

THE INFLUENCE OF PROMOTION TOOLS ON THE FORMATION OF HOST DESTINATION TOURISTIC IMAGE

Lim Khong Chiu and Omar A. Alananzeh

*School of Tourism, Hospitality and Environmental Management,
Universiti Utara Malaysia, Malaysia, 06010 Sintok,
Kedah Darul Aman, Malaysia*

ABSTRACT

Several factors have been shown to have a vital role in the formation of the touristic image of a destination. Promotion tools are considered a critical factor in destination image formation. However, recent surveys indicate that the roles and importance of promotion tools of MICE tourism on the formation of Jordan's destination image was not given emphasis. Thus, this study aims to determine the influence of promotion tools utilized to promote MICE tourism on the formation of the touristic image of Jordan. The differences in the perceptions of local and international MICE participants on the importance of promotional tools in terms of their gender and nationality were also examined. Results show the significant differences among MICE participants' perceptions on the importance of promotion tools and the roles of promotion tools significantly influence on the formation of Jordan's touristic image. This study provides implications for the event planners, event organizers, and other MICE event stakeholders, as well as enriching the limited research in MICE tourism in developing countries.

Keywords: MICE tourism, promotion tool, destination image, Jordan

1 Introduction

Promotion is one of the 'marketing mix' that attempts to increase the demand by conveying positive image of the product to the potential customers through appeals to the perceived demands, needs, values, tastes, and attitude of the market or a particular market segment (Norman & Pettersen, 2008). Thus, one of the main roles of the promotion tools aims to improve the perceived destination image (Cooper, Fletcher, Fyall, Gilbert, & Wanhill, 2008). Lee, Close and Love (2010) declared that 95 percent of MICE participants depend on promotion tools to search for ideal MICE destination. Whereas Rogers (1998) argued that promotional activities in MICE tourism are essential to promote the destination and its event and attract high yielder tourist, journalist, and politicians that can influence events and enhance the destination image. According to Fakeye and Crompton (1991), the failure of some destinations to fulfill their tourism potential is related to their promotion. Since tourism is intangible as well as a perishable service, therefore, promotion is important. It is the process of communicating between suppliers of tourism products and the potential tourists. It enhances their demand for travel (Crouch, 2000). The elements of integrated marketing communications mix which could be used by marketers of special events are composed of personal selling, advertising, sales promotion, direct mail, publicity, sponsorship, packaging, merchandising, WOM, and corporate identity (Allen, O'Toole, Harris & McDonnell, 2005). McCartney, Butler and Bennett (2008) asserted that Macau depends on several promotion tools such as TV/Radio, Internet, and travel programs to promote the image of Macao to leisure and business travelers.

Meanwhile, several researchers (e.g., Bhatt & Badan, 2005; Metaxas, 2009; Wicks & Schuett, 1991) emphasised the importance of promotion tools such as, newspapers, magazines, brochures, TV/ radio commercials, and Internet in advertising MICE events and promoting destinations. Bojanic (1991) also indicated to the importance of advertising MICE events in conveying and managing the image of the country to the potential tourists and in enhancing the attributes of the destination to them. Pan (2011) declared that TV tourism commercials are considered the dominant advertising channel of the destination image because they supply tourist with visual, pictorial, and verbal information about the destination and the event. Lee-Kelley, Gilbert, and Al-Shehabi (2011) argued that exhibitors tend to use Internet and TV to promote their exhibitions virtually. Virtual exhibitions are considered a useful platform to conduct promotional activities through the Internet. Exhibiting virtually will allow the visitors to stroll through its various exhibition halls.

