IJER © Serials Publications
13(1), 2016: 35-51
ISSN: 0972-9380

INFLUENCE OF DEMOGRAPHICS ON CONSUMERS' PERCEPTION TOWARDS EMAIL MARKETING IN OMAN: ANEMPIRICAL APPROACH

Suhail M. Ghouse* & Sarfraz Fayaz Khan*

Abstract: *The Internet has become a conjoint technology among the customers in the present digital age. Whether it is an individual customer or an organization, internet plays a key role as a facilitator to both entities. Email Marketing is one of the internet applications to the organizations in the marketing context which has uncluttered up new horizons to the marketing. Email marketing, which is now commonly a part of much broader digital marketing is well established in the developed countries and fast growing in the emerging markets with a promising future. Our study has been conducted in an emerging GCC market Oman and makes an attempt to explore the impact of demographic variables on consumer's perception towards email marketing using 'Pre-Disposition', 'Signup-Intention' and 'Initial Reaction' as the constructs for the study. As of the study revealed that people of all age and income groupshave an almost similar and positive response towards email marketing. However, the response of the people of different employment modes towards different constructs are somehow not identical and show varied response as discussed in the paper.*

Keyword: *Email, Marketing, Email Marketing, Demographics, Oman, etc.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Internet is one of the most influential inventions of the present times. It has a profound effect in almost every domain of our life. One of the key applications of internet is an email which is a simple yet very powerful tool and has become one of the most widespread forms of communication. Presently there are around 3.2 billion internet users in the world with Oman having about2 million active internet users which is 66.45% of the entire population. (International Telecommunication Union - United Nations, 2016). The marketers are always seeking new and innovative ways reaching out the masses and the email marketing is one of the highly sustainable promotional marketing tool because of its vast usage, simplicity, awareness, etc. Marketers can tap

* Assistant Professor, DMM, CCBA, Dhofar University, Sultanate of Oman, *E-mail: sghouse@du.edu.om; skhan@du.edu.om*

the diverse database of enormous strength in form ofinternetusers via various digital marketing strategies among which email marketing is the most prominent.Business organizations have found email marketing to be an effective tool as it reaches the existing as well as the future consumers in a cost and time effective way. This has resulted inconsumer's inboxes being flooded with marketing emails. The presentstudyis an attempt to explore the impact of email marketing on Omani customers'perception and their response towards it for a better understanding and strategic managerial implications.

2. EMAIL MARKETING: AN OVERVIEW

The boom of internet in the 21st century has surfaced way for various new forms of digital marketing techniques such as SMS (short message service), websites, search engines, social media and email. Email marketing is a form of digital marketing in which a commercial text or multimedia message is sent through an email to a target group of people. In general, any email sentby a business to present or prospective customers could be seen as email marketing (Jones, 2009).From a consumer's perspective, marketing email can be broadly categorized as the ones consumer has opted for by providing email address called as signup emails/permission based email and the ones where consumer's email address was shared or even sold amongst companies for marketing purpose. Companies drive various strategies to build a database of email addresses of present and future customers. One of the best strategies has been luring customers to provide their email addressesin exchange of discounts and special offers. Where companies fail in collecting email addresses by direct means, the indirect approach is adopted where prospective consumer's email address list is purchased (Priyanka, 2012).

2.1. Categories of marketing emails

Companies send different kinds of email to its present and prospective customers. Based on the functions and the purpose of the email, they are categorized as follows:

2.1.1. Email Newsletters (Opt-In / Permission Based Emails)

These are the emails which the consumers have opted for by subscribing to it. The purpose of such email newsletter is to build brand loyalty and also provide company / product updates.

2.1.2. Transactional Emails

Transactional emails are sent to individuals as a result of an action triggered by the individual. These are automated notifications such as welcome emails, shipping notices, order confirmations, password reminders, purchase receipts, etc. These emails give users a peace of mind in knowing that their transactions have been processed properly (Mailjet, 2016). These Emails also provide an opportunity to companies to include promotional messages along with transactional details.

2.1.3. Direct emails

Direct emails are sent entirely for the purpose of communicating a promotional message. These are generally sent to prospective consumers who have not registered or signed up for receiving these emails and their email address was either purchased or shared through a third party company.

3. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Email marketing has been a widely discussed and researched topic. Plenty of literature is available for review on email marketing in the international context. Email marketing is a relatively new concept in the Middle Eastern countries, especially in the suburban areas of Oman. This paper aims to fill this void by providing Omani consumer's perspective of email marketing. For the sake of this research, the following researcheswere reviewed which representstheglobal scenario on email marketing.

The companies across the world have been fairly quick to realize the potentials and benefits of digital marketing and have since long adapted to it with exponential growth in the digital marketing budget. In 2014, digital marketing was the fastest growing advertisement category in the world with 16 percent growth (Chief Marketing Officer (CMO) Council, 2015). As per the estimate of McKinsey by 2016, 168.5 billion dollars will be spent by the marketing organizations on digital marketing(McKinsey & Company, 2015). However, corporates in Oman seems to still be caged in the traditional marketing mindset. Wisdom dictates that consumer behaviors and attitudes should form the basis of marketing strategies and budget, but strangely companies in Oman contradict the market trend and continues to spend most of their marketing budget on newspapers, magazine and other print media.Despite the advent of digital media and the migration of consumers to digital platforms, in Oman, newspapers are still the most preferred means of advertisement with 85% of the marketing expenditure being spent on newspapers in 2013 (Mediate Oman, 2015). This great divide between the digital consumers and traditional marketing methods further increases the importance of this research as it seeks to explore the impact of email marketing on Omani consumers' perception and reaction towards email marketing.

Similar studies have shed much needed light on the challenges and opportunities in email marketing domain in different parts of the world.Another study revealed that contrary to popular belief of the time, consumers hold a moderately favorable view of advertising on a number of dimensions, entertainment and information being the most important (Sharon Shavitt, 1998). Other studies have also highlighted the dimensions of entertainment and information in internet based advertising and also that users are playing a highly active role on the internet and have become a part of internet by selecting, editing and controlling the information according to their preference. This high involvement is also a factor leading to higher impact and acceptance of web advertisement (Zheng Zhou, 2002). Researchers have also explored the effects of subscribed email newsletters (opt-in emails) on brand loyalty of a

multinational cosmetic brand. The results have suggested that routine emails have been instrumental in increasing consumer's loyalty towards the brand(Raulas, 2004). This research also proves that email newsletters (opt-in emails) have a higher success ratio then direct marketing emails. Similar finding were also supported by (Hsin Hsin Chang, 2013) suggested that permission based email is more effective as compared to spam email advertising. In a research on the Syrian consumers' beliefs regarding attitude and behavioral responses toward e-mail advertising, the author concluded that infotainment (entertainment and information) is the key parameter for the success of marketing emails and they positively influenced Syrian consumers. Syrian consumers reflected a positive attitude towards content- rich, colorful and entertaining emails(Mahmoud, 2015).

4. HYPOTHESIS

The following null hypotheses were formulated for the present study:

H_{01}: Significant differences do not exist between respondents of different age groups with respect to their 'Predisposition', 'Sign-up intention' and 'Reaction' towards e-mail marketing.

H_{02}: Significant differences do not exist between the respondents of different employment groups with respect to their 'Predisposition', 'Sign-up intention' and 'Reaction' towards e-mail marketing.

H_{03}: Significant differences do not exist between respondents of different income groups with respect to their 'Predisposition', 'Sign-up intention' and 'Reaction' towards e-mail marketing.

5. METHODOLOGY

5.1. Objectives

1. To study the influence of age on consumers' perceptions towards email marketing;
2. To study the influence of Income on consumers' perceptions towards email marketing;
3. To study the influence of employment type on consumers' perceptions towards email marketing.

5.2. Method of data collection and sampling

For this study, primary data was collected through online questionnaire designed using Google forms. The questionnaire was divided into two sections;the first section asked general demographic information and the second section was aimed towards gathering data about consumers' perception towards email marketing. For the second section,afive-point Likert scale was used, which rated (1)one as strongly disagree and (5)five as strongly agree.

Table 1
Constructs used in the study

Dimension	*Item Description*	*Source*
Predisposition	I enjoy receiving marketing emails I trust the information received through marketing emails	(Mahmoud, 2015)
Signup Intention	I sign up for receiving marketing email to get product related information I sign up for receiving marketing emails to avail discounts and special offers	(Ducoffe, 1996)
Initial Reaction	When I receive marketing emails, I delete them without reading When I receive marketing emails, I delete them after reading When I receive marketing emails, I report them as spam When I receive marketing emails, I read them and go to the product website for more information	Developed for this study

The statements developed for this research were meant to measure consumers 'Predisposition', 'Signup Intention' and 'Initial Reaction' toward email marketing.

