Service Quality in Distribution Through Academics, Administration, and Facilities, Affects Brand Performance

Arif FAKHRUDIN[1], Kifni YUDIANTO[2], You She Melly Anne DHARASTA[3]

Abstract

Purpose: The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of Service Quality on Brand Performance through Satisfaction at an aviation campus in the Special Region of Yogyakarta, Indonesia. **Research design, data, and methodology:** This research design was hypothesis testing using primary data obtained by distributing questionnaires directly to 200 respondents who were active students at an aviation campus in the Special Region of Yogyakarta, Indonesia. The analytical method used was the Structure Equation Model (SEM). **Results:** The results of this study show that: (1) there was a significant and positive relationship between Service Quality and Satisfaction, (2) there was a significant and positive relationship between Satisfaction with Brand Performance, and (3) there was a significant and positive relationship between Service Quality and Brand Performance. **Conclusion:** This study concludes that for the dimension of Academic service quality distribution from the service quality variable, it is suggested to improve detailed recording by academic teaching staff. For the dimensions of Administrative Service Quality distribution from the Service Quality variable, it is recommended to increase the hospitality in the campus environment. For the dimensions of Facility Service Quality distribution from the Service Quality variable, it is recommended to increase satisfaction in terms of facilities on campus. For the Satisfaction variable, it is suggested to improve the performance of the staff and the academic community.

Keywords: Service Quality, Distribution, Brand Performance, Satisfaction

JEL Classification Code: M31, M54, L84, I21

1. Introduction

Education is one of the most important parts of life. Currently, education is a basic need that must be met. Because by having a qualified education, people will have provisions in the competition in the world of work. With the awareness of the importance of education, people compete in gaining knowledge, both through formal education and informal education. The decision to choose a college is an investment decision.

The investment must benefit consumers after graduating from college. This is because in addition to requiring a large amount of money, studying at a university also takes a long time. Therefore, consumers will be very careful in choosing a university so that later the time and costs incurred are proportional to what they get from the service product of the university. This can usually be known from what is promoted by the university in marketing and distribution of the products and services it sells through the institution.

The new paradigm has brought campuses in the Special

1 First and Corresponding Author, Lecturer, Sekolah Tinggi
  Teknologi Kedirgantaraan Yogyakarta, Indonesia,
  Email: ariffakhrudin21@gmail.com
2 Second Author, Lecturer, Sekolah Tinggi Teknologi
  Kedirgantaraan Yogyakarta, Indonesia,
  Email: kifni.yudianto@sttkd.ac.id
3 Lecturer, Sekolah Tinggi Teknologi Kedirgantaraan Yogyakarta,
  Indonesia, Email: you.she@sttkd.ac.id

Region of Yogyakarta, Indonesia, to a competitive orientation not only at the national level but has shifted to competition between campuses globally. Currently, many foreign campuses are entering Indonesia not only to conduct comparative studies or establish cooperation but also to distribute large-scale promotions (Hamid, 2014). Amidst competition among campuses, especially among private campuses that are increasing, private campuses should become organizations oriented towards distribution or distribution to the market to produce better value or quality for consumers (Liu et al., 2006).

Service quality is a level of excellence that is felt by a person towards a service that is expected from the comparison between the desire and the perceived performance of consumers after buying the service. If the service received or perceived (perceived service) is as expected, then the service quality is perceived as good and satisfactory. Service quality is the level of expected excellence and control over these advantages to meet customer or consumer expectations. Service quality indicators include tangible, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy (Hume et al., 2006).

A brand is the identity of a product that can be used as a measure of whether the product is good and of good quality (Aaker, 2006). A product/service is said to be of good quality if it has good brand performance. When associated with a campus, a good campus should have a good brand performance. Brands are a new way for campuses to position themselves in the field of higher education (Aspara et al., 2014). Consumers see a brand as the most important part of a product/service, and a brand can be an added value to the product/service (Kotler, 2009).

Brand capacity describes the strength of the company in creating a goal (Gomes, 2003). Brand performance plays an active role to see the actual achievements of employees compared to the expected achievements of employees (Dessler, 2010). Brand performance is the result of work related to organizational goals and efficiency on a campus (Gibson, 2005).

