

**THE TRANSFORMATION OF
PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION
IN POST-REFORMATION INDONESIA 1998-2018:
CASE STUDIES OF
UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH YOGYAKARTA
AND UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH SURAKARTA**

MOH MUDZAKKIR

UNIVERSITI SAINS MALAYSIA

2022

**THE TRANSFORMATION OF
PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION
IN POST-REFORMATION INDONESIA 1998-2018:
CASE STUDIES OF
UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH YOGYAKARTA
AND UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH SURAKARTA**

by

MOH MUDZAKKIR

**Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

March 2022

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Allah SWT for the blessings given to me to complete this PhD thesis. For me, taking a PhD program is not just an academic journey, but also a spiritual journey or even an essential part of an author's life phase. Completing this journey requires strength and consistency. With the permission of Allah SWT, the author can pass up to the present point.

Second, I am very grateful to my supervisor, Associate Professor Mohammad Revaany Bustami. He is an excellent guide, directing and enlightening in the process of this PhD journey. He is a mentor and a discussion partner like Socrates, who is very helpful in understanding various things, both academic and non-academic issues. Through very intense interactions with my supervisor, I have gained many valuable pieces of knowledge and experiences about life. Exceptionally fortunate, I have a very friendly, caring, and helpful supervisor in my doctoral study at the Centre for Policy Research and International Studies (CenPRIS), Universiti Sains Malaysia.

I am also very grateful to informants from both UMY and UMS. They generously provided various information and even helped provide the documents I needed in this research. I thank Dang Ridho, Cak David and Gus Bah, as they helped me while I was at UMY. While at UMS, Zaki has helped communicate with the informants, even giving me a place to stay for two months at the boarding house of UMS Pondok Shobron.

Third, I would like to thank the academic and administrative staff at the Centre for Policy Research and International Studies (CenPRIS) Universiti Sains Malaysia for their direct or indirect assistance in this PhD journey. I also thank my friends in

arms studying at this centre, Suleiman Kawuwa, Hylmee Matahir, Ikomatussuniah, Zuliana Azwa Zulkifli, Chee Lam, and Rajih Arraki. Not to be forgotten, other USM friends such as Eko, Wani, Saryulis, and Redy.

Fourth, I also thank the Central Board of Muhammadiyah who have helped ease the two semesters of tuition fees through Pak Marpuji and Gus Bah. My special thanks to Dr Raja Juli Antoni and Dr Hidayatullah, Rector of the Muhammadiyah University of Sidoarjo, who helped with tuition fees. Really, I am very grateful to Dr Ari Wahyudi (deceased) as a colleague and Deputy Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences and Law, the State University of Surabaya who helped solve administrative problems.

Fifth, I am very grateful to my parents, the late Pak Sulaiman Teguh and the late Masriyati for educating me to what I am today. During my study years, my parents were no longer with me since 2018. Likewise, my older sister Siti Wakhidatin Nur Syamsiah passed away in 2017; it was really a tough trial for me to lose them all. May they be happy in heaven. I also thank my brothers, Mas Natsir Ansory and Mas Abdullah Imaddudin, who also wish for the success of this study.

Sixth, I really thank my beloved wife and daughter, who have been patient and supported this doctoral study. I owe both of them “time”. During my stay in Penang, my parents-in-laws helped my little family in Gresik, thanks to both of them helping to ease the burden on my family so far. Finally, this PhD journey arrived at its destination. Alhamdulillah and thank you Allah SWT. Hopefully, this knowledge and experience would become useful. Ameen.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
ABBREVIATIONS	x
LIST OF APPENDICES	xi
ABSTRACT	xiv
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Problem Statement.....	6
1.3 Research Question	7
1.4 Research Objective	7
1.5 Significance of Study.....	7
1.6 Scope of Study.....	8
1.7 Overview of Chapters	10
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	13
2.1 Introduction	13
2.1.1 Organisational Change	13
2.1.2 Organisational Change in Higher Education	16
2.1.3 Islamic Higher Education Institution in Indonesia.....	18
2.1.4 Muhammadiyah Universities; Islamic NGO-Based Private University	21
2.2 Theoretical Framework.....	25
2.2.1 Institutional Perspective	26
2.2.2 Resource Dependence Perspective	29

2.2.3	Dialectical Perspective	31
2.3	The Hypothetical Model of Study	32
2.4	Chapter Summary	36
CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY		37
3.1	Introduction	37
3.2	Research Strategy	37
3.3	Case Study Method	38
3.4	Sample of Study	39
3.5	Source of Data and Data Collection	40
3.5.1	In-depth Interview	41
3.5.2	Documentary Analysis	44
3.6	Data Analysis	46
3.7	Chapter Summary	49
CHAPTER 4 TRANSFORMATION AT UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH YOGYAKARTA		51
4.1	Introduction	51
4.2	Brief History of Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta	51
4.2.1	Foundation of the University; 1981-1990	53
4.2.2	Development Phase of University (1990 - 1997)	56
4.2.3	Institutional Consolidation Phase (1997 – 2010)	58
4.2.4	Internationalisation Phase (2010 – 2018)	61
4.3	Key Events of Transformation at Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta	65
4.3.1	First Key Event: Physical Development of UMY Campus	66
4.3.2	Second Key Event: The Case of the Bayugeni Project	86
4.3.3	Third Key Event: Internationalisation Policy of UMY	108
4.3.4	Fourth Key Event: Institutional Accreditation of UMY	145
4.3.5	Fifth key Event: Building Business Unit University	169
4.4	Generative Mechanisms of Key Events of Transformation at UMY	185

