
**THE INFLUENCE OF PROMOTION AND PHYSICAL
FACILITIES ON STUDENTS' DECISIONS IN CHOOSING
EDUCATIONAL SERVICES AT SMA MUHAMMADIYAH 1
PONTIANAK**

Yona Camellia¹

Universitas Muhammadiyah Pontianak, Pontianak, Indonesia
camelliyona@gmail.com

Samsuddin²

Universitas Muhammadiyah Pontianak, Pontianak, Indonesia
samsuddin@unmuhpnk.ac.id

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the influence of Promotion and Physical Facilities on Students' Decisions in choosing educational services at SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Pontianak. This research employs a quantitative approach with a causal associative design. The sample consists of 100 respondents selected using probability sampling with proportional stratified random sampling method. Data were collected via questionnaires and analyzed using multiple linear regression with SPSS, through validity and reliability tests, classical assumption tests, and hypothesis testing using t-test and F-test. The results indicate that all instruments are valid and reliable. Partially, Promotion has a positive and significant effect on Students' Decisions with a t-count value of 7.915 and significance of 0.000. Physical Facilities also have a positive and significant effect with a t-count value of 5.261 and significance of 0.000. Simultaneously, both variables have a significant effect with an F-count value of 62.923 and significance of 0.000. The coefficient of determination (R^2) of 0.565 indicates that 56.5% of the variation in Students' Decisions can be explained by Promotion and Physical Facilities, while the remainder is influenced by factors outside the study. These findings confirm that promotion and physical facilities play an important role in enhancing students' decisions, with promotion as the most dominant factor.

Keywords: Promotion, Physical Facilities, Students' Decisions, Educational Service Marketing

INTRODUCTION

Education is a long-term investment that plays a strategic role in improving human resource quality amid technological development and increasingly intense global competition. At the secondary education level, schools are required not only to produce academically excellent graduates but also to develop strong character and spiritual values. This condition encourages educational institutions to manage services professionally through a service marketing approach (SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Pontianak, 2025), particularly by optimizing promotion and providing physical facilities as part of the service marketing mix. In addition, promotion and physical facilities are important factors that can influence students' perceptions and decisions in choosing educational services (Setiawan et al., 2022).

Competition among secondary education institutions in Pontianak City, especially in Southeast Pontianak District, shows a relatively competitive dynamic. Based on 2025 data, there are 9 SMA and SMK operating in the area, each striving to maintain a competitive advantage to attract prospective students (West Kalimantan Provincial Education and Culture Office, 2025). Over time, the number of Islamic schools has increasingly attracted interest (Novena, 2020). Although interest in Islamic schools is rising, private schools are required to have effective marketing strategies, particularly through targeted promotion and adequate physical facilities to enhance school attractiveness amid tight competition (Erinawati et al., 2021).

SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Pontianak, as an Islamic-based private school, has made various efforts to improve competitiveness through promotion and physical facilities. Promotion is conducted through social media such as Instagram, TikTok, Facebook, websites, as well as direct outreach activities to schools (SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Pontianak, 2025). Furthermore, the school is supported by adequate physical facilities, such as 20 classrooms, laboratories, a library, and other supporting facilities. Nevertheless, empirical data show a decline in the number of applicants from 247 students in the 2022/2023 academic year to 201 students in the 2024/2025 academic year, representing a decrease of -18.62% in the latest period (SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Pontianak, 2025).

This phenomenon indicates a mismatch between promotional efforts and facility adequacy with students' decisions in choosing a school. This shows that the presence of promotion and physical facilities does not automatically increase students' interest and decisions if not managed effectively. Therefore, it is important to further examine how these two variables influence students' decisions in choosing educational services (Yulianti & Purwanti, 2026).

Previous studies show that promotion plays an important role in influencing consumer decisions in choosing educational services. Research by Batubara & Hidayat (2016) revealed that promotion aims to provide information, persuade consumers, and serve as reminders. Setiawan et al. (2022) found that promotion affects school choice decisions mediated by interest. Erinawati et al. (2021) also showed that promotion has a positive and significant effect on school choice decisions, although other variables such as service quality and price have greater influence. Meanwhile, Samsuddin et al. (2014) found that physical

evidence as part of the marketing mix also influences consumer decisions in choosing services.

