ISSN 2228-9860 eISSN 1906-9642 CODEN: ITJEA8



International Transaction Journal of Engineering, Management, & Applied Sciences & Technologies

http://TuEngr.com



A Study of People's Hotel Accommodation and Location Preferences in the Post-COVID-19 Phase

Mohammad Saquib¹, Asif Ali², Atikah Fukaihah Amir³, Fatemeh Khozaei^{4*}, Yasser Arab⁴

- ¹Department of Architecture, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi, INDIA.
- ²Architecture Section, University Polytechnic, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, INDIA.
- ³Program of Landscape Architecture, Department of Built Environment Studies and Technology, Faculty of Architecture, Planning and Surveying, Universiti Teknologi MARA Perak Branch, Seri Iskandar, Perak, MALAYSIA.

*Corresponding Author (Tel: +968 79281881, fatemehkhozaei@du.edu.om).

Paper ID: 15A1A

Volume 15 Issue 1

Received 23 July 2021 Received in revised form 19 November 2023 Accepted 23 December 2023 Available online 15 January 2024

Keywords:

COVID-19; Preferences of Tourists; Perceived stress; Hotel room preferences; Tourism; Hotel design; Hotel close to shopping hub; Hotel with beautiful urban surrounding.

Abstract

Among the major crises caused by the novel COVID-19, the hospitality industry was one of the most severely affected. The absence of tourism as a result of the lockdown and the post-Covid crisis seriously impacted the industry. The study aimed to analyze the change in tourists' attitudes and perceptions towards their hotel accommodation and location preferences, due to their perceived stress in the post-COVID-19 lockdown. An online survey was conducted among 450 respondents to assess the change in tourists' perception and evaluate results in terms of their gender, income, and marital status. The statistical analysis was conducted in SPSS®23.0. The study's findings reveal that during the COVID crisis, natural surroundings and pleasant weather conditions were the most important factors in determining hotel room and location preferences among people. The research is based on a survey conducted during the pandemic crisis. The findings of this study may be significant to the tourism sector in understanding tourist preferences during a pandemic. The outcome of this study can enhance the awareness of the tourism industry towards the perceived stress of the tourists and their relation with the location and accommodation preferences during a pandemic crisis.

Disciplines: Architecture, Tourism, Social Sustainability.

©2024 INT TRANS J ENG MANAG SCI TECH.

Cite This Article:

Saquib, M., Ali, A., Amir, A. F., Khozaei, F., Arab, Y. (2024). A Study of People's Hotel Accommodation and Location Preferences in the Post-COVID-19 Phase. *International Transaction Journal of Engineering, Management, & Applied Sciences & Technologies, 15*(1), 15A1A, 1-12. http://TUENGR.COM/V15/15A1A.pdf DOI: 10.14456/ITJEMAST.2024.1

⁴Department of Architectural Engineering, Dhofar University, Salalah, SULTANATE of OMAN.

1 Introduction

The novel COVID-19 caused a major crisis in the hospitality industry during the lockdown and the post-Covid phase, resulting in stagnation and travel restrictions (Qiu et al., 2020; Fotiadis et al. 2021). Flight cancellations, closure of the hospitality industry, foreign embassies, and a massive number of lockdowns almost everywhere in the world were shocking and unpredictable. A large number of workers lost their jobs, and all predictions of the industry booming in 2019 faded away.

Even before the COVID-19 pandemic, tourism was impacted globally due to several events (Blake and Sinclair, 2003; McKercher and Chon, 2004; Pechlaner and Frehse, 2010). However, the early 2020 pandemic crisis of the Coronavirus created challenges worldwide in all aspects of life, from physical to mental health (Greenberg *et al.*, 2020; Kar *et al.*, 2020; Y. Wang *et al.*, 2020; Gruber *et al.*, 2021). As a result, future trends in all sectors, including tourism, have been radically altered. As unprecedented changes were witnessed in the tourism sector (Bakar and Rosbi, 2020; McKibbin and Fernando, 2020; Ranasinghe *et al.*, 2020), the crisis also opened up new opportunities for the study of tourists' behavior, technological innovation, government policies, and academic research (Assaf and Scuderi, 2020; Li *et al.*, 2020; Seyitoğlu and Ivanov, 2021).