4.5	Chapter Summary	187
CHAPTER 5 TRANSFORMATION AT UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH SURAKARTA..... 189		
5.1	Introduction	189
5.2	Brief History of Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta	189
5.2.1	Foundation of the University; 1981 – 1992	192
5.2.2	Consolidation Phase of the University; 1992 – 1998	194
5.2.3	Development Phase of the University; 1998 – 2005	195
5.2.4	Institutional Strengthening; 2005 – 2013	196
5.2.5	Strengthening National and International Reputation; 2013-2018	198
5.3	Key Events of Transformation at Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta	200
5.3.1	First Key Event: Academic Staff Development.....	201
5.3.2	Second Key Event: Internationalisation of UMS	221
5.3.3	Third Key Event: Institutional Accreditation of UMS	256
5.3.4	Fourth Key Event: Building other Muhammadiyah Universities	282
5.4	Generative Mechanisms of Key Event of Transformation at UMS	317
5.5	Chapter Summary	320
CHAPTER 6 ORGANISATIONAL TRANSFORMATION OF THE TWO MUHAMMADIYAH UNIVERSITIES..... 322		
6.1	Introduction	322
6.2	Commonalities of Organisational Transformation of the Two Universities ...	322
6.2.1	Muhammadiyah Institutional Logics.....	322
6.2.2	University Accreditation and Quality Assurance.....	326
6.2.3	Internationalisation of the University	330
6.2.4	Institutional Entrepreneurship.....	335
6.3	Differences of Organisational Transformation of Two Universities	340
6.3.1	Internationalisation Orientation	340
6.3.2	The Institutionalisation of Academic Publications	345

6.3.3	Establishing Other Muhammadiyah Universities	351
6.4	Chapter Summary	355
CHAPTER 7 CONCLUSION.....		357
7.1	Introduction	357
7.2	Summary of Findings.....	357
7.3	Research Question 1	358
7.4	Research Question 2	368
7.4.1	Generative Mechanisms in Organisational Transformation of UMY ..	369
7.4.2	Generative Mechanisms in Organisational Transformation of UMS..	377
7.5	Research Question 3	388
7.5.1	Commonalities of Organisational Transformation.....	388
7.5.2	Differences of Organisational Transformation	392
7.6	Contributions to Literature and Theory	396
7.7	Theorising on Institutional Replication	400
7.8	Limitation of Study.....	405
7.9	Recommendations for Future Research	406
REFERENCES		408
APPENDICES		
LIST OF PUBLICATION		

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1.1 Number of Muhammadiyah Higher Education Institutions	4
Table 2.1 Types of Change based on Porras and Robertson (1992).....	14
Table 4.1 The Number of Enrolments 2008-2012.....	60
Table 4.2 The Enrolments of New Students at UMY	94
Table 4.3 The list of International Programs at UMY	114
Table 4.4 Number of UMY Publication.....	120
Table 4.5 Journals published UMY.	121
Table 4.6 List of accredited “A” Universities in Indonesia in 2014.....	147
Table 4.7 The Business units of UMY	172
Table 4.8 Funding sources	176
Table 4.9 The Generative Mechanisms of UMY’s Transformation.....	186
Table 5.1 Double Degree and Non-Degree Programs in UMS	224
Table 5.2 Number of Journal published by UMS.....	231
Table 5.3 UMS Scopus Documents Per Year	232
Table 5.4 UMS’s Institutional Accreditation	264
Table 5.5 Initial Development of UMKT	287
Table 5.6 The Generative Mechanisms of UMS Transformation	319
Table 7.1 Institutional Replication	401

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 2.1 Hypothetical Model.....	33
Figure 4.1 Road Map for Strategic Development of UMY	65
Figure 4.2 Stakeholders of Land acquisition.....	74
Figure 4.3 Fundraising of Land Acquisition	76
Figure 4.4 Generative mechanisms of integrated campus	81
Figure 4.5 Stakeholders in the Banyugeni Case.....	97
Figure 4.6 Generative Mechanisms of Banyugeni Case	106
Figure 4.7 Mahathir Global Peace School 5 in 2015	115
Figure 4.8 Generative Mechanisms of UMY’s Internationalization	144
Figure 4.9 Generative Mechanisms of Institutional Accreditation.....	164
Figure 4.10 Generative Mechanisms of Establishing University Business Units ...	183
Figure 5.1 Generative Mechanisms of Academic Staff Development	218
Figure 5.2 Generative Mechanisms of Internationalization of UMS	255
Figure 5.3 Generative Mechanisms of UMS’s Institutional Accreditation.....	277
Figure 5.4 Generative Mechanisms of UMKT Establishment	311
Figure 5.5 Generative Mechanism for the initiative to establish UMAM	316

ABBREVIATIONS

ADB	Asian Development Bank
BAN PT	Badan Akreditasi Nasional Pendidikan Tinggi (National Accreditation Board of Higher Education)
BPPLN	Beasiswa Pendidikan Pascasarjana Luar Negeri (Overseas Postgraduate Education Scholarships)
HEI	Higher Education Institution
IHE	Islamic Higher Education
MHEIs	Muhammadiyah Higher Education Institutions
PTM	Perguruan Tinggi Muhammadiyah (Muhammadiyah Higher Education Institutions)
TPSDP	Technological and Professional Skills Development Project
UMAM	Universiti Muhammadiyah Antarbangsa Malaysia
UMAT	UMY Multi Amal Usaha Terpadu
UMKT	Universitas Muhammadiyah Kalimantan Timur
UMM	Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang
UMS	Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta
UMY	Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A	University documents
Appendix B	Interview Guide
Appendix C	List of Informants

**TRANSFORMASI INSTITUSI PENGAJIAN TINGGI SWASTA
DI INDONESIA PASCA REFORMASI 1998-2018:
KAJIAN KES UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH YOGYAKARTA
DAN UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH SURAKARTA**