Customer satisfaction, especially in the service sector, is a must so that the company/organization remains successful (Parasuraman, 1996). Satisfaction is a level where the needs, desires, and expectations of customers can be met which will result in continued loyalty (Kotler, 2009).

The way to distinguish a service company from other service companies is to consistently provide services of a higher quality than competitors. If performance exceeds expectations, consumers will feel very satisfied. When consumers feel dissatisfied, consumers will be reluctant to reuse the company's services (Berry, 2007). To create customer satisfaction, a service must have control over the level of excellence. The superiority of a service depends on the uniqueness and quality shown by the service (Tjiptono,

2005). Customer perception of service quality is a comprehensive assessment of the superiority of a service (Iacobucci & Ostrom, 1998).

Based on the description in the background of the problem, the problems in this study are: (1) Is there an influence of Service Quality on Satisfaction?; (2) Is there an influence of Satisfaction on Brand performance?; and (3) Is there an influence of Service quality.

2. Literature Review

2.1. The effect of Service Quality on Satisfaction

Service quality can be defined as how far the difference between reality and customer expectations for the service they receive. If the reality is the same or more than expected, the service can be said to be of high quality or satisfactory and vice versa. Service quality is something that is perceived by customers. Customers will judge the perceived quality of a service based on what they describe in their minds. Customers will switch to other service providers who are better at understanding customer-specific needs and provide better services (Nguyen & Tran, 2018).

According to Yilmaz and Ari (2017), consumer satisfaction is a perception of a product, either goods or services that provide satisfaction to him if expectations are met. Satisfaction is a feeling that arises when consumers compare their perceptions of the performance of a product or service that is higher than their expectations. Satisfaction can encourage customer action to reuse products and services offered by the company. Satisfied customers tend to reuse the products or services offered by the company. The concept of satisfaction occupies a central position in marketing thought and practice. Satisfaction is the main factor that is most felt in a quality (Cronin et al., 2000). Service Quality can improve the service quality of service, so that customer satisfaction will be created (Fornell, 1996). This is because the perception of quality and satisfaction is driven by an attitude. Research also found that Service Quality directly affects Satisfaction (Alves & Raposo, 2007). For customers who get good service, then the satisfaction provided by the service provider will also increase. Based on this description, the first hypothesis (H1) is:

H1: There is a positive effect of Service Quality on Satisfaction.

2.2. The Effect of Satisfaction on Brand Performance

According to Kotler (2009), satisfaction is a person's feeling of pleasure that arises after he compares the

performance of the product he thinks about and the performance or results he expects. If the performance is below the customer's expectations, then he will feel dissatisfied. Conversely, if performance matches or exceeds expectations, the customer will feel satisfied or very satisfied. Furthermore, Ping, Bruce, and Ching (2019) explain that the cost of retaining existing customers will be much cheaper than the cost of finding new customers. For this purpose, consumer retention is one of the company's efforts to improve product performance.

According to Swasty and Wirania (2016), Brand Performance is one of the meanings of a brand regarding how a product or service can meet the functional needs of its consumers well, the extent to which the brand can meet the needs of consumers' aesthetic and economic uses and can meet the assessments of consumers who are objective. with good quality.

In their research, Sultan and Wong (2014), tested the effect of Satisfaction on Brand Performance. According to Wong and Merrilees (2007), brand performance measures come from a managerial perspective. However, this study conceptualized both satisfaction and brand performance. The study found that customer satisfaction affects brand performance because the results of satisfaction in achieving a goal will increase in terms of sales (O'Neill et al., 2006). Thus, student satisfaction, in the context of higher education, will affect brand performance in the market in terms of satisfaction results in increasing market share. The better the brand performance, the lower the brand switching rate. Brand performance has a positive influence on the level of customer satisfaction, because the better the brand performance, the higher the level of satisfaction felt by customers with a brand (Kotler, 2009). Thus, student satisfaction, in the context of higher education, will affect the brand's performance in the market in terms of satisfaction results in increasing market share. The better the brand performance, the lower the brand switching rate. Based on this description, the second hypothesis (H2) is:

H2: There is a positive effect of Satisfaction on Brand Performance.

