

THE INFLUENCE OF SERVICE QUALITY, INSTITUTIONAL REPUTATION, ON STUDENT LOYALTY AT PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION

Muhammad Bakrie

Universitas PGRI Palembang

Email: m.bakrie@univpgri-palembang.ac.id

Abstrak

Penelitian ini menyoroti pengaruh kualitas pelayanan dan reputasi institusi pendidikan tinggi swasta dalam membangun loyalitas mahasiswa. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kuantitatif dengan metode survei. Responden penelitian adalah 185 mahasiswa dari Universitas PGRI Palembang. Teknik Analisis menggunakan model persamaan struktural (*SEM*) *SmartPLS* berbasis varian. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa kualitas pelayanan berpengaruh langsung signifikan terhadap reputasi, tidak berpengaruh langsung signifikan terhadap loyalitas mahasiswa. Reputasi institusi berpengaruh langsung sangat signifikan terhadap loyalitas. Kualitas pelayanan mahasiswa memiliki pengaruh tidak langsung signifikan terhadap loyalitas mahasiswa melalui reputasi institusi, ini menyiratkan bahwa reputasi institusi membawa hubungan pengaruh (*antecedents*) antara variabel kualitas pelayanan terhadap loyalitas mahasiswa. Temuan ini dapat membantu institusi pendidikan tinggi untuk membuat rencana strategis yang lebih baik guna meningkatkan loyalitas mahasiswa melalui peningkatan kualitas pelayanan dan reputasi institusi.

Kata kunci: Loyalitas Mahasiswa, Kualitas Pelayanan, dan Reputasi institusi.

Abstract

This research highlights the effect of service quality and the reputation of private higher institutions in building student loyalty. This research uses a quantitative approach with a survey method. The research respondents were 185 students from PGRI Palembang University. Analysis techniques using variance-based structural equation models (SEM) SmartPLS. The results of the study indicate that the quality of service has a significant direct effect on reputation, not a significant direct effect on student loyalty. Institutional reputation has a very significant direct effect on loyalty. Student service quality has a significant indirect effect on student loyalty through the reputation of the institution, this implies that the reputation of the institution carries an influence relationship (antecedents) between service quality variables on student loyalty. These findings can help higher education institutions to make better strategic plans to increase student loyalty through improving the quality of service and the reputation of the institution.

Keywords: *Student's Loyalty; Services Quality; Institutional Reputations.*

1. Introduction

The increase of competition between higher education institutions to attract new students places greater emphasis on

meeting student expectations and needs (Thomas, 2011). As a consequence, higher education institutions are forced to commit on certain quality criteria and adopt market

orientation strategies to differentiate them from competitors by providing high quality services and with a lasting effect on the institution and the students (Thomas, 2011).

According to Poole *et al* . (2000) universities that face high competition and commercialization often turn to strategies to improve the quality of service and related factors to achieve competitive advantage in challenging environment recently.

Service quality, in this context, is recognized as a key performance measurement for excellence in education and a strategic variable for universities as service providers (Donaldson and Runciman, 1995) . The reputation of an institution is influenced by the quality of services provided by the institution (J e ong Kim, 2010) . On the other hand, Ravald and Grönroos (1996) state that customer not only appreciate the product but also the organization that supplies the product or service. Thus, the reputation of the supplier is important for customer loyalty (Zabala *et al* . 2005). The reputation of the institution is the main determinant of customer loyalty (Tarus and Rabach , 2013), therefore the vision of student loyalty and the factors responsible for their loyalty behavior should be the main concern when determining the most suitable organizational strategy (Yap *et al* . 2012; Helgesen and Nettet, 2007). According to Ali Deghan *et al.* (2014) Student loyalty is very important for academics and has been the subject of strategic attention for higher education institutions. Student loyalty is greatly influenced by the quality of service and reputation of the higher education institution itself (Fares, 2013) . Therefore, this paper investigate the effect of service quality and reputation of higher education institutions against students loyalty, and the variants of the proposed model were examined through a structural equation modeling approach.

