La Colegio Manageria: Journal of Islamic Educational Management
Vol. 1, Issue (1) 2026, pp. 37-48
E-ISSN Process, XXXX-XXXX DOI:

The Influence of Promotion and Brand Image on Students' Decision to Choose Private Senior High Schools

Elandari Sainul[1]

1 SMK Muhammadiyah Plus Tanjung Selor; elandari21@gmail.com.

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

brand image;
choosing decision;
educational marketing management
promotion

Article history:

Received 2026-04-14
Revised 2026-15-12
Accepted 2026-06-01

ABSTRACT

In an increasingly competitive educational landscape, private senior high schools must deploy effective marketing strategies to attract prospective students. Promotion and brand image are two consequential variables shaping enrolment decisions, yet their combined effects in the private secondary school context remain underexplored in the Indonesian literature. This study analyses the partial and simultaneous influence of promotion and brand image on students' decision to choose private senior high schools, and identifies the more dominant predictor. A quantitative causality design was employed with 84 Grade X students selected via proportionate random sampling from a population of 524 students across 14 class groups. Data were collected through a structured four-point Likert-scale questionnaire and analysed using multiple linear regression with IBM SPSS version 22, preceded by normality, linearity, heteroscedasticity, and multicollinearity tests. Promotion had a positive and significant partial effect on the choosing decision (t-count = 2.635 > t-table = 1.989; $p = 0.010$). Brand image also had a positive and significant partial effect (t-count = 4.449 > t-table = 1.989; $p = 0.000$). Simultaneously, both variables significantly influenced the choosing decision (F-count = 26.601 > F-table = 3.11; $p = 0.000$) with $R^2 = 0.396$. Brand image (beta = 0.449) emerged as the more dominant predictor over promotion (beta = 0.266). Promotion and brand image jointly explain 39.6% of the variance in students' school-choosing decisions. Educational institutions should prioritise building a credible institutional identity while sustaining an integrated promotional strategy to maximise enrolment.

Corresponding Author:
Elandari Sainul
SMK Muhamamdiyah Plus Tanjung Selor; elandari21@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Competition among educational institutions, particularly private senior high schools, has intensified considerably as the number of institutions grows within communities. This competitive landscape compels every institution to develop effective marketing strategies capable of attracting prospective students. Indonesia's National Education System Law No. 20 of 2003 affirms that education is a deliberate and planned effort to create an active and high-quality learning environment, prompting the public to be increasingly selective when choosing educational institutions.

Educational marketing management, according to Alma and Tidd, encompasses the activities of analysing, planning, implementing, and supervising programmes to achieve favourable exchanges with target markets (Alma, 2000; Tidd, 2023). Within this framework, promotion stands as one of the most strategic marketing instruments. Alexandrescu & Milandru (2018) define promotion as a marketing activity that seeks to disseminate information, influence, and remind target markets about the products or services being offered. Operationally, the promotional mix in education comprises advertising, sales promotion, personal selling, public relations, and direct marketing (Simangunsong et al., 2022). Through these combined promotional elements, educational institutions can reach prospective students more broadly and effectively.

Beyond promotion, brand image is a crucial factor shaping consumer decisions. Kotler & Keller (2009) state that brand image is the set of perceptions and beliefs held by consumers, as reflected in the associations embedded in their memory about a brand. In education, a positive brand image is built upon academic quality, student achievement, accreditation status, and the institution's overall reputation. Barnawi & Arifin (2013) conceptualise the branded school as one that has consistently built quality-driven excellence, resulting in a positive public perception. Safitri et al. (2020) affirm that a positive image is a valuable asset and a powerful foundation for educational institutions in shaping prospective students' choices.

Both variables ultimately converge on the choice decision. Kotler & Keller (2009) define the choosing decision as the consumer's final action based on preferences among available alternatives, following stages of need recognition, information search, alternative evaluation, and consideration of various factors. In the educational context, this decision is largely shaped by how effectively a school builds its image and communicates its advantages to the community. The indicators of the choosing decision used in this study are: conviction toward the institution, self-confidence in using the educational service, and the final decision to enrol (Kotler & Keller, 2009).

Prior research has established the relevance of both variables. Kango et al (2021), Hidaya & Lubis (2019), and Munarsih et al.(2020) found that promotion positively and significantly influences the decision to choose educational institutions. Tjay et al. (2025), Krisbiyanto & Nadhifah(2022), Murti (2019), and Setiawan & Haryantini (2024) consistently demonstrated that brand image significantly influences school-selection decisions. However, studies that combine both variables simultaneously in the context of private senior high schools remain limited, and this study is positioned to address that gap.

