

PROSIDING SEMINAR KEBANGSAAN SAINS, TEKNOLOGI & SAINS SOSIAL

27 ~ 28 MEI 2002

HOTEL VISTANA, KUANTAN, PAHANG

Anjuran :



**Universiti Teknologi MARA
Cawangan Pahang**

Dengan Kerjasama



**Kerajaan
Negeri Pahang Darul Makmur**

JILID 2



THE SIGNIFICANCE OF LINKAGES WITH FOREIGN UNIVERSITIES IN THE ADVERTISEMENTS OF LOCAL INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

MOHD RIDZUAN NORDIN, LIM YET MEE & LIM KWEE PHENG
Faculty of Business and Law, Multimedia University
Jalan Ayer Keroh Lama, Melaka

ABSTRACT

The linkages with foreign universities featured prominently in the advertisements of local institutions of higher education. The 3+0 colleges were observed to capitalise on these links more extensively than the normal colleges. As a result the 3+0 colleges were able to perform best in comparison to the normal colleges and the private universities. This indicates that the links with foreign universities serve as a major attraction for the colleges. The private universities advertise least and do not project the links with foreign universities prominently. Nevertheless the universities obtained the largest revenue per institution. This indicates that the service offered by the universities is differentiated from that offered by the colleges. The Malaysian public seems to be more receptive to service offered by the private universities than that of the colleges. Based on the findings of this study, it is proposed that private universities require different marketing mix than that for colleges. In this marketing mix, private universities can have lesser advertisements than that for the colleges. As for the colleges, clearer and more frequent advertising helps to increase revenue. On the other hand the public have a clearer knowledge about private universities. This is probably a result of the higher quality image of universities than that of colleges. A marketing mix that reinforces this image would be advantageous for the universities. This may entails using advertisement to inform the public on new intake and new programmes and resorting to publicity and promotion to project and maintain the quality image and high achievements of the universities.

Keyword: *marketing, management, private, higher education*

INTRODUCTION

The provisions of higher education through out the world are now done through both the public and private sectors. The distributions of roles between the two sectors differ from country to country. The differences primarily reflect the historical development of higher education in the particular country. The enhanced role of the private initiatives culminates from two developments pertaining to higher education. The first development relates to the increase in demand for higher education throughout the world. Higher education is now seen not only as public goods but also private goods. It is now recognised not only as an enabler to develop nation but more importantly to allow individuals to maximise their economic potential. Success in life is strongly correlated to the level of education. This recognition is driving demand for higher education in all part of the world and forces government of various countries to liberalise the provision of higher education. It resulted in major shift in the approaches adopted to provide higher education; from "elitist" to "mass".

The second development is the acceptance by many governments, even in the first world that the need for funds to increase the capacity for higher education is beyond their means. Solution adopted for the impasse again varies from country to country. It range from authorising public institutions of higher education to venture into profit making activities that provide resources for further expansion of capacity to allowing private initiatives to also provide higher education. In many cases both approaches were adopted. In many countries the private initiatives have evolved to a point where private institutions of higher education is at par to that of the public system. However these approaches normally cause the user of higher education, the students, having to make more contribution for the cost of their education. Individuals are not deterred to seek education in private institutions of higher education even when they're no subsidies at all from the government for their studies.

The developments in higher education facilitate the development of market behaviour led by the institutions of higher education as the seller and the students as client. Obviously the relationship between these players are in most cases strongly regulated by the government. As a market, as in any other market, the higher education market is

sensitive to changes in demand and supply. One feature of higher education that serves as a major constraint in the operation of institutions of higher education is the fact that it provide educational service and require big investment in fixed assets. On top of this, institutions of higher education has high component of overheads in its operating cost, in-terms of the academics hired to be the producer of the services. As such it is imperative for institutions of higher education to ensure that it has the student numbers to match the investment made and the operating cost incurred. Otherwise the institutions of higher education will be in a quandary.

Marketing of Higher Education: The American Marketing Association has formally defined marketing as “the process of planning and executing the conception, pricing, promotion, and distributions of goods, and services to create exchanges that satisfy individual and organisational objectives.” (1). Marketing concerns the relationship between the producer and consumers. There are various activities where the use of marketing has not been viewed positively and education is one. Teachers and academics find the commercial values of competition and individual choice incompatible with educational goals of providing equitable opportunities for the learning and development of people. Marketing their professional services appears to create tension between an emphasis on social values that put the good individual above that of those social values that give preferences to the greatest good to the greatest number in the community (2). The aspect of marketing that seems to cause most offence is that which relates to selling. It is thought to be unprofessional, if not unethical, for professional carers to attract custom when their implicit professional codes emphasise looking after people altruistically. The way marketing are done however determine whether the objective of providing the greatest good to the greatest number in the community will be realised.

