

CUSTOMER VALUE CO-CREATION BEHAVIOR OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN SOUTH SUMATERA

Supriyadi, Institute Informatika & Business Darmajaya
Willy Arafah, Trisakti University

ABSTRACT

This research was conducted in several higher education institutions in South Sumatra, the research questionnaire was distributed as many as 347 respondents and the results showed all hypotheses were positively correlated and accepted, except the influence of subjective norms on customer value co creation behavior there is a negative effect. Based on the results of this study indicate that the services provided at tertiary education must be better and focus on respondent satisfaction, tertiary education must also formulate to improve the brand image of tertiary education through good service. Higher education must be able to create a good academic culture, so that information from word of mouth can be carried out properly. Following the brand experiences, they should formulate branding strategies enabling the customer attitude and behavior. The research contributes to the value of co-creation by considering several variables which influence customer behavior such as brand awareness, perceived quality and also analyze multiple aspects of brand experience and its impact on customer attitude and behavior.

keywords: Antecedent, Customer Value Co-Creation Attitude, Customer Value Co-Creation Behavior, Brand Awareness, Perceived Quality, Subjective Norms, Higher Educations.

INTRODUCTION

Last year, we saw an abundance of progress and advancements in the development of Indonesian e-commerce. Starting from Alibaba's investments in Lazada and Tokopedia, the skyrocketing growth for newcomer Shopee in the mobile market, and the total transaction during Harbolnas 2017 (National Online Shopping Day) that reached Rp. 4 trillion in only three days. According to Prahalad & Ramaswamy (2000) in the traditional view the product holds a dominant role and can be created value since it is produced by the company and the production process then circulates in the market. According to Vargo & Lusch (2004) customers act as passive audiences and are not involved in the design or production phase, feeling the value of a product and service while circulating in the market and that is what is called exchange value. In the end customers will learn and make value based on the experience they feel from a brand according to (Payne et al., 2008). The experience of being the center of the process of value creation was also said by (Ramaswamy, 2011). Products that create value and provide experience to customers are very important to create a customer attitude towards the product or service.

Brand Experience is enough to pay attention to higher education as Gojek did, where every time a user makes use of the motorcycle taxi, the application always asks how we assess the driver. The survey conducted by Harris Interactive in 2010 said that 9 out of 10 consumers in America are willing to pay more to get a good experience. Brand Experience on higher education services and their influence on other factors such as brand awareness and acquired quality and prevailing norms that primarily affect the value of consumer behavior and ultimately

affect customer custom values. In this research there are new terms, namely customer value co-creation attitude and customer value co-creation behavior that were examined by Shamim et al. (2016) who examined the model of brand experience and customer value co-creation behavior. The previous research was used as a reference in research with several variables such as brand experience, subjective norms, customer value co-creation attitude and customer value co-creation behavior. Analysis of the data used is structured equation modeling (SEM) using the survey method directly and using a five-point Likert scale to test the hypothesis as many as 200 samples in Malaysia.

The purpose of this research is to determine the effect of brand experience that affects customer value co-creation of attitude, subjective norms that influence customer value co-creation attitude, which ultimately affects customer value co-creation behavior. The addition of variables in this study is the brand awareness and perceived quality variables examined by (Ding & Tseng, 2015). Another addition is the relationship between perceived quality and customer value co-creation attitude and customer value co-creation behavior. Variable brand awareness is examined whether it influences brand awareness, especially in the field of higher education services, and its effect on perceived quality. The difference in this study compared with previous research by Shamim et al. (2016) in addition to the addition of variables in previous studies that were examined more on physical products in hypermarkets, in this study more new fields, namely services in higher education because of the limitations of the research also mentioned that further research is expected to examine fields other than retail. This research seeks answers to what factors influence the customer value co-creation behavior.

Theoretical Background

Brand experience

Brand experience is conceptualized as sensory, affective, cognitive, behavioral and social responses to stimuli related to brands according to (Brakus et al., 2009). Experience related to behavior stimulates customer behavior or interests with physical experience, lifestyle, long-term behavior patterns or interactions with others. Social experience fulfills consumer needs for actualization, self-esteem and affinity by making customers feel connected to something related to the brand. Schmitt (1999) in Ding (2015) propose five important parts of experience, namely: to sense, to feel, to think, to act and to relate related to marketing experience. Product experience occurs when consumers interact with products according to Hoch (2002), shop, service experience when consumers feel the situation of the service provider / product and interact with people who provide services according to (Arnold et al., 2005).