However, there are several limitations in previous studies. The influence of promotion is not always the dominant factor compared to other variables such as service quality and price (Erinawati et al., 2021). The study conducted by Samsuddin et al. (2014) was conducted in different contexts, such as junior high schools or the hospitality service sector, so it has not specifically examined the combination of promotion and physical facilities at the senior high school level. Research directly examining the influence of promotion and physical facilities on students' decisions in the local context of Pontianak City is still limited.

Based on these gaps, this study contributes by integrating promotion and physical facility variables in one model to test their direct influence on students' decisions in choosing educational services. This research also takes the specific context of SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Pontianak as an Islamic-based private school in a highly competitive area, providing a more contextual empirical picture (SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Pontianak, 2025).

The purpose of this study is to analyze and empirically test the influence of promotion and physical facilities on students' decisions in choosing educational services at SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Pontianak. This research is expected to provide empirical contributions and serve as a basis for developing more effective educational marketing strategies to enhance school competitiveness.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Promotion

Promotion is defined as activities to inform and persuade the market about products or services through advertising, personal selling, sales promotion, and publicity (Kotler & Armstrong, 2015 in Manap et al., 2023). Promotion aims to introduce, communicate information, and remind consumers of product benefits to attract purchase interest (Lupiyoadi & Hamdani, 2009). Promotion indicators include advertising, sales promotion, personal selling, public relations, direct and digital marketing (Kotler & Armstrong, 2016). Research by Setiawan et al. (2022) shows that promotion affects school choice decisions. Similar results were found by Nurhakim & Tafsiruddin (2024), indicating that promotion has a positive and significant effect on school choice decisions. Furthermore, Samsuddin et al. (2014) show that promotion as part of the marketing mix affects consumer decisions in choosing services.

H1: Promotion has a positive and significant effect on Students' Decisions in Choosing Educational Services at SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Pontianak.

Physical Facilities

Physical facilities are defined as tangible elements that influence consumer decisions in purchasing and using products or services (Kotler & Armstrong, 2015 in Manap et al., 2023). According to Kotler and Keller (2009:75), facilities refer to all forms of physical equipment provided by service providers to support consumer comfort. In the educational context, learning facilities include infrastructure supporting the learning process. Infrastructure includes school buildings, classrooms, sports fields, places of worship, art

rooms, and sports equipment. Learning resources include textbooks, reading materials, laboratory tools and facilities, and other learning media. Physical facility indicators consist of facilities, service delivery design, equipment, furniture, and supporting items (Kotler & Armstrong, 2015 in Manap et al., 2023). Research by Jasmani & Najmah (2025) shows that physical evidence influences consumer decisions in choosing services. Erinawati et al. (2021) also show that service-related aspects of the marketing mix influence school choice decisions.

H2: Physical Facilities has a positive and significant effect on Students' Decisions in Choosing Educational Services at SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Pontianak.

Students' Decisions

Students' decisions are defined as the purchase decision process, a psychological process in understanding how consumers make decisions (Kotler & Armstrong, 2016). According to Alma (2018:97), purchase decisions are influenced by environmental factors such as culture, social class, family, and reference groups. Kotler & Armstrong (2016) define purchase decisions as part of consumer behavior examining how individuals, groups, and organizations select, purchase, use, and manage goods, services, ideas, or experiences to meet needs and desires. Purchase decision indicators include problem recognition, information search, alternative evaluation, purchase decision, and post-purchase behavior (Kotler & Armstrong, 2016). Students' decisions are positioned as the dependent variable influenced by promotion and physical facilities. Research by Nurhakim & Tafsiruddin (2024) shows that the school choice decision process begins with needs triggered by external factors such as service quality, price, and promotion. In that study, promotion has a positive and significant effect on the decision to choose SMK Ankes in East Jakarta, although service quality and price have greater influence.

