ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACT OF MARKETING MIX ON PATIENT VISIT INTEREST

Sonia Fillahi Indah[1*], Bayu Wahyudi[2], Yani Restiani Widjaja[3]

[1,2,3]Master of Management Departmen, Adhirajasa Reswara Sanjaya University, Bandung.
*Email correspondence : aasdasasa@gmail.com

ABSTRAK : ANALISIS DAMPAK MARKETING MIX TERHADAP MINAT KUNJUNGAN PASIEN

Latar Belakang: Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis pengaruh strategi pemasaran marketing mix yang terdiri dari variabel produk, harga, tempat, dan promosi terhadap minat kunjung pasien di Klinik "Bintang Beauty" Bali. Minat kunjungan pasien merupakan faktor penting dalam menentukan keberhasilan klinik dalam menarik pelanggan. Oleh karena itu, pemahaman tentang faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi minat pasien sangat penting bagi pengembangan strategi pemasaran klinik.

Tujuan: Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui sejauh mana variabel-variabel marketing mix berpengaruh terhadap minat kunjung pasien di Klinik "Bintang Beauty" Bali.

Metode: Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kuantitatif dengan metode analisis regresi linier. Data dikumpulkan melalui kuesioner yang dibagikan kepada 100 responden yang merupakan pasien Klinik "Bintang Beauty" Bali. Analisis dilakukan untuk menguji pengaruh variabel produk, harga, tempat, dan promosi terhadap minat kunjung pasien.

Hasil: Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa semua variabel dalam marketing mix (produk, harga, tempat, dan promosi) memiliki pengaruh signifikan terhadap minat kunjung pasien di Klinik "Bintang Beauty" Bali. Nilai t hitung untuk produk, harga, tempat, dan promosi lebih besar dari t tabel, dan nilai signifikansi untuk semua variabel kurang dari 0,05.

Kesimpulan: Dapat disimpulkan bahwa strategi pemasaran marketing mix yang terdiri dari produk, harga, tempat, dan promosi memiliki pengaruh yang signifikan terhadap minat kunjung pasien di Klinik "Bintang Beauty" Bali. Oleh karena itu, pengelola klinik perlu memperhatikan dan mengoptimalkan aspek-aspek tersebut dalam strategi pemasaran mereka untuk meningkatkan minat kunjung pasien.

Saran: Disarankan agar pihak klinik lebih meningkatkan kualitas produk dan layanan, menetapkan harga yang kompetitif, serta memperhatikan aksesibilitas tempat dan promosi yang tepat untuk menarik lebih banyak pasien.

Kata Kunci : Marketing mix, minat kunjung pasien, produk, harga, klinik, promosi.

ABSTRACT

Background: This study aims to analyze the influence of marketing mix strategies, including the variables of product, price, place, and promotion, on patient visit intention at "Bintang Beauty" Clinic in Bali. Patient visit intention is a crucial factor in determining the clinic's success in attracting customers. Therefore, understanding the factors influencing patient interest is essential for developing effective marketing strategies.

Purpose: The objective of this study is to determine the extent to which the marketing mix variables influence patient visit intention at "Bintang Beauty" Clinic in Bali.

Methods: This research employs a quantitative approach with linear regression analysis. Data were collected through questionnaires distributed to 100 respondents, who are patients of "Bintang Beauty" Clinic in Bali. The analysis was conducted to test the influence of product, price, place, and promotion variables on patient visit intention.

Results: The results indicate that all variables in the marketing mix (product, price, place, and promotion) have a significant influence on patient visit intention at "Bintang Beauty" Clinic in Bali. The calculated t-values for product, price, place, and promotion are greater than the t-table, and the significance values for all variables are less than 0.05.

Conclusion: It can be concluded that the marketing mix strategy, consisting of product, price, place, and promotion, significantly influences patient visit intention at "Bintang Beauty" Clinic in Bali. Therefore, clinic management should pay attention to and optimize these aspects in their marketing strategies to increase patient visit intention.

 DOI 10.33024, http://ejurnalmalahayati.ac.id/index.php/kebidanan

Suggestions: It is recommended that the clinic enhance the quality of products and services, set competitive prices, and improve the accessibility of the location and promotion strategies to attract more patients.