Experience in consuming a product initially based on hedonic motives or causing pleasure, thus forming consumer behavior towards certain products / services. In this view, consumer decisions are not based on product quality or price according to (Mathwick et al., 2001). In this view, it is also emphasized that customers need products that are unique, fun and can create an impression both when consuming products and after consuming products according to (Mishra et al., 2014). According to Pine & Gilmore (1998) in Ding et al. (2015) customer experience can occur when companies can use their products as an attractive tool to impress an event that can be remembered by customers. Brands that can engage consumers to participate will be the experience of consumers who feel valued by the company according to (Poullsson et al., 2004).

According to Norton et al. (2009) in Trudeau H. et al. (2016), this experience can provide new things for customers and eliminate boredom due to lifestyle routines. Brand experience has attracted a variety of concerns in research practice because brands are a fairly complex symbol in describing the values that underlie customer experience related to products and services that have been received according to (Fornier, 1998). The latest research is not only focused on defining and measuring brand experience, but it is also interesting to examine the factors that influence it and its impact on other variables according to (Iglesias et al., 2011). Prahalad & Ramaswamy (2003) show that currently more influential consumers and marketers should create a brand experience with their consumers. Tynan & McKechnie (2010) argue that service dominant logic, proposed by Vargo & Lush (2004), is more effective than traditional goods-dominant logic. Service services place more emphasis on the value created when the goods are used and the exchange value of the goods. Value is created through the participation of people in certain networks. Customers play an important role in the process of forming values according to (Baron & Haris, 2008; Ding & Tseng, 2015).

Fierce competition in the market makes products and services become easily traded commodities and become less competitive according to (Prahalad et al., 2003). Many brands such as Starbucks coffee, Disney and Singapore Airlines offer excellent brand experiences to engage customers in a number of senses (multisensory) and seek pleasure (hedonist), which is known as experiential marketing and maintains the company's reputation and performance according to (Schmitt, 1999). This company focuses on making memorable experiences to gain competitive advantage in the market (Pine & Gilmore, 1998; Ding & Tseng, 2015).

Subjective Norms (SN)

Subjective norms are normative beliefs of a social environment when a person behaves, normative beliefs that have a considerable impact on those who influence individuals (Montano & Kasprzyk, 2008; Wolf et al., 2015). In subjective norms it is divided into two, namely Normative Trust and Motivation to obey it (Park & Levine, 1999). Normative belief is someone's view of what others think when he does an act, while the motivation to obey is the tendency of a person to behave in accordance with the beliefs of a group in which he is incorporated (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1977; Shamim et al., 2016). In the research conducted by Tarkiainen & Sundqvist (2005) stated that subjective norms can influence behavior through attitude parameters, meaning that subjective norms can influence attitudes and attitudes that can influence behavior, it is also mentioned that a person's behavior is associated with subjective attitudes and norms. Subjective norms are related to social influences to carry out certain activities or behaviors (O'Neal, 2007; Al-Swidi et al., 2014). Subjective norms reveal how the perception of a reference group if someone does a certain behavior. Previous research conducted by Tarkiainen and Sundqvist (2005) found that in his study found that subjective norms were related to attitudes, and both could influence behavior, namely intention to buy. Chang (1998) in Al-Swidi et al. (2014) proposed an in-depth study of the influence of subjective norms on attitudes of individuals, Tarkiainen & Sunqvist (2005) conducted a study to continue previous research so that they found a significant influence between subjective norms and attitudes, with examples of buying organic food. In another study by Venkatesh & Davis (2000) also found the concept of the relationship between subjective norms and behavior. In his theory it is said that social effects play an important role for someone to perform certain behaviors and subjective norms are a person's perception of the importance of doing or not doing a behavior. In addition, there are two theories,

namely the theory of reasoned action and the theory of planned behavior, revealing that factors that influence intention for behavior are subjective norms.

Customer Value Co-Creation Attitude (CVCCA)

Customer value is very important in the theory and practice of marketing management (Kalifa, 2004; Lindgreen et al., 2012). In the business context, value is defined as the benefits received compared to the costs incurred (Ulaga & Eggert, 2006). Benefits and costs can vary in forms such as increased profits, cost savings, capital invested (Lindic & da Silva, 2011). Benefits and costs can change over time depending on the subjective perceptions of the user (Helkkula et al., 2012).

Determining the important values offered to customers and managing these values over time, is important as a competitive advantage (Landroquez et al., 2011). The attitude of consumers is mainly based on the process of forming value itself which occurs based on unique experiences felt by customers (Gronroos & Gummerus., 2014). The value formation process is formed when there is interaction and communication between service providers and customers (Gronroos et al., 2012). So that customers can participate in the value formation process if they have a positive nature when the process of interaction and dialogue with service providers.

The tendency of customers to engage in service interactions and dialogue with service providers is called customer value co-creation attitude (Shamim et al., 2016). According to him, the customer value co-creation of attitude is divided into three components, namely interaction, information sharing and responsiveness. The two main theories of existence are: functional theory of attitude and constructive theory of attitude (Shavitt, 1990). According to the functionalist view, attitude is formed based on information stored in memory. When individuals see a particular object, information that is remembered will encourage them to make a positive attitude or not to the product (Argyriou & Melewar, 2011; Shamim et al., 2016).

