. The research method used is to compare the results of research and journals that examine students' decision to choose a college. Then, examine the theories of consumer behavior so that it can be concluded what is considered by students. The results of previous studies show many influencing factors such as education costs, WOM, university reputation, location, lecture facilities, program accreditation and others. These results can be a reference and consideration for universities in Indonesia in attracting prospective students to choose certain universities and referring to others.

Keywords - Student Decision, Higher Education, Conceptual Research, Indonesia

I. Introduction

Higher education is one of the most important priorities for most Indonesians, although some people prefer to work and not continue their education to a higher level. To continue their education to university, everyone is faced with various choices such as university, education level and choice of study programs. Higher education is the final level of education to prepare students to become communities that have academic and professional abilities that can apply, develop and create science, technology and art. The university becomes a means of organizing and developing education that can improve the quality of life for people, nations and countries.

According to Indrajit & Djokopranoto (2006) there are 5 (five) dimensions of the meaning of universities or institutions in the field of education, namely the scientific dimension (education and technology), the dimensions of education (higher education), social dimensions (community life), company dimensions (units and educational organizations) and ethical dimensions. Intense competition makes universities aware of the need to fully exploit their assets to maximize performance and develop competitive advantage. Higher education institutions must be competitively oriented and always strive to be relatively better at serving prospective students who will enroll in college (Voon, Lee, Abdullah, & Teay Shawyun, 2009).

The decision to choose a college is a difficult and important decision that takes into account a person's strengths and interests when making that decision. It is important to remember that there are many colleges with transfer programs where students move to a particular university in the second or third year and also some students who start at certain universities then choose to complete higher education programs at other universities (Purely Interactive, 2018).

The decision of students to continue their studies is an action taken after students make judgments that are adapted to the conditions of several college choices. Conditions that are not in accordance with the expectations of students will raise doubts to choose and therefore decide not to continue their studies where they are expected. Making choices has many dimensions and impacts, choosing is part of the effort and part of the decision making process.

Many factors influence prospective students to choose universities in Indonesia. Due to too many choices of universities, both private and public in Indonesia, an analysis is required by each prospective student for each of these universities. From the results of previous studies, both theoretically and empirically, the authors tried to analyze and summarize the factors that influence prospective students to choose universities to continue their studies.

II. Literature Review

Student Decisions

The decision of students to continue their studies where they want plays an important role for their future success. If reality does not meet expectations, success will be uncertain. The act of choosing a university has many dimensions and impacts which are part of the resolution effort and part of the decision making process (Harahap, Hurriyati, Gaffar, & Amanah, 2018).

Student decisions are one of the important factors for universities because their decisions are key to the continuity of the college cycle. Students are assets for universities. The decisions taken by students are basically consumers' decisions in choosing universities as a place to continue their studies, which are mostly explained in consumer behavior (Harahap, Hurriyati, Gaffar, Wibowo, & Amanah, 2017). The study of university selection decisions usually focuses on the factors that influence it. Chapman (1981) suggested a comprehensive college model to explore the factors in choosing a college.

From a marketing perspective, higher education must be aware of student needs and determine student selection criteria. Colleges must strive to ensure that students are given a comprehensive educational experience and not only provide diplomas. To achieve this, higher education institutions must provide quality services that serve the needs and expectations of prospective students (Hussin, Soon, & Sidin, 2000).

Empirical findings reveal many factors that influence students in choosing college, but they are not consistent and the results vary for each study. As stated by Haur (2009), there are no determinants that cause students to choose a particular college.

Over the years, many researchers have analyzed the decision-making processes of students choosing universities. Many college choice models such as Chapman's Model (Chapman, 1981), Hanson and Litten Models (Hanson & Litten, 1982), Jackson's Model (Jackson, 1982) and the Hossler Model are used to find student decision-making factors (Hossler & Gallagher, 1987).

The college choice model describes the decisions and interactions made by prospective students from time to time. This model also provides researchers with a lot of information for further implications and research (Cabrera & La Nasa, 2000; Bergerson, 2009). As a result, the use of several college choice models draws an overview that will track how students make decisions to join education certain height and factors that influence their choice.

Hossler and Gallagher's College Choice Model found three steps through which students progress when they move from educational aspirations to enrollment in college. Middle school students who have the need to study on campus, at first they will look for general information about the university and consider the best choices, then finally make a choice that directs them to enroll in certain higher education institutions (Cabrera & La Nasa, 2000).

The decision of students to choose a university can be concluded as the attitude of prospective students by making choices at certain universities. Behavior of students choosing universities is very close to achieving satisfaction in accordance with their needs and desires. These factors include the need for universities, seeking university information, evaluating selected universities, choosing universities and choosing university behavior.

Indicator of Student Decision

According to Harahap et al., (2018) indicators of student decisions in choosing a university are measured using 5 (five) measurements as follows: 1) Needs for universities, 2) Finding university information, 3) Evaluating selected universities, 4) Choosing universities, 5) Behavior in choosing a university.

Education Costs

The cost of education is all types of expenses related to educational arrangements, both in the form of money or goods and personnel who can be valued with money (Supriadi, 2003). According to Mulyono (2010) costs are the amount of money provided or allocated and used or spent on the implementation of various functions or activities in order to achieve goals within the framework of the management process. The cost of education can be regarded as one of the important factors in the education process, if there is no support from this, the education process will be disrupted.