Thisquestionnairelink was emailed to 150 active internet users across Oman who werecommunicated on the basis of convenience. Sample size larger than 65 and less than 500 are appropriate for most researches(Sekaran, 2000). Based on this paradigm, 100 numbers of responses, which forms more than 66% response rate, were accepted over theGoogle Forms leading to the statistical analysisof the research.

6. FINDINGS & ANALYSIS

1. Age

H_{01}:Significant differences do not exist between respondents of different age groups with respect to their 'Predisposition', 'Sign-up intention' and 'Reaction' towards e-mail marketing.

Table 2 (A, B,C)
Analysis for testing the effect of Age on predisposition

Age Groups	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*Standard Error*
20-30	32	3.7656	.71825	.12697
30-40	54	3.2963	1.26833	.17260
40-50	12	2.2500	.58387	.16855
Above 50	2	3.5000	.00000	.00000
Total	**100**	**3.3250**	**1.12451**	**.11245**

(B) : ANOVA

Pre-Disp	*Sum of Squares*	*df*	*Mean Square*	*F*	*Sig.*
Between Groups	20.186	3	6.729	6.152	.001
Within Groups	105.001	96	1.094		
Total	**125.188**	**99**			

(C): Multiple Comparisons

Pre-Disp
Tukey HSD

(I) age	*(J) age*	*Mean Difference (I-J)*	*Std. Error*	*Sig.*
20-30	30-40	.46933	.23331	.191
	40-50*	1.51562	.35402	.000
	Above 50	.26562	.76227	.985
30-40	20-30	-.46933	.23331	.191
	40-50*	1.04630	.33377	.012
	Above 50	-.20370	.75309	.993
40-50	20-30*	-1.51562	.35402	.000
	30-40*	-1.04630	.33377	.012
	Above 50	-1.25000	.79877	.403
Above 50	20-30	-.26562	.76227	.985
	30-40	.20370	.75309	.993
	40-50	1.25000	.79877	.403

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Analysis

Table 2(A) above gives the descriptive information about the different age groups, such as their weights, means, and standard deviation etc. with regard to predisposition.

Table 2(B) is the ANOVA table for this case and here the level of significance "sig" is less than 0.05, (0.001<0.05) hence the null hypothesis is rejected. It may be inferred that respondents of different age groups have different predisposition towards email marketing.

Table 2(C) describes multiple comparisons (inter group comparison) between different age groups,i.e. the comparison is made between the age group *i* with the other three groups *j*. In the first row, the level of significance between the groups 20-30 and 30-40 is 0.191 which is greater than 0.05 hence in this case it is inferred that the respondents lying in these two age groups have almost an identical predisposition towards email marketing. Similarly, the value "sig" for 20-30 and 40-50 is 0.000, which is less than 0.05, hence these two age groups are totally independent. In general, the groups marked as * are the one having "sig" value less than 0.05, which shows that the respondents of these two groups have different predisposition towards email marketing.

Table 3
Analysis of the effect of age on signup intentions

(A) Descriptives

Age Groups	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*Standard Error*
20-30	32	3.9531	.69976	.12370
30-40	54	3.5926	1.13301	.15418
40-50	12	2.2500	.65713	.18970
Above 50	2	4.0000	.00000	.00000
Total	**100**	**3.5550**	**1.07284**	**.10728**

(B) ANOVA

Signup	*Sum of Squares*	*df*	*Mean Square*	*F*	*Sig.*
Between Groups	25.981	3	8.660	9.451	.000
Within Groups	87.967	96	.916		
Total	**113.947**	**99**			

(C) Multiple Comparisons

Signup
Tukey HSD

(I) age	*(J) age*	*Mean Difference (I-J)*	*Std. Error*	*Sig.*
20-30	30-40	.36053	.21355	.335
	40-50*	1.70312	.32403	.000
	Above 50	-.04688	.69771	1.000
30-40	20-30	-.36053	.21355	.335
	40-50*	1.34259	.30550	.000
	Above 50	-.40741	.68930	.935
40-50	20-30*	-1.70312	.32403	.000
	30-40*	-1.34259	.30550	.000
	Above 50	-1.75000	.73111	.085
Above 50	20-30	.04688	.69771	1.000
	30-40	.40741	.68930	.935
	40-50	1.75000	.73111	.085

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Analysis

Table 3(A) above gives the descriptive information about the different age groups, such as their weights, means, and standard deviation etc. with regard to signup intentions.