Scholars are considering the post-crisis implications of COVID-19 in the tourism sector, (Brouder, 2020; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2020). Several scholars attempted to examine the relationship between tourism and COVID-19 and develop theoretical models (Rutynskyi and Kushniruk, 2020; Uğur and Akbıyık, 2020; Yang et al., 2020; Zenker and Kock, 2020). However, research on the implications of COVID-19 on tourists' attitudes towards their accommodation preferences is still in the initial phase, and concrete results are yet to be established. Few studies have addressed the issue of Li et al (2020) suggest that due to the increased risk of infection in international travel, tourists preferred local destinations and short trips to nature-based settings and airy destinations (Li et al., 2020). According to Hall et al. (2020), the scarcity of tourists as a result of the pandemic may be regained quickly for some destinations, while others may require a more sustainable approach to tourism. In a survey of 637 respondents in Czech, Dušek & Sagapova (2021) revealed that wellness was the top priority when choosing accommodation during the summer of 2020. M. Wang et al. (2021) conclude that after the Covid outbreak, tourists prefer to pay a higher price for a cleaner room and a more comfortable environment. Nazneen et al.(2020) highlighted tourists' emphasis on hygiene and safety in accommodation facilities. Kaushal & Srivastava (2021) recognized hygiene and sanitation as prime factors in tourists' preferences for accommodation. According to Li et al. (2020), people preferred small accommodation units due to social distancing and a lower perceived risk of infection.

While various studies identified factors contributing to satisfaction or preferences (Darini & Khozaei 2016, Khozaei et al. 2016), studies on hospitality and hotel preferences in the post-COVID-19 era require further investigations. This study, therefore, aimed to investigate the change in tourists' preferences towards their hotel accommodation and its location, in relation to their

perceived stress during the post-COVID-19 phase. As a result, the research questions posed were whether tourist preferences significantly changed as a result of the pandemic crisis and whether participants' gender, income, or marital status had any influence on their hotel room and location preferences.

2 Literature Review

Tourists choose the destination and accommodation based on their personal experiences or the services offered (Heung, 2000). The type of traveler and the circumstances also influence tourist's attitudes toward their destination choices and accommodation preferences (Bigné et al., 2008; Žabkar et al., 2010; Aruan and Felicia, 2019). Hotels are the most crucial components of the tourism industry, and without high-quality hotels, no tourist destination could have an upholding power (Attila, 2016).

Previous studies highlight factors that influence tourist accommodation preferences, such as cleanliness, safety, price and value of money, staff attitudes, services, and physical attractiveness (Chu and Choi, 2000; Raymond K.S. Chu, 2000; Lockyer, 2005; Sohrabi *et al.*, 2012). The quality of the accommodation (Chen and Yang, 2010), and room facilities have also been considered a great determinant of peoples' choice (Sohrabi *et al.*, 2012). Some other studies have canonized the role of quietness in the surrounding environment (Albaladejo and Diaz-Delfa, 2009; Edgard and Iraci, 2011). Gender preferences differ as well, for example, in the case of female travelers, security and safety become the top priority (Fawzy, 2010). The younger generation, on the other hand, prefers accommodations equipped with Wi-Fi and the latest technology (Kelley, 2012).

Location is one of the other significant factors that affect travel decisions (Lockyer, 2005; Lee and Jang, 2011; Yang et al., 2018). Mccleary et al. (1993) stressed the importance of geographic and traffic conditions of hotel locations in travelers' choice. Hotel location has proved to be one of the most essential factors influencing both business travelers' hotel choices (Chou et al., 2008), and leisure travelers (Chu and Choi, 2000). The physical and socio-cultural characteristics of the neighborhood are also a determining factor in choosing a hotel location (Adam and Amuquandoh, 2013).

