

:

) ( (494) (%82,33)

:

---

2008/7/6 2007/3/27

)

/

(7000) " " " " (

( : )

1995 ( ) (13)

.( ( ) 1996 /10/8 1921

( ) , 1951

2000/1/23 1961

( ) 5000

%60 %40 1968

( ) 1971 (9)

(3.5) 2002/11 1985 1973

.(2005 )

1988 (270)

( 1995) .( )

(JMTS/Fast Jordan Mobil telephone services link) (260) 1990

(NTP) 1993

(2005 ) 1999 (%97)

:				1996 (0.5%)	
)	-1			. 2001 (16.7%)	
	(				
	-2				
	-3			(5000)	
				(548)	(550)
				2000/9/15	
:	:				
	.1				
	(				
		624	1999	(118)	
				2004	
	.2	%2,5		.2005	
		40%	2004	%30,3	1999
				.2005	
	.3		1999	14,2	
			) 2004		100,3
					.(2005
					2002
			2004/8/9		
			.2005		

:(4)  
( )

:(5)  
( )

:(6)  
( )

:(7)  
)  
(

.\*

:(1)  
( )

.(Kotler, & Keller 2006)

:(2)  
( )

:(3)  
( )

Lovelock & Wirtz 2004)).

---

\*

(Gabbott, H 1994)

( ) ( )  
.( ..

(Lovelock, & Wirtz )

2004

":

McCarthy & Perreault, )" )"

2004)

.(Zeithaml, V & Bither M (2000))

.(1998 )

"

"

:

(2004 )

:

-

: **Publicity** -4 (Kotler & Keller, 2006),  
 :  
 : -1  
 ..  
 ) ( )  
 Lovelock, C & ) (Kotler & Keller, 2006) (  
 . Wirtz 2004) :  
 : -2  
 :  
 . ( McCarthy & Perreault, 2004)  
 : :  
 : :  
 : (1 : .. -3  
 : :  
 : (2 : .(2004 )  
 : (3

)  
 .(

:  
 .1 ) (2000

.%63.32  
 .%65.55  
 .%50.9  
 .3 ) (Karjaluoto, 2005)

(1) :

73  
 .196

subjective

(2) .  
 ( )

.4  
 800 ) (Liu Chu-Me, 2002)

(3) .

.2 ) (2006

ان

.5 ) (Karjaluoto et al. 2003)

(1920)

397

properties

audibility

:(**Tannunbaum 1991**) .6

(3160)

(1) :

(2) .

:(**Thouret Arnaulac, 1996**) .10

.( )

:( **James, 1992**) .7

( )

. 1995  
:(**Kwon , 1996**) .11

:(**Hsu, Hsiu – Yoeu , 1993**) .8

"( )

" :

."

":

(1) :

(293)

(1) :

(2).

(2)

(3)

(3)

:(**Busse, 1998**) .12

:(**Arno, 1995**) .9

	.4	"	" :
	.5		.
	.1		.
	.2		.1
	.3		.
	:		.
(*1500000)			.2
2005			.
600			.3
.%82			.
<b>2006</b>		•	
		<b>2007,</b>	
	(1)		

(1)

%69	341	
%31	153	
%4.5	22	20
%54.9	271	29 - 20
%28.7	142	39 - 30
%8.7	43	49 - 40
%2.8	14	59 - 50
%0.4	2	69 - 60
*	*	70
%54.5	269	
%42.5	210	
%1.8	9	
%1.2	6	
%35.8	177	200
%41.7	206	399 - 200
%12.1	60	599 - 400
%5.1	25	799 - 600
% 2.2	11	999 - 800
%1.8	9	1199 - 1000
% 0.2	1	1399 - 1200
% 1	5	1400
%3.2	16	
%14.8	73	
%17.2	85	
% 50.2	248	
% 2.8	14	
% 9.9	49	
% 1.8	9	
% 100	494	

-2 :

( ) :  
% 77.86 = α  
% 60 :

-:

(2) :

(3)

-3 :

(2)

% 51.782	0.8172	2.5891	
% 73.066	0.8292	3.6533	
% 67.524	0.7844	3.3762	
% 68.54	0.8732	3.4270	
% 64.136	0.6125	3.2068	

-2

-1

3.4270  
% 68.54 0.8732  
3.6533  
0.8292  
% 73.066





: (5)

Dummy variables

(5) : (7)

H0	R <sup>2</sup>	R	SIG F	F	F
	0.011	0.104	,649	2.37	0.619

(0.619 = F ) (7)

: (6)

(6) : (8)

H0	R <sup>2</sup>	R	SIG t	t	t	
	0.007	0.081	0.073	1.96-	1.795-	.1
	0.021	0.045		1.96-	4,860-	.2
	0.016	0.041		1.96	5.657	.3
	0.003	0.051	0.259	1.96-	1.131-	.4

(8)

: (7)

Ho	(7) F	(9) F	
	0.875	0.025	.1
	0.661	0.651	.2
	0.823	0.304	.3
	0.022	2.373	.4
	0.138	1.633	.5

Two-Way Anova

(9)

.5

.1

.2

.3

.4

.1

.2

.3

.4

(3

(1

(4

(2

(2004).