Table 3(B) is the ANOVA table for this case and here the level of significance "sig" is less than 0.05, (0.000<0.05) hence the null hypothesis is rejected. It may be inferred that respondents of different age groups have different signup intentions towards email marketing.

Table 3(C) describes multiple comparisons (inter group comparison) between different age groups, i.e. the comparison is made between the age group *i* with the other three groups *j*. In this table, the groups marked as * are the one having "sig" value less than 0.05, which shows that the respondents of these two groups have different intentions for signup with respect to the corresponding i^{th} age group. All other groups having sig value greater than 0.05 shows that, there exists some similarity in the opinion of the respondents of these two corresponding groups.

Table 4
Analysis for testing the effect of Age on initial reaction
(A) Descriptives

Age Groups	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*Standard Error*
20-30	32	3.4531	.61052	.10793
30-40	54	3.6111	.97452	.13262
40-50	12	3.0833	.35887	.10360
Above 50	2	2.2500	.00000	.00000
Total	100	3.4700	.83581	.08358

(B) ANOVA

Initial	*Sum of Squares*	*df*	*Mean Square*	*F*	*Sig.*
Between Groups	5.855	3	1.952	2.960	.036
Within Groups	63.305	96	.659		
Total	69.160	99			

(C) Multiple Comparisons

Initial
Tukey HSD

(I) age	*(J) age*	*Mean Difference (I-J)*	*Std. Error*	*Sig.*
20-30	30-40	-.15799	.18116	.819
	40-50	.36979	.27488	.537
	Above 50	1.20312	.59188	.183
30-40	20-30	.15799	.18116	.819
	40-50	.52778	.25916	.182
	Above 50	1.36111	.58474	.099
40-50	20-30	-.36979	.27488	.537
	30-40	-.52778	.25916	.182
	Above 50	.83333	.62021	.538
Above 50	20-30	-1.20312	.59188	.183
	30-40	-1.36111	.58474	.099
	40-50	-.83333	.62021	.538

Analysis

Table 4(A) above gives the descriptive information about the different age groups, such as their weights, means, and standard deviation etc. with regard to initial reaction of the respondents towards marketing emails.

Table 4(B) is the ANOVA table for this case and here the level of significance "sig" is less than 0.05, (0.036<0.05) hence the null hypothesis is rejected. It may be inferred that respondents of different age groups have different initial reaction towards email marketing.

Table 4(C) describes multiple comparisons (inter group comparison) between different age groups, i.e. the comparison is made between the age group *i* with the other three groups *j*. In this table, the groups marked with * are the one having "sig" value less than 0.05, which shows that the respondents of these two groups have

different initial reactions toward marketing emails with respect to the corresponding i^{th} age group. All other groups having sig value greater than 0.05 shows that, there exists some similarity in the opinion of the respondents of these two corresponding groups regarding their initial reaction.

2. Employment

H_{02}:Significant differences do not exist between the respondents of different employment groups with respect to their 'Predisposition', 'Sign-up intention' and 'Reaction' towards e-mail marketing.

Table 5
Analysis for testing the effect of employment type on predisposition
(A) Descriptives

Employment type	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*Standard Error*
Govt Employed	35	3.4429	1.04861	.17725
Private	63	3.2381	1.17726	.14832
Self employed	2	4.0000	.00000	.00000
Total	100	3.3250	1.12451	.11245

(B) ANOVA

Pre-Disp	*Sum of Squares*	*df*	*Mean Square*	*F*	*Sig.*
Between Groups	1.873	2	.937	.737	.481
Within Groups	123.314	97	1.271		
Total	125.188	99			

(C) Multiple Comparisons

Pre-Disp
Tukey HSD

(I) employment	*(J) employment*	*Mean Difference (I-J)*	*Std. Error*	*Sig.*
Govt Employed	Private	.20476	.23770	.666
	Self employed	-.55714	.81973	.776
Private	Govt Employed	-.20476	.23770	.666
	Self employed	-.76190	.80983	.616
Self employed	Govt Employed	.55714	.81973	.776
	Private	.76190	.80983	.616

Table 5(A) above gives the descriptive information about the different employment groups, such as their weights, means, and standard deviation etc. with regard to predisposition.

