



The Influence of Service Quality, Price, and Customer Satisfaction on Customer Loyalty of Online Transportation

(Study on Maxim Application Service Users in 2025 in Bekasi City)

Amrulloh Ibnu Kholdun¹, Eddy Suharso²

¹Institut Transportasi dan Logistik Trisakti, Jakarta Timur, Indonesia

²Universitas Medika Suherman, Bekasi Jawa Barat, Indonesia

*Penulis Korespondensi: ibnu.10@gmail.com

Abstract. This study aims to analyze the influence of service quality, price, and customer satisfaction on customer loyalty among Maxim application users in Bekasi City. The problem in this study is motivated by the importance of building customer loyalty amid increasingly competitive online transportation services, evidenced by Maxim's low market share (12.3%) compared to Gojek (54.4%) and a pre-survey showing only 37.5% customer satisfaction. A quantitative approach with purposive sampling technique was employed, collecting data via structured questionnaires using a Likert scale from 111 active Maxim users in Bekasi City during May–June 2025. Data were analyzed using multiple linear regression with SPSS version 25. Results indicate that: (1) service quality has a positive and significant effect on customer loyalty ($t = 19.652$; $\beta = 0.648$; $p = 0.000$); (2) price has a positive and significant effect on customer loyalty ($t = 5.293$; $\beta = 0.202$; $p = 0.000$); (3) customer satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on customer loyalty ($t = 12.923$; $\beta = 0.435$; $p = 0.000$); and (4) simultaneously, all three variables significantly affect customer loyalty ($F = 375.685$; $p = 0.000$; $R^2 = 0.913$), meaning 91.3% of the variation in customer loyalty is explained by the model. Service quality is the most dominant variable ($\beta = 0.648$). These findings imply that Maxim needs to continuously improve service quality standards, set competitive prices, and ensure customer satisfaction to maintain long-term customer loyalty in the highly competitive online transportation market.

Keywords: Customer Loyalty; Customer Satisfaction; Maxim; Online Transportation; Price.

1. INTRODUCTION

The rapid development of information and communication technology has driven the emergence of digital-based service innovations, including in the transportation sector. In Indonesia, online transportation services such as Gojek, Grab, and Maxim have fundamentally transformed the way people meet their daily mobility needs. Data from Databoks (2022) show that online motorcycle taxis are used by 39% of the population as their daily means of transportation, second only to private vehicles (42%). The main reason for choosing online transportation is dominated by affordable prices (84.1%), followed by speed, comfort, and ease of ordering (GoodStats, 2023). This confirms that price and service quality are the primary determinants of consumer behavior in this industry.

Maxim, a Russian-origin online transportation platform that began operating in Indonesia in 2018 under PT. Teknologi Perdana Indonesia, has demonstrated significant growth with an average monthly download of 892,000 times in 2023, an increase of 15.39% compared to 2022 (GoodStats, 2025). Despite this growth, Maxim's market share remains considerably below Gojek (54.4%) and Grab, with only 12.3%. This condition indicates an existing gap in customer loyalty and satisfaction that warrants further investigation.

A pre-survey conducted on 30 Maxim users in Bekasi City confirmed this problem. Only 37.5% of respondents expressed satisfaction, and only 36.7% showed loyalty. The pre-survey on service quality also revealed that only 36.7% of respondents were satisfied with Maxim's service quality, particularly regarding travel insurance availability (21.9% responded yes) and driver attribute completeness (34.4%). Loyalty figures were equally concerning, with only 36.7% of respondents indicating loyalty. This situation creates urgency for research to identify the factors influencing Maxim customer loyalty.

Customer loyalty is a strategic asset for service companies because loyal customers not only make repeat purchases but also act as effective word-of-mouth marketers (Griffin, 2017). Prior research has consistently demonstrated that service quality (Parasuraman et al., 1988), price (Tjiptono, 2019), and customer satisfaction (Oliver, 2015) are the primary antecedents of loyalty. However, research specifically examining all three variables simultaneously in the context of the Maxim application in Bekasi City remains unavailable, forming the research gap that underlies this study.

