The Marketing Practices of Private Schools Leaders in Selected School Districts in Saudi Arabia

Mohammed Assiri

College of Education, Najran University, PO box 1988, Najran 61441, Saudi Arabia

Abstract

This study aimed to investigate the perceptions of private school leaders regarding their practices on school marketing. In order to achieve the purpose of this study, the following questions were answered: (1) how do private school leaders perceive their school marketing practices? and (2) do private school leaders differ in their perceptions of school marketing practices based on their gender, levels of education, and administrative experience? To conduct this study, the descriptive research model was applied. The population of this study included all private school leaders in two-selected school districts in Saudi Arabia. The questionnaire was a data collection instrument of this study, which consisted of 31 items that focus on marketing practices. The data were collected during the school year of 2016-2017. Descriptive and inferential statistics have been applied to analyze the data. The findings of this study revealed that the overall mean score for perception of private school leaders regarding marketing practices was classified as usually occurs. The findings revealed that there were not any statistically significant differences between groups based on gender, levels of education, and administrative experience regarding their perceptions of school marketing practices. The study concluded with some suggestions and recommendations for private school leaders to be successful in marketing practice.
Keywords: school leadership, school leader, school marketing.

1. Introduction

Marketing has become an essential managerial function for schools in contemporary times. Schools need to market themselves to their customers because "marketing when done correctly forces schools to focus on the needs of its customers and the quality of its products" (Bagin, Gallagher & Moore, 2008, p. 323). Similarly, Hepburn (2012) pointed out that "a marketing focus will improve the service offered by schools and make it easier to respond to the needs of parents and students" (p. 10). In addition, practicing marketing can help schools build and maintain public confidence and community support (Hanson & Henry, 1993; Kowalski, 2004). Marketing provides an essential contribution to school program evaluation and development (Page & Sharp, 2012). Marketing enables schools to know how they are perceived by their groups and to understand the different needs of these groups. Marketing, therefore, is an indispensable process for both public and private schools.

Private schools are required to have a marketing program in order to survive. Lockhart (2011) notes that "private schools have been marketing to varying degrees for decades" (p.5). Private schools also spend much effort, time and money on marketing their services and programs (Hepburn, 2012). Hanson (2003) wrote that, "private school must actively build a clientele if they are to survive in a competitive environment. Survival requires marketing" (p. 235). Kowalski (2004) pointed out "private schools have had to exist in a more competitive environment" (p. 204). Therefore, private schools need to consider marketing to build and sustain a positive reputation and image that will lead them in a competitive environment. Such a competitive environment impresses private schools' leaders to realize the importance and necessity of marketing process for the success of their schools.

According to Drysdale (1999) and Foskett (2002), the marketing activity is especially beneficial for private schools to succeed in competitive environments. Currently, the growing number of school choices for students leads to more competitive environment. The increasing competition between private schools and public schools and among private schools to attract prospective students encourage private schools to pay more attention to marketing. Thus Lockhart (2011) pointed out that "marketing is essential to managing the competition by positioning your school as the preferable choice" (p. 5). Additionally, marketing can differentiate schools from their competitors (National Association of Independent Schools, 2001). In fact, the purpose of school marketing is to become more competitive (Kurbatova, 2001). Marketing can provide a greater understanding of the processes employed in attracting and recruiting students for private schools. Marketing reinforces school administration to find adequate ways and techniques to meet and satisfy the needs and expectations of students and parents efficiently and effectively then other competitors.

A body of research on school marketing revealed that the marketing process was one of school administration actions (Bunnell, 2005). Several studies indicated that the management of marketing is one of school leaders' responsibilities and roles that should be taken into consideration (James & Philips, 1995; Foskett, 2002; Anast-May, Mitchell, Buckner & Elsberry, 2012). As stated by Kurbatova (2001), "the role of the school principal as the organizer of marketing activity is a big one" (p. 7). In the case of private schools, Kowalski

(2004) pointed out that "having to compete for students requires most private school administrators to sell their programs to multiple publics spanning age groups and interest level" (p.212). More specifically, the marketing has become a priority activity for private school leaders so that they can promote their schools to their target customers.

To manage marketing, the school leaders are required to incorporate marketing in their leadership practices and behaviors effectively and efficiently. Marketing has become an important managerial action, which must be added to the job descriptions of private school leaders. There are specific abilities and competencies that are necessary for school leaders to practice marketing in an appropriate manner (Foskett, 2015).