The cost of education is the overall financial sacrifice of the parents of students or students from the beginning to the end of education. This fee includes registration and credit fees per semester, building donation fees, student welfare and facilities per semester and other tuition fees including the development and financing of curricular and extra-curricular activities, book fees, equipment costs, state exam fees and other education fees used to support lectures.

Components of Education Costs

There are several components in education costs according to Abdullah (1985) which include: 1) Increased teaching and learning activities, 2) Maintenance and replacement of educational facilities and infrastructure, 3) Increased student activities, 4) Prosperity, 5) University household costs, 6) Guide fees, monitoring and reporting.

Indicators of Education Cost

Indonesia (2008) states that education cost indicators include: 1) Education registration fees, 2) Credit fees per semester, 3) Costs of student activities, 4) Costs of purchasing books.

Word of Mouth (WOM)

WOM is basically a message about a company's product or service or about the company itself in the form of comments about products, friendliness, honesty, speed of service and other things that are felt and experienced by someone that is conveyed to others. The message delivered can be in the form of a positive or negative message depending on what is felt by the communicator of the product / service consumed / received.

WOM is a complex phenomenon and is generally not directly controlled (Allsop, Bassett, & Hoskins, 2007). Arndt (1967) characterized WOM as a person-to-person verbal communication between recipients and communicators where recipients were considered non-commercial about brands, products or services. WOM is also always called free advertising. If an ad can be defined as 'presentation of ideas, goods, or non-personal services by the sponsor identified as being paid' then some WOM is not (Buttle, 1998). Customers owned by companies through WOM have longer long-term value compared to customers obtained through traditional marketing channels (Villanueva, Yoo, & Hanssens, 2008).

Harrison-Walker (2001) states that WOM is an informal communication between non-commercial speakers and people who receive information about brands, products, companies or services. WOM can be interpreted as a communication activity in marketing that shows how likely the customer will tell others about the experience in the process of buying or consuming a product or service. Customer experience can be a positive or negative experience.

In addition, WOM can also be used as a reference because customers usually have difficulty evaluating services that have never been received. A widely accepted understanding of consumer behavior is that WOM plays an important role in shaping customer attitudes and behavior. (Houston et al., 2001), show that WOM is seven times more effective than advertisements in magazines and newspapers, four times more effective than personal sales and twice as effective as radio advertising by companies in influencing customers to switch and use company products.

In general, humans like to talk because maybe it is a must for humans. Chatting will be able to get information, lessons and experiences, such as talking about a product or place that they feel is appropriate or happy, so they will naturally discuss and recommend to colleagues and relatives and this is what WOM means. One marketing technique used in the business world is word of mouth, a marketing campaign that relies on personal power to spread word of mouth (Enterprise, 2010). Word of Mouth or commonly called WOM is a way to share ideas, beliefs and experiences with each other (Balter & Butman, 2005). WOM is the action of consumers to provide information about brands, products or services to other consumers (between individuals). Channels of personal communication in speech or word of mouth (WOM) can be an effective promotion method because they are generally delivered from consumers by consumers and to consumers, so that satisfied consumers can provide chain messages that are accepted by many people (Enterprise, 2010).

Lupiyoadi & Hamdani (2006) states that word of mouth communication can be measured by the following indicators: 1) the willingness of customers to discuss positive things about the quality of company services to other companies, 2) recommendations on company services to others, 3) encourage friends / relations to purchase products from certain companies. Based on the opinions of several experts above, the authors draw the conclusion that WOM is an activity that can affect conversations and can also be influenced by consumers and other consumers (Harahap et al., 2018).

Indicators of WOM

According to Babin, Lee, Kim, & Griffin (2005), WOM is measured by the following indicators: 1). Consumer willingness to discuss positive things about the quality of company services to others, 2). Recommended company services for others, 3). Encourage friends / relations to purchase services from certain companies.

University's Reputation

Reputation is an assessment that develops over time based on the emotional, financial, social and cultural relationship between the organization and the public (Heath & Vasquez, 2001). The company's reputation is understood as a function of image and identity (Vercic & Vercic, 2007). Identity is formed in companies based on organizational culture which consists of practice, history, values and behavior (Melewar, Karaosmanoglu, & Peterson, 2005). Images are formed in external stakeholder thinking which refers to their temporary impressions of the organization formed by indirect experience and how they accept organizational identity in several stages (Hatch & Schultz, 1997; Balmer & Greyser, 2002; Melewar et al., 2005). Based on signal theory (Smith, Smith, & Wang, 2010; Walker, 2010), the benefits of reputation are as informative signals about the behavior and quality of organizational performance that will increase public confidence in the organization's products and services and will also increase investor confidence in organizational performance.

Another opinion states that reputation is a combination of the opinions, perceptions and behavior of stakeholder organizations (Post & Griffin, 1997). This opinion is in line with (Eberl & Schwaiger, 2005), which states that reputation is a kind of behavioral construct that exists and functions in the public mind in general. Reputation is also interpreted as a collection of facts that are experienced and the products of social processes, but not impressions in people's minds personally (Helm, 2007). Thus, reputation is a combination of opinions, perceptions and behaviors of organizational stakeholders in providing evaluations that develop from time to time regarding organizational performance based on emotional, financial, social and cultural relationships between the organization and stakeholders.