Student loyalty

Peppers and Rogers (2005) and Zeithaml, Bitner and Gremler (2006) state that customer loyalty is an action or strategy that can win the long term competition, a way to get, retain, and increase the number of customers. According to Dharmamesta (1999); Griffin (2005); and Barnes (2003) revealed that loyal customers are reflected in their behavior on making repeat purchases within a certain period of time, and these customers have a strong emotional relationship with the product or company. Customer loyalty is manifested in various ways including commitment to repurchase or subscribe to a preferred product or service (Oliver, 1997; Reichheld and Sasser, 1990; Dick and Basu, 1994).

In the context of education, student loyalty has a short-term and long-term impact on educational institutions. Loyal students positively influence teaching quality through active participation and committed behavior (Rodie and Kleine, 2000). Willing to recommend the institution to others. In addition, more and more graduates are continuing their education at a higher level in the same higher education to increase their knowledge (Marzo-Navarro *et al* . 2005).

Service quality

According to Zeithaml, Bitner and Gremler (2018), service quality (*SQ*) is defined as a focused evaluation that reflects customer perceptions on specific dimensions from services provided. Specific perceptions on service dimension are influenced by several factors including the service quality received, product quality, price factor, situational and personal factors. 5 dimensions that determine service quality: Tangibles, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance, and Empathy (Zeithaml, Bitner and Gremler (2018).

Service quality is an important factor for developing and maintaining customer relationships (Park *et al* ., 2006). Because

it has a significant impact on customer loyalty to service companies, this construct is a major determinant of the success or failure of companies in a competitive environment (Lin *et al.* 2009). Service quality is the difference between consumers' perceptions on the services offered by a particular company and their expectations about the companies that offer those services (Chou *et al.* 2011). Lemay *et al.* (2009) suggested two main factors that affect service quality, namely: a) customer perceptions on the real service they receive (*perceived service*), and b) service that is actually expected / desired (*expected service*).

Service is the behavior of producers in order to meet the needs and desires of consumers in order to achieve satisfaction for the consumers (Kotler, 2002). According to Stanton *et al.* (2007). Services are activities or actions that can be offered by one party to another that are not physically tangible.

Kotler (2005) said that service quality is a model that describes the condition of customers in the form of expectations for service from past experiences, word of mouth promotions, and advertising by comparing the service they expect with what they receive/feel. Lemay *et al.* (2009) suggested two main factors that affect service quality, namely: a) customer perceptions of the real service they receive (*perceived service*). Quality must start from consumer needs and end at customer perception. This means that a good quality image is not based on the provider's point of view or perception, but based on the customer's point of view or perception, and b) service that is actually expected/desired (*expected service*).

Institutional Reputation

Reputation is: (a) an assessment by stakeholders of the company's ability to meet its expectations, (b) a collective system of subjective trust among members of a social group, (c) the collective trust that exists within the organization's field

(d) the visibility and stability of the media gained by the company and (e) the collective representation that many people have in mind about an organization from time to time (Alessandri *et al.* 2006). Eckert (2017) stated that a company's reputation is relatively stable and long-term as a result of a collective assessment by outsiders of a company's actions and achievements. Hoffmann *et al.* (2016), reputation reflects the bona fide of the company. Jøsang *et al.* (2007) define reputation is something that is often expressed or believed about the nature or attitude of a person.

Higher education reputation is "a subjective and collective acknowledgment or assessment of *stakeholders* towards a university, which shows their views, attitudes, evaluations, levels of trust, admiration, good feelings, and appreciation for higher education institutions from time to time as a result of past actions, which can contribute to the achievement of sustainable competitive advantage for these higher education institutions (Lupiyoadi, 2016). According to Aula and Tienari (2011), university reputation can be built in various ways, namely: "*societal significance, interdisciplinary innovativeness, and symbolic break with the past*". Instill goals to be a top university in the world and build a unique interdisciplinary university that fosters innovation relevant to business practice through research and best teaching. Emphasizes novelty and new beginnings through symbols not directly related to university. The three themes above are the three main pillars for building a university's reputation.

Service Quality and Student Loyalty

Service quality according to Parasuraman *et al.* (1985) is the difference between customer service expectations and service perceived. The theory of *customer behavior* says that customer satisfaction is the perspective of the consumer experience after consuming or using a product or

service. An effective way of measuring customer satisfaction is to assess the relationship between customer satisfaction and service quality.

