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The objective of this study to analyze the effect of service quality and brand trust on loyalty through customer satisfaction. The Go-Jek (Go-Ride) users in Palembang were taken as respondents. This research used purposive sampling technique; the number respondents were collected, 100 respondents. The data analyzedby using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). The results of this study indicate that brand trust does not affect consumer loyalty. The suggestions in this study that the management is expected to conduct a survey to determine the needs of the desired customer and provide promotions related to the desired requirements.

**1. Introduction**

The advancement of information technology has resulted in major shocks in all business worlds. One of these shocks to businesses that use online applications. There is no one of business not touched by advances in information technology. The presence of application technology in smartphones based on Android, windows or ios operating systems has brought signiﬁcant changes in all areas, including transportation.

Smartphone application technology able to answer the needs of the community will make it easy access mode of transportation

in major cities, especially the city of Palembang. By using a mobile phone, customers can directly choose what mode of transportation will be present in front of the customer's home. Online application technology makes it easy for consumers to save time. Customers no longer need to walk to ﬁnd the modes of transportation used, simply by using the online application the consumer can already be picked up by the drivers in place. Complete with driver self-data, vehicle type, phone number, and travel rate. Customers can also see the journey to be skipped through GPS (Global Positioning System).

According to a survey conducted by YLKI (Indonesian Consumer Foundation) on the site <http://ylki.or.id/2017/07/warta->

konsumen-transportasi-online-kawan-atau-lawan/, to respond to the growing dynamic of online transportation exist in some big cities in Indonesia involving 4,668 respondents. It can be concluded that survey respondents are dominated by working age or in other words that the presence of online transport is widely utilized by those who are productive.

Also, the selection of modes of transportation for cars and motorcycles is still a consumer choice in using transportation. The

number of 4,668 customer respondents, 55 percent used online transportation of cars and motorcycles; while using motorcycles as much as 21 percent and by using the car as much as 24 percent. While the reason customers choose or use online transportation, generally can be seen in the table below.
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**Table 1.** The Customers Reasons Use Online Transportation

**Secure Cheap Fast Comfortable**

61,4% 84,1% 81,9% 78,8%

Source: ylki.or.id

From the table above can be seen that the reason customers use online transport for 84.1%. This indicates that the price factor becomes the consideration of most customers. Customers assume that online transportation is cheaper than conventional transportation.

According to a survey conducted that the frequency of its use, most customers use online transportation is as much as 2-3 times a

week that is equal to 31.6 percent. Customers' opinion and frequency of use are in line with customer opinions that assess the level of online transportation services very good (77.7 percent) and only 0.4 percent who said less good. More as shown in table 2.

**Table 2.** Customer Perceptions of Online Transport Services

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Very good** | **Enough** | **Less good** | **Very bad** |
| 77,7% | 21,8% | 0,4% | 0,1% |
| Source: ylki.or.id |  |  |  |

From the results of the survey dominant customer opinion that assessed the positive service of online transportation, does not seem to automatically remove customer disappointment, as many as 41 percent of customers claimed to have been disappointed.

The elaborated, the form of disappointment or customer complaints against online transportation services is divided into two

types; related to technology applications and human resources (drivers). From this two types of disappointment, the shape is very diverse. Based on the results of this survey indicates that the absence of minimum service standards provided by the transport operator concerned. The potential impact of customer loss is enormous. The number of customer complaints against online transport operators, indicating that; Firstly, online transport operators do not yet have a measurable minimum service standard. This resulted between the driver with each other in one operator is not the same in providing services to customers.

Second, the online transport operator does not have a complaint handling mechanism. As mandated by Law No. 8 of 1999 on

Customer Protection, the customer has the right to be heard of complaints about the use of goods/services (article 4).

The operators' competition in the online transport is also evident from the YLKI survey which says Go-Jek occupies the highest

rated customer rating, 72.6 percent; then Grab as much as 66, 9 percent; Uber is used by 51 percent and BlueBird as much as 4.4 percent. This result is not surprising given the three operators who master the application of online transport.

According to Zeithmal and Bitner (2000: 75), satisfaction is Response or response of consumers regarding the fulﬁllment of

needs. Satisfaction is an assessment of the characteristics or features of the product or service, or the product itself, which provides the level of customer pleasure associated with the fulﬁllment of customer consumption needs.