H3: Promotion and Physical Facilities have a significant effect on Students' Decisions on Students' Decisions in Choosing Educational Services at SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Pontianak.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses a survey approach as the main data collection technique (Sugiyono, 2023), through distributing questionnaires to SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Pontianak students. Based on its explanatory level, this study is classified as associative research (Sujarweni, 2025), aiming to identify the relationship and influence of promotion and physical facilities on students' decisions. The research was conducted at SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Pontianak. The data used consist of primary and secondary data. Primary data were obtained directly from respondents through questionnaires. Secondary data were obtained from school documents and internal data related to student numbers and supporting information. The population consisted of all active students in the 2024/2025 academic year, totaling 710 students. The sample size was determined using the Slovin formula with a 10% margin of error, resulting in 100 respondents. The sampling technique used was proportional stratified random sampling, with 29 respondents from Grade X, 36 respondents from Grade XI, and 35 respondents from Grade XII.

Variable measurement used a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5 to measure respondents' perceptions of variable indicators (Sugiyono, 2023). The variables used include independent variables: promotion (X1) and physical facilities (X2), and the dependent variable: students' decisions (Y). Data analysis used multiple linear regression to determine the effect of independent variables on the dependent variable. Model testing involved instrument testing, including validity and reliability tests, as well as classical assumption tests consisting of normality, linearity, and multicollinearity tests (Ghozali, 2018). Hypothesis testing was performed using a simultaneous test (F-test) and partial test (t-test) to determine the effect of each variable on students' decisions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Test Research Instruments

a. Validity Test

The validity test ensures each statement item measures the variable accurately by correlating item scores with total scores. The r-count is compared with the r-table (df = 98, n = 100, r-table = 0.196, significance 0.05). Results for Promotion (X1), Physical Facilities (X2), and Students' Decisions (Y) are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Validity Test Results

Variable	Indicator	r-count	r-table	Description
Promotion (X1)	X1.1	0.749	0.196	Valid
	X1.2	0.819		
	X1.3	0.845		
	X1.4	0.569		
	X1.5	0.718		
	X1.6	0.627		
	X1.7	0.728		
	X1.8	0.749		
	X1.9	0.819		
	X1.10	0.837		
	X1.11	0.840		
	X1.12	0.788		
Physical Facilities (X2)	X2.1	0.646	0.196	Valid
	X2.2	0.698		
	X2.3	0.694		
	X2.4	0.721		
	X2.5	0.829		
	X2.6	0.837		
	X2.7	0.884		
	X2.8	0.727		
	X2.9	0.765		
	X2.10	0.789		

	X2.11	0.719		
	X2.12	0.803		
	X2.13	0.825		
	X2.14	0.792		
	Y.1	0.629		
	Y.2	0.680		
	Y.3	0.776		
	Y.4	0.770		
	Y.5	0.698		
Students' Decisions (Y)	Y.6	0.623	0.196	Valid
	Y.7	0.693		
	Y.8	0.852		
	Y.9	0.674		
	Y.10	0.730		
	Y.11	0.877		
	Y.12	0.873		

Source: Processed Data, 2026

Based on the validity test shown in Table 1, all statement items for Promotion (X1), Physical Facilities (X2), and Students' Decisions (Y) have r-count values greater than r-table (0.196), indicating that they are valid and suitable for use as research instruments.

b. Reliability Test

The reliability test was conducted to measure the consistency of the instrument using Cronbach's Alpha, with the criterion that values above 0.60 are considered reliable. Results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Reliability Test Results

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items	Minimum Reliabilities	Description
Promotion (X1)	0.934	12		
Physical Facilities (X2)	0.946	14		
Students' Decisions (Y)	0.926	12	0.60	Reliable

Source: Processed Data, 2026

The results in Table 2 indicate that all variables have Cronbach's Alpha values > 0.60, thus all instruments are declared reliable.