Table 5(B) is the ANOVA table for this case and here the level of significance "sig" is greater than 0.05, (0.481>0.05) hence the null hypothesis is accepted. It may be inferred that respondents of different employment groups have almost similar predisposition.

Table 5(C) describes multiple comparisons (inter group comparison) between different employment groups, i.e. the comparison is made between the employment

group *i* with the other three groups *j*. In this table, for all the groups the "sig" value is greater than 0.05, which shows that the respondents with different employment mode have identical predisposition towards marketing emails.

Table 6
Analysis for testing the effect of employment type on signup intentions
(A) Descriptives

Employment type	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*Standard Error*
Govt Employed	35	3.6286	1.17788	.19910
Private	63	3.5000	1.03175	.12999
Self employed	2	4.0000	.00000	.00000
Total	**100**	**3.5550**	**1.07284**	**.10728**

(A) ANOVA

Signup	*Sum of Squares*	*df*	*Mean Square*	*F*	*Sig.*
Between Groups	.776	2	.388	.333	.718
Within Groups	113.171	97	1.167		
Total	**113.947**	**99**			

(B) Multiple Comparisons

Signup
Tukey HSD

(I) employment	*(J) employment*	*Mean Difference (I-J)*	*Std. Error*	*Sig.*
Govt Employ	Private	.12857	.22771	.839
	Self employed	-.37143	.78530	.884
Private	Govt Employ	-.12857	.22771	.839
	Self employed	-.50000	.77581	.796
Self employed	Govt Employ	.37143	.78530	.884
	Private	.50000	.77581	.796

Table 6(A) above gives the descriptive information about the different employment groups, such as their weights, means, and standard deviation etc. with regard to signup intentions.

Table 6(B) is the ANOVA table for this case and here the level of significance "sig" is greater than 0.05, (0.718>0.05) hence the null hypothesis is accepted. It may be inferred that respondents of different employment groups have almost similar signup intentions.

Table 6(C) describes multiple comparisons (inter group comparison) between different employment groups, i.e. the comparison is made between the employment group *i* with the other three groups *j*. In this table, for all the groups the "sig" value is greater than 0.05, which shows that the respondents with different employment mode have identical signup intentions for marketing emails.

Table 7
Analysis for testing the effect of employment type on initial reaction
(A) Descriptives

Employment type	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*Standard Error*
Govt Employed	35	3.4714	.81973	.13856
Private	63	3.4524	.85885	.10820
Self employed	2	4.0000	.00000	.00000
Total	100	3.4700	.83581	.08358

(B) ANOVA

Initial	*Sum of Squares*	*df*	*Mean Square*	*F*	*Sig.*
Between Groups	.581	2	.291	.411	.664
Within Groups	68.579	97	.707		
Total	**69.160**	**99**			

(A) Multiple Comparisons

Initial
Tukey HSD

(I) employment	*(J) employment*	*Mean Difference (I-J)*	*Std. Error*	*Sig.*
Govt Employed	Private	.01905	.17726	.994
	Self employed	-.52857	.61131	.664
Private	Govt Employed	-.01905	.17726	.994
	Self employed	-.54762	.60392	.637
Self employed	Govt Employed	.52857	.61131	.664
	Private	.54762	.60392	.637

Table 7(A) above gives the descriptive information about the different employment groups, such as their weights, means, and standard deviation etc. with regard to initial reaction of the respondents towards marketing emails.

Table 7(B) is the ANOVA table for this case and here the level of significance "sig" is greater than 0.05, (0.664>0.05) hence the null hypothesis is accepted It may be inferred that respondents of different employment groups have different initial reaction towards email marketing.

Table 7(C) describes multiple comparisons (inter group comparison) between different employment groups, i.e. the comparison is made between the employment group *i* with the other three groups *j*. In this table, for all the groups the "sig" value is greater than 0.05, which shows that the respondents with different employment mode have somehow identical initial reaction for marketing emails.

3. Income

H_{03}:Significant differences do not exist between respondents of different income groups with respect to their 'Predisposition', 'Sign-up intention' and 'Reaction' towards e-mail marketing.