In a competitive environment, an indicator that can indicate customer satisfaction is whether the customer will buy back and use

the product in the future. Customers will be loyal to a brand if they get satisfaction from the brand. Therefore, if customers try several brands that are then evaluated whether the brand has exceeded their satisfaction criteria or not. If after a try and then a good response then it means that the customer is satisﬁed so he will decide to buy back the brand consistently all the time. This means that customers have created loyalty to the brand.

Zohaib (2014) in his research entitled "Effect of brand trust and customer satisfaction on brand loyalty in Bahawalpur" shows

that brand trust variables are the most important factor of brand loyalty. These results indicate that the customer is already fulﬁlled in return for brand trust. In this study illustrates the positive and signiﬁcant relationship between brand trust variables to loyalty. Other research conducted by Bakti and Sumaedi (2017) in his research entitled P-TRANSQUAL: a service quality of public land transport services, in the quality of service, proved to have good validity and stability to measure the quality of paratransit services in Indonesia.

However, in a study conducted by Berlianto (2016) in his research entitled the inﬂuence of e-service quality, e-satisfaction and

e-trust on e-loyalty, Go-jerk found that ease of use, e-scape, responsiveness, customization and assurance which is the ﬁfth quality of electronic services used in this research has no positive effect on e-satisfaction, e-satisfaction has effect on e-trust, e-trust has no effect on behavioral loyalty, affective loyalty, cognitive loyalty, and conative loyalty.

Similarly, research conducted by Kiswara (2017) in his research entitled analysis of service quality, customer satisfaction, trust,

commitment and customer loyalty in e-commerce services (study on traveloka customer service) shows that brand trust does not affect loyalty. High brand loyalty can increase sales and attract new customers because they have conﬁdence that buying branded products can minimize the risk at least

. The existence of loyal customers on the brand is necessary for companies to survive. Keeping brand loyalty a strategic effort is

more effective than attracting new customers. According to Rangkuti (2002) brand loyalty is a measure of customer loyalty to a brand. The importance of brand loyalty is that customers do not move to other products and always make purchases on the brand.

Based on the above, this research is conducted with the aim to analyze the quality of service and brand trust on loyalty through

customer satisfaction. Quality of service and brand trust on an online transportation service is important to be analyzed because based on the research stated that the quality of service and brand trust affect the loyalty and satisfaction of the consignment.

**2. Literatur Review**

*2.1. Service Quality*

Service Quality is an abstract and elusive construct because of three features for service: intangibility, heterogeneity, and the inability of production and consumption (Parasuraman et al., 1985, 1988). Meanwhile, according to Zeithaml (1988), service quality is the assessment of the customer to the superiority or overall service excellence. Therefore, the quality of land transport services is an overall passenger evaluation of the performance of public transport. The higher the public transport service performance, the more positive the perception of passengers on the quality of service from public transport services and vice versa.

*2.2. Brand Trust*

According to Chi, Yeh, and Chiou (2009, p231) say that Brand trust means customers who believe that a speciﬁc brand will offer a highly reliable product, such as complete functionality, quality assurance, and after-sales service to them.

*2.3. Customer Satisfaction*

The deﬁnition of customer satisfaction by Kotler (2014: 150) is the feeling of pleasure or disappointment that comes after comparing the performance of the thought product to the expected performance (or outcome).

From the deﬁnition if the services provided are not in accordance with the expectations of customers Go-Ride and if

expectations are set too low, then consumers will feel dissatisﬁed and disappointed, if the performance in accordance with expectations then customers will feel satisﬁed, which is given beyond expectations, then the customer will feel happy and very satisﬁed.

According to Giese and Cote in Literature and Customer View Satisfaction contains signiﬁcant differences in the deﬁnition of

satisfaction, all deﬁnitions share some common elements. When examined as a whole, three common components can be identiﬁed: 1) customer satisfaction is response (emotional or cognitive); 2) the response is related to a particular focus (hope, product, consumption experience); and 3) response occurs at a given time (after consumption, after selection, based on accumulated experience). Customer responses follow a common pattern similar to literature. Satisfaction consists of three basic components, a response related to a particular focus that is determined at a given time.

*2.4. Customer Loyalty*

The opinion of Oliver in Chaudhuri and Holbrook (2012: 27) deﬁnes customer loyalty as a strong commitment to repurchase a product or service consistently in the future.

