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Abstract—The value of customer loyalty for the institution has the effect of decision making involving alternative available brands. More value in loyalty can minimize costs in marketing, leverage, attract new customers, be responsive in responding to threats, opportunities, opportunities, strengths from competitors. Looking at the 33-year Open University experience, the study tries to broaden our understanding of understanding college branding that focuses on diverse brand concepts. The principles of brand management and good strategies that will be used will overcome the imaging barriers of brand distance education. The methodology in this research uses Structure Modelling Partial Least Square with stratify random sampling, the number of samples 285 people through four Likert scales. The findings prove that Service Quality has a significant positive effect (5,147) on Brand Image, Service Quality has a significant positive effect (2,978) on brand trust level, Service Quality has a significant positive effect (7,719) on Brand Loyalty, Service Quality has a significant positive effect (11,489) Tangible, (9,519) empathy, (9,857) responsiveness, (15,819) reliability and (8,568) guarantees and greater than t-tables. Based on the results of the discussion of research on the Factor Analysis of the Relationship Structure between Brand Trust, Brand Loyalty, Brand Image on Service Quality shows the conclusion that Service Quality has a significant positive effect on Brand Image, Quality of Service Significantly positive effect. The level of brand trust, Service Quality has a significant positive effect on Brand Loyalty. The positive experience of students in service needs to be appreciated by UPBJJ in supporting the promotion and public education. Enhancing services is perfect to support the experience effects of new customers. From these results customers will spread good news to prospective customers / prospective students, can increase loyalty efforts by paying attention to the needs of students in improving services.

Keywords: brand trust, brand loyalty, brand image, service quality

I. INTRODUCTION

Generations’ demands in the era of complex global competition are demanded to increase competence in all fields and science. Panting and becoming a top priority for higher education is increasingly pressing in Indonesia as well as abroad in increasing the contribution and competence of human resources in gaining a portion of the work from competition. Government Regulation no. 51 of 2018 concerning the implementation of distance education in higher education that can help government programs in fulfilling the right to study for all citizens, especially areas that experience limited access. Open University (UT) is a pioneer in Distance Education (PJJ) in Indonesia, which is followed by other tertiary institutions, both PTN and PTS that have fulfilled the rules, allowing them to open competitive distance programs so that the market share and equity of Education in accordance with the mandate of the 1945 Constitution of all citizens the country gets the same education. The sense of doubt and trust of the prospective student community towards PJJ, especially associations, the popularity of a strong brand in the minds of institutional clarity, ways of learning, academic management and other administrative services provided to determine the selection of prospective customers according to what is expected. Loyalty and loyal customers are the key to the success of selling products / services in the short term but sustainable competitive advantage because customer loyalty has strategic value for the UT institution. 2017 student atrisi data shows students in 4 semesters did not register as much as 35% of the total number of students [1]. The value of customer loyalty for the institution has the effect of decision making involving alternative available brands. More value in loyalty can minimize costs in marketing, leverage, attract new customers, be responsive in responding to threats, opportunities, opportunities, strengths from competitors. Looking at the 34-year Open University experience, this research tries to broaden our understanding of our understanding of college branding that focuses on diverse brand concepts. The principle of managing a brand is a good strategy that will be used will overcome the imaging hurdles of a distance education brand. Problem Formulation Does Brand Trust Affect Service Quality Does Brand Loyalty affect Service Quality Does Brand Image Affect Service Quality. The results of this study are expected to provide some valuable things, especially insights to University leaders in building, improving service quality, maintaining trust, loyalty and a strong brand image of the university as well as positive thinking in the community. The purpose of this study is to provide input and description of how a university creates, shows and realizes the planned vision and mission.

