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ABSTRACT

The objective of this thesis is to find out the perception of overseas student whether president University is perceived by them as a international University. The reason that the researcher writes this thesis is that there are many overseas students think that President University isn't international University, thus this research is basically to find out those reason.

Through the research, students can have the deeply understanding what are the international university standards (base on different authors opinion) and also brand equity concept. President University can use this research for improvement and also as a feedback from the students.

This research use quantitative method to get the answer for the problem. Based on the quantitative research method, a questionnaire was conducted to do the survey and collect data from President University overseas student’s batch 2007 and 2008 (according with the criteria). Base on the criteria, the population for the research was fifty (50) students, which forty (40) was the total example taken by the researcher for the study.

Base on the analysis of the data, the result concluded on average, both 2007 and 2008 overseas students at President University, depict uncertainty perception regarding whether President University is an international university.

The researcher recommends several measures regarding these study findings. First recommendations is for the university and also overseas students to conduct further studies on this field or topic about overseas students perception about President University, any topic will be helpful for the university itself, due of its position in the market, such as an international university.
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CHAPTER I

I. INTRODUCTION

1. 1. Background of the study

World Class University is a need nowadays. Especially in countries which economy is growing so fast, countries such as China, Russia, Brazil, Japan and Indonesia. Can you imagine what will be the impact to economy, in terms of investment for Indonesia if we can add one of the top world-class university in the world, the impact will be great.

The benefits of international education and student exchange programs have been promoted widely in the last decade. International education have been recognized as instrumentally powerful in fostering mutual cultural understanding among people. (Simone E. Volet & Peter D. Renshaw, 1995)

Let’s take the example of Jakarta International school (JIS), a great school which name have been mention worldwide as one the best schools in Asia, not only for the level of education, which is one of the best in Indonesia, but also its environmental, social and structural. Social because it combine culture diversity, English environment, parents participations, activities(sport), extracurricular activities, trips around the world, etc. In term of instructor, Jakarta international school has: football (3), baseball and softball field (1), basketball facility, gym, auditorium, canteen, laboratory, internet facilities, etc

Now if we can take that kind of school’s model and bring it to our university (president University) the value added will be enormous, even more now that Indonesia economy is growing and soon or later will find more opportunities, such as new student, investment, sponsors, financial supports, Etc.

In the other hands, President University has multicultural students continues their education level here. Students from different backgrounds and cultures united there to achieve one purpose of getting higher education in continuing their study.
President University itself could provide things that attract these multinational students to enjoy their education life there.

These international students have own reasons to go abroad and continue their education in president university, which is located in Indonesia. Their cross-border mobility is a core component of the internationalization of higher education. It has significant implications economically and academically, and is expected to grow during the coming years.

But the competition is complex, nowadays private universities are competing to each others in a highly competitive environment in which educational quality, carrier center, ratio between students and lecturers, tuition fee are those strongly emphasized.

President University is not an exception. Being evaluated as an international university puts more pressure on competitiveness of this university. General speaking, it needs to compare itself with a mass of university around the World to achieve its goal. Since being built and operating until now.

2. 2. President University
The conceptual plan of President University was first in September 1997 by Mr. S. D. Darmono, the President Director of PT Jababeka Tbk. and Prof. Donald W. Watts, who was the President of Bond University, Queensland and Vice Chancellor of Curtin University, Western Australia. The goal of their proposed University was to create an institution of learning which would prepare future leaders of industry and society by giving them the skills and experience necessary to excel upon graduation.

The university officially began in 2001, offering a Bachelor of Engineering degree. At that time, the institution was called the School of Engineering based in Cikarang, Bekasi. On 16 April 2004, the Ministry of Education granted President University official status as a fully fledged university.

Although still a young University, President University is growing at a tremendous rate every year. There are now around a thousand students attending
President University from Indonesia as well as many other countries. PU has expanded its course offerings and now offers 12 different majors in subjects ranging from Industrial Engineering to Public Relations.

President University is located in Jababeka Education Park in Kota Jababeka, surrounded by Jababeka Industrial Estate with more than 1,350 national as well as multinational companies such as Unilever, Mattel, Samsung, Mulia, ICI Paints, and others. Its location also allows students to make use of world-class facilities such as the Jababeka Golf & Country Club and the President Executive Club. (Source: www.president.ac.id)

There are 3 key differences between President University and other schools:

1. The President Internship Program: PU’s internship program is an important and essential part of the curriculum at PU. Students are required to do 2 semester long internships at corporations and industries, working alongside experienced professionals and using what they’ve learned in the classroom in the real world. With close relationships to the 1,350 multinational companies in Jababeka, PU can ensure all of its students an internship that matches their needs and interests. The President Internship Program will give you the experience and connections you need to start your career on the right path.

2. An International Environment: To be able to compete in today’s global job market; you need to be able to work with people from all over the world. In PU, all classes are conducted entirely in English, the global language of business and academics. In addition, PU has a large number of foreign students (about 30% of the student body) and foreign teachers- this creates a global environment where students are forced to speak English and learn about other cultures in and out of the classroom.

3. A World-Class Education at a Reasonable Price- President University offers extensive scholarship programs for talented and motivated students. (Source: www.president.ac.id)
The University is equipped with standard facilities to support students in learning such as: Library, Laboratory, Workshop room, seminar hall, student shop, student council, Resto Plaza for meals, dormitory, golf and swimming pool, President Executive Club and other sport facilities.

1. 3. Problem identified

President University is an international university. It has curriculum based on international standards. Moreover, students in the university also come from varieties backgrounds and cultures. There are multicultural students in the university, study together to pursue one purpose, which is getting a higher education background.

Here, the university also has contributions to help these students to achieve their objective. The ultimate goal of schools is to transform its students by providing knowledge and skills and by building character and instilling virtue (Sergiovanni, 1991). Students with various intellectual abilities, from multicultural and diverse socio-economic backgrounds are the objective of this educational process. However, factors from those students themselves could not ignore. Those aspects absolutely support the desire of those students as human, to fulfill their needs and achieve their targets.

As an international student who has studied in President University for at least two years, i have seen some facts that inspired me to conduct this research.

First of all, there have been a lot of changes in management terms. This shows something unstable and ineffective. It is obvious that any organizations need to be under control of staff, personnel that have experience and know the organization well in order to be effective in management.

Secondly, there have been many complaints from international students regarding quality of the learning styles used for the lectures, such as lacking of verbal communication (English speaking) and techniques, learn environment, the management effectiveness, culture perception, and the facilities provided for activities (for international students).It create misunderstanding amount
international students. In some cases students wonder whether President University is an international university.

Therefore, the researcher wants to dig deeply into the problems in this research. After identifying the problems, the statement of problems are formed in the next section.

1. 4. Statement of the problem

Based on what have been identified above, the statement of problems of this research could be expressed as following:

**Topic:** This thesis (research) is about to measure of the perception of overseas students whether President University is an international university.

**Question:** The researcher wants to find out what and why problems and complaints exist among students regarding to the international environment for overseas students.

**Rationale:** In order to show among x variables that are examined, which one should be improved to enhance the total quality of President University? This will help the university has a better understanding about international student’s perceptions about the university and contribute to the common effort to build a world-class university.

In short, the statement of problems could be stated in the question form as:

**Is President University perceived by overseas students an international university?**

1. 5. Research objectives

This academic work aims to discuss in terms of:

There are three main objectives. The first one is to find out what affects international students’ perception about President University. It is done through a research in President University and literature review. Second, to give President University suggestions which are not only theory-based but also practical.
Thirdly, to learn something from the thesis research process and prepare for career use in the future.

1. **6. Significance of the study**

This study is only one small effort to contribute to the big plan to build an international university. The researcher hopes that this study will help the university have a better understanding what students expect from the university and how they have perceived the quality of it. As the results, the study will give some suggestions for the university to improve the quality in term of international environments. Furthermore, this study is not only beneficial to the university in general, but also to the students in particular; as its main purpose is to improve social life in the college.

Finally, the study could be a reference for students who are interested in the field as a contribution to academic.

1. **7. Theoretical framework**

The purpose of the brand equity pyramid is to outline the basic building blocks of what the brand should stand for in order to guide the process of building brand equity. It is the basis for determining key elements of the brand strategy – brand vision, brand positioning, and brand personality and brand measurement.
The model was developed by Kevin Keller, professor of brand strategy at Dartmouth, based on his ‘Customer Based Brand Equity Model’ (CBBE). Keller is the author of two definitive texts on brand building. The pyramid is just one of 4-5 leading representations of the components of brand equity. Kevin Lane Keller mirrors the Equity Engine SM approach by seeing the brand as a blend of the rational and the emotional, measured in terms of performance characteristics and imagery. Customers' relationship to a brand can be plotted in terms of their altitude on the pyramid of engagement and their relative bias towards a rationally dominant or emotionally dominant relationship. (Pilet, 2010)
1. **Scope and limitation of the study**

According to the problems and purposes of this research, it has the following limitation:

- The scope is small; it is only researched among international students who are studying in President University.
- Many students are busy doing some activities; therefore, it is hard to collect data from them.
- The population of the students in President University is only estimated, which affects to the calculation of the probability.