Conversely, constructive theory believes that attitudes can form spontaneously based on information obtained and direct experience (Reed et al., 2002). Attitudes have also been shown to be significant influence for behavior, customer choice and consumption satisfaction (Nowlis et al., 2002).

Customer Value Co-Creation Behavior (CVCCB)

Customer Value Creation Behavior (CVCB) is defined as the active behavior of customers in adding value to physical, virtual and one's mind in using the product or service provided by the company. (Gronroos & Voima, 2013). Customer Value Creation Behavior is a direct involvement of the value formation process. Behavior is conceptualized as customer participation behavior and customer citizenship behavior (Yi & Gong, 2013). Customer participation behavior refers to customer involvement in the process of producing and delivering products / services according to (Dabholkar, 1995).

In this case it can occur when the customer interacts with the service provider when the service is delivered. These interactions can be in the form of asking for information or sharing information to create value (value creation). According to Shamin et al. (2016) the interaction is an important behavior in the process of forming value co-creation. In general, the activity is divided into three parts, namely information seeking, information exchange, behavioral responsibility and personal interaction according to (Yi & Gong, 2013). Customer participation

behavior is needed in the success of adding value to a product or service while voluntary customer membership behavior is needed for added value.

Customer citizenship behavior (CCB) can provide advice on improving or improving services, helping other customers to get services, and spreading positive words about company services. Customer citizenship behavior in this form is a positive behavior that is an added value for service providers (Revilla-Camacho et al., 2015; Shamim et al., 2016). Customer Value Creation Behavior can increase customer activity with activities such as sports or activities that can improve the ability of customers through value creation activities (Yim et al., 2012; Gong et al., 2016). Customer participation behavior and customer citizenship behavior can enable customers to interact with complex value creation activities so as to increase customer confidence and increase the sense of competition among customers who participate in this value creation (Ryan et al., 2000).

Customer Value Creation Behavior allows customers to interact with each other through mutual benefits for themselves, other customers and employees. Customer Value Creation Behavior can increase psychological relevance in a social community according to (Gagne & Deci, 2005). If customers feel as part of a social community, psychological needs can be fulfilled and customers can function effectively and optimally as value creators based on their experience according to (Gronroos & Voima, 2013). In previous studies the results were Customer Value Creation Behavior which could improve service quality and customer loyalty. Customer Value Creation Behavior can also increase the overall productivity of a company through quality and quantity of services and through cost reduction because fewer employees are needed (Schneider & White, 2004; Zeithaml et al., 2013; Gong et al., 2016).

Hypotheses Development

In terms of brand experience, customers are parties who play an active role in their experience with a particular brand and have two objectives, namely the goal of seeking pleasure and purpose for the use of a brand. Brand experience can function as an important factor for consumers to be able to judge a brand. There are two possibilities, first, brand experience as an intrinsic condition that shapes consumer judgment on a brand according to (Zeithaml, 1988). Consumers assess whether the brand's usefulness can be achieved as long as consumers consume the brand. Customers further assess whether brand experience can portray value with good service according to (Mathwick et al., 2002). Related to the formation of value co-creation, according to congruity theory, a person will give a positive attitude if his actions are in accordance with his beliefs. This belief will then lead to a positive attitude in the form of customer involvement in the value formation process. If the quality of a brand is considered high, the purpose of consumption can be achieved. Second, brand experience can lead to brand awareness because the information received is in accordance with the consumer's memory in accordance with previous experience according to (Keller, 1993). According to Aaker (1996) consumers will deduce the quality of a brand from brand awareness. Zeithaml et al. (1996), in his research found that brand quality has a direct influence on behavior. In another study in the field of financial services, Taylor et al. (2007) found a positive influence between perceived quality and intention to buy.

Apart from perceived quality, there are factors that influence attitude, namely subjective norms. Where subjective norms is an impulse that is accepted by someone in a social group to conduct behavior in accordance with group members. According to Chang et al. (2010) there is a significant relationship between subjective norms and attitude. Tarkiainen & Sundqvist (2005)

also found that subjective norms were a significant factor in influencing attitude. Subjective norms have more influence on attitudes compared to behavior, it is also found that the attitude of customers is influenced by influences in norms in social groups. Related to the process of forming value co-creation, customers can be involved in the process of forming values when influenced by social groups such as family, friends, parents, and others.