The implementation of marketing in the manufacturing industry involves four Ps being product, price, promotion and place that form the “marketing mix” (3). Marketing of services such as higher education is different from the marketing of product. This difference derive from the fact that service are characterise by intangibility-service cannot be identified by the senses, heterogeneity-the varied nature of provision due to human factor, perishability-service cannot be conserved and stored and inseparability-the provision of service cannot be separated from its consumption (4). The nature of service lead to Cowell (5) to proposed additional three Ps to the marketing mix being people, process and physical evidence. People is integral in the delivery of service the way or process of which is as important as the result itself. Due to the intangible nature of service there has to be physical evidence that demonstrate the quality of service rendered.

The major marketing challenge of service relates to its intangible nature. In order to overcome this problem, Shostack (6) proposed that the providers must “tangibilise” service. They also need to present clues to emphasise the realities of their service and differentiate them from their many competitors (7). Based on the experiences of management consultants, to be successful service providers must be distinctive and special (8). Its human resource must reflect high professionalism and credibility since the reputation of the human resource will reflect that of the institutions. The communication in the marketing process should create confidence on the high quality that can be delivered by the institutions.

Assael (9) suggested that the buyers’ decision-making processes vary with the type of decision, and that the more complex and expensive decisions would involve more buyers’ deliberation. He distinguishes four types of consumer buying behaviour. The first one is *complex buying behaviour* when high customer involvement is required and there is significant difference between brands. The second behaviour is *variety seeking behaviour* when low involvement of customer is required while there is significant difference between brands. The third buying behaviour is *dissonance reducing buying behaviour* which is a result of high involvement of buyer and when there are few differences between brand. Fourth is the *habitual buying behaviour* when there is low involvement of customer and there are few differences between brands. Higher education is certainly complex and expensive. As such the buyers’ decision-making process will be the complex buying process. This would entail extended decision making and distinctive information gathering pattern that would involve the use of personal sources of information (10).

There are a number of factors that students consider when choosing institutions of higher education. These include the type of course, the reputation of the institutions, the campus atmosphere, the quality of teaching staff and whether the institution is private or public and specialised or comprehensive. Students may also consider more personal factors such as distance from home, input from families and the institutions that their friends are studying in. Soutar and Turner (11) found that in the case of Western Australian school-leaver, four most important determinants for university preferences are course suitability, academic reputation, job prospects and teaching

quality. Their findings mirror a number of studies done in other countries. Joseph and Joseph (12) found that in the case of New Zealand students the four most important factors are academic and programme issues, cost of education, location and recreation facilities and family and peer influences. In a later study (13) these authors found that in the case of Indonesian students, the most important factors are “course and career information” and “physical aspects and facilities”. The common finding among these studies is that the suitability of courses and their qualities is always the most important determining factors.

Moogan et al 2001 (14) however found that in the case of UK’s students, once the decision on the programme of studies and its qualities has been made, the location of the institutions become a relatively more important attributes. This also involves the lifestyles that the institutions offer. Prospective students may then be concern about other “non-academic” information such as where to live, or where to socialise or the resources of the institutions as a whole. This finding reflects that the development of university preferences involves complex buying behaviour. Even though student’s final decision may be determined by the most important attributes, their decision would also be influenced by other factors.

Institutions marketing approach must match potential candidates decision making process especially at the stages of information search and evaluation of alternative. Needless to say that the institutions that are unknown to students will simply be disregarded or ignored. So will be institutions that are not forthcoming with providing the necessary information. A very important element of the marketing of any institutions of higher education is its image. Kotler and Fox (15) define image as “the sum of beliefs, ideas, and impressions that a person has of an object”. The image portrayed by institutions of higher education plays a critical role in the attitudes of the institution’s public towards the institutions (16, 17). Paramewaran and Glowacka, 1995 (18) found that higher education institutions need to maintain or develop a competitive advantage in an increasingly competitive market. The willingness of candidate to study in a particular institution is dependent on the institution’s image. It is for this reason that higher education institutions must understand that their image will affect the likelihood of people attending, recommending, donating or joining it. There are techniques such as the correspondence analysis that would allow the management of higher education institutions to visualise their institution’s type of competitive advantage in relation to competitive higher education strengths and weaknesses. This information would be crucial for strategy development and helps position an institution in the minds of the publics. It would also be useful in deciding specific marketing programmes and services, in introducing courses and in identifying new markets (19).

