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Abstract
This study explores the student orientation, higher education image, perceived value, satisfaction and student trust at the higher education. The authors hypothesize a significant effect between variables. Data from 347 samples are used to empirically test the hypothesized effects with multi-stage cluster sampling. The results provide evidence of a significant impact between student orientation, student perceived value, and student satisfaction. Higher education image has a significant influence toward satisfaction, perceived value has a significant effect toward satisfaction and trust, student satisfaction has a significant effect toward student’s trust
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Introduction
Research in the service marketing has developed quickly into rampant marketing theory (Ng & Forbes, 2009: 45). The service logic explain that it refers to a certain of activities (Gronroos, 1988), consisting of “deeds, processes and performance” (Zeithaml et al., 2006: 4). Marketing concept was applied by universities to gain competitive advantage (Hensley-Brown & Oplatka, 2006). All higher education in most countries is a non-profit sector, the marketing concepts applied to the sector do not function as in the business sector (Nicolescu, 2009: 37), but most of what has been investigated for services which is operationable in the education context (Ng & Forbes, 2009: 45). In service organization, customer trust is an important guarantee for long life survive. Building confidence is important in nearly all form of the relationship (Zakaria et al., 2011: 8876).

Many literatures identified that trust is a complicated construct because it has not yet perceived in a unified definition (Lin et al., 2013; Seto-Pamies, 2012), dynamic and multi-faceted (Amin et al., 2013). Morgan and Hunt (1994) reveal that trust occurs when one party has a reliability in an exchange partner’s reliability and integrity. Trust could be prerequisite to form and maintain a long time relationship between company and trust, mainly in service market (Martinez & Bosque, 2013; Sirdeshmukh et al., 2002; Morgan and Hunt, 1994). In a more advance education context, Hennig-Thurau et al. (2001: 335) defined student’s trust as “the students’ confidence in the university’s integrity and reliability.” Trust at higher education context is resulting from students experience with institution’s employees (Rojaz-Mendez, 2009). Another definition of student’s trust proposed by Ghosh et al. (2001: 325), student trust is “the degree to which a student is willing to rely on or have faith and confidence in the college to take appropriate steps that benefit him and help him achieve his learning and career objectives.” Previous literatures explain that customer trust is influenced by customer satisfaction (Jiao et al., 2012, Mosavi dan Ghaedi, 2012). In higher education sector, student’s trust is affected by student satisfaction (Rojas-Méndez et al., 2009). Its satisfaction is “the favourability of a student’s subjective evaluation of the various outcomes and experiences associated with education” Elliott & Shin, 2002: 198).

Its satisfaction is influenced by the value perception (Alves and Raposo, 2006; Ledden et al., 2007; Brown and Mazzarol, 2009; Brady and Cronin, 2001). Value is “the consumer’s overall assessment of the utility of a product based on perceptions of what is received and what is given” (Zeithaml, 1988:14). Customer value explicit by situasional, depend on where the exchange context was happen (Sampaio et al., 2012).

The organization will be vivid if it have a long life relationship with its customer although the organization should created an extraordinary value for the customer (Narver dan Slater, 1990), the value would be influenced by the customer satisfaction (Woodruff, 1997). So, Creating the sustainable superior value for the customer take place the important part of the organization (Deshpande et al., 1993; Slater dan Narver, 1994). “To create superior value for buyers continuously requires that a seller understand a buyer’s entire value chain”. (Slater and Narver, 1994: 22). Customer concentration is “the set of beliefs that puts the customer’s interest first, while not excluding those of all other stakeholders such as owners, managers, and employees, in order to develop a long-term profitable enterprise” (Deshpande et al., 1993: 27). Student orientation is “the degree to which a college/university take actions and make decisions based upon the needs of the students as well as the goal and objectives of the institution” (Bristow & Schneider, 2002: 21). The superior value influenced by institutional image (Sanchez-Fernandez et al., 2010; Brown & Mazzarol, 2009; Alves & Raposo, 2006).

The aims of the study are (1) To examined the implication of student orientation toward student perceived
value and student satisfaction at private higher education in Aceh; (2) To examined the impact of higher education image toward student satisfaction at private higher education in Aceh; (3) To examined the impact student perceived value toward student satisfaction and student trust at private higher education in Aceh; (4) To examined the impact student satisfaction toward student trust at private higher education in Aceh.

**Literature Review**

In order to write literature review, this articles refers to articles related toward student orientation, higher education image, student perceived value, student satisfaction and student trust.

**Student Orientation**

It is referring to as “The degree to which a college/university take actions and make decisions based upon the needs of the students as well as the goal and objectives of the institution” (Bristow & Schneider, 2002: 21). Student orientation concept at higher education developed by Bristow and Schneider (2002), consisting of eight indicators: (1) the higher education provided the useful lessons; (2) handling complain immediately; (3) help me to achieve the goal; (4) provided qualified service; (5) care about my family finance; (6) give me a good experience in studying; (7) feels that the student are important; and (8) aware that the requirements of students are as crucial as those of lecturer and staffs.

