

THE INFLUENCE OF LECTURER INSTRUCTIONAL COMMUNICATION, ACADEMIC SERVICE QUALITY, AND HIGHER EDUCATION REPUTATION ON STUDENT STUDY INTEREST

By
Molyanti¹⁾, Sunarto²⁾
^{1,2}Diponegoro University
¹Email: molyanti@poliupg.ac.id

Abstract

The aim of this study is to determine the impact of teachers' communication, academic quality and higher educational reputation on student interests. By collecting data through surveys, the method uses a quantitative approach. The research instrument used a questionnaire tested for validity and reliability using the Cronbach's alpha technique. The sample consisted of 168 people comprised of 30 male and 138 female students of the 2020 class State Polytechnic of Ujung Pandang. The research method uses multiple linear regression analysis. The study results are as follows: (1) Lecturer education communications have a positive impact of 34.1 percent on student participation in college. (2) Academic services quality has a positive impact of 26.7% upon the interest of the students in college. (3) Higher education reputation has a positive effect on student interest of 35.5%. (4) Professors' instructional communications and academic services quality have a positive impact on college students interest by 35.3%. (5) The qualities of academic services and the reputation of institutions of higher education have an effect of 40.3 percent on student interest. (6) The students' interest in study positively affects educational communication from lecturers and reputation in universities by 43.9%. (7) The student interest in studying positively influences 43.9% on teacher education communications, academic quality and the reputation of the universities.

Keywords: instructional communication, quality of service, reputation, student interest

1. INTRODUCTION

Education is a strategic aspect for a country, where an important factor for a person's life is the learning experience gained over time (Sagala, 2016:4). Higher education is a means of organizing and developing higher education. Higher education in Indonesia has two directions of education, namely academic education and vocational education. Academic education is directed at mastering and developing science and technology, while vocational education is specialized in preparing specific applied skills.

State Polytechnic of Ujung Pandang as vocational education is one of the higher education programs with a diploma and applied undergraduate programs to prepare ready-to-use staff. In the last five years, the number of registrants for the State Polytechnic Entrance Examination, especially those who register at the State Polytechnic of Ujung Pandang, has increased. On the other hand, the number of new students who resigned also increased. Based on the data obtained from the Head of the Academic and Student Affairs Section, it was found that most of the new student's resignations had reasons because they had graduated from another university, which means that students prefer to study at universities rather than polytechnics.

Producing graduates on time is one of higher education goals in preparing students to become members of society who have expertise in academics and technology. Expertise in academics and

technology can be achieved along with intellectual advancement through education in tertiary institutions. The expectation of intellectual improvement is a significant factor for students interested in studying in higher education and career and prospects (Byrne et al., 2012; Nurniah et al., 2012: 176). Academic improvement and knowledge cannot be separated from the role of a lecturer as an educator through the teaching and learning process.

The essence of education itself is a process of interaction, a two-way reciprocal relationship between educators and students (Mahmud, 2017: 15). In the teaching and learning process, scholarly communication is known as instructional communication. Instructional communication is a communication process that is formed and designed explicitly for the communicant so that changes in behavior are developed, especially in aspects of cognition, affection, and psychomotor (Yusuf, 2010; Hidayati, 2017:4). Lecturers are expected to be able to transfer knowledge and knowledge to students effectively and efficiently. Therefore, the quality of lecturer instructional communication is one of the critical success factors in the teaching and learning process.

The interaction of lecturers as educators and students as students in the field of educational communication takes place between two parties (Yusuf, 1990; Siregar and Primasari, 2014: 34). Students tend to believe that lectures in class contribute to performance by reducing academic

anxiety and improving the quality of their education (Bongey et al., 2006; Deal, 2007; Traphagan, 2005; Owston et al., 2011:263). This shows that the teaching and learning process in the classroom helps students improve their intellectual abilities, since the teacher supports teaching communication. Effective readers are therefore also regarded as effective communicators (Göksoy, 2014: 1334). In the process of communication, the learning atmosphere created in education shows that it is important.