Mazarrol and Soutar, 1999 (20), proposed that the correct marketing and market entry strategies by institutions of higher education should result in the creation of a series of competencies that provide sources of competitive advantage. These competencies include the creation of brand identity that portray quality image, ability to secure coalition and strategic alliance, ability to undertake forward integration, organisational learning ability, organisational culture that is strong and encourage internal competition and innovation, and the creative use of technology.

A wide range of academic programmes is now available to Malaysian through the private higher education system. These include the internal diploma awarded by the private colleges itself, the twinning academic programmes, the 3+0 programmes and the academic programmes in private universities. The significant role played by the private sector is reflected in the total number of students studying in private institutions of higher education. As of year 2000, there were about 210,000 students in the private higher education system (9). Currently there are more than 600 private colleges, 8 conventional private universities, one “virtual” private university, a private university college and four branch campuses of foreign universities. A total of 26 colleges were also approved to conduct 87 degree programmes belonging to universities, in United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand (8); also known as the 3+0 programmes.

Attracting student into private institutions of higher education is a very challenging management task. This is because the private institutions are at a disadvantage to the public institutions. Students studying in public institutions pay only about 10% of the cost to educate them while those in the private institutions pay full cost. Without grant or subsidy from the government, the private institutions are fully exposed to the market environment. The challenges faced in managing these institutions are further compounded by the rapid changes in the higher education market place. The fluctuation in the Malaysian economy, the expansion of public facilities by the government and the establishment of more private universities and branch campuses of foreign universities further enhance the dynamics in the higher education market place, especially for the smaller institutions.

Institutions are resorting to aggressive marketing to ensure they get the student numbers required. Their continued existence depends on their ability to attract sufficient candidates to study with it. This is certainly not easy. Ridzuan et al, 2002 (21) has shown that the performances of private institutions are strongly affected by the type of academic programmes that they conduct. Private universities have been found to be expanding at a fast rate at the cost of other private institutions. It has also been found that the 3+0 colleges have an advantage over the normal colleges. This paper reports the marketing efforts of selected Malaysian private institutions of higher education, especially in highlighting its linkages with foreign universities. Attempts will also be made to establish the relationships between advertising tactics with the financial performances of the institutions.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Twenty-three private institutions of higher education (PIHE) were chosen for this study. These institutions comprises of 6 private universities, 8 private colleges that conduct 3+0 programmes and 9 normal private colleges. Institutions were chosen among those that advertise themselves and on the access by researcher to the financial statements of these institutions.

The frequencies that these institutions advertised themselves in 6 newspapers between 1st February to 30th June 2001 were studied. The time period was chosen since it was the period when marketing efforts by institutions of higher learning are most intensive. The time period covers immediately before the release of SPM examination result and the start of new academic year for most of the institutions. The newspaper chosen were New Straits Time, Star, Berita Harian, Utusan Melayu, Nanyang Siang Pau and Namban.

The advertisements were analysed quantitatively and qualitatively. The quantitative analysis involves determining the frequencies the institutions advertise themselves and computing the cost incurred for the advertisements. The advertising cost was calculated based on the size of each advertisement and the rate charge per unit size by the respective newspapers. The qualitative analysis involves analysing the content of each advertisement. The information contained in the advertisements was characterised into 6 categories based on earlier literatures (11-13). These categories are the Study Environment, Programme of Studies, Tuition Fees, Academic Quality and Reputation. The breakdown of these categories is given in Table 1.

Table 1: Categories used to characterised information contained in an institution’s advertisement

1. Study Environment a. Own Campus b. Good Facilities c. Quality Student Life d. Strategic Location e. E-Learning Environment	2. Programme of Studies a. Link with Overseas Institutions b. Focus on Specific Programme c. Accredited Programme d. Quick to Graduate e. Programmes Variety f. Flexible Learning Method
3. Tuition Fees a. Save Money b. Scholarship/Loan Provided	4. Academic Quality a. Highly Qualified Teaching Staff b. Job Relevant
5. Reputation a. Established on its own right b. Partnership with foreign universities	