Internet is also the most powerful method of communication with the target market. It is actively used by travel and hospitality companies, because it is inexpensive and could greatly affect consumers' perceived image through creating virtual experience of destination (Gretzel & Fesenmaier, 2000; Ho & Dempsey, 2010; Pavlou & Belullo, 2007). WWW and E-mail are the main components of the Internet. The Web offers tourism organizations an alternative way of communication and E-mail has emerged as the most commonly used type of communication (Wei, Ruys, Hoof & Combrink, 2001). A study conducted by Cheung and Law (2002) showed that Singapore has been ranked as the first Asian city in leading MICE tourism and Hong Kong ranked as the second. These two cities

have been using WWW and they have constructed their own websites as online advertising channels to be promoted and marketed as MICE destinations. Several researchers (McLemore & Mitchell, 2001; Werthner & Ricci, 2004) revealed that the number of travellers using the Internet in the USA has grown to 190 percent from 1996 to 1999. In 2003, 30 percent of US adult population used the Internet to search for information about destinations. Nowadays, the Internet has become the first source of information all over the world. People use the Internet to choose or plan for their vacation. Eighty four percent of the American travellers use the Internet to buy air tickets or make their online hotel reservation (Boo, Koh & Jones, 2008).

Furthermore, Lee et al. (2010) indicated that the Internet has proven to be an effective promotion tools for MICE event tourists for online registration as well as provides them with useful meeting and destination information. Lau, Milne and Johnson (2005) investigated the role of WWW in MICE events promotion and its contribution to the local economic development. They stated that the role of WWW must not be ignored and that simple marketing websites can be developed to be web portals which foster the cooperation at the destination, regional and international level. In addition, they affirmed that MICE websites enhance the performance of local economic linkages and stimulate business opportunities and create great economic benefits to the region. These websites enable tourists of MICE event and other visitors of the host destination to build their own itinerary and know about the product on offer before they start their business trip or holidays. Thus, the Internet is an inexpensive, flexible method of promotion. It promotes tourism products and may replace the existing distribution channels in the longer term. Tourists will be able to see the online brochure of destinations, gain up-to-date information, accuracy, greater choice, and an easy-to-use interface (Williams & Palmers, 1999).

1.1 Relationship between MICE Promotion Tools and Destination Image Formation

There is a general agreement that sources of information, also known as image forming agents or stimulus factors, are the forces which influence the forming of a destination image (Beerli & Martin, 2004a). Similarly, Ruzic, Turkalj and Racic (2003) emphasised on the roles of MICE promotion tools in creating a new image of Croatia. They also stated that MICE tourism requires identification of promotion tools that could be best used to attract MICE events and participants. Mistilis and Dwyer (1999) affirmed that MICE promotion tools are seen as essential especially WWW for both tourism enterprises and destinations to get the competitive advantages in delivering quality services and creating destination image. Tasci and Gartner (2007) claimed that non-commercial information sources such as TV reports, articles, newspaper reports, books, and the promotion tools utilised to promote the destinations are the main determinants of destination image. These promotion tools are also used for reinforcing the destination image, or establishing a destination image, or changing the perceived image of a destination into more positive one. Molina and Esteban (2006) asserted that promotion tools such as brochures, newspapers, and friends and relatives have an influence on destination image formation. They examined the roles of the promotion tool (brochure) on destination image formation and its influence on destination choices.

Similarly, Boo et al. (2008) conducted a study to evaluate the attractiveness of five convention cities in USA based on visitors' behaviour. The results showed that the groups who viewed some information about the convention city from different promotion tools rated the image of the city higher than those who did not view any information. In addition, the groups who utilised the Internet to make their convention reservation online perceived the image of the host city higher than those who did not make their reservation online. They also revealed that the higher education groups rely on Internet to find information about the convention destination. Kim, Lehto and Morrison (2007) asserted that females perceived the importance of Internet higher than males in searching information about events and destinations. TV/Radio and newspapers showed to be the most important promotion tools among young people (Schneider & Sonmez, 1999)

Gunn (1972) stated that the non-tourism information such as magazines, books, and articles has an indirect role on forming the organic image of destination, while direct promotion tools of a destination such as brochures, travel agents, and advertisements has a direct role on forming the induced image of a destination. In addition, Baloglu and McCleary (1999) stated that promotion tools are a force which influences the formation of perceptions or cognitive evaluation but not on the affective image. In other words, cognitive image plays an intervening role between information sources and affective image. They hypothesised that cognitive image is formed by external factors such as TV/Radio, brochures, newspapers, and other types of media and social stimuli such as recommendations of friends and relatives or WOM. Castellort and Mader (2010) indicated that promotion tools utilised to promote events has three functions: minimizing the risk in choosing a destination through providing the tourists with up-to-date information about the destination, build the image of the destination, and finally, promotion tools influence the final decision of MICE event tourists.