Classical Assumption Test

a. Normality Test

The normality test was conducted using the Kolmogorov–Smirnov method to determine whether the data are normally distributed, with criteria Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) > 0.05. Results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Normality Test Results (I)

Test	Value
N (Sample)	100
Test Statistic	.054
Asymp.Sig.(2-tailed)	.200c

Source: Processed Data, 2026

Based on Table 3, the Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.200 > 0.05, indicating that the data are normally distributed.

b. Linearity Test

Linearity was tested using the Test for Linearity to examine linear relationships between variables, with criteria of Linearity significance < 0.05 and Deviation from Linearity > 0.05.

**Table 4. Linearity Test Results
Promotion and Students' Decisions**

Students' Decisions * Promotion		Sig.	Description
Between Groups	(Combined)	.000	Linear
	Linearity	.000	
	Deviation from Linearity	.128	

Source: Processed Data, 2026

The linearity test shows a linear relationship between Promotion (X1) and Students' Decisions (Y), with Linearity Sig. = 0.000 < 0.05 and Deviation Sig. = 0.128 > 0.05.

Results for Physical Facilities (X2) and Students' Decisions (Y) are presented in Table 5.

**Table 5. Linearity Test Results
Physical Facilities and Students' Decisions**

Students' Decisions * Physical Facilities		Sig.	Description
Between Groups	(Combined)	.000	Linear
	Linearity	.000	
	Deviation from Linearity	.072	

Source: Processed Data, 2026

The results indicate a linear relationship for Physical Facilities (X2) and Students' Decisions (Y) as well, with Linearity Sig. = 0.000 < 0.05 and Deviation Sig. = 0.072 > 0.05.

c. Multicollinearity Test

Multicollinearity was tested to determine whether there is a high correlation among independent variables in the regression model. This test is important because an excessively strong relationship between independent variables can affect the accuracy of regression coefficient estimates and reduce model reliability. Based on the analysis using SPSS, the results of the multicollinearity test are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Multicollinearity Test Results

Variable	Tolerance	VIF
Promotion	.913	1.095
Physical Facilities	.913	1.095

Dependent Variable: Students' Decisions

Source: Processed Data, 2026

Based on the multicollinearity test, both Promotion (X1) and Physical Facilities (X2) have VIF values of $1.095 < 10.00$ and Tolerance $0.913 > 0.10$, indicating that there is no multicollinearity symptom in the regression model.

Hypothesis Test

a. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Multiple linear regression analysis was used to determine the effect of independent variables on the dependent variable both simultaneously and partially, as well as to form the regression equation. The regression coefficients are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Results

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.475	.254		5.810	.000
	Promotion	.437	.055	.555	7.915	.000
	Physical Facilities	.242	.046	.369	5.261	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Students' Decisions

Source: Processed Data, 2026

The resulting multiple linear regression equation is:

$$Y = 1.475 + 0.437 X_1 + 0.242 X_2$$

- 1) The constant (1.475) indicates that if Promotion (X1) and Physical Facilities (X2) are considered constant or zero, the Students' Decisions score is 1.475.
- 2) The regression coefficient (b1) for Promotion (X1) is 0.437, which is positive, indicating that every increase in Promotion will increase Students' Decisions by 0.437 units.
- 3) The regression coefficient (b2) for Physical Facilities (X2) is 0.242, which is positive, indicating that every increase in Physical Facilities will increase Students' Decisions by 0.242 units

b. Correlation Coefficient Analysis (R)

The correlation coefficient was used to determine the strength and direction of the relationship between variables using the multiple correlation coefficient. The results are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Correlation Coefficient Test Results (R)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.751a	.565	.556	.39754

Predictors: (Constant), Physical Facilities, Promotion.

Source: Processed Data, 2026

Based on Table 8, the correlation coefficient R is 0.751, indicating that the relationship between Promotion and Physical Facilities with Students' Decisions is classified as strong.

c. Determination Coefficient (R²)

Based on the coefficient of determination (R²) test presented in Table 8, the R-Square value is 0.565. This value indicates that, in this study, the variables Promotion and Physical Facilities can explain 56.5% of the effect on Students' Decisions, while the remaining 43.5% is influenced by other factors outside the research variables.

d. Simultaneous Test (F Test)

The simultaneous test (F Test) was used to determine the effect of the independent variables collectively on the dependent variable. The results are presented in Table 9.

