

:

()

:

()

•

•

•

•

:

(2004)

(1423) .

()

.2011/4/3

2010/2/3

/

2011 ©

-2

)

(1422

1418

)

(1423

1425

1418

)

(1429

-3

(1423

)

)

(1992

-4

:

-1

-5

(1423

)

- 1-)
 .(1417)
- 2- ()
- 3- 1423)
 .(1423)
- 4-)
- 5- .(1428)
- 6- (Lancaster and Massingham, 1993: 206)
 (A.M.A.)
- " (Frich, 1996: 1)
- : (4Ps)
 .(Barion, 2006)
- (7Ps)
 (participants) :
 physical) (process)
 Lancaster and Massingham, 1993;) (evidence
 .(Jonathan, 2008

(2009)

(2003)

:

(Baragh,1996)

()

(Barton, 1978)

(Maringe,2005)

(1999)

(2002)

) (value-based marketing)

(1998

(Bhatt, 1988)

(2005)

)

(2009

- 1988

) ()
()

(2009)

)

: (Kotler and Fox, 1995)

(Myers, 2006)

(2005)

()

()

(1424)

(2006 1998)

(1423)

(1995

(Davies and Ellison,2001)

:

:

(1999)

)

(1979

:

:

(1425)

: (2000)

:

:

:

:

(1418)

Gratiot,)

(1979

() :

%53 (Fox,1985)

(North Texas University, 1993)

() () %13

(Griggs,1985)

(Griggs)

(Maddaus, 1993)

()

(Beales and Maureen, 1995) () (Weas, 1992)

) (

()

(Oplatka ,2007)

() :

() :

(Cohen-Zada and .William, 2008)

:

) •

(

) •

(

()

(Ho)

:

:(Ho1)

:

(-)

) -

(-

() -

: () -

) (-

: (Ho2)

:

(1) :

(4)

(3)

(2)

(6)

(5)

(8)

(7)

:

:

:

(1419)

:

1430/1429

1430/1429

(700)

(%10)

(1)

(46)

.(Malhotra, 1996)

(7335) 1430/1429

(7335)

:(1)

1138	121	246	69	167	217	318		.1
746	482	0000	61	0000	89	114		.2
1226	152	279	62	195	144	394		.3
1662	292	756	67	152	143	252		.4
176	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	176		.5
332	0000	280	0000	34	0000	18		.6
896	127	291	58	139	94	187		.7
364	85	75	34	37	95	38		.8
348	194	0000	63	0000	91	0000		.9
400	295	0000	37	0000	68	0000		.10
14	0000	0000	0000	0000	14	0000		.11
33	0000	0000	0000	0000	33	0000		.12
7335	1748	1927	451	724	988	1497		

1430

- -

:

(%63) (441) .(%68.4) (479)
 (2) (38)

: (2)

441	38	479	700	
% 63	%5.4	%68.4	%100	

()

(

)

: ()

.(

-1

-2

(25)

-3

Reliability ()
 ()

"5" (Likert Scale)
 (3) ("1"

Validity ()

)

(392) (%83.7)
 (%88.9)
 (%11.1) .(Sekaran, 2006)

(SPSS)

/ :

(Descriptive Statistics)

(334) (% 75.7)
 (%24.3) .(One Sample T-test)
 (ANOVA F)

(3)

:

(%55.1)
 (135) :
 (%30.6)

(63 %14.3) (50 30) (%75)
 (3) (44) (30) (333)
 (%64) (51) (64)
 (%20) (ريال 10) (ريال 20) (%14.5) (%10)

(52) (ريال 10) (36%)
(ريال 5)

(245) (55.6%) (44.4%) (196)
(33.6%) (148) (160)
(10.9%) (19.3%) (36.3%) (85)
(94.6%)
(5.4%)

(3):

	%		
10.0	10.0	44	30
41.7	31.7	140	40-30
85.5	43.8	193	50 - 41
100.0	14.5	64	51
	100.0	441	
88.9	88.9	392	
100.0	11.1	49	
	100.0	441	
75.7	75.7	334	
100.0	24.3	107	
	100.0	441	
10.2	10.2	45	
30.6	20.4	90	
85.7	55.1	243	
100.0	14.3	63	