Meanwhile, Harahsheh (2009) emphasised on unsolicited information on image formation. He proposed that positive WOM recommendations have a substantial impact upon organic images of destinations and consumer

decision to visit a destination while negative WOM recommendations affect their decision to select that destination or repeat the visit. Govers, Go and Kumar (2007) concluded that the media in general has a significant influence on destination image formation. Accordingly, these previous studies have affirmed the roles of promotion tools on forming the destination image and showed that the event organisers, meeting planners, and other MICE stakeholder should understand the preferences of their target market on the importance of promotion tools in order to convey the right effective message.

The image of the destination has a significant role on tourists' travel decision and selection of the destination to visit. Thus, various approaches and strategies have been utilised by most of the host destinations to develop their destination image. However, in the context of Jordan less emphasis was given to develop its touristic image. The review of related literature indicates that some studies have considered the context of Jordan as a tourist destination. For example, Alhroot (2007) considered the marketing of Jordan as a tourist destination, Walker and Firestone (2009) focused on the general information about the destination of Jordan, Taji (2005) emphasized on niche marketing of tourism in Jordan, and Badhadho (2007) concentrated on conference tourism in Jordan. Based on these previous studies, the researchers have targeted different aspects of Jordan tourism industry without focusing on its touristic image and the role of MICE tourism. In addition, less emphasis was given by Jordan on forming its destination image which resulted in unclear and ineffective approaches and strategies utilised to positioning Jordan as a touristic image. Thus, the purposes of this study are to identify the relative importance of promotional tools as perceived by the MICE participants and to investigate the roles of promotion tools on touristic image formation of Jordan from the perspective of local and international MICE participants. This study attempted to answer the following research questions:

- a. How do the participants perceive the importance of promotion tools in promoting MICE events?
- b. Do the socio-demographic characteristics of MICE tourism participants differ on their perceptions on the formation of destination image?
- c. To what extent does the role of promotion tools influence on Jordan destination image formation?

1.2 Research Hypotheses:

Based on the research purposes and research questions of the study, three hypotheses were developed as follows:

H1: There is no difference in MICE participants' perceptions in terms of their gender and nationality (local vs. International) on the importance of promotion tools in promoting MICE events.

H2: There is no difference in MICE participants' perceptions in terms of their gender and nationality (local vs. International) on the destination image formation of Jordan.

H3: The role of promotion tools in MICE tourism positively influences the destination image formation of Jordan.

2 Research Methodology

This research utilized correlational design by using quantitative approach through survey methods to assess the roles of promotion tools of MICE tourism on the formation of Jordan touristic image. Self-administered questionnaire was used to collect data from the selected respondents. The survey instrument was of a four-page questionnaire utilized to collect data on the importance of MICE promotional tools and the perception of participants on the formation of Jordan touristic image. The questionnaire was designed in English and translated into Arabic by a professional Jordanian translator, then translated back into English to diminish any translating error or difference in meaning between the two versions (Brislin, 1980). The first section of the questionnaire composed of two questions to identify the importance of promotion tools used by the private and public sectors in marketing and promoting MICE tourism. The second section of the questionnaire consisted of two questions to measure the destination image formation of Jordan from the perspective of MICE participants. The third section included socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents such as gender, nationality, income, and educational level. The information collected was used for further investigation on the role of these socio-demographic characteristics of MICE participants on destination image formation. The questionnaire was pilot tested on a sample of MICE participants to ensure the reliability and validity of the instrument. The results of the pilot study found to be psychometrically sound (Lim & Omar, 2012).

The study was conducting between August 2010 and January 2011. The questionnaire was personally administered to each subject during the events. Subjects were selected using cluster random sampling techniques. Cluster sampling is a form of probability sampling. It is used in two or more stages because either the population is large or the researcher cannot easily identify the population (Creswell, 2008). MICE events were divided into four clusters: Meetings, incentives, conferences, and exhibitions. A total of 1060 questionnaires were collected from 12 MICE events and finally 857 valid questionnaires were obtained after deleting outliers.