2.3. The Influence of Service Quality on Brand Performance

Service quality is a level of excellence that is felt by a person towards a service that is expected from the comparison between the desire and the perceived performance of consumers after buying the service. If the service received or perceived (perceived service) is as expected, then the service quality is perceived as good and satisfactory. Service quality is the level of expected excellence and control over these advantages to meet customer or consumer expectations (Hume et al., 2006).

Brand performance is generally often associated with the result of the brand equity model, brand performance is defined as the economic gain expected by manufacturers from achieving a strong brand. The elements in brand equity are assumed to be an important factor in the general performance of a brand when experiencing growth or decline. The higher the brand equity of a company will have an impact on the high tendency of customers to choose the brand so that it can increase sales (Baldauf, 2003). Brand performance shows how well the brand ranks according to consumer assessments objectively and considers price elasticity, price premium, market share, profitability, and success in the extension category as the main index of measuring brand performance (Keller & Lehman, 2003).

Wong and Merrilees (2007) suggest that Brand performance is the impact of campus performance as a brand in terms of students' perceptions in the market. This perception leads to the quality of the campus in providing services (Service Quality). A good service will produce satisfaction for its users. In this case, students will feel confident about their perceived brand performance due to the quality of service they get during college. Based on this description, the third hypothesis (H3) is:

H3: There is a positive effect of Service Quality on Brand Performance.

Table 1: Previous research

Variable		The influence between variables (previous research)	Authors, year
Service Quality	**Satisfaction**	Previous research found that service quality directly affects satisfaction.	Alves and Raposo (2007).
Satisfaction	**Brand Performance**	Previous research found that customer satisfaction affects brand performance.	Sultan and Wong (2014).
Service Quality	**Brand Performance**	Previous research found that service quality affects brand performance.	Wong and Merrilees (2007).

2.4. Conceptual Framework

This conceptual framework provides guidance in the research carried out. In the context of this research, the aim is to describe the role of Service Quality on Brand Performance through Satisfaction. The conceptual framework in this study is described as follows:

H1: There is a positive effect of Service Quality on Satisfaction.

H2: There is a positive effect of Satisfaction on Brand Performance.

H3: There is a positive effect of Service Quality on Brand Performance.

Figure 1: Research Model

3. Research Methods and Materials

This research consists of three variables, namely Service Quality, Satisfaction, and Brand Performance. This research design used hypothesis testing, namely research aiming to test research hypotheses that generally explained the characteristics of certain effects or differences between groups or the independence of two or more factors in a situation. Based on the development method, this study used cross-sectional.

Table 2: Distribution of Participant Profile

Characteristics of Respondents	Amount
Gender	
Male	75
Female	125
Age	
≤ 20 years old	63
21-23 years old	60
24-26 years old	40
4 > 26 years old	37
Study Time	
≤ semester 4	65
Semester 4 – 6	80
Semester 7 – 9	35
> Semester 9	20

This research was conducted by giving questionnaires to respondents of various ages, genders, and lengths of study by answering the statements according to the instructions. The questionnaire submitted to the respondents used a Likert Scale with measurement numbers one to five, where 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, and 5 = Strongly Agree. The total number of statement items is 41 items, namely 9 items for the PSQ variable for the Academic service quality dimension, 10 items for the PSQ

variable for the administrative service quality dimension, 7 items for the PSQ variable for the Facilities service quality dimension, 7 items for the Satisfaction Variable and 8 items for the Brand variable. performance. The sampling technique used.

The validity of a social research result is largely determined by the measuring instrument used. To overcome this, two kinds of tests were needed, namely the test of reliability and the test of validity (test of validity or validity). A reliability test is a term used to indicate the extent to which the measurement results are relatively consistent when the measurement is repeated two or more times. The reliability of the data in this study was tested using Interitem Consistency Reliability by looking at the value of Cronbach's coefficient alpha as the coefficient of reliability.

The reliability test results are shown in Table 3 below. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of each variable meets the reliability criteria recommended by Sekaran (2011), which is > 0.60. Thus, respondents' answers to the statements used to measure each of these constructs are consistent and reliable.