According to Hsu *et al.* (2008) customer satisfaction can mediate the relationship between quality and customer loyalty. The creation of customer satisfaction is formed from the quality of service obtained by consumers in accordance with expectations/desire, can provide several benefits, including the relationship between companies/institutions and customers/students to be harmonious, providing a good basis for repeat purchases and creating customer loyalty, as well as forming recommendations. word of mouth that benefits companies/institutions, such as a higher education institution.

Institutional Reputation and Student Loyalty.

There are two elements that make up reputation according to Akhtar *et. al.*, (2016), the service quality and the work of the institution. By definition, according to Griffin (2005), when there is a repeat purchase, there is a potential for loyalty and the institution reputation is built because of the high quality of service. According to Griffin (2005), at the same time, service customers can also feel the indirect consequences of the gait of the institution that he is using his services for. Pride will arise because he feels in a great community and gets recognition from others who believe. Loyalty to remain in the community will be created by itself.

Service Quality and Institutional Reputation

According to Selnes (1993) service quality determine the reputation of an institution because that reputation can provide an attraction to attract customers. Customers who receive good quality products will feel happy and the experience will be shared with others, so that the reputation image will be stronger.

A strong reputation is an indicator of the value of product or service quality.

The dimension of service quality is one of the dimensions of reputation in educational settings, including universities. University academic reputation can be measured from reputation at the level of study programs, reputation at the institutional level and academic performance. (Wibowo, 2014).

From description of student service quality and the reputation theory of a higher education institution/university above, it can be assumed that the service quality of higher education has a direct effect on the reputation of higher education institution .

Based on the literature review stated above, it is possible to formulate the conceptual framework in Figure 1 and the following hypotheses:

H1 Service quality has a direct positive effect on student loyalty.

H2 The reputation of the institution has a direct positive effect on student loyalty.

H3 Service quality has a direct positive effect on the institutional reputation.

H4 Service quality has an indirect effect on student loyalty through the variable reputation of the institution.

2. Methodology.

Population and Sample: The population of this study were all final semester students of PGRI Palembang University who were registered in the 2018/2019 academic year, as many as 1,776 students. The number of samples is determined according to Bartlett Table, Kotrlik and Higgins, (2001) for continuous data (*continuous data*) with a margin of error of 3%, (*margin of error* = .03) and alpha 1%. The number of samples required is 185 students. Determination of respondents is done by simple random sampling (*simple random sampling*) and proportional to each study program.

Measurement : Measuring independent variables and dependent variables using a *five-point Linkert type* with alternative

respondents answers expressed in the form of interval data on a scale of 1 to five, namely: score 1 (strongly disagree), score 2 (disagree), score 3 (neutral), a score of 4 (agree) and a score of 5 (strongly agree) .

3. Research result

The results of the research are made in a theoretical model diagram, then an analysis is carried out to calculate the path coefficient using the *software algorithm SEM-SmartPLS 3.0* . Factorial analysis in the structural model and its relation to the dimensions of each variable of student loyalty, service quality and institutional reputation is carried out by calculating the *loading factor value* of each indicator on each dimension of each variable. The results of the analysis of the *loading factor values* are presented in Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Table 1. *Outer Loading Factors Variable Student Loyalty (Y)*

No. Indicator Items	Student Loyalty Variable (Y)			
	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4
Q7	1,000			
Q10		0.739		
Q11		0.792		
Q13		0.787		
Q14		0.799		
Q18		0.779		
Q20			0.838	
Q21			0.885	
Q27				1,000

From the results of PLS Alogarithm Figure 1. and the tabulation matrix, an evaluation was carried out to determine the *convergent validity* of each value of the indicator observation results. The results of the evaluation of the *convergent validity* model show that all loading values are greater than 0.7, so that all indicators are declared valid and can be used for further analysis.

PLS *Alogarithm output* against the AVE value as given in table 2 shows that the indicators in the model are declared all

valid, where all AVE values are greater than 0.5.