Based on the above background, this study aims to: (1) analyze the effect of service quality on customer loyalty; (2) analyze the effect of price on customer loyalty; (3) analyze the effect of customer satisfaction on customer loyalty; and (4) analyze the simultaneous effect of service quality, price, and customer satisfaction on the loyalty of Maxim application users in Bekasi City.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Service Quality

Service quality is defined as the level of excellence expected and control over that excellence to meet customer desires (Tjiptono in Ahyani, 2022). Kotler & Keller (2016) state that service quality is a consumer's cognitive evaluation at the time of product or service delivery. Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (2018) identified five dimensions of service quality through the SERVQUAL instrument: (1) *reliability* — the ability to deliver promised service accurately and dependably; (2) *tangibles* — physical facilities, equipment, and personnel appearance; (3) *responsiveness* — willingness to help customers promptly; (4) *assurance* — knowledge and courtesy of employees and their ability to inspire trust; and (5) *empathy* — caring, individualized attention to customers. In the context of online transportation, these dimensions encompass driver reliability, vehicle comfort, application ease of use, and the ability to inspire trust and safety.

Research by Mardalis & Riyadi (2021) on online transportation in Yogyakarta proved that service quality positively and significantly affects loyalty, especially on driver reliability and fleet comfort dimensions. Sugiarsih Duki Saputri (2019) on Grab users in Semarang also confirmed that service quality dimensions significantly influence loyalty. Based on this theoretical and empirical foundation:

H1: Service quality has a positive and significant effect on customer loyalty of Maxim application users in Bekasi City.

Price

Price is defined as the amount of money that must be paid by consumers to obtain a product or service, and is the only element of the marketing mix that directly generates revenue for the company (Tjiptono in Putri et al., 2021). Kotler & Armstrong note that price is determined by company policy while considering market demand, competition, and profitability consequences. Tjiptono (2012) identifies four indicators of price: affordability, price-quality consistency, competitive pricing, and price-benefit consistency.

The concept of perceived value proposed by Zeithaml (1988) suggests that consumer-perceived value is the result of a comparison between benefits received and the sacrifices (price) made. When consumers perceive price as fair and proportional to the service received, they develop a positive perception that impacts long-term loyalty (Lupiyoadi & Hamdani, 2006). Arifianto & Prabowo (2020) on online transportation users in Jakarta also proved that rational pricing promotes customer loyalty. Therefore:

H2: Price has a positive and significant effect on customer loyalty of Maxim application users in Bekasi City.

Customer Satisfaction

Customer satisfaction is defined as a feeling of pleasure or disappointment arising from comparing the performance of a received product or service with expectations (Kotler & Keller in Muhammad Luthfi Rizky & Hijriyantomi Suyuthie, 2024). Oliver (2015) emphasizes that satisfied customers are more likely to continue using the service and recommend it to others. Tjiptono (in Fahriani & Febriyanti, 2022) identifies seven indicators of customer satisfaction: service product quality, price assessment, product promotion and information, local attributes, employee service, supporting facilities, and environmental ambiance.

Hidayat & Firmansyah (2020) on Gojek users in Surabaya proved that customer satisfaction significantly influences loyalty, especially when customers experience ease of ordering, safety, and good service quality. Oliver (1999) also states that satisfaction is the primary factor driving repeat purchase intention and recommendations. Based on this:

H3: Customer satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on customer loyalty of Maxim application users in Bekasi City.

Simultaneous Effect

Lupiyadi (2013) states that the combination of quality service, competitive pricing, and high satisfaction is the key determinant of success in building customer loyalty. Rachmawati et al. (2021) empirically proved that service quality and price simultaneously significantly influence satisfaction, which in turn affects loyalty. Sugiharto & Nugroho (2021) on application-based transportation services confirmed that the combination of all three factors makes a real contribution to forming loyalty on a sustained basis:

H4: Service quality, price, and customer satisfaction simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on customer loyalty of Maxim application users in Bekasi City.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

This study used a descriptive quantitative approach with a survey method. Malhotra et al. (2017) state that quantitative research employs data measurement with various statistical analysis tools, while a descriptive design aims to describe the relationship between variables in a planned and structured manner. The research was conducted during May–June 2025, with the research object being active users of the Maxim online transportation application in Bekasi City.