Data analysis was carried out using *Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS-PC) version 16.0* for Windows software programme. The *t*-test was conducted to test for *H1* and *H2* in order to examine MICE participants' perceptions of the importance of promotional tools and destination image formation, and simple regression was used to test for *H3* in order to analyze the roles of promotion tools on Jordan's touristic image formation.

4 Results

4.1 Profile of Respondents

Table1 presents the demographic profile of respondents which includes gender, nationality, age, income, and educational level. The total number of respondents was 857 with 41% were females and 59% were males. Nationality of respondents comprised of 36.2% local and 63.8% international. Most of the respondents had bachelor's degree (44.3%) and 37% of participants have monthly income between \$1001 and \$2000. The respondents participated in this study represents all age groups with the largest age groups were between 41 and 50 (30.1%).

Table1. Profile of Respondents

Variable	f	%		f	%
Gender			Marital status		
Female	351	41.0	Single	230	26.8
Male	506	59.0	Married	557	65.0
Nationality			Divorced	49	5.7
National	310	36.2	Widow	21	2.5
International	547	63.8	Occupation		
Age			Student	40	4.7
<30	134	15.6	Homemakers	30	3.5
31-40	235	27.4	Clerical worker	58	6.8
41-50	258	30.1	Salesperson	111	13.0
51-60	139	16.2	Professional	90	10.0
>60	91	10.6	Executive/ Manager	135	15.8
Educational level			Unemployed	29	3.4
High School education	74	8.6	Self-employed worker	105	12.3
College Diploma	166	19.4	Worker	62	7.2
Bachelor degree	380	44.3	Retired	47	5.5
Master degree	124	14.5	Civil servant	110	12.8
Doctoral degree	113	13.2	Others	40	4.7
Monthly income					
<\$1000	178	20.8			
\$1001-\$2000	317	37.0			
\$2001-\$3000	134	15.6			
\$3001-\$4000	123	14.4			
>\$4000	105	12.3			

4.2 Promotion tools: importance and roles

Results in Table 2 showed that there are significant differences on the perception of all promotion tools between local and international respondent except for Internet which showed no significant differences between the respondents. The international respondents perceived magazine, brochure, WOM, travel agents, tourist information center, guidebooks, and public relations higher than local respondents, whereas local respondent had higher means for TV/Radio, and newspaper. The differences between female and male respondents' perceptions of the importance of promotion tools showed that female respondents had higher means on Internet and newspaper while Male respondents rated magazine, brochures, and travel agents higher than female respondents. Thus, the findings of this study partially support the first hypothesis in terms of participants' nationality and gender.

Table 3 indicates the differences of socio-demographic characteristics of MICE participants in terms of gender and nationality on the perceptions of the cognitive and affective image of a destination. *T*-test results revealed significant differences between local and international MICE participants on the cognitive factors namely, "Natural resources", "General infrastructure", "Atmosphere", "Political and social factor", "Economic and cultural factor". "Tourist facilitation", as well as significantly different on the perceptions of "Affective factor". However, based on the mean scores, local respondents tended to assess the destination image more favourably than the international respondents. Independent sample *t*-test's results also revealed that significant differences were existed on the perception of destination image factors between females and males on "Natural resources", "General infrastructure". "Atmosphere", "Economic and cultural factor", "Tourist facilitation", "Affective factor". Whereas, results showed

that there were no significant differences on the perception of “political and social factor” between females and males. The results indicated that the higher scores on cognitive and affective factors were exhibited by female respondents as compared to male respondents. This study indicated that female respondents held a more positive image than the male respondents on Jordan. Thus, the hypothesis *H2* was supported by the data in the case of nationality different in terms of their perceptions between local and international, but however, the results showed partially support for gender different.