Copyright © 2020 The Authors. Published by Atlantis Press SARL.
This is an open access article distributed under the CC BY-NC 4.0 license -http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/.
II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Brand Trust

Building and maintaining a trusting and long-lasting relationship with customers is crucial for the success of the brand in today's highly competitive global market. Because of its importance, brand trust has attracted the attention of practitioners and researchers recently. Moorman et al define trust as "a willingness to rely on an exchange partner from who has confidence" [2]. Chudhuri and Holbrook define brand trust as "The willingness of consumers to rely on the ability of brands to perform stated functions". Trust has several important benefits: trust is the willingness of the average consumer to depend on the ability of the brand to perform the functions that it expresses [3]. I am seen as multidimensional in most marketing studies and trust is reportedly involved as part of brand credibility in brand equity acceptance [4] and fundamental to the development of loyalty [5] and perhaps the most powerful relationship marketing tool a company has [6].

B. Brand Loyalty

This research has also found that customer satisfaction that has a direct effect on customer loyalty is positive. Brand loyalty is a measure of assessment in a brand [7]. Consumer brand loyalty is an option compared to other brands and customers repeat purchases of the same brand and from other brands. Likewise, brand loyalty is not constant and must be strengthened [8]. Product brand loyalty can also affect the perception of customers who are more loyal and will excel and lead from the brand as a superior value from another offering. Brand loyalty provides valuable and strategic value in the potential to reduce marketing costs, influence Commerce and the ability to attract new customers [9].

C. Brand Image

Brand image has been an important concept in consumer behaviour research since the early 1950s. Brand image has long been recognized as an important concept in marketing [10]. Brand image plays an important role in brand building. Brand image as "a series of brand associations associated with a brand's memory, usually in a meaningful way" and can be defined as a combination of consumers' perceptions and beliefs about a brand [7]. On the other hand, brand image as "a set of beliefs held about a particular brand" [11]. This set of beliefs plays an important role in the buyer's decision making process when customers evaluate alternative brands. Brand image as "a multifunctional set of tangible and intangible features, which enable consumers to identify products". Esch et al have confirmed the direct impact of brand image on consumer brand trust [12]. Lehu asserts that corporate image is the main cause of high levels of consumer confidence [13]. In addition, brand image has a positive effect on brand trust. Company brand loyalty is the result of a company's brand image [14]. Brand image was found to have a positive effect on brand loyalty [15].

D. Quality of Service

Service quality supports customer satisfaction while providing motivation and recommendations as well as promoting intention to return [16]. That is a key predictor of the future success of a business that continues to develop to have a service orientation. So, this shows the gap between consumers' initial service expectations and the actual services they receive. Parasuraman et al developed SERVQUAL as an instrument for measuring service quality [17]. This is the most commonly used approach to measuring service quality, which compares customer expectations before their service meetings with their perceptions about the actual service after their service meetings [17]. SERVQUAL has five general dimensions or factors [18]:

1) Tangibles: Physical facilities, equipment, and personnel appearance.
2) Reliability: The ability to perform promised services reliably and accurately.
3) Responsiveness: Willingness to help customers and provide fast service.
4) Guarantees: Derived from competence, courtesy, credibility, and security; knowledge and the politeness that is extended by the employee and his ability to inspire confidence and confidence.
5) Empathy: Derived from access, communication, and understanding customers, this attribute comes from caring and individual attention that the company provides to its customers.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research was conducted to analyse the main elements of brand equity at the Open University (UT), namely brand trust or brand trust level, brand loyalty, brand image that will shape quality perception, 3 types of services: academic administration, exam learning assistance. Brand trust and brand loyalty become elements of market behaviour to determine the UT's market share price. Strong brand equity allows the preference and loyalty of consumers to institutions to be stronger. A product / service that has strong brand equity can form a strong brand foundation and be able to develop the existence of a brand association. By knowing the strength of the brand, UT will obtain information that can be used as a basis for monitoring UT's marketing management. Of the three elements will have a very big influence for UT and can be seen how UT brand equity is able to compete in the world of education (see Figure 1).
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Characteristics of respondents is the identity of the respondents used as samples in the study which aims to provide an overview of the sample that has been determined and distributed questionnaires to UT students which include:

Respondent data from the registration period showed that the most 35% who filled out this questionnaire in 2016.2 were followed by students in 2018.2 and the lowest in semester 2017.1. The contribution of the 2016.1 registration year provides a strong picture of the variable level of loyalty and variable level of trust in the brand which means researchers can measure the accuracy of the quality of service in this study. The average sex is dominated by women and the remaining 49.2% are men and their status is unmarried 51.4% and 48.4% are married and the average age of them is the productive age of lectures from 18-25 years at 46.1%. Education & Employment Respondent's research data shows that productive age in college with an average education level of high school graduates and other employment sources is 38%. after graduating from high school there are many other jobs to support the lecture process such as sales marketing, operating, transportation supervisors, public figures etc. There are also respondents who work as state servants and entrepreneurs around 12% with credit transfer status from D3 to S1 with the aim of increasing competence and status as well as prestige in job careers (interview results). A person's income is a decisive indicator in continuing his studies in the diagram showing that income with high school graduates is around 2.1 million to 4 million at 54%. There are about 22 respondents who have income below less than 2 million and this can be appreciated that there is no influence between the levels of income to one's intention to continue studying. The next characteristic of information sources shows that relatives or friends are very influential in motivating to continue studying, this is inversely proportional to the effectiveness of the promotion and public education socialization through supporting media which only contributes 13% and only 0.1 percent of print media. For services that are often used in facilitating administration, 56% of respondents choose services that are in the branch office compared to entrust to friends or to the manager, only 5.4%. The popularity of UT which is reflected through the inherent associations in the minds of consumers is about the interest in learning at UT because the virtual space that is given is enough to convince consumers to join, as well as access to learning assistance such as tutorials and exams to facilitate students in obtaining information obtained and obtaining time spent flexible if you have busy work or become an entrepreneur and entrepreneur. Respondents' answers about the decision to go to college are career enhancement, competition in the world of work, administrative requirements, improvement of skills & knowledge, motivation is very strong in supporting associations about the UT brand.

A. Analysis of Structural Equation Modeling

Data analysis method will be used with the Partial Least Square (PLS) method and descriptive analysis of the three variables of brand trust, brand loyalty, brand image and service quality. This analysis is useful to describe the results obtained from the distribution of the questionnaire so that it can be interpreted as a description of the factors that can affect a respondent's loyalty through descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics is a tool that can help statistics to describe the data collected in this study. The analysis is done by transforming raw data into data forms that are easily understood and interpreted and then arranged, manipulated, and presented in a form of information. In addition, the data were analysed using the Partial Least Square (PLS) method and using SmartPLS tools. PLS is an alternative method of SEM (Structural Equation Modelling) that can be used to overcome problems in relationships. The small sample size and the use of reflexive indicators make PLS more suitable to be chosen compared to other analytical tools. The following equation is the inner model.

Fig. 1. Theoretical framework.
TABLE I. SEM ANALYSIS

| Path Coefficients (Mean, STDEV, T-Values) | Original Sample (O) | Sample Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (STDEV) | Standard Error (STERR) |
|------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| B.Loy -> Brand trust                     | 0.246               | 0.240           | 0.110                     | 0.110                  |
| B.Loy -> Citmer                          | 0.231               | 0.242           | 0.106                     | 0.106                  |
| Brand image -> Brand trust               | 0.329               | 0.318           | 0.146                     | 0.146                  |
| Responsiveness -> Customer Loy           | 0.168               | 0.167           | 0.017                     | 0.017                  |
| Empathy -> Servqual                      | 0.240               | 0.240           | 0.025                     | 0.025                  |
| Guaranty -> Servqual                     | 0.181               | 0.183           | 0.021                     | 0.021                  |
| Reliabilityity Servqual                  | 0.310               | 0.309           | 0.020                     | 0.020                  |
| Servqual -> B.Loy                        | 0.618               | 0.619           | 0.080                     | 0.080                  |
| Servqual -> Brand trust                  | 0.335               | 0.349           | 0.112                     | 0.112                  |
| Servqual -> brand image                  | 0.544               | 0.537           | 0.106                     | 0.106                  |
| Tangible -> Servqual                     | 0.310               | 0.308           | 0.027                     | 0.027                  |