3 Methodology

The study examined people's preferences to reside in various possible hotel rooms in varying locations in relation to their perceived stress during the post-Covid phase. An online survey was conducted with questions based on peoples' preferences for hotel accommodation and location and their perceived stress.

To examine the respondent's hotel room preferences, 3d visualization of five different views visible from the hotel room window was presented. These views ranged from Room#1 with a view of the most natural surroundings, to Room#5 with scenes from the most urban context. Preferences to stay in these hotel rooms were sought on a five-point Likert scale.

The study also examined the respondent's location preferences for the choice of their hotels. The seven criteria selected for location preferences were affordable neighborhood and

surroundings, beautiful natural surroundings, beautiful urban surroundings, close to shopping hubs, close to cultural and historical areas, pleasant weather, close to the centre and vibrating areas.

To study the perceived stress, seven statements administered were- I felt I was close to panic, I was unable to become enthusiastic about anything, I felt I wasn't worth much as a person, I felt that I was rather touchy, I was aware of the action of my heart in the absence of physical exertion, I felt scared without any good reason, and I felt that life was meaningless. Responses to these questions were sought on a four-point scale.

4 Analysis and Results

Out of 450 questionnaires distributed through online mode, 426 responses were received, out of which 6 were returned blank, and 420 were usable, which yielded a fairly high 98% content response rate. Data were analyzed using SPSS® Statistics 23.0 (Table 1). There was a preponderance of female participants (61.9 %) over males (38.1%). In terms of income, 52.4% of respondents were in 1-3 million range, 22.6% in 4-6 million range. Of the sample studied, 67.9 % of respondents were single, 32.1% married, and no respondents were divorced/ separated.

| Table 1: The | demographic | background | of responde | ents. |
|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------|
| Moniolala | C-4 | | E | 0/ |

| Variable | Categories | Frequency | % |
|----------------|---------------------|-----------|------|
| Gender | Male | 260 | 61.9 |
| | Female | 160 | 38.1 |
| Income | 1 to 3 million | 220 | 52.4 |
| | 4 to 6 million | 95 | 22.6 |
| | 7 to 9 million | 25 | 6.0 |
| | Above 10 million | 30 | 7.1 |
| Marital status | Single | 285 | 67.9 |
| | Married | 135 | 32.1 |
| | Divorced/ Separated | 0 | - |

The data was analyzed for tourist's preferences towards their hotel room and location, and their perceived stress during the COVID phase.

4.1 Hotel Room Preferences

In the analysis of people's preferences for their hotel rooms, Room#1 with the most natural surroundings (M= 4.06, SD=0.97) was most preferred. In a test of reliability for items relating to hotel room preferences, Cronbach's Alpha was reported as .801 which is strong and acceptable (Taber, 2018). No significant correlations were observed between people's room preferences and their perceived stress.

4.1.1 Room Preferences and Gender

Both males (M= 4.09, SD=0.92) and females (M= 4.04, SD=1.01) preferred Room#1 (Table 2), the Independent samples t-tests revealed no significant difference (0.132 < p < 0.629) among people's choice towards their hotel room preferences.

Table 2: Independent Samples Test for hotel room preferences based on gender

| | Female (n | | Male (r | =160) | _ | P | |
|--------|-----------|------|---------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | t | 1 | |
| Room#1 | 4.04 | 1.01 | 4.09 | 0.92 | -0.55 | 0.58 | |
| Room#2 | 3.63 | 0.96 | 3.70 | 0.87 | -0.7 | 0.484 | |
| Room#3 | 3.06 | 1.28 | 3.22 | 1.03 | -1.33 | 0.184 | |
| Room#4 | 2.75 | 1.35 | 2.94 | 1.17 | -1.51 | 0.132 | |
| Room#5 | 2.49 | 1.50 | 2.56 | 1.44 | -0.48 | 0.629 | |

4.1.2 Room Preferences based on Income

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of income groups of people on their room preferences (Table 3). People across all income groups significantly preferred Room#1(F (3, 361) = 5.891, p<0.01), while the other moderate preferences were for Room#2 (F (3, 346) = 11.98, p<0.01), and Room#3 (F (3, 346) = 6.8, p<0.01), all with more natural surroundings.