ABSTRAK

Tesis ini mengkaji transformasi organisasi dalam pendidikan tinggi Muhammadiyah dalam pasca reformasi Indonesia 1998-2018. Secara khusus, penyelidikan ini mengambil pendekatan kajian kes dalam menyiasat pengalaman UMY dan UMS. Boleh dikatakan, titik kemuncak institusi adalah ketika kedua universiti mendapat pengiktirafan tertinggi dengan akreditasi "A" oleh Lembaga Akreditasi Pengajian Tinggi Nasional. Dengan latar belakang ini, kajian ini mempunyai tiga objektif: (i) mengkaji peristiwa penting perubahan sepanjang dua dekad transformasi organisasi di dua buah universiti Muhammadiyah; (ii) menzahirkan mekanisme generatif yang menyumbang kepada transformasi dua universiti Muhammadiyah; (iii) menjelaskan persamaan dan perbezaan antara transformasi organisasi kedua universiti. Untuk menjawab objektif kajian tersebut, strategi penyelidikan retroduktif digunakan dengan menerapkan kaedah kualitatif. Data kajian diperoleh melalui wawancara dengan pemimpin kedua universiti Muhammadiyah ini dan disokong dokumen universiti. Berdasarkan penemuan dan analisis, penyelidikan ini menemui lima peristiwa penting dalam transformasi organisasi di UMY, pembangunan kampus bersepadu, kes Banyugeni, pengantarabangsaan, akreditasi institusi, dan pengembangan perniagaan universiti. Sementara itu, transformasi organisasi UMS didorong empat peristiwa penting:

pengembangan staf akademik, pengantarabangsaan, akreditasi institusi, dan pembinaan universiti Muhammadiyah yang lain. Kedua-dua universiti mempunyai persamaan dalam logika institusi Muhammadiyah, akreditasi dan jaminan kualiti, pengantarabangsaan, dan keusahawanan institusi. Sedangkan perbezaan antara keduanya terletak pada orientasi pengantarabangsaan, melembagakan penerbitan akademik, dan pengembangan universiti Muhammadiyah lainnya. Transformasi organisasi di kedua universiti ini berlaku bukan hanya kerana mereka menyesuaikan diri dengan perkembangan pendidikan tinggi, tetapi juga kerana logik institusi Muhammadiyah sesuai dengan perubahan. Sama pentingnya, penyelidikan ini menerangkan dinamika NGO Islam berkaitan dengan pengembangan pendidikan tinggi swasta. NGO Islam Muhammadiyah memainkan peranan penting dalam mendorong dan memudahcara pertumbuhan dan pengembangan universiti Islam swasta di Indonesia. Secara teorinya, penyelidikan ini menyumbang kepada pengenalan teori replikasi institusi dalam memahami transformasi organisasi di universiti swasta di bawah naungan organisasi induk yang sama. Akhirnya, replikasi institusi adalah tawaran teoritis baru yang cuba menjambatani secara teoritis antara isomorfisme institusi dan keusahawanan institusi dalam menjelaskan fenomena transformasi organisasi di universiti swasta Islam, khususnya universiti-universiti Muhammadiyah di Indonesia.

**THE TRANSFORMATION OF PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION
INSTITUTION IN POST-REFORMATION INDONESIA 1998-2018:
CASE STUDIES OF UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH YOGYAKARTA
AND UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH SURAKARTA**

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the organisational transformation in Muhammadiyah higher education in post-reformation Indonesia 1998-2018. Specifically, this research took a case-study approach in investigating the experiences of UMY and UMS. Arguably, the institutional high point was when the two universities received the highest recognition with an “A” accreditation by the National Accreditation Board of Higher Education. Against this background, this study has three objectives: (i) to examine the key events of changes throughout two decades of organisational transformation in the two Muhammadiyah universities; (ii) to reveal generative mechanisms contributing to the transformation of two Muhammadiyah universities and; (iii) to explain commonalities and differences between the organisational transformation of the two universities. In answering the objectives of this study, a retroductive research strategy was employed by implementing qualitative methods. The research data were obtained through interviews with the leaders of these two Muhammadiyah universities and supported by university documents. Based on the findings and analysis, five key events were found in organisational transformation at UMY, integrated campus development, the Banyugeni case, internationalisation,

institutional accreditation and university business development. Meanwhile, the UMS organisation's transformation was driven by four key events: academic staff development, internationalisation, institutional accreditation and building other Muhammadiyah universities. The two universities have similarities in the institutional logic of Muhammadiyah, accreditation and quality assurance, internationalisation, as well as institutional entrepreneurship. Whereas the difference between the two lies in the orientation of internationalisation, institutionalising academic publications, and the development of other Muhammadiyah universities. The organisational transformation at these two universities occurred not only because they adjusted to the development of higher education, but also because the institutional logic of Muhammadiyah was compatible with changes. Equally important, this research explains the dynamics of an Islamic NGO concerning the development of private higher education. The Islamic NGO Muhammadiyah plays a vital role in encouraging and facilitating the growth and development of private Islamic universities in Indonesia. Theoretically, this research contributes to the introduction of institutional replication theory in understanding organisational transformation in private universities under the auspices of the same parent organisation. Eventually, the institutional replication is a new theoretical offer that attempts to theoretically bridge between institutional isomorphism and institutional entrepreneurship in explaining the phenomenon of organisational transformation in Islamic private universities, especially Muhammadiyah universities in Indonesia.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Private Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) are the dynamic and fast-growing segment of post-secondary education in the globalised world era (Altbach, 1999). The unprecedented demand for higher education but lack of support from the government occurs mostly in developing countries. This situation has brought private higher education to the forefront to seize the opportunity. More than 50% of students have enrolled in the private higher education institutions sector across Asia, and almost 60% of the region's HEIs are private (Asian Development Bank, 2012). Government promotion of private providers in higher education, as well as the growth of private higher education, are much more significant in Asia than in other parts of the world (Levy, 2010). Consequently, private higher education is increasingly influential in Asia. In several countries, including Japan, South Korea, the Philippines and Indonesia, private post-secondary institutions dominate the higher education systems in terms of numbers with 80% of students attending private HEIs (Altbach, 2005; Welch, 2012; Asian Development Bank, 2012).

While public universities are commonly more prestigious in most countries, several private schools rank at the top of the hierarchy. A significant number of private higher education institutions also exist in Thailand, Vietnam, and Taiwan (Altbach, 1999). Even in a public HEI-dominated Asian nation like Malaysia, there is a fast-growing segment of private HEIs (Lee, 1999; Yean, 2013). In East Asia, the number of private HEIs is growing rapidly. There are 2000 private post-secondary schools in China, although only a handful are officially recognised by the government (Altbach,

1999; p. 313). In India, most undergraduate schooling is provided by private colleges affiliated with public universities (AISHE, 2015).