Based on this background, this study aims to: (1) analyse the partial influence of promotion on students' decision to choose a private senior high school; (2) analyse the partial influence of brand image on the choosing decision; and (3) analyse the simultaneous influence of promotion and brand image on the choosing decision. The findings are expected to contribute theoretically to the field of educational marketing management and practically to school administrators in designing more effective marketing strategies.

METHODS

This study adopted a quantitative, causal design to examine the relationships between the independent and dependent variables (Sugiyono, 2013). The independent variables were promotion (X_1) and brand image (X_2), and the dependent variable was the choice decision (Y).

The study population comprised all 524 Grade X students distributed across 14 class groups. Sample size was determined using the Yamane formula with a 10% margin of error, yielding a sample of 84 respondents. Proportional random sampling was used, selecting 6 students from each class to ensure proportional representation across all groups.

The research instrument was a structured questionnaire developed from the indicators for each variable. Promotion was measured by 15 items covering five indicators (advertising, sales promotion, personal selling, public relations, and direct selling); brand image by 9 items across three indicators (attributes, benefits, and brand attitude); and the choosing decision by 9 items covering three indicators (conviction, self-confidence, and decision-making). A four-point Likert scale was used (1 = Strongly Disagree to 4 = Strongly Agree). Instrument validity was assessed using Pearson correlation, and reliability using Cronbach's Alpha.

Data analysis proceeded in three stages: (1) classical assumption tests comprising Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality, linearity, Glejser heteroscedasticity, and multicollinearity tests; (2) descriptive statistics; and (3) hypothesis testing via multiple linear regression, partial t-test, simultaneous F-test, and coefficient of determination (R^2). All analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics version 22.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Result

Respondent Characteristics

Of the 84 respondents, 36 (42.9%) were male, and 48 (57.1%) were female. By parental occupation, the majority were self-employed entrepreneurs (25 respondents; 29.8%), followed by private-sector employees (21; 25%) and military personnel (5; 6%). Respondents were drawn equally from 14 classes, with 6 respondents per class.

Classical Assumption Tests

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test yielded a p-value of 0.200 (> 0.05), confirming normality. The linearity test showed deviations from linearity of 0.165 for X_1–Y and 0.682 for X_2–Y (both > 0.05), indicating linear relationships between the variables. The Glejser heteroscedasticity test produced significance values of 0.543 for promotion and 0.759 for brand image (both > 0.05), indicating no heteroscedasticity. The multicollinearity test showed Tolerance = 0.731 (> 0.10) and VIF = 1.368 (< 10) for both independent variables, confirming the absence of multicollinearity. All classical assumptions were satisfied, and multiple linear regression analysis could proceed.

Descriptive Statistics

The mean score for promotion (X_1) was 3.60. The highest-scoring indicator was direct selling (3.72), followed by personal selling and sales promotion (both 3.61), advertising (3.54), and public relations (3.53). The mean score for brand image (X_2) was 3.55, with brand attitude as the highest indicator (3.62), followed by benefits (3.58) and attributes (3.45). The mean score for the choosing decision (Y) was 3.56, with self-confidence as the highest indicator (3.65), followed by decision-making (3.57) and conviction (3.48). A full summary is presented in Table 1

Table 1. Mean Scores of Research Variable Indicators.

Variable	Indicator	Mean Score
Promotion (X_1)	Advertising	3.54
	Sales Promotion	3.61
	Personal Selling	3.61
	Public Relations	3.53
	Direct Selling	3.72
	Variable Mean	3.60
Brand Image (X_2)	Attributes	3.45
	Benefits	3.58
	Brand Attitude	3.62
	Variable Mean	3.55
Choosing Decision (Y)	Conviction	3.48
	Self-Confidence	3.65
	Decision-Making	3.57
	Variable Mean	3.56

[1]Tables may have a footer.

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

The results of the multiple linear regression analysis are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Mean Scores of Research Variable Indicators.

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta (β)	t	Sig.
Constant	6.190	3.834	-	1.614	0.110
Promotion (X_1)	0.226	0.086	0.266	2.635	0.010
Brand Image (X_2)	0.454	0.102	0.449	4.449	0.000

Source: Processed data from SPSS 22 (2023).