Table 3: Reliability Test Results

Number of Items		Koefisien	
No.　Variabel	Statement	Cronbach Alpha	Decision
1　Academic service quality	9	0.707	Reliable
2　Administrative service quality	10	0.667	Reliable
3　Facilities service quality	7	0.671	Reliable
4　Satisfaction	7	0.728	Reliable
5　Brand performance	8	0.722	Reliable

Based on Table 4 below on validity testing, it is known that the nine-statement items used in the research instrument have a p-value of 0.000 less than 0.05. The correlation coefficient ranges from 0.744 to 0.891. This can be

interpreted that each item of the statement is valid. Therefore, the relationship between statement items and the total value Service Quality variables through the distribution of Academic dimension is very strong, meaning that the statement items are suitable to be used as a variable measurement tool.

Table 4: PSQ Validity Test for Academic Service Quality Dimensions

No.	Question Items	P-Value	Correlation coefficient	Decision
1	Lecturers show a genuine interest in solving my problem in terms of academic matters	0.000	0.744	Valid
2	I see lecturers are skilled in teaching	0.000	0.837	Valid
3	Lecturers provide feedback about my progress	0.000	0.835	Valid
4	The teaching staff meets my needs	0.000	0.847	Valid
5	Overall, I evaluate the quality of service provided by the staff and lecturers on this campus	0.000	0.866	Valid
6	I received enough time for consultation with the lecturers	0.000	0.853	Valid
7	I see that the academics on this campus is knowledgeable	0.000	0.891	Valid
8	The academic background on this campus is very good	0.000	0.833	Valid
9	The academic performance is properly recorded by the teaching staff	0.000	0.856	Valid

Based on Table 5 below, it is known that the ten statement items used in the research instrument have a p-value of 0.000 less than 0.05.

The correlation coefficient ranges from 0.704 to 0.897. This can be interpreted that each item of the statement is valid. It can be concluded that the relationship between statement items and the total value of Service Quality variables through the distribution of the Administrative dimension is strong, meaning that the statement items are suitable to be used as a variable measurement tool.

Table 5: PSQ Validity Testing for Administrative Service Quality Dimensions

No.	Question Items	P-Value	Correlation coefficient	Decision
1	I see that the administrative staff provide fast service	0.000	0.897	Valid
2	I see that the administrative staff serve politely	0.000	0.805	Valid
3	The administrative staff can meet my requirement	0.000	0.887	Valid
4	I see that the administrative staff save records accurately	0.000	0.848	Valid
5	I see that the administrative staff work skillfully	0.000	0.704	Valid
6	Overall, I evaluate	0.000	0.844	Valid

Based on Table 6 below, it is known that the seven statement items used in the research instrument have a p-value of 0.000 less than 0.05. The correlation coefficient ranges from 0.753 to 0.888. According to the results, the relationship between statement items and the total value Service Quality variables through the distribution of Facilities dimension is very strong, meaning that the statement items are suitable to be used as a variable measurement tool.

Table 6: Validity Test for Facilities Service Quality Dimensions

No.	Question Items	P-Value	Correlation coefficient	Decision
1	I see that this campus has good infrastructure	0.000	0.830	Valid
2	I see that the class facilities are adequate	0.000	0.767	Valid
3	I see that this campus has up-to-date equipment	0.000	0.852	Valid
4	I see that the library facilities are adequate	0.000	0.895	Valid
5	I see that the scenic view of this campus is very good	0.000	0.753	Valid
6	The campus location is very strategic and ideal	0.000	0.888	Valid
7	I see that the classroom is very good	0.000	0.815	Valid

Based on Table 7 below, it is known that the seven statement items used in the research instrument have a p-value of 0.000 less than 0.05. The correlation coefficient ranges from 0.553 to 0.731. In general, the relationship between statement items and the total value of the Satisfaction variable is quite strong, meaning that the statement items are suitable to be used as a variable measurement tool.