| T Statistics (tO/STERR)                  |                      |                  |                           |                        |
|------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| B.Loy -> Brand trust                     | 2.240               |                 |                           |                        |
| B.Loy -> Citmer                          | 2.180               |                 |                           |                        |
| Brand image -> Brand trust               | 2.260               |                 |                           |                        |
| Responsiveness -> Servqual               | 9.857               |                 |                           |                        |
| Empathy -> Servqual                      | 9.519               |                 |                           |                        |
| Guaranty -> Servqual                     | 8.668               |                 |                           |                        |
| Reliability -> Servqual                  | 15.819              |                 |                           |                        |
| Servqual -> B.Loy                        | 7.719               |                 |                           |                        |
| Servqual -> Brand trust                  | 2.978               |                 |                           |                        |
| Servqual -> brand image                  | 5.147               |                 |                           |                        |
| Tangible -> Servqual                     | 11.489              |                 |                           |                        |

In the Table 1 as above the Path Coefficient output looks at the significance of the effect of each of the Brand Trust, Brand Loyalty and Brand Image variables and their impact on Service Quality by looking at the value of the parameter coefficient (see Figure 2):

- The magnitude of the parameter coefficient for the variable Brand Loyalty (X2) to Loyalty (original sample) 0.246 which means there is a positive influence between Brand Loyalty (X2) against (X1) Brand Trust. Or it can be interpreted that the more satisfied brand loyalty, the level of consumer brand trust will increase. Value of t - Statistic of 2.240 Significantly Positive (t table of significance 5% = 1.96). Therefore, the value of t statistic is greater than t-table 1.96 (2.240> 1.96). From the hypothesis proves there is an influence between brand loyalties on the level of trust in the brand.

- Other supporting variables about Brand Loyalty (X2) on satisfaction (original sample) 0.231 which means there is a positive influence between Brand Loyalty (X2) against (X3) Brand Image. Or it can be interpreted that the better the brand loyalty, the Brand Image will increase according to the t-Value of 2,180 which means Significantly Positive (t table of 5% significance = 1.96). Because the t-statistic value is smaller than t-table 1.96 (2.180> 1.96). The level of satisfaction affects the level of brand loyalty as evidenced by the answers to the hypothesis.

- Interpretation of the parameter coefficient for the variable Responsiveness (Xa) to Service Quality (Y1) (original sample). Effect of staff responsiveness (Xa) on (Y1) Quality of Service. Or it can be interpreted that the responsiveness of staff in providing services provided the quality of service will increase according to the t-Statistics Value of 9,857 Significant (t table of 5% significance = 1.96). Therefore, the value of t statistic is smaller than t-table 1.96 (9,857> 1.96).

- Parameter coefficients for the Empathy variable (Xb) on Service Quality (Y1) (original sample). Influence of Staff Empathy (Xb) on (Y1) Service Quality. Or it can be interpreted that the Empathy of the staff in providing services provided the quality of service will increase according to the t-Statistic Value of 9,519 Significant (t table of significance 5% = 1.96). Therefore, the value of t statistic is smaller than t-table 1.96 (9,519> 1.96).