An essential distinction between public and private HEIs lies in how they are governed, financed and how they function (Geiger, 1991; Levy, 1992). Traditionally, public HEIs are owned, operated, and funded by the government, whereas private HEIs are commonly owned and run by non-state entities such as individuals, families, companies or corporations, religious organisations, and foundations (Asian Development Bank, 2012; p. 2). Private HEIs typically receive little or no state funding, thus heavily relying on tuition and other student fees. The global expansion of education makes it essential to consider the status of private higher education and its specific problems. While private universities share common roots with public institutions and have several similar roles and functions, they also have special characteristics. Most important is the source of funding since private institutions are responsible for their funding. Other distinctive factors include internal governance and management, the relationship between private HEIs and public authorities as well as institutional planning (Altbach, 2005).

In the Indonesian context, private HEIs play a central role in providing more access to higher education, contributing to two-thirds of student enrolment in Indonesia (MOE, 2014). The number of private higher education institutions reaches 68% of the total higher education institutions in Indonesia and the remaining 12% is public higher education institutions managed by the state (Higher Education Statistics, 2019). With the proliferation of these private higher learning institutions lies the challenge of the survival capacity of the private HEIs, with the number of students getting smaller and dispersed to these learning institutions (Moeliodihardjo, 2001).

Due to over-dependence on student tuition, many private institutions with small enrolment tend not to survive, let alone thrive.

Moreover, some experts argued that only a handful of private institutions are considered healthy, viable and capable of providing quality education. These institutions are even of better quality compared to many public universities. They are better managed, provide better services to their students and have more concerns over the employability of their graduates (Moeliodihardjo, 2001). Some successful institutions are mainly supported by strong financial backers, allowing them to survive during the difficult initial development stage (2001, p. 11). However, more central to their survival is the existence of professional managers, strong leadership, and visionary founders.

The Muhammadiyah in Indonesia is one of the biggest providers of private post-secondary education. This organisation has 171 higher education institutions spanning from Aceh in Western Indonesia to Papua in Eastern Indonesia. This organization has 171 universities ranging from Aceh in Western Indonesia to Papua in Eastern Indonesia. The number of 171 Muhammadiyah higher education institutions came from 168 higher education institutions directly under Muhammadiyah and 8 under the autonomous women's organization of Muhammadiyah, 'Aisyiyah. These Muhammadiyah higher education institutions have different forms of institutions, such as universities, institutes, colleges, polytechnics, and academies. In general, the profile of Muhammadiyah higher education is depicted in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1 Number of Muhammadiyah Higher Education Institutions

No.	Type of Institution	Muhammadiyah	'Aisyiyah	Number
1.	University	47	1	48
2.	Institute	5	0	5
3.	College	97	4	101
4.	Polytechnic	4	1	5
5.	Academy	10	2	12
Total number		163	8	171

(Sayuti, et. al., 2019)

Among the 48 Muhammadiyah universities, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta (UMS), Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang (UMM) and are the leading and most prominent in relation to academic institutional achievement nationally. In its development, the other two Muhammadiyah also followed in the footsteps of the three "A" accredited universities, namely the Prof. Dr. Hamka (Uhamka), Universitas Ahmad Dahlan (UAD) also received an A-accreditation institutionally from the National Accreditation Board of Indonesian Higher Education (Sayuti et.al., 2019). The institutions gained national institutional accreditation with an "A" or "excellent" grade (BAN PT, 2016) at par with several prominent public universities such as Universitas Indonesia (UI) and Universitas Gadjah Mada (UGM). The aforementioned institutional achievement of these Muhammadiyah universities, since both are public and private institutions, must fulfil certain institutional requirements regarding management, teaching, research, and other rigorous processes for the said accreditation process.

Based on the 2016 and the 2017 QS World University Rankings, UMS was ranked first among the private universities in Indonesia and was included in the Top 10 among all Indonesian universities (*Solopos*, 8 June 2017; UMS, 2017). UMS is a private university that has sent the biggest number of lecturers studying doctoral

degrees abroad in 2015, 2016, and 2017 nationally (UMS, 2017). This achievement advanced the development of human resources and collaboration with overseas academic institutions through the internationalization agenda. In addition, UMS has attracted public demands by gaining the reputation of being a "well-established" private university, especially in institutional financing.

Compared to the previous universities, UMY was the latest to be established in 1981. The institution had developed as swift as UMS institutionally in a decade. To some extent, UMY has been at the forefront of internationalisation through academic and student development programs (Nurmandi, 2013). It is located in the city dubbed as the "student city" of Yogyakarta, which attracts students from all around Indonesia. Nevertheless, UMY is continuously challenged by other universities surrounding the city. Interestingly, UMY has transformed into an established higher education institution based on National Accreditation and generated internationalisation projects at home and abroad (Nurmandi, 2013, p.88).

The organizational transformation that occurred at the two universities enabled them to strengthen the quality of the higher education organization internally, such as improving the quality of quality assurance, development of academic staff, financial resources, and publications. In addition, the organizational transformation also morally compels these two universities to contribute to the development of other Muhammadiyah universities. Furthermore, UMY and UMS pushed for an internationalization agenda as part of the organizational transformation strategy. These two Muhammadiyah universities not only develop internationalization in an academic context but also to strengthen the internationalization agenda of Muhammadiyah as the parent organization. UMY and UMS are institutionally supportive in being actively

involved in the peace mission of Muhammadiyah as an Islamic organization in the Southeast Asian region.

Based on the preceding, this study examines the change and transformation of the Muhammadiyah higher education institutions. This study focuses on the organisational transformation that occurred in two Muhammadiyah universities, UMY and UMS. Thus, the study can explain how the two Muhammadiyah universities build and transform their organizations institutionally hence that they are able to reach the current level.

1.2 Problem Statement

This study focuses on the institutional or organisational change in Muhammadiyah universities for two decades after the reformation era (1998-2018).

Generally, this research endeavours to describe emerging events, issues and debates within organisational transformation in Muhammadiyah higher education institutions. These include key events and issues that affected the institutional development of the two Muhammadiyah universities for two decades, particularly the following: university governance and leadership, funding, academic affairs, and internationalisation. Also, this study examines the underlying mechanisms of institutional transformations among the two Muhammadiyah universities, namely UMS and UMY.

