THE ROLE OF MICE DESTINATION ATTRIBUTES ON FORMING JORDAN TOURISTIC IMAGE

Lim Khong Chiu
School of Tourism,
Hospitality and Environmental
Management, Universiti Utara,
MALAYSIA.
lkc@uum.edu.my

Omar A. Ananzeh
School of Tourism,
Hospitality and Environmental
Management, Universiti Utara,
MALAYSIA.
omarananzeh@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The attributes of a MICE destination have been shown to have a vital role on the formation of its touristic image. This study examines the role of MICE destination attributes on the formation of the touristic image of Jordan from the perspective of local and international MICE event participants. Amman and the Dead Sea were the study site of this study. Push-Pull theory was utilised to show the importance of pull attributes on forming the destination Image. The relative importance of six attributes of MICE destination is determined. The results revealed significant differences between participants on their perceptions on the importance of MICE destination attributes and that MICE destination attributes influence the destination image formation. The findings also provided implications for event planners, event organizers, and other MICE stakeholders in Jordan as well as for academic researchers in MICE tourism.

Keywords: MICE Destination attributes, Cognitive image, Affective image, Push-Pull Theory.

INTRODUCTION

MICE tourism (Meetings, Incentive travels, Conferences, and Exhibitions) has been described as a new segment of tourism industry; a new type of tourism arising out of the increase in number of conventions and exhibitions; the fastest growing segment and most lucrative sector of the travel and tourism industry (Oppermann, 1996a; Ruzic, Turkalj, & Racic, 2003; Wang & Wang, 2008).

Several studies have been conducted to reveal the importance of MICE destination attributes (Oppermann, 1996a, 1996b; Go, Govers, 1999). Lee and Back (2007) examined the role of MICE destination attributes on forming the overall destination image. However, research examined the role of MICE destination attributes on the formation of cognitive and affective image was dearth. In addition, reviewing literature revealed that there were two studies examined the touristic image of Jordan; Schneider and Sonmez (1999) explored the touristic image of Jordan from the perspective of regional and interregional leisure visitors, and Harahsheh, Morgan, and Edwards (2010) examined the touristic image of Jordan in the British and Swedish markets and explored the role of religious beliefs on the formation of that image. Thus, the role of MICE destination attributes on forming Jordan touristic image has not been evaluated. Therefore, this study aims to fill this research gap by investigating the role and importance of MICE destination attributes on forming the touristic image of Jordan from the perspective of local and international MICE event participants.

The influence of socio-demographic characteristics of MICE event participants on the perceived destination image has been searched (e.g., Baloglu, 1997; Baloglu & McCleary, 1999; Beerli & Martin, 2004a, 2004b). However, the influence of socio-demographic characteristics of MICE participants on the perceptions of MICE destination attributes was not targeted, except for the issue of nationality of the MICE participants which have been addressed, but without emphasis on domestic participants' perceptions.

HYPOTHESIS AND ATTRIBUTES

Accordingly, this paper aims to determine and evaluate the role of MICE destination attributes on the formation of Jordan touristic image, and to identify the relative importance of MICE destination

attributes as perceived by the participants in terms of their socio-demographic characteristics such as, nationality, gender, age, monthly income, and educational levels. Based on the above, the following hypotheses were proposed:

H1: Destination attributes of MICE tourism positively influence the destination image formation of Jordan.

H2: There is no difference in MICE participants' perception on the importance of MICE destination attributes in terms of their socio-demographic characteristics such as nationality, gender, age, monthly income and educational level.

Destination attributes are critical for event planners, associations, attendees, and the host destination. The competition between destinations in hosting MICE events has increased, which demands to identify key criteria to satisfy clients and meet their needs and clients' expectations. Dann (1977) affirmed that there is a clear relation between push factors and pull factors. Push factors are the desires, needs, and perceptions affect the person, whereas pull factors are the destination attributes. These attributes may be natural, cultural resources, or some kind of activities and events (Kim & Lee, 2002; Kim, Chon, & Chung, 2003; Klenosky, 2002). Abdul Rashid and Ismail (2008) found that the destination attributes are the pulling factors that attract tourists to the destination. Kim et al. (2003) asserted that escaping and seeking affecting travelers' motivation (whether to go) and the attributes of the destination effect on their decision of choosing their destination (where to go). Thus, the destination attributes (pull factors) effect on expected delegates' decision to travel or participate in an event.

