

New Students Recruitment System and Factors Influencing Their Choice: A Study at a State University in West Sumatera

Received:22-03-2022 ; Revised:01-04-2022 ; Accepted:03-04-2022

Suswati Hendriani^{1*}, Kasmuri², Reni Susanti³, Fitra Kasma Putra⁴

^{1, 3, 4}Institut Agama Islam Negeri Batusangkar

²Universita Islam Negeri Sultan Kasim Riau

Korespondensi: Jl. Sudirman No.137 Kuburajo, Limakaum, Batusangkar, Sumatera Barat

e-mail: suswati.hendriani@iainbatusangkar.ac.id , kasmuri@uinsuskariau.ac.id renisusanti@iainbatusangkar.ac.id , fitrakasmaputra@iainbatusangkar.ac.id

**) Corresponding Author*



Abstrak: Merekrut mahasiswa baru yang memadai secara kuantitas dan kualitas adalah agenda rutin setiap perguruan tinggi yang ingin maju dan tetap eksis. Oleh sebab itu, kegiatan rekrutmen mahasiswa baru perlu dilakukan secara baik dan terencana agar tujuan rekrutmen memberikan hasil yang optimal. Idealnya, rekrutmen mahasiswa baru dilakukan dengan membentuk badan khusus yang tugasnya memikirkan cara-cara terbaik untuk menggaet calon mahasiswa baru. Hal itu akan bisa dilakukan apabila banyak pihak dilibatkan untuk mendapatkan masukan-masukan yang berharga. Tentu saja setiap perguruan tinggi memiliki cara yang tidak sama. Oleh karena itu, artikel ini dimaksudkan untuk melengkapi kekurangan pengetahuan tentang sistem rekrutmen mahasiswa baru yang telah ada. Melalui penelitian survey, sistem rekrutmen mahasiswa baru pada IAIN Batusangkar. Desain penelitian yang digunakan adalah *cross-sectional design*. Populasi penelitian ini adalah semua mahasiswa IAIN Batusangkar. Sampel dipilih dengan menggunakan *cluster sampling technique* dimana terpilih 3.485 mahasiswa sebagai sampel penelitian. Instrumen penelitian yang digunakan untuk mengumpulkan data adalah angket tertutup. Data yang terkumpul dianalisis dengan Statistik Deskriptif. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan terjadi peningkatan efektivitas promosi yang dilakukan dari level tidak efektif (51.01%) pada tahun 2016 ke level efektif (62.45%) pada tahun 2018. Keberhasilan sistem rekrutmen mahasiswa baru adalah karena pada sistem rekrutmen yang baru, rekrutmen mahasiswa baru dilakukan dengan berbagai cara, mulai dari pemanfaatan brosur, beasiswa hingga mempromosikan akreditasi program studi da lembaga. Faktor yang paling dominan dalam mempengaruhi keputusan mahasiswa dalam memilih perguruan tinggi adalah orang tua dan biaya kuliah yang relatif terjangkau.

Kata Kunci: Sistem rekrutmen, mahasiswa baru, efektifitas

Abstract: *Recruiting new students quantitatively and qualitatively adequate to be able to get advancement and to exist is a routine agenda of a university. Thus, new student recruitment activity should be well done and well planned so that optimum results can be reached. Ideally, new student recruitment system is done by a specific permanent body whose task is to think about the best ways to get new prospective students. This can be realized when many parties are involved to get worthy suggestions. Of course each university has different methods, Therefore, this article is aimed at completing knowledge gap on new student recruitment system and factors influencing their choice of university. Through this research, new student recruitment system at LAIN Batusangkar was found out. The study used cross-sectional design. The population of the research was all the students of LAIN Batusangkar. The sample of the study was selected using cluster sampling technique in which 3.485 students were selected to be the research sample. The instrument used to collect the data of the research was a closed-ended questionnaire. The collected data was analyzed through Descriptive Statistics. The results of the research showed that there was an increase of promotion effectiveness from ineffective level in 2016 (51.01%) to effective level (62.45%) in 2018. The success of the new recruitment system to recruit new students because it was carried out in various ways, ranging from the use of brochures, scholarships, to promoting the accreditation value of the study program and institution. The most dominant factors in influencing student decision in choosing a university were parents and relatively affordable tuition.*

Keywords: *Recruitment system, new student, effectiveness*

INTRODUCTION

New students' recruitment can determine the existence of a university in the future. The success of the recruitment activity will give impacts on the university directly or indirectly. Thus, if the new student recruitment activity is not well done and well planned, sooner or later the university will collapse. Planning it well and seriously will give benefits for the university continuation.