**Higher Education Image**

It is “a holistic and vivid impression held by an individual or a particular group towards an organization and is a result of sense-making by the group and communication by the organization of a fabricated and projected picture of itself” (Hatch & Schultz, 1997: 359). Organization image is “the result of an aggregate process by which the public compares and contrasts the various attributes of organization” (Nguyen & LeBlanc, 2001: 303). Higher education image is “the sum of all the beliefs an individual has towards the university” Duarte et al., 2010: 23). And Polat defined that higher education image is “the vision, picture, or impression that is formed in individuals’ mind, based on the data and information they gather through their interactions with the elements of an organization” Polat and Hezer, 2011: 257).

Image indicators for the research was adapted Nguyen and LeBlanc (2001), Quoquab et al. (2013) and Hussain et al. (2014). There were: (1) the society are proud for the higher education; (2) I hear the positive things about the higher education; (3) the higher education offer the benefit for the society; (4) the higher education is innovative; (5) the higher education is forward-looking; (6) the higher education is known as the right place for study; (7) the higher education has the better image that other private university in Aceh; (8) the higher education is famous in Aceh.

**Student Perceived Value**

It is “the consumer’s overall assessment of the utility of a product based on perceptions of what is received and what is given” (Zeithaml, 1988: 14). Value is “refers to the consumer’s anticipations concerning the outcome of purchasing and using a product or service taking into account both benefit and sacrifice” (Spreng et al., 1993:52). This is “the difference between the prospective customer’s evaluation of all the benefits and all the costs of an offering and the perceived alternatives” (Kotler dan Keller, 2009: 161). Indicators for perceived value variable was adapted from LeBlanc (1999), Ledden et al. (2007); Ledden & Kalafatis (2010); Lai et al. (2012). They were: (1) cost for tuition fee is suitable with benefit I receive; (2) the money I spend for study is reasonable; (3) my sacrifice for time is suitable with the benefit I receive; (4) I interested with the lessons content; (5) I learn the new things from the study; (6) the course contents contributes to the high value of my education; (7) Academic guidance from the lecturer has an effect on the value of may education; (8) I proud to be the student of the higher education; (9) I am glad that I get the study at this higher education; (10) taking study at the higher education was improve my self-confidence.

**Student Satisfaction**

Satisfaction is “the consumer’s affective reaction to the overall experience of purchasing and using a product or service” (Spreng et al., 1993:52). That is “the potential wish of a student’s independent evaluation of the various outputs outcomes and experiences related to education (Elliott & Shin, 2002: 198). To measure student satisfaction, the researchers develop the indicators such as Casidy (2014), Li (2013), Rojas-Mendez et al. (2009), Hennig-Thurau et al. (2001), Athiyaman (1977). This research adapted the indicators from some of the authors above. There are: (1) option to enroll in the institution was a correct one; (2) satisfied with decision on attending at the higher education; (3) satisfied with the service; (4) service quality is exceeded from my expectation; (5) study in this university is suitable with I wish; (6) overall, I am satisfied in study; (8) the content of the study is suitable with I wish.
Student Trust

It is referring to “as existing when one party has confidence in an exchange partner’s reliability and integrity” (Morgan & Hunt, 1994: 23). Student trust is “the degree to which a student is willing to rely on or have faith and confidence in the college to take appropriate steps that benefit him and help him achieve his learning and career objectives” (Ghosh et al., 2001: 325), and Hennig-Thurau et al. (2001:335) define “student trust is the students’ confidence in the university’s integrity and reliability”.

Trust indicators examined by Carvalho and Mota (2010), Sampaio et al. (2012), and Perin et al. (2012). This research adapted the indicators from Carvalho and Mota (2010), Sampaio et al. (2012), and Perin et al. (2012). The indicators are: trust that the lecturer is expert, has an integrity, responsive, and reliable and trust that the employee is expert, has an integrity, responsive, and reliable.

Based on the literature, trust is influenced by satisfaction (Rojas-Mendez et al., 2009) satisfaction is influence by value (Alves and Raposo, 2006; Ledden et al., 2007) and value is influence by customer orientation (Valenzuela et al. (2010; Lee et al., 2010; Blocker et al., 2011). Inspite of many surveys about the relationship between these variables but was a little attention in the higher education context.

Previous research explained that there was a correlation between market orientation and perceived value (Valenzuela et al., 2010; Lee et al., 2010). Although the relationship between market orientation and perceived value established, it was a few research in higher education context. Based on the literature review it can be formulated research hypotheses as follows:

**H1. Student orientation has a significant effect toward student perceived value**

Previous study explained that it has a significant influence toward satisfaction of buyers in business sector (Ndubisi, 2012; Chung et al., 2014). but has a week significant effect at higher education sector (Mavondo et al., 2004). Based on literature, there is important to reexamine the influence of student orientation toward student satisfaction.