Table 7: Validity Test for Satisfaction Variable

No.	Question Items	P-Value	Correlation coefficient	Decision
1	Overall, I am satisfied with this campus	0.000	0.648	Valid
2	Overall, this campus is good	0.000	0.595	Valid
3	Overall, this campus fulfills my need	0.000	0.677	Valid
4	It has been a good decision for me to choose this campus	0.000	0.617	Valid
5	Overall, I am satisfied with the performance of this campus service	0.000	0.731	Valid
6	Overall, I am satisfied with the quality which is worth the price	0.000	0.553	Valid
7	Overall, this campus provides more satisfaction than other campuses	0.000	0.675	Valid

Based on Table 8 below, it is known that eight statements are used in the research instrument. Has a p-value of 0.000 less than 0.05. The correlation coefficient ranges from 0.521 to 0.800. Therefore, the relationship between statement items and the total value of the Brand performance variable is strong, meaning that the statement items are suitable to be used as a variable measurement tool.

Table 8: Validity Test for Brand Performance Variable

No.	Question Items	P-Value	Correlation coefficient	Decision
1	The campus I chose has a reliable brand	0.000	0.720	Valid
2	A degree from this campus can be said worthy	0.000	0.800	Valid
3	The campus is performing well	0.000	0.680	Valid
4	I see that this campus has a good reputation	0.000	0.562	Valid
5	I am proud to be a student on this campus	0.000	0.610	Valid
6	A degree from this campus can improve workability	0.000	0.521	Valid
7	Graduates from this campus receive a good salary	0.000	0.720	Valid
8	The companies have received many graduates from this campus	0.000	0.711	Valid

4. Results and Discussion

The analytical tool method in this study is the Structural Equation Model (SEM) used to analyze the relationship or influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable which is forming a path. According to Ghozali and Fuad (2005), the data analysis technique using the Structural Equation Model was carried out to thoroughly explain the influence between variables in the study. In the SEM analysis technique, the program used is AMOS.

Descriptive statistical testing was carried out to explain in detail the description of respondents' answers about Service Quality, Satisfaction, and Brand performance by looking at the average value (mean), and standard deviation to show variations in respondents' answers.

Based on the Data Descriptive Testing table, the Service Quality variable has an average value (mean) of 3,720. This illustrates that the respondents feel that the quality of service provided by the campus is good. The standard deviation value is 0.373 which indicates that the standard deviation tends to be small and the data collected is clustered or in other words, the distribution of Service Quality data is said to be good.

Satisfaction has a mean value of 3.591. This explains that the better the quality of service provided, the students feel that the campus where they study is a good campus, which suits their needs and they feel that they have not made the wrong choice and do not want to move to another campus because of the performance and quality of service from the campus that is good, chosen satisfactorily, and worth the price so that they do not regret their decision to choose the campus they want. Furthermore, the average value of the standard deviation of Satisfaction is 0.496. This shows that the standard deviation value tends to be small, or in other words, the distribution of the Satisfaction data is said to be good.

Brand performance as measured by eight statement items has a mean value of 3.745. This explains that with the increase in the quality of services provided, it can be said that a brand from the aviation campus in Yogyakarta has a good and reliable performance that can create a good reputation and improve the workability of graduates so that graduates will be chosen by companies and receive good salaries. can make them feel proud to have been part of the aviation campus. Furthermore, the average value of the standard deviation of Brand performance is 0.351. This result shows that the standard deviation value tends to be small, so the data collected tends to be concentrated/centralized, or in other words, the distribution of Brand performance data is said to be good, so that the graduates

will be chosen by the company and receive a good salary that can make them feel proud to have been part of the aviation campus in the Special Region of Yogyakarta, Indonesia.

Table 9: Table of Descriptive Test Results Data

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation
Service Quality	3.720	0.373
Academic service quality	3.800	0.383
Administrative service quality	3.755	0.359
Facilities quality	3.832	0.406
Satisfaction	3.591	0.496
Brand Performance	3.745	0.351

It can be seen in the summary table of the results of hypothesis testing using the SEM method, the results of testing the first hypothesis show an R-value of 0.002 <0.05, so in this result, H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted. The value of standardized regression weights (b) shows a value of 0.432 which means that there is a positive effect of Service Quality on Satisfaction. Sultan and Wong (2014) state that Service Quality will have a positive effect on Satisfaction. Service Quality can improve the service quality of service

so that customer satisfaction will be created (Fornell, 1996).