Brankus et al. (2009) divide the main experience into 5 parts, namely to sense, to feel, to think, to act and to relate. The five parts are in accordance with the five dimensions of brand experience. Brand experience has a stronger influence on customer attitudes than other associations. Attitudes and behavior will have a very strong relationship when the input of these attitudes and behaviors is the same thing. This also confirms that customer value co-creation attitude is a link between brand experience and customer value co-creation behavior, where brand experience is the same input.

Another thing to discuss between attitudes toward behavior, in the discovery found that people who try to attune behavior seriously will be reflected in his attitude. In a situation like this, intention is very important as a supporting factor for attitudes to influence behavior. The types of attitudinal and behavioral relationships are supported by other studies (Schultz & Oskamp, 1996; Cai & Shannon, 2012). Shamim et al. (2016) predicts that the customer value co-creation attitude can influence the customer value co-creation behavior spontaneously. On the basis of reasoning above, we propose the following hypotheses:

H1: Brand experience affects brand awareness

H2: Brand experience affects the perceived quality

H3: Brand experience influences subjective norms

H4: Brand awareness affects the perceived quality

H5: Perceived quality influences customer value co-creation

H6: Subjective norms affect the customer value co-creation attitude

H7: Brand experience affects the customer value co-creation attitude

H8: Brand experience affects the customer value co-creation behavior

H9: Subjective norms affect the customer value co-creation behavior

H10: Customer value of co-creation attitude influences customer value co-creation behavior

METHODS

Design and Stimulus

Previous research was conducted by Shamim et al. (2016) found a brand experience relationship with customer value co-creation behavior, Ding & Tseng (2015) who found a brand experience relationship with brand awareness and quality then Boisvert & Ashill (2011) who found quality relationships with attitude. Based on the three journals mentioned above, the authors see a close relationship between brand experience, subjective norms, brand awareness, perceived quality, customer value co-creation attitude, customer value co-creation behavior so

that the authors combine the three conceptual frameworks of the journal into one research. This research aims to analyze the antecedent customer value co-creation behavior on higher education in Jakarta.

The research design used is hypotheses testing which aims to test the hypothesis. The unit of analysis that will be used is individuals, namely users as consumers who get brand experience. The analytical method used in this study is structural equation modeling (SEM).

Subjects and Procedures

The sampling technique used in this study was purposive sampling. Purposive sampling is a technique of collecting data based on certain research criteria. The criteria of this study are respondents who is studying at some universities in Palembang (south sumatera).

Measure

The variables examined in this study are brand experience, brand awareness, perceived quality, subjective norms, customer value co-creation attitude and customer value co-creation behavior. The measurement of each variable uses several statement indicators as follows:

Brand Experience

It has been operationalized by using items expressed by (Schmitt et al., 2009) consisting of 5 (five) experiences, namely: to sense (Sensory), to feel (affective), to think (cognitive), to act (behavior) and to relate (social). To sense is measured from the 3 (three) items as follows:

1. This brand involves my feelings.
2. This brand is perceptively attractive.
3. This brand is less attractive to my feelings.

To act is measured from 3 (three) items as follows:

1. This brand makes me think about lifestyle.
2. This brand reminds me of the activities that I do.
3. This brand doesn't make me think about what to do and my habits @.

To think, it is measured from 3 (three) items as follows:

1. This brand arouses my interest.
2. This brand stimulates my curiosity.
3. This brand does not create creative thinking.

To feel measured from 3 (three) items as follows:

1. This brand keeps me in a good mood.
2. This brand involves my emotional response.
3. This brand does not appeal to my feelings @.

To relate, measure the 3 (three) statements as follows:

1. This brand made me think of cooperation.
2. I can connect with other people with this brand.

3. This brand does not remind me of relationships and social rules.

Brand Awareness

It has been operationalized using 4 (four) statements expressed by (Yoo & Donthu, 2001) as follows:

1. I can recommend this brand among competing brands.
2. I can easily remember this brand symbol or logo.
3. Some features of this brand easily enter my memory.
4. I have difficulty imagining this brand in my mind®.

Perceived Quality

It has been operationalized by using 3 (three) statements expressed by (Yoo & Donthu, 2001) as follows:

1. This brand is very functionally useful.
2. The quality of this brand is very high.
3. This brand is very reliable in performance.

Subjective Norms

It has been operationalized using the 11 (eleven) statements expressed by (Chen, 2012) as follows:

1. People who are important in my opinion encourage me to participate in discussions about company services as something interesting to do.
2. People who influence my life encourage me to service providers to receive better value or service.
3. The important people in my opinion ask me to have a dialogue with the service provider when using the service.
4. I am involved in dialogue with service providers to get better service or value because my close group wants me to do that.