1. **Assumptions and hypothesis**

1.9.1 Assumption

In order to achieve research’s objectives, the researcher would like to give two assumptions as following:

1. Assume that the president university is considered as international university thus, it has satisfied student’s needs in term of knowledge, skills, culture environment, services quality, academy performance.

2. Assume that all the students who are the respondents of the survey have sufficient experience by been student in the university. Therefore, assume that the minimum time of experience is sufficient for answering the questions in the survey.

1. **Definition of terms**

1. Quality: the degree to which a service satisfies customer by considering meeting their needs, wants, and expectations. (Christopher Lovelock, Jochen Wirtz, *Service Marketing People, Technology, Strategy*, 2007)


CHAPTER II

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

3. 1. Customer-Based Brand Equity model

The Customer-Based Brand Equity model provides a unique perspective on what brand equity is and how it should best be built, measured, and managed. (Keller, 2001)

The development of the Customer-Based Brand Equity model was driven by three goals. First, the model had to be logical, well-integrated, and grounded. The model needed to reflect state-of-the-art thinking about branding from both an academic and industry point of view. Second, the model had to be versatile and applications of branding continued to emerge for products, services, organizations, people, places, and so forth, the model needed to have far-ranking relevance. Third, the model had to be comprehensive with enough breadth to cover important branding topic as well as enough depth to provide useful insight and guidelines. The model needed to help marketers set strategic direction and inform their brand-related decisions. (Keller, 2001)

With this broad set of objectives in mind, the Customer-Based Brand Equity model was developed. The basic premise of the model is that the power of a brand lies in what customers have learned, felt, seen, and heard about the brand over time. In other words, the power of a brand resides in the minds of customers. The challenge for marketers in building a strong brand is ensuring that customers have the right type of experiences with products and services and their accompanying marketing programs so that the desired thoughts, feeling, images, beliefs, perceptions, opinions, and soon become linked to the brand. The remainder of the paper outlines in details how this “brand knowledge” should be created and how the brand-building process should be handled. (Keller, 2001)
2.1.1 The four steps of brand building

Building a strong brand, according to the Customer-Based Brand Equity model, can be thought of in terms of a sequence of steps, in which each step is contingent upon the successful complaint of the previous step. All steps involve accomplishing certain objectives with customers, both existing and potential. The first step is to ensure identification of the brand with customers and an association of the brand in customers’ minds with a specific product class or customer need. The second step is to firmly establish the brand meaning in the minds of customers by strategically linking a host of tangible and intangible brand associations. The third step is to elicit the proper customer responses to this brand identity and brand meaning. The fourth and final step is to convert brand response to create an intense, active loyalty relationship between customers and the brand. (Keller, 2001)

These four steps represent a set of fundamental questions that customers invariably ask about brands, implicitly if not explicitly: (Keller, 2001)

Who are you? (Brand identity)

What are you? (Brand meaning)

What about you? What do I think or feel about you? (Brand responses)

What about you and me? What kind of association and how much of a connection would I like to have with you? (Brand relationship)

There is an obvious sequence in this “Brand ladder;” that is, meaning cannot be established unless identity has been created; responses cannot occur unless the right meaning has been developed; and a relationship cannot be forged unless the proper responses have been elicited. (Keller, 2001)

2. 1.2 Brand-building Blocks

Enacting the four steps to create the right brand identity, brand meaning, brand responses, and brand relationship is a complicated and difficult process. To provide some structure, it is useful to think of six “brand-Building Blocks” to
accomplish the four steps necessary to create a strong brand. To connote the sequencing involved, these building blocks can be assembled as a brand Pyramid. Creating significant brand equity involves reaching the pinnacle of the pyramid and will only occur if the right brand-building blocks are in place. The corresponding brand steps represent different levels of the pyramid as illustrated in Figure 1. (Keller, 2001)

![Customer-Based Brand Equity Pyramid](image1)

Figure 2.1 Customer-Based Brand Equity Pyramid

![Subdimensions of Brand-Building Blocks](image2)

Figure 2.2 Subdimensions of Brand-Building Blocks

2.2. Brand meaning

Although a myriad of different types of brand associations are possible, brand meaning can broadly be distinguished in terms of functional, performance-related considerations versus abstract, imagery-related considerations. Thus, brand meaning is made up of two major categories of brand associations that exist in
customers’ minds-related to performance and imagery-with a set of specific subcategories within each. These brand associations can be formed directly-from a customers’ own experiences and contact with the brand-or indirectly-through the depiction of the brand in advertising or by some other source of information (e.g., word-of-mouth). (Keller, 2001)

We next describe the two main types of brand meaning and the subcategories within each. (Keller, 2001)

2.2.1. **Brand performance**

The product itself is at the heart of brand equity, as it is the primary influences of what consumer’s experiences with a brand, what they hear about a brand from others, and what the firm can tell customers about the brand in their communications. Designing and delivering a product that fully satisfies consumer needs and wants is a prerequisite for successful marketing, regardless of whether the product is a tangible good, service, or organization. To create brand loyalty and resonance, consumers’ experiences with the product must at least meet, if not actually surpass, their expectations. Numerous studies have shown that high quality brands tend to perform better financially, for example, Yielding higher returns on investment. (Keller, 2001)

Brand performance relates to the ways in which the product or service attempts to meet customers’ more functional needs. Thus, brand performance refers to the intrinsic properties of the brand in terms of inherent product or service characteristics. How well does the brand rate on objective assessments of quality? To what extent does the brand satisfy the utilitarian, aesthetic, and economic needs and wants of customers in its product or service category? (Keller, 2001)

The specific performance attributes and benefits that constitute functionality will vary widely by category. Nevertheless, there are five important types of attributes and benefits that often underlie brand performance:

1. Primary characteristic and secondary features. Customers often hold beliefs about the level at which the primary characteristic of a product
operate (e.g., low, medium, high, or very high). They may also hold beliefs about special, perhaps even patented, features or secondary elements of a product that complement these primary characteristic. (Keller, 2001)

2. Product reliability, durability, and serviceability. As noted, customers can view the performance of product or services in a broad manner. Reliability refers to the consistency of performance over time and from purchase. Durability refers to the expected economic life of the product if it needs repair. Thus, perceptions of product performance are impacted by factors such as the speed, accuracy, and care of product delivery and installation; the promptness, courtesy, and helpfulness of customer service and training; the quality of repair service and the time involved; and so on. (Keller, 2001)

3. Service effectiveness, efficiency and empathy. Customers often have performance-related associations with the service interactions they have with brands. Along those lines, service effectiveness refers to how completely the brand satisfies customers’ service requirements. Services efficiency refers to the manner in which these services are delivered in terms of speed, responsiveness, and so forth. Finally, service empathy refers to the extent to which service providers are seen as trusting, caring, and having the customer’s interests in mind. (Keller, 2001)

4. Style and design. Consumer may have associations with a product that go beyond its functional aspect to more aesthetic considerations such as its size, shape, materials, and color. Thus, performance may also depend on sensory aspects-how a product looks and feels and perhaps even what it sounds or smells like. (Keller, 2001)

5. Price. Finally, the pricing policy for the brand can create associations in consumers’ minds to the relevant price tier or level for the brand in the category, as well as to its corresponding price volatility or variance (in terms of the frequency or magnitude of discounts, etc.). In other words, the pricing strategy adopted for a brand can dictate how consumers categorize the price of the brand (e.g., low, medium, or high) and how firm or flexible
that price is perceived to be (e.g., as frequently or infrequently
discounted). (Keller, 2001)

Brand performance thus transcends the “ingredients” that make up the product or
service to encompass aspects of the brand that augment these ingredients. Any of
these different performance dimensions can serve as a means by which the brand
is differentiated. Often, the strongest brand positioning involves performance
advantages of some kind, and it is rare that a brand can overcome severe
deficiencies in this area. (Keller, 2001)

2.2.2 Brand Imagery

The other main type of brand meaning involves brand imagery. Brand imagery
deals with the extrinsic properties of the product or service, including the ways in
which the brand attempts to meet customers’ psychological or social needs. Brand
imagery is how people think about a brand abstractedly rather than what they
think the brand actually does. Thus, imagery refers to more intangible aspects of
the brand. (Keller, 2001)

Many different kinds of intangibles can be linked to a brand, but four categories
can be highlighted:

1. User profiles. One set of brand imagery associations involve the type of
person or organization who uses the brand. This imagery may result in a
profile or mental image by customers of actual users or more aspirational,
idealized users. Associations of a typical or idealized brand user may be
based on descriptive demographic factors or more abstract psychographic
factors. Demographic factors might include gender, age, race, income, and
material status. Psychographic factors might include attitudes toward life,
careers, possessions, social issues, or political institutions. In a business-
to-business setting, user imagery might relate to the size or type of the
organization. User imagery may focus on the characteristics of more than
just one type of individual and center on broader issues in term of
perceptions of a group as a whole. For example, customers may believe
that a brand is used by numerous people and therefore view the brand as "popular" or a "market leader". (Keller, 2001)

2. Purchase and usage situations. A second set of associations concerns the conditions under which the brand could or should be bought and used. Associations of a typical purchase situation may be based on a number of different considerations, such as: (1) type of channel (e.g., department store, specialty store, or direct through Internet or some other means); (2) specific store (e.g., Macy's, Foot Locker, or Fogdog.com); and (3) ease of purchase and associated rewards, if any. Similarly, associations of a typical usage situation may be based on a number of different considerations, such as: (1) time of the day, week, month, or year when the brand is used (e.g., inside or outside the home); and (3) type of activity for which the brand is used (e.g., formal or informal). (Keller, 2001)

3. Personality and values. Brand may also take on personality traits and values similar to those of people. Brand personality is often related to the more descriptive usage imagery but involves much richer, more contextual information. Five dimensions of brand personality (with corresponding subdimensions) that have been identified are: (1) sincerity (e.g., down-to-earth, honest, wholesome, and cheerful); (2) excitement (e.g., daring, spirited, imaginative, and up-to-date); (3) competence (e.g., reliable, intelligent, successful); (4) sophistication (e.g., upper-class and charming); and (5) ruggedness (e.g., outdoorsy and tough). (Keller, 2001)

4. History, heritage, and experiences. Finally, brand may take on association with their past and with certain noteworthy events in the brand history. These types of associations may involve distinctly personal experiences and episodes or be related to past behavior and experience of friends, family, or others. Consequently these types of associations may be fairly idiosyncratic, although they sometimes exhibit certain commonalities. Alternatively, these associations may be more public and broad-based and therefore will be shared to a larger degree. In either case, associations with
history, heritage, and experiences involve more specific, concrete examples that transcend the generalizations that make up the usage imagery. (Keller, 2001)

2.2.3 Key criteria for brand meaning
Thus, a number of different types of associations related to performance and imagery may become linked to the brand. Regardless of the type involved, the brand associations that make up the brand image and meaning can be characterized and profiled according to three important dimensions: (Keller, 2001)

Strength - How strongly is the brand identified with the brand association?

Favorability - How important or valuable is the brand association to customers?

Uniqueness - how distinctively is the brand identified with the brand association?

Successful results in these three dimensions produce the most positive brand responses, the underpinning of intense and active brand loyalty. To create brand equity, it is important that the brand have strong, favorable, and unique brand associations, in that order. In other words, it does not matter how unique a brand association is unless customer evaluate the association favorably, and it does not matter how desirable a brand association is unless it is sufficiently strong so that customer actually recall it and link it to the brand. At the same time, it should be recognized that not all strong associations are favorable and not all favorable associations are unique. (Keller, 2001)

Creating strong, favorable, and unique associations is a real challenge for marketers, but is essential to build customer-based brand equity. Strong brands typically have firmly established strong, favorable, and unique brand associations with consumers—for example, Volvo and Michelin (safety), Intel (performance and compatibility), Marlboro (western imagery), Coke (Americana and refreshment), Disney (fun, magical, family entertainment), Nike (innovative products and peak
athletic performance), BMW (styling and driving performance), and so on. (Keller, 2001)

2.3 Brand Responses

Brand responses refer to how customer respond to the brand, its marketing activity, and other sources of information, that is, what customer think or feel about the brand. Brand responses can be distinguished according to brand judgments and brand feelings, that is, in terms of whether they arise more from the "head" or from the "heart" (Keller, 2001)

2.3.1 Brand judgment

Brand judgments focus upon customers' personal opinion and evaluations with regard to the brand. Brand judgments involve how customers put together all the different performance and imagery associations for the brand to form different kinds of opinions. Customers may make all types of judgments with respect to a brand, but in terms or creating a strong brand, four types of summary brand judgments are particularly important (and are cited in ascending order importance): (Keller, 2001)

1. Brand quality. There are a host of attitudes that customer may hold toward brands, but the most important relate in various ways to the perceived quality of the brand. Other notable attitudes related to quality pertain to perceptions of value and satisfaction. (Keller, 2001)

2. Brand credibility. Customers may form judgments that transcend specific brand quality concerns to consider broader issues related to the company or organization making the product or providing the services associated with the brand. In other words, customers may form judgments with respect to the company or organization behind the brand. Brand credibility refers to the extent to which the brand as a whole is seen as credible in terms of the dimensions- perceived expertise, trust-worthiness, and likability. In other words, to what extent is the brand seen as: (1)
competent, innovative, and a market leader (brand trustworthiness); and (3) fun, interesting, and worth spending time with (brand likability). (Keller, 2001)

3. Brand consideration. Eliciting favorable brand attitudes and perceptions of credibility is important but may be insufficient if customers do not actually seriously consider the brand for possible purchase of usage. Consideration is more than mere awareness of a brand; it suggests the likelihood that customers will actually include the brand in the set of brands they might buy or use. Consideration depends in part on how personally relevant customers find the brand, that is, the extent to which they view the brand as being appropriate and meaningful for themselves. Thus, customers often make an overall appraisal as to whether they have any personal interest in a brand and whether they would or should ever buy that brand. Brand consideration is a crucial filter in terms of building brand equity. No matter how highly regarded or credible a brand may be, unless the brand also receives serious consideration and is deemed relevant, customers will always keep brand at a distance and never closely embrace it. Brand consideration will depend in large part on the extent to which strong favorable brand associations can be created as part of the brand image. (Keller, 2001)

4. Brand superiority. Finally, superiority relates to the extent to which customers view the brand as unique and better than other brands. In other words, do customers believe that the brand offers advantages that other brands do not? Superiority is absolutely critical in terms of building intense and active relationship with customers and will depend to a great degree on the number and nature of unique brand associations that make up the brand image. (Keller, 2001)
2.3.2 Key criteria for brand responses
Although different types of customer responses—both “head” and “heart”—are possible, ultimately what matters is how positive these responses are. Additionally, it is important that they are accessible and readily come to mind when consumers think of the brand. Brand judgment and feelings can favorably impact consumer behavior only if consumers internalize or think of positive responses in their encounters with the brand. (Keller, 2001)

Few have attempted to define a world-class university (Altbach, 2003) the dictionary defines world class as "ranking among the foremost in the world; of an international standard of excellence." It can at least point to some relevant characteristics necessary for world-class status. (Altbach, 2003)

-Excellence in research underpins the idea of world class—research that is recognized by peers and that pushes back the frontiers of knowledge. Such research can be measured and communicated. But if research is the central element, other aspects of a university are required to make outstanding research possible. Top-quality professors are, of course, central. And to attract and retain the best academic staff, favorable working conditions must be available. These include arrangements for job security—many countries call it tenure—and appropriate salaries and benefits, although academics do not necessarily expect top salaries. The best professors see their work as a "calling"—something to which they are committed by intellectual interest and not just a job. (Altbach, 2003)

-Academic freedom and an atmosphere of intellectual excitement is central to a world-class university. This means that professors and students must be free to pursue knowledge wherever it leads and to publish their work freely without fear of sanction by either academic or external authority. Some countries permit unfettered academic freedom in the nonpolitical hard sciences, but place restrictions on it in the more sensitive social sciences and humanities. In most countries, academic freedom also extends to expression of opinions by members of the academic community on social and political issues as well as within the narrow confines of professional expertise. (Altbach, 2003)
- The governance of the institution is also important. World-class universities have a significant measure of internal self-governance and an entrenched tradition, usually buttressed by statutes, ensuring that the academic community (usually professors, but sometimes including students) has control over the central elements of academic life—the admission of students, the curriculum, the criteria for the award of degrees, the selection of new members of the professoriate, and the basic direction of the academic work of the institution. (Altbach, 2003)

- Adequate facilities for academic work are essential—the most advanced and creative research and the most innovative teaching must have access to appropriate libraries and laboratories, as well as to the Internet and other electronic resources. With the increasing complexity and expansion of science and scholarship, the cost of providing full access becomes ever higher. While the Internet has meant some cost savings and has eased access to many kinds of knowledge, it is by no means a panacea. Facilities go beyond labs and libraries—staff and students must have adequate offices as well. (Altbach, 2003)