Reputation for organizations is a vital intangible asset. If managed properly, the company's reputation can increase the organization's ability to sell products and services, attract investors, recruit talented employees and anticipate political influence (Heath & Vasquez, 2001). A good reputation will bring many benefits, while a bad reputation can bring down the organization. There are four things that affect an organization's reputation, namely: credibility, reliability, responsibility and honesty (Fombrun & Shanley, 1990). The relationship between the four influences each other and will jointly shape the reputation of the organization.

As explained in the background, the university's reputation is one of the things considered by prospective students in determining a university. University reputation can be measured by university popularity (brand identity), total number of applicants and the ratio of the number received with the number of applicants (Indrajit & Djokopranoto, 2006). The university's reputation is also described as a collective representation held by various university stakeholders (Alessandri, Yang, & Kinsey, 2006). By applying the general principles of reputation proposed by (Fombrun & Shanley, 1990; Caruana, 1997; Gotsi & Wilson, 2001; Bromley, 2002; Grunig & Hung, 2002; Alessandri et al., 2006), formulated that university reputation can be formed based on stakeholder experience in interacting with universities directly or indirectly through information obtained from various channels and communication symbols.

In line with (Alessandri et al., 2006; Finch, Hamilton, Baldwin, & Zehner, 2013), the study found that the reputation of universities was important to understand when graduates sought employment. This is because universities create their own image and bring reputation into the industry (Alessandri et al., 2006). Universities are becoming more competitive where they try to attract the best students and then provide the best employment opportunities for students who have been accepted (Alessandri et al., 2006). This led the university to create a competitive advantage by attracting top students and top companies (Finch et al., 2013).

The university's reputation is related to employee performance. The performance of a graduate in the workplace will always be identified with the reputation of the university. In addition, students feel that studies at certain universities show their success in getting a job and perceptions of wage gain after they graduate, their company preferences in the job market, pride and empowerment of students in the job market (Sultan & Wong, 2012).

Indicators of University's Reputation

Sontaite & Bakanauskas (2011), proposed ten factors that could be indicators of measurement of company reputation for higher education institutions, namely emotional attraction, behavior, study, citizenship and social responsibility, leadership, performance, workplace, competition, career, innovation. The most important indicators for customers of higher education institutions are innovation, behavior, performance and study. While the least important factor in measuring a company's reputation for customers of higher education institutions is: attractive leaders, environmental responsibility, value for money, admiration.

Location

In general, a good location can make it easier for service providers to run their business. According to Swastha & Handoko (2008), location is where business or business activities are conducted. Important factors in business

development are the location of urban areas, the way to achieve and the travel time of the location. Good location factors relative to each different type of business. Meanwhile, according to Lupiyoadi & Hamdani (2006), location is a decision made by a company or educational institution in connection with where operations and staff will be placed.

Based on the opinion above, it can be concluded that location is a decision made by a company or educational institution to determine the choice where the campus will be built, campus activities or campus operational activities. The location of higher education can also determine the image of the university.

Location Indicators

According to Tjiptono (2012), the location indicators are accessible location, large and safe parking area, and supportive environment. The ease of access to universities, locations that are not so far from the city center and the ease of access to important objects can influence the decisions of secondary school graduates to choose certain universities. Thus, the location of higher education is also an important consideration in choosing a particular college.

Learning Facilities

Learning facilities are complete learning that must be owned by schools that can simplify and launch business implementation, can be material and money (Djamarah, 2002). According to Gie (2002) for good learning there must be adequate learning facilities such as study rooms, adequate lighting, handbooks and completeness of learning equipment. Learning facilities in principle are something that facilitates learning. Syah, (2008), has distinguished educational facilities and infrastructure. Educational tools are all equipment, materials, furniture that are directly used in the education process at school. Educational infrastructure is all basic equipment that indirectly supports the implementation of the education process in schools.

According to Bafadal (2004), school facilities can be grouped into 2 (two) namely education facilities and educational infrastructure. Understanding learning facilities or facilities are all equipment, materials and furniture that are directly used in the learning process at school. While education infrastructure is all basic equipment that indirectly supports the implementation of the education process in schools. So learning facilities are everything that makes it easy to learn. According to Mulyasa (2007), educational tools are equipment that are directly used and support the educational process, especially teaching and learning processes such as buildings, classrooms, tables, chairs and tools and learning media. Educational infrastructure is a facility that does not directly support the education or teaching process such as pages, parks, schools, roads to schools.

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that learning facilities are something that supports and facilitates the teaching and learning process in the form of goods or money divided into 2 (two) namely education facilities and educational infrastructure. Educational tools are all tools, furniture, materials that are directly used to support the teaching and learning process, while the education infrastructure is something that indirectly supports the teaching and learning process on campus.

Indicator of Learning Facilities

Learning facilities are assessments made by students about physical appearance and comfort (facilities and infrastructure) owned and offered by the campus in supporting lecture activities. Indicators of educational facilities are: 1). Condition of physical facilities, 2). Lecture building, 3). Supporting facilities for lectures.