Table 2: Analyses of difference among participants on MICE promotion tools in terms of gender and nationality

Participants Profile	Promotion Tools										
	Internet	Magazines	Brochures	Word of Mouth (WOM)	Travel Agents	T.V/Radio	Newspaper	Tourist Information Center	Guidebooks	Public Relations	
Nationality											
Local(n=310)	4.72	3.84	3.90	4.34	4.06	4.48	4.60	3.71	3.97	4.39	
International(n=547)	4.78	4.39	4.09	4.48	4.23	3.06	3.34	3.95	4.12	4.50	
Mean Differences	-.056	-.553	-.186	-.137	-.169	1.425	1.256	-.232	-.151	-.161	
<i>t</i>	1.714	12.753	2.699	2.749	2.913	25.369	24.865	3.663	2.638	2.433	
Sig.	.087	.000*	.007*	.006*	.004*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.003*	.015*	
Gender											
Female	4.80	4.13	3.94	4.41	4.09	3.65	3.91	3.88	4.05	4.44	
Male	4.73	4.24	4.07	4.44	4.23	3.52	3.72	3.85	4.07	4.48	
Mean Differences	.076	.107	.128	.028	.138	.128	.183	.037	.022	.038	
<i>t</i>	2.539	2.262	2.056	.580	2.425	1.664	2.629	.612	.371	.806	
Sig.	.011*	.024*	.040*	.552	.016*	.097	.009*	.541	.711	.421	

*Significant at 0.05 level.

Table3: Analyses of difference among participants on destination image in terms of gender and nationality

Destination Image	Natural resources	General infrastructure	Atmosphere	Political and social Factor	Economic and cultural factor	Tourist facilitation	Affective factor
Nationality							
Local(n=310)	4.502	4.423	4.287	4.108	4.468	4.345	4.798
International(n=547)	4.207	3.986	4.060	4.021	4.264	3.962	4.697
Mean Differences	.294	.437	.227	.087	.203	.383	.101
<i>t</i>	7.014	11.614	4.658	2.273	5.207	9.115	3.622
Sig.	.000*	.000*	.000*	.023*	.000*	.000*	.000*
Gender							
Female	4.4957	4.3141	4.2330	4.0655	4.4668	4.1903	4.8661
Male	4.1884	4.0267	4.0791	4.0441	4.2493	4.0383	4.6418
Mean Differences	.30732	.28742	.15400	.02139	.21742	.15197	.22430
<i>t</i>	7.556	7.772	3.332	.576	5.433	3.476	8.940
Sig.	.000*	.000*	.001*	.565	.000*	.001*	.000*

*Significant at 0.05 level.

A simple linear regression method was performed to explore the role of promotion tools on the formation of the touristic image of Jordan. Results of simple linear regression are presented in Table 4 which indicate that the roles of promotion tools significantly influence on the cognitive image ($F=912.715, p<.0001$), affective image ($F= 191.284, p<.0001$) as well as overall image ($F=689.160, p<.0001$) formation of Jordan. The findings also revealed that the roles of promotion tools were able to explain 44.6% of variances in the overall image of Jordan. Thus, the hypothesis for *H3* was supported by the data of the study.

Table 4: Regression analyses for the prediction of Jordan touristic image from the roles of promotion tools

Promotion tools	Cognitive Image			Affective Image			Overall Image		
	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
The roles of promotion tools	.719	30.212	.000	.428	13.831	.000	.668	26.252	.000
	F=912.715, p<.000, adjusted R ² = .516			F=191.284, p<.000, adjusted R ² = .182			F=689.160, p<.000, adjusted R ² = .446		

5 Discussion and Conclusions

This study sought to explore the role of promotion tools on Jordan touristic image formation by focusing on the question of how the participants of MICE events perceived importance of each promotion tool, destination image formation and to what extent the roles of promotion tools affect the formation image of Jordan. The results of this study revealed the significant differences existed between locals' perception of promotion tools and the international's perceptions except for Internet which showed no significant differences in the perception between local and international respondents. This indicates that Internet is widely used by local and international respondents. Li and Vogelsong (2003) pointed out to the importance of Internet as an effective promotion tool that can reach the customer directly and efficiently which could be the most creative method to promote destination image. A search of relevant literature showed that some previous studies (Boo, et al.,2008; Molina and Esteban, 2006; Molina, Gomez & Martin-Consuegra, 2010) supported the results of this study in which Internet was rated as the most important promotion tool in searching and promoting information about MICE tourism.