Based on Table 2, the regression equation is:

$$\hat{Y} = 6.190 + 0.226X_1 + 0.454X_2$$

The constant value of 6.190 indicates the baseline score of the choosing decision when both predictors are zero. The regression coefficient of 0.226 for promotion indicates that each one-unit increase in promotion raises the choosing decision score by 0.226, ceteris paribus. The coefficient of 0.454 for brand image indicates a larger contribution: each one-unit increase in brand image raises the choosing decision score by 0.454.

Coefficient of Determination (R^2)

The R^2 value of 0.396 indicates that promotion and brand image together explain 39.6% of the variance in students' choosing decisions. The remaining 60.4% is attributable to variables outside the model, such as tuition fees, school location, facilities, and alumni recommendations.

Partial t-Test

The results of the partial t-test are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Partial t-Test Results

Variable	t-count	t-table	Sig.	Result
Promotion (X_1)	2.635	1.989	0.010	Significant
Brand Image (X_2)	4.449	1.989	0.000	Significant

Source: Processed data from SPSS 22 (2023)

Promotion obtained t-count 2.635 > t-table 1.989 ($p = 0.010 < 0.05$), so H_1 is accepted: promotion has a positive and significant partial effect on the choosing decision. Brand image obtained t-count 4.449 > t-table 1.989 ($p = 0.000 < 0.05$), so H_2 is accepted: brand image has a positive and significant partial effect on the choosing decision.

Simultaneous F-Test

The results of the simultaneous F-test are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Simultaneous F-Test Results

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-count	Sig.
Regression	178.885	2	89.442	26.601	0.000
Residual	272.354	81	3.362	-	-
Total	451.238	83	-	-	-

Source: Processed data from SPSS 22 (2023)

F-count 26.601 > F-table 3.11 ($p = 0.000 < 0.05$), so H_3 is accepted: promotion and brand image simultaneously exert a positive and significant influence on students' choosing decisions.

Discussion

Influence of Promotion on the Choice Decision

The findings confirm that promotion exerts a positive and significant partial influence on students' decisions to choose private senior high schools (t-count = 2.635, p = 0.010), with a standardised coefficient (beta) of 0.266. This result is consistent with Hidaya & Lubis (2019), who found that promotional intensity was a significant determinant of student enrolment decisions at a private management school in Medan, and with Munarsih et al. (2020), who confirmed that parents' school-selection choices were meaningfully shaped by the promotional activities undertaken by the institution. The finding extends these earlier results to the private senior high school context, reinforcing the view that promotion is a generalisable driver of educational consumer behaviour across institution types and levels.

Among the five promotional indicators, direct selling recorded the highest mean score (3.72), followed by personal selling and sales promotion (both 3.61), advertising (3.54), and public relations (3.53). The primacy of direct selling is theoretically significant. Education is classified as a high-involvement service purchase characterised by intangibility and experiential uncertainty; prospective students and their families cannot evaluate the quality of an educational institution before enrolment as they might a tangible product (Alma, 2000; Shin et al., 2018). Under conditions of high perceived risk, face-to-face communication reduces information asymmetry more effectively than impersonal media, because it allows immediate dialogue, personalised responses to concerns, and visible signals of institutional professionalism (Alexandrescu & Milandru, 2018). The student admission committee (PPDB) at the school under study leverages direct engagement sessions at partner junior high schools, home visits by teachers, and on-site open days to communicate the school's value proposition in a relational and culturally resonant manner. These community-embedded tactics are consistent with Kotler and Keller's (2009) argument that personal selling is particularly powerful in markets where trust and social relationships are primary decision criteria. Public relations, despite recording the lowest mean (3.53), should not be overlooked. Simangunsong et al (2022) highlight that public relations activities, including participation in community events, media engagement, and the cultivation of alumni networks, build long-term institutional legitimacy that reinforces the effectiveness of direct promotional efforts. In contexts where word-of-mouth remains a dominant information channel, public relations investments that generate positive publicity can produce disproportionately large returns on enrolment (Sisnuhadi & Sirait, 2021). The comparatively lower score for public relations may reflect the school's current under-investment in structured media and community outreach programmes, suggesting a direction for future promotional development. From a strategic management perspective, the integrated promotional mix observed at this school, combining digital channels (website, social media) with high-touch personal engagement, reflects best practice in educational services marketing. Ratumbuysang et al. (2021) demonstrated that multi-channel promotional approaches that balance mass-reach media with personal contact consistently outperform single-channel strategies in influencing consumer intent. Private schools operating in competitive local markets should therefore allocate promotional budgets across both digital and interpersonal channels, periodically evaluating channel effectiveness using enrolment conversion data to optimise resource allocation