(2006)

(4 ) .

(2000)

(1998)

2001 2000 1999

298

(2005)

3 27718

**2004**

***http://www.jordan-explorer.com.2005***

Agus, Arawati. 2005. The Structural Linkages between Arno. 2001. The Evolution of Developing Countries for Service Communication, Master Thesis

Busse, M. 1998. Price Competition and Advertising in the Cellular Telephone, PHD Thesis·Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Hsu, Yueh. 1983. The Use of Cellular Telephony in Taiwan, Master Thesis, Michigan State University

Heikki Karjaluoto, Jukka Pakola, Marjukka Pietilä and Rauli Svento. 2003. An Exploratory Study On Antecedents and Consequence of Moblie Phone Usage

in Finland. This paper is published in the AMA Summer Marketing Educators' Conference Proceedings (Chicago, USA), 14: 170-178.

Heikki Karjaluoto, Jari Karvonen, Manne Kesti, Timo Koivumki, Marjukka, anninen, Jukka Pakola, Annu Ristola, Jari Salo. 2005. Factors Affecting Consumer Choice of Mobile Phones: Two Studies from Finland. ***Journal of Euromarketing***; 14(3): 12-36

James, M. C. 1995.The Adaptation of Mobile Phone Michigan State University, Master Thesis.

Gabbott, M, Hogg G. 1994. Consumer Behavior &

- Services: A Review *Journal of Marketing*, 10(4): 311-324.
- Kotler, P.& Keller, K. 2006. Marketing Management: Prentice-Hall, NY, 12<sup>th</sup> edition.
- Kwon, Hysoun. 1996. Adoption of Cellular Phone Technology and Services, USA, PHD Thesis, Hawaii University.
- Liu Chu-Mei. 2002. The Effects of Promotional Activities on Brand Decision in the Cellular Telephone Industry. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 11(1): 42-51.
- Lovelock, C & Wirtz J. 2004. Service Marketing, 4<sup>th</sup> edition Pearson, UK. McCarthy J. and W. D. Perreault, Jr. Basic Marketing, 5<sup>th</sup> edition: Irwin, 37-38.
- Tannenbaum, R. 1991. Cellular Telephone: A Comparative Analysis of Adoption and Impact, Master Thesis, Carleton University, USA.
- Touret Arnault. 1996. The Evolution of Cellular Telephone in France. Master Thesis, Michigan State University.
- Zeithaml, V & Bithier M. 2000. Service Marketing: Integrating Customer Focus Across the Firm, 2nd edition, McGraw – Hill, NY.

---

# The Influence of the Promotional Mix Elements on Jordanian Consumer's Decisions in Cell Phone Service Usage: An Analytical Study

*Hani H. Al-Dmour and Muhammad T. R. Al-Shraideh*

## ABSTRACT

This research aims to identify the importance of the promotional mix factors that influence Jordanian consumer's decisions when using cell phone service in Jordan. Through studying subscription decision, subscription type choice and usage average. Then, the study provided recommendations on the method of increasing the study efficiency and capacity. The study was conducted on promotional mix factors (advertisement, publicity, public relations, personal sales and the means to boost sales) which are used by cell phone telecommunication companies to affect Jordanian consumer's behavior.

To achieve the objectives of the research, and to test its hypotheses, a convenience sample was chosen from the population, which contains 494 subscribers in Amman, and the respondent rate reached 82.33% of 600. Also, the study tool was designed and drafted accurately after returning to the previous studies' surveys in order to assure the adequacy of the survey's questions to all variables which were covered by the subjects of the study.

The study reached the conclusion that the sales promotional tools has the most important influence on the consumer's decision in choosing the service provider and usage rate in comparison with the other elements. There is a strong impact of the elements of the promotional mix combined on the subscription decision in cell phone network service, while advertisements and personal sales are less important when taken individually. But, promotional sales and public relations, both play a more important role in influencing the subscribing decisions when taken individually.

**KEYWORDS:** Promotional mix, Communications service, Sale promotion, Advertisement, Personal sales.

---

Received on 27/3/2007 and Accepted for Publication on 6/7/2008.