Many studies have been conducted related to admission process of new students such as (Wilkins et al., 2012; (Mattern & Wyatt, 2009)(Vrontis et al., 2007)(Obermeit, 2012). (Hagel & Shaw, 2007; Mangan et al., 2010; Callender & Jackson, 2008; and Daharnis & Ardi, 2016); . new student admission policy (Hoerudin, 2019), and student admission assessment (Mesran et al., 2017). However, this study is different from the previous ones since in this study the combination of efforts to obtain more new students and the factors influencing student choice of higher education were found out. Therefore, this article discusses the two things: efforts made by promotion team and factors influence their choice. Each university, of course, has different methods of marketing and the results or their marketing depends on student choice.

METHOD

This is survey research using cross-sectional design. The population of the research was the students of IAIN Batusangkar, i.e., "a group of elements or cases, whether individuals, objects, or events, that conform to specific criteria and to which we intend to generalize the results of the research" (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). The sample of the research was selected using cluster sampling technique since it is more feasible to choose groups of individuals than individuals (Gall et al., 2003). Based on the techniques, the first and the fifth semester students were selected, numbering 1.874 students and 1.611 respectively. Thus the total number of the respondents was 3.485. From the total number, 70% were selected for the research. From them, 1.312 of the sophomore, and 1.128 of the junior were selected. Thus, the total number of the population was 2.240

Research instrument used here was closed-ended questionnaire. The questionnaire was constructed based on relevant theories. Before, the questionnaire was validated by 3 validators to find out its content validity. It was proved as strongly valid with validity coefficient as high as 0.896. Besides, the questionnaire was also tried out sixty students to find out its reliability. The try-out results showed that the it was reliable with coefficient

of reliability as high as 0.78 0,78. The questionnaire was appropriate to use due a large number of the respondents as suggested by Sugiyono (2017).

Then, the questionnaire was distributed to 2,240 respondents. For the first semester, only 1,296 of the total 1,312 (98.78%) sophomores who filled in and returned the questionnaire, and for the fifth semester, of 1,128 respondent, only 783 of them (69.41%) who filled and returned the questionnaire. So, the total number of the respondents who filled and returned the questionnaire was 2,079 respondents (92. 81%)

The data of the study were, then, collected by distributing the questionnaire to the respondents. Using the questionnaire, the respondents' bio data and the data of promotion techniques were collected. Through the questionnaire, various things or factors influencing their choosing university to study were found out. In other words, through the questionnaire, the effective techniques used by the Committee of the New Student Admission was found out.

Then, the data collected through the questionnaire was analyzed using Descriptive Statistics by finding out the percentage of each promotion component. Based on the percentages, the promotion results were compared between the data of 2016 and those of 2018 to see the effectiveness of the new student recruitment system to get promotion program .

Table 1. Effectiveness of Promotion

No	Effectiveness level	Percentage Range
1	Strongly ineffective	0.00% - 20.00 %
2	Ineffective	21.00% - 40.00 %
3	Effective enough	41.00% – 60.00%
4	Effective	61.00% – 80.00 %
5	Strongly effective	81.00% -100.00%

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Sources of Student Choice of University

Table 2. Source of Information Offered by Promotion Team

No	Information Source	Number/ Percentage
1	Brochure/leaflet	496/17.23 %

2	Promotion team	480/16.68 % 3
3	Web	398/13.83 %
4	Senior students	339/11.78 %
5	Alumni	311/10.81 %
6	Counsellor teacher	224/7.79 %
7	Student teacher	127/4.41 %
8	Content teacher	111/3.86 %
9	Lecturer	111/3.86 %
10	Headmaster	74/2.57 %
11	Banner	66/2.29 %
12	Intern student	62/2.15 %
13	Radio	36/1.25 %
14	Billboard	31/ 1.08 %
15	Newspaper	12/0.42 %

Based on Table 2 above, it can be seen that the first source of information where the new students got the information was source brochure, followed by promotion team, Web of IAIN, students, alumni, counsellor teacher, student teacher, lecturer, headmaster, banner, intern students, radio, billboard, and newspaper respectively.