Table 8
Analysis for testing the effect of income on predisposition
(A) Descriptives

Income group	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*Standard Error*
Below 500	17	2.8235	.66005	.16008
500-1000	44	3.7386	.73523	.11084
1000-1500	29	2.7241	1.36661	.25377
1500-2000	8	4.6250	.69437	.24550
Above 2000	2	2.0000	.00000	.00000
Total	**100**	**3.3250**	**1.12451**	**.11245**

(B) ANOVA

Pre-Disp	*Sum of Squares*	*df*	*Mean Square*	*F*	*Sig.*
Between Groups	39.304	4	9.826	10.869	.000
Within Groups	85.883	95	.904		
Total	**125.188**	**99**			

(C) Multiple Comparisons

Pre-Disp
Tukey HSD

(I) income	*(J) income*	*Mean Difference (I-J)*	*Std. Error*	*Sig.*
Below 500	500-1000*	-.91511	.27152	.009
	1000-1500	.09939	.29043	.997
	1500-2000*	-1.80147	.40765	.000
	Above 2000	.82353	.71077	.775
500-1000	Below 500*	.91511	.27152	.009
	1000-1500*	1.01450	.22742	.000
	1500-2000	-.88636	.36545	.117
	Above 2000	1.73864	.68743	.093
1000-1500	Below 500	-.09939	.29043	.997
	500-1000*	-1.01450	.22742	.000
	1500-2000*	-1.90086	.37971	.000
	Above 2000	.72414	.69512	.835
1500-2000	Below 500*	1.80147	.40765	.000
	500-1000	.88636	.36545	.117
	1000-1500*	1.90086	.37971	.000
	Above 2000*	2.62500	.75168	.006
Above 2000	Below 500	-.82353	.71077	.775
	500-1000	-1.73864	.68743	.093
	1000-1500	-.72414	.69512	.835
	1500-2000*	-2.62500	.75168	.006

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level. (Income in OMR)

Table 8(A) above gives the descriptive information about the different income based groups, such as their weights, means, and standard deviation etc. with regard to predisposition.

Table 8(B) is the ANOVA table for this case and here the level of significance "sig" is less than 0.05, (0.000<0.05) hence the null hypothesis is rejected. It may be inferred

that respondents of different income groups have different predisposition towards email marketing.

Table 8(C) describes multiple comparisons (inter group comparison) between different income groups, i.e. the comparison is made between the income group *i* with the other three groups *j*. In this table, the groups marked with * are the one having "sig" value less than 0.05, which shows that the respondents of these two groups have different predisposition toward marketing emails with respect to the corresponding i^{th} income group. All other groups having sig value greater than 0.05 shows that, there exists some similarity in the opinion of the respondents of these two corresponding groups regarding predisposition.

Table 9
Analysis for Testing the effect of Income on Signup Intention
(A) Descriptives

Income group	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*Standard Error*
Below 500	17	3.2353	.66421	.16109
500-1000	44	3.8750	.84993	.12813
1000-1500	29	3.0345	1.29512	.24050
1500-2000	8	4.6250	.69437	.24550
Above 2000	2	2.5000	.00000	.00000
Total	100	3.5550	1.07284	.10728

(A) ANOVA

Signup	*Sum of Squares*	*df*	*Mean Square*	*F*	*Sig.*
Between Groups	25.486	4	6.371	6.842	.000
Within Groups	88.462	95	.931		
Total	**113.948**	**99**			

(B) Multiple Comparisons

Signup Tukey HSD

(I) income	*(J) income*	*Mean Difference (I-J)*	*Std. Error*	*Sig.*
Below 500	500-1000	-.63971	.27557	.147
	1000-1500	.20081	.29476	.960
	1500-2000*	-1.38971	.41373	.010
	Above 2000	.73529	.72136	.846
500-1000	Below 500	.63971	.27557	.147
	1000-1500*	.84052	.23081	.004
	1500-2000	-.75000	.37089	.263
	Above 2000	1.37500	.69768	.288
1000-1500	Below 500	-.20081	.29476	.960
	500-1000*	-.84052	.23081	.004
	1500-2000*	-1.59052	.38537	.001
	Above 2000	.53448	.70548	.942
1500-2000	Below 500*	1.38971	.41373	.010
	500-1000	.75000	.37089	.263
	1000-1500*	1.59052	.38537	.001
	Above 2000*	2.12500	.76288	.049
Above 2000	Below 500	-.73529	.72136	.846
	500-1000	-1.37500	.69768	.288
	1000-1500	-.53448	.70548	.942
	1500-2000*	-2.12500	.76288	.049

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.(Income in OMR)

Table 9(A) above gives the descriptive information about the different income groups, such as their weights, means, and standard deviation etc. with regard to signup intentions.