Influence of Promotion on the Choice Decision

Brand image emerged as the more dominant predictor of students' choosing decisions, with a regression coefficient of 0.454 (beta = 0.449) compared with 0.226 for promotion (beta = 0.266). This result is consistent with a broad stream of prior research. Tjay et al. (2025) found that brand image was the primary driver of students' institutional choice at a private economics school in Balikpapan. Krisbiyanto & Nadhifah (2022) reported similar findings among senior high school students in Mojokerto, while Murti (2019) and Setiawan & Haryantini (2024) documented significant effects on brand image across multiple higher education contexts. The present study extends this body of evidence to the private senior high school level, confirming that the dominance of brand image over promotion is a robust and replicable pattern across institution types and geographic settings. The theoretical basis for brand image's stronger influence lies in the concept of consumer heuristics in the face of uncertainty. Kotler & Keller (2009) explain that brand image functions as a cognitive shortcut: when evaluating complex, intangible services, consumers rely on stored mental associations about an institution's reputation, quality, and identity rather than processing all available information anew at each decision point. In the education sector, where the consequences of a poor choice are significant and largely irreversible in the short term, this heuristic mechanism is particularly powerful. A school with a strong, positive brand image effectively pre-answers the prospective student's most fundamental question, "Can I trust this institution to deliver on its promises?" before any promotional message is received. Brand image thus operates upstream of promotion in the consumer decision journey.

The brand attitude indicator recorded the highest mean score (3.62) among the three brand image dimensions, followed by benefits (3.58) and attributes (3.45). Brand attitude reflects students' overall evaluative judgment of the institution, the degree to which they believe enrolment will yield personally meaningful outcomes. Specifically, respondents strongly agreed with statements about the school's capacity to prepare graduates for prestigious university admissions and to develop international language competencies. These beliefs are not easily manufactured through advertising; they are accumulated over time through the observable track record of graduates, the institution's visible commitment to academic standards, and the reputation built through years of consistent performance (Barnawi & Arifin, 2013). The lower score for the attributes indicator (3.45) is noteworthy. Attributes encompass the tangible and intangible characteristics associated with the institution's physical facilities, teacher qualifications, class size, and extracurricular offerings. The relatively lower rating on this dimension may reflect students' ambivalence about certain physical or structural aspects of the school, even as they maintain positive attitudes toward its outcomes. (Safitri et al., 2020) note that attribute-level brand perceptions are more susceptible to real-time experience and facility quality than outcome-level perceptions, suggesting that investment in physical infrastructure and teacher professional development could further strengthen the overall brand image by elevating the attribute dimension.

Barnawi & Arifin (2013) conceptualise the branded school as one whose institutional identity is inseparable from its demonstrated academic excellence. In practical terms, this means that brand image management is not a communications function alone but a quality management function: the brand is only as strong as the outcomes it reliably produces. Private schools seeking to differentiate themselves in competitive enrolment markets should therefore develop longitudinal outcome-tracking systems that monitor graduate university placements, academic competition results, and employer perceptions of alumni, and communicate these outcomes through transparent, evidence-based channels to prospective students and their families. Such approaches create a virtuous cycle in which documented quality outcomes strengthen brand image, which in turn attracts higher-calibre applicants, further reinforcing institutional quality. It is also worth noting the interaction between brand image and socioeconomic context.

The respondent profile shows that the largest parental occupational group is self-employed entrepreneurs (29.8%), followed by private-sector employees (25%). These are groups for whom educational investment decisions are taken seriously and evaluated against both economic and social return criteria. For such families, a school's brand image serves as a signal of the social capital their children will accumulate through enrolment in the networks, credentials, and reputational halo that association with a respected institution confers. Kotler & Keller (2009) describe this as the symbolic benefit dimension of brand image: the value derived not from the product's functional attributes but from what ownership or use of the brand communicates about the consumer's identity and aspirations. Educational managers should therefore pay attention to how their institutional brand is perceived not only by students but also by the parent community and the broader social network, as these stakeholders are influential intermediaries in the enrolment decision process, consistent with improvements in academic quality, strengthening accreditation, and achieving recognition at national and international levels