Academic Program

The academic education program is higher education which is directed primarily at mastering science and developing and prioritizing quality improvement and broadening knowledge horizons (Mastur & Triono, 2014). Ford, Joseph, & Joseph (1999), also found that academic programs such as various courses, program level flexibility, flexibility of major changes and various degree choices were the most important factors for choosing higher education institutions. Whereas Mehboob (2012), shows that students are satisfied with the choice of higher education based on information satisfaction in relation to academic recognition (the existence of a recognized academic program).

So it can be concluded that academic programs are higher education programs to master science in order to improve the quality of science education and insights that can provide satisfaction for students.

Academic Program Indicators

Related research conducted by Ford et al., (1999), regarding the influence of academic programs on students' decision making in choosing courses states 3 indicators of academic programs, including: 1). The university has

a variety of degree options available, 2). The university has a number of special programs available, and 3). The university has flexible entry requirements.

Accreditation of Study Program

Accreditation is one form of assessment of the quality and feasibility of higher education institutions or courses conducted by independent organizations or agencies outside of universities. Another form of external quality assessment is an assessment related to accountability, licensed by certain entities. There is also data collection by government institutions for specific purposes and surveys to rank universities (BAN-PT, 2008).

Study program accreditation is a comprehensive evaluation and evaluation process of study program commitment to the quality and capacity of the tertiary tridarma program to determine the feasibility of academic programs. Evaluation and assessment in the framework of accreditation of study programs is carried out by an assessment team consisting of peer experts and / or experts who understand the implementation of study program academic programs. Decisions about quality are based on evaluation and assessment of evidence relating to established standards and based on the reasons and considerations of peer experts. The required evidence includes a written report prepared by an accredited, verified and validated study program through a field visit or assessment of the assessment team to the location of the study program. Thus, the objectives and benefits of study program accreditation are as follows:

1. Provide assurance that accredited study programs meet the quality standards set by the National Accreditation Board of Higher Education (BAN-PT), so as to provide protection for the community from the implementation of study programs that do not meet the standards.
2. Encouraging study programs / universities to continue to improve and maintain high quality.
3. The results of accreditation can be used as a consideration in transfer of credit, proposals for assistance and allocation of funds and receiving recognition from relevant institutions or institutions.

The quality of study programs is the totality of conditions and characteristics of inputs, processes and products or services of study programs that are measured by a number of standards as benchmarks for assessment and will determine and reflect the quality of higher education institutions. Quality assessment in the context of study program accreditation must be based on clear and complete standards as a benchmark for assessment and also requires an operational explanation of the procedures and steps taken, so that the assessment can be carried out systematically.

Indicator of Study Program Accreditation

According to BAN-PT (2008), study program accreditation standards include the standard of study program commitment to institutional capacity and commitment to the effectiveness of educational programs packed into seven accreditation standards. Standard 1: Vision, Mission, Goals and Objectives and Achievement Strategies. Standard 2: Governance, Leadership, Management Systems and Quality Assurance. Standard 3: Students and Graduates. Standard 4: Human Resources. Standard 5: Curriculum, Learning and Academic Atmosphere. Standard 6: Funding, Facilities and Infrastructure and Information Systems. Standard 7: Research, Community Service and Cooperation.

Relevant Studies

Table 1. Relevant studies in choosing a college

Authors	Title	Results	Implications	Journal
Suryani & Ginting, (2013)	Factors Affecting Student Decisions Choosing Faculty of Universitas Islam Sumatera Utara Al Munawwaroh Medan	Shows that process factors, motivation, physical evidence, references, costs and location became the main factor of students choosing the faculty of economics at UISU	The university should evaluate every policy in managing its study program to be interested and liked, making it a student choice	Modernisasi Vol. 9 No. 1 pp. 33-48

Authors	Title	Results	Implications	Journal
Wibowo, (2014)	University Research Performance, University Reputation and University Choices: A Systematic Review	Demonstrating that the university's academic reputation is found to have an effect on the choice of university	Universities are required to be able to meet the needs and wants of potential students (market) to be able to attract students	Jurnal Manajemen, Vol.13, No. 2, pp. 91-115
Ammalia & A, (2014)	The Influence of Brand Equity And Corporate Reputation To Student Interest New Universitas Singaperbangsa Karawang	Demonstrate brand equity and corporate reputation affect the interest of students choosing a university	The university must improve the reputation of the university and maintain the quality of service, so that the prospective students	Jurnal Ilmiah Solusi Vol.1 No. 3 pp. 86-94
Artini, Kirya, & Suwendra, (2014)	Factors Affecting Student's Decisions In Choosing The Department at Faculty of Economics and Business (FEB) Ganesha University of Education (UNDIKSHA) As Place of Lecture	Show that the most dominant influence student choose Undiksha as place of lecture is internal factor that is; price, process, product and promotion	The consideration of education, promotion, process and product cost becomes the choice of prospective students choosing a university	e-Journal Bisma Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha Jurusan Manajemen (Volume 2 Tahun 2014)
Harahap, (2015)	Analysis of Factors Affecting Student Decision In Choosing Accounting Department As A University Lecture Place in Pekanbaru City	Indicates that personal factors (volition, career prospects) and psychological (motivation, perception and trust) influence student decisions in choosing a major in the university	Factors of perception, motivation, trust, career prospects and volition of their own into consideration that must be reviewed and in guard of educational institutions to attract students choose university	JOM. FEKON Vol. 2 No. 2 pp. 1-15
Harahap et al., (2017)	The Influence of University's Reputation to Student Decision Choosing Study at Universitas Islam Sumatera Utara	Shows the university's reputation significantly influence the decision of students choose university studies	Reputation becomes one of the considerations of students choosing a study, so the college must maintain the quality and reputation of the institution.	Prosiding Seminar Nasional & Konferensi FMI 9 2017 Semarang pp. 1-12 ISBN : 978-602-8557-31-3
Handayani, (2007)	Different Student Decisions In Choosing STIE in East Java	Shows the factors that become consideration of students to choose STIE namely; processes and people, products, promotions, places, prices, physical form, trust and service	Each university is expected to pay attention to the factors that students consider in universities	Ekuitas Vol.11 No.3 pp. 321 - 348 ISSN 1411-0393