	%		
	100.0	441	
7.0	7.0	31	5000 ريال
36.0	29.0	128	ريال 10 5000
79.1	43.1	190	ريال 20 10
100.0	20.9	92	ريال 20
	100.0	441	
94.6	94.6	417	
100.0	5.4	24	
	100.0	441	
55.6	55.6	245	
78.5	22.9	101	
89.2	10.7	47	
100.0	10.8	48	
	100.0	441	
36.3	36.3	160	
55.6	19.3	85	
100.0	44.4	196	
	100.0	441	
31.7	31.7	140	
52.6	20.9	92	
100.0	47.4	209	
	100.0	441	

(%47.4) (209)

(92 140)

() : (%20.9) (% 31.7)

:
 . (%4.1) (16) -1
) -2
 (%67.3) (297) (
 . (%8.6) (38)
 () (4)
 ()
 (270)
 () (%61.2)
 (%34.7) (153)

:(4)

	%			
14.0	14.0	62		
61.2	47.2	208		
95.9	34.7	153		
100.0	4.1	16		
	100.0	441		
67.3	67.3	297		
76.4	9.1	40		
85.0	8.6	38		
100.0	15.0	66	(/)	
	100.0	441		

.(2.54492)	(4.4649)		
	(8 2)		
) (2)		
(
) (8)		
.(
(4.2676 4.3946)	(8 2)		
(0.80117 0.77364)			
(20)			
)	:	:
	(
.(1.20573)	(3.2200)		
) (4 13)			
) ((one-sample test)	(t)
((441)	
(3.3175 3.2721)		(25)	
(1.29821 1.16516)			
		(5)	
			(3)
	(Grand Mean)		
		(5)	
)
	(

(5):

1.04407	3.7959		1
0.77364	4.3946		2
1.26105	3.4649		3
1.29821	3.3175		4
2.54492	4.4649		5
1.02497	3.8299		6
0.96723	4.1293		7
0.80117	4.2676	.(...	8
1.01560	4.1361	.(...	9
1.03304	4.0317		10
1.24342	3.3220		11
1.12346	3.6054		12
1.16516	3.2721		13
1.06274	3.9887		14
1.16419	3.4059		15
1.13423	3.4785		16
1.11787	3.8027		17
1.08127	3.7324		18
1.05696	3.6825		19
1.20573	3.2200		20
0.83071	4.2041		21
1.06838	3.3832		22
1.13213	3.4014		23

1.07052	3.4966		24
1.00000	3.8571		25

(6)

(0.52874) (3.7474)
 .(0.00) (29.684)

(t-test)

:(6)

	df	(t-test)				
0.00	440	29.684	0.52874	3.7474	441	

(7) (t-test)

(25)

(29.684) (t-test)

(0.00)

) ()

(())

())

(4.0789)

())

) (32.981)

(0.68698)

())

(

0.77287)

(3.6685 3.8875)

(19.424 24.116)

(0.72270

One-sample t-

)

(test

3.5832)

(

(8) .(51 50 - 41 40

(0.003) (4.717)
(437 3)

(ANOVA F) : (8)

*	F		df		
0.003	4.717	1.286	3	3.859	
		0.273	437	119.151	
			440	123.010	

. 0.05 > *

(3.6696) (50 -41)

.(0.51589)

Post Hoc)

(Comparisons
(Tukey HSD)
(Scheffe)

(Ho2-2)

(2003)

(9)

50 -41)

. (51) (

:

.(10)

(t-test)

(3.9413) (51)

.(11)

(0.54188)

(9): (Post Hoc Comparisons) (Tukey)

%95		*			(I - J)	(J)	(I)
0.3192	-0.1463	0.774	0.09025	0.08642	40 - 30	30	
0.3826	-0.0673	0.271	0.08723	0.15764	50 - 41		
0.1497	-0.3777	0.681	0.10226	-0.11398	51		
0.3192	-0.3192	0.774	0.09025	-0.08642	30	40 - 30	
0.3826	-0.0783	0.609	0.05797	0.07122	50 - 41		
0.1497	-0.4036	0.055	0.07879	-0.20039	51		
0.3192	-0.3826	0.271	0.08723	-0.15764	30	50 - 41	
0.3826	-0.2207	0.609	0.05797	-0.07122	40 - 30		
0.1497	-0.4659	0.002	0.07532	-0.27161*	51		
0.3777	-0.1497	0.681	0.10226	0.11398	30	51	
0.4036	-0.0028	0.055	0.07879	0.20039	40 - 30		
0.4659	0.0774	0.002	0.07532	-0.27161*	50 - 41		