Jordan's Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities (MoTA) realised the importance of MICE events in tourism industry and its positive reflection on the economy especially in off-peak season. Badhadho (2006) asserted that MICE tourism has increased in Jordan after peace treaty 1994. A destination could globally compete in hosting MICE events when it has the following attributes: Amenities; sufficient facilities for conventions and exhibitions, and meeting room facilities as well as its ability to have certain basic services such as fire, police, water, etc. Accessibility; refers to the level of ease with which attendees can travel to and from the event site taking into consideration the time and effort. Accountability; refers to the ability of the host destination to provide overall quality to MICE tourism participants in terms of customs, telecommunications, health care, and qualified employees. Affordability; refers to the overall price or cost of participating in an event. Attractions; refers to the ability of the host destination to provide meeting attendees with attractions and places of interest. And activities; refers to recreational activities before, during and after the meeting event.

DESTINATION IMAGE: CONCEPTS, IMPORTANCE AND MEASUREMENTS

Destination image is a critical factor in travel decisions. Several definitions could be found in literature for the concept of destination image, such as Crompton (1979) defined image as the sum of beliefs, ideas, and impressions that a person has about a destination. Echtner and Richie (1993) described destination image as "perceptions of an area" or "impressions of a place". Alcaniz, Garcia, & Blas, (2009) pointed out that the perceptions of the destination attributes form its image. Thus, image is the intangible picture of a destination involved tourist's knowledge and feeling towards it. Gunn (1972) conceptualised tourist destination image into two stages; the organic image and the induced image. Fakeye and Crompton (1991) introduced the "complex image" which is formed when a tourist has actually experienced the destination. In addition, Gartner (1993) introduced three components of destination image: cognitive image which is formulated from external stimuli, the affective image refers to the person's feeling and evaluation of a destination, and the conative image refers to the person's behavior resulted from cognitive and affective components. The importance of destination image emerges from its influence on the tourist behavior; the destinations that have stronger images have a higher possibility of being chosen by tourists (Jayswal, 2008).

Methodologies were developed to assess and measure this concept in order to capture tourists' perceptions of its attributes, and to identify the strengths and implement strategies to develop and enhance the weaknesses (San Martin & Bosque, 2008). Echtner and Ritchie (1993) pointed out that most researchers have utilised quantitative research methods in examining destination attributes.

Abdul Rashid and Ismail (2008) stated that the combination of these cognitive and affective components strongly related in producing the overall image of the destination. Therefore, this study will utilize structured method to examine the cognitive and affective components of image as perceived by MICE participants.

METHODS

Research Design

This research utilised correlational design by using quantitative approach through survey methods to assess the role of destination attributes of MICE tourism on the formation of Jordan touristic image. Self-administered questionnaire was used to collect data from the selected respondents. To ensure the content validity, eight academic experts in tourism field discussed the items in the questionnaire. The instrument was pilot tested on a sample of the study population to ensure its reliability and validity.

The survey instruments consisted of three sections: The first question consisted of 30 items adapted from previous studies (e.g., Baloglu & Love, 2003; Baloglu &love, 2005; Robinson & Callan, 2005) to identify the important attributes for MICE destination, and rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important). The second section composed of two questions to measure image formation. The first question consisted of 30 items to measure cognitive image on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Items were developed after reviewing other measurement scales on destination image formation (Beerli & Martin, 2004a, 2004b; Echtner & Ritchie, 1993, 2003; McCartney, Butler, & Bennett, 2009; Schneider & Sonmez, 1999). The second question consisted of four emotional adjectives : arousing-sleepy, unpleasant-pleasant, boring-exciting, and distressing-relaxing which were adapted from (Beerli & Martin, 2004a, 2004b; Baloglu & Love, 2005; Baloglu & McCleary, 1999) and rated on a five-bipolar scale ranging from "extremely" to "neither" to "extremely" (e.g., extremely arousing, arousing, neither, sleepy, extremely sleepy). The third section included socio-demographic questions designed to provide general information about the respondent characteristics such as respondent's gender, nationality, income, and educational level.