The population of this study was all Maxim customers in Bekasi City (approximately 500 people). The sampling technique used was *purposive sampling* based on the following criteria: (1) active Maxim application users in Bekasi City; (2) at least 17 years of age; and (3) having used Maxim services at least once. Sample size determination used the G*Power application with a significance level (α) of 5%, statistical power of 95%, and a correlation value of 0.3, resulting in a minimum sample of 111 respondents. The study successfully collected data from 111 valid and analyzable respondents.

The research instrument was a structured questionnaire with a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree), measuring four variables: service quality (X1) with 5 items (reliability, tangibles, empathy, responsiveness, assurance); price (X2) with 4 items (affordability, price-quality consistency, competitive pricing, price-benefit consistency); customer satisfaction (X3) with 7 items (product quality, price, promotion information, local attributes, employee service, facilities, environmental ambiance); and customer loyalty (Y) with 3 items (repeat purchase, recommendation, resistance to competitors).

Validity testing used correlation index with the criterion of $r > 0.30$. All items were declared valid with no dropped items, with correlation indices: service quality (0.475–0.700), customer satisfaction (0.388–0.800), price (0.566–0.680), and customer loyalty (0.637–0.911). Reliability testing used Cronbach's Alpha, with all variables meeting the reliability standard: service quality ($\alpha = 0.737$), customer satisfaction ($\alpha = 0.848$), price ($\alpha = 0.799$), and customer loyalty ($\alpha = 0.823$).

Classical assumption tests showed that all variables had normal distributions (Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, $p > 0.05$) and linear relationships (Deviation from Linearity test, $p > 0.05$). Data analysis used multiple linear regression with the equation $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \epsilon$, assisted by SPSS version 25 software. Hypothesis testing included the coefficient of determination test (R^2), simultaneous test (F-test), and partial test (t-test) at a significance level of $\alpha = 5\%$.

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Respondent Profile

Data were collected from 111 active Maxim users in Bekasi City. The respondent profile is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Respondent Demographic Profile (n = 111)

Variable	Category	n	%	Dominant Group
Gender	Male	43	38.74	Female (61.26%)
	Female	68	61.26	
Age	< 25 years	31	27.93	25–30 yrs (39.64%)
	25–30 years	44	39.64	
	31–40 years	32	28.83	
	> 40 years	4	3.60	
Education	Senior High (SMA/K)	34	30.63	Bachelor (54.95%)
	Diploma (D3/D4)	8	7.21	
	Bachelor (S1)	61	54.95	
	Master (S2)	8	7.21	

Source: Primary data processed by researcher (2025).

Table 1 shows that the majority of respondents were female (61.26%), aged 25–30 years (39.64%), and held bachelor's degrees (54.95%). This demographic profile reflects the characteristics of productive-age urban populations who are familiar with digital technology and actively use application-based services in their daily lives. The dominance of female users is consistent with national trends showing women's higher engagement with digital convenience services (GoodStats, 2023).

Validity and Reliability Test

Table 2 summarizes the validity and reliability test results for all research instruments.

Table 2. Validity and Reliability Test Results.

Variable	Items	Correlation Range (r)	Cronbach's α	Status
Service Quality (X1)	5	0.475 – 0.700	0.737	Valid & Reliable
Price (X2)	4	0.566 – 0.680	0.799	Valid & Reliable
Customer Satisfaction (X3)	7	0.388 – 0.800	0.848	Valid & Reliable
Customer Loyalty (Y)	3	0.637 – 0.911	0.823	Valid & Reliable

Source: SPSS Version 25 output (processed, 2025).

All items across all variables were declared valid ($r > 0.30$) with no items dropped, indicating that all questionnaire statements accurately measure their respective constructs. All variables also demonstrated acceptable reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha > 0.70$), confirming that the instruments produce consistent and stable measurements. Customer satisfaction showed the highest reliability ($\alpha = 0.848$), while service quality showed the lowest but still acceptable value ($\alpha = 0.737$).

Classical Assumption Tests

Table 3 presents the results of normality and linearity tests.

Table 3. Normality and Linearity Test Results

Variable	Normality (p)	Linearity – Dev. from Lin. (p)	Status
Service Quality (X1)	0.200	0.333	Normal & Linear
Price (X2)	0.200	0.346	Normal & Linear
Customer Satisfaction (X3)	0.076	0.996	Normal & Linear
Customer Loyalty (Y)	0.200	—	Normal

Source: SPSS Version 25 output (processed, 2025).