The effectiveness of communication between teachers and students lies at the forefront of achievement of education objectives and impacts on student final results. The key actors in university activities are the lecturers (Harvey 1995; Pozo-Munoz et al. 2000; Masserini et al. 2019:94). In order to provide the students with knowledge and skills, lecturers are responsible for education. In the delivery of messages, the communication between lecturers and students has been identified as a critical learning element. The steps of the training process are divided into sequential phases according to Hart, Scott and McCroskey (1978), i.e. specification and targets of education content, interpretations of initial behavior, determination of educational strategies and the development and feedback of educational units (Yusuf, 1990: 28-30; Zakiah & Umar, 2005: 126-127).

Douglas (2006) reports that professor competence, attitudes, activities and styles of teaching are essential for providing high-quality education, as is the quality of services and support. As public policies change, universities are more student-oriented and are more competitive so that institutions are market-oriented (DeShields et al., 2005; Masserini et al., 2019: 92). Therefore, the success and continuity of higher education is an important factor for business universities to have a competitive advantage. Institutes of higher education must make practical plans for competitive and market survival immediately. Students who receive academic services evaluate the performance of education services received during lectures. The quality of academic services has an impact on the satisfaction of the service (Parengki, 2012). Quality of service is the inconsistency between the perceptions of consumers about certain companies' services and expectations about companies offering services.

It is called the servqual model in the measurement of service quality. ServQual is an essential rule used by service organizations in order to improve service quality according to Zeithaml and others (1990) at Hardiyansyah (2018: 63-64). The dimensions of reliability, responsiveness, confidence, empathy and tangibility and their influence on university student interests are used to measure service quality. The extent of the quality and satisfaction of higher education services is important for students. After all, universities can suffer from the dissatisfaction that arises. The quality of services that

the students feel and play a role in the success of higher education is essential to their degree of happiness (Abdullah, 2005; Kusyana, 2020: 12). The competitive advantage of happy students is that they are more likely to stay in school (Duz Terrace, 2015, 568).

Universities' reputation is one of the principal factors that contribute to competitiveness, including the decision of students to enroll in higher education (Panda et al., 2019). Graduates with a good reputation will affect the performance of the company's employees (Sultan and Wong, 2012). Therefore, students believe that they can succeed in getting the job they expect from a reputable university. The reputation of an organization refers to the public perception that its members have over time of the organization (Sung and Yang 2008; Munisamy et al., 2014:454). A good reputation can bring many benefits, and a bad reputation can lead to an organization's failure (Heath & Vaques, 2001; Harahap, 2017:4). Universities must therefore administer their reputation.

Continuing to study at a reputable tertiary institution (Sabando et al., 2018) begins with the emergence of a sense of interest and the need to develop knowledge. Student interest is an essential issue in higher education, primarily because of the importance of academic performance for student life (Afzal et al., 2010; Harandi, 2015: 429). With interest in a person, it will be a driving force in carrying out an action and participating in it. Interest is a feeling of liking or a sense of interest in an activity or activity (Slameto, 1995; Nurhasanah and Sobandi, 2016: 130). Student interest in college can be assessed based on four elements: interest in lectures, attention during college, lecture motivation, and college knowledge (Slameto, 1995; Nurfarini & Saudi. 2020: 125). Therefore, interest is defined as a person's effort to participate with his environment and a tendency to examine and investigate and carry out an exciting activity for a person. The interest that a person already has can be used as a basis or basis for carrying out an activity so that it can lead to achieving maximum results.

This research was conducted to determine the relationship between the influence of the lecturer's instructional communication, academic service, and university reputation on student interest in college. The purpose of this study was to analyze the effect of the variable quality of lecturer instructional communication, quality of academic services, and university reputation on student interest in the State Polytechnic of Ujung Pandang.

Research hypothesis:

- H1: There is a positive influence between lecturer's instructional communication on student interest in college.
- H2: There is a positive influence between academic services on student interest in college.

- H3: There is a positive influence between the reputation of higher education institutions on student interest in studying.
- H4: There is a positive influence between lecturer's instructional communication and academic services on student interest in college.
- H5: There is a positive influence between academic service and university reputation on student interest in college.
- H6: There is a positive influence between lecturer instructional communication and the college's reputation on student interest in studying.
- H7: There is a positive influence between lecturer instructional communication, academic services, and the college's reputation on student interest in studying.