When the sources of information were compared between the previous year and the following year, different orders were found Table 3 shows the sources of information for the student in previous and the following year:

Table 3. A Comparison of Sources of Information for the New Student

No	2016	2018
1	Brochure/leaflet: 333/ 19.02 %	Brochure/leaflet: 496 17,23 %
2	Web: 219/12.51%	Promotion team 480 16,68 % 3
3	Alumni: 204/ 11.65%	Web IAIN: 398/ 13.83 %
4	Senior students: 204/ 11.65%	Senior students: 339/11.78%
5	Promotion team: 160/ 9.14 %	Alumni: 311/10.81 %
6	Counsellor teacher: 127/7.25%	Counsellor teacher: 224/7.79%
7	Student teacher: 85/4.85 %	Student teacher: 127 4,41 %
8	Lecturer: 76/4.34 %	Content teacher: 111/3.86 %
9	Radio: 67/3.82%	Lecturer: 111/3.86 %

10	Banner: 64/3.65 %	Headmaster: 74/2.57 %
11	Content teacher: 61/3.48 %	Banner: 66/2.29 %
12	Headmaster: 51/2,91 %	Intern student: 62/ 2.15 %
13	Billboard: 47/2.68 %	Radio: 36/1.25 %
14	Intern student: 45/2.57%	Billboard: 31/1.08 %
15	Newspaper: 8/0.46%	Newspaper: 12/0.42 %

Based on the table 3 above, it can be seen that there are differences in kinds and number of media used as the vehicles to send information about IAIN Batusangkar between promotion activities in two different years. Promotion activity in the previous year of the year 2016 used 10 kinds of media to send information to the new students with total number of 1.137. The next promotion activity in the year of 2018 succeeded in sending information to new students as many as 15 media with the total number of the new students was 2.878. Thus, it may be concluded that there was an increase in number of the new students reached by the information namely as many as 1.741 students (153.12%).

After the comparison was made between the promotion activities between 2016 and 2018, it can be stated that there was an increase of promotion effectiveness from ineffective level in 2016 (51.01%) to effective level (62.45%) in 2018. Besides, when the number of students receiving information from the promotion activities was compared, it was found that in 2016, the impact of the promotion was only 2,001, meanwhile, in 2018, the impact was as many as 4,007. Thus, it can be seen that there was an increase from 2016 to 2018, namely as many as 102.25%.

The results of the research showed that the promotion activities conducted to increase the number of the new students were in line with Suratmo (2004), including placing banners at public places, using advertisements in mass media, spreading brochure, doing school visit, doing open-house, holding competitions, offering special programs, using web via internet, and so on; and using promotion

technique of words of mouth. Related to the promotion, words of mouth were proved to be effective in influencing students in increasing students' entering a university (Astuti, 2015). Using Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in university management is another effort (Indrayani, 2011). In managing a university, ICT in the form of internet is utilized for formal sites, administrative works, teaching media, digital library service, online journal subscription, and conducting distant learning (Situmorang, 2012). Other ways to promote a university, according to him, is by setting relatively affordable tuition, increasing the accreditation value of the study programs, offering scholarships, taking advantage of the closest people of the prospective students such as friends, parents, and by conveying the prospects of the study program.

Factor or Actor Influencing Student Choice of University

The results of this study showed that there were many people and things that influenced student choice of university, as shown in the table 4, as follows:

Table 4. Factor or Actor Influencing Student Choice of University

No	Actor/Factor	2016	2018
1	Special program	4.98%	5.5%
2	Academic reputation	4.98%	3,43%
3	Institution accreditation	5.31%	5.78%
4	Study program accreditation	5.23%	5.51%
5	Promotion team	1.75%	2.47%
6	Leader quality	1.09%	1.41%
7	Lecturer quality	1.52%	1.49%
8	Administrative staff quality	0.23%	0.47%
9	Adequacy of facilities and infrastructures	2.06%	2.15%
10	Building performance	1.57%	1.28%
11	Relatively affordable tuition	9.39%	8.44%
12	Location convenience (near)	7.54%	7.06%
No	Actor/Factor	2016	2018

13	Conducive environment	3.00%	2.94%
14	Safety from disasters	3.30%	2.41%
15	Good climate for health	2.26%	2.13%
16	Headmaster/vice headmaster	0.25%	0.32%
17	Counsellor teacher	1.02%	0.10%
18	Content teacher	0.61%	0.72%
19	Senior students	2.61%	3.01%
20	Intern students	0.43%	0.41%
21	Student teachers	0.71%	0.57%
22	Alumni	1.88%	2.33%
23	Students' parents	8.73%	8.16%
24	Relatives	2.26%	1.94%
25	Students' elder bothers/sisters	4.11%	3.87%
26	Students' younger brothers/sisters	0.43%	0.34%
27	Students' neighbors	0.81%	0.80%
28	Students' friends	2.11%	1.87%
29	Other people	0.20%	0.53%
30	Scholarship	3.25%	4.06%
No	Actor/Factor	2016	2018
31	Study program prospects	2.56%	2.71%
32	Religion	4.49%	5.00%
33	Race	1.17%	0.84%
34	More role	1.55%	1.44%
35	Better status	2.23%	1.84%
36	Cultural similarity	1.78%	1.51%
37	Interesting culture	1.73%	1.41%
38	Students' activity	0.61%	0.57%
39	Other reasons (self)	0.46%	0.32%