Kata kunci/Keywords: Marketing mix, patient visit intention, product, price, clinical beauty, promotion.

INTRODUCTION

Marketing plays a pivotal role in the success of any healthcare organization, acting as a key driver for achieving organizational objectives. A well-designed marketing mix is critical for healthcare providers to elicit desired responses from their target audiences. The healthcare sector is experiencing rapid advancements and changes, which necessitate that organizations continuously evaluate both internal and external factors to maintain their sustainability. For clinics and hospitals, marketing is not merely a tool to attract patients but also a strategic approach to strengthening their presence in an increasingly competitive market. Meeting patient expectations by offering high-quality services and products is fundamental for healthcare providers to remain viable and successful. In this context, the marketing mix becomes an essential component, as it allows healthcare organizations to design strategies that align with patients' evolving needs and preferences. This alignment is especially crucial for clinics aiming to increase patient visits and ensure long-term operational success.

In Indonesia, regulatory frameworks emphasize the importance of healthcare facilities in providing quality services to the public. Law No. 17 of 2023 on Health underscores the role of primary healthcare facilities, such as clinics, in delivering essential health services. Similarly, Government Regulation No. 28 of 2024 highlights the need for clinics to adopt effective marketing strategies to enhance service delivery and patient satisfaction. The marketing mix framework, comprising product, pricing, promotion, place, people, process, and physical evidence, offers a comprehensive approach to improving the quality and appeal of healthcare services. By leveraging these elements strategically, healthcare facilities can better address patient needs while strengthening their competitive advantage. These regulations serve as a reminder of the critical role marketing plays in enabling healthcare providers to achieve their objectives in a highly dynamic and regulated environment.

Empirical studies further highlight the significance of marketing strategies in the healthcare sector. Research conducted at Rajawali Citra Hospital in Yogyakarta demonstrated that various components of the marketing mix—namely product, price, place, and promotion—have a significant impact on patient visit intentions (Mochammad Rofik, 2022). The findings suggest that implementing marketing strategies that effectively address these elements can drive patient satisfaction and encourage repeat visits. This underscores the importance of a well-thought-out marketing approach in achieving both operational and strategic goals for healthcare providers. Moreover, these findings are particularly relevant for private clinics that rely heavily on patient loyalty and referrals to sustain their business. Understanding the connection between marketing strategies and patient behavior is, therefore, essential for clinics to remain competitive and adapt to changing market dynamics.

The healthcare industry in Indonesia continues to grow, reflecting increasing competition among providers. According to the Indonesian Ministry of Health's 2022 report, the number of primary clinics reached 11,460, with an additional 1,950 main clinics, marking a significant increase in healthcare facilities across the country. In Bali, data from 2023 reveals that private clinics dominate the healthcare landscape, with 208 primary clinics compared to 31 inpatient community health centers and 75 hospitals. These figures illustrate the growing demand for private clinics in the region, driven by public preference for accessible and specialized services. As competition intensifies, healthcare providers are compelled to improve service quality and enhance their marketing strategies to attract and retain patients. This trend underscores the critical role of marketing in ensuring the sustainability and profitability of healthcare facilities, particularly in regions where private clinics play a dominant role.

"Bintang Beauty" Clinic, a private beauty clinic located in Singaraja, Buleleng, Bali, serves as a case study for examining the impact of marketing strategies on patient visits. Established in 2008, the clinic has built a strong brand reputation over 16 years, known for its competitive pricing and high-quality services. However, fluctuations in patient visits in recent years, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic, highlight challenges in maintaining consistent growth. These fluctuations indicate a need for strategic improvements to enhance the clinic's marketing efforts and operational performance. As a provider of beauty and personal care services, "Bintang Beauty" Clinic operates in a highly competitive market, where patient satisfaction and

loyalty are key determinants of success. Addressing these challenges through a comprehensive marketing strategy is crucial for the clinic to adapt to current market demands and sustain its competitive edge.

This study seeks to build on existing research and address the challenges faced by "Bintang Beauty" Clinic by exploring the influence of marketing mix strategies on patient visit intentions. By identifying effective strategies and their impact, the findings aim to provide actionable insights for improving the clinic's performance and competitiveness in the healthcare sector.