Statistical Hypothesis:

- H0: There is no linear influence between variables
- H1: There is a linear influence between variables

2. METHODS

This research is a positive research paradigm used to research certain populations and samples. This research is explanatory. The explanatory study is designed to explain the law of cause and effect and to assess the extent and impact of the relationship between one variable and another (Guba, 1994; Salim, 2001: 75).

All the students in this study were new Ujung Pandang State Polytechnic students in the 2020 class. The sampling technique uses unlikely sampling techniques, i.e. sampling techniques that do not offer equal opportunities to be selected as sample members for each part of the population (Suryadi et al. 2019: 164). A sample of 168 people consisted of 30 men and 138 women from all new chemical engineering students at Ujung Pandang's state-owned polytechnics.

A survey in the form of a survey distributed to respondents is the data collection method. The questionnaire consisted of 29 instructional communication statements by the lecturer, 27 academic service accounts, 11 university-recognition reports and 15 university-interest reports on scale 4 of Likert. Before using, the questionnaire was tested for its validity and reliability (Jogiyanto, 2007). Technique of validity measurement by the correlation of a product and reliability with the alpha technique of Cronbach.

The research method uses multiple linear regression analyses to determine the effect and connection between the separate and the dependent variable (Ghozali, 2012). The determination coefficient (R2), the simultaneous influence test (F) and the partial test (t) have been performed in order to detect the regression equation. The test process uses the application version 25 of SPSS.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
The Influence of Lecturer Instructional Communication on Student Study Interest
Table1.

Coefficient of Determination Analysis of Lecturer Instructional Communication

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. The error of the Estimate
1	.587 ^a	.345	.341	4.59597

a. Predictors: (Constant), Lecturer Instructional Communication (X1)

On the basis of Table 1 above, the Pearson Product Moment correlation between teacher training (X1) and college student interest (Y) is calculated to produce a R value of 0.587, where the value is strongly defined at the level of correlation and relationship. While the results of the regression test of the lecturer's instructional communication variable (X1) can explain the variable of student interest in college (Y) linearly, the amount of the adjusted R square number is 0.341, which means that the influence of the lecturer's instructional communication (X1) with student interest in college (Y) is 34.1%. In comparison, the remaining 65.9% is influenced by other variables besides the lecturer's instructional communication.

Table2.

Results of simple regression analysis X1 with Y

ANOVA						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1844.296	1	1844.296	87.312	.000 ^b
	Residual	3506.412	166	21.123		
	Total	5350.708	167			

a. Dependent Variable: Student Study Interest (Y)

b. Predictors: (Constant), Lecturer Instructional Communication (X1)

The above table shows a value below 0.000 and a value below 0.05 and F is 87,312 > F table 2.66, then H0 and H1 is rejected, which means there has been an influence on the student interest in college between the lecturers' teaching communication.

Table 3.

T-Test Results of Lecturer Instructional Communication Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	16.636	3.557		4.677	.000
	Lecturer Instructional Communication (X1)	.332	.036	.587	9.344	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Student Study Interest (Y)

The above data shows that the T value is $9.344 >$ Table 1.97453 and that the T value is $0.0000 < 0.05$. It can be said that lecturer education (X1) has a positive and significant impact on university student interest (Y). Although the b-coefficient value indicates the number 0.332, it indicates that the student's interest in lectures (Y) will rise by 0.332 points at a constant of 16.636, for each 1 percent addition to the teacher's communication. The first hypothesis, that teacher communication has a positive effect on student interest in college, was therefore accepted. This is the first hypothesis, in which the value T is greater than ($>$) the value of the table T. The probability meaning value is below ($<$) 0.05 which means that H0 is rejected and H1 accepted, meaning that teacher communication has a positive effect of 34.1 per cent on the university interest.