Based on, the Table 4 above, it can be seen that the most influential factors in new students' choosing a university were as follow (ranged from the most to the least influential): (1) relatively affordable tuition; (2) parental effects; (3) location convenience (near), (4) university accreditation, (5) study program accreditation; (6) special program; (7) religion; (8) scholarships, (9) elder brothers or sisters; (10) academic reputation; (11) senior students; (12) conducive environment; (13) study program prospects, (14) promotion team, (15) save location from natural disasters; (16) alumni; (17) completeness of facilities and

infrastructures; (18) good climate; (19) relatives; (20) friends, (21) status, (22) cultural similarities; (23) lecturer quality, (24) more roles; (25) interesting cultures; (26) leaders' good quality; (27) building performance; (28) races, (29) neighbors; (30) content teachers; (31) student teachers; (32) student activities; (33) other people; (34) quality of administrative staffs; (35) intern students; (36) younger brothers/sisters; (37) themselves; (38) Headmaster/vice headmasters; and (39) counsellor teachers.

The research results were in line with (Briggs, 2006; Johnston, 2010; Anderson, 1999; Al-Fattal, 2010; and Tarazona, 2014; Akmal & Lubis, 2014)

The results of this research showed that factors influencing new students' decision making in choosing a university namely: tuition fee, study program accreditation, scholarships, friends, parents, university itself, and graduate prospect; and for (Teranishi et al., 2004) the factors include academic reputation, financial reasons, the desire to live not far from home, and the advice of friends and "academic quality, facilities, campus surroundings, personal characteristics", (Sidin et al., 2003; (Fernandes, 2010). The Guardian survey results in Anderson (1999) suggest that institutional factor as an important factor for the students choice of higher education.

Fuadi (2012) pointed out that the average number of media that succeeded in influencing new students namely the university itself, regional student forums, banners, invitation to schools and outdoor advertisement. For Kana (2014), students choice to enter a university was influenced positively and significantly by reference groups, family, and marketing communications. Family has positive and significant effect on students' choice of university. However, marketing communications have no positive and significant effects on students' choosing a university (Khotimah, 2012); (Purwanti, 2015) stated that easily accessed location, relatively affordable tuition, provided services, and the feeling of pride of being a university students influenced his or her choice in choosing a university to study. According to (Nurwildani, 2014), sub-criterion university

gets the weight of 0.741, sub-criterion accreditation quality gets the weight of 0.559, sub-criterion relatively affordable tuition gets the weight of 0.661, sub-criterion facilities/infrastructures like comfortable place to study gets the weight of 0.543, and from the main criteria, criterion of quality gets the weight of 0.400. Thus, the most influential factors of new university students' choice of study ranked from the quality of the university, relatively affordable tuition, accreditation, comfortable study rooms. Another study results revealed that student choice of university was influenced by quality of teaching, tuitions, availability of courses, facilities, and employability (Kayombo & Carter, 2016). However, the results of this study were in some points different from those of Amwila and Magdalena stating that the influential factors for university students' decision in choosing a university involve students' background of education, social-economic status of his/her parents, and campus facilities and infrastructures. According to Mattern & Wyatt (2009), factors that influenced the student choice of higher education include average distance of their home, score of SAT, high GPA from school, income of parents, parental educational background, their ethnicity, and gender. In line with them, some factors that mostly influence in the student choice of university include "gender, family assets, parents' of education, potential work opportunities, sources of information and desired field of study". (Haryanti et al., 2016). In line with the, another study showed that demographic factors like students' gender, their nationality, their parents' education and job influenced their choice of university (Al-Ali Mustafa et al., 2018)