RESEARCH METHODS

Research Design

This study is a quantitative analytical cross-sectional study. A quantitative method is used to investigate a population or sample, with data collected using an instrument and analyzed statistically. The cross-sectional design enables the researcher to observe both exposure and outcomes simultaneously within a specific timeframe.

Research Location and Time

The research was conducted at Klinik "Bintang Beauty," a private cosmetic and skincare clinic located in Singaraja, Buleleng, North Bali. The study period spanned two months, from June to December 2024.

Population and Sample

The population comprises individuals in Bali who sought treatment at Klinik "Bintang Beauty" from October 2024 to November 2025. The sample was selected using the simple random sampling technique, with inclusion criteria as follows patients aged over 18 years, male or female, returning patients (visited more than once), literate individuals with at least primary school education who could comprehend the questionnaire, willing participants with no familial ties to clinic employees, exclusion criteria included new patients, illiterate individuals, and unwilling participants.

The sample size was calculated using the Lemeshow formula, yielding 68 respondents.

Research Variables and Data Collection

Primary data were obtained through digital questionnaires distributed to clinic patients. The variables included product, price, place, promotion, and revisit intention. All variables were measured using Likert-scale questionnaires.

Research Instruments

The research instrument included a structured questionnaire distributed via Google Forms. The Likert-scale responses were used to measure levels of agreement, ranging from "strongly agree" (4) to "strongly disagree" (1). Data were edited, coded, and scored using a Likert scale to ensure logical and consistent processing. Verification analysis will through classical assumption test, multiple linear regression, and hypotesis testing.

RESEARCH RESULT

Validity Test

Table 1
Product variable validity test results (X1)

Correlations							
		X1.1	X1.2	X1.3	X1.4	X1.5	Total X1
X1.1	Pearson Correlation	1	.489**	.422**	.330**	.397**	.687**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.006	.001	.000
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68
X1.2	Pearson Correlation	.489**	1	.595**	.381**	.383**	.764**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.001	.001	.000
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68
X1.3	Pearson Correlation	.422**	.595**	1	.325**	.446**	.745**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.007	.000	.000
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68
X1.4	Pearson Correlation	.330**	.381**	.325**	1	.640**	.738**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.006	.001	.007		.000	.000
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68
X1.5	Pearson Correlation	.397**	.383**	.446**	.640**	1	.781**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.001	.000	.000		.000
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68

 DOI 10.33024, http://ejurnalmalahayati.ac.id/index.php/kebidanan

Total X1	Pearson Correlation	.687**	.764**	.745**	.738**	.781**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68

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

Table 2
Price variable validity test results (X2)

Correlations

		X2.1	X2.2	X2.3	X2.4	X2.5	Total X2
X2.1	Pearson Correlation	1	.268*	.257*	.215	.077	.582**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.027	.035	.078	.532	.000
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68
X2.2	Pearson Correlation	.268*	1	.187	.135	.348**	.619**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.027		.127	.272	.004	.000
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68
X2.3	Pearson Correlation	.257*	.187	1	.183	.268*	.608**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.035	.127		.136	.027	.000
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68
X2.4	Pearson Correlation	.215	.135	.183	1	.492**	.625**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.078	.272	.136		.000	.000
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68
X2.5	Pearson Correlation	.077	.348**	.268*	.492**	1	.705**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.532	.004	.027	.000		.000
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68
Total X2	Pearson Correlation	.582**	.619**	.608**	.625**	.705**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 3
Place variable validity test results (X3)

Correlations

		X3.1	X3.2	X3.3	X3.4	X3.5	Total X3
X3.1	Pearson Correlation	1	.318**	.442**	.133	.168	.648**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.008	.000	.279	.170	.000
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68
X3.2	Pearson Correlation	.318**	1	.206	.248*	.182	.610**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.008		.091	.041	.137	.000
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68
X3.3	Pearson Correlation	.442**	.206	1	.121	.252*	.647**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.091		.325	.038	.000
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68
X3.4	Pearson Correlation	.133	.248*	.121	1	.418**	.595**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.279	.041	.325		.000	.000
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68
X3.5	Pearson Correlation	.168	.182	.252*	.418**	1	.657**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.170	.137	.038	.000		.000
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68
Total X3	Pearson Correlation	.648**	.610**	.647**	.595**	.657**	1

	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4
Promotion variable validity test results (X4)