The Influence of Academic Service Quality on Students' College Interest

Table4

Coefficient of Determination Analysis of Academic Service Quality

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. The error of the Estimate
1	.521 ^a	.271	.267	4.84685

a. Predictors: (Constant), Academic Service Quality (X2)

The link between the variable quality of academic service (X2) and the interest from students in college (Y) results in a calculated R value of 0,521, where the value is defined as the correlation and relation. This can be seen in Table 4. Based on Table 4 above. While the academic service variable (X2) regression test results may linearly explain student variable interest in college (Y), the quantity of adjusted R square number amounts to 0.267, which means an impact of academic service quality on college interest is 26.7 percent. In comparison, besides education service quality, the remaining 73.3% are influenced by other variables.

Table 5.

Results of Simple Regression Analysis X2 and Y

ANOVA						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1451.044	1	1451.044	61.768	.000 ^b
	Residual	3899.665	166	23.492		
	Total	5350.708	167			

a. Dependent Variable: Student Study Interest (Y)
b. Predictors: (Constant), Academic Service Quality (X2)

Table 5 above shows $0.000 < 0.05$ and $F 61.768 >$ to show significance. F table 2.66, then H0 and H1 are rejected, which means that the quality of academic service is affected by the interest of students at university.

Table of6.

T-Test Results of Academic Service Quality

Coefficients						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	24.130	3.276		7.366	.000
	Academic Service Quality (X2)	.282	.036	.521	7.859	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Student Study Interest (Y)

From the data in table 6 above, it is known that the calculated T value is $7.856 >$ T table 1.97453, and the significance value shows $0.000 < 0.05$. It can be said that academic services (X2) have a positive and significant effect on student interest in college (Y). While the value of the coefficient b shows the number 0.282, this indicates that for every 1% addition of academic services (X2), student interest in studying (Y) will increase by 0.282 points at a constant of 24,130. Thus, the second hypothesis is accepted. Namely, academic service (X2) positively affects student interest in college (Y). This demonstrates the second hypothesis since the value T is over ($>$) the value in the T table. This means that H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted, meaning that the quality of academic services affects the student interest in school positively by 26.7 percent.

The Influence of Higher Education's Reputation on Students' Interest in Studying

Table7.

Coefficient of Determination of Higher Education Reputation

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. The error of the Estimate
1	.599 ^a	.359	.355	4.54535

a. Predictors: (Constant), Higher Education Reputation (X3)

It is known from Table 7 above that the correlation between higher education (X3) reputation and student (Y) interest results in a calculated R value of 0.599 where the value of the student is based on correlation and relationship levels. The value is determined at Pearson product minute range. Whereas the result from the university reputation variable regression test (X3) may linearly explain the variable student interest in college (Y), the adjusted R square number is 0.350, meaning that a university's reputation for university interest is 35.5 percent. Compared with other variables apart from the university reputation, the remaining 64.5 percent is influenced.

Table 8.

Results of Simple Regression Analysis X3 with Y

ANOVA						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1921.112	1	1921.112	92.986	.000 ^b
	Residual	3429.596	166	20.660		
	Total	5350.708	167			

a. Dependent Variable: Student Study Interest (Y)
b. Predictors: (Constant), Higher Education Reputation (X3)

Table 8 above shows that the significance value is $0.000 < 0.05$ and $F \text{ counts } 92,986 > F \text{ table } 2.66$, then H_0 is rejected, and H_1 is accepted, which means that there is an influence between the reputation of higher education institutions on student interest in college.

Table9.
T-Test Results for the Reputation of Higher Education

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	14.671	3.650		4.019	.000
	Higher Education Reputation (X3)	.877	.091	.599	9.643	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Student Study Interest (Y)

It is known from the above figures of Table 9 that the value calculated is $9,643 > T \text{ table } 2.66$ and that the value of meaning $0.000 < 0.05$. It can be said that university reputation (X3) has a positive and substantial effect on university student interests (Y). Although the b-coefficient is worth 0.877, this shows that the student interest in studying (Y) will rise by 0.877 points, a constant of 14,671. For each 1% added to the reputation of the university (X3). Thus, the third assumption, namely the higher education reputation (X3), has a positive impact on the interest of students in studying (Y). This is the third hypothesis as the value T calculated exceeds ($>$) the value of the T table. The probability value is less than ($<$) 0,05, which means H_0 is rejected and H_1 accepted; that is, 26,7 percent of the student interest in college in the quality of academic services is affected positive.