Widowati & Surjawati, (2015)	Study About Decision Choosing Department S1 Accounting (Empirical Studies In Students Undergraduate Program Accounting Semarang University)	Demonstrating that the factors of academic programs related to the profession, word of mouth recommendation became the main consideration of the students decided to choose majors at the university	Universities should be keen to see opportunities, the relevance of the profession of interest to students on the job with existing courses to attract prospective students	J. DINAMIKA SOSBUD Volume 17 Nomor 2, pp. 1-11 ISSN 1410-9859
Meilyaningsih & Sisilia, (2015)	Analysis of Decision Making Factors Applying to Private Higher Education Institutions (Study In D3 Program Marketing Management Telkom University Class of 2014).	The decision of students to choose Telkom University is influenced by the cost of education, accreditation, marketing communications, university image, motivation, service attitude, facilities, situation, condition, process, promotion, information, parent or family, education quality, job opportunity, social.	The University should prepare and prioritize the most needed and desired aspect of students in choosing courses to meet from the overall aspect in general.	e-Proceeding of Management : Vol.2, No.3 pp. 3597-3602 ISSN : 2355-9357
Djafar, (2017)	Factors Affecting Students Choosing Islamic Education Management Studies Program Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training UIN Alauddin Makassar	The driving force of the students choosing the Department of Islamic Education Management is their own desires, family support, program accreditation and academic programs (majors).	Universities are expected to always strive to develop majors with brilliant programs and ideas, so that the study program is able to compete with other courses	Jurnal Idaarah, Vol. I No. 1 pp. 74-88

Source: retrieved from journals & thesis

Table 1 is a collection of several study decisions on choosing universities in Indonesia that are relevant to this article. The table serves to help the author compare and look for new things to be discussed in this article.

The advantage of relevant research is finding the similarities and differences in this research with other studies. In addition, it is also used to compare existing research with the research that the author will examine.

III. Results and Discussion

Results

Some of the results of previous studies conducted at universities in Indonesia stated that many factors influence prospective students to choose certain universities such as tuition fees, WOM, university reputation, location, lecture facilities, study programs and accreditation programs. These factors are most important in influencing students' decisions to choose campus.

Discussion

Higher education as a place for higher education is a way to improve the standard of living and quality of life of the community. Education will give someone guidance to develop talents, interests and intellectuals as capital to face competition in the world of work and maintain existence.

From several previous studies it was concluded that the main reason for choosing a particular university in Indonesia was affordable education costs (Handayani, 2007; Tambunan, 2010; Handayani, 2007; Tambunan, 2010; Suryani & Ginting, 2013; Khoiriyah et al., 2013; Artini et al., 2014; Meilyaningsih & Sisilia, 2015. Besides WOM because it is a marketing effort that encourages people or prospective students to discuss, promote, recommend certain universities to prospective other students (Tambunan, 2010; (Tambunan, 2010; Suryani & Ginting, 2013; Khoiriyah et al., 2013; Widowati & Surjawati, 2015; Meilyaningsih & Sisilia, 2015;

Harahap, Hurriyati, Gaffar, Wibowo, & Amanah, 2017a; Harahap et al., 2018). The university's reputation is also a consideration. Leading campuses that have graduates or alumni spread throughout the world of work are more desirable (Harahap, 2004; Tambunan, 2010; Khoiriyah et al., 2013; Andriani & Adam, 2013; Wibowo, 2014; Ammalia & A, 2014; Meilyaningsih & Sisilia, 2015; Harahap et al., 2017b), strategic locations that are easy to reach (Handayani, 2007; Tambunan, 2010; Khoiriyah et al., 2013), lecture facilities (Handayani, 2007; Meilyaningsih & Sisilia, 2015), study programs provide interesting majors (Tambunan, 2010; Widowati & Surjawati, 2015) and program accreditation which are quality guarantees that are recognized internally and externally (Meilyaningsih & Sisilia, 2015; Djafar, 2017; Kamal & Rahmadiane, 2017).

The quality of a tertiary institution can be determined from the quality and convenience of graduates to get jobs in accordance with the field of science. Bowen (1977), said that these characteristics emphasize that college products are learning, research and community service and the main product is learning. In addition, additional products such as personal self-discovery, career choice and placement, direct satisfaction and pleasure are also characteristics of the college. Higher education can be seen as part of an economic industry that provides academic, research and service levels (Dill, 2001).