Correlations							
		X4.1	X4.2	X4.3	X4.4	X4.5	Total X4
X4.1	Pearson Correlation	1	.201	.371**	.244*	.205	.615**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.100	.002	.045	.094	.000
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68
X4.2	Pearson Correlation	.201	1	.284*	.258*	.293*	.673**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.100		.019	.034	.015	.000
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68
X4.3	Pearson Correlation	.371**	.284*	1	.237	.158	.624**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.019		.052	.198	.000
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68
X4.4	Pearson Correlation	.244*	.258*	.237	1	.383**	.664**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.045	.034	.052		.001	.000
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68
X4.5	Pearson Correlation	.205	.293*	.158	.383**	1	.625**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.094	.015	.198	.001		.000
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68
Total X4	Pearson Correlation	.615**	.673**	.624**	.664**	.625**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 5
Validity test results of the Patient Visit Interest variable (Y)

Correlations							
		Y1.1	Y1.2	Y1.3	Y1.4	Y1.5	Total Y
Y1.1	Pearson Correlation	1	.331**	.191	.045	.152	.501**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.006	.118	.715	.216	.000
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68
Y1.2	Pearson Correlation	.331**	1	.220	.088	.234	.573**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.006		.072	.475	.054	.000
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68
Y1.3	Pearson Correlation	.191	.220	1	.466**	.333**	.721**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.118	.072		.000	.006	.000
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68
Y1.4	Pearson Correlation	.045	.088	.466**	1	.333**	.643**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.715	.475	.000		.006	.000
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68
Y1.5	Pearson Correlation	.152	.234	.333**	.333**	1	.684**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.216	.054	.006	.006		.000
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68
Total Y	Pearson Correlation	.501**	.573**	.721**	.643**	.684**	1

DOI 10.33024, http://ejurnalmalahayati.ac.id/index.php/kebidanan

Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
N	68	68	68	68	68	68

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

Based on the analysis in Table 1 regarding the validity test of the Product (X1) variable, it can be concluded that all the statement indicators related to the Product (X1) variable meet the data validity criteria. Then, in Table 2, the results of the validity test for the Price (X2) variable show that all the statement indicators related to the Price (X2) variable meet the data validity criteria. Next, in Table 3, the validity test results for the Place (X3) variable indicate that all the statement indicators related to the Place (X3) variable meet the data validity criteria. In Table 4, the validity test results for the Promotion (X4) variable show that all the statement indicators related to the Promotion (X4) variable meet the data validity criteria. Lastly, in Table 5, the validity test results for the Patient Visit Interest (Y) variable show that all the statement indicators related to the Patient Visit Interest (Y) variable meet the data validity criteria.

Reability Test

Based on Table 6 above, it shows that all statement indicators in the Product (X1), Price (X2), Place (X3), Promotion (X4), and Patient Visit Interest (Y) variables have a Cronbach's Alpha value greater than 0.60, indicating that all statement indicators in the questionnaire are reliable. Since the validity and reliability tests show that the questionnaire used is valid and reliable, the data can then be used for further research.

Table 6
Reability test result

. Reability test result *Product* (X_1)
Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.797	.798	5

. Reability test result *Price* (X_2)
Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.615	.616	5

Reability test result *Place* (X_3)
Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.623	.624	5

. Reability test result *Promotion* (X_4)
Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.638	.641	5

Reliability Test Results for the Patient Visit Interest variable (Y)
Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.617	.611	5

Normality Test

Table 7
Normality Test Result

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test		
		Unstandardized Residual
N		68
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	.79885837
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.058

	Positive	.050
	Negative	-.058
Test Statistic		.058
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200[c,d]

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.
d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

Based on the test conducted using SPSS 25, Table 7 shows the results of the normality test with a significance value of 0.200, which is greater than the critical value of 0.05. Therefore, it can be concluded that the residuals of the regression model are normally distributed.