The literature on school marketing first appeared at the end of the twentieth century. More specifically, the prior literature on school marketing has been explored in the early 1980s (Kotler & Fox, 1985). In the 1990s, several books on educational marketing had been published (Pardey, 1991; Gray, 1991; Holcomb, 1993; Evans, 1995; Gewirtz, Ball & Bowe, 1995; Davis & Ellison, 1997; Kotler & Armstrong, 1999). This literature was theoretical more than practical. Some marketing approaches and guidelines were provided for educators and school leaders to market their schools optimally and effectively. By the end of the 1990s, a body of empirical studies on school marketing was conducted (James & Philips, 1995; Bagley, Woods & Glatter, 1996; Brich, 1998). Naturally, the literature of school marketing has emerged from the literature of school administration and marketing of non-educational institutions.

There are several definitions proposed for school marketing. According to Kotler and Fox (1985) school marketing is "the analysis, planning, implementation, and control of carefully formulated programs designed to bring about voluntary exchanges of values with target markets to achieve institutional objectives" (p. 7). This definition emphasizes that the schools need to be market oriented. Another definition was presented by Pardey (1991), who defined school marketing as "the process which enables client needs to be identified, anticipated, and satisfied, in order that the institution's objectives can be achieved" (p. 12). Evans (1995) defined it as "the management process of identifying and satisfying the requirements of consumers and society in a sustainable way" (p. 4). These definitions underscore that the marketing of school is considered to be a process that is implemented within the school itself. Bagin, Gallagher & Moore, (2008) stated that school marketing is "discovering, defining, and delivering what people need and want" (p. 323). School marketing begins by determining and satisfying target customers' needs and wants by building and maintaining communication and relationship with target customers.

According to Lockhart (2011), the marketing of schools is important for several reasons such as increased competition, demographic changes, media scrutiny, and scarce resources. Additionally, Hanson (2003) argued why applying marketing within schools. He provided three reasons, which are: "1) developing truer images of what goes on in schools, 2) obtaining additional resources, and 3) addressing the potential for increased student learning" (p. 236). Marketing is a valuable process for schools in order to provide the programs and services demanded by target customers and society as a whole (Anast-May, Mitchell, Buckner & Elsberry, 2012; Maringe, 2015). Additionally, marketing can "enhance the educational program, improve communication effectiveness, provide a function for community engagement, and make school a more enjoyable place for everyone" (Bagin, Gallagher & Moore, 2008, p. 329). Marketing can facilitate the achievement of a school's goals and objectives.

To implement the marketing successfully, there are some steps that school leaders need to follow. Banach (2001) suggested five steps as a model for school marketing. These steps include analyzation of the environment, strategy development, drafting a marketing plan, implementing the plan, and finally evaluating the results. Additionally, Hepburn (2015) identified the stages for school marketing, which include marketing research, meeting market needs, message and brand development, evidence gathering, using of mass media, and relationship management. More specifically, marketing must be translated into the marketing plan. According to Foster, (2011), a school marketing plan consists of seven elements: 1) identification of the offers, 2) determining the target customers, 3) determining the budget, 4) identifying human resources, 5) setting goals and objectives, 6) selecting strategies, and 7) evaluation. Therefore, school leaders are encouraged to establish a marketing plan, which is the best way to achieve the goals of schools and meet the needs of customers.

Vining (2006) identified several obstacles facing marketing. Such obstacles include staff resistance, unrealistic expectations, creative voids, fear of marketing, and lack of time for planning, reflection, and training. In Saudi Arabia specifically, there are several obstacles facing private schools (Al-Maliki, 2012). This is why marketing for private schools is needed now more than any other time prior. This study aims to shed light on the marketing practices of private school leaders. This provides insights into marketing of private schools as a new critical domain of school administration Therefore, the purpose of this study is to investigate the perceptions of private school leaders regarding their practices on school marketing. To achieve the purpose of this study, the following questions will be answered: (1) how do private school leaders perceive their school marketing practices? and (2) do private school leaders differ in their perceptions of school marketing practices based on their gender, levels of education, and administrative experience?

2. Methodology
This section presents the methodology of this study. It describes the research model, the study participants, the study instrument, the data collection procedures, and the data analysis process.

2.1. Research Design
This study is quantitative in nature. In order to conduct this study, the descriptive research model was applied. This descriptive research model allows a researcher to "examine a situation as it is" (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010, p. 182) as well as in "making careful descriptions of educational phenomena" (Gall, Borg & Gall, 1996, p. 374). More specifically, this descriptive study is categorized as research surveys, which "involves acquiring information about one or more groups of people about their characteristics, opinions, attitudes, or previous experiences" (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010, p. 187).

2.2. Study Participants
This study was conducted in Saudi Arabia. The population of this study includes all private school leaders in two selected Saudi school districts, the Makka School District and the Assir School District. The data of this study was possible from the participation of 59 private school leaders. Table (1) presents information about the participants in this study.