**H2. Student orientation has a significant effect toward student satisfaction**

Previous research explained that it has a relation between institutional image and student satisfaction (Chen, 2010; Tu et al., 2012; Chung et al., 2014). Although the correlation between both variables was established, it has a little attention toward higher education context (Temizer, 2012).

**H3. Higher education image has a significant influence toward student satisfaction**

The influence of value toward customer satisfaction has a great attention among researcher (Blocker et al., 2011; Yang et al., 2014), were explained that it value has an effect toward customer satisfaction at business sector. At higher education sector, value perception has a significant effect toward satisfaction (Ledden et al., 2007; Brown and Mazzarol, 2009). But Dib & Alnazer (2013) explain that value has a week influence toward student satisfaction.

**H4. Student perceived value has a significant effect toward student satisfaction**

Eventhough it has various researchs regarding the relationship between two variables as stated (Mosavi and Ghaedy, 2012; Karjaluoto et al., 2012; Chinomona et al., 2013) but has a little attention at higher education sector.

**H5. Student perceived value has a significant effect toward student trust**

This significant relationship has been confirmed that by previous researchers (Mosavi and Ghaedi, 2012; Chu et al., 2012; Amin et al., 2013). A few study was explained that student satisfaction has a significant influence toward student trust at higher education (Rojas-Mendez et al., 2009).

**H6. Student satisfaction has an influence on student trust**

Based on the literature and hypotheses, the conceptual framework proposed as shown at Figure 1.
register, age, gender and source of finance, (2) student orientation consisted of 8 indicators, (3) higher education image consisted of 8 indicators, (4) student perceived value 10 indicators, (5) student satisfaction 7 indicators, and (6) student trust 8 indicators.

Data collection
The population of the research were student at the private education in Aceh consisting of 109 institutions (www.forlap.dikti.id). Sampling technique for the research is two-stage cluster sampling. The first step is classifying the higher education based on zone. The higher education devided into university, higher education and academy. The second step is classifying higher education based on zone and choosing the sample based on selected zone. Total sample for the research refer to Hair et al. (2010). The data were collected from personal interview using questionnaires. The period for data collection was from March to April 2017. The data were analyzed with SPSS and SEM-AMOS as an analytical tool.

Results and Discussions
Research respondents were students at privat higher education in Aceh. All respondents was undergraduate students consisted of 347 students. Based on the registered year, majority of students registered at 2014 there were 74 (37%), registered at 2013 there were 70 (35%), registered at 2015 there were 47 (23.5%), finally who registered at 2011 and 2012 there were 5 (2.5%) and 4 (2%). Regarding to gender, most of the informants were female 113 (56.5%) and male 87 (43.5%). Based on age, 110 (55%) respondents in 20-21 years old, 57 (28.5%) in 22-23 years old, and 33 (16.5%) respondents in 23 years old and above. Based on source of studying fee, 161 (80.5%) from parents, 30 (15%) from themselves, only 9 (4.5%) from scholarship.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) Student Orientation
CFA was the first step in structural equation modeling approach (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988). The outcome of CFA for student orientation variable consisting of eight indicators shown that standardized regression weight value for indicators x 11, x 12, x 13 were under 0.5, so these indicators should be removed from the calculation, then the model was re-examine with 5 indicators (x14, x15, x16, x17, x18). The result show that the standardized regression weight value was above 0.5. The goodness of fit for student orientation variabel indicate that the model was acceptable with probability (0.076), GFI (0.983), AGFI (0.938), CFI (0.963), RMSEA (0.75), TLI (0.958), DF (7), CMIN/DF (2.116).

Higher Education Image
The result of CFA for higher education image (X2) at the first step has not cover yet the cut-off value standardized because of loading factor value below 0.50 for indicators X21, X22, and X23, so these indicators should be eliminated from further processing, then the model was re-examine with five indicators (x24, x25, x26, x27, x28). The result shown that the standardized regression weight value above 0.5. The goodness of fit for higher education image variabel indicate that the model was acceptable with Probability (0.022), RMSEA (0.073), GFI (0.987), AGFI (0.950), CMIN-DF (2.857), TLI (0.967), CFI (0.987).