Multicollinearity Test

Table 8
Multicollinearity Test result

Coefficients[a]							
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1(Constant)	.710	1.399		.507	.614		
Product	.173	.078	.207	2.222	.030	.509	1.965
Price	.384	.093	.383	4.142	.000	.518	1.930
Place	.183	.060	.218	3.047	.003	.864	1.157
Promotion	.232	.070	.282	3.305	.002	.608	1.643

Heteroscedasticity Test

Table 9
Heteroscedasticity Test Result

Coefficientsa					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients B	Unstandardized Coefficients Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
1(Constant)	.983	.830		1.184	.241
Product	-.073	.046	-.272	-1.595	.116
Price	-.015	.055	-.048	-.281	.780
Place	.025	.036	.091	.697	.488
Promotion	.050	.042	.188	1.207	.232

Dependent Variable: ABS_RES

Linearity Test

Table 10
Product Linearity Test Results (X1) with Patient Visit Interest (Y)

ANOVA Table							
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Minat Kunjung Pasien * Product	Between Groups	(Combined)	72.298	6	12.050	9.101	.000
		Linearity	69.633	1	69.633	52.595	.000
		Deviation from Linearity	2.665	5	.533	.403	.845
	Within Groups		80.761	61	1.324		
	Total		153.059	67			

 DOI 10.33024, http://ejurnalmalahayati.ac.id/index.php/kebidanan

Table 11
Pricet Linearity Test Results (X2) with Patient Visit Interest (Y)

ANOVA Table							
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Minat Kunjung Pasien * Price	Between Groups	(Combined)	87.623	6	14.604	13.614	.000
		Linearity	83.594	1	83.594	77.927	.000
		Deviation from Linearity	4.029	5	.806	.751	.588
	Within Groups		65.436	61	1.073		
	Total		153.059	67			

Table 12
Place Linearity Test Results (X3) with Patient Visit Interest (Y)

ANOVA Table							
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Minat Kunjung Pasien * Place	Between Groups	(Combined)	43.205	6	7.201	3.998	.002
		Linearity	36.103	1	36.103	20.047	.000
		Deviation from Linearity	7.101	5	1.420	.789	.562
	Within Groups		109.854	61	1.801		
	Total		153.059	67			

Table 13
Promotion Linearity Test Results (X4) with Patient Visit Interest (Y)

ANOVA Table							
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Minat Kunjung Pasien * Promotion	Between Groups	(Combined)	73.706	7	10.529	7.961	.000
		Linearity	70.535	1	70.535	53.332	.000
		Deviation from Linearity	3.171	6	.528	.400	.876
	Within Groups		79.353	60	1.323		
	Total		153.059	67			

Based on the results in Table 8, it shows that the VIF values for the Product (X1) variable are 1.965, the Price (X2) variable is 1.930, the Place (X3) variable is 1.157, and the Promotion (X4) variable is 1.643. Therefore, it can be stated that the VIF values for all independent variables are less than 10. Based on the results in Table 9, it informs that the significance values for the Product (X1) variable is 0.116, for the Price (X2) variable is 0.780, for the Place (X3) variable is 0.488, and for the Promotion (X4) variable is 0.232. Based on Table 10, the results of the linearity test between Product (X1) and Patient Visit Interest (Y) can be concluded that there is a significant linear relationship between Product (X1) and Patient Visit Interest (Y). In Table 11, the results of the linearity test between Price (X2) and Patient Visit Interest (Y) show a significant linear relationship between Price (X2) and Patient Visit Interest (Y). Based on Table 12, the results of the linearity test between Place (X3) and Patient Visit Interest (Y) indicate a significant linear relationship between Place (X3) and Patient Visit Interest (Y). Lastly, in Table 13, the results of the linearity test between Promotion (X4) and Patient Visit Interest (Y) show a significant linear relationship between Promotion (X4) and Patient Visit Interest (Y).

Multiple Regression Test

Table 14
Multiple Regression Test Result

Coefficients[a]							
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1(Constant)	.710	1.399		.507	.614		
Product	.173	.078	.207	2.222	.030	.509	1.965
Price	.384	.093	.383	4.142	.000	.518	1.930
Place	.183	.060	.218	3.047	.003	.864	1.157
Promotion	.232	.070	.282	3.305	.002	.608	1.643

Dependent Variable: Interest in Patient Visits

The regression analysis results show that if all independent variables are zero, the Patient Visit Interest (Y) will be 0.710. Each increase of one score in the variables Product (X1), Price (X2), Place (X3), and Promotion (X4) will increase Y by 0.173, 0.384, 0.283, and 0.232, respectively. Among all variables, Price has the most dominant influence on Patient Visit Interest because its coefficient value is the largest.