IV. Conclusion

The results of the analysis of relevant journals and theses conclude that prospective students are important assets for tertiary institutions in Indonesia. To attract their interest many factors influence it. Every college must always be prepared and keep abreast of market developments, fulfill the desires and needs of students so that they are still in demand and favored by students.

College managers need to be more professional in managing the lecture process. They must fulfill the facilities and infrastructure and improve the quality and qualifications of the teaching staff. Marketing communication strategies must be well designed in order to be able to influence the motivation and attitudes of prospective students such as direct promotion by visiting schools, distributing brochures, promotions in print media, electronic media and others.

Universities need to pay attention to study programs to be more creative and prioritize special skills-based study programs in accordance with the needs of the labor market. Universities must be managed more professionally by prioritizing user satisfaction such as students, teaching staff and managers.

References

- Abdullah, N. S. (1985). *Analisis Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Permintaan Pendidikan Sebagai Salah Satu Bahan Pertimbangan dalam Menentukan Prioritas Jenis Sekolah*. Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.
- Alessandri, S. W., Yang, S.-U., & Kinsey, D. F. (2006). An Integrative Approach to University Visual Identity and Reputation. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 9(4), 258–270. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.crr.1550033>
- Allsop, D. E. E. T., Bassett, B. R., & Hoskins, J. A. (2007). Word-of-Mouth Research: Principles and Applications. *Journal of Advertising Research*, (December), 398–411. <https://doi.org/10.2501/S0021849907070419>
- Ammalia, E. R., & A, W. A. (2014). Pengaruh Brand Equity Dan Reputasi Korporat Terhadap Minat Mahasiswa Baru Universitas Singaperbangsa Karawang. *Jurnal Ilmiah Solusi*, 1(3), 86–94.
- Andriani, E., & Adam, H. (2013). Pengaruh Biaya Pendidikan, Latar Belakang Sosial Ekonomi, Motivasi dan Reputasi Terhadap Minat Mahasiswa dalam Memilih Prodi S1 Akuntansi Perguruan Tinggi di Malang. *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa FEB Universitas Brawijaya*. Malang, 1(2), 14–17.
- Arndt, J. (1967). Role of Product-Related Conversations in the Diffusion of a New Product. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 4(3), 291–295.
- Artini, I. D. A. J., Kirya, I. K., & Suwendra, I. W. (2014). Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Keputusan Mahasiswa Dalam Memilih Jurusan Di Fakultas Ekonomi Dan Bisnis (FEB) Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha (Undiksha) Sebagai Tempat Kuliah. *Journal Bisma Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha Jurusan Manajemen*, 2(1), 1–8.
- Babin, B. J., Lee, Y., Kim, E., & Griffin, M. (2005). Modeling consumer satisfaction and word-of-mouth: restaurant patronage in Korea. *Journal of Service Marketing*, 19(3), 133–139. <https://doi.org/10.1108/08876040510596803>
- Bafadal, I. (2004). *Manajemen Perlengkapan Sekolah*. Jakarta: PT. Bumi Aksara.