The study was conducted between May 2011 and October 2011, in Amman and the Dead Sea, the study site of this study. Amman is the capital city of Jordan and has the majority of hotels in addition to large convention enterprises. The Dead Sea, on the other hand, has a range of high-class hotels in addition to the biggest convention center in Jordan. The questionnaire was personally administered to each subject during events. Subjects were selected using cluster random sampling techniques. MICE events were divided into four clusters: Meetings, incentives, conferences, and exhibitions. Twelve MICE events were chosen. 1060 questionnaires were distributed, 857 questionnaires were valid after deleting outliers. Factor analysis, t-test, AONOVA, and multiple regression were conducted to examine MICE participants' perceptions of the importance of destination attributes and the role of these attributes on the formation of Jordan touristic image.

STUDY RESULTS

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.

Data Analysis

Dimensions of MICE destination attributes were isolated by using factor analysis. The method of Principal Component using varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalization yielded six distinct dimensions that accounted for 64.467 of the total variance as shown in Table 2. The criterion of eigen values greater than one combined with a visual inspection of the Screen Plot was used to identify the number of factors to be extracted. The factors were labeled as affordability, attraction, accessibility, amenities, activities, and accountability. The MICE destination attributes used in this study contains 24 items. Six original items were ignored because either the Item-total correlation of these items was less than 0.45 or the factor loading value of these items was less than 0.40.

Table 3 provides a summary of the results of factor analysis of cognitive and affective items. Six factors of cognitive image attributes were derived and these were labelled; atmosphere, political and social factor, tourist facilitation, natural resources, general infrastructure, and economic and cultural factor. Four original items of cognitive image were ignored because either the Item-total correlation of these items was less than 0.45 or the factor loading value of these items was less than 0.40.

Hypotheses Testing

Multiple regression method was employed to explore the role of MICE destination attributes on the formation of the touristic image of Jordan. Several assumptions should be met when utilising multiple regression analysis such as linearity, normality, and homoscedasticity of the residuals (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Normality probability plot of the regression and residual scatterplot grid were employed to examine the assumption of normality. Results showed no major deviation from normality. No nonlinear pattern was found between the independent and dependent variables. The residual scatterplot grid was also utilised to check the assumption of normality. This grid shows that if 95% of residuals are fallen between -2 and + 2, then the errors are normally distributed. The tolerance of variables and the variance inflation factor (VIF) were reviewed. The results revealed that the normality distribution of data was not violated and there was no multicollinearity in this analysis. Therefore, the data were considered adequate for regression analysis.

The influence of MICE destination attributes on cognitive and affective image was tested to support the influence of MICE destination attributes on the overall destination image of Jordan as the hypothesis required. Results (Table 4) showed that accountability was the most predictor to contribute to cognitive image formation, amenities was the most predictor to contribute to cognitive image formation and the overall image formation. Accountability was the second contributor to affective and overall image formation. Based on the results, hypothesis H1 was confirmed.