Simultaneous Influence of Promotion and Brand Image on the Choosing Decision

The simultaneous analysis confirms that promotion and brand image together explain 39.6% of the variance in students' choosing decisions ($R^2 = 0.396$, F-count = 26.601, $p = 0.000$). This finding supports the view that effective educational marketing is not a single-lever exercise but a system in which promotional communication and institutional reputation operate interdependently. Muhaimin (2015) observe that educational institutions that succeed in attracting and retaining students typically excel in both dimensions simultaneously: they communicate effectively, and they deliver genuine quality. When these two elements are misaligned, when a school promotes aggressively but fails to build a credible brand, or when it possesses a strong reputation but communicates it poorly, the composite effect on enrolment decisions is diminished. The R^2 value of 0.396 indicates a moderate-to-substantial explanatory power, appropriate for a parsimonious two-variable model in the social sciences. It is, however, important to situate this figure within the broader theoretical context. Consumer behaviour models in educational contexts routinely identify five to eight distinct decision-influencing variables, including tuition affordability, geographic accessibility, peer influence, parental expectations, and teacher quality (Kotler & Keller, 2009; Walling, 2021). The present model captures nearly 40% of this complex variance with just two predictors, demonstrating that promotion and brand image together constitute a highly significant portion of the total explanatory landscape. From a managerial perspective, the differential effect sizes provide actionable guidance. The beta coefficient for brand image (0.449) is approximately 1.7 times larger than that for promotion (0.266), suggesting that a marginal unit of resource invested in brand-building activities is likely to yield a proportionally greater return in enrolment outcomes than the same resource invested in promotional volume. This does not imply that promotion should be deprioritised; rather, it suggests that promotional investment should be viewed as the vehicle through which brand image is disseminated and activated. Promotion without a compelling brand narrative has limited persuasive power; brand image without promotional reach remains invisible to the target market. The optimal strategy integrates both: building the substance of brand quality first, then communicating it through targeted, multi-channel promotional activities.

The remaining 60.4% of unexplained variance points to the multi-causal nature of school selection decisions and highlights directions for future inquiry. Several theoretically plausible variables were not captured in the present model. Tuition fees and scholarship availability are known determinants of private school choice, particularly among price-sensitive household segments (Murti, 2019). School location and transportation access are especially salient in Indonesian peri-urban and rural contexts, where daily commuting is costly. Rinaldi (2021) demonstrated that price perceptions significantly moderate the relationship between promotional effort and consumer purchase intent in financial services, a dynamic that likely extends to educational services. Alumni word-of-mouth networks constitute another powerful but unmeasured influence: prospective students frequently receive informal recommendations from older siblings, cousins, or family friends who have direct experience with the institution, and these recommendations can override formal promotional messages entirely. A further limitation worth noting concerns the four-point Likert scale used in this study. The absence of a neutral midpoint forces respondents to commit to a direction, agree or disagree, which can produce ceiling effects when respondents are uniformly satisfied with the institution under study. The mean scores across all indicators ranged from 3.45 to 3.72 on a four-point scale, suggesting moderate-to-high favourability with limited variance. Future studies employing five- or seven-point scales may capture finer gradations of respondent sentiment and yield greater discriminatory power in the regression analysis. Additionally, cross-sectional survey data capture perceptions at a single point in time; longitudinal or cohort-based research designs would better illuminate how brand image and promotional exposure accumulate and interact across the multi-month enrolment decision cycle. Taken together, the findings of this study carry implications for educational policy and institutional practice. At the policy level, the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture could encourage private schools to invest in transparent outcome-reporting systems that enable prospective students to make evidence-informed enrolment decisions, a practice that simultaneously rewards high-performing institutions with stronger brand equity and creates accountability incentives for lower-performing institutions. At the institutional level, school leaders should consider establishing a dedicated marketing and communications function responsible for both brand management and promotional planning, recognising that these activities require specialised expertise distinct from academic administration. Investment in staff training for PPDB committees, development of consistent brand guidelines, and systematic collection of graduate outcome data are concrete steps that can strengthen both dimensions of the marketing capability identified in this study as central to enrolment success.

Practical Implications for School Marketing Management

The empirical evidence presented in this study carries several concrete implications for the strategic management of private senior high schools. First, the dominance of brand image (beta = 0.449) over promotion (beta = 0.266) suggests that schools operating in competitive local enrolment markets should re-evaluate the balance of their marketing expenditure. Many Indonesian private schools allocate the majority of their marketing budgets to short-term promotional activities such as banner advertising, paid social media promotions, and open-day events, while investing relatively little in the longer-term brand-building activities identified by this study as more consequential. A strategic reorientation is warranted: promotional spending should be sustained at a level sufficient to maintain awareness and reach, but a meaningful share of the marketing budget should be redirected toward activities that systematically build and communicate institutional quality, including academic enrichment programmes, teacher professional development, student competition participation, and alumni achievement tracking.