- Adequate funding must be available to support the research and teaching as well as the other functions of the university. Not only is maintaining a complex academic institution expensive, support must be consistent and long-term. The cost of maintaining a research university continues to grow because of the increasing complexity and cost of scientific research. Universities cannot benefit from many of the productivity increases due to automation—teaching and learning still generally require professors and students in direct contact. Funding is a special challenge in the present environment because governments are disinvesting in higher education in many countries. Academic institutions are everywhere asked to pay for an increasing part of their budgets through tuition and fees to students, generating funds by consulting and selling research-based products, and other revenue generating activities. The fact is that public support is necessary for research universities everywhere. Only in the United States and to a lesser extent Japan do private research universities of the highest rank exist. And in the United States there are significant government subsidies through government research grants and access to loans and grants to students. The top
private institutions have significant endowments as well. The American tax system, which provides for tax-free donations to nonprofit institutions such as universities, is a major factor in permitting the growth of world-class private universities. Research universities have the ability to generate significant funds through a variety of means, but there is no substitute for consistent and substantial public financial support. Without it, developing and sustaining world class universities is impossible. (Altbach, 2003)

What are these transformations? There are three other characteristics that should be added to Altbach’s list: cosmopolitanism, diversity and modern management. World-class universities should combine professors from the country and abroad, and a large number of foreign students. With them, they can create an environment in which local assumptions and experiences are permanently compared and contrasted with the experiences of other countries, not only regarding specific contents of research and course programs, but mostly regarding the tacit assumptions and ways of life that are visible only to those who have had the experience of living with different cultures. The use of English as a second language is essential. Some countries, particularly in Asia and Africa, decided to adopt English as the working language of their main universities. European countries such as Holland, Sweden, and, to a growing extent, Germany and France, are offering courses in English, and admit students working in English, particularly in graduate programs. In Brazil, besides the adoption of English, it would be necessary to adopt Spanish as an alternate language option. (Altbach, 2003)

Diversity has to do with social inclusion, but it is more than that. World-class universities should be open to persons from different cultural and social origins and backgrounds, and allow for the emergence and strengthening of a more diversified leadership. This can be done through different means, including admission and hiring policies that take social and cultural diversity into consideration, and the creation of alternative course paths to enrich the university experience for all participants. (Altbach, 2003)
On the other hand, Standards are really important almost for everything, especially in the education field. All University should publish standards set of information setting out what students can expect in terms of the nature and quality of their program. (Mandelson, 2008)

This will set out how and what students will learn, their own study responsibility, what that knowledge will quality them to do, whether they will have access to external expertise experiences, and what facility they will have access to. The university website will continue to bring together information in a comparable way so the students can make informed choices. Students should have clear information both about the opportunities for international experiences, and how new technologies are integrated into their programs. The aim is a system in which students can make genuinely informed choices about study, based on an understanding of the nature of the teaching program they can expect, and the long-term employment prospect it offers. (Mandelson, 2008)

Quality and standards in UK universities are underpinned by a strong, internationally respected system based on six key features: (www.UniversitiesUK.ac.uk, 2008)

1. National tools that are used by all universities (the ‘Academic Infrastructure’) including Frameworks for higher education qualifications, Subject Benchmark Statements and a sector-wide Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education; (www.UniversitiesUK.ac.uk, 2008)

2. Universities’ own systems for ensuring their standards are right and quality is maintained, such as procedures for the design and review of courses and the use of external examiners; (www.UniversitiesUK.ac.uk, 2008)

3. Independent external review of each university by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA), resulting in published reports; (www.UniversitiesUK.ac.uk, 2008)
4. Effective engagement with students and employers, including professional, statutory and regulatory bodies, which helps to shape what universities do; (www.UniversitiesUK.ac.uk, 2008)

5. Mechanisms to support improvements in quality, for example by learning from the experience of others, sharing good practice and ways of supporting professionalism in teaching; (www.UniversitiesUK.ac.uk, 2008)

6. Measures to address complaints. Universities have the main responsibility for ensuring high quality and standards are maintained, independently overseen by the Quality Assurance Agency. (www.UniversitiesUK.ac.uk), Standards are set by Quality Assurance agency for higher education. The role of the QAA will develop in three ways first, it will have a greater focus on the student experiences and the service delivered to the student. We want to see more students unions and individual student involvement in the audit process. A proactive and effective quality system also needs clear, transparent, fair, and effective mechanisms for handling. (www.UniversitiesUK.ac.uk, 2008)

Knowledge of the economic, technical and social importance and benefits of standards therefore become imperative in the curricula of future managers, scientists and technologists. (www.iso.org, 2007)

Beneficiaries of the program must be registered students and the course must be completed by an examination, with a recognized diploma certifying that students have gained adequate knowledge of the role and use of standardization in relation to technology, trade or sustainable development. (www.iso.org, 2007)

“We are committed to being a leading innovator in developing standards in higher education, and we work with partners both at home and abroad. Each year we receive visitors from around the globe, to learn from our world-class quality assurance approaches. (Rodney and Anthony, 2009)
Moreover, Higher education funding council for England (HEFCE), another across the sector, will also be undertaking a review of teaching quality information (TQI). TQI, important elements of the quality assurance framework, is the publication of information about quality and standards, to help potential students to make choices about where to study. (Mandelson, 2008)

Simultaneously, the higher education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) established a special sub-committee of its Teaching. Quality and the Student experience committee (TQSESC also found no evidence of a systemic failure in quality in England higher education. (Mandelson, 2008)

In Oman, all private higher education institutions in Oman have their standards of quality set by an external university. Since 1995, all private higher education’s institutions are required by the Ministry of Higher Education’s quality procedures to be academically affiliated to a “reputable international university.” (Al Haribi, 2005)

Oman has set the right foundation education by adopting a well defined strategy in the international context. (Al Haribi, 2005)

Currently, in Australia, external quality assurance for the nation's 39 universities and some other higher education institutions is handled by the Australian Universities Quality Agency. Responsibility for the other 150 non-university institutions (known as non self-accrediting institutions or NSAIs) is shared among the state, territory and federal governments, depending on the location of the institution. (Woodhouse, 2009)

Moreover, English language is the basic of any international university. A particular dialect of English, being the only non-localized dialect, of global currency with put significant variation, universally accepted as the appropriate educational target in teaching English; which may be spoken with an unrestricted choice of accent Strevens 1983; 88 cited in (Quirk, 2002 p. 3)
Maintains that standard English is what might be termed the unmarked variety; it is not unusual or different in any way and is typically associated with written English. (Quirk, 2002)

The Longman dictionary of applied linguistics (Richards, Platt, and Weber 1985) also associates Standards English with written language and it notes its status in relation to other varieties. It defines Standard English as the variety of a language which has the highest status in a community or nation and which is usually based on the speech and writing of educated speakers of the language cited in (Quirk, 2002 p. 3)

A standard variety is generally:

a) Used in the news media and in literature

b) Described in dictionaries and grammars

c) Taught in schools and taught to non-native speakers when they learn the language as a foreign language.

It has been common practice for many years for higher education institutions to provide opportunities for students to evaluate their learning and teaching experience, typically in the form of end-of-semester or end-of-course evaluations. Many institutions also gain feedback from students about services such as the library or computing. A recent addition to these information sources in the UK has been the National Student Survey (NSS), which focuses on learning and teaching experiences. However, surveys of the overall experience or overall quality have been rarer cited in David and Marion, 2007 p.2.

The word “international” is used a lot to represent positive things in people’s minds. If we think of something being of “international standard”, we immediately consider it to be something that is made to a higher standard and so, we hope, quality is guaranteed. The word “international” is now commonplace in education. Universities and colleges have for years promoted international credentials as they attract students from around the world. Australia has built
strong and positive relations with many nations as many students come here to continue their studies. Indonesia in particular has for many decades now sent many students to universities in Australia. (Davies, 2010).

University students are not then literally going international. They are not physically traveling overseas and experiencing foreign ways of living and studying but they are being required to follow an international curriculum. This makes it absolutely essential that those entrusted with the responsibility of delivering such an international curriculum are capable and are meeting standards: meeting those all important international standards. (Davies, 2010).

Higher education can and does lead into professions and this again can and will form a way in which quality may be measured. Universities and colleges can and should have accreditations of their courses by professional bodies and institutes. This will contribute to the employability profile of its graduates and so hint at the strengths of a particular institute in its delivery of higher educational programs. (Gower, 2010).

There is something to be said for the notion that quality attracts quality, and so a higher education institute of repute will build links and associations that strengthen the quality of the education that it provides. Similarly, quality teaching staff will be attracted and retained. This is often an immediate reflection on an institute, i.e. their ability to retain staff. (Gower, 2010).

Higher education can and does lead into professions and this again can and will form a way in which quality may be measured. Universities and colleges can and should have accreditations of their courses by professional bodies and institutes. This will contribute to the employability profile of its graduates and so hint at the strengths of a particular institute in its delivery of higher educational programs. (Gower, 2010).