Customer Value Co-Creation Attention (CVCCA)

It has been operationalized using items expressed by (Shamim et al., 2014) and divided into three types, namely interaction attitude, knowledge sharing, and responsive attitude. Interaction attitude is measured from 4 (four) items as follows:

1. I like to interact with companies regarding existing features.
2. I like to interact with existing features to find out.
3. I like to interact with other customers to get information related to products and services.
4. I prefer to interact with service providers to get and share information.

Knowledge sharing is measured from 3 (three) items as follows:

1. I choose to share information with service providers who have a polite attitude.
2. I feel more confident to engage in dialogue with employees who have initiatives in discussions.
3. I am more interested in dialogue with uniformed service workers.

Responsive attitude is measured from 4 (four) items as follows:

1. I will respond positively if the company asks for my advice to improve service.
2. I will respond positively if the company asks for my opinion regarding design and service features.
3. I will respond positively if the company involves me in developing services.
4. I will respond positively if the company takes the initiative to respond to my recommendations regarding innovation in its services.

Customer Value Co-Creation Behavior (CVCCB)

It has been operationalized by using items disclosed by (Yi & Gong, 2013) and divided into two types, namely customer participant behavior and customer citizenship behavior. Customer Participation Behavior is measured from 11 (eleven) items as follows:

1. I request other information about what the company has to offer.
2. I am looking for information where company services are obtained.
3. I pay attention to how other people use this company's services well.
4. I provide the information needed so that company workers can carry out their duties properly.
5. I give a good response if the employee asks about the service.
6. I make all the conditions needed to get the service.
7. I simply carry out all the responses or attitudes that the company expects of me.
8. I am friendly with the employees of the company.
9. I am good with the employees of the company.
10. I am polite to the employees of the company.
11. I am polite to the employees of the company.

Customer citizenship behavior is measured from 8 (eight) items as follows:

1. If I have input for the company to improve the company's services, I will tell the company employees to know.
2. When I receive good service from employees of the company, I will comment on that.
3. If I experience a problem, I tell the employee of the company.
4. I help other customers if they need my help.
5. I teach other customers to use the service well.
6. If the service received by another customer is not good, I am willing to help accommodate that.
7. If the employee makes a problem while providing services, I will be patient.
8. If I wait longer than the normal time I receive service, I will adapt.

The measurement scale used in this study is the interval of the Likert scale measurement method. Likert scale is a method that measures attitudes by expressing agreement or disagreement with certain subjects, objects or events. The scale used is the Likert Scale - five points with an interval arrangement of scale 1 to scale 5 as follows: (1). Strongly Disagree; (2). Disagree; (3). Neutral ; (4). Agree; (5). Strongly agree. The formation of research has been operationalized through literature discussions with several changes designed to reveal the scale of research.

RESULTS

Analysis of results and interpretations is based on the results of testing of the hypothesis. The purpose of testing this hypothesis is to find out whether the H1 hypothesis being tested is accepted or rejected so that the Alternative Hypothesis (H0) is rejected. Hypothesis testing is done using structural equation model analysis (SEM) which is a statistical method that is most suitable for this research. The purpose of this method is to predict changes in the dependent variable (dependent variable) associated with changes that occur in a number of independent

variables (independent variable. This can be seen by looking at the significance value (p) of each hypothesis test result. The error tolerance limit (α) used is 0.05. If $p < \alpha$ or <0.05 , there is a significant effect between the variable x on the variable y. The results of hypothesis testing by comparing between t values with estimated values of beta coefficients (β) arranged in a table. In this study, the authors used the help of AMOS version 23 software to test the research hypothesis. The following Table 1 results of the calculation of regression with AMOS software.

Influence between research variable	Estimate (β)	S.E	C.R	P	Information
Brand Experience → Brand Awareness	0,376	0,60	5,971	***	Significance
Brand Experience → Perceived Quality	0,472	0,50	7,226	***	Significance
Brand Experience → Subjective Norms	0,636	0,094	9,309	***	Significance
Brand Awareness → Perceived Quality	0,406	0,059	6,631	***	Significance
Perceived Quality → Customer Value Co-Creation Attitude	0,481	0,075	7,089	***	Significance
Subjective Norms → Customer Value Co-Creation Attitude	0,256	0,042	4,550	***	Significance
Brand Experience → Customer Value Co-Creation Attitude	0,252	0,071	3,632	***	Significance
Brand Experience → Customer Value Co-Creation Behavior	0,143	0,054	2,191	0,208	Significance
Subjective Norms → Customer Value Co-Creation Behavior	-0,057	0,33	-1,030	0,303	Not Significance
Customer Value Co-Creation Attitude → Customer Value Co-Creation Behavior	0,735	0,078	7,603	***	Significance

Sources : Data processing with using AMOS 23.0

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Based on data analysis it is known that the value of CR (t) = 5.971, with estimate (β) 0.376 and the level of significance (p) <0.05 . From these results indicate that Ha1 is accepted and can be concluded that there is a significant influence of Brand Experience on Brand Awareness. Thus the higher the Brand Experience of the Higher education, the higher the Brand Awareness, the lower the Brand Experience from the Higher education, the lower Brand Awareness. According to the theory, Brand Experience can lead to Brand Awareness because the information received is in accordance with the consumer's memories in accordance with previous experience (Keller, 1993). According to Chang et al. (2010), brand awareness has a significant effect on brand associations. Smilansky (2009) also shows that experiential marketing can increase brand association by changing consumer perceptions of certain brands. So this hypothesis is in line with the theory above.