Table 9. Simultaneous Test Results (F Test)

Model	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Significance
Regression	19.889	9.944	62.923	.000b
Residual	15.330	.158		

Dependent Variable: Students' Decisions

Predictors: (Constant), Physical Facilities, Promotion.

Source: Processed Data, 2026

Based on the results of the F-test presented in Table 9, the F-count value of 62.923 > F-table 3.09 with significance 0.000 < 0.05, it can be concluded that H3 is accepted. Promotion and Physical Facilities simultaneously have a significant effect on Students' Decisions.

e. Partial Test (t Test)

The partial test (t Test) was conducted to determine the effect of each independent variable on the dependent variable. The results are presented in Table 10.

Table 10. Partial Test Results (t Test)

Coefficients ^a				
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta	
				t

1	(Constant)	1.475	.254		5.810	.000
	Promotion	.437	.055	.555	7.915	.000
	Physical Facilities	.242	.046	.369	5.261	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Students' Decisions						

Source: Processed Data, 2026

Based on the results of the partial test (t Test) in Table 10 above, the t-count results were then compared with the t-table. The t-table value is 1.660. The results of the partial t-test in Table 10 can be described as follows:

- 1) The t-count obtained for the variable Promotion (X1) is 7.915, which is greater than the t-table value of 1.660. In addition, the significance value is 0.000, which is smaller than the significance level of 0.05. Based on these results, it can be concluded that H1 is accepted. Therefore, the Promotion variable has a positive and significant partial effect on Students' Decisions.
- 2) The t-count obtained for the variable Physical Facilities (X2) is 5.261, which is greater than the t-table value of 1.660. In addition, the significance value is 0.000, which is smaller than the significance level of 0.05. Based on these results, it can be concluded that H2 is accepted. Therefore, the Physical Facilities variable has a positive and significant partial effect on Students' Decisions.

Effect of Promotion (X1) on Students' Decisions (Y)

Based on the results of the partial test (t Test), the variable Promotion (X1) has a t-count value of 7.915, which is greater than the t-table value of 1.660, and the significance value is $0.000 < 0.05$. This indicates that Promotion has a positive and significant effect on Students' Decisions. Empirically, these results show that an increase in promotional activities conducted by the school is followed by an increase in students' decisions in choosing the school. This is also reinforced by the regression coefficient value of 0.437, meaning that every one-unit increase in promotion will increase students' decisions by 0.437 units. The relatively high t-count value (7.915) compared to other variables indicates that promotion is the variable with the strongest partial effect in this research model. These results are in line with Fauzi & Kartiko (2023), who showed that promotion and product have a positive and significant effect on the decision to choose a madrasah, with promotion being the more dominant variable influencing the decision. These results are further reinforced by Rahayu & Muafiah (2022), who also stated that promotion is consistently influential on students' decisions partially. Therefore, it can be interpreted that promotion strategy plays a dominant role in influencing students' decisions compared to other factors in this study.

Effect of Physical Facilities (X2) on Students' Decisions (Y)

Based on the results of the partial test (t Test), the variable Physical Facilities (X2) has a t-count value of 5.261, which is greater than the t-table value of 1.660, and the significance value is $0.000 < 0.05$. This indicates that Physical Facilities have a positive and significant effect on Students' Decisions. Quantitatively, the regression coefficient value of 0.242 shows

that every increase in physical facilities will increase students' decisions by 0.242 units. Although the effect is significant, the magnitude of this coefficient is smaller than that of the promotion variable. These results do not align with the study conducted by Astuti (2020), which found no effect of facilities on students' decisions in choosing educational services at SMK Muhammadiyah Imogiri, likely due to differences in research context, particularly regarding the condition and variation of available facilities. In this study, physical facilities are more relevant in supporting learning comfort, thereby influencing students' decisions. However, these results are in line with Yulianti & Purwanti (2026), who showed that the quality of services and school facilities simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on students' decisions, with a contribution of 75.6%. This finding strengthens the argument that facilities play a role in influencing students' decisions in choosing educational services. This indicates that physical facilities remain an important factor in influencing students' decisions, but their contribution is relatively lower compared to promotion. In other words, the availability of adequate facilities can increase students' interest but not as strongly as the effect of promotion in driving decision-making.