On top of that, this study aims to capture the patterns of organisational transformation of Muhammadiyah universities comparatively. Theoretically, this study explains how Islamic Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO) builds and transforms Islamic based universities in developing countries. Based on previous studies, there was no explanatory model of the organisational transformation of Islamic based private universities. As a result, this study fills the literature gap related to the

study of higher education and Islamic Non-Governmental organisations in Indonesia and Southeast Asia.

1.3 Research Question

1. What are the key events of organisational transformation in the two Muhammadiyah universities throughout 1998 - 2018?
2. What are the various generative mechanisms contributing to the transformation of two Muhammadiyah universities?
3. What are the commonalities and differences between the organisational transformation of the two universities?

1.4 Research Objective

Based on the research questions above, this study has three research objectives, namely:

1. To examine the key events of changes throughout almost two decades of organisational transformation in the two Muhammadiyah universities.
2. To reveal the generative mechanisms contributing to the transformation of two Muhammadiyah universities.
3. To explain the commonalities and differences between the organisational transformation of the two universities.

1.5 Significance of Study

The significance of this research is to contribute to the theoretical discourse of the development of the Islamic NGO-based private higher education institutions in

Indonesia, specifically Muhammadiyah universities in the post-reformation period. So far, literature on the subject related to organisational transformation or development within Muhammadiyah universities is still limited. Based on this fact, this study contributes to:

1. Research on the organisational transformation of private universities in Indonesia is still limited. As a result, the development of literature on this topic is also not very developed. Thus, this study contributes towards an informed understanding of the development and transformation of Muhammadiyah universities in the response to social change, in the case study of Muhammadiyah universities in Indonesia.
2. The research enhances the Muhammadiyah organisation and the other private higher education institutions to initiate institutional or organisational reform in their higher education institutions based on the research findings.
3. Equally important, this study helps to generate relevant studies in the field of higher education in Indonesia. Future research in organisational transformation among private learning institutions with a different locale can be pursued.

1.6 Scope of Study

Research on the sociology of higher education originally has four major domains: the study of educational inequality, college effects, the academic profession, and higher education institutions as an organisation (Clark, 1973). The fourth domain is also stated as the aspect of organisation and governance of higher education (Teichler, 1996). In addition, Tight offered the fourth domain, which consists of institutional management key themes or issues including governance and institutional leadership, institutional development and history, institutional structure and relation between higher education, industry and community (Tight; 2003).

This study focuses on the Muhammadiyah higher education institutions (MHEIs) as the unit of analysis in the institutional transformational development, specifically on the two Muhammadiyah universities in Indonesia namely Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta (UMS) and Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta (UMY). Moreover, this research limits the organisational transformation within the two Muhammadiyah universities during the post-reformation era; 1998-2018. This study examines the transformation of Muhammadiyah higher education in the 1998-2018 period for two reasons. *First*, there was a reformation movement in 1998 that became the turning point of the socio-political transformation in Indonesia, from the New Order era to the Reformation era (Crouch, 2010; Priyono & Hamid; 2014). The reform movement at the political level also impacted other fields, namely economic, social, cultural, including education. *Second*, political reforms have also impacted reforms and changes in higher education policies in Indonesia (Mappiasse, 2014). The higher education reform policies on strengthening governance, quality assurance, accreditation and internationalisation not only have an impact on public universities but also on Indonesian private universities, including Muhammadiyah universities. As a result, Muhammadiyah universities experienced significant development during this period, especially UMY and UMS.

This study purposely selected those two universities since they are among the leading Muhammadiyah universities based on the national accreditation body. These institutions are also appointed as the exemplary centre university by Muhammadiyah. In addition, both higher education institutions have strategic roles in supporting the Muhammadiyah movement nationally and regionally. Equally important, the two universities are located in two different cities and provinces that have a distinction in cultural and historical aspects in Java Island, Indonesia.

1.7 Overview of Chapters

The following is an overview of the entire thesis, chapter by chapter. Chapter 2: Literature Review and Conceptual Framework sets the stage for the empirical exploration. It provides reviews of relevant literature essential for understanding the contextual and theoretical background on which the research is based. This chapter is divided into four parts; Organisational change in Higher Education, Islamic Higher Education Institution in Indonesia, and Muhammadiyah Universities; Islamic NGO Based Private University.

Part 1 provides an overview of organisational change in higher education. It is important to know the form of organisational change in this research. Based on this study, the form of organisational change, in this case, is transformational. In addition, Part 2 discusses Islamic higher education institutions in Indonesia as a result of the education system in Indonesia that accommodates Islamic based education at higher education levels. Lastly, Part 3 examines the Muhammadiyah universities as Islamic NGO based private universities.

Chapter 3; Research Methodology introduces the methodology of this research. The chapter describes the research strategy as a starting point before choosing the research methods. In this study, retroductive research was implemented as a research strategy derived from the critical realism paradigm. In addition, the chapter also considers case study as a relevant research method. The chapter sketches the stages of the actual research exercise: interviews and document analysis. The challenges and difficulties of the research experience are also noted.

Chapter 4 discusses the findings and analysis of organisational transformation at the Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta (UMY). Before describing some of the key events of transformation at UMY, this chapter describes a brief history of UMY

from its founding, developmental and contemporary phases. It describes and analyses five key events using critical realism analysis stages regarding the university's physical development, the Banyugeni case, internationalisation policies, institutional accreditation, and business unit development. In the analysis, this chapter also describes the generative mechanisms that appear in each of the five key events that drive change in UMY.

Chapter 5 presents findings and analysis of organisational transformation at the Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta (UMS). It illustrates the brief history of UMS and its development to date. Also, it describes four key events and generative mechanisms in the transformation of the UMS organisation. Furthermore, this chapter describes and explains four important events using critical realism, academic staff development, internationalisation policies, institutional accreditation and development of other Muhammadiyah universities. In analysing key events, this study found several generative mechanisms as the causes of these key events in organisational transformation at UMS.