Second, the primacy of direct selling among the five promotional indicators (mean = 3.72) underscores the value of relational marketing in the Indonesian educational context. Indonesia's collectivist cultural orientation, in which family networks and community endorsements carry significant weight in major decisions, means that institutional credibility is often transmitted through personal channels rather than mass media (Muhaimin, 2015). Schools should therefore invest in training their PPDB committees not merely as information providers but as relationship managers who can engage prospective students and families with empathy, cultural sensitivity, and a clear narrative of institutional purpose (Fanani & Ma'arif, 2025; Fauziyah et al., 2025; Humaida et al., 2026; Pambayun et al., 2025). The practice observed at the study site, requiring teachers to serve as informal school ambassadors within their residential communities and incentivising partner junior high schools to generate referrals, represents an organisationally embedded form of direct engagement that is difficult for competitors to replicate and therefore constitutes a genuine source of promotional advantage.

Third, the attributes dimension of brand image recorded the lowest mean (3.45) across all indicators, revealing a specific vulnerability. Physical infrastructure, classroom quality, laboratory facilities, library resources, and sports amenities are increasingly important evaluation criteria for prospective students and parents in the post-pandemic era, where the experiential quality of on-campus learning is more actively scrutinized (Ahadiyah et al., 2024; Mustapha, 2026; Ramadhan et al., 2025; Safitri et al., 2020). School leaders should prioritise infrastructure investment in facilities most likely to be visible to prospective students during campus visits, as these tangible signals of institutional investment directly translate into perceptions of brand attributes. Simultaneously, the strong performance on the brand attitude indicator (mean = 3.62) indicates that the school's academic outcomes are already generating positive aspirational perceptions among students, an asset that should be more explicitly leveraged in promotional communications through data-driven storytelling about graduate achievements.

Theoretical Contributions and Positioning

This study makes several theoretical contributions to the educational marketing management literature. Most fundamentally, it provides quantitative evidence that consumer behaviour models developed in commercial marketing contexts, specifically Kotler & Keller's (2009) brand image framework and the consumer decision process model, transfer meaningfully to the non-profit educational services setting, even when applied to the understudied segment of private senior high schools. The majority of prior research on educational branding has been conducted at the higher education level, where the decision-making process is typically more protracted, more formally structured, and more heavily mediated by academic qualification requirements. The present findings suggest that analogous brand-driven mechanisms operate even at the secondary education level, where students are younger, decisions are more parent-mediated, and the geographic consideration set is typically more constrained (Adeoye, 2024; Anam et al., 2025).

The study also contributes to the growing body of literature on educational marketing in the Indonesian context, where the rapid expansion of the private school sector has intensified competition for students but has not been matched by commensurate growth in management research on how schools can compete effectively and ethically for enrolment. Alma (2000) identified the theoretical importance of promotional activities in Indonesian educational marketing, and Barnawi & Arifin (2013) argued for the strategic significance of institutional branding, but the empirical relationship between these constructs and measurable enrolment outcomes remained underspecified. The present study fills this gap by providing a rigorously tested, quantitative model of the promotional and brand image drivers of school selection, complete with standardised effect sizes that allow practitioners to assess the relative importance of each variable.

Furthermore, the study's finding that brand attitude, an evaluative dimension concerned with perceptions of outcome quality, is the strongest brand image indicator extends Kotler and Keller's (2009) tripartite brand image model (attributes, benefits, brand attitude) by identifying attitude as the most behaviourally consequential dimension in the educational context. This finding is consistent with attitude-behaviour consistency theory, which predicts that evaluative judgments about outcomes are more strongly predictive of behavioural intent than perceptions of attributes or functional benefits alone. Future research could test this proposition more directly by modelling the three brand image dimensions as separate predictors, allowing their individual effects on choosing decisions to be estimated and compared, rather than treating brand image as a composite variable as in the present study.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and discussion, three conclusions are drawn. First, promotion has a positive and significant partial effect on students' decisions to choose private senior high schools (t-count = 2.635; $p = 0.010$). Second, brand image has a positive and significant partial effect on the choosing decision (t-count = 4.449; $p = 0.000$) and is the more dominant predictor. Third, promotion and brand image simultaneously exert a positive and significant influence on the choosing decision (F-count = 26.601; $p = 0.000$), jointly contributing 39.6% of the explained variance.