The Influence of Lecturer Instructional Communication and Academic Services on Students' Interest in Lectures

Table 10
Coefficient of Determination Analysis

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. The error of the Estimate
1	.601 ^a	.361	.353	4.55151

a. Predictors: (Constant), Academic Service Quality (X2), Lecturer Instructional Communication (X1)

Based on table 10 above, it is known that the Pearson Product Moment correlation between the instructional communication variable of lecturers (X1), and the variable of academic service quality (X2), with the student interest variable (Y), produces a calculated R-value of 0.601, where the value is strongly defined at the level of correlation and relationship. While the results of the regression test of the lecturer's instructional communication variable (X1) and the academic service quality variable (X2) jointly affect the student interest variable (Y), the amount of the adjusted R square number is 0.353, which means that the influence of lecturer's instructional communication (X1), Academic quality

service (X2) towards student interest in a college is 35.3%. In comparison, the remaining 64.7% is influenced by other variables besides lecturer instructional communication and academic service quality variables.

Tabell11
Simultaneous Influence Test Results

ANOVA						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1932.525	2	966.263	46.643	.000 ^b
	Residual	3418.183	165	20.716		
	Total	5350.708	167			

a. Dependent Variable: Student Study Interest (Y)
b. Predictors: (Constant), Lecturer Instructional Communication (X1), Academic Service Quality (X2)

The simultaneous test results showed that the meaning value is $0,000 < 0.05$, and the value of F is $46,643 >$. F Table 2.66 is then rejected and H_1 accepted, which means that the quality of academic services and education communication influence college interests.

Table12. T-Test Results

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
		1	(Constant)	15.216		
	Lecturer Instructional Communication (X1)	.252	.052	.446	4.821	.000
	Academic Service Quality (X2)	.104	.050	.191	2.064	.041

a. Dependent Variable: Student Study Interest (Y)

Because the mean value is $0,000 < 0,05$, it may be concluded from the results of a partial test in Table 12 above that the instructional communication variable of the lecturer partially impacts the college interest variable, H_0 being rejected and H_1 is accepted. In other words, the relationship between teaching and student interest in college is linear. Or that the teaching communication of the lecturer influences student interest in college may be interpreted. For variables of academic service, student interest in learning partially affects because its significance is $0.041 < 0.05$, then H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted. This means that the link between academic services and the interest of university students is linear.Or it can be interpreted that educational services affect student interest in studying. This proves the fourth hypothesis, namely the instructional communication of lecturers and the quality of academic services, positively affects student interest in college by 35.3%.

The Influence of Academic Services and College Reputation on Students' Interest in Studying

Table13
Coefficient of Determination Analysis

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. The error of the Estimate
1	.641 ^a	.410	.403	4.37287

a. Predictors: (Constant), Student Study Interest (X3), Academic Service Quality (X2)

The correlation between academic service quality (X2) and university reputation (X3) with student interest (Y) can be seen on Table 13 above as a result of the Pearson Product Moment, where the correlation is defined strongly at correlating value of a calibrated R value of 0.641. And the connection. Meanwhile, both the regression tests for academic service quality (X2) and higher education reputation class (X3) affect student tutoring (Y). The adjusted R square number is 0.403, which means that, together with the interest of college students, university quality (X2) and reputational level (X3) has a 40.3 percent impact on academic service quality (X2). Other variables, besides the quality of academic services and the reputation of university, influence the remaining 59,7 percent.

Table14
Simultaneous Influence Test Results

ANOVA						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2195.578	2	1097.789	57.410	.000 ^b
	Residual	3155.131	165	19.122		
	Total	5350.708	167			
a. Dependent Variable: Student Study Interest (Y)						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Higher Education Reputation (X3), Academic Service Quality (X2)						

The significance value in Tables 14 above is $0.000 < 0.05$ and F is $57.410 > F$ Table 2.66 then rejects H_0 and accepts H_1 , which means that the university's reputation for quality academic services is affected by university interest.