The results of testing the second hypothesis show an R-value of 0.010 <0.05, so in this result, H0 is Rejected and H2 is Accepted. The value of standardized regression weights (b) shows a value of 0.661, which means that there is a positive effect of Satisfaction on Brand performance. Sultan and Wong (2014) stated that there is an effect of Satisfaction on Brand performance. The satisfaction found that customer satisfaction affects brand performance because the results of satisfaction in achieving a goal will increase in terms of sales (O'Neill et al., 2006).

The results of testing the third hypothesis show an R-value of 0.023 <0.05, so in this result, H0 is Rejected and H3 is Accepted. The value of standardized regression weights (b) shows a value of 0.454 which means that there is a positive effect of Service Quality on Brand performance. Wong and Merrilees (2007) suggest that Brand performance is the impact of campus performance as a brand in terms of students' perceptions in the market. This perception leads to the quality of the campus in providing services (Service Quality). If the quality of service provided is maximal, then the performance of the brand that will be seen also looks good and there is no doubt about the quality.

Table 10: Summary Table of Hypothesis Testing Results with SEM

Path Analysis		Standardized Regression Weight (β)	ρ-value	Conclusion	Decision
Service Quality	*Satisfaction*	0.432	0.002	H0 rejected	H1 supported
Satisfaction	*Brand Performance*	0.661	0.010	H0 rejected	H2 supported
Service Quality	*Brand Performance*	0.454	0.023	H0 rejected	H3 supported

5. Conclusions

Based on research conducted on the effect of Service Quality distribution through Academics, Administration, and Facilities on Brand performance through Satisfaction, the test results obtained tend to show results following the theory of Sultan and Wong's (2014) research and also have similarities with the previous theory. There is a positive effect of Service Quality on Satisfaction. There is a positive effect of Satisfaction on Brand performance. There is a positive influence of Service Quality on Brand performance.

The theoretical and practical implications of this research show that for the Academic service quality dimension distribution from the Service Quality variable, it is recommended to improve detailed recording by teaching staff to academics. For the Administrative service quality dimension distribution from the Service Quality variable, it is recommended to increase the hospitality that exists in the campus environment. For the dimensions of Facilities service quality distribution from the Service Quality variable, it is recommended to increase satisfaction in terms of existing facilities on campus. For the Satisfaction

variable, it is recommended to increase the sense of student satisfaction with the campus, by increasing the performance of staff and academics. For the Brand performance variable, it is recommended to improve campus performance well.

Based on the results of the research that has been stated previously, some suggestions can be given. First, further research is recommended to conduct in other universities. Second, further researchers are suggested to conduct research not only on educational services, but also on restaurant, bank, hotel, and tourism services. In addition, further research is expected to examine the Trust variable as a factor that affects Brand performance and to compare perceptions between international students who study in the country with domestic students within the scope of aviation.

References

Aaker, D. A. (2006). *Strategic Market Management*. New York: John Wiley and Son Inc.

Alves, H., & Raposo, M. (2007). Conceptual model of student satisfaction in higher education. *Journal Total Quality Management*, *18*(5), 571-588. https://doi.org/10.1080/147833

60601074315

Aspara, J., Aula, H. M., Tienari, J., & Tikkanen, H. (2014). Struggles in organizational attempts to adopt new branding logics: The case of a marketizing university. *Journal of Consumption Markets and Culture*, *17*(6), 522-552. https://doi.org/10.1080/10253866.2013.876347

Baldauf, S. L. (2003). The Deep Roots of Eukaryotes. *Journal of Marketing Science*, *30*(3), 1703-1706. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1085544

Berry, L. L., & Parasuraman, A. (1991). *Marketing Services.* New York, NY: The Free Press.

Cronin, J., Brady, M., & Hult, G. (2000). Assessing the effect of quality, value, and customer satisfaction on consumer behavioral intentions in service environments. *Journal of Retailing*, *76*(2), 193-218. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359(00)00028-2

Dessler. (2010). *Human Resource Management.* Jakarta: Indeks.