There is something to be said for the notion that quality attracts quality, and so a higher education institute of repute will build links and associations that strengthen the quality of the education that it provides. Similarly, quality teaching staff will be attracted and retained. This is often an immediate reflection on an institute, i.e. their ability to retain staff. (Gower, 2010).
The aspirations of so many for and toward higher levels of education should not blind people to the very real need to be critical and seek out quality. (Gower, 2010).

Like pretty much any walk of life there are varying qualities in higher education; realizing this and so too realizing one’s goals cannot be based on blind faith but must be based on asking challenging questions and seeking out answers. (Gower, 2010).

International qualifications are being seen as a way of addressing Indonesia’s education problems, or that might be more accurately stated as: finding a way around them or even avoiding them. International qualifications are now a part of our national schools and so we need to be aware of them, but we also need to be watchful of them. Just because the word “international” is used does not mean that we should be any less careful or demanding of standards. (Widastomo, 2010).

It almost seems as though it is too easy for schools to become "international" and there are not strong enough checks and balances to make sure that these schools are really performing and achieving results for children and parents. There are now so many schools that claim the status of providing international qualifications that it is almost amazing. But that amazement should not numb us but stimulate us into action. (Widastomo, 2010).

The question concerning the awarding body or institution is intended to tackle the more immediate means and methods via which standards are achieved and monitored for the qualification. We are talking about international qualifications here and so the qualification that is being awarded is from outside of Indonesia and so too then are the authorities and inspectors that are charged with the responsibility for making sure worthiness of the award has been achieved. (Widastomo, 2010).

What we must be looking for, therefore, is the methods via which the international authority administers and controls quality. For example, are all of the examination papers sent to the source of the award for marking; or is there authority for examinations to be marked locally? If examinations can be marked locally, how does the overseas awarding authority make sure that its standards are being kept?
(There is always the risk that when marking is done locally it can be less strict and so potentially lower standards and thresholds for a pass). (Widastomo, 2010).

Essentially what we are trying to determine here is how well the locally based school is set up and established to really deliver the international standards required. If the international body or institution that is in effect partnering with the school in providing an international qualification does not impose such requirements, then we may begin to question the level of commitment and overall standards being brought into Indonesia. (Widastomo, 2010)

University performance evaluation is not a new issue. Institutional evaluations were undertaken in American universities almost 100 years ago while in Europe, France was the first country that initiated comprehensive institutional evaluation in 1984 (Hämäläinen et.al, 2001) cited in Anninos, 2007 p.2.

University performance evaluation is achieved through; Typical Evaluation, focusing:

a) In the quality of a subject in all study programmers that the subject is taught (for example, the subject “total quality management” in a business administration study programmer),

b) In the study programmer,

c) In the quality of an institution in every aspect of each operation (for example, educational or administrative) and

d) The quality of a specific theme, that is a practice within higher education (for example students' summer training programmer in organizations)(DEI,2003) cited in Anninos, 2007 p.2, 3

Accreditation is the procedure by which a private or a state-independent actor evaluates the quality of an institution or a study programme with the view to certify that it meets specific and pre-defined standards (Vlasceanu et.al., 2004). The result of the accreditation procedure will provide the awarding of a status, recognition or a license for operation for a certain period of time. It may include
an initial self study and external evaluation by experts. It’s main objective is to maintain and improve quality in a higher education institution, study programme or course cited in Anninos, 2007 p.2.

Audit: It is the process by which it is examined if the mechanisms and procedures that assure quality within an evaluation unit are present, are functioning properly and are effective. It focuses on the accountability and examines whether the stated objectives are being achieved. The reasons for quality audit include the evaluation of performance of quality assurance systems and quality monitoring procedures, the assurance that units are responsible for quality, the initiation of improvements in the priority setting procedure and the facilitation of decision making. It also helps towards learning and improvement along with university accountability (Hämäläinen et.al, 2001; Vlasceanu et.al, 2004) cited in Anninos, 2007 p.2.

Benchmarking: According to Vlasceanu et.al. (2004), benchmarking is a systematic method to collect and present information regarding the performance of organizational units and allow comparisons with the aim to establishing best practices, identifying performance weaknesses and strong points. Benchmarking is a diagnostic, self assessment and learning tool at the same time, while on the other hand it constitutes a dynamic process of learning and performance comparison (Epper, 1999). Benchmarking may be internal, external competitive, external collaborative, external cross sectional and implicit and its methodology can be based on an excellence model, be horizontal or vertical or even be based on specific performance indicators sets (Alstete, 1995). Its main idea is to supply the institutional administration with an external reference point or a standard to evaluate quality or the cost of internal activities, practices and procedures (Hämäläinen et.al, 2002) cited in Anninos, 2007 p.3.

Ranking Systems: It is an established technique used to present the ranking of a university in comparison with other universities in terms of their performance. They provide information to students, university administration and stakeholders regarding the quality of universities. Even though there are many problems regarding their methodology and the scientific base and validity of the systems,
they are still popular and a means of initiating improvements (sometimes only on the surface) within institutions cited in Anninos, 2007 p.3.

Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA): It is a linear programming technique used when there are many inputs and outputs but no clear functional relationship between the two. It is a tool for evaluating relative efficiency (Kocher et.al, 2006). DEA permits the analysis of multiple input and output factors at the same time (Rickards, 2003) cited in Anninos, 2007 p.3.

Merisotis (2002) suggests that before the development of any system for university performance evaluation, it has to be determined what is the content and the meaning of quality in higher education so that it becomes clear, what it is important and to whom. The comprehensive performance evaluation of a university cannot be based solely on a ranking system. Mainly because as appears from the heavy criticism they attract and their analysis, quality is not sufficiently evaluated cited in Anninos, 2007 p.6.

It has been common practice for many years for higher education institutions to provide opportunities for students to evaluate their learning and teaching experience, typically in the form of end-of-semester or end-of-course evaluations. Many institutions also gain feedback from students about services such as the library or computing. A recent addition to these information sources in the UK has been the National Student Survey (NSS), which focuses on learning and teaching experiences. However, surveys of the overall experience or overall quality have been rarer (Aldridge and Rowley, 1998) cited in David and Marion, 2009 p.2.
CHAPTER III

III. METHODOLOGY

4. 1 Research Method

3.1.1 Types of research methods
There are two types of research methods. One is qualitative research method, the other one is quantitative research method. This research used quantitative tools for analysis.

Based on Ritchie and Lewis (2003), and Royse (1999), qualitative research is a naturalistic, interpretative approach concerned with understanding of the meanings of certain observed phenomena or actions. It uses methods such as interviews, reports, diaries, etc. Qualitative research is collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data by observing what people do and say. On the other hand, quantitative research uses numbers to prove or disprove a hypotheses or notion. Ross (1999) says that Quantitative research uses data that is structured in the form of numbers or that can be immediately transported into numbers. James Neill (2007) says that “the aim is to classify features, count them, and construct statistical models in an attempt to explain what is observed. Quantitative data is more efficient, able to test hypotheses, but may miss contextual detail.

3.1.2 Comparing two research methods
For qualitative research, it allows the moderator to interact with respondents, which allows in-depth probing of issues and yields great detail in response. Besides, it also allows for interaction between group members (McCullough, 2006). Patton (2002) also notes that qualitative research permits the evaluator to study selected issues, cases, or events in depth and detail. Data collection is not constrained by predetermined categories of analysis, allowing for a level of depth and detail that quantitative strategies cannot provide. Qualitative research mainly focuses on descriptive studies which are supported by theoretical backgrounds. It has a thorough analysis on the results from qualitative research methods.
For quantitative research, it allows for large-scale measurement of ideas, beliefs, and attitudes (Patton, 2002). Miles & Huberman (1994) all aspects of the study are carefully designed before data is collected. The results are statistically reliable which means it can reliably determine if one idea, concept, product, package, etc. is better than the alternatives. What’s more, the results are projectable to the population, which means that the proportion of respondents answering a certain way are similar to the proportion of the total population that would have answered the way if they all had been asked (McCullough, 2006). Quantitative research is supported by data collected from research process. The data analysis uses all kinds of quantitative research tools such as mean, correlations, regressions, etc (McCullough, 2006).

3.1.3 Reasons to choose quantitative research method

Qualitative research is best use for generating ideas and concepts as well as uncovering consumer language in order to subsequently ask consumers the right questions in a way they most accurately understand. It is not appropriate for evaluating pre-existing ideas (McCullough, 2006).

Oppositely, quantitative research is used when the issues to be tested are known and the language used by consumers to describe these issues is known. It is not appropriate as an initial learning phase, or as a method to develop creative ideas. Quantitative research is evaluative, not generative (McCullough, 2006).

In research part of this thesis, quantitative research method was a better choice than qualitative research. The first reason was that the result of the research remained unknown and needed to be investigated. Thus qualitative research tools such as interviews were not suitable for it. Based on the characteristics of quantitative research, a deep analysis of the research data is more persuasive than descriptive research. Besides, quantitative research is more objective which is very much needed in this research. Quantitative research speaks with facts. In the research in this thesis, objective attitude took advantage in finding out the truth behind. What’s more, the third reason to choose quantitative research method was because the population of respondents was not suitable for using qualitative
research, which meant qualitative research methods could not help find out the motivators of the population as a whole, but unilateral.