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The list of colleges studied and the values of selected variable are given in Appendix 1. Table 1 and Table 2 summarised the data pertaining to the characteristics of the advertisements and the financial performances of the institutions. The contributions by the respective group of institutions are also given in the Table 1. There were 834 advertisements by the institutions found in the 6 papers between 1st February and 30th June 2002. Out of these 445 advertisements highlighted the existence of linkages of academic programmes and 555 advertisements highlighted close relationship and affiliation between the institutions with foreign universities. The advertisements by the 3+0

colleges (AG2) made up 49.16% of the total advertisement followed by that of the normal colleges (AG1). Most of the advertisement that highlighted linkages and affiliation with foreign universities are also that of the 3+0 colleges. The private universities (AG3) tend to advertise the least and tend not to highlight their links and affiliation with foreign universities.

A total expenditure of RM 5,389,925 was incurred by the institutions for the advertisements. Out of this, spending by AG1 made up 48.79% followed by that of AG2 (42.71%) with that of AG3 the least. The total revenue and profit after tax (PAT) of the institutions for financial year 2000 were RM 569 million (m) and RM 901,444 respectively. PAT for financial year 2000 amount to 0.16% of revenue. Revenue by private universities made up 43.79% followed by that of the 3+0 colleges (40.21%). However consistent with earlier studies (21) the private universities are losing money while that colleges are making profit.

The results presented in Table 1 indicated that both categories of colleges tend to highlight their linkages and affiliation with foreign universities. Moreover the 3+0 colleges capitalise more on these ties. The efforts by the 3+0 colleges yielded better financial gain than that of the normal colleges. Table 2 indicated that the 3+0 colleges (AG2) advertised most frequently and secured much higher revenue than the normal colleges (AG1). However as shown in Table 3, it is also found that the private universities secured highest revenue per institutions even though it advertised the least. This suggests that the universities have a clear advantage over colleges in terms of attracting candidates as reflected in its their higher revenues. This advantage does not however translate into higher profitability since the university as a group loses money.

Table 2: The accumulated value of selected variable and the % contribution by the various groups of institutions

Group	Tot. Ad (Number)	Ad. Prog. Link	Ad. Affiliation	Ad-Cost (RM)	Revenue (RM)	PAT (RM)	OP-Cost (RM)
Total	834	445	555	5,389,925	569,080,040	901,444	552,501,804
AG1	39.69%	30.79%	35.68%	48.79%	16.00%	846.80%	14.99%
AG2	49.16%	65.84%	56.40%	42.71%	40.21%	1671.31%	36.70%
AG3	11.15%	3.37%	7.93%	8.49%	43.79%	-	48.31%
						2418.10%	

Table 3: Mean value of selected variables for institutions in each group

Variables	AG1	AG2	AG3
Revenue	7959036	28601600	41534059
Profit after tax	255503	1883239	-3632976
Num. of Advertisement	24	51	16
Advert. Programme Link	5	37	3
Advert. Affiliation	18	39	7

The mean value of revenue, total number of advertisements, number of advertisements that highlights links of academic programme and those indicating affiliations with foreign universities for the groups were also computed and compared using independent samples t-Test. The significant differences in the means of the various groups at better than 0.05 significance levels are given below:

Variables	Differences in group mean (Mean; t-Value; Sig. Level)
Revenue	(AG2>AG1;3.274;0.015) (AG3>AG1;3.136;0.008)
Num. Of Advertisement	(AG2>AG1;2.928;0.010) (AG2>AG3;4.013;0.002)
Advert. Programme Link	(AG2>AG1;3.712;0.002) (AG2>AG3;3.719;0.003)
Advert. Affiliation	(AG2>AG1;2.170;0.046) (AG2>AG3;3.825;0.002)

To elucidate further the relationship between the various variables, the correlation between the expenditure on advertisement by the institutions and its Revenue, PAT and % PAT/Revenue were determined and the result presented in Table 3. Overall, it was observed that Revenue is not correlated to advertising expenditure. However, analysis of the individual groups found that the advertising expenditures by universities (AG3) have the weakest correlation with revenue while that of 3+0 colleges (AG2) the highest. The correlation for AG1 is between that of AG2 and AG3. These observations are also true for the correlation between advertising expenditure with PAT and with % PAT/Revenue.