According to Grifﬁn (2010: 291) There are ﬁve factors that cause customers loyal to products / services used are: 1) Brand

value; Customer perceptions that compare between the cost or the price to be borne and the beneﬁts it receives. 2) customer characteristics; Characteristics of customers in using the brand. Every individual has different characteristics than the other invidus. 3) Service Quality; Customer perceptions concerning the quality of service experienced if qualiﬁed then have a positive effect. 4) Customer satisfaction; Associated with the consumer experience when making contact with the brand he uses. This factor is very important, but customer satisfaction alone is not enough to cause a customer to remain faithful to a brand. 5) Trust; It concerns the extent to which the competitive competition between trust in a category of product or service.

*2.5 Relationship Quality of Service and Customer Loyalty*

Wijayanti (2007) states that customer satisfaction can increase the buying intensity of the customer. The creation of an optimal level of customer satisfaction then encourages the creation of loyalty in the minds of customers who feel satisﬁed. Customer loyalty is seen as the strength of the relationship between the relative attitude of a person and a repeat business. Hallowell (1996) states that satisfaction has a positive inﬂuence on customer loyalty. The same is expressed by Darsono Weellyan (2007) that satisfaction has a positive association with loyalty, but with a note of increased satisfaction does not always result in increased loyalty to the same degree.

H1 = Service Quality positively affects Customer Loyalty.

*2.6. Brand Trust Relationship and Customer Loyalty*

Morgan and Hunt (1994) say that trust and commitment are key to building loyalty. According to Aaker (Maylina, 2003), customer loyalty will arise when there is trust from customers to the product brand so that there is communication and interaction among customers is by talking about the product. The relationship between variables with customer loyalty is, the higher the customer's conﬁdence in a product, the higher the level of customer loyalty to a brand. The commitment of customers to the product is a trust in using a product that includes recommendations and beliefs. Thus the higher the level of consumer loyalty to a brand. Customer commitment to the product is a belief in using a product that recommendations and trust. Indirectly companies can utilize contact relationships, specialization, and scale economic operations of employees with customers to increase customer commitment to the product brand (Aaker in Maylina, 2003).

H2 = Brand Trust has a positive effect on Customer Loyalty.

*2.7. Relationship of Service Quality and Customer Satisfaction*

Customer satisfaction is a stand-alone construct and inﬂuenced by the quality of service, as well as customer loyalty inﬂuenced by the quality of service (Oliver, 1980 in Aryani and Rosinta, 2010). Aryani and Rosinta (2010) state there is a strong and positive inﬂuence between the variable quality of service to customer satisfaction. Service quality can also inﬂuence customer loyalty directly (Zeithmal et al., 1996; Japrianto et al., 2007) and indirectly affect customer loyalty through customer satisfaction (Samuel and Wijaya, 2009). The same opinion was expressed by Hallowell (1996) that satisfaction has the potential to build loyalty. Customer satisfaction is the key to creating customer loyalty.

Akbar and Parvez (2009) stated that the factors that form customer loyalty are the quality of service, trust and customer

satisfaction. A similar opinion is also put forward by Hallowell (1996) which suggests that customer satisfaction is a prerequisite of customer loyalty. Loyal customers have a lower tendency to switch brands, less price sensitive, buy more frequently and more, become the strong word of mouth, create business referrals.

H3 = Service Quality positively affects Customer Satisfaction.

*2.8. Relationship of Brand Trust and Customer Satisfaction*

Asseal (1998), customer satisfaction arises when customer expectations are by the purchase decisions that have been made. Satisfaction can be felt after individuals buy and use products or services provided by a company (Ritonga: 2011). While the belief of a brand comes after customers buy and consume and feel satisﬁed with a product. Brand belief emerges from past experiences and consumer interactions with products (Garbarino and Johnson: 1999). Trust is a collection of knowledge and experience with the brand. If customers are satisﬁed with a product or service based on experience, then customers will feel conﬁdent in the brand they buy. Based on research conducted by Singh and Sirdeshmukh (2009) on the theory of social change, satisfaction after consuming a product or service has a positive relationship directly to customer conﬁdence in the brand of the product or service.

H4 = Brand Trust has a positive effect on Customer Satisfaction.

*2.9. Relationship of Customer Satisfaction and Customer Loyalty*

Customer satisfaction is an encouragement of individual desire directed to the goal to obtain satisfaction Customers will be loyal to a product or service offered when he gets satisfaction from the product or service. This is by the proposed Dick and Basu et al. (1994) in Lupiyoadi (2006) that customer satisfaction is a factor affecting customer loyalty.

The relationship between Customer Satisfaction with Customer Loyalty is, The higher the customer satisfaction, the higher the

loyalty of the customer to remain loyal to use the product. Supported from previous research by Suryanti (2007), where satisfaction has a signiﬁcant inﬂuence on customer loyalty.