3.2 Research Instruments

3.2.1 Research tool
A survey was used to collect data in this proposal thesis research.

3.2.2 Questionnaire design
There were three parts in this questionnaire.

The first part was an introduction to the respondent. It told about the purpose of the survey research, the objective of the study, the content of the survey, and appreciation. The first part gave respondents a generally ideas of what it was about and what they were expected to do to cooperate.

The second part of the questionnaire was respondent personal data. It covered related criteria of the respondents. Part two included description of the gender, age, major, year and ethnicity.

The third part is about survey questions, which are 16 (sixteen questions) related to certain variables. This Section is a general introduction of the questions and the rating methods. With sixteen questions in total, respondents are asked to choose the rating from 1 to 5 which is from strongly disagree to strongly agree. It was developed by Rensis Likert. This scale is the most frequently used variation of summated rating scale. Summated rating scales consist of statements that express either a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward the objective of interest. The participants are asked to agree or disagree with each statement (Copper and Schindler, 2006). It is shown as follows.
Table 3.1 Likert Scale Scoring Method 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This questionnaire was adopted from Keller’s theory about brand equity, using Judgment, Performance and Salience (Keller, 2001). The first part is about Judgment; focus on customer’s opinion based on performance and imagery cited by Pilet, 2001. The six questions are all about Judgment of overseas students at President University.

1. I perceive President University has good performance in term of academic staff assistance to the students such as politeness, helpfulness and support.

2. I perceive President University as an international university because the increasing number of overseas students and lectures over the years.

3. I perceive President University as an international university because of the theoretical and practical method used by the lecturers during the classes.

4. I perceive President University as an international university because of lecturers support (lecturers are able to spend time after class to explain more about the subject and answer questions)

5. I perceive President University as an international university because of good customer service and care such as giving students feedback, opinions, ideas and requirements.
6. I perceive President University as an international university because of lectures’ performance, such as speak clearly English all the time and context of the English classes.

The second part is about Performance; Related to the satisfaction of the customer functional needs cited by Pilet, 2001. The five questions are all about the functional needs of overseas student at President University.

7. I perceive President University as an international university because of its Facilities such as President executive club, swimming pool, golf courts, basketball courts, volleyball corner, library, computer lab and tennis corner.

8. I perceive President University as an international university because of its campus activities, such as activities to enhance student social life.

9. I perceive President University as an international university because of the multicultural background of its students.

10. I perceive President University as an international university base on its multilanguage environment (more than one language spoken by students and lecturers).

11. I perceive President University as an international university because of the students housing facility (as a one of the standards of an international university).

The third part is about Salience; relates to the awareness of the brand cited by Pilet, 2001. The five questions are all about the awareness of overseas student about President University.

12. I perceive President University as an international university because of its image.

13. I perceive President University as an international university because what they offer on its advertisement.
14. I perceive President University as an international university because of what it portray or spread about its position in the education industry.

15. I perceive President University as a international university because of its strengths (English as a primary language on the classroom).

16. Over all, i perceive President University as a international university.

3.2.3 Data analysis tool
Once the data are collected, data analysis is used to give the raw data meaning. Data analysis involves entering data to computer files, inspecting data for errors, and running statistical tools to perform the analysis. This study uses the assistance of Microsoft excel as statistic analysis program.

3.2.3.1 Statistical treatment
Researcher decides used descriptive statistical tools below to administer the questioner’s data.

3.2.3.1.1 Frequency distribution
It is the most often tool to give the general picture of the data. The distribution table is constructed first based on the data category. The next step is to visualize the data with figures. It is completed with the cumulative frequency, percent, and cumulative percentage.

3.2.3.1.2 Central tendency
It is to show how the data has a tendency to be central in certain value. The value is considered representing the whole value of the data.

3.2.3.1.3 Mean
It is the average value of a set of numbers (The American Heritage® Medical Dictionary, 2007)
In weighted mean of this study, all value play equal role, and considered there will be no extreme values (outliers) due to using numeric likert scale.

If the respondents get mean score in the scale of 3.00-3.99, it has a meaning of uncertainty in making decision whether to choose or not to choose. The reason of being uncertainty could be varied.

For each single question, the data will be analyzed by using simple program. After that, a general conclusion will be made regarding to the resources to three variables using Keller’s theory: Salience, Performance and judgments (Keller, 2001).

At last, the research will find out which factor(s) are perceived for overseas students whether President University is an international university.

3.3 Sampling design
The sampling design shows the complete procedures used to determine the sample. It notifies a method being used to obtain the sample and respondents.

3.3.1 Population size
The population is drawn from all faculties in President University morning class at Cikarang started by batch 2007-2008, but only overseas students. The others batches are not included due to criteria of the resource.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Malaysian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Computing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 Number of overseas students at President University

3.3.2 Sampling units
Overseas students only, which meet the following criteria:

1. Only overseas student from batch 2007-2008, due to the length of stay (the most important point about their perception about President University as an international university).

2. 2009 student are not qualify due their English is still in development, thus they will get confuse about the questions.

3.3.3 Margin of error
The research sets the Confidence level as an amount of 90%. Thus the margin of error applied by researcher is 10% because the researcher assumes not all sample are serious in filling out the questionnaire thus the fictious survey questionnaire might occurs and because the samples might intentionally giving out wrong information due to certain reasons.

There is classified population data for overseas students in President University base on their year (2007 and 2008), which fifteen overseas students (15) are from year 2007 and forty overseas students (40) from year 2008.

3.3.2 Sampling Technique
Non-probability sampling is applied in this study, more specifically purposive sampling. According to Patton (1990), the type of the sampling technique is snowball. In snowball sampling, it begins by identifying someone who meets the criteria for inclusion in your study (Trochim, 2006).

### 3.4 Limitations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems encountered</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties to find similar studies</td>
<td>Search on the internet and libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-consume in collecting data</td>
<td>Ask assistance to some friends (Chinese) to find all the respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties in determining the right method</td>
<td>Ask some opinion for my thesis adviser and lectures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to be used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas students who fit the criteria of the</td>
<td>Ask some help some lectures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty to match the questions with the</td>
<td>Looking some studies which use the same theoretical frame work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3 Limitations
CHAPTER VI

IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULT

This chapter interprets and evaluates the questionnaires which are collected from the overseas students in President University batch 2007 and 2008.

4.1 Respondent profile of individual personal data

4.1.1 The distribution by country for the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Countries of the respondents

According to the questionnaire, 25 of the despondences come from China equal to 62.5%, 10 of the despondences come from Vietnam equal to 25%, 2 of the despondences come from Philippine equal to 5%, 2 of the despondences come from Somalia equal to 5%, 1 of the despondences come from Korea equal to 2.5%. This number of students was taken from the academic data base; all of them are overseas students from President University, from different major and age. Those students have been meet the specific criteria.
4.1.2 Distribution of batches for the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 Batch of the respondents

All the overseas students are form batch 2007 and 2008; 9 of them, 22.5% are form batch 2007 and 31 of them, 77.5% are form batch 2008.

4.1.3 Distribution of age for respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 Age of the respondents

The age of the respondents is between 19 and 24, although there is a not student with 23 years old. The chart above shows the survey data base on age. As the chart shows, 5 of the respondents has 19 years old equal to 12.5%, 16 of the respondents has 20 years old equal to 40%, 13 of the respondents has 21 years old equal to 32.5%, 5 of the respondents has 22 years old equal to 12.5% and 1 of the respondent has 24 years old equal to 2.5%. The dominant ages are 20 and 21 years old, which are the normal age for university students.
4.2 Judgments

The figure shows that 2007 overseas students are the dominant of all the mean scores with the highest score in the question 3 with 3.6, while the 2008 overseas students has the highest score in question 2 with 3.41. According to mean score table of interpretation, all the 2007 overseas students are interpreted as uncertain respond, that's mean the respondents could not decide whether President University is an international university, they choose neither agree nor disagree. In the other hand, 2008 overseas students are between 2.67 (the lowest) up to 3.41 (the highest), that’s mean they choose between disagree and neither agree nor disagree.
Question 1 – Judgment base on good performance in term of academic staff assistance to the students:

The 2007 overseas students respond most in the scale 3 area with 44.4% as the highest, same as 2008 overseas students with 41.9%. There is a slight different of 2.5% between 2007 and 2008 in the scale 3. Second highest respond for 2007 overseas students is in the disagree area with 33.3%, same as 2008 overseas students with 25.8%, with a slight different of 7.5%. There are some comments that the respondents write down, such as:

1. “Some of the staffs are being really polite and some may not be. Well, this depends on the individual”.
2. “People from academic never help the students, especially in the library”.
3. “Mediocre in most aspects”.