Chapter 6 discusses the findings and analysis of the similarities and differences in the two Muhammadiyah universities' organisational transformations. The first part of this chapter discusses the similarities between the two Muhammadiyah universities related to the institutional logic of Muhammadiyah, internationalisation, quality assurance and accreditation as well as institutional entrepreneurship. The second part describes the differences in the organisational transformation between the two educational institutions that lie in the internationalisation orientation, the institutionalisation of publications and the role in building other Muhammadiyah universities.

Finally, Chapter 7 summarises the findings of critical events and generative mechanisms in organisational transformation at UMY and UMS. This part recaps the similarities and differences of the organisational transformation in the two Muhammadiyah universities. This final chapter also presents contributions to literature and theory, theorising on institutional replication, limitations of the study and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents three aspects: literature review, theoretical framework, and hypothetical model of study. First, this chapter explores a literature review on four themes: organisational change, organisational change in higher education, Islamic higher education in Indonesia and Muhammadiyah universities as Islamic NGO-based private universities. Second, it describes the theoretical framework comprising institutional perspective, resource dependency perspective and dialectical perspective. Third, it describes the hypothetical model in this study.

2.1.1 Organisational Change

In analysing an organisation, Van De Ven & Poole (1995) define change as “an empirical observation of the difference in form, quality, or state over time in an organisational entity” (p. 512). Kezar (2001) indicates that based on its timing and implementation, organisational change may occur as either evolutionary change, revolutionary change, or somewhere on the spectrum in between. In addition, Porras and Robertson (1992) present a framework for a conceptual understanding of change as shown in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1 Types of Change based on Porras and Robertson (1992)

Order of Change	Category of Change	
	Planned	Unplanned
First	Developmental	Evolutionary
Second	Transformational	Revolutionary

(Adapted from Sarah Louisa Birchley, 2013)

This framework can be used to categorise the type and order of change of an organisation. It is based on the category of change (planned or unplanned) and the order (first or second). In their definition, planned change is derived from a decision made by the organisation with the specific goal to improve its function. This type of change occurs when the organisation has to respond to external demands. In contrast, unplanned change is a type of change that comes from outside the system and is something that the organisation must respond to. It is more unstructured or even accidental.

According to Warrick (2011), organisational transformation means that all aspects of an organisation, aside from core values, are subject to change to strengthen the organisation as a whole. Warrick (2011) also argues that transformational leaders play a key role in the success of a major change effort by conveying vision, values, direction and inspiration. Greiner (1967) argues that successful change often results from the severe pressure that notably shifts the organisational foundation; intervention and reorientation through an outside consultant or new leader; the diagnosis begins at the top and flows downward, and the clear commitment to institutionalising the change.

Furthermore, Davis, Kee and Newcomer (2010) see that instituting change requires three phases: visioning, strategy and implementation. Change requires ongoing dialogue and engagement through a common language and vocabulary, with

leadership primarily responsible for developing and articulating the vision, assessing the risk involved and determining the organisation's capacity to overcome associated barriers. Obloj, Cushman and Kozminski (1995) describe transformational "breakthrough" as a "simultaneous and sharp shift in strategy, power, structure and controls" (p. 156). They identified four pivotal factors of successful breakthroughs: (1) a clear goal that forms an easy-to-explain core concept; (2) the idea of a breakthrough must be internalised into the organisation's values and dreams; (3) leadership models' breakthrough behaviour from the top and is directly involved in action and change, and changes must become a normal part of operations and subject to continual improvement (Obloj, Cushman & Kozminski, 1995). For Frahm (2011), communication is a critical component of successful change management.

Warrick (2011) defines organisational transformation as "an ongoing process of knowing present realities, identifying future ideals as well as developing and implementing a process" (p. 16). While Greiner, Cummings and Bhambri (2003) define successful transformation as a combination of large-scale internal organisational change, major external change in market position and improved financial performance. Greiner, Cummings and Bhambri (2003) found this trifecta critical because "today's organisation was typically designed years before and subsequently conditioned to implement yesterday's strategy" (p. 3). Greiner, Cummings and Bhambri's (2003) 4-D theory of strategic transformation outlines four key factors: the focus and sequence of intervention phases led by the CEO; the CEO's action orientation; the organisation's degree of receptivity toward change and enabling or prohibiting elements in the external market environment. This is corroborated by the study of Davis, Kee and Newcomer (2010), which define strategic transformation as a "process-based approach designed to deliver a set of defined initiatives (projects)

that achieves a desired set of goals and involves key stakeholders (internal and external) in the process. The process involves a definition of these goals and the definition of specific plans (initiatives) designed to achieve these goals” (Davis, Kee & Newcomer, 2010, p. 67).

Lastly, Davis, Kee and Newcomer (2010) discovered that “building the capacity for transformational change is a key to the longstanding survival of the organisation” (p. 73). They also argue that strategic transformation can only occur through a change in the organisation’s design and its relationship with external stakeholders. To determine the area to focus improvements, Obloj, Kushman and Kozminski (1995) argue that organisations pinpoint the intersection among their strategy, environment and competitive advantage.

2.1.2 Organisational Change in Higher Education

Research on the sociology of higher education originally has four major domains: the study of educational inequality beyond the secondary level, the social-psychological effects of college on students, the study of academic man or higher education as a profession and the organisations of higher education (Clark, 1973). The fourth domain is also stated as the aspect of organisation and governance of higher education (Teichler, 1998). In addition, Tight (2003) classifies that the fourth domain consists of institutional management key themes or issues including governance and institutional leadership, institutional development and history, institutional structure and relation between higher education, industry, and community.