Practically, private educational institutions are advised to integrate digital-based and personal selling promotional strategies while continuously strengthening brand image through demonstrated academic achievement, graduate quality, and accreditation. Theoretically, this study enriches the body of knowledge in educational marketing management, particularly for the private senior high school sector.

This study is limited by its single-site scope and restricted set of variables. Future research should extend the population to multiple schools, incorporate additional variables such as tuition fees, location, and word-of-mouth, and combine quantitative and qualitative approaches to achieve a more comprehensive understanding of school-selection decision dynamics

REFERENCES

Adeoye, M. A. (2024). The Fruit of Deception: Untangling the Mystery of Adam's Choice in Genesis 3. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences*, *1*(2), 79–93. https://doi.org/10.59373/ijoss.v1i2.73

Ahadiyah, W., Zahidi, S., & Hidayatussholihah, R. (2024). Strategi Pembelajaran Quantum sebagai bentuk Interpretasi Profil Pelajar Pancasila Di Era Digital. *Journal of Education and Learning Innovation*, *1*(2), 174–185. https://doi.org/10.59373/jelin.v1i2.60

Alexandrescu, M.-B., & Milandru, M. (2018). Promotion as a form of Communication of the Marketing Strategy. *Land Forces Academy Review*, *23*(4), 268–274.

Alma, M. (2000). *Manajemen pemasaran dan pemasaran jasa*.

Anam, M. A., Anwar, K., & Warman, T. (2025). Strengthening Students' Scientific Literacy through the Ilmi Interpretation Approach in Islamic Religious Education in Elementary Schools. *Attadrib: Jurnal Pendidikan Guru Madrasah Ibtidaiyah*, *8*(3), 621–635. https://doi.org/10.54069/attadrib.v8i3.1054

Barnawi & Arifin, M. (2013). Branded school membangun sekolah unggul berbasis peningkatan mutu. *Yogyakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media*.

Fanani, Z., & Ma'arif, M. A. (2025). Implementing the SKUA Program (Ubudiyah and Akhlakul Karimah Proficiency Standards) in Developing Students' Religious Competence in Madrasah Ibtidaiyah. *Journal of Education and Learning Innovation*, *2*(1), 40–51. https://doi.org/10.59373/jelin.v2i1.79

Fauziyah, Nuha, A. A., Mehnaz, & Darmaningrum, K. T. (2025). Da'wah and Innovation for Economic Empowerment of Traditional Market Traders in The Digital Era. *Communicator: Journal of Communication*, *2*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.59373/comm.v2i1.95

Hidaya, A. D. S., & Lubis, D. S. W. (2019). Pengaruh Promosi dan Harga Terhadap Keputusan Mahasiswa Memilih Kuliah di Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Manajemen Sukma Medan. *Jurnal Studi Manajemen*, *1*(1), 1–7.

Humaida, H., Wati, I. K., Mukmin, M., & Kausar, S. (2026). Digitalizing Islamic Education: Developing a Methodological Model for Generation Z Learners. *Attaqwa: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Islam*, *22*(1), 75–95. https://doi.org/10.54069/attaqwa.v22i1.1044

Kango, U., Kartiko, A., & Maarif, M. A. (2021). The Effect of Promotion on the Decision to Choose a Higher Education through the Brand Image of Education. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, *13*(3), 1611–1621. https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v13i3.852

Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2009). *Marketing Management*. Pearson Prentice Hall/Pearson Education International. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=z3h_NAEACAAJ

Krisbiyanto, A., & Nadhifah, I. (2022). Pengaruh Lokasi dan Citra Sekolah Terhadap Keputusan Siswa Memilih Sekolah di Sekolah Menengah Atas Negeri. *Academicus: Journal of Teaching and Learning*, *1*(1), 20–31. https://doi.org/10.59373/academicus.v1i1.4

Muhaimin, M. (2015). *Manajemen Pendidikan (Aplikasinya dalam Penyusunan Rencana Pengembangan Sekolah/Madrasah)*. Prenada Media.

Munarsih, M., Akbar, M. F., & Sudarsono, A. (2020). Pengaruh Promosi Terhadap Keputusan Memilih Sekolah Pada Orangtua Siswa Sdit Bina Cendekia–Depok. *Jurnal Ekonomi Efektif*, *2*(3).