Table 2 *Outer Loading Factors Institutional Reputation Variables (X₂)*

No. Indicator Items	Dimensions of Var. Reputation, X ₂			
	X2.1	X2.2	X2.3	X2.4
Q73	0.769			
Q83	0.757			
Q86	0.841			
Q87	0.725			
Q91	0.757			
Q92	0.757			
Q95		0.745		
Q96		0.746		
Q97		0.740		
Q98		0.808		
Q99		0.767		
Q100		0.780		
Q101		0.782		
Q102			0.776	
Q103			0.726	
Q104			0.809	
Q105				0.743
Q106				0.794
Q107				0.720

Table 3 *Outer Loading Factors Service Quality Variable (X₁)*

No. Indicator Items	Dimensions of Service Quality Variables, X ₁				
	X _{1.1}	X _{1.2}	X _{1.3}	X _{1.4}	X _{1.5}
Q ₃₇	0.767				
Q ₃₈	0.782				
Q ₃₉	0.768				
Q ₄₀	0.760				
Q ₄₁	0.785				
Q ₄₂	0.757				
Q ₄₃		0.802			
Q ₄₄		0.717			
Q ₄₅		0.760			
Q ₄₆		0.788			

Q ₄₇		0.765			
Q ₄₈		0.727			
Q ₄₉			0.710		
Q ₅₀			0.700		
Q ₅₁			0.791		
Q ₅₂			0.786		
Q ₅₃			0.808		
Q ₅₄			0.717		
Q ₅₅			0.711		
Q ₅₆			0.802		
Q ₅₇			0.783		
Q ₆₁				0.851	
Q ₆₂				0.890	
Q ₆₃				0.852	
Q ₆₅					0.760
Q ₆₆					0.750
Q ₆₇					0.776
Q ₆₈					0.766
Q ₆₉					0.832
Q ₇₀					0.823
Q ₇₁					0.779

Table 4 Loading Factors Dimension Variable Loyalty, Service Quality and Institutional Reputation

Variable	Loading Factor
Student Loyalty (Y)	
Y ₁	0.580
Y ₂	0.899
Y ₃	0.535
Y ₄	0.694
Service Quality (X ₁)	
X _{1.1}	0.805
X _{1.2}	0.870

X _{1.3}	0.951
X _{1.4}	0.823
X _{1.5}	0.877
Institutional Reputation (X ₂)	
X _{2.1}	0.935
X _{2.2}	0.888
X _{2.3}	0.731
X _{2.4}	0.729

To ensure that there are no problems related to measurements for the structural model, the step taken is to test the unidimensionality of the model using *composite indicators reliability* and *alpha cronbach*. For these two indicators the cut-off value is 0.7. Table 1 shows that all indicators have a composite value of reliability and *Cronbach's Alpha* above 0.7. Therefore, no reliability/indimesiaoneality problems were found in the formed model, and the sub-indicators were consistent in measuring the construct.

From the validity test of the comparison of the square root values of AVE and S square in Tables 5 and 6. it is known that the constructs in the model can be said to have good discriminant validity.

Table 5. Value of AVE, Composite Reliability and Cronbachs Alpha and R Square

	AV E	Composit e Reliabilit y	Cronbach s Alpha
Quality	0.555	0.966	0.963
Loyalty	0.507	0.938	0.931
Reputatio n	0.598	0.959	0.956

Table 6. Latent Variable Correlation

var.	Qual ity	Reputa tion	Loya lty	Ro ot AV E	R Squ are
Kua	1,00			0.6	-

litas	0			86	
reputasi	0.785	1,000		0.674	0.714
Loyalitas	0.590	0.678	1,000	0.631	0.610

Table 7 Inner Model Direct Effect Value

No	Influence	coef Track	t-value	P value	Conclusion
1	Quality of Service for Student Loyalty	0.102	1.029	0.30	Not significant
2	Institutional Reputation for Student Loyalty	0.488	4.622	0.00	Significant
3	Service Quality towards Institutional Reputation	0.785	21,612	0.00	Significant

Table 8 Inner Model Indirect Effect Total Value

Influence	coef. Track	t-value	P value	Conclusion
Service Quality towards Loyalty through reputation	0.488	6.363	0.000	Significant

Hypothesis test :

Hypothesis testing (β , γ , and λ) was carried out using the *resampling Bootstrapping method* developed by Geiser and Stone in Haryono (2017). The statistic test using t statistic or t test . The results of the analysis related to the results of hypothesis testing and an explanation of

the strength of the relationship between variables involved in this analysis can be seen in Table 7 and 8.