H5 = Customer Satisfaction has a positive effect on Customer Loyalty.

*2.10. Relationship Quality of Service to Loyalty through Customer Satisfaction*

According to academics, customer satisfaction is a stand-alone construct and is inﬂuenced by the quality of service (Rosinta et al., 2010). Service quality can also affect customer loyalty directly (Zeithaml et al., 1996) and indirectly affect customer loyalty through satisfaction (Caruana, 2002)

H6 = Service Quality positively affects Loyalty through Customer Satisfaction

*2.11. Relation of Beliefs to Loyalty through Customer Satisfaction*

Trust and commitment are the mediating variables in the long-term relationship between the company and the customer (Morgan and Hunt, 1994). Based on research conducted by Tezinde et al. (2001) that trust and satisfaction will affect the relationship with customers and loyalty.

H7 = Brand Trust has positive inﬂuence Loyalty through Customer Satisfaction.

*2.12. Research Thinking Framework*

Previous research used as a reference in preparing the variables in this study, the research conducted by I Gede Mahatma Yudha Bakti and Sik Sumaedi (2013) using P-TRANSQUAL; Comfort, Tangible, Personnel, and Reliability. Kiswara (2017) uses service quality, customer satisfaction, trust, commitment, and loyalty. This research will analyze the inﬂuence of service quality variables, Brand Trust, Customer Satisfaction and Consumer Loyalty. Figure 1 shows the frame of mind in this study.
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**Figure 1.** Research framework

**3. Research Methods**

The writer used a causal design to conduct this study. The population of this study was college students who have Go-Jek application. This research used a purposive sampling technique. Purposive sampling is sample determination technique with a certain consideration. The criteria in the sampling in this study were: 1) Students who are conducting studies in public and private universities. 2) Have a Go-Jek application and already have a user ID. 3) Have used Go-Ride services at least three times. The samples used in this study were 100 respondents.

The data types in this study were used: a) Quantitative data, comes from questionnaires given to customers who use Go-Jek services especially

Go-Ride, b) Qualitative data, Qualitative data used in this study are: Go-Jek-related data especially Go-Ride.

The data sources in this study using primary data and secondary data. The primary data used in this study were obtained from questionnaires

distributed through surveys. The questionnaire includes questions relating to service quality, brand trust, consumer satisfaction, and Go-Jek (Go- Ride) customer loyalty in Palembang City. Meanwhile, the secondary data used in this study is Go-Jek user data, the number of consumers who have used the Go-Ride and Rating provided by the customer to the driver.

Survey to a ﬁeld is a method in this research. The writer distributed the questionnaire is a list of questions asked to students of UNSRI

Palembang campus and the Tridinanti University of Palembang to obtain data relating to research, the respondents asked to ﬁll out questionnaires according to the guidelines that have been provided. This questionnaire is intended to obtain data in testing the hypothesis.

The data analyzed by using SEM (Structural Equation Modeling) program AMOS 16. Some of the steps done through AMOS program is to

test SEM assumption (normality test, multicollinearity test, and outliers test). The data analysis is also done by using the SPSS program.

**4. Result and Discussion**

**Figure 2.** AMOS Program Output

Source: Results of the research, 2018

Based on Table 3 obtained a Chi-square value of 141.007 with p-value 0.160. Because the p-value generated is greater than α =

5%), then the model is said to be ﬁt. The GFI ﬁt index, AGFI, TLI, and CFI yielded values of only 0.979; 0.906; 0.971 and 0.916. Due to GFI, and TLI greater than 0.90, it indicates that the model is ﬁt. The value of CMIN / DF obtained is 1.609, the value is <2.00 and indicates that the ﬁt model and RMSEA value is 0.162. Because this value is smaller than 0.8, then the model is said to ﬁt. According to Haryono & Wardoyo (2012: 116), from several models feasibility test, the model is said to be feasible if at least one of the feasibility test methods of the model is fulﬁlled. While AMOS test results from the Full Model is already ﬁt in Table 3 below:

**Table 3.** The test results from Amos Full Model Fit

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Regression Weights Results** | Estimate | S.E. | C.R. | P |
| Customer satisfaction |  | Service quality | .236 | .124 | 2.235 | .021 |
| Customer satisfaction | Brand trust | .221 | .121 | 2.651 | .026 |
| Customer loyalty | Service quality | .224 | .497 | 3.659 | .006 |
| Customer loyalty | Customer satisfaction | .024 | .469 | .117 | .735 |
| Customer loyalty | Customer loyalty | .270 | .744 | 2.128 | .033 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standardized Regression Weights** | **results**  |  | Estimate |
| Customer satisfactionCustomer satisfaction Customer loyalty Customer loyaltyCustomer loyalty **Correlation results** Service quality | Service qualityBrand Trust Service quality Brand trustCustomer satisfaction | .453.322.114.015.100 |
|  | Estimate |
| <--> Brand trust | .727 |
| **Hasil Uji Square Multiple Correlations** | Estimate |
| Customer satisfaction | .522 |
| Customer loyalty | .008 |

Source: AMOS test result (2018)

Based on the results from Table 3 it can be seen that for the ﬁrst hypothesis obtained a value of t-Value or C.R amounted to

3.659> 1.967 or P value 0.001 <0.05 then H1accepted, so it can be concluded that Service Quality affects Customer Loyalty. The results of this study are in harmony with Hallowell (1996) which states that satisfaction has a positive inﬂuence on consumer loyalty.

Results of the second hypothesis test obtained t-Value or C.R 0.117 <1.967 or P value 0.735> 0.05 then H2 rejected, so it can be

concluded that Brand Trust does not affect Customer Loyalty. This study corroborates research Kiswara (2017) where the results of his research said that trust does not signiﬁcantly affect customer loyalty.

The third hypothesis testing result obtained that t-Value or C.R2.235> 1.967 or P value 0.021 <0.05 then H3 accepted, so it can

be concluded that the Quality of Service inﬂuence on Customer Satisfaction. The results of this study are consistent with the results of previous research, where the Quality of Service has a positive and signiﬁcant impact on Customer Satisfaction. The research was conducted by Aryani and Rosinta (2010), Kassim et al. (2009), Omar Cashier (2011), Wendha, et al. (2013) and Kiswara (2017.) The fourth hypothesis in getting t-Value or C.R 2.635> 1.967 or P value 0.021 <0.05 then H4 accepted, so it can be concluded that the Brand Conﬁdence effect on Customer Satisfaction. This result is in line with research conducted by Kiswara (2017).

From Table 3 we get the result for the ﬁfth hypothesis that is t-Value or C.R 2.651> 1.967 or P value 0.026 <0.05 then H4 is

accepted, so it can be concluded that Customer Satisfaction affects Customer Loyalty. The ﬁndings of this study are following the proposed Dick and Basu et al. (1994) in Lupiyoadi (2006) that customer satisfaction is a factor affecting customer loyalty.

The results of the sixth hypothesis obtained the result that the value of indirect effect of Quality of Service to Customer Loyalty

through Costumer Satisfaction obtained value t arithmetic for Hypothesis 1 of 3.659 x 2.128 = 7.7863 and the value of t arithmetic Hypothesis 3 of 2.235 x 2.128 = 4.756. Results of the second calculation t hypotesiss> 1.96, so the hypothesis accepted. This result is in line with Caruana (2002).

The seventh hypothesis obtained a result that the value of indirect inﬂuence of Brand Trust to Customer Loyalty through

Customer Satisfaction, obtained t value for Hypothesis 2 of 0.117 x 2.128 = 0.2489 and the value t arithmetic Hypothesis 4 of 2.651 x 2.128 = 5.641, Hypothesis 5 2.128 x 2.128 = 4,528. The results of the third calculation t arithmetic hypothesis are only two that the value of t>> 1.96, so the hypothesis accepted. This result is following research conducted by Tezinde et al. (2001) that trust and satisfaction will affect the relationship with customers and loyalty.

**5. Conclusion and Suggestion**

*5.1.Conclusion*

This study aims to identify the effect of service quality and brand trust on loyalty through customer satisfaction. The results of this study indicate that of the seven hypotheses prepared; there is one hypothesis that is rejected the inﬂuence of brand trust on loyalty.

*5.2. Suggestion*

Based on the research results can be concluded into short-term and long-term suggestions. For short-term suggestions, 1) management is expected to conduct socialization to the drivers by explaining how the importance of customers to continue to use Go-Ride services, 2) Conduct continuous updates to the customer promo, 3) Provide knowledge of route to drivers, 4) Conducting a customer survey of the prime activities the customer wants. As for long-term advice, 1) Go-Jek must improve the network of online applications, 2) Management should involve Go-Ride partners in decision-making, especially on the online motorcycle taxis, 3) Go-Jek must improve the ability to understand customer needs and more proactive (making the service as a corporate culture).
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