The above observation indicated that the advertising effort and the way it was implemented provide better return to the 3+0 colleges than that for normal colleges. It was also observed that there is minimal correlation between the advertising expenditure by the universities with their financial performances. This finding can be interpreted as indicating that the private universities and the colleges are offering two differentiated services. The sale of service offered by the private universities, that is its own degree programmes does not require extensive advertising. This also implied that the required marketing mix for the service offered by the universities should be different from that provided by the colleges. In the case of the service offered by the colleges, the 3+0 colleges seem to be offering more attractive service than that of the normal colleges. Extensive advertising by the 3+0 colleges also enabled it to maintain the preferred position relative to the normal colleges and ensure profit margin from its operation.

Table 4: Correlation between advertising expenditure with selected variables

Group	Revenue	PAT	%PAT/Revenue
<i>AG1</i>	(0.555;0.121)	(0.181;0.641)	(0.126;0.747)
<i>AG2</i>	(0.573;0.138)	(0.627;0.096)	(0.419;0.302)
<i>AG3</i>	0.121;0.819)	(-0.063;0.906)	(0.092;0.863)
<i>All institutions</i>	(0.063;0.774)	(0.291;0.178)	(0.263;0.226)

CONCLUSION

The linkages with foreign universities featured prominently in the advertisements of local institutions of higher education. The 3+0 colleges were observed to capitalise on these links more extensively than the normal colleges. As a result the 3+0 colleges were able to perform best in comparison to the normal colleges and the private universities. This indicates that the links with foreign universities serve as a major attraction for the colleges. The private universities advertise least and do not project the links with foreign universities prominently. Nevertheless the universities obtained the largest revenue per institution. This indicates that the service offered by the universities is differentiated from that offered by the colleges. The Malaysian public seems to be more receptive to service offered by the private universities than that of the colleges.

Based on the findings of this study, it is proposed that private universities require different marketing mix than that for colleges. In this marketing mix, private universities can have lesser advertisements than that for the colleges. As for the colleges, clearer and more frequent advertising helps to increase revenue. On the other hand the public have a clearer knowledge about private universities. This is probably a result of the higher quality image of universities than that of colleges. A marketing mix that reinforces this image would be advantageous for the universities. This may entails using advertisement to inform the public on new intake and new programmes and resorting to publicity and promotion to project and maintain the quality image and high achievements of the universities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Multimedia University's Internal Research Grant, No. PR/2001/0138 is acknowledged.

REFERENCES

1. Ebert, R.J. and Griffin, R.W. 2001. *Business Essential*, Third Edition, Prentice Hall: 246.
2. Harvey, J.A. and Busher, H. 1996. Marketing Schools and consumer choice, *International Journal of Education Management*. Vol. 10 (4): 26-32.
3. Borden, N.H. 1965. The concept of the marketing mix. In Shwartz, G. (Editors), *Science in Marketing*, Wiley, New York, NY 1965.
4. Rushton, A.M. and Carson, D.J. 1985. Marketing of services: managing the intangibles. *European Journal of Marketing*. Vol. 19 (3): 19-40.
5. Cowell, D.W. 1984. *The marketing of services*. Heinemann. London.
6. Shostack, G.L. 1983. Breaking free from product marketing. *Journal of Marketing*. Vol. 41: 73-80.
7. Onkvisit, S. and Shaw, J.J. 1988. Marketing Barriers in international trade, *Business Horizon*, May-June: 64-72.
8. Frank, E. 1994. Marketing HRD- an overview. *Journal of European Industrial Training*. Vol. 18 (8): 4-9.
9. Assael, H. 1981. *Consumer behaviour and marketing action*. Kent Publishing Company. Boston. MA.
10. Murray, K.B., 1991. A test of services marketing theory: consumer information acquisition activities. *Journal of Marketing*. Vol. 55: 10-25.
11. Soutar, N.G and Turner, J.P. 2002. Students' preferences for university: a conjoint analysis. *The International Journal of Education Management*. Vol. 16 (1): 40-45.
12. Joseph, M. and Joseph, B. 1988. Identifying need of potential students in tertiary education for strategy development. *Quality Assurance in Education*. Vol. 6 (2): 90-96.
13. Joseph, M. and Joseph, B. 2000. Indonesian students' perceptions of choice criteria in the selection of a tertiary institution: strategic implications, *The International Journal of Educational Management*. Vol. 14 (1): 40-44.
14. Moogan, Y.J., Baron, S. and Bainbridge, S. 2001, *Timings and trade-offs in the marketing of higher education courses: a conjoint approach*, *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, Vol. 19 (3), pp: 179-187.
15. Kotler, P. and Fox, K. 1995. *Strategic marketing for educational institutions*. 2nd Edition. Prentice Hall. Englewood Cliffs. NJ.
16. Yavas, U. and Shemwell, D.J. 1996. Graphical representation of university image: a correspondence analysis. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*. Vol. 7 (2): 75-84.
17. Landrum, R.R, Turrisi, R. and Harless, C. 1998. University image: the benefits of assessment and modelling. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, Vol. 9 (1): 53-68.
18. Paramewaran, R. and Glowacka, A.E. 1995. University image: an information processing perspective. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*. Vol. 6 (2): 41-56.
19. Ivy, J. 2001. Higher education image: a correspondence analysis approach. *The International Journal of Educational Management*. Vol. 15 (6): 276-282.
20. Mazarrol, T. and Soutar. G.N 1999. Sustainable competitive advantage for educational institutions: a suggestive model. *The International Journal of Educational Management*. Vol. 13 (6): 287-300.
21. Nordin, M.R, Lim, Y.M and Lim, K.P. 2002. The financial performances of Malaysian private institutions of higher education, paper presented in *Seminar Kebangsaan Sains, Teknologi dan Sains Sosial 2002*, 27-28 May 2002, Kuantan.