Local respondents perceived newspaper and TV/ Radio higher than the international respondents. TV/ Radio and newspaper are national media using Arabic language during their publishing and transmission. Therefore, Jordan should encourage national TVs/Radios to go international, so they can promote MICE tourism of Jordan and encourage more meeting attendance and repeat visits. Pan (2011) declared that TV tourism commercials are considered one of the destination image formation agents. Meanwhile, international respondents rated public relations, WOM, magazine, travel agents, guidebooks, brochures, and tourist information center higher than local respondents. Fall (2004) posited that public relations in MICE tourism is one of the important promotion tools that revitalize tourism industry, whereas other studies (Ho & Dempsey, 2010; Louvieris & Oppewal, 2004; Simpson & Siguaw, 2008) pointed out to the importance of positive WOM expressed by friends and family about a destination in affecting others' feeling and behaviour. Furthermore, females viewed internet and newspaper highly, while males had positive perceptions on magazines, brochures, and travel agents.

Meeting planners, organizers, stakeholders and other destination marketers should realize that these tools can play an effective role in reaching important tourist groups. Local participants relied more on Internet, TV/Radio, newspapers, public relations and WOM. At the same time, extensive use of Internet, public relations, WOM, magazines, and brochures should be done to target high yield international tourists. Therefore, to target the local and international delegates, the best use of these promotion tools should be achieved. They need to target first-time meeting attendees and encourage them to become regular attendees for future meetings in the destination.

In addition, the results indicated that the role of promotion tools did influence on cognitive image formation of Jordan as it explained about 51.6% of the variance. Additionally, the result showed that it influenced on affective image formation of Jordan and accounted for 18.2% of the variation in the affective image. Further, to predict the influence of the role of promotion tools on the overall image of Jordan which is based on the mean scores of the cognitive image and affective image, it was regressed on the overall image. The results revealed that it influenced the overall image and explained about 44.6% of the variance. Thus the findings seem to support Govers et al.'s (2007) suggestion on the importance and role of promotion in tourism is the critical component of destination image formation.

The study findings provided insights in relation to the roles and importance of promotion tools and their roles on the formation of destination image from the perspective of MICE event participants. Furthermore, the study has contributed to the understanding of the most beneficial promotion tools in MICE industry from the perspective of a representative sample of MICE participants. The research findings revealed the differences between socio-demographic characteristics of the participants in terms of their gender and nationality. Therefore, based on the findings of this study, the preferences of participants in terms of their socio-demographic characteristics should be taken into account while planning for a MICE event in order to attract more attendees and successfully meet their needs and expectations.

It is hoped that the information attained in this study is beneficial and useful in developing Jordan's MICE destination attributes, and promoting and enhancing its touristic image in the competitive MICE industry internationally. Tourism bodies of Jordan should direct their promotion campaigns to encourage high spending tourists to be frequent visitors of Jordan. They should target the local and international tourists. They should also develop a specific communication for each group of MICE participants. In addition, the findings of this study have paved the way for government and private tourism sectors to set out their strategies of planning, developing, and marketing MICE industry as well as a promotional strategy of the touristic image of Jordan.

However, several limitations should be addressed to encourage future researchers to come out with more affective research on this important topic of the role of MICE promotion tools on destination image in the future. As there was lack of academic attention pertaining to MICE tourism in Jordan; resulting of secondary data concerning this important sector were scant. Generalizability of study findings was also another limitation of this study as the

questionnaire was completed by a selected group and might not be representative of the population from which this group is drawn. It is suggested that future research should explore the relationships between the perceptions of tourists on the importance of MICE promotion tools and their intention to participate. Moreover, it would be important for future studies also to replicate the present study by focusing on separate entity of MICE events such as Meetings, Incentives, Conferences, or Exhibitions on the formation of the touristic image of Jordan which may provide more specified results and implications. In addition, it is suggested for future studies to evaluate the differences of the perceptions of first-time visitors and repeat visitors on the importance of promotion tools and its influences on touristic image formation in order to determine the effectiveness of promotion strategy used by the host destination.