Student's Perceived Value
The result of CFA for this construct (Y1) at the first step, the cut-off value not in requirement range and the data distribution was not normal yet where some of the data shown that the skewness and curtosis value out of range ±2.58. For data normalization, the data which the skewness and curtosis value out of range ±2.58 excluded one by one then re-examine. The excluded indicators consisting of Y11, Y12, Y13 and Y18. The result shown that Probability (0.012), RMSEA (0.080), GFI (0.985), AGFI (0.942), CMIN-DF (3.206), TLI (0.979), CFI (0.992). The result shown that the goodness-of-fit Index value was qualified to the next test. The indicators are: I interested with the lessons content (Y14); I study the unexpected things from the survey (Y15); the learning contents attributed to the a higher value of my study (Y16); Academic rule of game from the lecturer has an effect on the value of may education (Y17); I am glad that I get the study at this higher education (Y19); taking study at the higher education was improve my self-confidence (Y110).

Student Satisfaction
The result of CFA for student satisfaction variable shown that standardized regression weight value for indicators Y12 and Y15 were below 0.5. The result shown that the standardized regression weight value were above 0.5. The goodness of fit for student satisfaction variabel indicate that the model was acceptable. The result of CFA for student trust variable shown that standardized regression weight value all of the indicators were below 0.5, but the skewness and curtosis value for Z15 and Z16 were out of range ±2.58, it should excluded from the analysis then re-examine. The goodness of fit for student trust variabel after re-
examinations indicate that the model was acceptable which Probability (0.215), GFI (0.991), AGFI (0.972), CFI (0.991), RMSEA (0.032), TLI (0.995), DF (7), CMIN/DF (1.365).

### Structural Modeling

The result of structural modeling shown that the standardized regression weight value were above 0.5. The goodness of fit for structural model indicate that the model was acceptable which chi-square (446.929), p (0.000), gfi (0.895), agfi (0.869), cfi (0.945), rmsea (0.059), tli (0.937), df (202), cmin/df (2.213).

![Figure 2 Output of Structural Equation Modeling](image)

The structural output as shown on the above figure indicated that all research hypotheses proposed have a significant effect on each other either in regard to direct or indirect effect and it is therefore confirmed the facts that all 6 proposed hypotheses are supported.

### Discussions and Implications

Verificative analysis result for student orientation effect toward student perceived value shown that probability value below 0.05 (β = 0.651, p < 0.000) so H1 was not rejected. Student orientation has an effect toward student perceived value. It means that the better of student orientation at private higher education, more superior the student perceived value. If the student have the higher expectation, the student will be more diligent to study. Further more, the private higher education should provide good orientation toward the student, such as provided qualified service; care about my family finance; feels that the student are important; and understand the requirements of of students are as important as that of faculty and administrative officers. The finding of the research was support the previous research (Lee et al., 2010; Blocker et al., 2011).

Verificative result for student orientation effect toward student satisfaction shown that probability value below 0.05 (β = 0.472, p < 0.000) so H2 was not rejected. Student orientation has a significant effect toward student satisfaction. It means that the better of student orientation at private higher education, the student be more satisfied. If the student have satisfied, the student will be more exciting to study. Further more, the private higher education should provide good orientation toward the student. The finding of the research was support the previous research (Ndubisi, 2012; Mavondo et al., 2004; Casidy, 2014).

Examination for higher education image effect toward student satisfaction shown that probability value below 0.05 (β = 0.181, p < 0.018) so H2 was not rejected. Higher education image has a significant effect toward student satisfaction. It means that the better of higher education image at private higher education, the student be more satisfied. If the student have satisfied, the student will be more interesting to study. Further more, the private higher education should create good image. The finding of the research was support the previous research (Alves and Raposo, 2006; Temizer, 2012; Kheiry et al., 2012).

Verificative result for student perceived value effect toward student satisfaction shown that probability value below 0.05 (β = 0.217, p < 0.001) so H4 was not rejected. Student perceived value has a significant effect toward student satisfaction. It means that the higher of value for the student at private higher education, the student be more satisfied. If the student have satisfied, the student will be more exciting to study. Further more, the private higher education should create superior value for the student. The finding of the research was support the previous research (Ledden et al., 2007; Brown and Mazzarol, 2009; Giner and Rillo, 2016).

Examination result for student satisfaction effect toward student trust shown that probability value below 0.05 (β = 0.455, p < 0.000) so H6 was not rejected. Student satisfaction has a significant effect toward student trust. It means that the higher of student satisfaction at private higher education, the higher level of
student trust toward private higher education. So, to gain student trust the private higher education should enhance the student satisfaction. The finding of the research was support the previous research (Rojas-Mendez et al., 2009)

Conclusions and Recomendations

Conclusions
The research outcome indicated that there are a significant influence among student’s orientation, perceived value, and satisfaction. Furthermore, student orientation, higher education image has a significant effect on student trust either directly or through perceived value or student satisfaction

Recomendations
1. Enhancing student trust toward, the college could enhance credibility of the private higher education.
2. In order to build student trust, the private higher education should be satisfied its student by creating superior value for them.
3. The superior value resulting from good application of student orientation program can create sustainable good image for private higher education.
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