Fornell, C., Johnson, M. D., Anderson, E. W., Cha, J., & Bryant, B. E. (1996). The American Customer satisfaction index: nature, purpose, and findings. *Journal of Marketing*, *60*(4), 7-18. https://doi.org/10.2307/1251898

Ghozali, Imam, & Fuad. (2005). *Structural Equation Modeling.* Semarang: Diponegoro University Publisher.

Gibson, R. S. (2005). *Principles of Nutritional Assessment*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.

Gomes, F. C., (2003). *Human Resource Management*. Yogyakarta: Andi.

Hamid, H. (2014). *Social Education Research Methods*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Hume, M., Sullivan Mort, G., Liesch, P. W., & Winzar, H. (2006). Understanding service experience in non-profit performing arts: Implications for operations and service management. *Journal of Operations Management*, *24*(4), 304-324. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2005.06.002

Kotler, Philip. (2009). *Marketing Management*. Jakarta: Erlangga.

Keller, K. L., & Lehmann, D. R. (2003). Assessing long-term brand potential. *Journal of Brand Management*, *17*(1), 6-17. https://www8.gsb.columbia.edu/researcharchive/articles/5938

Lacobucci, D., & Ostrom, A. L. (1998). The Effect of Guarantees on Consumers Evaluation of Services. *Journal of Service Marketing,* *12*(5), 362-378. https://doi.org/10.1108/08876049810235405

Liu, et al. (2006). Middle school students' self-efficacy, attitudes, and achievement in a computer-enhanced problem-based learning environment. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research*, *31*(3), 246-767. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ735721

Nguyen, N. D. P., & Tran, T.D.P. (2018). Repurchase Intention: The Effect of Service Quality, System Quality, Information Quality, and Customer Satisfaction as Mediating Role: A PLS Approach of M-Commerce Ride-Hailing Service in Vietnam Marketing and Branding Research. *Journal Vancouver*, *5*(2), 78-91. https://doi.org/10.19237/MBR.2018.

O'Neill, J. W., Mattila, A. S., & Xiao, Q. (2006). Hotel guest satisfaction and brand performance: The effect of franchising strategy. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality and Tourism, 7*(3), 25-39. https://doi.org/10.1300/J162v07n03_02

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1996). A Conceptual Model of Service Quality and Its Implications for Future Research. *Journal of Marketing*, *49*(2), 41-50. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224298504900403

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1996). The behavioral consequences of service quality. *Journal of Marketing*, *60*(2), 31-46. https://doi.org/10.2307/1251929

Ping, L. H., Bruce C. Y. L, & Ching, C. C. (2019). The influence of service quality on customer satisfaction and loyalty in B2B technology service industry. *Total Quality Management and Business Excellence*, *30*(13), 1449-1465. https://doi.org/10.1080/14783363.2017.1372184

Sekaran, U. (2011). *Research Methods for Business*. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.

Sultan, P., & Wong, H. Y. (2014). An integrated-process model of service quality, institutional brand, and behavioral intentions. *Journal Managing Service Quality*, *24*(5), 487-521. https://doi.org/10.1108/MSQ-01-2014-0007

Sultan, P., & Wong, H. Y. (2014). Service quality in higher education: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences*, *2*(2), 259-272. https://doi.org/10.1108/17566691011057393

Swasty, & Wirania. (2016). *Branding Understanding and Designing Brand Strategy*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

Tjiptono, F. (2015). *Marketing Strategy*. Yogyakarta: Andi Offset.

Wong, H. Y., & Merrilees, B. (2007)*.* Multiple roles for branding in international marketing. *Journal International Marketing Review*, *24*(4), 384-408. https://doi.org/10.1108/026513307 10760982

Yilmaz, V., & Ari, E. (2017). The effects of service quality, image, and customer satisfaction on customer complaints and loyalty in high-speed rail service in Turkey: A proposal of the structural equation model. *Transportmetrica A: Transport Science*, *13*(1), 67-90. https://doi.org/10.1080/23249935.2016.1209255