Based on *bootstrapping results* (Tables 7 and 8) were tested on ten hypotheses. The test results show that five of the ten hypotheses proposed are supported because they have a t_{value} of >1.98 and a p value of <0.05 , which means that it has a positive and significant effect, namely H2. Institutional reputation has a direct positive and significant effect on student loyalty; H3 service quality has a positive and significant direct effect on institutional reputation, and H4 service quality significantly positive and significant indirect effect on loyalty through institutional reputation ($t_{value}=6.363>1.98$, $p_{value}=0.00<0.05$ For 1 (one) hypothesis that does not support, which means no significant effect , namely : H1 service quality does not have a direct influence on student loyalty ($t_{value}=1.029<1.98$, $p_{value}=0.304>0.05$).

A. Discussion of Research Results The Direct Effect of Service Quality on Student Loyalty

Service quality has no direct effect on loyalty. This statement is based on the path coefficient value of 0.102, the estimated T value of $1.029 < 1.96$ and the P value of $0.304 > 0.05$. The direct effect of service quality on student loyalty is only 10.2% (very low) and the remaining 89.8% is influenced by other factors. So the quality of academic services provided to students such as providing good physical facilities, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and direct attention to students that are currently being carried out have not been able to make students loyal. The results of this study are in line with the research of Dib and Mokhles (2013).

In contrast to the research of Lee-Kelley, Davies, and Kangis (2002) , Bloemer , DeRuyter, and Petters (1998) , and Chandra, Ng and Priyono (2018) , the service quality variable has a positive and significant direct influence on loyalty. The

difference in the results of this study is caused by differences in the level of service quality provided by a university to the quality of service that has not exceeded student expectations.

The influence of institutional reputation on student loyalty

The results of this study indicate that institutional reputation variable has a direct and significant effect on student satisfaction. The direct effect is 0.524, the T statistic is $6.572 > 1.96$ and the P-value is $0.00 < 0.050$. In other words, if the reputation of the institution increases or decreases by one unit, student satisfaction increases or decreases by 0.524 units, meaning that reputation has a direct influence on student loyalty and from the qualitative analysis above indicates that a high reputation, or broad recognition of the institution, is closely related with student loyalty.

Theoretically, this can be explained that the good quality of service, the wide gait of the university, the recognition of the Government, namely the National Accreditation Board, and a positive student/graduate profile can be said to be a high driving factor for students not to move or attend lectures until they finally graduate. , willing to recommend to others, willing to continue studying Masters, and maintain good relations with the college where they study. The results of this study are in line with the results of research conducted by Alves and Raposo (2010), Helgesen and Nettet (2007), and Nguyen and LeBlanc (2013) .

Through a strategy built for maintaining and keep continuing improve reputation through improving facilities and infrastructure, developing roles and obtaining various recognitions from various parties, it is clear that it is easier for a higher education institution to excel in highly fierce competition, which in the end the public's interest in choosing to study at university will be greater.

In the relation of reputation to loyalty, the most significant factor is the reputation of study program that chosen by student. That is, the better the reputation of the study program, it will automatically increase student loyalty to higher education institutions as a whole.

This study confirms the results of research conducted by Deghan *et.al* (2014) that the higher the reputation will automatically increase student loyalty.

The influence of service quality on institutional reputation

The results of hypothesis testing indicate that service quality has a direct and significant effect on the institutional reputation. The reputation of a well-known institution can increase student satisfaction and student loyalty. Good service quality is a characteristic of educational institutions that are able to improve the reputation of the institution. These results support the findings of the research by Deghan *et . al* . (2014).

Institutions with strong reputations enjoy superior market positions, although they need to continually reinvest in resources and skills to maintain their competitiveness. University administrators can handle parental or student satisfaction to achieve a good university reputation. A carefully crafted and implemented program to enhance parent/student satisfaction and the reputation of the institution will be an important tool for attracting students in the future.

Indirect Effect of Service Quality on Student Loyalty through Institutional reputation variables.