Table 15
T-Test Result

Coefficients[a]							
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1(Constant)	.710	1.399		.507	.614		
Product	.173	.078	.207	2.222	.030	.509	1.965
Price	.384	.093	.383	4.142	.000	.518	1.930
Place	.183	.060	.218	3.047	.003	.864	1.157
Promotion	.232	.070	.282	3.305	.002	.608	1.643

a. Dependent Variable: Interest in Patient Visits

Based on Table 15, all independent variables (Product, Price, Place, and Promotion) have a calculated t value greater than the t table value (1.9965) and a significance level less than 0.05, indicating that all of them have a significant effect on Patient Visit Interest (Y).

Simultaneous Test (F Test)

Table 16
Simultaneous Test (F Test) Result

ANOVA[a]						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	110.301	4	27.575	40.630	.000[b]
	Residual	42.758	63	.679		
	Total	153.059	67			

a. Dependent Variable: Interest in Patient Visits
b. Predictors: (Constant), Promotion, Place, Price, Product

Table 16 results in a significance value of 0.000. This significance value is less than the critical value of 0.05, so it can be accepted that all independent variables, namely Product (X1), Price (X2), Place (X3), and Promotion (X4), collectively have a significant effect on Patient Visit Interest (Y).

 DOI 10.33024, http://ejurnalmalahayati.ac.id/index.php/kebidanan

This aligns with Hypothesis 5 in this study, which states that the Marketing Mix consisting of Product, Price, Place, and Promotion has a simultaneous effect on patient visit interest at the "Bintang Beauty" Clinic in Bali. Therefore, it can be concluded that the hypothesis is accepted.

Determination Coefficient

Based on the analysis results in Table 17, the coefficient of determination is 0.721, indicating a strong relationship between the independent and dependent variables. This means that the linear regression model explains 72.1% of the variance in the dependent variable, Patient Visit Interest (Y), while the remaining 27.9% is due to other factors not covered in this study. This result is in line with Umy & Fitri's 2021 study, which found that the marketing mix of product, price, promotion, place, process, and physical evidence influenced patient revisit interest in health services at Balkesmas in Ambarawa, while factors like people and customer service did not have a significant effect.

Table 17
Determination Coefficient Result

Model Summary[b]				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.849[a]	.721	.703	.824

Predictors: (Constant), Promotion, Place, Price, Product
Dependent Variable: Interest in Patient Visits

Table 18
Guidelines for Interpreting Coefficients of Determination

Interval Coefficient	Relationship Level
0.00-0.199	Sangat Lemah
0.20-0.399	Lemah
0.40-0.599	Sedang
0.60-0.799	Kuat
0.80-1.00	Sangat Kuat

DISCUSSION

Based on the analysis, the t-value for the Product variable (X1) is 2.222, which is greater than the t-table value of 1.9965, with a significance value of 0.030 (less than 0.05), indicating that Product has a significant effect on patient visit interest. Product, in marketing terms, refers to anything offered to the market to satisfy needs and wants, including goods and services provided by a company. This finding is consistent with Ahmad Ahid Mudayana's research (2019), which found that product influences patients' decisions in choosing outpatient units at the Ahmad Dahlan University Hospital. However, according to Sary et al. (2023), no significant effect was found between product (service type) and patient visit frequency, suggesting that a good perception of the product increases patient satisfaction and return visits.

The t-value for the Price variable (X2) is 4.142, exceeding the t-table value of 1.9965, with a significance value of 0.000 (less than 0.05), indicating that Price significantly affects patient visit interest. Reasonable pricing influences consumer decisions, and patient satisfaction is critical in healthcare services. Satisfied patients are more likely to become loyal customers and recommend the clinic to others (Wijaya et al., 2024). This finding aligns with research by Umy & Fitri (2021), which indicated that respondents with a positive perception of pricing were more likely to return, while those with a negative view were not. However, in a study by Sitti et al. (2023), no significant effect was found between price and repeat visits, likely because the clinic's affordable pricing and payment methods met the respondents' expectations, aligning with findings by Riduwan Vidya Wira (2016) on price accessibility and satisfaction.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the calculations, the t-values for the Product (X1), Price (X2), Place (X3), and Promotion (X4) variables are all greater than the t-table value of 1.9965, with significance values of 0.030, 0.000, 0.003, and 0.002, respectively, all less than 0.05. This indicates that all these variables have a significant effect on Patient Visit Interest (Y) at Klinik Bintang Beauty.