Table 1. Describing of Study Participants (n=59)

Variable	Type	n	%
Gender	Male	46	78
	Female	13	22
Level of education	Bachelor	54	91.5
	Graduate	5	8.5
	Less than 5 years	7	11.9
Administrative experience	5-10 years	15	25.4
	More than 10 years	37	62.7
Total of Participants		59	100

2.3. Study Instrument
The questionnaire was used as the data collection instrument of this study. To design the questionnaire, the related literature and empirical studies were reviewed. For the purpose of this study, the researcher developed this questionnaire to investigate the perceptions of private school leaders regarding their marketing practices. The questionnaire was divided into two sections. The first section includes the demographic information of the study participants. The second section consists of 31 items that focus on marketing practices. This section was divided into four dimensions: a) internal market analysis (8 items), b) external market analysis (9 items), c) market plan development (8 items), and d) marketing communication (6 items). The respondents were asked to provide an answer for each item using a 5-point Likert type scale. The respondents rated each item by using one of these five points: 1) never occurs, 2) seldom occurs, 3) sometimes occurs, 4) usually occurs, and 5) always occurs. To get the content validity of the questionnaire, the researcher asked some experts in the field of education to review the items of the instrument and determine the degree to which the items relate and represent the dimensions. After receiving suggestions and recommendations of experts, modifications and corrections were made and the final structure of the questionnaire was designed. The internal validity was calculated using the Pearson Correlation Coefficient. The correlation coefficient scores were significant at the 0.01 level for all items and dimensions (See Tables 2 & 3).

Table 2: Pearson Correlation Coefficient between Items of the Questionnaire (n=59)

Dimensions of the Marketing Practices							
Internal market analysis		External market analysis		Market plan development		Marketing communication	
Item No.	The Correlation Coefficient	Item No.	The Correlation Coefficient	Item No.	The Correlation Coefficient	Item No.	The Correlation Coefficient
1	.735**	9	.715**	18	.764**	26	.777**
2	.816**	10	.773**	19	.904**	27	.870**
3	.778**	11	.752**	20	.950**	28	.820**
4	.706**	12	.720**	21	.924**	29	.854**
5	.765**	13	.750**	22	.926**	30	.806**
6	.741**	14	.807**	23	.947**	31	.871
7	.708**	15	.765**	24	.954**		
8	.700**	16	.774**	25	.928**		
		17	.774**				

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 3: Pearson Correlation Coefficient between Dimensions of the Questionnaire (n=59)

Dimension	Number of Items	The Correlation Coefficient
Internal market analysis	8	.877**
External market analysis	9	.930**
Market plan development	8	.908**
Marketing communication	6	.822**

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The reliability of the questionnaire was calculated using Cronbach's Alpha. The Cronbach's Alpha score for all dimensions, and overall score for the questionnaire were high as presented in table (4).

Table 4: Cronbach's Alpha Scores for the Reliability of the Questionnaire (n=59)

Dimension	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Internal market analysis	8	.87
External market analysis	9	.90
Market plan development	8	.97
Marketing communication	6	.90
All Items	31	.96

2.4. Data Collection Procedures

The researcher collected data of the study during the school year of 2016-2017. Official permission was obtained from School Districts to distribute the questionnaire to the participants. Participation in this study was voluntary. Data was collected using the online questionnaire technique. The researcher sent the online link of the questionnaire to School Districts. The link was then forwarded to private school leaders across the district. When participants clicked on the online link, they were directed to the questionnaire with its recruitment statement. The participants had access to the questionnaire for 30 days.

The majority of the participants (n=32) completed the questionnaire within two weeks of the initial email. Two weeks later, a follow-up reminder was sent included, the link and deadline for completion of the questionnaire, a brief thanks for those who participated, and a plea for those who net yet participated to complete the questionnaire. The remaining 27 participants responded within two weeks of the reminder email. After that no additional responses, the researcher closed the link of questionnaire.

2.5. Data Analysis

In this study, the descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data with the Statistical Package of the Social Sciences (SPSS). The statistical techniques that were used in this study include the Pearson Correlation Coefficient, which was computed to measure the internal validity of study instrument. The Cronbach' Alpha was employed to measure the reliability of the study instrument. Frequencies and percentages were used to describe the participants of the study. The mean scores and standard deviation scores were utilized to answer the first question in this study. To determine the overall marketing practices of private school leaders, the rating scale was designed used this formula (5-1)/5+1. The maximum score was (5) – the minimum score of the scale is (1), and are divided by the number of categories of the scale (5), then added (1) to the result. The rating scale is presented in Table (5). To answer the second question of the study, the researcher used the two-independent sample t-test in order to explore the differences between two groups based on gender (male-female), and education level (Bachelor Degree-Graduate Degree). Additionally, the One Way analysis of variance

(ANOVA) was used to investigate the differences between three groups based on years of administrative experience (less than 5 years, 5-10 years, more than 10 years).