- Balmer, J. M. T., & Greyser, S. A. (2002). Managing the Multiple Identities of the Corporation. *California Management Review*, 44(3), 72–86.
- Balter, D., & Butman, J. (2005). *Grapevine : The New Art of Word of Mouth Marketing*. New York: Portfolio Hardcover.
- BAN-PT. (2008). *Buku II Standar dan Prosedur Akreditasi Program Studi Sarjana*. Jakarta: Kemendikbud.
- Bergerson, A. A. (2009). College Choice and Access to College: Moving Policy, Research, and Practice to the 21st Century. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 35(4), 1–141.
- Bowen, H. R. (1977). *Investment in learning*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Bromley, D. (2002). Comparing Corporate Reputations: League Tables, Quotients, Benchmarks, or Case Studies? *Corporate Reputation Review*, 5(1), 35–50. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.crr.1540163>
- Buttle, F. A. (1998). Word of mouth : understanding and managing referral marketing. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 6, 241–254.
- Cabrera, A. F., & La Nasa, S. M. (2000). Understanding the College-Choice Process. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2000(107), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.10701>
- Caruana, A. (1997). Corporate reputation: concept and measurement. *Journal of Product & Brand Management Accounting*, 6(2), 109–118.
- Chapman, D. W. (1981). A Model of Student College Choice. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 52(5), 490–505.
- Dill, D. D. (2001). The regulation of public research universities: Changes in academic competition and implications for university autonomy and accountability. *Higher Education Policy*, 14(1), 21–35. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0952-8733\(00\)00027-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0952-8733(00)00027-1)
- Djafar, H. (2017). Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Mahasiswa Memilih Program Studi Manajemen Pendidikan Islam (MPI) Fakultas tarbiyah dan Keguruan UIN Alauddin Makassar. *Jurnal Idaarah*, 1(1), 74–88.
- Djamarah, S. B. (2002). *Psikologi Belajar*. Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.
- Eberl, M., & Schwaiger, M. (2005). Corporate reputation : disentangling the effects on financial performance. *European Journal of Marketing*, 39(7/8), 838–854. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560510601798>
- Enterprise, J. (2010). *Buzz marketing dengan google buzz dan google wave*. Jakarta: PT. Media Elex Komputindo Kelompok Gramedia.
- Finch, D. J., Hamilton, L. K., Baldwin, R., & Zehner, M. (2013). An exploratory study of factors affecting undergraduate employability. *Education + Training*, 55(7), 681–704. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-07-2012-0077>
- Fombrun, C., & Shanley, M. (1990). What's in a Name? Reputation Building and Corporate Strategy. *Academy of Management Fou*, 33(2), 233–258. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256324>
- Ford, J. B., Joseph, M., & Joseph, B. (1999). Importance-performance analysis as a strategic tool for service marketers: The case of service quality perceptions of business students in New Zealand and the USA. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 13(2), 171–186. <https://doi.org/10.1108/08876049910266068>
- Gie, T. L. (2002). *Cara Belajar Yang Efisien*. Yogyakarta: Liberty.
- Gotsi, M., & Wilson, A. M. (2001). Corporate reputation : seeking a definition. *Corporate Communications An International Journal*, 6(1), 24–30.
- Grunig, J. E., & Hung, C. F. (2002). The Effect of Relationships on Reputation And Reputation on Relationships: A Cognitive, Behavioral Study. In *5th Annual International, Interdisciplinary Public Relations Research Conference, Miami, Florida* (pp. 1–65).
- Handayani, N. (2007). Perbedaan Keputusan Mahasiswa Dalam Memilih STIE di Jawa Timur. *EKUITAS (Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Keuangan)*, 11(3), 321–348. Retrieved from <https://ejournal.stiesia.ac.id/ekuitas/article/view/2242/2075>
- Hanson, K., & Litten, L. (1982). *Mapping the road to academia : A review of research on women, men and college selection process*. In *The undergraduate woman: Issues in education* (ed. P. Per). Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Harahap, D. A., Hurriyati, R., Gaffar, V., & Amanah, D. (2018). The impact of word of mouth and university reputation on student decision to study at university. *Management Science Letters*, 8(6), 649–658. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2018.4.027>
- Harahap, D. A., Hurriyati, R., Gaffar, V., Wibowo, L. A., & Amanah, D. (2017a). Effect of Word of Mouth on Students Decision to Choose Studies in College. In *1st International Conference on Islamic Economics, Business, and Philanthropy (ICIEBP 2017)* (pp. 793–797). SCITEPRESS – Science and Technology Publications, Lda.
- Harahap, D. A., Hurriyati, R., Gaffar, V., Wibowo, L. A., & Amanah, D. (2017b). Pengaruh Reputasi Universitas Terhadap Keputusan Mahasiswa Memilih Studi di Universitas Islam Sumatera Utara. In *Prosiding Seminar Nasional & Konferensi Forum Manajemen Indonesia (FMI 9), Semarang* (pp. 1–12).