Figure 4.2
Question 2 – Judgment base on the increasing number of overseas students and lectures over the years:

![Chart showing responses to the statement about President University being an international university.](chart)

Figure 4.3

Both 2008 and 2007 overseas students of President University have the most frequent value of 4 which is in the area of agree. The 2007 overseas students respond as an amount of 55.6% as the highest responds and the 2008 overseas students responds as an amount of 45.2% as the highest responds. Both of them sees the increasing number of overseas students and lectures over the years as agree areas, that’s mean mostly of them are agree with that statement.

The second highest score is form 2008 overseas students with 25.8%, choosing area 3 which is neither agree nor disagree. The second highest of 2007 overseas students is area 2 with 22.2%, it represent disagree. As additional information, there is one respondent that wrote the follow comment:”Yes, it has increased but that doesn’t really indicate if President University is an international university”
Question 3 – Judgment base on the theoretical and practical method used by the lecturers during the classes:

The 2007 overseas students respond positively (most of them) in the scale 4 area with 55.6% as the highest, while for 2008 overseas students respond most in the scale 3 are with 41.9% with a different of 13.7% between the scale 4 with represent Agree area and scale 3 which represent neither agree nor disagree.

Second highest respond for 2007 overseas students is in the neither agree nor disagree, which is area 3 with 22.2%, while for 2008 overseas students the second highest respond in the scale 4 area with 29.0% which represent the agree area.

Figure 4.4
Question 4 – Judgment base on lecturers support (lecturers are able to spend time after class to explain more about the subject and answer questions):

I perceive President University as an international university because of lecturers support (lecturers are able to spend time after class to explain more about the subject and answer questions)

![Bar Chart](image)

The 2007 overseas students respond positively (most of them) in the scale 4 area with 55.6% as the highest, while for 2008 overseas students respond most in the scale 3 area with 41.9% with a different of 13.7% between the scale 4 with represent Agree area and scale 3 which represent neither agree nor disagree.

Second highest respond for 2007 overseas students is in the neither agree nor disagree, which is area 3 with 33.3%. In the other hand, 2008 overseas students the second highest respond in the scale 4 area with 25.8% which represent the agree area, although the is a slight different between area 2, which represent disagree and area 3 which represent neither agree nor disagree with 3.2%.
Question 5 – Judgment base on good customer service and care such as giving students feedback, opinions, ideas and requirements:

In the question 5, 2007 overseas students respond most in the scale 4 with 44.4% as the highest, which represent agree area, it’s mean that 2007 overseas students are agree that PU is an international university base on their Feedback, opinions, ideas and requirement, while 2008 overseas students respond most in the scale 2 with 38.7% as the highest, which represent disagree area.

Second highest respond for 2007 overseas students is in the neither agree nor disagree with 33.3%, while 2008 overseas students second highest respond as agree area, with 29.0%.
Question 6 – Judgment base on its facilities such as President executive club, swimming pool, golf courts, basketball courts, volleyball corner, library, computer lab and tennis corner:

In the questions 6, the figure show that 2007 overseas students respond have the same frequency percentage but in different areas, such as area 3 and 5, which represent neither agree nor disagree and strongly agree. While 2008 overseas students highest frequency percentage is in scale 4 with 29.0% which represent the agree area and the second highest respond with 25.8% in neither agree nor disagree. In the scale 2, which represent disagree, has also a high score form both 2007 and 2008, with 22.2% and 22.6% with a slight different of 0.4%. As additional information, there is one comment from one of the respondents: “A reminder should be made that this is not President University’s facility. A facility should be basically part of someone’s possession/properties.”
4.2.1 Frequency of percentage based on Judgment

The figure below shows the frequency of overseas students batch 2007 and 2008 from President University which is perceived by them as an international university base on Judgment. It shows that the most frequent value for 2007 overseas students is 4 with 37.0% as the highest responds in the agree scale which mean they perceived President University is an international university base on Judgment. In the other hand the most frequent value of 2008 overseas students is 3 with 32.8% as the highest responds, which mean that 2008 overseas students are neither agree nor disagree base on Judgment.

![Frequency of percentage of 2007 and 2008 overseas students base on Judgment](image)

Figure 4.8
4.3 Performance

The figure above depicts that 2007 overseas students responds have the highest score with 4.22, representing the agree area. In the other hand 2008 overseas students have the highest score with 3.77, representing the agree area. It important to mention that the second highest score from 2007 is also 3.77, but on the strongly agree area. The table above also show that the highest score is 4.22 from 2007 overseas students and the lowest is form 2008 overseas students, although most of the mean scores are interpreted as uncertain or neither agrees nor disagrees according to mean range table of interpretation, which represents the majority, meaning that overseas students from President University couldn’t decide whether PU is perceived by them as an international university in term of performance.
Question 7 – Performance base on lectures’ performance, such as speak clearly English all the time and context of the English classes:

![Graph showing responses to question 7]

Both 2007 and 2008 overseas students have positive respond on the agree area, both with the highest percentage. For 2007 overseas students is 44.4% and for 2008 overseas students is 38.7% with 5.7% different. These highest score reflect that on average, 2007 and 2008 overseas students are agree with regard to the lectures’ performance such as speak clearly English all the time and context of the English classes. In the other hand, the second highest score for 2007 are below to the area 2 with 22.2% and 3 with 22.2%, it shows that the second highest score is between disagree and neither agree nor disagree. While the second highest respond for 2008 overseas students is on the disagree area with 25.8%. As additional information, one of the respondents add the following comment: “Sometimes they speak Bahasa Indonesia during the class”.
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Question 8 – Performance base on campus activities, such as activities to enhance student social life:

The figure above show that 2007 overseas students respond most in the scale 4 area with 44.4% as the highest, which represent agree. While 2008 overseas students respond most in the scale 3 with 41.9% as the highest, which represent neither agree nor disagree. There is slight different of 2.5% between 2007 and 2008 overseas students. Second highest respond for 2007 overseas students is in the area disagree with 22.2% and neither agree nor disagree with 22.2%, while the second highest respond for 2008 is in the agree area with 35.5%.

The figure above show that the two common tendencies of overseas students for both 2007 and 2008 is between agree and neither agree nor disagree.
**Question 9 – Performance base on the multicultural background of its students:**

The figure above shows that 2008 overseas students respond most in the scale 4 area with 41.9% as the highest, while for 2008 overseas students respond most as disagree area with the percentage of 33.3% and also 33.3% percentage in the scale 4 which represent agree area. Second highest respond for 2008 is the neither agree nor disagree with 25.8%. The figure also show that the most common tendency is in the agree area for both 2007 and 2008 overseas students.
Question 10 – Performance base on multilanguage environment (more than one language spoken by students and lecturers):

Both 2007 and 2008 overseas students of President University have the most frequent value of 4 which represent the agree area. The 2007 overseas students respond as an amount of 55.6% as the highest responds and the 2008 overseas students responds as an amount of 32.3% as the highest responds. Both of them sees President University as an international university base on its multilanguage environment. The second highest responds are also the same for both 2007 and 2008 overseas students of President University, they choose the area of strongly agree with 33.3% and 29.0% for 2007 and 2008 overseas students.
Question 11 – Performance base on the students housing facility (as a one of the standards of an international university):

The figure above shows that the highest respond for 2007 overseas students is the area 4 which mean that they choose President University is an international university base on the students housing facility, with an amount of 44.4%. While the highest respond for 2008 overseas students is the scale 2, which mean that they are disagree about President University is an international university base on the housing facilities. In the other hand the second highest respond for 2007 overseas students are in divide two, one in the neither agree nor disagree and the other one in strongly agree both with 22.2%, while the second highest respond of 2008 overseas students is the area 3 with 32.3%. As additional information, two of the respondents add the following comments: “I have not a clear idea of how should a standards students housing be like”. “No, because when something is broken they take too long to repair it”.

Figure 4.14
4.3.1 Frequency of percentage based on Performance

The figure below shows the frequency of President University overseas students, batch 2007 and 2008, which perceived it as an international university base on its Performance. It depicts that both 2007 and 2008 overseas students are agree that PU is an international university base on their performance, with an amount of 44.4% and 32.9%, which represent the highest percentage. In the other hand, the second highest respond for 2007 overseas students is the scale 5, which represent strongly agree, with an amount of 20.0%, while 2008 overseas students is the scale of 3, which represent neither agree nor disagree, with an amount of 27.7%.