Table 5: Rating Scale

Score Range	Classifications
1.0 -1.80	Never occurs
1.81- 2.60	Seldom occurs
2.61- 3.40	Sometimes occurs
3.41- 4.20	Usually occurs
4.21- 5.0	Always occurs

3. Findings

The findings of the study are presented in this section. The data collected were analyzed and reported to answer the questions of this study. The findings are organized into two subsections.

The first subsection provides the descriptive analysis of the data including means and standard deviations to answer the first question of this study: how do private school leaders perceive their school marketing practices? In order to answer this question, the means and standard deviations for each item and four dimensions are calculated and presented in tables (6-10).

Table 6: The Means, Classification, and Rank for the School Marketing Practices (n=59)

Dimensions	Items	Mean	Classification	Rank
Internal market analysis	8	4.32	Always occurs	2
External market analysis	9	4.05	Usually occurs	3
Market plan development	8	3,58	Usually occurs	4
Marketing communication	6	4.35	Always occurs	1
Overall of the school marketing practices	31	4.07	Usually occurs	

Table 6 shows the mean scores, classification, and rank for the four dimensions as well as the overall of perceptions of private school leaders regarding their practices on school marketing. These four dimensions were arranged for the highest to the lowest as follows: marketing communication was classified as "always occurs" (M= 4.35); internal market analysis was classified as "always occurs" (M= 4.32); external market analysis was classified as "usually occurs" (M= 4.05); and market plan development was classified as "usually occurs" (M= 3.58). Finally, the data reveals that the overall mean score (M= 4.07) for perception of private school leaders regarding marketing practices was classified as "usually occurs."

Table 7: The Means, Standard Deviations, Classification, and Rank for the Items of Internal Market Analysis Dimension (n=59)

Item No.	Internal Market Analysis Dimension	Mean	Std. Deviation	Classification	Rank
1	I analyze the current programs at school.	4.41	.812	Always occurs	4
2	I determine the areas of strengths and weaknesses of school programs.	4.49	.728	Always occurs	2
3	I analyze the professionalism and experience of teachers and staff.	4.63	.692	Always occurs	1
4	I explore the perceptions of current students about school.	4.08	.952	Always occurs	7
5	I analyze the quality and availability of school facilities.	4.46	.877	Always occurs	3
6	I analyze the customer service processes in the school.	4.22	.892	Always occurs	6
7	I analyze the school's activities.	4.41	.790	Always occurs	5
8	I utilized the analysis information in marketing the school.	3.86	1.23	Usually occurs	8

Table 7 illustrates the means, standard deviations, classification, and rank of the item-by- item on the internal marketing analysis dimension. The mean scores of the items were arranged from (3.86-4.63). The respondents scored highest on the item number (3) with a mean score of (4.63), and scored lowest on the item number (8) with mean score of (3.86). Seven items including (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and, 7) were classified as "always occurs," while item number (8) was classified as "usually occurs."

Table 8: The Means, Standard Deviations, and Rank for the Items of External Market Analysis Dimension (n=59)

Item No.	External Market Analysis Dimension	Mean	Std. Deviation	Classification	Rank
1	I search for the needs of students and families.	3.86	.991	Usually occurs	6
2	I seek the expectations of students and families.	4.00	1.05	Usually occurs	5
3	I explore the community perceptions regarding the school.	4.22	.811	Always occurs	4
4	I determine the opportunities that exist in the external environment to support school marketing.	3.76	1.10	Usually occurs	8
5	I determine the threats in the external environment that face school marketing.	3.78	1.19	Usually occurs	7
6	I discover the reasons that encourage students and families to choose the school.	4.47	.897	Always occurs	1
7	I analyze what makes the school different from other schools.	4.37	.927	Always occurs	2
8	I identify the target customers of the school.	4.29	.872	Always occurs	3
9	I divide the target customers into subgroups to analyze and understand their needs and interests.	3.76	1.11	Usually occurs	8

Table 8 shows the means, standard deviations, classification, and rank of each item on the external marketing analysis dimension. The mean scores of the items were arranged from (3.76- 4.47). The respondents scored highest on the item number (6) with mean score of (4.47), and scored lowest on the items number (4, and 9) with mean score of (3.76). Additionally, four items including (3, 6, 7, and, 8) were classified as "always occurs," while five items including (1, 2, 4, 5, and 9) were classified as "usually occurs."