Related to the promotion activity, the research results of Karim & Mulyani (2016) found out that promotion activities did not influence the students because the university students have got information about a university from their parents and relatives. The results of a study conducted by Imasari & Lu (2010) showed that advertisement influenced student choice of university. This is in line with Dharmawansyah et al. (2014) and It is in

line with Diamond et al., (2012). In contrast, the increasing of students to enter a university can be promoted through a lecturer workshop and university open house (Carolina & Tallo, 2018).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The policy for disbursement of Socialization funds by the Ministry of Religion is effective in increasing the number of the new students at IAIN Batusangkar. This is proved by the increase of impacts of promotion model used on the desire of the new students to choose IAIN Batusangkar as a university to study with the increased number as high as 102.25%. Based on the positive results, it is recommended to the committee for new student recruitment to use the promotion model used by the Committee for Selection and Recruitment of New Students (SPMB) 2018 with more optimal preparation, especially in preparing those who will be involved in the process of selection and recruitment on new students, like lecturers, administrative staffs, students, and alumni. Disbursement of socialization/promotion funds needs to be carried out so that the achievement of socialization results is more optimal.

REFERENCES

- Akmal, A., & Lubis, M. H. (2014). Strategi Promosi pada Politeknik LP3I Medan. *Jurnal Bisnis Administrasi*, 03(2), 1–9.
- Al-Ali Mustafa, S., Sellami, A. L., Elmaghraby, E. A. A., & Al-Qassass, H. B. (2018). Determinants of College and University Choice for High-School Students in Qatar. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 7(3), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v7n3p1>
- Al-Fattal, A. (2010). *Understanding student choice of university and marketing strategies in Syrian private higher education* (Issue September). <http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/1115/>
- Anderson, P. (1999). Factors Influencing Student Choice in Higher Education. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 3(4), 128–131. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360310998171>

- Astuti, S. (2015). Analisis Bauran Promosi Dalam Peningkatan Jumlah Mahasiswa Baru di FKIP UHAMKA Jakarta. *Jurnal Utilitas*, 1(1), 91–102.
- Briggs, S. (2006). An exploratory study of the factors influencing undergraduate student choice: The case of higher education in Scotland. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(6), 705–722.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070601004333>
- Callender, C., & Jackson, J. (2008). Does the fear of debt constrain choice of university and subject of study? *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(4), 405–429.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070802211802>
- Carolina, & Tallo, A. J. (2018). Kegiatan Workshop untuk Meningkatkan Jumlah Mahasiswa Program Studi Teknik. *Jurnal Teknik Arsitektur ARTEKS*, 2(2), 89–98.
<https://doi.org/10.30822/artk.v2i2.145>
- Daharnis, D., & Ardi, Z. (2016). the Compatibility Student Choice of University Majoring; a Preliminary Studies. *GUIDENA: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan, Psikologi, Bimbingan Dan Konseling*, 6(1), 101.
<https://doi.org/10.24127/gdn.v6i1.440>
- Dharmawansyah, S., Cangara, H., & Sultan, M. I. (2014). Strategi Promosi dalam Meningkatkan Jumlah Mahasiswa pada Politeknik Negeri Media Kreatif Makassar. *Jurnal Komunikasi KAREBA*, 3(4), 256–263.
- Diamond, A., Vorley, T., Roberts, J., & Jones, S. (2012). Behavioural Approaches to Understanding Student Choice. In *CFE, HEA and TUoS*.
https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/resources/student_choice.pdf
http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/Documents/research/Student_Choice.pdf
- Fernandes, J. L. (2010). An Exploratory Study of Factors Influencing the Decision of Students to Study at Universiti Sains Malaysia. *Kajian Malaysia*, 28(2), 107–136.
- Fuadi, D. (2012). Efektifitas Penggunaan Media Dalam Meraih Calon Mahasiswa Baru: Studi Kasus Pada Lima Perguruan Tinggi Swasta di Surakarta. *Jurnal Pendidikan Ilmu Sosial*, 22(2), 144–162.
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2003). Educational Research: An Introduction. In *Pearson Education, Inc* (Vol. 32, Issue 3, p. 274).
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3121583>
- Hagel, P., & Shaw, R. (2007). The Influence of Delivery Mode on Consumer Choice of University. *European Advances in Consumer Research. Volume 8*, 8, 531–536.
- Haryanti, Wijayanto, H., & Sumarwan, U. (2016). Analysis of the Factors Influencing Bogor Senior High School Student Choice in Choosing Bogor Agricultural University (Indonesia) For Further Study. In *Journal of Education and e-Learning Research* (Vol. 3, Issue 3).
<https://doi.org/10.20448/journal.509/2016.3.3/509.3.87.97>
- Hoerudin, C. W. (2019). Evaluation of New Students Admission Policy Based on Zonation System in Bandung City. *Jispo*, 9(2), 351–361.
- Imasari, K., & Lu, C. (2010). Pengaruh Media Periklanan terhadap Pengambilan Keputusan Siswa SMU untuk Mendaftar di Universitas Kristen Maranatha: Sikap Konsumen sebagai Variabel Moderasi (Studi Kasus Siswa SMU di Bandung). *Jurnal Bisnis Dan Ekonomi (JBE)*, 17(2), 109–120.
- Indrayani, E. (2011). Pengelolaan Sistem Informasi Akademik Peruruan Tinggi Berbasis Teknologi dan Komunkasi (TIK). *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan*, 12(1), 51–67.
- Johnston, T. C. (2010). Who and What Influences Choice of University? Student and University Perceptions. *American Journal of Business Education*, 3(10), 15–24.
- Karim, S., & Mulyani, Y. (2016). Evaluasi Kegiatan Promosi Politeknik Negeri Balikpapan dalam Menjaring Mahasiswa Baru Periode 2013–2015. *Jurnal Sains Terapan*, 2(2), 92–102.
- Kayombo, K. M., & Carter, S. (2016). Understanding Student Preferences for University Choice in Zambia. *Journal of Education Policy, Planning & Administration*, 6(3), 1–21.