. 0.05

*

(10):

*	F	df					
0.003	4.717	440	0.52677	3.8273	44	30	
			0.52024	3.7409	140	40 - 30	
			0.51589	3.6696	193	50 - 41	
			0.54188	3.9413	64	51	
			0.52874	3.7474	441		

. 0.05 >

*

(0.071)

(3.273)

(t-test)

(11)

()

(t-test) : (11)

.()

(α)	(t-test)				
0.071	3.273	0.50428	3.7412	392	
		0.69890	3.7967	49	

(12)

(t-test)

(Ho2-3)

()

(t-test) .() :
(.0.390) (0.740)

.()
(t-test)

(t-test) : (12)

.()

(α)	(t-test)				
0.390	0.740	0.54110	3.7610	392	
		0.58815	3.7050	49	

(F) (13)

(Ho2-4)

(2.606)
(437 3)

(0.051)

)

.(

(13):

*	F		df		
0.051	2.606	0.721	3	2.162	
		0.277	437	120.848	
			440	123.010	

* > 0.05

(Ho2-5)

5 (ريال 5000)
 20 ريال 10 ريال 10
 : (ريال 20 ريال) (14)

(ANOVA F) (14):

*	F		df		
0.000	6.986	1.210	3	3.629	
		0.269	437	117.380	
			440	123.010	

Post Hoc) (F) (14) (ANOVA F
 Tukey) (Comparisons (6.986)
 (HSD 3) (0.000)
 (15) (437
)
 (ريال 20) (ريال 5000
 (ريال 10 5 آلاف ريال)
 20) (ريال 20 10)
 (

(15): البعدية (Post Hoc Comparisons)، توكي (Tukey) ، لمعرفة دوافع أولياء الأمور لإلحاق الأبناء والبنات بالمدارس الأهلية في محافظة الإحساء حسب متغير الدخل الشهري.

%95		*			(I - J)	(J)	(I)
0.3074	-0.2277	0.981	0.10375	0.03989	(10 -5)	5000	
0.5014	-0.0165	0.076	0.10039	0.24245	(20 -10)		
0.5797	0.0254	0.027	0.10763	0.30210*	20		
0.2277	-0.3074	0.981	0.10375	-0.03989	5000	10 -5	
0.3554	0.0497	0.004	0.05926	0.20256*	(20 -10)		
0.4449	0.0795	0.001	0.07084	0.26221*	20		
0.0165	-0.5014	0.076	0.10039	-0.24245	5000	20 -10	
-0.0497	-0.3554	0.004	0.05926	-0.20256*	(10 -5)		
0.2294	-0.1101	0.802	0.06583	0.05965	20		
-0.0245	-0.5797	0.027	0.10763	-0.30210*	5000	20	
-0.0795	-0.4449	0.001	0.07084	-0.26221*	(10 -5)		
0.1101	-0.2294	0.802	0.06583	-0.05965	(20 -10)		

. 0.05

*

.(16)

(5000 ريال)
 (0.67362) (3.9265)
 5)
 20 10) (ريال 10
 (3.8866) (ريال 20) (ريال
 (3.6243) (3.6840)

:(16)

*	F	df				
0.000	6.986	440	0.67362	3.9265	31	5000 ريال
			0.46295	3.8866	128	10 - 5 ريال
			0.49692	3.6840	190	20 - 10 ريال
			0.57300	3.6243	92	ريال 20
			0.52874	3.7474	441	

* . 0.05 >

(t-test)

(Ho2-6)

(17)

.()

(3.716)

(t-test)

.(0.055)

.() ()

(t-test)

(t-test)

:(17)

.()

(α)	(t-test)				
0.055	3.716	0.51970	3.7400	417	
		0.66717	3.8750	24	

(Ho2-7)