![Percentage base on performance](image-url)

Figure 4.15
4.4 Salience

The figure above depicts that 2007 overseas students lead in mean scores, most of the scores (except for scale 3 which represent neither agree nor disagree) are higher than the 2008 overseas students’ scores. The two highest mean scores are 4.22 from 2007 overseas students and 3.87 from 2008 overseas students. Even though the highest score is 4.11 from 2007 overseas students, the majority of the mean scores are interpreted as uncertain or neither agree nor disagree according to the mean range table of interpretation, meaning that the majority of the overseas student bath 2007 and 2008 couldn’t decide whether President University is an international university base on Salience.
Question 12 – Performance base on its image:

The highest respond is from 2007 overseas students with 44.4%, scale 4 which represent that they are agree of President University is an international university base on its image, while from 2008 overseas students is in the scale 2 with 35.5% which represent disagree area. In the other hand, the second highest respond of 2007 overseas students, with an amount of 33.3%, is the neither agree nor disagree area, while the second highest respond of 2008 overseas students, with an amount of 25.8%, is the agree area. As additional information, three of the respondents add the following comments: “This image may be referred to their marketing strategic”, “Because of their name President”, “Advertising is much better than reality”
Question 13 – Performance base on what they offer on its advertisement:

![Bar chart](image)

**Figure 4.18**

The figure above shows that the highest respond for both 2007 and 2008 overseas students in President University regarding to their perception whether is an international university comes from the agree area, the 2007 overseas students with 55.6% and 2008 overseas students with 38.7%. The second highest respond for 2007 are draw between al the rest area, such as 1, 2, 3 and 5, which mean that are different perception between 2007 students. While the highest respond of 2008 overseas students is in the neither agree nor disagree area, with 25.8%. Even thought the agree area has the highest score, it seen that some of the students have different perception about President University as an international university.
Question 14 – Performance base on what it portray or spread about its position in the education industry:

The figure above shows that both 2007 and 2008 overseas students have a positive respond that is on the agree area, both with the highest percentage. For 2007 overseas students is 44.4% and for 2008 overseas students is 35.5% with 9.9% as the different. These highest percentages scores reflect that on average, 2007 and 2008 overseas students are agree that President University is an international university base on what it portray or spread about its position in the education industry. Moreover, both 2007 and 2008 overseas students also possess scale 3 as their second highest respond with 33.3% for 2007 and 32.3% for 2008. In the other hand the third respond is scale 2 area is disagree. It also shows that they are not respondents who choose the scale 1 area, which mean that strongly disagree.
Question 15 – Performance base on its strengths English as a primary language on the classroom):

![Bar chart showing responses](image_url)

The highest respond for both 2007 and 2008 overseas students is in the scale 4 area, meaning that they have favorable responds about President University as an international University base on its strengths English as a primary language on the classroom), 2007 with 44.4% and 2008 with 41.9%. The second highest respond in the same area scale 5 area which represent strongly agree, 2007 with 33.3%, while 2008 overseas students choose the scale 3 which represent neither agree nor disagree, with 29.0%. It also shows that there no students who choose the scale 2 which represent disagree area.
Question 16 – Performance base on “over all, i perceive President University as a international university”

The figure above shows that they are different perception for 2007 and 2008 overseas students about President University as an international university. The highest respond is from 2007 overseas students with 33.3% split by two scale, 3 which represent neither agree nor disagree area and 4 which represent agree area. In the other hand, the highest respond from 2008 overseas students with 32.3%, in the scale 2, which represent disagree area. The second highest respond from 2007 overseas students is 22.2%, in the scale 2 which represent disagree area, while 2008 overseas students is split by two scales, 3 which represent the neither agree nor disagree area and 4 which represent agree area, both with 25.8%. As additional information, there are three respondents add a comment as follow: “Barely qualifying”. “For its multiple-cultured students, staff and English speaking environment, yes, but for its facilities and education curriculum, no”. “Just so so, PU has many things to learn from others universities”
4.4.1 Frequency of percentage based on Salience

The figure below show the frequency of percentage based on salience. Both, 2007 and 2008 have the highest respond in scale 4, which represent agree area, 2007 overseas students with 44.4% and 2008 overseas students with 33.5%. According to the figure, the second highest respond is in scale 3, which represent neither agree nor disagree area, 2007 overseas students with 26.7% and 2008 overseas students with 26.5%, with a slightly different of 0.2% between them.

Figure 4.22
### 4.5 Average Mean scores by batch.

**Batch 2007:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Average mean score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Judgement</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salience</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 Overseas students batch 2007

As table 4.4 depicted on average, 2007 overseas students in President University are interpreted to have uncertainty or neither agree nor disagree to choose whether President University is an International university, according to the mean range table of interpretation. It also shows that some question’s scale are below 3, such as question 1, 3, 5, for Judgment, question 11, for Performance and question 12 for Salience.

The table also depicts that Performance is on the first rank, the second place is possessed by Salience and the third is possessed by Judgment.
Batch 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Average mean score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judgement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,44</td>
<td>3,66</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3,44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4,22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3,77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salience</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3,11</td>
<td>3,44</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3,44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3,22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4,11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3,33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 Overseas students batch 2008

As the figure 4.4 shows, all the overage per variables is within 3 scales, which are interpreted as 2008 overseas students have uncertainty or neither agree nor disagree to choose whether President University is an International university. It also shows that some question’s scale are above 3, such as question 10, for Performance and question 15, for Performance

The table also depicts that Performance is on the first rank, the second place is possessed by Salience and the third is possessed by Judgment
4.4.1 Average Mean scores of overseas students’ perception whether President University is an international university (batch 2007 and 2008)

The figure above shows that average mean is 3, all the means are within the scale of 3, meaning that 2007 and 2008 overseas students have uncertainty or neither agree nor disagree to choose whether President University is an International university. It also shows that the highest respond is from 2008 overseas students with 3.66, while for 2007 overseas students highest respond with 3.44.
### 4.5 Comments by the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Batch</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Mediocre in most aspects”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“Some of the staffs are being really polite and some may not be. Well, this depends on the individual”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“Yes, it has increased but that doesn’t really indicate if President University is an international university”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“A reminder should be made that this is not President University’s facility. A facility should be basically part of someone’s possession/properties.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Sometimes they speak Bahasa Indonesia during the class”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“I have not a clear idea of how should a standards students housing be like”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“Advertising is much better than reality”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“This image may be referred to their marketing strategic”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Barely qualifying”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“Just so so, PU has many things to learn from others universities”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“People from academic never help the students, especially in the library”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“No, because when something is broken they take too long to repair it”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>“Because of their name President”,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“For its multiple-cultured students, staff and English speaking environment, yes, but for its facilities and education curriculum, no”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 Comments by the respondents
CHAPTER V

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusion
Base on the data result, a conclusion can be drawn that on average, both 2007 and 2008 overseas students at President University, depict uncertainty perception regarding whether President University is an international university. Base on the Keller’s theory and as the variables shows, there is Uncertainty in all the variables used by this study, such as Judgment, Performance and Salience. It can’t be determined how President University overseas students batch 2007 and 2008 cannot decide base on the variables their perception of President University as an International university. The reasons beyond this uncertainty could be varied, such as having not experience at all with all the questions, have not feeling on be part of the university, not interest of any opinion or ideas of the university, so reasons cannot be assumed to be certain.

On the other hand, on this study the length of stay can be the different in term of percentage, due to some answer to certain question are perceived different base on the batch of the students, although the interpretation is the same for mean scores (uncertainty).

Base on Keller’s theory, Customer-based brand equity occurs when the consumer is familiar with the brand and holds some favorable, strong, and unique brand associations in memory cited in Kerry and Frank 2004 p. 1-22

Build a strong brand is ensuring that customers have the right type of experiences with products and services and their accompanying marketing programs so that the desired thoughts, feelings, image, beliefs, perceptions, opinions, and so on become linked to the brand.(Intoduction To Brand Equity | Holistic Brand Strategy cited by Collings 2008, pag 51
5.2 Recommendations

Since the result of perception of overseas students in President University whether it is an international university is interpreted as uncertain, there are some actions that President University has to take in order to adjust regarding of Overseas students perception. As the most dominant findings is Performance which is 3.66 for 2008 overseas students, the 0.34 of justification needs to be adjusted, thus the result will be positive. The most dominant preference indicator for 2007 overseas students is also Performance with 3.34, 0.66 needs to be adjusted, thus it will be positive. There are many different perception about this topic, so the researcher recommend another father study, but more deeply, if is possible with a interview as a methodology to find out all the factor that influences the overseas students.

The researcher recommends several measures regarding these study findings. First recommendations is for the university and also overseas students to conduct further studies on this field or topic about overseas students perception about President University, any topic will be helpful for the university itself, due of its position in the market, such as an international university. It’s important to mention that the population for this study was limited. It is the beginning for those who want to find out more about this interesting topic in the further. The researcher also recommends the use of factor analysis method in instead of central tendency, so the funding could be analyzed more details for further studies.

The second recommendation is for the university, to give more effort in improving its image for both, overseas students and Indonesian students and performance in term of international standards. The university has the power to improve not only for the students that are part of the campus right now, but also for the students who are coming and also those who will come in the further.
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