All variables demonstrated normal distributions ($p > 0.05$ in the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test) and linear relationships with the dependent variable (Deviation from Linearity $p > 0.05$), fulfilling the prerequisites for multiple linear regression analysis.

Coefficient of Determination (R^2)

Based on the coefficient of determination test in Table 4, an R^2 value of 0.913 was obtained. This means 91.3% of the variation in customer loyalty can be explained by service quality, price, and customer satisfaction together, while only 8.7% is explained by factors outside the model, such as brand image, promotion, and ease of application access.

Table 4. Coefficient of Determination Test Results.

Dependent Variable	R-Square (R ²)
Customer Loyalty (Y)	0.913 (Very Strong)

Source: SPSS Version 25 output (processed, 2025).

Simultaneous Test (F-Test)

Table 5 presents the simultaneous test results.

Table 5. Simultaneous Test (F-Test) Results.

Dependent Variable	F-Count	Sig.
Customer Loyalty (Y)	375.685	0.000*

Source: SPSS Version 25 output (processed, 2025). *Significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

The F-test result in Table 5 shows an F-count of 375.685 with significance 0.000 ($p < 0.05$). Because the significance value is far below the threshold $\alpha = 0.05$ and the F-count is very large, H4 is accepted: service quality, price, and customer satisfaction simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on customer loyalty.

Partial Test (t-Test) and Regression Equation

Table 6 presents the partial test results and regression coefficients.

Table 6. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Results.

Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta (β)	t-Count	Sig.	Decision
Constant	65.488	19.169	—	3.416	0.001	—
Service Quality (X1)	10.690	0.544	0.648	19.652	0.000*	H1 Accepted
Price (X2)	2.819	0.533	0.202	5.293	0.000*	H2 Accepted
Customer Satisfaction (X3)	9.609	0.744	0.435	12.923	0.000*	H3 Accepted

Source: SPSS Version 25 output (processed, 2025). *Significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

Based on Table 6, the regression equation is: $Y = 65.488 + 10.690 X1 + 2.819 X2 + 9.609 X3$. The equation shows that all three independent variables have positive and significant effects. Service quality has the largest coefficient ($B = 10.690$; $\beta = 0.648$), making it the most dominant variable in influencing customer loyalty.

Effect of Service Quality on Customer Loyalty (H1)

Service quality proved to have a positive and significant effect on customer loyalty ($\beta = 0.648$; $t = 19.652$; $p = 0.000$). This is the most dominant variable in the model, contributing the largest share to explaining customer loyalty variation. The high standardized beta value ($\beta = 0.648$) indicates that every one-unit increase in perceived service quality increases customer loyalty by 0.648 units, assuming other variables remain constant.

This finding is consistent with the SERVQUAL theory of Parasuraman et al. (1988/2018), which emphasizes that the five dimensions of service quality collectively shape

quality perceptions that affect satisfaction and loyalty. In the Maxim context, the pre-survey revealed shortcomings in several dimensions, particularly travel insurance availability (*reliability*, only 21.9% responded yes) and driver attribute completeness (*tangibles*, only 34.4%). These facts indicate that while service quality is the primary determinant of loyalty, there is still considerable room for Maxim to raise its standards.

From the perspective of expectancy-disconfirmation theory (Oliver, 1980), loyalty is formed when service performance consistently meets or exceeds customer expectations. Maxim customers who experience responsive, punctual, polite drivers and well-maintained vehicles will build positive cognitive schemas toward the brand, creating psychological switching barriers. This explains why Tjiptono & Chandra (2016) emphasize the importance of service quality consistency in building long-term loyalty. The findings of Mardalis & Riyadi (2021) and Sugarsih Duki Saputri (2019) across different platforms and regions confirm the cross-context consistency of this relationship.

Effect of Price on Customer Loyalty (H2)

Price proved to have a positive and significant effect on customer loyalty ($\beta = 0.202$; $t = 5.293$; $p = 0.000$). Although it has the lowest standardized beta among the three predictors, its significance remains statistically confirmed. The positive beta value indicates that the more positively customers perceive price — in terms of affordability, price-quality consistency, competitiveness, and price-benefit consistency — the higher their loyalty becomes.