Murti, T. K. (2019). Pengaruh brand image, promosi dan biaya pendidikan terhadap keputusan mahasiswa melanjutkan studi pada program studi pendidikan ekonomi. *Edunomic Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi*, *7*(2), 102.

Mustapha, R. O. (2026). Integrating Islamic Ethical Values to Improve Public Perception of NURTW Members in Ibadan Metropolis. *Attaqwa: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Islam*, *22*(1), 28–43. https://doi.org/10.54069/attaqwa.v22i1.1105

Pambayun, S. P., Firmansyah, M. R., Nurkhasanah, M., Indayati, T., & Masfiah, S. (2025). Implementasi Program Unggulan dalam Pembentukan Akhlak Mulia di Madrasah Ibtidaiyah: Perspektif Al-Ghazali. *Adiluhung: Journal of Islamic Values and Civilization*, *1*(1), 16–28. https://doi.org/10.59373/adiluhung.v2i1.113

Ramadhan, R. S., Kusrini, N. A. R., & Ardianto, A. (2025). The Bridging the Lingustic Gap: Challenges in Building AI Models For Non-Standard Dialects. *Attaqwa: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Islam*, *21*(1), 69–81. https://doi.org/10.54069/attaqwa.v21i1.978

Ratumbuysang, M. F. N. G., Budimansyah, D., Nurdin, E. S., Atmono, D., Amima, S. P., Mutiani, M., & Amelia, R. (2021). *Digital Marketing Mastery: Strategi Unggul di Era Internet*.

Rinaldi, R. (2021). Dampak Kualitas Layanan dan Persepsi Harga Terhadap Kepuasan dan Loyalitas serta Peran Moderasi Gender (Studi Kasus Pada Nasabah Bank BRI di Yogyakarta). *Journal Competency of Business*, *5*(2), 142–154. https://doi.org/10.47200/jcob.v5i02.1099

Safitri, N. W., Suddin, A., & Widajanti, E. (2020). ANALISIS PENGARUH BRAND AWARENESS, BRAND IMAGE, DAN MEDIA COMMUNICATION TERHADAP KEPUTUSAN PEMBELIAN (Survei pada Lembaga Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Interactive English Language Center di Surakarta dan Sukoharjo). *JAMASADA: JURNAL MANAJEMEN SUMBER DAYA MANUSIA*, *14*. https://ejurnal.unisri.ac.id/index.php/Manajemen/article/view/3816

Setiawan, E., & Haryantini. (2024). PENGARUH CITRA MEREK DAN KUALITAS PELAYANAN TERHADAP KEPUTUSAN ORANG TUA DALAM MEMILIH SEKOLAH PADA SMP KATOLIK SANG TIMUR DI TANGERANG. *Journal of Research and Publication Innovation*, *2*(1), 537–547.

Shin, M. M., Noh, E. J., & Lee, J. (2018). Study abroad programs as a service convergence: An international marketing approach. *Service Business*, *12*(2), 253–275. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11628-017-0345-6

Simangunsong, C., Rozza, S., Marbun, J., Simbolon, B. A. J., & Laksono, R. O. H. (2022). BAURAN PROMOSI SEBAGAI STRATEGI UNTUK MENINGKATKAN PILIHAN MAHASISWA PADA PROGRAM STUDI AKUNTANSI. *Epigram*, *19*(1), 63–83. https://doi.org/10.32722/epi.v19i1.4315

Sisnuhadi, S., & Sirait, S. K. (2021). Pengaruh promosi media sosial, celebrity endorser, dan perceived quality terhadap keputusan pembelian. *Jurnal Riset Manajemen Dan Bisnis*, *16*(1), 45–56.

Sugiyono, D. (2013). *Metode penelitian pendidikan pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif dan R&D*. https://digilib.unigres.ac.id/index.php?p=show_detail&id=43

Tidd, J. (2023). Managing Innovation. In *IEEE Technology and Engineering Management Society Body of Knowledge (TEMSBOK)* (pp. 95–108). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119987635.ch6

Tjay, S., Dewi, W., & Widodo, T. (2025). The Effect of Education Quality and Tuition Fees on School Selection Decisions Through Mediation of School Image at Citra Bangsa School Tangerang. *Indonesian Interdisciplinary Journal of Sharia Economics (IIJSE)*, *8*(2), 5133–5148. https://doi.org/10.31538/iijse.v8i2.6667

Walling, M. L. (2021). *Approaches to Executive Decision-Making at Public Institutions Experiencing Financial Instability in Texas*.