Based on data analysis, it is known that the value of CR (t) = 7.226, with estimate (β) 0.472 and the level of significance (p) < 0.05 . From these results indicate that Ha2 is accepted and can be concluded that there is a significant effect of brand experience on perceived quality. Thus the higher the brand experience of the Higher education, the higher the perceived quality is felt. This hypothesis is in the opinion of Mathwick et al. (2001) that customers value whether brand experience can portray value with good service felt by consumers.

Based on data analysis, it is known that the value of CR (t) = 9,309, with estimate (β) 0.636 and the level of significance (p) < 0.05 . From these results indicate that Ha3 is accepted

and can be concluded that there is a significant effect of brand experience on subjective norms. Thus the higher the brand experience of the Higher education, the higher the subjective norms. Conversely the lower the brand experience of the Higher education, the lower the subjective norms. This is in accordance with the theory of Shamim & Butt (2013) who found that brand experience (brand experience) has a strong influence on customer attitudes towards the brand. Regarding value co-creation, according to the theory of congruity, someone will give a positive attitude if the action is in accordance with his beliefs. (Lee & Jeong, 2014).

Based on data analysis, it is known that the value of CR (t) = 6.631, with estimate (β) 0.406 and the level of significance (p) < 0.05. From these results indicate that Ha4 is accepted and can be concluded that there is a significant effect of brand awareness on perceived quality. Thus the higher brand awareness of the Higher education, the higher the perceived quality, the lower the brand awareness of the Higher education, the lower the perceived quality. This is in accordance with the theory put forward by Blackwell et al. (2006) that consumers will assess the quality of a brand from brand awareness.

Based on data analysis it is known that the value of CR (t) = 7.089, with estimate (β) 0.481 and the level of significance (p) < 0.05. From these results indicate that Ha5 is accepted and can be concluded that there is a significant effect of perceived quality on the customer value co-creation attitude. Thus the higher the perceived quality of the Higher education, the higher the customer value co-creation attitude, whereas the lower the perceived quality of the Higher education, the lower the customer value co-creation attitude. This opinion strengthens the research of Boisvert & Ashill (2011) who found a positive relationship between brand quality and customer attitude.

Based on data analysis, it is known that the value of CR (t) = 4,550, with estimate (β) 0,256 and the level of significance (p) < 0,05. From these results indicate that Ha6 is accepted and it can be concluded that there are significant subjective norms towards the customer value co-creation attitude. Thus, the higher the subjective norms of the Higher education, the higher the customer value cocation attitude, on the contrary the lower the subjective subjective norms, the lower the customer value co-creation attitude. From the estimate value (β) 0.189, it means that the subjective nAorm correlation to the customer value co-creation attitude is still small. Because attitudes that get used to seriously will affect behavior (Bagozzi et al., 1990, Cai & Shannon, 2012). That means the influence of subjective norms is only at the level of attitude, not yet on the behavior.

Based on data analysis it is known that the value of CR (t) = 3,632, with estimate (β) 0.252 and the significance level (p) < 0.05. From these results indicate that Ha7 is accepted and can be concluded that there is a significant influence of brand experience on the customer value co-creation attitude. Thus the higher the brand experience of the Higher education, the higher the customer value co-creation attitude, on the contrary the lower the brand experience, the lower the customer value co-creation attitude. This hypothesis is in accordance with the opinion of Chang and Chieng (2006) which states that brand experience has a stronger influence on the attitude of customers than other associations. Another opinion expressed by Wang et al. (2012) who find customer experience has a strong impact on customer attitudes. In 2013, Shamim and Butt found that brand experience (Brand Experience) had a strong influence on customers' attitudes towards brands.

Based on data analysis, it is known that the value of CR (t)=2.191, with estimate (β) 0.143 and the level of significance (p)=0.028. From these results indicate that Ha8 is accepted and can be concluded that there is a significant influence of brand experience on customer value

co-creation behavior. Thus the higher the brand experience of the Higher education, the higher the customer value co-creation behavior, conversely the lower the Higher education experience, the lower the customer value co-creation behavior. This hypothesis is in accordance with the opinion conveyed by Schwarz & Bohner (2001) where attitudes and behavior will have a very strong relationship when the input of attitudes and behaviors is the same thing, namely brand experience.