This finding reinforces Zeithaml's (1988) concept of perceived value, where consumer-perceived value is the result of comparing benefits received against sacrifices (price) made. Maxim, with a pricing strategy that tends to be more competitive than other platforms (pre-survey data show 53.9% of respondents found Maxim's prices affordable), creates a positive value proposition in the minds of consumers. However, the relatively lower beta value for price (0.202) compared to customer satisfaction (0.435) and service quality (0.648) indicates that price alone is insufficient to build strong loyalty.

This finding aligns with Lupiyoadi & Hamdani (2006), who explain that price can function as a quality indicator: when consumers perceive price as proportional to the service received, they develop positive perceptions that impact long-term loyalty. Arifianto & Prabowo (2020) on online transportation users in Jakarta also proved that rational pricing, when accompanied by satisfying service experiences, promotes customer loyalty. From a strategic perspective, this result signals that Maxim's low-cost competitive advantage needs to be balanced with service quality improvements — a *good value* strategy where quality service is provided at a relatively low price.

Effect of Customer Satisfaction on Customer Loyalty (H3)

Customer satisfaction proved to have a positive and significant effect on customer loyalty ($\beta = 0.435$; $t = 12.923$; $p = 0.000$), making it the second strongest predictor after service quality. This finding is consistent with Oliver's (2015) theory, which positions satisfaction as a psychological bridge to loyalty: satisfied customers build emotional and cognitive bonds with the service provider that motivate them to continue using the service.

A deeper analysis reveals that Maxim customer satisfaction derives from seven dimensions: service product quality, price assessment, information and promotion, local attributes, driver/employee service, supporting facilities, and travel environmental ambiance. This comprehensive, multi-dimensional satisfaction creates an overall positive experience that transcends satisfaction with any single aspect. In the digital competition era, customers experiencing this overall satisfaction not only return to use the service but also transform into brand advocates who voluntarily recommend Maxim to their social networks (Hapsari et al., 2017).

Hidayat & Firmansyah (2020) on Gojek users in Surabaya demonstrated a similar mechanism: satisfaction derived from ease of ordering, safety, and service quality significantly drove loyalty. From a customer lifetime value (CLV) perspective, increasing customer satisfaction is a high-return investment, as the cost of retaining existing customers is far lower than acquiring new ones. Kotler & Keller (2016) estimate that acquiring a new customer can cost 5–7 times more than retaining an existing one. Therefore, Maxim's customer satisfaction enhancement programs — such as real-time feedback systems, 24-hour customer service, and compensation programs for dissatisfaction — have the potential to deliver significant financial impact through increased loyalty.

Simultaneous Effect and Model Fit (H4)

The simultaneous test produced an F-count of 375.685 with significance 0.000 ($p < 0.05$) and $R^2 = 0.913$. The very large F-count reflects that the regression model is an excellent fit for explaining customer loyalty variation. The R^2 value of 0.913, far above the 0.7 threshold considered strong by Ghazali (2012), means that 91.3% of the variability in Maxim customer loyalty in Bekasi City can be jointly explained by service quality, price, and customer satisfaction.

This very high R^2 value carries two important implications. First, statistically, the model is highly representative in capturing the main determinants of Maxim customer loyalty, validating the selection of the three independent variables as appropriate predictors. Second, this value demonstrates that the synergistic interaction between service quality, competitive

pricing, and customer satisfaction creates a cumulative effect on loyalty far greater than the influence of each variable separately. This is consistent with Lupiyoadi's (2013) view that the combination of these three factors constitutes the success triad in building service customer loyalty.

The remaining 8.7% unexplained by the model opens avenues for future research to explore other variables such as brand image, promotion, ease of application use, switching cost, trust, and demographic and psychographic factors not included in this model. Sugiharto & Nugroho (2021) confirm that the synergy of all three factors in application-based transportation services produces more stable loyalty that is resistant to competitive disruption. This finding has practical implications for Maxim management to adopt an integrated customer experience strategy that simultaneously manages all three dimensions in a sustained and consistent manner.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This study confirms that all four hypotheses are accepted. Based on data analysis from 111 respondents of Maxim application users in Bekasi City: (1) service quality has a positive and significant effect on customer loyalty ($B = 10.690$; $\beta = 0.648$; $t = 19.652$; $p = 0.000$), and is the most dominant predictor; (2) price has a positive and significant effect on customer loyalty ($B = 2.819$; $\beta = 0.202$; $t = 5.293$; $p = 0.000$); (3) customer satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on customer loyalty ($B = 9.609$; $\beta = 0.435$; $t = 12.923$; $p = 0.000$); and (4) simultaneously, the three variables significantly affect customer loyalty ($F = 375.685$; $p = 0.000$; $R^2 = 0.913$), explaining 91.3% of the variation in loyalty.