- The magnitude of the parameter coefficient for the Guaranty variable (Xc) to Service Quality (Y1) (original sample). Effect of Guarantee (Xc) on (Y1) Quality of Service. Or it can be interpreted that the Guarantee owned by staff in providing services provided the quality of service will increase according to the t-Statistic Value of 8,668 Significant (t table significance of 5% = 1.96). Therefore, the value of t statistic is smaller than t-table 1.96 (8.668> 1.96).
The magnitude of the parameter coefficient for the variable Reliability (Xd) to Service Quality (Y1) (original sample). Effect of Reliability (Xd) on (Y1) Quality of Service. Or it can be interpreted that the reliability of the staff in providing services provided the quality of service will increase according to the value of t-Statistics of 15,819 Significant (t table significance of 5% = 1.96). Therefore, the value of t statistic is smaller than t-table 1.96 (15,819 > 1.96).

The magnitude of the parameter coefficient for the Tangible variable (Xe) to Service Quality (Y1) (original sample). Effect of Tangible (Xe) on (Y1) Service Quality. Or it can be interpreted that Tangible owned by staff in providing services provided the quality of service will increase according to the t-Statistics Value of 11,489 Significant (t table of significance of 5% = 1.96). Because the t-statistic value is smaller than t-table 1.96 (11.489 > 1.96).

The magnitude of the parameter coefficient for the variable Service Quality (Y1) to Brand Loyalty (original sample) 0.618 which means there is a positive influence between Service Quality (Y1) against (X1) Brand Loyalty. Or it can be interpreted that the higher the Quality of Service the level of Loyalty to the brand will increase. Value of t - Statistic of 7,719 Significantly Positive (t table of significance 5% = 1.96). Therefore, the value of t statistic is greater than t-table 1.96 (7,719 > 1.96).

The magnitude of the parameter coefficient for the variable Service Quality (Y1) to Brand Trust (original sample) 0.335 which means there is a positive influence between Service Quality (Y1) against (X2) Brand Trust. Or it can be interpreted that the higher the Quality of Service the level of Trust in the brand will increase. Value of t - Statistic of 2.978 Significantly Positive (t table of significance 5% = 1.96). Therefore, the value of t statistic is greater than t-table 1.96 (2.978 > 1.96).

The magnitude of the parameter coefficient for the variable Service Quality (Y1) to Brand Image (original sample) 0.544 which means there is a positive influence between Service Quality (Y1) against (X3) Brand Image. Or it can be interpreted that the higher the Quality Services, the brand image will increase. Value of t - Statistic of 5.147 Significantly Positive (t table of significance 5% = 1.96). Therefore, the value of t statistic is greater than t-table 1.96 (5.147 > 1.96).

V. HYPOTHESIS

- Service Quality Significantly positive effect (5,147) on Brand Image.
- Service Quality Significantly positive effect (2997) on the level of brand trust.
- Service Quality Significantly positive effect (7,719) on Brand Loyalty.
- Service Quality Significantly positive effect on (11,489) Tangible, (9,519) empathy, (9,857) responsiveness, (15,819) reliability and (8,568) guarantees.

VI. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the discussion of research on the Factor Analysis of the Relationship Structure between Brand Trust, Brand Loyalty, Brand Image against Service Quality shows the conclusion that Service Quality has a significant positive effect on Brand Image. Quality of Service Significantly positive effect. Towards brand trust level. Service Quality Significantly positive effect on Brand Loyalty. Service Quality Significantly positive effect on Tangible, empathy, responsiveness, reliability and guarantee, each of which has a t-table value > 1.96. The level of brand trust has an influence on the level of re-registration and has an impact on the promotion of promotion through word of mouth conducted by UPBJJ-UT. A strong brand image will form an institution that remains innovative and relevant and must ensure that it runs according to the planned vision and mission and strategy. With an effective brand image management, the sustainability of marketing success will be better. The level of brand loyalty from the experience of customers in using the services provided by UPBJJ to their students can be an effective strategy covering all expectations and goals of the customer when using the services provided.

VII. SUGGESTION

- Positive experience from students in services needs to be appreciated by UPBJJ in supporting public promotion and education.
• Enhance the service completely to support the effects of the experience of new customers. From these results customers will spread good news to prospective customers/prospective students.

• The increase loyalty efforts by paying attention to the needs of students in improving services.
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