- Khotimah, S. (2012). Perumusan Strategi bagi Perguruan Tinggi Swasta (PTS) untuk Meraih Keunggulan Bersaing (Studi Kasus pada Universitas Merdeka Malang). *Jurnal SPREAD*, 2(1), 73–84. <https://doi.org/10.36352/jt-ibsi.v2i2.60>
- Mangan, J., Hughes, A., Davies, P., & Slack, K. (2010). Fair access, achievement and geography: Explaining the association between social class and students' choice of university. *Studies in Higher Education*, 35(3), 335–350. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070903131610>
- Mattern, K., & Wyatt, J. (2009). Student Choice of College: How Far Do Students Go For An Education? *Journal of College Admission*, Spring, 18–29.
- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2001). Research in Education: a Conceptual Introduction. In *Pearson Education* (pp. 114–116).
- Mesran, Kristianto Hondro, R., Syahrizal, M., Putera Utama Siahaan, A., & Rahim, R. (2017). *Student Admission Assessment using Multi-Objective Optimization on the Basis of Ratio Analysis (MOORA) Modeling of Rainfall Characteristics for Monitoring of the Extreme Rainfall Event in Makassar City View project Student Admission Assessment using Multi. Siabaan 2016*, 1–6. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320841856>
- Nurwildani, M. F. (2014). Analisis Faktor Pendukung Keputusan Pemilihan Perguruan Tinggi Tingkat Sarjana Menggunakan Metode AHP (Analitical Hirarki Process). *Engineering: Jurnal Bidang Teknik*, 5(1).
- Obermeit, K. (2012). Students' choice of universities in Germany: structure, factors and information sources used. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 22(2), 206–230. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08841241.2012.737870>
- Purwanti, E. (2015). Analisis Faktor-Faktor Pengambilan Keputusan Mahasiswa Memilih STIE “Ama” Salatiga. *Among Makarti*, 8(16), 40–54.
- Sidin, S. M., Hussin, S. R., & Soon, T. H. (2003). An Exploratory Study of Factors Influencing the College Choice Decision of Undergraduate Students in Malaysia. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 8(3), 259–280.
- Situmorang, J. R. (2012). Pemanfaatan Internet Sebagai New Media Dalam Bidang Politik , Bisnis , Pendidikan Dan Sosial Budaya. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis*, 8(1), 77–91.
- Tarazona, M. (2014). Determinant Factors Contributing to Student Choice in Selecting a University. *Journal of Education and Human Development*, 3(2), 391–404.
- Teranishi, R. T., Ceja, M., Antonio, A. L., Allen, W. R., & McDonough, P. (2004). The College-Choice Process for Asian Pacific Americans: Ethnicity and SocioEconomic Class in Context. *The Review of Higher Education*, 27(4), 527–551.
- Vrontis, D., Thrassou, A., & Melanthiou, Y. (2007). A contemporary higher education student-choice model for developed countries. *Journal of Business Research*, 60(9), 979–989. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2007.01.023>
- Wilkins, S., Balakrishnan, M. S., & Huisman, J. (2012). Student Choice in Higher Education: Motivations for Choosing to Study at an International Branch Campus. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 16(5), 413–433. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315311429002>