Results of t-test / ANOVA on the second hypothesis (Table 5) showed that local participants perceive MICE destination attributes higher than international respondents on five dimensions except for activities which does not show any significant between local and international participants. Females rated the importance of these attributes higher than males. Age factor shows significant relationship, respondents aged 60 years old and above significantly perceived high MICE destination attributes on accountability, attraction, and accessibility factors. The group aged 30 years and below perceived MICE destination attributes on amenities factor. In addition, those groups earning monthly income less than $1000 and the monthly income groups of $1001-$2000 perceived significantly high on most MICE destination attributes. While the monthly income groups of more than $4000 perceived MICE destination attributes less on affordability factor. In terms of education level groups, bachelor degree perceived accessibility factor higher than other educational levels, whereas doctoral groups perceived attractions factor as the most important factor. High school education groups rated amenities factor as the most important destination attributes. Thus, the second hypothesis was rejected.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Apparently, results revealed that local respondents rated MICE destination attributes higher than international respondents. Local respondents were concerned with affordability while international respondents perceived attractions and accountability as the most important attributes. Females tended to have higher perceptions on all MICE destination attributes. In terms of age, respondents aged 60 years old and above significantly perceived positively on accountability, attractions and accessibility. It could be that they considered more the ability of host destination to provide them with overall quality that could relax them in addition to the ease of reaching the host destination and other places within the country. Affordability factor was perceived highly by the group aged 31 to 40 years. Whereas, the group aged 30 years and below rated amenities attribute higher than other age groups. That is because leisure services attract more young people. Participants with monthly income less than$2000 perceived amenities and affordability higher than other income groups, while monthly income group of more than $4000 rated "affordability" less than other income groups. Bachelor degree groups rated accessibility higher than other educational level groups, whereas the doctoral level group was more concerned with destination attractions and less on affordability factor.

The results of regression of attributes of MICE destination on the cognitive image indicated that accountability is found to be the most significant predictor of the cognitive image, followed by amenities, accessibility, and affordability. Furthermore, amenities were found to be the most significant predictor of the affective image, followed by accountability, and attraction, whereas, affordability was not a significant predictor of the affective image.

Finally, the results of regression revealed that there were positive relationships between MICE destination attributes and the overall image formation; amenities found to be the most significant predictor of the overall image, while affordability was the last predictor. Furthermore, Lee and Back (2007) stated that destination attributes form the overall destination image. Moreover, the study findings revealed positive evaluation of the respondents towards Jordan touristic image which supported the previous study of Schneider and Sonmez (1999) that tourists perceived Jordan as safe and interesting, and the Jordanians are hospitable and friendly.

This study was a part of a doctoral research program into the role of MICE tourism on the formation of the tourist image of Jordan. The results of this study provide managerial and theoretical contributions in which it enables an exploration and understanding of the role of MICE destination attributes on image formation of the host country as well as the preferences of participants in terms of their socio-demographic characteristics.

Based on the results of this study, 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. The findings of this study have paved the way for tourism bodies to set out their strategies of planning, developing, and marketing MICE industry. The comparison between respondents in terms of their socio-demographic characteristics should enable event organisers, planners, event managers, and the host destinations to understand the preferences of MICE participants and evaluate their projected image and compare it with the received image of the respondents which will help them in their future positioning and in their communication and promotional strategies. Another theoretical contribution of this study is the development of an instrument which can be used for future studies related to MICE tourism and destination image based on studies in the context of Jordan.

Several limitations were involved in this study. These were the lack of academic attention to MICE tourism in Jordan. In addition, the tourism industry bodies in Jordan such as MoTA and Jordan Tourism Board (JTB) have rare recorded statistics for MICE tourism. They have statistics only for the nationality of tourists and they ignored the other demographic characteristics or purpose of visit. Thus, it is recommended for all bodies involved in tourism industry to document information related specially to the demographic characters of tourists, purpose of visit, number of meetings, conferences, etc., to be able to recognize the target market and set future plans and strategies.

However, the results of this study should encourage scholars' inquiries to further the body of knowledge contributed to by this study. It is recommended for future to evaluate the differences of the perceptions of first-time participants and repeat participants. Future studies could also explore the impact of MICE tourism in Jordan on its tourism industry and community, such as the social, cultural and economic impacts.

REFERENCES

Abdul Rashid, R., & Ismail, H. N. (2008). *Critical Analysis on Destination image literature: Roles and Purposes.* Paper presented at 2nd In international Conference on Built Environment in Developing Countries (ICBEDC).

Alcaniz, B. E., Garcia, I. S., & Blas, S. S. (2009). The functional-psychological continuum in the cognitive image of a destination: A confirmatory analysis. *Tourism Management,* 30(5), 715-723.

Badhadho, I. (2006). Conference tourism in Jordan. *Itijahat Business Magazine.*6

Baloglu, S. (1997). The relationship between destination images and socio-demographic and trip characteristics of international travellers. *Journal of Vacation Marketing,* 3(3), 221-233.