Table 9: The Means, Standard Deviations, and Rank for the Items of Market Plan Development Dimension (n=59)

Item No.	Market Plan Development Dimension	Mean	Std. Deviation	Classification	Rank
1	I engage teachers and staff to participate in the marketing process.	3.75	1.30	Usually occurs	2
2	I build a marketing team according to marketing plan needs.	3.44	1.30	Usually occurs	6
3	I identify the objectives of the school's marketing plan.	3.53	1.20	Usually occurs	4
4	I incorporate the objectives of the marketing plan with the vision and mission of the school.	3.78	1.23	Usually occurs	1
5	I determine the strategies to accomplish the objectives of the marketing plan.	3.68	1.21	Usually occurs	3
6	I have a timeline to implement the marketing plan of the school.	3.44	1.24	Usually occurs	6
7	I describe the tactics of the marketing plan.	3.49	1.26	Usually occurs	5
8	I periodically evaluate the results of the marketing plan.	3.53	1.29	Usually occurs	4

Table 9 displays the means, standard deviations, classification, and rank of the item-by- item on the dimension of market plan development. The mean scores of the items were arranged from (3.44-3.78). The respondents scored highest on the item number (1) with mean score of (3.78), and scored lowest on the items number (2, and 6) with mean score of (3.44). Furthermore, all items of this dimension were classified as "usually occurs."

Table 10: The Means, Standard Deviations, and Rank for the Items of Marketing Communication Dimension (n=59)

Item No.	Marketing Communication Dimension	Mean	Std. Deviation	Classification	Rank
1	I spend time to enhance the image of the school in the community.	4.59	.812	Always occurs	1
2	I make sure a clear and true message is delivered to the target customers.	4.34	.940	Always occurs	3
3	I work to establish a unique marketing brand for the school	4.25	1.04	Always occurs	5
4	I always use different tools to communicate actively with students and their families.	4.56	.836	Always occurs	2
5	I develop long-term relationships with students and their families.	4.31	1.03	Always occurs	4
6	I develop cooperative relationships with local partners and supporters.	4.08	1.01	Usually occurs	6

Table 10 presents the means, standard deviations, classification, and rank of each item on the marketing communication dimension. The mean scores of the items were arranged from (4.08- 4.59). The respondents scored highest on the item number (1) with mean score of (4.59), and scored lowest on the items number (6) with mean score of (4.08). Additionally, five items including (1, 2, 3, 4, and 5) were classified as always occurs, while one item (6) were classified as usually occurs.

The second subsection presents the inferential analysis of the data using the two-independent sample *t*-test, and One Way (ANOVA), in order to answer the second question of the study: do private school leaders differ in their perceptions of school marketing practices based on their gender, levels of education, and administrative experience? The findings answering this question are presented in tables (11-13).

Table 11: T-test for Two-independent Sample to Compare the Responses of Male and Female Regarding the School Marketing Practices (n=59)

Dimensions of the School Marketing Practices.	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	*t*-Value	df	Sig.(2-Tailed)
Internal market analysis	Male	46	34.26	5.607	.833	57	.408
	Female	13	35.62	3.042			
External market analysis	Male	46	36.20	7.241	.698	57	.488
	Female	13	37.69	4.956			
Market plan development	Male	46	27.89	9.180	1.163	57	.250
	Female	13	31.23	9.011			
Marketing communication	Male	46	25.98	4.955	.469	57	.641
	Female	13	26.69	4.423			
The overall of the school marketing practices	Male	46	124.33	24.085	.949	57	.346
	Female	13	131.23	19.253			

Table 11 presents the *t*-test findings that investigate the difference between two groups based on gender. The researcher found that there was not any statistically significant difference between male and female participants regarding school leaders' perceptions in their school marketing practices. The findings also showed there was not statistically significant differences between male and female on all dimensions, which are internal analysis, external analysis, developing a market plan, and marketing communication.

The *t*- test for the two-independent sample showed that the difference on the overall perceptions of school leaders in their marketing practices between males (N= 46, M= 124.33, SD= 24.085) and females (N= 13, M= 131.23, SD= 19.253) was not statistically significant, *t* (57) = .949, *p*= .346. This indicated that male and female school leaders presented the same perceptions regarding their marketing practices.

For the internal market analysis dimension, the *t*- test for the two-independent sample showed that the difference on the school leaders' perceptions of this dimension between males (N= 46, M= 34.26, SD= 5.607) and females (N= 13, M= 35.62, SD= 3.042) was not statistically significant, *t* (57) = .833, *p*= .408. This revealed that males and females school leaders had the same perceptions regarding their internal market analysis practices.

In addition, the *t*- test for the two-independent sample showed that the difference on the school leaders' perceptions of the external marketing analysis dimension between males (N= 46, M= 36.20, SD= 7.241) and females (N= 13, M= 37.69, SD= 4.956) was not statistically significant, *t* (57) = .698, *p*= .488. This displayed that males and females school leaders demonstrated the same perceptions regarding their external market analysis practices.

For the market plan development dimension, the *t*- test for the two-independent sample showed that the

difference on the school leaders' perceptions of this dimension between males (N= 46, M= 27.89, SD= 9.180) and females (N= 13, M= 31.23, SD= 9.011) was not statistically significant, t (57) = 1.163, p= .250. This revealed that males and females school leaders showed the same perceptions regarding their practicing to develop a market plan for schools.