Path coefficient value of direct influence of service quality variable on reputation is 0.785 and the influence of reputation on student loyalty is 0.488, then the indirect effect of service quality on loyalty is 0.383 while the direct effect of service quality on student loyalty is 0.102, then the total effect of service quality on student loyalty is 0.488 and t statistic =

6.363, and p value = 0.00, this means that the reputation construct of the institution is said to be able to mediate in increasing the effect of good service quality. This can be seen from the increase in the path coefficient value from 0.102 to 0.488 or the increase in influence from 10.20% to 48.8%. Thus the total effect of service quality on student loyalty is 0.590 with an estimated T value = 12.145 > 1.96 and a P value = 0.00 < 0.05, which can be concluded that service quality indirectly has a significant effect on student loyalty through the variable the reputation of the institution. These results are in line with the results of research conducted by Kaura, Prasad and Sharma (2015).

4. Conclusion

Based on the study of the conceptual framework of four hypotheses. Overall, three hypotheses were found to be supported and one hypothesis was not supported. Service quality does not directly affect student loyalty. The reputation of the institution has a direct and significant effect on student loyalty. Service quality has a significant direct effect on the reputation of the institution. Service quality indirectly through the reputation of the institution has a significant effect on student loyalty. These results indicate that the quality of service provided can shape students to be loyal through the variable reputation of the institution.

Implication

Based on research findings that the quality of service is very influential on the institutional reputation. Therefore, educational institutions need to continue improving the quality of service in order to improve the reputation of the institution, and ultimately increase student loyalty.

The influence of institutional reputation on loyalty is the most significant factor. Where the higher the reputation of the institution it will be able to increase student loyalty to higher education institutions as a whole.

Student loyalty is one of the key success factors in managing higher education. Students do not transfer colleges to other places, students' willingness to recommend other people to study where they are currently studying and are willing to continue their master's degree and maintain good relations with U-PGRI are four strategic impacts of student loyalty. The findings of this study provide managerial implications in the context of increasing student loyalty.

The results of this study indicate that service quality is an appropriate instrument to measure service quality in education. In addition, because all dimensions of service quality attributes are positively correlated with reputation, educational institutions must emphasize all dimensions of service quality in maintaining and improving service quality for students.

In an effort to build student loyalty, what must be a concern for higher education management is to continue to maintain and improve the reputation of the institution and continue to strive to improve and improve the quality of service in order to provide better student loyalty.

REFERENCES

- Akhtar, N., Ahmed, I., Jafar, H. Y., Rizwan, A., & Nawaz, J. M. (2016). The impact of packaging, price and brand awareness on brand loyalty: A reseller perspective in mobile sector of Pakistan. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 5(3), 790-807.
- Alessandri, S. W., Yang, S., & Kinsey, D.F. (2006). An integrative approach to university visual identity and reputation. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 9(4), 258-270.
- Alves, H. & Raposo, M. (2010). The influence of university image on student behavior. *International Journal of Educational Management*. 24(1), 73-85.
- Aula, H.M., & Tienari, J. (2011). Becoming "world-class"?