6 References

- Alhroot, A. H. H. (2007). *Marketing of a destination: Jordan as a case study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Huddersfield, UK.
- Allen, J., O'Toole, W., Harris, R., & McDonnell, I. (2005). *Festival and special event management*. Brisbane: John Wiley & Sons Australia.
- Badhadho, I. (2007). Conference tourism in Jordan. *Itijahat Business Magazine*, 6.
- Baloglu, S. (1997). The relationship between destination images and sociodemographic and trip characteristics of international travellers. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 3(3), 221-233.
- Baloglu, S., & McCleary, K. W. (1999a). A model of destination image formation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(4), 868-897.
- Baloglu, S., & McCleary, K. W. (1999b). US international pleasure travellers' images of four Mediterranean destinations: A comparison of visitors and nonvisitors. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38(2), 144-152.
- Beerli, A., & Martin, J. D. (2004). Factors influencing destination image. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3), 657-681.
- Bell, C. (2008). 100% PURE New Zealand: Branding for back-packers. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 14(4), 345-355.
- Bhatt, H., & Badan. B.S. (2005). Encyclopaedia of Tourism in the New Millennium. *Tourism: Marketing and Operations*. (Vol. 3). Crescent Publishing Corporation.
- Bojanic, D. (1991). The use of advertising in managing destination image. *Tourism Management*, 12(4), 352-355.
- Boo, S., Koh, Y., & Jones, D. (2008). An exploration of attractiveness of convention cities based on visitor behavior. *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, 9(4), 239-257.
- Brislin, R. W. (1980). *Translation and content analysis of oral and written material*. In H. C. Triandis, & J.W. Berry (Eds.), *Handbook of cross cultural psychology: vol. 2. Methodology*. New York: Wiley.
- Castellort, M., & Mader, G. (2010). Press media coverage effects on destinations—A Monetary Public Value (MPV) analysis. *Tourism Management*, 31(6): 724-738.
- Cheung, C., & R. Law. (2002). Virtual MICE promotion: A comparison of the official web sites in Hong Kong and Singapore. *Journal of Convention & Exhibition Management*, 4(2), 37- 51.
- Cooper, C., Fletcher, J., Fyall, A., Gilbert, D., Wanhill, S. (2008). *Tourism principles and practice* (4th ed). Harlow: Financial Times Prentice Hall.
- Creswell, J. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. NJ: Upper Saddle River.
- Crouch, G. I. (2000). An analysis of Hong Kong tourism promotion. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 5(2), 70-75.
- Fakeye, P., & Crompton, J. L. (1991). Image differences between prospective, first-time, and repeat visitors to the Lower Rio Grande Valley. *Journal of Travel Research*, 30(2), 10-16.
- Govers, A., Go, F. M., & Kumar, K. (2007). Promoting tourism destination image. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(1), 15-23.
- Gretzel, U., Yuan, Y. L., & Fesenmaier, D. R. (2000). Preparing for the new economy: Advertising strategies and change in destination marketing organizations. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(2), 146-156.
- Gunn, C. A. (1972). *Vacationscape-Designing Tourist Regions*. Washington: Taylor & Francis.
- Harahsheh, S. (2009). *An Evaluation of the image of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan in the British and Swedish markets and the implications for marketing the country as a tourism destination*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Bournemouth University, United Kingdom.
- Ho, J. Y. C., & Dempsey, M. (2010). Viral marketing: Motivations to forward online content. *Journal of Business Research*, 63(9-10), 1000-1006.
- Kim, D. Y., Lehto X. Y., & Morrison, A.M. (2007). Gender differences in online travel information search: Implications for marketing communications on the Internet. *Tourism Management*, 28(2): 423-433.
- Lau, C. K., Milne, S., & Johnston, C.S. (2005). MICE, ICT and local economic development: The case of The Kahurangi. New Zealand. *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, 7(1), 61-75.
- Law, R., & J. Wong. (2003). Successful factors for a travel web site: perceptions of on-line purchasers in Hong Kong. *Journal of hospitality & tourism research*, 27(1): 118-124.
- Lee, S., Closc, A., & Love, C. (2010). *How information quality and market turbulence impact convention and visitors bureaus' use of marketing information: Insights for destination and event marketing*. Washington: Taylor & Francis.
- Lee-Kelley, L., Gilbert, D., & Al-Shehabi, N. F. (2004). Virtual exhibitions: an exploratory study of Middle East exhibitors' dispositions. *International Marketing Review*, 21(6): 634-644.