Finally, the t- test for the two-independent sample showed that the difference on the school leaders' perceptions of the marketing communication dimension between males (N= 46, M= 25.98, SD= 4.955) and females (N= 13, M= 26.69, SD= 4.423) was not statistically significant, t (57) = .469, p= .641. This indicated that males and females school leaders had the same perceptions regarding their marketing communication practices.

Table 12: T-test for Two-independent Sample to Compare the Responses of Groups Based on Level of Education Regarding School Marketing Practices (n=59)

Dimensions of the School Marketing Practices	Level of Education	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-Value	df	Sig.(2-Tailed)
Internal market analysis	Bachelor	54	34.63	5.232	.341	57	.734
	Graduate	5	33.80	4.764			
External market analysis	Bachelor	54	36.48	7.006	.162	57	.872
	Graduate	5	37.00	4.301			
Market plan development	Bachelor	54	28.67	9.314	.108	57	.914
	Graduate	5	28.20	8.379			
Marketing communication	Bachelor	54	26.22	4.905	.451	57	.654
	Graduate	5	25.20	4.025			
The overall of the school marketing practices	Bachelor	54	126.00	23.649	.165	57	.869
	Graduate	5	124.20	18.566			

Table 12 shows the t-test findings that investigate the differences between different levels of education. The findings found that there was not a statistically significant difference among groups with different levels of education (bachelor, graduate) regarding school leaders' perceptions in their school marketing practices. The findings also showed there was not a statistically significant differences between these groups on all dimensions, which are internal analysis, external analysis, market plan development, and marketing communication.

The t- test for the two-independent sample showed that the difference on the overall perceptions of school leaders in their marketing practices with bachelor's degrees (N= 54, M= 126.00, SD= 23.649) and school leaders with graduate degrees (N= 5, M= 124.20, SD= 18.566) was not statistically significant, t (57) = .165, p= .869. This indicated that the school leaders with different levels of education had the same perceptions regarding their marketing practices.

For the internal market analysis dimension, the t- test for the two-independent sample showed that the difference on the school leaders' perceptions of this dimension between school leaders with bachelor's degrees (N= 54, M= 34.63, SD= 5.232) and school leaders with graduate degrees (N= 5, M= 33.80, SD= 4.764) was not statistically significant, t (57) = .341, p= .734. This clarified that different levels of education had no effect on school leaders' perceptions regarding their internal market analysis practices.

The t- test for the two-independent sample showed that the difference on the school leaders' perceptions of the external marketing analysis dimension between school leaders with bachelor's degrees (N= 54, M= 36.48, SD= 7.006) and school leaders with graduate degrees (N= 5, M= 37.00, SD= 4.301) was not statistically significant, t (57) = .162, p= .872. This demonstrated that different levels of education had no effect on school leaders' perceptions regarding their external market analysis practices.

For the market plan development dimension, the t- test for the two-independent sample showed that the difference on the school leaders perceptions of this dimension between school leaders with bachelor's degrees (N= 54, M= 28.67, SD= 9.314) and school leaders with graduate degrees (N= 5, M= 28.20, SD= 8.379) was not statistically significant, t (57) = .108, p= .914. This demonstrated that different levels of education had no effect on school leaders' perceptions regarding their external market analysis practices.

Last, the t- test for the two-independent sample showed that the difference on the school leaders perceptions of the marketing communication dimension between school leaders with bachelor degrees (N= 54, M= 26.22, SD= 4.905) and school leaders with graduate degrees (N= 5, M= 25.20, SD= 4.025) was not statistically significant, t (57) = .451, p= .654. This indicated that the different levels of education had no effect on school leaders' perceptions regarding their external market analysis practices.

Table 13: One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Comparison of Groups Responses Based on Administrative Experience of School Leaders Regarding the School Marketing Practices (n=59)

Dimensions of School Marketing Practices	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Internal market analysis	Between Groups	103.163	2	51.581	2.004	.144
	Within Groups	1441.380	56	25.739		
External market analysis	Between Groups	129.754	2	64.877	1.426	.249
	Within Groups	2546.958	56	45.481		
Market plan development	Between Groups	205.530	2	102.765	1.231	.300
	Within Groups	4674.266	56	83.469		
Marketing communication	Between Groups	10.060	2	5.030	2.11	.810
	Within Groups	1334.856	56	23.837		
The overall of the school marketing practices	Between Groups	1463.080	2	731.540	1.385	.259
	Within Groups	29572.547	56	528.081		

Table 13 presents the One Way analysis of variance (ANOVA) findings that reveal the differences between groups of school leaders with different administrative experience (less than 5 years, 5-10 years, and more than 10 years). The findings showed that there were not statistically significant differences among groups with different administrative experience regarding school leaders' perceptions in their school marketing practices. In addition, the findings revealed there were not statistically significant differences between these groups regarding their internal analysis, external analysis, market plan development, and marketing communication.