Table 15
T-Test Results

Coefficients						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	10.128	3.711		2.729	.007
	Academic Service Quality (X2)	.148	.039	.272	3.789	.000
	Higher Education Reputation (X3)	.656	.105	.448	6.240	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Student Study Interest (Y)						

Table 15 above shows that the variable in university quality of academic service partially affects student interest, given that the value is $0.000 < 0.05$, and H_0 is then rejected and H_1 is accepted. That means that the quality of academic services is linked in a linear way with university student interest. Or the quality of educational services could be construed as affecting the interest of students in studying. Meanwhile, the reputational variable affects the quality of students in part because the meaning is $0.000 < 0.05$, H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted. This means a linear relationship between the reputation of universities and the interest of students in learning. Or the importance of university can be interpreted as affecting the interests of students at university. This is a positive effect on the interest of students by 40,3 per cent, the fifth hypothesis, namely the quality of university services and the reputation of higher schools.

The Influence of the Quality of Lecturer Instructional Communication and the Reputation of Higher Education on Students' Study Interest
Table16.

Coefficient of Determination Analysis

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. An error of the Estimate
1	.668 ^a	.446	.439	4.23999
a. Predictors: (Constant), Higher Education Reputation (X3), Lecturer Instructional Communication (X1)				

From Table 16 above, the results of a correlation between the high quality of education (X1), with student interest studies (Y), can be seen to produce an R-value calculation of 0.668 in which the value is defined at the level of relationship and correlation. While both the student variable of interest (Y) in the lecturer (X1) and the university reputation variable (X3) are affected by the regression test, an adjusted R square number of 0.439 means the student interest rate is affected by the educational communication quality of the teacher (X1) and colleges (X3) together. Other variables, in addition to teacher education communication and college reputation, influence the remaining 56.1 percent.

Table17.
Simultaneous Influence Test Results

ANOVA						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2384.414	2	1192.207	66.316	.000 ^b
	Residual	2966.294	165	17.978		
	Total	5350.708	167			
a. Dependent Variable: Student Study Interest (Y)						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Higher Education Reputation (X3), Lecturer Instructional Communication (X1)						

Table 17 above shows that the significance value is $0.000 < 0.05$ and F counts $66.316 > F$ table 2.66, then H_0 is rejected, and H_1 is accepted, meaning that there is an influence between instructional communication and college reputation on student interest in college.

Table18.
T-Test Results

Coefficients						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	6.568	3.761		1.747	.083
	Lecturer Instructional Communication (X1)	.204	.040	.361	5.077	.000
	Higher Education Reputation (X3)	.571	.104	.390	5.481	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Student Study Interest (Y)						

The education communication variable of teachers can be shown on the basis of table 18 above, to affect the interest of the student at college in part, since the meaning value is $0.000 < 0.05$, H_0 is

rejected and H1 accepted. In other words, the relationship between teaching and student interest in college is linear. In other words, teacher communication affects the interest of students at college. In the meanwhile, the reputational variable of higher education has a partial impact on student interests because its meaning is $0.000 < 0.05$, H0 is rejected and H1 accepted. It means that the reputation of universities and the interest of students in studying are linear. This demonstrates that the sixth hypothesis – teacher communication and the importance of institutions of higher education – has a positive influence of 43.9 per cent on university interests.

The Influence of Lecturer Instructional Communication, Academic Service Quality and Higher Education Reputation on Student Study Interest.

Table 19.
Coefficient of Determination Analysis

Model Summary					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. The error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.670 ^a	.449	.439	4.240	1.973

a. Predictors: (Constant), Higher Education Reputation (X3), Academic Service Quality (X2), Lecturer Instructional Communication (X1)
b. Dependent Variable: Student Study Interest (Y)

Based on table 19 above, it can be seen that the correlation results of Pearson Product Moment for instructional communication for lecturers (X1), quality of academic services (X2), and reputation of universities (X3) with student interest study (Y) produce a calculated R-value of 0.670, where the value is firmly defined. At the level of correlation and relationship. Meanwhile, for the results of the regression test for the instructional communication variable of lecturers (X1), the variable of academic service quality (X2) and the Variable Of University Reputation (X3) together affect the student interest in college (Y), the amount of the adjusted R square is 0.439 which means Instructional Communication, Lecturers (X1), Academic Service Quality (X2), and Higher Education Reputation (X3) together on student interest in a college is 43.9%. In comparison, the remaining 56.1% is influenced by variables other than lecturer instructional communication, academic service quality, and university reputation. While the Durbin Watson value is greater than 1, which is 1,973, there is no autocorrelation, or there is no correlation between X1, X2, and X3.