(4.050) :
 (437 3) (0.007)
) :
 .((ANOVA F)
 (F) (18)

(ANOVA F) :(18)

*	F		df		
0.007	4.050	1.109	3	3.327	
		0.274	437	119.683	
			440	123.010	

. 0.05 > *

(19)

Post)

() ()

(Hoc Comparisons
 (Tukey HSD)

(Tukey) (Post Hoc Comparisons) :(19)

%95		*		(I - J)	(J)	(I)
0.0461	-0.2731	0.259	0.06188	-0.11346		
-0.0530	-0.4828	0.008	0.08334	-0.26792*		
0.2059	-0.2201	1.000	0.08260	-0.00709		
0.2731	-0.0461	0.259	0.06188	0.11346		
0.0839	-0.3928	0.340	0.09241	-0.15446		
0.3430	-0.1302	0.653	0.09175	0.10638		

%95		*		(I - J)	(J)	(I)
0.4828	0.0530	0.008	0.08334	0.26792*		
0.3928	-0.0839	0.340	0.09241	0.15446		
0.5378	-0.0161	0.073	0.10739	0.26082		
0.2201	-0.2059	1.000	0.08260	0.00709		
0.1302	-0.3430	0.653	0.09175	-0.10638		
0.0161	-0.5378	0.073	0.10739	-0.26083		

. 0.05

*

(20)

(20):

*	F	df				
0.007	4.050	440	0.49702	3.6921	245	
			0.61225	3.8055	101	
			0.46123	3.9600	47	
			0.50818	3.6992	48	
			0.52874	3.7474	441	

. 0.05 >

*

(Ho2-8)

(0.46123) (3.9600) ()

(3.6921) ()

(0.49702)

)
(

(F) (21)

...

(0.666)

(0.407)

(438 2)

:(21)

*	F		df		
0.666	0.407	0.114	2	0.228	
		0.280	438	122.782	
			440	123.010	

.05 >

*

() :

() :

() :

() :

() :

:

-1

-2

-2

-

-

-3

-3

(

)

-4

-4

:

•

-5

•

(

)

Internal)

•

(Customers

-6

()

•

•

•

:

•

•

-2 ()

-3

-1

1979 / 1998

1999 2004

2000 .37

1998 126 27 1998

1999 1423 149 - 133 2009

14-13 : 1425

1440 : 1425

2003 : 1416

16 56

(.46-31 1995

.50-35
 2005
 2001
 : 1419 2009
 .25-3 1 :
 1998 .194-193
 1423
 . 1998 19-18 :
 2002 23 -19 1423 17- 13
 : 2002
 1418
 ()
 1998 .67-55
 : 1422
 -18
 . 1998 19
 1413 1423
 234
 .69- 68 1440
 1423
 :
 2006
 :
 .609 - 565 37 /
 1992
 : 1999
 .271 -219 25
 1418 %62 1429
 http://
 www.saudiinfocus.com/ar/forum/showthread.
 .60-45 php?p=70395.
 1424 1418
 2003 41 :
 .63 - 41 :