First, the One Way analysis of variance (ANOVA) showed that the differences between groups of schools' leaders with different administrative experience regarding school leaders' perceptions in their school marketing practices were not statistically significant, $F(2, 56) = 1.385$, $p= .259$. This finding indicated that the school leaders with different administrative experience showed the same perceptions regarding their marketing practices.

For the internal market analysis dimension, the One Way analysis of variance (ANOVA) showed that the differences between groups of school leaders with different administrative experience regarding their perceptions in their school marketing practices were not statistically significant, $F(2, 56) = 2.004$, $p= .144$. It can be concluded that the school leaders with different administrative experiences had the same perceptions regarding their internal market analysis practices.

The One Way analysis of variance (ANOVA) displayed that the differences on school leaders' perceptions of the external marketing analysis dimension between groups of school leaders with different administrative experience were not statistically significant, $F(2, 56) = 1.426$, $p= .249$. This finding indicated that the school leaders with different administrative experience did not differ in their perceptions regarding their external market analysis practices.

For the market plan development dimension, the One Way analysis of variance (ANOVA) showed that the differences on the school leaders' perceptions of this dimension between groups of school leaders with different administrative experience were not statistically significant, $F(2, 56) = 1.231$, $p= .300$. This finding indicated that the school leaders with different administrative experience did not differ in their perceptions regarding their market plan development practices.

Finally, the One Way analysis of variance (ANOVA) displayed that the differences on the school leaders' perceptions of the marketing communication dimension between groups of school leaders with different administrative experience were not statistically significant, $F(2, 56) = 2.11$, $p= .810$. It can be seen that the school leaders with different administrative experience had the same perceptions regarding their marketing communication practices.

5. Discussion of Findings

This study investigated the perceptions of private school leaders regarding their practices on school marketing in selected school districts in Saudi Arabia. The study found that the overall school marketing practice perceived by private school leaders was classified as "usually occurs." In addition, leaders of private schools perceived that their marketing practice was classified as "always occurs" in the marketing analysis and marketing communication dimensions, whereas they perceived that their marketing practice was classified as "usually occurs" in the external marketing analysis and the market plan development dimensions. This indicated that the school leaders practice school marketing on a daily basis. Several studies mentioned that the practice of school marketing is one of the most important roles and responsibilities of private school leaders (James & Philips, 1995; Foskett, 2002; Kurbatova, 2001). Moreover, School leaders are found as active marketing managers (Anast-May, Mitchell, Buckner & Elsberry, 2012).

Additionally, the study findings indicated that practicing effective school marketing is essential for private schools in order to survive, to meet student and public needs, and to build confidence in local communities. As

mentioned by Drysdale (1999) and Foskett (2002), marketing activity is beneficial for private schools to succeed in a competitive environment, and school marketing ensures competitiveness for private school. The study of Anast-May, Mitchell, Buckner & Elsberry (2012) revealed that the school leaders were aware of the significance to market their school.

According to the findings of the study, school marketing is seen as an effective approach to develop school programs and services that will enhance the reputation and image of private schools. Hepburn (2012) emphasized school marketing enables schools to improve their programs and services. Marketing also ensures school program evaluation and development (Page & Sharp, 2012).

The researcher found that there are not any statistically significant differences on the overall perceptions of male and female school leaders regarding their marketing practices. This finding indicated that both male and female school leaders clearly believe that school marketing promotes success for private schools in their competitive environment. As such, for several decades, private schools utilized marketing in order to provide worthy choices for their target groups (Lockhart, 2011).

The findings of the study showed that there were not statistically significant differences on the overall perceptions of school leaders in their marketing practices with differing levels of education in either bachelor or graduate degrees. Two decades ago, it can be clearly seen that the relevant literature on school marketing was slight. Thus, there are no specific courses regarding school marketing provided for either those with either degrees. The literature of school marketing has emerged from the literature of school administration and marketing of non-educational institutions. This literature appeared in the 1980s (Kotler & Fox, 1985) while the empirical studies on school marketing were conducted at the end of the 1990s (James & Philips, 1995; Bagley, Woods & Glatter, 1996; Brich, 1998).

Finally, the findings of the study revealed that there were not statistically significant differences between different groups with differing administrative experiences. This means that the administrative experiences of private school leaders had no effect on their perceptions regarding their marketing practices. The researcher could conclude that private school leaders basically come from public schools. They had spent long careers as teachers and leaders in public schools. Most of their experiences in school administration were in public school. They are not required to practice school marketing in public schools. However, when they are assigned to manage private schools, they must use school marketing. The literature underscored that private schools need to establish a marketing team to be able to attract the right students and families (Kowalski, 2004; Hepburn, 2012).