Table 20.
Simultaneous Influence Test Results

ANOVA						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2401.845	3	800.615	44.526	.000 ^b
	Residual	2948.863	164	17.981		
	Total	5350.708	167			

a. Dependent Variable: Student Study Interest (Y)
b. Predictors: (Constant), Higher Education Reputation (X3), Academic Service Quality (X2), Lecturer Instructional Communication (X1)

The value of $0.000 < 0.05$ and F counts

$44.526 >$ is shown in Table 21. F table 2.66 then refuses H0 and the H1 is accepted which means that there is an impact on the student's interest in school among teacher communication and the quality of academic services.

Table 21.
T-Test Results

Model		Coefficients						
		Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics		
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF	
1	(Constant)	5.346	3.768		1.684	.094		
	Lecturer Instructional Communication (X1)	.173	.051	.306	3.387	.001	.411	2.432
	Academic Service Quality (X2)	.047	.048	.087	.985	.326	.429	2.332
	Higher Education Reputation (X3)	.546	.107	.373	5.109	.000	.629	1.590

a. Dependent Variable: Student Study Interest (Y)

Table 21 above shows that an instructional communication variable affecting the interest of the student in college variables on the basis of an important $0.001 < 0.05$ value, which is then rejected by H0 and accepted by H1. In other words, the relationship between teaching and student interest in college is linear. Or that the teaching communication of the lecturer influences student interest in college may be interpreted. The quality variable of the academic service doesn't partly affect the interest of students to keep on studying as the meaning is $0.326 > 0.05$, H0 and H1 are rejected. This means that the quality of academic services and student interest in studying have no linear relationship. Or the quality of education services cannot be interpreted as affecting the student's college interest. While the reputation variable for higher education concerns partially student interest in studying, as the meaning value is $0.000 < 0.05$, H0 is rejected and H1 accepted. This means that the reputation of the university and the interest of students in studying are linear. Or the importance of university can be interpreted as affecting the interests of students at university. This proves the seventh hypothesis, namely lecturer's instructional communication, service quality, and college reputation, positively affects student interest in college by 43.9%.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the analysis, it can be concluded that: 1) Instructional communication of lecturers has a positive and significant effect on student interest in lectures by 34.1%; 2) Academic service quality has a positive and significant effect on student interest in college by 26.7 percent; 3) College reputation has a positive and significant effect on student interest in college by 35.5%; 4) Lecturer instructional communication and academic service quality simultaneously positively affect student interest in college by 35.3%; 5) The quality of

educational facilities and the credibility of universities have a combined effect of 40.3 percent on educational quality in college; 6) Lecturer instructional communication and college reputation simultaneously positively affect student interest in college by 43.9%; and 7) Lecturer instructional communication, academic service quality, and university reputation simultaneously positively affect student interest in college by 43.9%.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to the 2019 PasTi DiktiScholarship Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education manager.