Baloglu, S., & Love, C. (2003). Association Meeting Planners' Perceived Performance of Las Vegas. *Journal of Convention & Exhibition Management*, 5(1), 13-27.

Baloglu, S., & Love, C. (2005). Association meeting planners' perceptions and intentions for five major US convention cities: the structured and unstructured images. *Tourism Management,* 26(5), 743-752.

Baloglu, S., & McCleary, K. W. (1999). A model of destination image formation. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 26(4), 868-897.

Beerli, A., & Martin, J. D. (2004a). Factors influencing destination image. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 31(3), 657-681.

Beerli, A., & Martin, J. D. (2004b). Tourists' characteristics and the perceived image of tourist destinations: a quantitative analysis--a case study of Lanzarote, Spain. *Tourism Management,* 25(5), 623-636.

Crompton, J. L. (1979). An assessment of the image of Mexico as a vacation destination and the influence of geographical location upon that image. *Journal of Travel Research*, 17(4): 18-23.

Dann, G. M. S. (1977). Anomie, ego-enhancement and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 4(4), 184-194.

Echtner, C. M., & Ritchie, J. R. B. (1993). The measurement of destination image: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Travel Research,* 31(4), 3-13.

Echtner, C. M., & Ritchie, J. R. B. (2003). The meaning and measurement of destination image. *Journal of tourism studies,* 14(1), 37-48.

Gartner, W. (1993). Image formation process. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing,* 2(3), 191-216.

Go, F., & Govers, R. (1999). The Asian perspective: Which international conference destinations in Asia are the most competitive? *Journal of Convention & Exhibition Management,* 1(4*), 37-50.*

Gunn, C. A. (1972). *Vacationscape-Designing Tourist Regions.* NewYork: Taylor & Francis.

Harahsheh, S.S., Morgan, M.E., & Edwards, J.R. (2010). The influence of religious belief on destination image: The case of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. *International Journal of Management Cases,* 9 (3/4), 63-73.

Jayswal, M. (2008). *Events Tourism: Potential to build a brand destination*. Paper presented at Conference on Tourism in India-Challenges Ahead.

Kim, S., Chon, K., & Chung, K.Y. (2003). Convention industry in South Korea: an economic impact analysis. *Tourism Management,* 24(5), 533-541.

Kim, S., & Lee, C. (2002). Push and pull relationships. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 29(1), 257-260.

Klenosky, D. B. (2002). The" pull" of tourism destinations: A means-end investigation. *Journal of Travel Research,* 40(4), 385-395.

Lee, M. J., & Back, K. (2007). Effects of destination image on meeting participation intentions: Empirical findings from a professional association and its annual convention. *The Service Industries Journal,* 27(1), 59-73.

McCartney, G., Butler, R., & Bennett, M. (2009). Positive tourism image perceptions attract travellers--fact or fiction? The case of Beijing visitors to Macao. *Journal of Vacation Marketing,* 15 (2), 179-193.

Oppermann, M. (1996a). Convention cities-Images and changing fortunes. *Journal of tourism studies, 7*(1), 10-19.

Oppermann, M. (1996b). Convention destination images: analysis of association meeting planners' perceptions. *Tourism Management,* 17(3), 175-182.

Robinson, L., & Callan, R. (2005). UK conference delegates' cognizance of the importance of venue selection attributes. *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, 7(1), 77-95.

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.

San Martin, H., & del Bosque, R. A. I. (2008). Exploring the cognitive-affective nature of destination image and the role of psychological factors in its formation. *Tourism Management, 29*(2), 263-277.

Schneider, I., & Sonmez, S. (1999). Exploring the touristic image of Jordan. *Tourism Management,* 20, 539-542.

Tabachnick, B.G., & Fidell, L.S. (2007). Using multivariate statistics. (5th ed.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon

Wang, Z., & Wang, E. (2008). *Tourism to the Tourism Destinations Social Influence Research Summary.* Paper presented at the 4th International Conference on wireless communications, Networking and Mobile Computing.