The practical implications for Maxim management are threefold. First, **service quality improvement** should be the top priority, particularly in the *reliability* dimension (travel insurance, driver punctuality) and *tangibles* (driver attribute completeness and vehicle cleanliness), implemented through structured driver training programs and transparent performance evaluation systems. Second, a **good-value pricing strategy** that maintains price affordability while improving service quality, accompanied by transparent fare systems and planned incentive programs, will strengthen the price-loyalty relationship. Third, **comprehensive customer satisfaction programs** focusing on the entire service experience dimension — from ease of ordering to responsive complaint handling — will maximize the satisfaction-loyalty conversion.

This study has several limitations: (1) geographic coverage is limited to Bekasi City, restricting the generalizability of findings to other regions; (2) self-reported data collection

methods are susceptible to common method bias; and (3) the model explains only three predictor variables. Future research is recommended to: (1) expand coverage to multiple cities to enhance generalizability; (2) add mediating variables (*brand trust*) and moderating variables (*switching cost*); (3) employ longitudinal designs to capture loyalty change dynamics over time; and (4) explore differences in effects across demographic or usage frequency segments.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author expresses gratitude to all respondents who participated in this study, as well as to the academic supervisors and colleagues at Institut Transportasi Dan Logistik Trisakti who provided guidance and support throughout the research process. This article is an adaptation of the author's undergraduate thesis completed in 2025.

REFERENCES

- Ahyani, A. (2022). Pengaruh Kualitas Produk Dan Kualitas Pelayanan Terhadap Kepuasan Konsumen. *Scientific Journal of Reflection: Economic, Accounting, Management and Business*, 5(3), 694–701. <https://doi.org/10.37481/sjr.v5i3.523>
- Aprileny, I., Rochim, A., & Emarawati, J. A. (2023). Pengaruh kualitas pelayanan, harga dan kepercayaan terhadap loyalitas pelanggan melalui kepuasan pelanggan. Universitas Muhammadiyah Prof. Dr. HAMKA.
- Arifianto, D., & Prabowo, H. (2020). Pengaruh harga dan kualitas layanan terhadap loyalitas pelanggan melalui kepuasan pelanggan. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 9(2), 145–156.
- Budiono, A. (2021). Pengaruh kualitas produk, persepsi harga, promosi, lokasi, kualitas pelayanan terhadap loyalitas konsumen melalui kepuasan konsumen. *SEGMENT Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 17(2), 223–247. <https://doi.org/10.37729/sjmb.v17i2.6868>
- Fahriani, N. S., & Febriyanti, I. R. (2022). Pengaruh kualitas pelayanan terhadap kepuasan pelanggan pada pusat perbelanjaan. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 13(2), 112–125.
- Ghozali, I. (2012). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS 20*. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
- Griffin, J. (2017). *Customer loyalty: How to earn it, how to keep it*. Jossey-Bass.
- Hapsari, R., Clemes, M. D., & Dean, D. (2017). The impact of service quality, customer engagement and selected marketing constructs on airline passenger loyalty. *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences*, 9(1), 21–40. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJQSS-07-2016-0048>
- Hidayat, R., & Firmansyah, D. (2020). Pengaruh kepuasan pelanggan terhadap loyalitas pengguna layanan Gojek di Surabaya. *Jurnal Ilmu dan Riset Manajemen*, 9(1), 1–16.
- Indrawati, & Diah, L. A. (2020). Pengaruh harga, kualitas pelayanan, dan promosi terhadap keputusan penggunaan transportasi online Maxim di Kota Bandung. *Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen*, 9(2), 103–114.