- Reputation-building in a university merger. *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 7(1), 7-29.
- Barnes, J. G. (2003). *Secret of Customer Relationship Managemet*. Yogyakarta: Andi.
- Bartlett, J.E., Kotrlík, J.W & Higgins, C.C. (2001). Organizational Research: Determining Appropriate Sample Size in Survey Research. *Information Technology, Learning, and Performance Journal*, 19 (1), 43-50.
- Bloemer, J., Ruyter, K.,O & Peeters, P. (1998). Investigating drivers of bank loyalty: the complex relationship between image, service quality and satisfaction. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 16(7), 276–286.
- Chandra, T., Martha Ng, Chandra, S. & Priyono, I. (2018). The effect of service quality on student satisfaction and student loyalty: An empirical study. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 9(3), 109-131.
- Chou, C. C., Liu, L. J., Huang, S. F., Yih, J. M. & Han, T. C. (2011). An evaluation of airline service quality using the fuzzy weighted SERVQUAL method. *Applied Soft Computing*, 11(2), 2117-2128. Doi: 10.1016/j.asoc.2010.07.010
- Dehghan, A., Dugger, J., Dobrzykowski, D. & Balazs, A. (2014). The antecedents of student loyalty in online programs. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 28 (Iss 1), 15-35. Permanent link to this document: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-01-2013-0007>.
- Dharmmesta, B., Swastha (1999). *Loyalitas Pelanggan: Sebuah Kajian Konseptual sebagai Panduan bagi Peneliti*, (Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis Indonesia, 14(3), 73-88.
- Dib, H., & Mokhles, A. (2013). The impact of service quality on student satisfaction and behavioral consequences in higher education services. *International Journal of Economy, Management and Social Sciences*, 2(6), 285–290.
- Dick, A., Basu, K. (1994). Customer loyalty: toward an integrated conceptual framework. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Marketing Science*, 22, 99–113
- Donaldson, B. and Runciman, R. (1995). Service quality in further education; An insight into management perceptions of service quality and those of the actual service provider, *Journal of Marketing Management*, 11(1-3):243-256.
- Eckert, C. (2017). Corporate reputation and reputation risk: Definition and measurement from a (risk) management perspective. *The Journal of Risk Finance*, 18(2), 145-158.
- Fares, D., Achour, M. & Kachkar. O. (2013). The Impact of Service Quality, Student Satisfaction, and University Reputation on Student Loyalty: A Case Study of International Students In IIUM, Malaysia. *Information Management and Business Review*, 5(12), 584-590.
- Griffin, J.(2005). *Customer Loyalty, Menumbuhkan dan Mempertahankan Kesetiaan Pelanggan*, Alih Bahasa : Dwi Kartini Yahya dan dkk., Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Griffin, J., (1995), *Customer Loyalty, How To Earn It How To Keef It*, USA: A Devision Of Simon and Schukers.,
- Haryono, S. (2017). *Metode SEM untuk penelitian manajemen*, Jakarta, Luxima Metro Media.
- Helgesen, Ø. & Nettet, E. (2007). Why Accounts for Students' Loyalty? Some field study evidence. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 21(2), 126-143.
- Hoffmann, C.P., Bronn, P. S. & Fieseler, C. (2016). A good reputation: Protection against shareholder

- activism. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 19(1), 35–46.
- Hsu, G.J.Y., Lin, Y.H. & Wei, Z.Y. (2008). Competition policy for Technological Innovation in an Era of Knowledge-based Economy. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 21(8), 826–832.
- Jøsang A, Islam R, & Boyd C. 2007. A survey of trust and reputation systems for online service provision. *Decision Support Systems*, 43(2): 618-644.
- Kaura, V., Durga Prasad, C. & Sharma, S. (2015). Service quality, service convenience, price and fairness, customer loyalty, and the mediating role of customer satisfaction. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 33(4), 404-422. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBM-04-2014-0048>
- Kim, J. (2010). The link between service quality, corporate reputation and customer responses, A thesis submitted to the University of Manchester for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Humanities, Manchester Business School. Retrieved Dec.10 2017. from <http://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/40024254.pdf>.
- Kotler, P. (2002). *Manajemen Pemasaran Edisi Millenium*, Jilid I. Jakarta: Prehallindo.
- Kotler, P. (2005). *Manajemen Pemasaran*, Jilid I dan II. PT. Indeks, Jakarta.
- Lee-Kelley, L., Davies S. & Kangis, P. (2002). Service quality for customer retention in the UK Stell Industry: Old dogs and New tricks? *European Business Review*, 4(4), 276 – 286.
- Lemay, G., Larsen, P. & Johnson, D. (2009). Service quality in higher education. *Total Quality Management and Business Excellence*, 20(2), 139–152.
- Lin, S. P., Chan, Y. H. & Tsai, M. C. (2009). A transformation function corresponding to IPA and gap analysis. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 20(8), 829–846.
- Lupiyoadi, R. (2016). *Manajemen Pemasaran Jasa Berbasis Kompetensi*. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
- Marzo-Navarro, M., Pedraja Iglesias, M. and Rivera Torres, P. 2005, “A new management element for universities: satisfaction with the offered courses”, *International Journal of Educational Management*, Vol. 19 No. 6, pp. 505-26.
- Nguyen, N., LeBlanc, G. (2013). Image and reputation of higher education institutions in students’ retentions decisions. *International Journal of Education Management*, 15(6), 303-311.
- Oliver, R.L. (1993). Cognitive, Affective, and attribute bases of the satisfaction response. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20(Issue 3), 418–430.
- Oliver, R.L. (1997). *Satisfaction: A Behavioural Perspective on the Consumer*. Irwin/McGraw Hill, New York, NY.
- Parasuraman A, Zeithaml VA, Berry L., A. (1985). Conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing*, 49(4), 41-50.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. & Berry, L. (1986). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring customer profitability at the individual level, *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 22, 245 – 266.
- Park, J. W., Robertson, R. & Wu, C. L. (2006). Modelling the Impact of Airline Service Quality and Marketing Variables on Passengers’ Future Behavioural Intentions. *Transportation Planning and Technology*, 29(5), 359-381. doi: 10.1080/03081060600917686 pp. 391-418.
- Pect, Mark A. (1997). *Integrated Account Management: How Bussiness-to-*