Considering Teichler’s (1998) typology, this study is concerned with the fourth sphere, organisation, and governance in higher education institutions. Tiplic (2008) observed that the enquiry on organisational change in higher education has developed particularly over the three decades; the research was mostly focused on changes

triggered by external forces for higher education organisations. The external forces, which can take the form of several current trends affecting higher education institutions, have been the subject of various studies. These studies comprised public sector reforms in the higher education field (Bauer et al., 1999; De Boer & Huisman, 1999; Bleikie, Hoestaker & Vabo, 2000; Meek & Hayden, 2005), the marketisation of higher education (Gumport, 2000, Kirp, 2003; Massy, 2004), the corporatisation of higher education (Gould, 2003), managerialism in higher education (Teichler, 1998; Gumport, 2000, Amaral, Magalhaes & Santiago, 2003; Salminen, 2003) and globalisation of higher education (Salmi, 2009; Marginson, 2010; Marginson & Sawir 2011; Sindhu & Kaur, 2011, Rena, 2001; 2015). Therefore, it can be stated that change or transformation in higher education is constructed into new types of higher education organisations. It has been named, among others; the changing university (Schuller, 1995), the service university (Tjeldvoll, 1998), the entrepreneurial university (Clark, 1998), the enterprise university (Zamonski, Marginson & Considine, 2000), the hybrid university (Mouwen, 2000), the learning university (Duke, 2002) and the world-class university (Salmi, 2009).

Fumasoli and Stensaker (2013) argue that many types of research on organisational change in Higher Education (HE) were concentrated on the relation between the state and HEIs as well as the changes in governance styles. Scholars have focused on external drivers of change, specifically on policy change, and on their structural impact (Amaral et al., 2003; Teixeira et al., 2004; Huisman, 2009; Paradeise et al., 2009; Locke et al., 2011). Hence research in higher education has neglected the complex reality of the university as an organization possessing its own structures, cultures, and practices (Fumasoli and Stensaker, 2013, p. 479). In contrast, fewer studies have addressed the intra-organisational change dynamics of organisational

change (Capano & Regini, 2014) and future scenario based organisational transformation in HE (Nasruddin, Bustami & Inayatulloh, 2012).

Kezar (2001; 2018) described several models of organisational change in HE and concluded that organisational change (mostly in Western countries) could be best explained and understood through political/dialectical, social-cognition and cultural models. Political processes such as persuasion, informal negotiation, mediation, and coalition-building appear to be very powerful strategies for creating change. Social cognition models illustrate the importance of altering mental models, learning, constructed interaction and other processes for creating change. Cultural models demonstrate the importance of symbolism, history, and traditions as well as institutional culture for facilitating change on campus (Kezar, 2001; 2018; Kezar & Eckel, 2002).

Furthermore, studies on organisational change in higher education tend to take a comparative method in international and national settings (see Marginson & Sawir, 2006; Mukherjee & Wong, 2011; Teichler, 1998; Clark, 1998). While a comparative approach can identify differences and similarities among countries and institutions, it has been recognised that such an approach does not explain the reason there are differences in organisational responses to changing an environment. Several studies explained and focused on the micro-processes of change within higher education institutions as an organisation (Harris, 2003; Tiplic, 2008; Holley, 2009; Tan & Goh, 2014; Jin & Horta, 2018). Equally important, those studies mostly discussed public higher education institutions comparatively but not on private higher education.

2.1.3 Islamic Higher Education Institution in Indonesia

Many scholars studied Islamic higher education (IHE) in contemporary Indonesia. Some of them described that Islamic education in Indonesia cannot be

detached from the role of Middle East networks (Nakamura and Nishino, 1993; Buchori and Fadjar, 2004; Angela, 2005; Welch, 2012a and 2012b; Kinoshita, 2009; Asari, 2010; Azra, 2011; Assegaf, 2012; Lukens-Bull, 2013). Azra's (1999) study revealed that the *Ulama* (religious scholars) network is highly influential in the development of Islamic education in Indonesia. Islamic education focuses on the writings and teaching of a few famous ulama and is limited to the development of '*hifdh*' (learning thing by heart) and '*syarh*' (the explanation of well-known texts).

In contemporary times, some studies stated that Islamic discourse in Indonesia is influenced by scholars increased access to Islamic Public Higher Education (IPHE) at Western universities (Jabali, 2003; Asari, 2007). They adopted a tradition of the scientific approach to Islamic higher education (IHE) pedagogy in Indonesia. The approach is such as a socio-historical approach to religious studies in the Indonesian Islamic higher education system. Also, the current development of some institutions tends to adopt Western education systems, which can be observed from the increase of science-based pedagogy in public and private Islamic learning institutions. The institutions also encourage their human resources or lecturers to pursue postgraduate degrees at Western universities rather than Middle East universities.

More specifically, Fuad Jabali and friends (2003) painted a picture of Islam in Indonesia from the perspective of IPHE. It focuses on the role of Islamic higher education institutions, especially Universitas Islam Negeri (UIN) Jakarta and Universitas Islam Negeri (UIN) Yogyakarta, both of which played a pivotal role in developing Islamic thoughts and disseminating ideas throughout the country. They showed that graduates from Western Universities including McGill University have a big role in the modernisation of state Islamic universities. While Jabali affirmed the growing influence of the Western graduate network, Hiroko Kinoshita (2009)

attempted to prove that the Middle East network still plays a significant role in the contemporary IPHE in Indonesia. Her research stated the influence of studying in the Middle East, especially graduates from Al Azhar University. The development of the IHE Institution could not have been achieved without the contribution of these graduates.

Meanwhile, other scholars scrutinised the development of Islamic Studies in IPHE such as Amin Abdullah (2006), Azyumardi Azra (2011) and Sa'adi (2011). They mostly analysed the development and paradigm shift of Islamic studies in Indonesian IHE. According to Abdullah (2006), the organisational transformation from the State Islamic Institute (Institut Agama Islam Negeri/IAIN) to the State Islamic University (Universitas Islam Negeri/UIN), is not only a change in the name of higher education organizations but also a transformation of study approaches in developing scientific fields in an integrated-interconnection manner between traditional Islamic scholarship and the others scientific fields, such as natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities in Islamic universities. Azra (2011) noticed that the organizational transformation of IAIN into UIN was the result of a long process that had begun before the reform era, 1998. This institutional transformation accelerated after entering the reformation era with the establishment of state Islamic universities in several provinces. He also observed that changes in the organization of Islamic higher education occurred at the level of organizational form and in the perspective of scientific development.