- Louvieris, P., & Oppewal, H. (2004). Channel benefits portfolio management in the eBusiness era. *Qualitative Market Research*, 7(4), 257-264.
- Li, X., & Vogelsson, H. (2003). *A model of destination image promotion with a case study of Nanjing, PR China*. Paper presented at Northeastern recreation research symposium.
- Lim Khong Chiu., & Omar, A. Anazed. (2012). Evaluation the relationship between the role of promotion tools in MICE Tourism and the formation of the touristic image of Jordan. *Academica Turistica (Tourism & Innovation Journal)*, 5 (1), 59-73.
- MacKay, K. J., & Smith, M. C. (2006). Destination advertising: Age and format effects on memory. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(1), 7-24.
- McLemore, C., & Mitchell, N. (2001). An Internet conversion study of www.arkansas.com-A state tourism website. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 7(3), 268-274.
- Metaxas, T. (2009). Place marketing, strategic planning and competitiveness: The case of Malta. *European Planning Studies*, 17(9), 1357-1378.
- Mistilis, N. & Dwyer, L. (1999). Information technology and service standards in MICE tourism. *Journal of Convention & Exhibition Management* 2(1): 55-65.
- Molina, A., & Esteban, A. (2006). Tourism brochures: Usefulness and image. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(4), 1036-1056.
- Molina, A., Gomez, M., & Martin-Consuegra, D. (2010). Tourism marketing information and destination image management. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(5), 722-728.
- Norman, S., & Pettersen, M. (2008). *Reaching the Japanese Tourist-A qualitative study investigating Australian Tourism Companies' promotional efforts on the Japanese market*. Unpublished master thesis, University of the Sunshine Coast, Australia.
- Pan, S. (2011). The Role of TV Commercial Visuals in Forming Memorable and Impressive Destination Images. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(2), 171-185.
- Pavlovic, D. K., & Belullo, A. (2007). *Internet- an agent of tourism destination image formation: Content and correspondence analysis of Istria travel related websites*. Paper presented at the 4th international conference. Global Changes for Competitiveness: Business and Government perspective, Pula, Croatia.
- Rogers, T. (1998). *Conferences - A twenty-first Century Industry*. Harlow: Longman.
- Ruzic, Turkalj, D., Z., & Racic, N. (2003). *Marketing Aspects of the Development of Congress and Incentives Activities in Croatia*. Paper presented at the fifth international conference on "Enterprise in transition", 1605-1617.
- Schneider, I., & Sonmez, S. (1999). Exploring the touristic image of Jordan. *Tourism Management*, 20, 539-542.
- Simpson, P. M., & Siguaw, J. A. (2008). Destination Word of Mouth: The role of traveler type, residents, and identity salience. *Journal of Travel Research*, 47(2), 167-182.
- Taji, E. T. (2005). Marketing Strategies for Tourism Recovery in Jordan. Emphasis on Niche Market. Retrieved from http://web2.msm.nl/news/articles/050707papers/0220_Taji.PDF
- Tasci, A. D. A., & Gartner, W. C. (2007). Destination image and its functional relationships. *Journal of Travel Research*, 45(4), 413-425.
- Walker, J., & Firestone, M. D. (2009). *Lonely Planet Jordan* (7th ed.). Washington: Lonely Planet.
- Wei, S., Ruys, H. R., van Hoof, H. B., & Combrink, T. E. (2001). Uses of the Internet in the global hotel industry. *Journal of Business Research*, 54(3), 235-241.
- Werthner, H., & Ricci, F. (2004). E-commerce and tourism. *Communications of the ACM*, 47(12), 101-105.
- Wicks, B., & Schuett, M. (1991). Examining the role of tourism promotion through the use of brochures. *Tourism Management*, 12(4), 301-312.
- Williams, A. P., & Palmer, V.J. (1999). Tourism destination brands and electronic commerce: Towards synergy? *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 5(3), 263-275.