Table 9(B) is the ANOVA table for this case and here the level of significance "sig" is less than 0.05, (0.000<0.05) hence the null hypothesis is rejected. It may be inferred that respondents of different income groups have different signup intentions towards email marketing.

Table 9(C) describes multiple comparisons (inter group comparison) between different income groups, i.e. the comparison is made between the income group *i* with the other three groups *j*. In this table, the groups marked as * are the one having "sig" value less than 0.05, which shows that the respondents of these two groups have different intentions for signup with respect to the corresponding i^{th} income group. All other groups having sig value greater than 0.05 shows that, there exists some similarity in the opinion of the respondents of these two corresponding groups regarding the signup intentions.

Table 10
Analysis for testing the effect of income on initial response
(A) Descriptives

Income group	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*Standard Error*
Below 500	17	2.8971	.26603	.06452
500-1000	44	3.4545	.68044	.10258
1000-1500	29	3.5603	.98574	.18305
1500-2000	8	4.6250	.69437	.24550
Above 2000	2	2.7500	.00000	.00000
Total	100	3.4700	.83581	.08358

(B) ANOVA

Initial	*Sum of Squares*	*df*	*Mean Square*	*F*	*Sig.*
Between Groups	17.537	4	4.384	8.068	.000
Within Groups	51.623	95	.543		
Total	69.160	99			

(C) Multiple Comparisons

Initial
Tukey HSD

(I) income	*(J) income*	*Mean Difference (I-J)*	*Std. Error*	*Sig.*
Below 500	500-1000	-.55749	.21051	.070
	1000-1500*	-.66329	.22517	.032
	1500-2000*	-1.72794	.31605	.000
	Above 2000	.14706	.55106	.999
500-1000	Below 500	.55749	.21051	.070
	1000-1500	-.10580	.17632	.975
	1500-2000*	-1.17045	.28333	.001
	Above 2000	.70455	.53297	.678

contd.

1000-1500	Below 500*	.66329	.22517	.032
	500-1000	.10580	.17632	.975
	1500-2000*	-1.06466	.29439	.004
	Above 2000	.81034	.53892	.563
1500-2000	Below 500*	1.72794	.31605	.000
	500-1000*	1.17045	.28333	.001
	1000-1500*	1.06466	.29439	.004
	Above 2000*	1.87500	.58278	.015
Above 2000	Below 500	-.14706	.55106	.999
	500-1000	-.70455	.53297	.678
	1000-1500	-.81034	.53892	.563
	1500-2000*	-1.87500	.58278	.015

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 10(A) above gives the descriptive information about the different income groups, such as their weights, means, and standard deviation etc. with regard to initial reaction of the respondents towards marketing emails.

Table 10(B) is the ANOVA table for this case and here the level of significance "sig" is less than 0.05, (0.036<0.05) hence the null hypothesis is rejected. It may be inferred that respondents of different income groups have different initial reaction towards email marketing.

Table 10(C) describes multiple comparisons (inter group comparison) between different income groups, i.e. the comparison is made between the income group *i* with the other three groups *j*. In this table, the groups marked with * are the one having "sig" value less than 0.05, which shows that the respondents of these two groups have different initial reactions toward marketing emails with respect to the corresponding i^{th} income group. All other groups having sig value greater than 0.05 shows that, there exists some similarity in the opinion of the respondents of these two corresponding groups regarding their initial reaction.

7. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The present study shows that the Omani respondents with different demographic variables have different opinions and views regarding the predisposition, sign-up intentions and the initial reaction towards the email marketing. As per the findings from the analysis of different age groups of the respondents, respondents are negatively predisposed towards email marketing because of their different views. However, in the multiple comparisons, the younger and the matured bracket of the respondents have identical predisposition while the younger and the older bracket have different predispositions which reflects the similarity of views according to the age groups of the respondents. The respondents of different age groups have different signup intentions towards email marketing and they also exhibit different initial reaction towards email marketing by different companies. The young and oldrespondents'results reflect different attitudes towards the email marketing, the young tend to give a positive response while the older respondents show a negative

attitude towards the email marketing.This finding is supported by the findings of (Mahmoud, 2015) according to which consumers like email ads which deliver timely, credible and content rich information.