- Istiyawari, L., Hanif, M. R., & Nuswantoro, A. (2022). Pengaruh kualitas pelayanan, persepsi harga, dan kepuasan pelanggan terhadap loyalitas pelanggan. Universitas Negeri Semarang.
- Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). *Marketing Management* (15th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Lupiyoadi, R., & Hamdani, A. (2006). *Manajemen Pemasaran Jasa*. Salemba Empat.
- Malhotra, N. K., Nunan, D., & Birks, D. F. (2017). *Marketing research: An applied approach* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Mardalis, A., & Riyadi, A. (2021). Pengaruh kualitas layanan terhadap loyalitas pelanggan transportasi online di Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Manajemen Transportasi & Logistik*, 12(1), 67–75.
- Mekel, V. R., Moniharapon, S., & Tampenawas, J. L. (2022). Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan dan Kepuasan Konsumen Terhadap Loyalitas Konsumen Pada Perusahaan Transportasi Gojek Manado. *Jurnal EMBA*, 10(1), 1285–1294.
- Muhammad Luthfi Rizky, & Hijriyantomi Suyuthie. (2024). Pengaruh Kualitas Produk, Kualitas Pelayanan dan Harga terhadap Kepuasan Pelanggan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Dan Karya Mahasiswa*, 2(4), 259–269. <https://doi.org/10.54066/jikma.v2i4.2359>
- Nalendra, A. R. A. (2022). Pengaruh kualitas pelayanan, harga, kepuasan pelanggan terhadap loyalitas pelanggan (Studi kasus pelanggan IM3 Madiun). Universitas Merdeka Madiun.
- Oliver, R. L. (1999). Whence consumer loyalty? *Journal of Marketing*, 63(Special Issue), 33–44. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1252099>
- Oliver, R. L. (2015). *Satisfaction: A behavioral perspective on the consumer* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12–40.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (2018). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing*, 49(4), 41–50.
- Putri, A. A., & Suharyono, S. (2019). Pengaruh harga dan kualitas layanan terhadap kepuasan pengguna transportasi online. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis (JAB)*, 73(1), 100–108.
- Rachmawati, I., Suliyanto, & Rahayu, M. (2021). Pengaruh kualitas layanan dan harga terhadap kepuasan dan dampaknya terhadap loyalitas pelanggan. *Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen*, 19(3), 562–572.
- Setiawan, H., & Sayuti, A. J. (2017). Effects of Service Quality, Customer Trust and Corporate Image on Customer Satisfaction and Loyalty. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 19, 31–40. <https://doi.org/10.9790/487X-1905033140>
- Sholikhah, A. F., & Hadita. (2021). Pengaruh kualitas layanan, kualitas produk dan harga terhadap loyalitas pelanggan melalui kepuasan pelanggan. Universitas Bhayangkara Jakarta Raya.
- Sianipar, G. J. (2019). Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan, Persepsi Harga Dan Citra Merek Terhadap Kepuasan Pelanggan. *CoverAge: Journal of Strategic Communication*, 10(1), 46–53. <https://doi.org/10.35814/coverage.v10i1.1232>

- Sugiharto, B., & Nugroho, R. (2021). Pengaruh kualitas layanan, harga, dan kepuasan terhadap loyalitas pelanggan transportasi daring. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis dan Kewirausahaan*, 5(2), 110–121.
- Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan Tindakan*. Alfabeta.
- Sugiarsih Duki Saputri, R. (2019). Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan dan Harga Terhadap Loyalitas Pelanggan Grab Semarang. *CoverAge: Journal of Strategic Communication*, 10(1), 46–53. <https://doi.org/10.35814/coverage.v10i1.1232>
- Sutanto, D., Pramono, R., & Wulandari, A. (2022). Analisis pengaruh kualitas layanan, harga, dan promosi terhadap loyalitas pelanggan transportasi online. *Jurnal Riset Manajemen dan Bisnis (JRMB)*, 17(1), 77–88.
- Tjiptono, F. (2012). *Service management: Mewujudkan layanan prima*. ANDI.
- Tjiptono, F. (2019). *Strategi pemasaran (5th ed.)*. ANDI.
- Tjiptono, F., & Chandra, G. (2016). *Service, quality & satisfaction (3rd ed.)*. Andi Offset.
- Zeithaml, V. A. (1988). Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value: A means-end model and synthesis of evidence. *Journal of Marketing*, 52(3), 2–22.