5. REFERENCES

- Cordova, A., Dolci, J., & Gianfrate, G. (2015). The determinants of crowdfunding success: evidence from technology projects. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 181, 115-124.
- Darmawan, K. Z. (2006). Komunikasi Instruksional dalam Proses Pembelajaran Mahasiswa. *Mediator: Jurnal Komunikasi*, 7(1), 125-138.
- Douglas, J., Douglas, A., & Barnes, B. (2006). Measuring student satisfaction at a UK university. *Quality assurance in education*.
- Fredrickson, J. E. (2012). Linking student effort to satisfaction: The importance of faculty support in creating a gain-loss frame. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 16, 111.
- Ghozali, Imam. (2012). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS 20*. Semarang: Badan Penerbit-Universitas Diponegoro
- Göksoy, S. (2014). Teacher candidates' (pedagogical formation students') communication skills. *Creative Education*, 2014.
- Harahap, D. A. (2017). Pengaruh Reputasi Universitas Terhadap Keputusan Mahasiswa Memilih Studi di Universitas Islam Sumatera Utara.
- Hardiyansyah. (2018). *Kualitas Pelayanan Publik (Konsep, Dimensi, Indikator dan Implementasinya)*. Yogyakarta: Gava Media.
- Heijstra, T. M., & Rafnsdottir, G. L. (2010). The Internet and academics' workload and work-family balance. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 13(3), 158-163.
- Hidayati, H., & Firdaus, M. (2017). *Komunikasi Instruksional Dalam Pendidikan Pembentukan (Diktuk) Bintara Polri Di Sekolah Polisi Negara Polda Riau* (Doctoral dissertation, Riau University).
- Jogiyanto. (2016). *Pedoman Survey Kuesioner: Pengembangan Kuesioner, Mengatasi Bias, dan Meningkatkan Respon*. Yogyakarta: BPFE
- Kusyana, D. N. B., Purwaningrat, P. A., & Sunny, M. P. (2020). Peran Kualitas Layanan Dalam Menciptakan Loyalitas Mahasiswa. *Widya Manajemen*, 2(1), 10-27.
- Mahmud, D. M. (2017). *Psikologi Pendidikan*. Yogyakarta: Andi
- Masserini, L., Bini, M., & Pratesi, M. (2019). Do quality of services and institutional image impact students' satisfaction and loyalty in higher education?. *Social Indicators Research*, 146(1), 91-115.
- Mulyana, D. (2007). *Ilmu Komunikasi Suatu Pengantar*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Munisamy, S., Jaafar, N. I. M., & Nagaraj, S. (2014). Does reputation matter? Case study of undergraduate choice at a premier university. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 23(3), 451-462.
- Nurhasanah, S., & Sobandi, A. (2016). Minat belajar sebagai determinan hasil belajar siswa. *Jurnal Pendidikan Manajemen Perkantoran (JPManper)*, 1(1), 128-135.
- Nurniah, N., Burhany, D. I., & Nasir, N. (2015). Analisis Motivasi Dan Ekspektasi Mahasiswa Dalam Menempuh Pendidikan Tinggi Akuntansi. *Ekuitas (Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Keuangan)*, 19(2), 174-191.
- Panda, S., Pandey, S. C., Bennett, A., & Tian, X. (2019). University brand image as competitive advantage: a two-country study. *International Journal of Educational Management*.
- Quintal, V. A., Wong, D. H., Sultan, P., & Wong, H. Y. (2012). Service quality in a higher education context: an integrated model. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*.
- Sagala, S. (2016). *Memahami Organisasi Pendidikan: Budaya dan Reinventing, Organisasi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Salim, A. (2001). *Teori dan Paradigma Penelitian Sosial*. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana.
- Siregar, N. A. G., & Primasari, W. (2015). Strategi Komunikasi Instruksional Guru Bahasa Indonesia Dengan Siswa Di Smp Amal Mulia Klapanunggal Bogor. *Makna: Jurnal Kajian Komunikasi, Bahasa, dan Budaya*, 6(1), 32-41.
- Sujarweni, W. (2015). *Metode Penelitian Bisnis dan Ekonomi*. Yogyakarta: Pustakabarupress
- Suryadi, E., Darmawan, D., Mulyadi, A. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Komunikasi dengan Pendekatan Kuantitatif*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya
- Susanto, P. (2012). Pengaruh kualitas pelayanan akademik dan citra merek lembaga terhadap kepuasan mahasiswa Universitas Negeri Padang. *Tingkap*, 8(1), 65-78.
- Widoyoko, E. P. S. (2012). *Teknik Penyusunan Instrumen Penelitian*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

ZR, H. N., & Saugi, W. (2020). Pengaruh Kuliah Online Terhadap Minat Belajar Mahasiswa Pendidikan Agama Islam (PAI) Di IAIN Samarinda. *El-Buhuth: Borneo Journal of Islamic Studies*, 2(2), 121-131.