APPENDIX

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		59.0	Divorced	49	5.7
National	310	36.2	Widow	21	2.5
International	547	63.8			
Age			**Occupation**		
< 30	134	15.6	Student	40	4.7
31-40	235	27.4	Homemakers	30	3.5
41-50	258	30.1	Clerical worker	58	6.8
51-60	139	16.2	Salesperson	111	13.0
>60	91	10.6	Professional	90	10.0
Educational level			Executive/ Manager	135	15.8
High School education	74	8.6	Unemployed	29	3.4
College Diploma	166	19.4	Self-employed worker	105	12.3
Bachelor degree	380	44.3	Worker	62	7.2
Master degree	124	14.5	Retired	47	5.5
Doctoral degree	113	13.2	Civil servant	110	12.8
			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			

www.journals.savap.org.pk
274

Table2: Summary of factor analysis of MICE destination attributes

Items/Factor s	Factor Loading	Eigenvalues	Variance Explained
Factor 1: Affordability (.91)[a]			
Cost of transportation	0.842	9.091	33.671
Hotel room rates	0.819		
Competitive rates as compared to nearby destinations	0.811		
Affordable local restaurants	0.743		
Affordable exhibit fee/rental	0.738		
Factor 2: Attractions (.84)			
Variety of local attractions	0.780	2.502	9.267
Climate	0.743		
Variety of local restaurants	0.722		
Variety of shopping facilities	0.708		
Local culture	0.667		
Factor 3: Accessibility (.78)[a]			
Clear location signs within the venue	0.720	1.772	6.561
Accessibility by air	0.716		
Accessibility by road	0.704		
Ease of local transportation	0.584		
Safety and security at destination	0.537		
Disabled access and facilities	0.413		
Factor 4: Amenities (.71)[a]			
Quality of event space	0.722	1.203	5.460
Quality of event facility (product and services)	0.677		
Business class standard of bedrooms	0.523		
Leisure facilities	0.518		
Factor 5: Activities (.73)[a]			
Availability of tours activities	0.474	1.364	4.456
Availability of festivals /performing arts	0.841		
Availability of water sport	0.698		
Factor 6: Accountability (.73)[a]			
Quality of local restaurants	0.585	1.474	5.052
Availability of communication center	0.802		
Private dining rooms for delegates	0.615		
Distance of airport from event site/hotel	0.589		
Total Variance Explained			**64.467**

[a] Reliability score (Cronbach alpha) for each factor grouping is shown in parentheses.

Table3: Summary of actor Analysis of cognitive and affective image

Items/Factor s	Factor Loading	Eigenvalues	Variance Explained
Factor 1: Atmosphere (0.877)[a]			
Jordan has a fashionable location	0.797	10.297	34.325
Jordan is an exotic destination	0.778		
Jordan has a luxury location	0.693		
Jordan offers many facilities to get touristic information	0.615		
Jordan has a well-known location with good reputation	0.599		
Factor 2: Political and Social Factors (0.861)[a]			
Jordan enjoys politic stability	0.821	2.447	8.158
The people in Jordan are friendly and hospitable	0.802		
Jordan is a safe place to visit	0.698		
Factor 3: Tourist Facilitation (0.772)[a]			
There is wide variety of products on offer to buy in Jordan	0.772	1.788	5.961
There are good facilities for families in Jordan	0.652		
There is a good quality of life in Jordan	0.594		
Jordan has places to do business	0.592		
Jordan has clean location	0.468		
Factor 4: Natural Resources (0.816)[a]			
Jordan has nice beaches	0.766	1.552	5.174
Jordan has nice weather	0.736		
Jordan has great variety of flora and fauna	0.716		
Jordan has lovely landscape	0.595		
Factor 5: General Infrastructure (0.837)[a]			
Jordan has good substructure of hotels and apartments	0.803	1.362	3.078
There are good developed infrastructures in Jordan	0.759		
There are facilities for training sports, leisure and amusing activities (golf, diving, tennis, etc.)	0.701		
Jordan has places to have meeting/ exhibition	0.556		
Factor 6: Economic and Cultural Factor (0.774)[a]			
Jordan offers different ways of living	0.619	1.046	3.833
Jordan offers many cultural events	0.572		
Jordan has rich location with a great economic development	0.560		
The food in Jordan is good	0.528		
There is a big level of poverty in Jordan	0.491		
Jordan is a good place to go shopping	0.452		
Jordan has many interesting historic and cultural venues	0.425		
Factor: Affective Image (0.853)[a]		1.150	4.538
Arousing/ sleepy	0.870		
Unpleasant/pleasant	0.815		
Boring/exciting	0.854		
Distressing/relaxing	0.860		
Total Variance Explained			61.989