SUGGESTION

It is recommended that the clinic enhance the quality of products and services, set competitive prices, and improve the accessibility of the location and promotion strategies to attract more patients.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, M. D. F., Ardiansah, M. N. And Hamidah, N. (2017) 'The Effect Of Company Size , Company Age , Public Ownership And Audit Quality On Internet Financial Reporting', *Sriwijaya International Journal Of Dynamic Economics And Business*, 1(2), Pp. 153–165.

Agustina, M., Sawitri, D., Priyatna, N. M., & Wijayanti, T. C. (2022). Peranan Word of Mouth didalam Memediasi Efektifitas Digital Marketing Berbasis Social Media dan Kepuasan Pasien Terhadap Keputusan Pasien Rawat Jalan Untuk Berkunjung di Rumah Sakit Umum Daerah Waluyo Jati. *JEKOBIS : Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, *1*(2), 114–126.

Amir, N. O., Sudibyo, R. P. And Hasanah, M. A. (2020) 'Pengaruh Penggunaan Digital Marketing Terhadap Kinerja Pedagang Bunga Di Desa Sidomulyo, Kota Batu', *Jurnal Ekonomi Pertanian Dan Agribisnis (Jepa)*, 4(2), Pp. 373–383.

Apenteng, B. A. *Et Al.* (2020) 'Examining The Relationship Between Social Media Engagement And Hospital Revenue', *Health Marketing Quarterly*, 37(1), Pp. 10–21.

Assauri, S. 2017. *Manajemen Pemasaran*. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada

Az-Zahra, P., & Sukmalengkawati, A. (2022). Pengaruh Digital Marketing Terhadap Minat Beli Konsumen. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen, Ekonomi, & Akuntansi (MEA)*, *6*(3), 2008–2018. https://doi.org/10.31955/mea.v6i3.2573

Azizah, R. I., & AS, F. (2023). Peran Pemasaran Digital, Fasilitas, Kepuasan terhadap Minat Berkunjung Ulang Pada Desa Wisata. *El-Mal: Jurnal Kajian Ekonomi & Bisnis Islam*, *5*(3), 1689–1710. https://doi.org/10.47467/elmal.v5i3.5791

Faizal, D. A., Riu, S. D. M., & Talibo, N. A. (2019). Hubungan Penerapan Manajamen Puskesmas dan Komitmen Kerja dengan Mutu Pelayanan di Puskesmas Lelilef Kecamatan Weda Tengah. *Jurnal Kesehatan : Amanah Prodi Ilmu Keperawatan STIKES Muhammadiyah Manado*, *3*(1), 68–75.

Kemenkes RI. (2022). Profil Kesehatan Indonesia. Jakarta: Kementerian. Kesehatan Republik Indonesia.

Kalsum, Umi; Harlen, Harlen; and Machasin, Machasin (2023) "Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi Dan Komitmen Organisasi Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Dan Turnover Intention Pada Perawat Rsia Eria Bunda Pekanbaru," Jurnal Sosial Humaniora Terapan: Vol. 5: Iss. 1, Article 5. DOI: 10.7454/jsht.v5i1.1017 Available at: https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/jsht/vol5/iss1/5

Rofik, M. (2022). Pengaruh Strategi Pemasaran Marketing Mix Terhadap Minat Kunjung Pasien Poli Umum Di Rumah Sakit Umum Rajawali Citra Yogyakarta.

Sahidillah Nurdin, Yani Restiani Widjaja, Nanda Eka Putri. 2023. Strategi Meningkatkan Minat Pembelian Menggunakan Social Media Marketing dan Word of Mouth. Jurnal Sains Manajemen.

Wijaya, H., Rohendi, A., & Mulyani, K. (2024). Pengaruh Kepercayaan, Kualitas Pelayanan, dan Kewajaran Harga terhadap Kepuasan Pasien di Klinik S, Tangerang Selatan. Innovative: Journal Of Social Science Research, 4(1), 2446–2457. https://doi.org/10.31004/innovative.v4i1.7848