Based on data analysis, it is known that the value of CR (t) = -1.030, with estimate (β) - 0.057 and the level of significance (p)=0.303. From these results show that Ha9 is rejected and can be concluded that there is no significant influence of subjective norms on customer value co-creation behavior. This hypothesis supports the research conducted by Kim et al. (2009) that find subjective norms have more influence on attitude (customer value co-creation attitude), not on behavior (value of the co-creation behavior).

Based on data analysis, it is known that the value of CR (t)=7.603, with estimate (β) 0.735 and the level of significance (p) $p < 0.05$. From these results indicate that Ha10 is accepted and can be concluded that there is a significant effect of customer value co-creation attitude on customer value co-creation behavior. Thus the stronger the influence of the customer value co-creation attitude of a Higher education, the higher the customer value co-creation behavior, on the contrary the lower the influence of the customer value co-creation attitude of a Higher education, the lower the customer value co-creation behavior. This hypothesis is consistent with the research conducted by Laroche et al. (1996) which states that attitudes toward brands affect the intention to buy. Furthermore Lei et al. (2008) who found that attitudes towards the expansion of new services will have an impact on behavioral intentions.

Managerial Implications

As a response to the dynamic factors that affect consumer behavior especially the buying behavior in the retail sector that is generally dominated by compulsive and impulsive buying behavior, a creativity of retailers in designing strategies is needed. The retail industry is a fairly homogeneous industry at which products sold between retailers are almost the same. However, behind this homogeneity, there is an interesting thing to be observed. In facing the increasingly competitive retail business, various different and interesting alternatives should be done by the retailers so that consumers will make the store as an option to shop. One strategy that is considered able to win the competition is to develop the strategy of retail mix marketing (Lazer, 1961; Gauri, et al., 2008; Balasescu, 2014; Azeem & Sharma, 2015; Terblanche, 2017).

They developed a retail mix marketing which consists of product, price, promotion, as well as service and facility/location. Along with the shifting of conventional stores to online shops, the explanations of each retail mix definition needs to be adjusted. Other than that, the addition of retail mix marketing elements is very possible when starting a new e-business (Kalyanam & Shelby, 2002). For example, the location of the store (in the physical sense) should be interpreted as a form of website where consumers "*visit*" the web. Therefore, it should be designed as a user-friendly website with common characteristics such as the clear identity of the website, good devices, fast loading time, intuitive navigation, compelling content, easy-to-read text, fun element of experience, clear rules, and guaranteed visitor privacy.

REFERENCES

- Al-Swidi, A., Mohammed Rafiul Huque, S., Haroon Hafeez, M., & Noor Mohd Shariff, M. (2014). The role of subjective norms in theory of planned behavior in the context of organic food consumption. *British Food Journal*, 116(10), 1561-1580.
- Arnold, M.J., Reynolds, K.E., Ponder, N., Lueg, J.E. (2005). Customer delight in a retail context: investigating delightful and terrible shopping experiences. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(8), 1132-1145.
- Boisvert, J., Ashill, N.J. (2011). How brand innovativeness and quality impact attitude toward new service line extensions: the moderating role of consumer involvement. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 25(7), 517-527.
- Brakus, J.J., Schmitt, B.H., Zarantonello, L. (2009). Brand experience: what is it? How is it measured? Does it affect loyalty?. *Journal of Marketing*, 73(3), 52-68.
- Chang, K.W., Yim, C.K., Lam, S.S. (2010). Is customer participation in value creation a double-edged sword? Evidence from professional financial services across cultures. *Journal of Marketing*, 74(3), 48-64.
- Dabholkar, P.A. (1995). A contingency framework for predicting causality between customer satisfaction and service quality. *NA-Advances in Consumer Research*, 22.
- Ding, C.G., & Tseng, T.H. (2015). On the relationships among brand experience, hedonic emotions, and brand equity. *European Journal of Marketing*, 49(7/8), 994-1015.
- Fornier, S. (1998). Consumers and their brands: Developing relationship theory in consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24(4), 343-373.
- Gagne, M., Deci, E.L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(4), 331-362.
- Gong, T., Choi, J.N., & Murdy, S. (2016). Does customer value creation behavior drive customer well-being?. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 44(1), 59-75.
- Gronroos, C., & Gummerus, J. (2014). The service revolution and its marketing implications: service logic vs service-dominant logic. *Managing Service Quality*, 24(3), 206-229.
- Gronroos, C., & Voima, P. (2013). Critical service logic: making sense of value creation and co-creation. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 41(2), 133-150.
- Helkkula, A., Kelleher, C., Pihlström, M. (2012). Characterizing value as an experience: implications for service researchers and managers. *Journal of Service Research*, 1094670511426897.
- Hoch, S.J. (2002). Product experience is seductive. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29(3), 448-454.
- Iglesias, O., Singh, J.J., Batista-Foguet, J.M. (2011). The role of brand experience and affective commitment in determining brand loyalty. *Journal of Brand Management*, 18(8), 570-582.
- Keller, K.L. (1993). Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity. *The Journal of Marketing*, 1-22.
- Lindgreen, A., Hingley, M.K., Grant, D.B., & Morgan, R.E. (2012). Value in business and industrial marketing: Past, present and future. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 41(1), 207-214.
- Lindic, J., & Marques da Silva, C. (2011). Value proposition as a catalyst for a customer focused innovation. *Management Decision*, 49(10), 16941708.
- Mathwick, C., Malhotra, N.K., Rigdon, E. (2002). The effect of dynamic retail experiences on experiential perceptions of value: an Internet and catalog comparison. *Journal of Retailing*, 78(1), 51-60.
- Mishra, A., Dash, S.B., & Cyr, D. (2014). Linking user experience and consumerbased brand equity: the moderating role of consumer expertise and lifestyle. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 23(4/5), 333-348.
- Nowlis, S.M., Kahn, B.E., Dhar, R. (2002). Coping with ambivalence: The effect of removing a neutral option on consumer attitude and preference judgments. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29(3), 319-334.
- Park, H.S., Levine, T.R. (1999). The theory of reasoned action and selfconstrual: Evidence from three cultures. *Communications Monographs*, 66(3), 199-218.
- Payne, A.F., Storbacka, K., Frow, P. (2008). Managing the co-creation of value. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36(1), 83-96
- Pine, B.J., & Gilmore, J.H. (1998). Welcome to the experience economy. *Harvard Business Review*, 76, 97-105.
- Poullsson, S.H., & Kale, S.H. (2004). The experience economy and commercial experiences. *The Marketing Review*, 4(3), 267-277.
- Prahalad, C.K., & Ramaswamy, V. (2003). The new frontier of experience innovation. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 44(4), 12-18.
- Prahalad, C.K., & Ramaswamy, V. (2000). Co-opting customer competence. *Harvard Business Review*, 78(1), 79-90.