Effect of Promotion (X1) and Physical Facilities (X2) on Students' Decisions (Y)

Based on the results of the simultaneous test (F Test), the F-count value is 62.923, which is greater than the F-table value of 3.09, with a significance level of $0.000 < 0.05$. This indicates that Promotion and Physical Facilities simultaneously have a significant effect on Students' Decisions. Furthermore, the correlation coefficient (R) value of 0.751 indicates that the relationship between the independent variables (Promotion and Physical Facilities) and the dependent variable (Students' Decisions) is strong. Meanwhile, the coefficient of determination (R^2) value of 0.565 indicates that 56.5% of the variation in Students' Decisions can be explained by the variables Promotion and Physical Facilities, while the remaining 43.5% is influenced by other factors outside the research model. These results confirm that the combination of promotion and physical facilities simultaneously contributes substantially to explaining students' decisions. The regression model shows that both independent variables jointly provide a positive effect on students' decisions. These findings are in line with Nurhakim & Tafsiruddin (2024), who showed that promotion and facilities positively influence school choice decisions both partially and simultaneously, with promotion having a more dominant effect. Similarly, Jasmani & Najmah (2025) demonstrated that promotion and facilities simultaneously have a significant effect on parents' decisions in choosing schools; although the research object was parents, the decisions taken still relate to the selection of educational institutions.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the influence of Promotion and Physical Facilities on Students' Decisions at SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Pontianak. The findings revealed that both variables have a positive and significant effect on students' decisions in choosing the school. Promotion was found to be the more dominant factor, indicated by a higher t-count value compared to Physical Facilities. In addition, the simultaneous test showed that Promotion and Physical Facilities together significantly influence Students' Decisions. The correlation

coefficient demonstrated a strong relationship between the independent variables and Students' Decisions, while the coefficient of determination indicated that 56.5% of the variation in Students' Decisions could be explained by Promotion and Physical Facilities. Theoretically, this study contributes to the development of educational service marketing literature, particularly regarding factors that influence students in selecting educational institutions. The results strengthen the understanding that effective promotional strategies and adequate physical facilities are important elements in attracting prospective students. Practically, the findings provide useful insights for school management in designing more effective promotional programs and improving school facilities to increase competitiveness and student interest. However, this study has several limitations. First, the research was conducted only at SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Pontianak, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other schools with different characteristics. Second, the study only focused on two independent variables, whereas students' decisions may also be influenced by other factors such as school image, educational service quality, tuition fees, social environment, and parental influence. Therefore, future research is recommended to include additional variables that may affect students' decisions and to involve a broader research scope covering multiple schools or regions. Future studies may also apply different research approaches or methods to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the factors influencing students' decisions in choosing schools.