In addition to Abdullah (2006) and Azra (2011), Sa'adi (2011) studied Islamic higher education from the perspective of Islamic philosophers who provide their diverse opinions on how to build the epistemological underpinnings of Islamic higher education in Indonesia. In this sense, several prominent intellectuals (from outside

Indonesia) include, including Muhammad Iqbal, Fazlur Rahman, and Ismail Raji al-Faruqi, who paralleled or affected Indonesian thinkers such as Mukti Ali, Harun Nasution, Nurcholish Madjid, Amin Abdullah, and Imam Suprayoga. According to Said, some of these scholars still focus on the realm of theoretical thought, while others, such as Amin Abdullah and Imam Suprayoga, have actualized it via the establishment of Islamic higher education institutions.

Hasan Asari (2007), Anthony Welch (2012) and Ronald Lukens-Bull (2013) were concerned with the history and development of the educational system in IPHE. Asari (2007) and Lukens-Bull (2013) trace the origins and development of Islamic higher education in post-independence Indonesia, the old order, the new order to the reformation era. Meanwhile, Welch (2013) examines the development of Islamic higher education in Indonesia relates it to academic mobility. Additionally, Richard G. Kraince (2007) explored the role of public Islamic higher education in promoting better relations between various religious communities in post-authoritarian Indonesia. However, the studies that focus on Islamic private higher education still lack scholarly attention. This study endeavours to fill the literature gap on the development of private Islamic higher education in Indonesia.

2.1.4 Muhammadiyah Universities; Islamic NGO-Based Private University

Regarding Islamic private higher education, Thomas Murray (1973) studied the historical background of public and private universities in Indonesia including Muhammadiyah Universities as Islamic based private universities. He revealed that the first Muhammadiyah University was established in Padang Panjang, West Sumatra in 1955 but moved to Jakarta and transformed into Universitas Muhammadiyah Jakarta (UMJ) in 1956. The university opened campus branches, such as in Yogyakarta, Purwokerto, Malang and became the independent Muhammadiyah universities

differently in the 1960s and 1970s. The study contributed to an understanding of the institutional development of Muhammadiyah higher education Institutions (MHEIs) in 1955-1972. However, the holistic understanding of the early development of Muhammadiyah universities was insufficient as Murray just wrote on the emergence of Muhammadiyah universities chronologically devoid of critical analysis on the context of the organisational change or transformation.

Cognisant of the role of historical development, Pambudi (2008) studied the historical development of Muhammadiyah higher education in Jakarta from 1957 to 1965. He focused on the emergence of Universitas Muhammadiyah Jakarta (UMJ) as the first university under Muhammadiyah organisation in the Old Order (Orde Lama) era. The creation of the Muhammadiyah higher education institution was conceived during the Mukdamar (National Congress) Muhammadiyah in 1936 when Indonesia was still under Dutch colonial rule. Against this political constraint, the idea was not realised until the independence of Indonesia. The embryo of Muhammadiyah University was established firstly in West Sumatra in 1957, which after that moved to Jakarta and transformed into UMJ. The study provided the institutional development of UMJ from a historical perspective.

Candraningrum (2008) traced the historical development of the English departments in Muhammadiyah, from 1958 until 2005. The study focused on the institutionalisation of the English department from a postcolonial perspective. She traced the dominant discourse utilised and employed by the English department of Muhammadiyah universities. From her study, it was found out that there were dialogues and negotiations between the Islamic values and Western values concerning the English curriculum. Interestingly, English departments have initiated a

multicultural dialogue through the inclusion of Western literary canon in the English curriculum in Muhammadiyah universities.

Furthermore, Hawanti (2015), Tobroni & Purwojuwono (2016) revealed that Muhammadiyah universities continue to grow dynamically. Muhammadiyah universities hold the spirit of the Muhammadiyah Islamic paradigm as the basis to enlighten humankind. Muhammadiyah Higher Education Institutions (MHEIs) are now part of the top choices for higher learning institutions among high schools' graduates. With approximately 177 MHEIs, the dynamics of education in Muhammadiyah is inevitable. MHEIs spread all over Indonesia. The dynamic role of Muhammadiyah's educational institutions has made the organisation an important partner for the Indonesian government in deciding national policy, including education policy.

The study by Said, Muhammad & Elangkovan (2014) revealed that MHEIs support each other for improving the quality of education. This challenge of a paradigm shift to enhance the quality of MHEIs is a continuing project to the Muhammadiyah leadership. The leaders of MHEIs need to formulate a new paradigm in their educational institutions leading towards synergised intellectual development and professionalism following the need of the market and the economy without losing the traditional values of Islam in a globalised world.

In response to the globalisation agenda, Nurmandi (2012) examined the development of internationalisation at Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta (UMY) by organisational transformation. To realise internationalisation, the university management changed the organisational structure to support internationalisation by setting up an international office in 2009. This organisational transformation affects the decision-making process, especially related to internationalisation. Moreover, he

concluded that the process of internationalisation at UMY is not mainly driven by the strategy that is well-formulated at the top institutional level or from the vision of the university leadership. It is also shaped by the actors of the decentralised units of the university. The departments that are involved in the internationalisation process collaborate to jointly overcome problems and formulate goals based on shared interests. After the result is achieved by individual departments besides taking note of the significant implications and impact of decentralised activities, the university leadership argues the successful program as being part of the university strategy. This phenomenon leads to a new understanding of university organisations that innovation is merely coming from the smaller academic units at the central level.

Furthermore, Syamsudin, Djoko, Suhardjanto and Lukviarman (2016) examined the role of university governance to organisational commitment in Muhammadiyah higher education institutions. In the research, corporate governance framework was employed to analyse organisational behaviours in universities. The study showed a positive effect of university governance on sustainable institutional commitment among Muhammadiyah universities. In addition, the governance mechanisms in Muhammadiyah University have distinction and uniqueness determined from Muhammadiyah organisation's values.

The literature and related works abovementioned are some of the several studies on Muhammadiyah higher education. Some focused on institutional development (Murray, 1973; Pambudi, 2008), teaching discourse (Candraningrum, 2008), the role of Islamic values in higher education (Hawanti, 2015; Tobroni & Purwojuwono; 2016), leadership in higher education (Said, Muhammad & Elangkovan), university governance (Syamsudin, Djoko, Suhardjanto and Lukviarman, 2016) and internationalisation (Nurmandi, 2012). This study is hoped to