- bussiness Marketers Maximize Customer Loyalty and Profitability*. New York: Amacon.
- Peppers, D. & Rogers, M. (2005) Return on Customer: Creating Maximum Value from Your Scarcest Resource (Random House, 2005), Retrieved Dec 10, 2018 from <http://www.returnoncustomer.com>.
- Petruzzelli, A.M. (2011). The impact of technological relatedness, priorities, and geographical distance on university-industry collaborations: A joint-patent analysis. *Technovation*, 31, 309-319
- Petruzzellis, L.& Romanazzi, S. (2010). Educational value: how students choose university", *International Journal of Educational Management*, 24(2), 139-158. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513541011020954>
- Poole, M., Harman, E., Snell, W., Deden, A. & Murray, S. (2000). ECU Service 2000: A client-centred transformation of corporate services, 00/16. Canberra: Evaluations and Investigations Programme. Higher Education Division, Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs.
- Ravald, A. & Grönroos, C. (1996). The value concept and relational marketing. *European Journal of Marketing*, 30(20), 19-30.
- Reichheld, F.F., Sasser, W.E. (1990). Zero Defections: Quality Comes to Service. *Harvard Business Review*, 68(5), 105-111
- Ristekdikti. (2016). Pangkalan Data Pendidikan Tinggi. Ristekdikti Online; <http://www.forlap.dikti.go.id>. Retrieved Oktober 8, 2016.
- Rodie, A.R. & Kleine, S.S. (2000). *Customer participation in services production and delivery in T.A.* Swartz and D. Iacobucci (eds.), *Handbook of Service Marketing and Management*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA. 111-125. Dana, S.
- Selnes, F. (1993). An examination of the effect of product performance on brand reputation, satisfaction and loyalty. *European Journal Marketing*, 27(9), 19-35.
- Stanton, W.J., Etzel, M.J., dan Walker, B.J. (2007). *Fundamentos de Marketing* (14th edition), McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc. Mexico.
- Tarus, D.K., Rabach, N. (2013). Determinants of customer loyalty in Kenya: does corporate image play a moderating role? *The TQM Journal*, 25(5), 473-491.
- Thomas, S. (2011). What drives student loyalty in universities: an empirical model from India. *International Business Research*, 4(2), 183-102.
- Wibowo, A.J.I. (2014). *Kinerja Riset Universitas, Reputasi Universitas, Dan Pilihan Universitas: Sebuah Telaah Sistematis*. *Jurnal Manajemen*, 13(2), 91-115.
- Yap, B.W., Ramayah, T., Nushazelin, W., Shahidan, W. (2012). Satisfaction and trust on customer loyalty: a PLS approach. *Business Strategy Series*, 13(4), 154-167.
- Zabala, I., Panadero, G., Gallardo, L.M., Amate, C.M., Sa´nchez-Galindo, M., Tena, I., Villalba, I. (2005). Corporate reputation in professional services firms: reputation management based on intellectual capital management. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 8(1), 59-71. Retrieved Jan 15, 2017 from <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.crr.1540239>.
- Zeithaml, V.A., Bitner, M.J. & Gremler, D.D. (2018). *Service Marketing, Integrating Customer Focus Across the Firm*. New