REFERENCES

- Alma, B. (2018). *Manajemen Pemasaran dan Pemasaran Jasa*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Astuti, A. D. (2020). Fasilitas, Harga, Kualitas Pendidikan, dan Lokasi sebagai Determinan Keputusan Siswa Memilih Jasa Pendidikan di SMK Muhammadiyah Imogiri (Studi Kasus pada Jurusan Tata Busana). *Jurnal Administrasi dan Manajemen*, 10(2), 134–140. <https://doi.org/10.52643/jam.v10i2.1128>
- Batubara, A., & Hidayat, R. (2016). Pengaruh Penetapan Harga dan Promosi terhadap Tingkat Penjualan Tiket Pada PSA Mihin Lanka Airlines. *Ilman*, 4(1), 33-46.
- Erinawati, F., & Syafarudin, A. (2021). Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan, Harga, Promosi terhadap Keputusan. *Jurnal Valuasi: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Manajemen Dan Kewirausahaan*, 1(1), 130-146. <https://doi.org/10.46306/vls.v1i1.10>
- Fauzi, I., & Kartiko, A. (2023). Pengaruh Promosi an Produk terhadap Pengambilan Keputusan Memilih Madrasah. *Munaddhomah: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 4(2), 242–251. <https://doi.org/10.31538/munaddhomah.v4i2.435>
- Ghozali, I. (2018). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS 25 (9th ed.)*. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
- Jasmani, J., & Najmah, S. (2025). Pengaruh Promosi dan Fasilitas terhadap Keputusan Orang Tua Memilih Sekolah Taman Kanak-Kanak PAUD Rahayu di Kabupaten Bogor. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis STIE Bisnis Internasional Indonesia (BII)*, 5(1), 150–160. <https://doi.org/10.56145/ekobis.v5i1.306>

- Kotler, P., & Armstrong, G. (2016). *Principles of marketing (16th ed., Global Edition)*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2009). *Manajemen pemasaran (Jilid 1)*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Lupiyoadi, R. & Hamdani, A. (2009) *Manajemen Pemasaran Jasa 2nd*. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
- Manap, A., Sani, I., Sudirman, A., Noviany, H., Rambe, M. T., Rafilina, R., Adnan, Y., Abdurrohman, A., Adha, S., Fajar, F., Pujilestari, S., Mulyana, I. K. E., & Widiati, E. (2023). *Manajemen Pemasaran Jasa: Konsep dasar dan strategi*. Eureka Media Aksara.
- Novena, M. (2020). Peminat Madrasah Terus Meningkat. Retrieved January 6, 2023, from <https://radarsemarang.jawapos.com/berita/jateng/ungaran/2020/01/04/peminat-madrasah-terus-meningkat>
- Nurhakim, R., & Tafsiruddin, M. (2024). Pengaruh Promosi dan Fasilitas terhadap Keputusan Siswa Memilih Sekolah di SMA Nusantara Plus. *Jurnal PenKoMi: Kajian Pendidikan dan Ekonomi*, 7(1), 225–234.
- Rahayu, N. S., & Muafiah, E. (2022). Analisis Pengaruh Bauran Pemasaran terhadap Keputusan Siswa dalam Memilih Sekolah di SMAN 1 Pulung. *Exceclencia: Journal of Islamic Education & Management*, 2(1), 209–222. <https://doi.org/10.21154/exceclencia.v2i01.574>
- Samsuddin, & Suseno, H. (2014). Pengaruh Produk, Harga, Promosi, Tempat, Orang, Proses, Bukti Fisik terhadap Keputusan Konsumen Membeli Jasa Kamar Superior pada Hotel Santika Pontianak. *Jurnal Manajemen Motivasi*, 10(1), 225–237.
- Setiawan, I., Prianto, A., Sukarya, E., Mulyana, D., Komala, I., & Sapruwan, M. (2022). Pengaruh Promosi, Lokasi dan Pelayanan terhadap Keputusan Orang Tua Murid Memilih SMP Presiden Jababeka yang Dimediasi oleh Minat Beli. *JURNAL EMAS: Ekonomi Manajemen Akuntansi Kewirausahaan*, 3(1), 7-13. Retrieved from <https://journal.lppmpelitabangsa.id/index.php/emas/article/view/641>
- Sugiyono. (2023). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sujarweni, V. W. (2025). *Metodologi penelitian: Lengkap, praktis, dan Mudah Dipahami*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Baru Press.
- Yulianti, A. K., & Purwanti, P. (2026). Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan dan Fasilitas Sekolah terhadap Keputusan Siswa Memilih Sekolah pada SMK Wiyata Mandala Kota Bogor. *Jurnal Akademik Ekonomi dan Manajemen*, 3(1), 310–323. <https://doi.org/10.61722/jaem.v3i1.9224>