- Ramaswamy, V. (2011). It's about human experiences... and beyond, to co creation. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 40(2), 195-196.
- Reed, A., Wooten, D.B., & Bolton, L.E. (2002). The temporary construction of consumer attitudes. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 12(4), 375-388.
- Ryan, R.M. & Deci, E.L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68.
- Shamim, A., Ghazali, Z., Albinsson, P.A. (2016). An integrated model of corporate brand experience and customer value co-creation behaviour. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 44(2), 139-158.
- Tarkiainen, A., & Sundqvist, S. (2005). Subjective norms, attitudes and intentions of Finnish consumers in buying organic food. *British Food Journal*, 107(11), 808-822.
- Taylor, S.A., Hunter, G.L., Lindberg, D.L. (2007). Understanding (customerbased) brand equity in financial services. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 21(4), 241-252.
- Trudeau, H.S., & Shobeiri, S. (2016). Does social currency matter in creation of enhanced brand experience?. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 25(1), 98-114.
- Tynan, C., McKechnie, S., & Chhuon, C. (2010). Co-creating value for luxury brands. *Journal of Business Research*, 63(11), 1156-1163.
- Uлага, W., & Eggert, A. (2006). Relationship value and relationship quality: Broadening the nomological network of business-to-business relationships. *European Journal of Marketing*, 40(3/4), 311-327.
- Vargo, S.L., & Lusch, R.F. (2004). Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(1), 1-17.
- Vargo, S.L., & Lusch, R.F. (2004). The four service marketing myths remnants of a goods-based, manufacturing model. *Journal of Service Research*, 6(4), 324-335.
- Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F.D. (2000). A theoretical extension of the technology acceptance model: Four longitudinal field studies. *Management Science*, 46(2), 186-204.
- Wolf, S., Weißenberger, B.E., Wehner, M.C., Kabst, R. (2015). Controllers as business partners in managerial decision-making: Attitude, subjective norm, and internal improvements. *Journal of Accounting & Organizational Change*, 11(1), 24-46.
- Yi, Y., & Gong, T. (2013). Customer value co-creation behavior: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(9), 1279-1284.
- Yoo, B., & Donthu, N. (2001). Developing and validating a multidimensional consumer-based brand equity scale. *Journal of Business Research*, 52(1), 1-14
- Zeithaml, V.A. (1988). Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value: a means-end model and synthesis of evidence. *The Journal of Marketing*, 2-22.
- Zeithaml, V.A., Berry, L.L., & Parasuraman, A. (1996). The behavioral consequences of service quality. *the Journal of Marketing*, 31-46.