Table 4: Regression analyses for the prediction of Jordan touristic image from MICE destination attributes

MICE Destination Attributes	Cognitive Image			Affective Image			Overall Image		
	β	t	p	β	t	p	β	t	p
Amenities	.242	10.937	.000	.294	9.916	.000	.313	13.424	.000
Accessibility	.223	9.929	.000	.088	2.730	.006	.181	7.686	.000
Affordability	.201	8.825	.000	-.006	-.176	.860	.114	4.746	.000
Accountability	.267	11.657	.000	.206	6.231	.000	.275	11.448	.000
Attraction	.143	6.197	.000	.137	4.114	.000	.164	6.728	.000
Activities	.164	7.680	.000	.093	3.027	.003	.150	6.678	.000
	F=292.417, p<.000, adjusted R^2 =.671			F=67.121, p<.000, adjusted R^2 =.317			F=251.159, p<.000, adjusted R^2=.637		

Table 5: Analyses of difference among participants on MICE destination attributes

MICE destination Attributes	Amenities	Accessibility	Affordability	Accountability	Attraction	Activities
Nationality						
Local(**n=310**)	4.742	4.401	4. 318	4.123	4.301	4.198
International(**n=547**)	4.311	4.197	4.006	4.032	4.137	4.151
Mean Differences	.431	.203	.312	.091	.164	.047
t	14.478	6.592	7.492	2.171	4.747	1.192
Sig.	.000*	.000*	.000*	.030*	.000*	.234
Gender						
Female	4.587	4.370	4. 243	4.195	4.307	4.249
Male	4.384	4.202	4.033	3.975	4.119	4.112
Mean Differences	.203	.167	.210	.220	.187	.136
t	6.116	5.455	5.069	5.444	5.444	3.638
Sig.	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*
Age						
Below 30	4.55	4.27	4.21	4.01	4.20	4.17
31-40	4.50	4.32	4.25	4.06	4.19	4.16
41-50	4.41	4.20	4.06	4.02	4.14	4.15
51-60	4.36	4.26	3.94	4.08	4.15	4.14
Over 60	4.54	4.33	4.03	4.25	4.39	4.24
df	4	4	4	4	4	4
F	3.926	2.511	7.695	3.085	4.808	.537
sig	.004*	.041*	.000*	.015*	.001*	.709
Monthly income						
Less than $1000	4.55	4.29	4.21	3.98	4.11	4.17
$1001-$2000	4.54	4.36	4.26	4.11	4.20	4.19
$2001-$3000	4.31	4.22	4.11	4.09	4.20	4.19
$3001-$4000	4.41	4.14	3.94	3.96	4.22	4.10
More than $4000	4.35	4.14	3.70	4.12	4.26	4.13
df	4	4	4	4	4	4
F	7.972	8.755	22.639	2.810	1.833	.712
sig	.000*	.000*	.000*	.025*	.120	.548
Educational levels						
High School Education	4.57	4.29	4.14	4.08	4.12	4.19
College Diploma	4.46	4.27	4.21	4.04	4.16	4.19
Bachelor Degree	4.49	4.31	4.20	4.02	4.18	4.16
Master Degree	4.39	4.21	4.09	4.11	4.14	4.16
Doctoral Degree	4.38	4.16	3.70	4.15	4.39	4.13
df	4	4	4	4	4	4
F	2.889	2.939	17.635	1.439	5.876	.262
Sig.	.022*	.020*	.000*	.219	.000*	.903

*Significant at 0.05 level.