5. Conclusion

This study investigated the perceptions of private school leaders regarding their practices on school marketing. The study revealed that the overall school marketing practice perceived by private school leaders was classified as "usually occurs." According to the findings of the study, some suggestions were provided. To be successful in marketing, private school leaders should ask their target customers in the community to determine the education that they want for their children. In addition, private school leaders are required to determine the skills and competencies that are necessary to practice school marketing. A good relation with public and nonpublic agents should be established in order to gain their support. This study provided the results regarding marketing practices in private schools. For further study, the challenges of marketing in private school should be conducted. Another study need to be conducted about school marketing of private schools in different regions of the Middle East.

References

Al- Maliki, F. (2012). *Regulatory organizational faced by principals of private schools at Taif Governorate* (Unpublished master's thesis). Umm Al-Qurra University, Makka, Saudi Arabia.

Anast-May, L., Mitchell, M., Buckner, B., & Elsberry, C. (2012). School principals as marketing managers: The expanding role of marketing for school development. *Journal of School Public Relations. (33)*, 262-291.

Bagley, C., Woods, P., & Glatter, R. (1996). Scanning the market. *Educational Management and Administration*, 24(2), 125–138.

Bagin, D., Gallagher, D., & Moore, E. (2008). *The school and community relations*. Boston, NJ: Pearson.

Banach, W. (2001). *The ABC complete book of school marketing:* Lanham, MD: Roman & Littlefield Publishing Group.

Birch, C. (1998). Research note: marketing awareness in UK primary schools. *Journal of Marketing Practice,* 4(2), 57–63.

Bunnell, T. (2005). Strategic marketing planning in international schools. *International Journal of Educational Management, 19*(1), 59–66.

Davis, B., & Ellison, L. (1997). *Strategic marketing for schools*. London: Pitman Publishing.

Drysdale, L. (1999). Relationship marketing: A new paradigm for marketing schools. *Principal Matters, 36*(1), 36–37.

Evans, I. (1995). *Marketing for schools*. London: Cassell.

Foskett, N. (2002). *Marketing*. In T. Bush & L. Bell (Eds.), Educational management: Principles and practice. London: Sage.

Foskett, N.(2015). Marketisation and education marketing: The evolution of a discipline and a research field. *In The Management and Leadership of Educational Marketing: Research, Practice and Applications*, 39-61.

Foster, B. (2011). *School marketing manual for the digital ages*. Queensland, Australia: Great Development Pty Ltd.

Gall, M., Borg, W., & Gall, J. (1996). *Educational research: An introduction*. New York: Longman.

Gewirtz, S., Ball, S., & Bowe, R. (1995). *Markets, choice and equity in education*. London: Open University Press.

Gray, L. (1991). *Marketing education*. Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.

Hanson, E., & Henry, W. (1993). Strategic marketing for educational systems: A guide for implementation. *NASSP Bulletin, 77*, (556), 79-88.

Hanson, E. (2003). *Educational administration and organizational behavior*. Boston, NJ: Pearson.

Hepburn, S. (2012). *An introduction to marketing for schools*. Peterborough, England: Fast-print.

Hepburn, S. (2015). *Marketing your school: Stand out from the crowd by meeting the needs of your parents and your community*. Lexington, KY.

Holcomb, J. H. (1993). *Educational marketing*. New York, NY: University Press of America.

James, C.; & Philips, P. (1995). The practice of educational marketing in schools. *Educational Management and Administration, 23* (2), 75-88.

Kotler, P., & Armstrong, G. (1999). *Principles of marketing*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kotler, P. & Fox, K. (1985). *Strategic marketing for educational institutions*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kowalski, T. (2004). *Public relations in schools*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Kurbatova, A. (2001). Marketing and activity of school principal. *Rassian Education and Society, 43*, (5), 6-24.

Leedy, P., & Ormrod, J. (2010). *Practical research: Planning and design*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Lockhart, J. (2011). *How to Market your school: A guide to marketing, communication, and public relations for school administrators*. Plymouth, UK: Roman & Littlefield Publishing Group.

Maringe, F. (2015). Integrating marketing into the leadership and management of schools: A curriculum-focused approach. *In The Management and Leadership of Educational Marketing: Research, Practice and Applications,* 63-85.

National Association of Independent Schools (2001). *Marketing independent schools in the 21st century*. Washington DC: National Association of Independent Schools.

Page, B.; Sharp, A. (2012). The contribution of marketing to school-based program evaluation. *Journal. of Social Marketing, 2* (3), 176 – 186.

Pardey, D. (1991). *Marketing for schools*. London: Kogan Page.

Vining, L. (2006). Obstacles to school marketing. *Education Today, 3*, 17-18.