215	FMM Institute	475427-W	1	3091680	7234	0.23	3084446	558453	52200	56	0	56
216	UNITAR	410764-P	3	19288000	-1595600 0	-82.73	3447800 0	141415	45366000	26	0	26
217	Monash University	458601-U	3	20758223	-312385	-1.50	2101906 5	76432	8951070	10	8	9
218	UTP	352875-U	3	13055922	-1651921 0	-126.53	2957513 2	22848	35080699 6	6	0	1
219	IMU	237397-W	3	31747925	6998920	22.05	2163600 5	55009	94125156	11	7	7
221	UNITEN	398494-K	3	78695349	-2192218	-2.79	8088756 7	62660	12895019	11	0	1
222	MMU-UTSB Sdn Bhd	436821-T	3	85658936	6183038	7.22	7931489 8	99427	54004601	29	0	0
231	Kolej WIT	233505-P	1	4428035	-1173496	-26.50	5601531	42228	18086498	9	9	0
				56908004 0	901444	0.16	5525018 04	538992 5	90012125 0	834	445	555

Appendix 1: List of institutions and the value of selected indicators for financial year 2000

Ref	COLLEGE	Co. No	Group	Revenue	PAT	%PAT/R EV	OP-Cost	Ad- Cost	Fixed- Assets	Tot. Ad	Program me Link	Affiliatio n
2	Kolej Bandar Utama	193236-T	2	9148144	-621102	-6.79	9755068	418496	2359569	75	74	74
3	Kolej Damansara Utama	76997-T	2	46515472	6343997	13.64	3744904 9	549641	30207047	83	54	52
8	Sepang Institute Of Technology	243934-D	2	10827126	-3758027	-34.71	1430696 8	76620	3567311	22	19	21
18	The One Academy	210547-P	1	8392390	969207	11.55	7018800	52620	7788593	10	0	0
36	Systematic College	145998-U	2	27548000	4470000	16.23	2269600 0	148809	34019000	56	20	21
44	Inti Group Of Colleges	328838-A	2	58669817	5700677	9.72	5091699 9	600571	13177279	46	46	46
45	Kolej Nilai	307215P	2	23952630	1444818	6.03	1891515 6	325760	12733639 1	35	35	30
82	KOLEJ PRIME	100589-U	1	11471896	1204545	10.50	8954625	284582	7085126	10	1	9
102	Institut Bina Usahawan	386571-W	1	7186824	7366	0.10	7179458	92254	869567	45	36	45
112	Institut Megatech	166242-A	1	2518605	-293573	-11.66	2812178	72210	1583426	23	0	0
118	Institut Profesional Baitulmal	238474-D	1	4009537	765401	19.09	4774938	4820	1437219	1	0	0
127	Institut Cosmopoint	226112-K	1	19431561	5333853	27.45	1412588 7	497542	4762473	117	89	39
133	ITTAR	126545-U	1	14859000	-1073000	-7.22	1577200 0	463033	6720000	23	0	14
134	Institut Twintech -L & G	260301-A	1	15673360	1885848	12.03	1349853 9	562170	19757059	37	2	35
151	Kolej Sedaya	185479-U	2	12481823	-46166	-0.37	1289260 2	108600	14849553	50	5	26
156	Maktab Taylor	072641-M	2	39669785	1531717	3.86	3583689 3	73725	40314097	43	40	43