1423

.10

1417

.45 – 12 75

1430

.75

1430/1429

- Barion, K. 2006. The Concept of the Marketing Mix, **Presentations on Marketing Management**, vol. 1, September, 2-7.
- Beales, Janet and Wahl, Maureen. 1995. Given the Choice: A Study of the PAVE Program and School in Milwaukee, Reason Foundation, Los Angeles, CA.
- Berry, Leonard L., Parasuraman, A. and Zeithmal, V. 1991. Marketing Services Competing Through Quality. New York: The Free Press.
- Bhatt, Sanjeer. 1988. Marketing Services. **The Economic Times**, April 28th, 1988, 20.
- Christopher H. Lovelock. 1996. Services Marketing, Prentice Hall, Inc., New Jersey, 66.
- Cohen-Zada, Danny and William Sander. 2008. Religion, Religiosity and Private School Choice: Implications for Estimating the Effectiveness of Private Schools, **Journal of Urban Economics**, Vol. 64, Issue 1, July 2008, 85-100.
- Davies, Brent and Linda Ellison. 2001. School Leadership for the 21st Century: A Competency and Knowledge Approach, London : Routledge, Conger, J. A. and Benjamin.
- Fox, Ireas. 1985. Private Schools and Public Schools: Parents View, London: The Macmillan Press, Ltd.
- Gay, L. R. and Diehl, P. L. 1992. Research Method for Business and Management, N. Y.: Maxwell MacMillan International Co., 141.
- Gratitot, Margaret Harding. 1979. Why Parents Choose Nonpublic Schools: Comparative Attitudes and Characteristics of Public and Private School Consumers, Stanford University.
- Griggs, Clive. 1985. Private Education in Britain, London, The Falmer Press.
- Jonathan, Ivy. 2008. A New Higher Education Marketing Mix: The 7Ps for MBA Marketing, **International Journal of Educational Management**. Volume 22, Issue 4, 288 – 299.
- Kotler, P. 2003. Marketing Management Analysis, Planning, Implementation and Control. (11th Ed). Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Kotler, Philip and Karen F. A. Fox. 1995. Strategic Marketing for Educational Institutions, 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 484 .
- Lancaster and Massingham. 1993. Essentials of Marketing, 2nd ed, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 209.
- Lovelock, Christopher H. 2001. Services Marketing, Englewood Services Competing Through Quality. New York: The Free Press.
- Maddaus, John. 1993. The Problem of Location in Parental Choice of School, ERIC Number ED348154.
- Maringe, Felix. 2005. Interrogating the Crisis in Higher Education Marketing: The CORD Model, **International Journal of Educational Management**. V.19, Issue 7, 564 – 578.
- Myers, Ted. 2006. Marketing for School Improvement, Teacher: **The National Education Magazine**; Issue Aug. 2006, 52-56.
- North Texas University : Denton, Center for the Study of Education Reform. 1993. Who Chooses and Why? Baseline Demographic Data Report. San Antonio

-
- School Choice Research Project. ED: 35961.
- Oplatka, Izhar. 2007. The Place of the (Open House) in the School-Choice Process, **Urban Education**, Vol. 42, No. 2, 163-184.
- Sekaran, U. 1992. *Research Methods for Business; A Skill Building Approach*, (4th Ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- West, Anne. 1992. Factors Affecting Choice for School of Middle Class Parents: Implications for Marketing, **Educational Management and Administration**, V.20, No. 4, Oct., 212.
- Williams, S., L. Han and W.J. Qualls. 1998. A Conceptual Model and Study of Cross-Cultural Business Relationships, **Journal of Business Research**, 42 (2): 135-143 .

The Role of the Marketing Mix Elements of Service to Increase the Demand for Private Schools: A Field Study on Private Schools in the Province of Al-Ahsa

S. A. S. Al-Melhem

ABSTRACT

This study aims to explore the views of parents (as customers) towards private schools in the province of Al-Ahsa in Saudi Arabia, on the main factors affecting their decisions to send their children to private schools according to the marketing mix elements of service.

The study found a range of results that was highlighted as follows:

- Most of the elements of service marketing mix affect the motives of parents to send children to private schools. Most influential element was (the element of service accompanying the product), followed by (product quality and then promotion), while the least influential elements were (pricing and distribution), respectively.
- Most parents are satisfied (as customers) with the level of their sons and daughters in private schools who have studied during this year.
- The study showed no statistically significant differences between the motives of parents in the province of Al-Ahsa in getting their sons and daughters to private schools, according to the elements of the marketing mix service, on the basis of differences of nationality, kinship, educational qualification of parents, as well as place of residence.
- The study also showed the presence of statistically significant differences between the motives of parents in the province of Al-Ahsa in getting their sons and daughters to private schools, according to the marketing mix elements of service, according to age among the parents, family's monthly income and type of current function of the parents.

Based on those results, the researcher presented a number of recommendations at the end of the study.

KEYWORDS: Private schools, Marketing education, Services marketing, Marketing mix, Al-Ahsa province/ Saudi Arabia.

Associate Professor, Dept. of Administration, Faculty of Shari'a and Islamic Studies, Al-Imam Mohammad b. Saud Islamic University, Al-Ahsa, KSA.

Received on 3/2/2010 and Accepted for Publication on 3/4/2011.