The three different employment groups considered in the study mirrored identical responses in case of predisposition, signup and initial response towards the email marketing. They consider the email marketing as a source of information and entertainment for which they are targeted by the different marketing organizations(Mahmoud, 2015). Further, the different employed groups consider email marketing as a vital source of organizational promotion which they experience in their work and respective organizations.

In case of the different income groups, respondents have a mixed behavior in case of email marketing as the groups show similar and different predisposition, signup intention and the initial reaction towards email marketing.The results of the present research are in general concurrence with the previous researches in the area of internet advertising (Mahmoud, 2015)(Sharon Shavitt, 1998)(Zheng Zhou, 2002).

The Marketers should try to provide the right mix of 'infotainment' through emails by making them more entertaining and informative in accordance with the different age groups targeted. Suitable efforts should be made to reduce the incidences where the consumers delete the mails even without reading them or report them as spam. This could be achieved if the marketers opt for permission based emails, as some researchers have described opt-in e-mail ads as more effective than spamming, as the former sends the ads to the targeted individual instead of randomly sent(Hsin Hsin Chang, 2013).This study predicts a reasonably promising future for email marketing in Oman with respect to the different age groups and the employed as the education is highly promoted in Oman among different age groups (literacy rate being 86.9%). Email marketing is highly effective in targeting the employed class of the society. It may also be recommended to methodically design and plan for macro e-mail advertising campaigns in Oman and the GCC region to have a better view of the response towards email marketing.

References

Azeem, M., & Haq, Z. (2012), Consumers' attitudes toward commercial e-mail spamand web pop-ups: interference, perceived loss of control, and irritation. *Informationand Knowledge Management*, *2*(1), 21–34.

Chief Marketing Officer (CMO) Council. (2015), Retrieved 2016, from https:// www.cmocouncil.org: *https://www.cmocouncil.org/facts-stats-categories.php?view=all& category=marketing-spend*

Ducoffe, R. H. (1996), Advertising value and advertising on the web. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 21–35.

Hsin Hsin Chang, H. R. (2013), The determinants of consumer behavior towards email advertisement. *Emerald Insight's Internet Research*, 316 - 337.

International Telecommunication Union - United Nations. (2016, Feb 21). Retrieved Feb 21, 2016, from CT Facts and Figures – The world in 2015: http://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Statistics/Pages/facts/default.aspx

Jones, D. R. (2009), In *Understanding Digital Marketing.* London, UK & PA, USA: Kogan Page Limited.

Mahmoud, A. B. (2015), E-mail Advertising in Syria: Assessing Beliefs,Attitudes, and Behaviors. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 649-665.

Mailjet. (2016, feb 22), Retrieved feb 22, 2016, from www.mailjet.com: https://www.mailjet.com/support/what-is-a-transactional-email,18.htm

McKinsey & Company. (2015), Retrieved 2016, from McKinsey & Company Website: http://www.mckinsey.com/industries/media-and-entertainment/our-insights/the-state-of-global-media-spending

Mediate Oman. (2015), Retrieved feb 2016, from http://mediate-Oman.com/: http://mediate-oman.com/media-scene-2014-15/

Priyanka, S. (2012), A study on impact of Online Advertising on Cosnumer Behavior (with special reference to Emails). *International Journal of Engineering and Management Sciences, 3*(4), 461-465.

Raulas, M. M. (2004), The impact of e-mail marketing on brand loyalty. *Journal of Product & Brand Management, XIII*(7), 498-505.

Sanjay Hooda, S. A. (2012), consumer behaviour towards e-marketing: A study of Jaipur consumers. *Journal of Arts, Science & Commerce, III*(2).

Sekaran, U. (2000), *Research Methods for Business.* John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Sharon Shavitt, P. L. (1998), Public Attitudes towards Advertising: More Favorable Than You Might Think. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 7-22.

Zheng Zhou, Y. B. (2002), Users=Attitudes Toward Web Advertising: Effects of Internet Motivation and Internet Ability. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 71-78.