- <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/8ZG6N>
- Harahap, F. (2015). Analisis Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Keputusan Mahasiswa Dalam Memilih Jurusan Akuntansi Sebagai Tempat Kuliah Di Universitas Di Kota Pekanbaru. *Jom. Fekon*, 2(2), 1–12.
- Harahap, N. (2004). *Analisis Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Keputusan Mahasiswa dalam Menempuh Pendidikan Politeknik LP3I Medan*. Universitas Sumatera Utara.
- Harrison-Walker, L. J. (2001). The Measurement of Word-of-Mouth Communication and an Investigation of Service Quality and Customer Commitment As Potential Antecedents. *Journal of Service Research*, 4(1), 60–75. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109467050141006>
- Hatch, M. J., & Schultz, M. (1997). Relations between organizational culture, identity and image. *European Journal of Marketing*, 31(5,6), 356–365. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb060636>
- Haur, L. S. (2009). *Higher Education Marketing Concerns: Factors Influencing Malaysian Students' Intention to Study at Higher Educational Institutions*. University of Malaya, Malaysia.
- Heath, R. L., & Vasquez, G. (2001). *Handbook of Public Relations*. Thousand Oaks California: Sage Publications.
- Helm, S. (2007). One reputation or many ? of corporate reputation. *Corporate Communications An International Journal*, 12(3), 238–254. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13563280710776842>
- Hossler, D., & Gallagher, K. S. (1987). Studying Student College Choice: A Three-Phase Model and the Implications for Policymakers. *Spring College and University*, 52(3), 207–221.
- Houston, M. B., Walker, B. A., Hutt, M. D., Reingen, P. H., Houston, M. B., Walker, B. A., ... Reingen, P. H. (2001). Cross Unit a Competition Market Charter : The Enduring Influence of Structure. *Journal of Marketing*, 65(2), 19–34.
- Hussin, S. R., Soon, T. H., & Sidin, S. M. (2000). Marketing Analysis of the Higher Education Service Sector in Malaysia: Consumer Perspective. *Pertanika J. Soc. Sci. & Hum*, 8(1), 1–6.
- Indonesia, R. (2008). Pendanaan Pendidikan. *PERATURAN PEMERINTAH REPUBLIK INDONESIA NOMOR 48*, pp. 1–42.
- Indrajit, R. E., & Djokopranoto, R. (2006). *Manajemen Perguruan Tinggi Modern*. Yogyakarta: Andi.
- Jackson, G. A. (1982). Public Efficiency and Private Choice in Higher Education. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 4(2), 237–247. <https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737004002237>
- Kamal, B., & Rahmadiane, G. D. (2017). Pengaruh Persepsi , Akreditasi Prodi, Dan Promosi Terhadap Keputusan Memilih Program Studi Akuntansi Pada Politeknik Harapan Bersama. *Jurnal Inspirasi Bisnis Dan Manajemen*, 1(2), 145–158.
- Khoiriyah, D., Susilawati, M., & Nilakusumawati, D. P. E. (2013). Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Minat Mahasiswa Asal Luar Bali Kuliah di FMIPA Universitas Udayana Bali. *E-Jurnal Matematika*, 2(1), 24–32.
- Lupiyoadi, R., & Hamdani, A. (2006). *Manajemen Pemasaran Jasa* (Edisi Kedu). Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
- Mastur, & Triono. (2014). *Materi Layanan Klasikal Bimbingan dan Konseling Bidang Bimbingan Karier*. Yogyakarta: Paramitra Publising.
- Mehboob, F. (2012). Factors Influencing Student's Enrollment Decisions in Selection of Higher Education Institutions (HEI'S). *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 4(5), 558–568.
- Meilyaningsih, E., & Sisilia, K. (2015). Analisis Faktor Pengambilan Keputusan Mendaftar Di Institusi Pendidikan Tinggi Swasta (Studi Pada Program Studi D3 Manajemen Pemasaran Universitas Telkom Angkatan 2014). *E-Proceeding of Management*, 2(3), 3597–3602.
- Melewar, T. C., Karaosmanoglu, E., & Peterson, D. (2005). Corporate identity : Concept , components and contribution. *Journal of General Management*, 31(1), 59–81. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030630700503100104>
- Mulyasa. (2007). *Manajemen Berbasis Sekolah*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mulyono. (2010). *Konsep Pembiayaan Pendidikan* (Cetakan I). Yogyakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.
- Post, J., & Griffin, J. (1997). Corporate reputation and external affairs management. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 1(1/2), 165–171.
- Purely Interactive. (2018). *Choosing a College or University*. Ontario. Retrieved from <http://www.transitionresourceguide.ca/resources/choosing-a-college-or-university>
- Smith, K. T., Smith, M., & Wang, K. (2010). Does brand management of corporate reputation translate into higher market value ? *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 18(3), 201–221. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09652540903537030>
- Sontaite, M., & Bakanauskas, A. (2011). Measurement Model of Corporate Reputation at Higher Education Institutions : Customers' Perspective. *Systematic Research*, 59, 115–130.
- Sultan, P., & Wong, H. Y. (2012). Service quality in a higher education context : an integrated model. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 24(5), 755–784. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13555851211278196>

- Supriadi, D. (2003). *Satuan Biaya Pendidikan* (Cetakan I). Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Suryani, W., & Ginting, P. (2013). Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Keputusan Mahasiswa Memilih Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Islam Sumatera Utara Al Munawaroh Medan. *Modernisasi*, 9(1), 33–48.
- Swastha, B., & Handoko, T. H. (2008). *Manajemen Pemasaran, Analisa Perilaku Konsumen* (Edisi D). Yogyakarta: BPFE.
- Syah, M. (2008). *Psikologi Pendidikan dengan Pendekatan Baru*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Tambunan, L. T. (2010). *Analisis Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Keputusan Mahasiswa Dalam Menempuh Pendidikan Pada Jurusan Akuntansi Universitas HKBP Nomensen Medan*. Universitas Sumatera Utara.
- Tjiptono, F. (2012). *Strategi Pemasaran*. Malang: Bayu Media Publishing.
- Vercic, A. T., & Vercic, D. (2007). Reputation as Matching Identities and Images : Extending Davies and Chun's (2002) Research on Gaps between the Internal and External Perceptions of the Corporate Brand. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 13(4), 277–290. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527260701300151>
- Villanueva, J., Yoo, S., & Hanssens, D. M. (2008). The Impact of Marketing-Induced Versus Word-of-Mouth Customer Acquisition on Customer Equity Growth. *Journal of Marketing Research*, XLV(February), 48–59.
- Voon, B. H., Lee, N., Abdullah, F., & Teay Shawyun. (2009). Measuring Market Orientation in Higher Education: Student's Perspective with Cross-national Validation. *Journal of International Business, Economics and Entrepreneurship*, 14(1), 101–115.
- Walker, K. (2010). A Systematic Review of the Corporate Reputation Literature: Definition, Measurement, and Theory. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 12(4), 357–387. <https://doi.org/10.1057/crr.2009.26>
- Wibowo, A. J. I. (2014). Kinerja Riset Universitas, Reputasi Universitas, dan Pilihan Universitas: Sebuah Telaah Sistematis. *Jurnal Manajemen*, 13(2), 91–115.
- Widowati, A. I., & Surjawati. (2015). Studi Tentang Keputusan Memilih Jurusan S1 Akuntansi (Studi Empiris Pada Mahasiswa Program Studi S1 Akuntansi Universitas Semarang). *Jurnal Dinamika Sosbud*, 17(2), 1–11.
-