Table 3: Independent Samples Test for hotel room preferences based on income

| | | E | | | | |
|--------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|-------|-------|
| | 1 to 3 million | 4 to 6 million | 7 to 9 million | Above 10 million | 1' | p |
| Room#1 | 4.1 | 4.3 | 4 | 3.5 | 5.89 | 0.001 |
| Room#2 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.2 | 3 | 11.98 | 0 |
| Room#3 | 3.3 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 2.3 | 6.8 | 0 |
| Room#4 | 3 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.3 | 2.32 | 0.075 |
| Room#5 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.4 | 2 | 1.72 | 0.163 |

4.1.3 Room Preferences and Marital Status

Both single (M= 4.30, SD=0.87) and married respondents (M= 3.56, SD=1.00) preferred Room#1, though singles were more enthusiastic towards their hotel room preferences and reported higher means (Table 4). The Independent samples t-test showed a significant preference for Room#1 t(419)= 7.46, p < 0.01, and Room#5 t(419)= 2.86, p< 0.005 among single respondents, indicating their contrasting preferences for natural as well as urban settings.

Table 4: Independent Samples Test for hotel room preferences based on marital status.

| | Single (| n=285) | Married (| (n=135) | 4 | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|--------|----------|--------|-----------|---------|------|-----------------|
| | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | ι | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| Room#1 | 4.30 | 0.87 | 3.56 | 1.00 | 7.46 | 0 |
| Room#2 | 3.70 | 0.98 | 3.58 | 0.80 | 1.31 | 0.19 |
| Room#3 | 3.16 | 1.28 | 3.04 | 0.94 | 1.06 | 0.291 |
| Room#4 | 2.86 | 1.41 | 2.74 | 0.90 | 0.99 | 0.321 |
| Room#5 | 2.65 | 1.58 | 2.24 | 1.18 | 2.86 | 0.005 |

4.2 Hotel Location Preferences

In the analysis of people's preferences for their hotel location, "pleasant weather" (M=4.60, SD=0.74), and "beautiful natural surroundings" (M=4.57, SD=0.68) were most preferred, indicating people's willingness to live in natural settings. In a test of reliability for items on hotel's location preferences, Cronbach's Alpha was reported as .524 with moderate, but acceptable reliability

(Hinton et al., 2014). No significant correlations were observed between hotel location preferences and perceived stress among people.

4.2.1 Location Preferences and Gender

Females (M= 3.90, SD=1.17) significantly preferred hotel rooms with 'beautiful urban surrounding' t(419)= 3.18, p=0.002, compared to males (M= 3.56, SD=1.00) (Table 5). Females also significantly preferred (M= 4.10, SD=0.95) a hotel room 'close to shopping hub' t(419)= 8.85, p<0.01, against males (M= 3.06, SD=1.28).

 Table 5: Independent Samples Test for hotel location preferences based on gender

| | Female (n=260) | | Ma (n=1 | | t | р |
|--|----------------|------|------------|------|-------|-------|
| | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | | |
| Affordable neighborhood and surrounding | 3.46 | 1.10 | 3.50 | 0.90 | -0.39 | 0.698 |
| Beautiful natural surrounding | 4.54 | 0.72 | 4.63 | 0.60 | -1.33 | 0.186 |
| beautiful urban surrounding | 3.90 | 1.17 | 3.56 | 1.00 | 3.18 | 0.002 |
| close to shopping hubs | 4.10 | 0.95 | 3.06 | 1.28 | 8.85 | 0 |
| close to cultural and historical areas | 3.77 | 1.25 | 4.03 | 0.89 | -2.51 | 0.013 |
| pleasant weather | 4.56 | 0.72 | 4.66 | 0.78 | -1.32 | 0.187 |
| close to the city centre and vibrating areas | 3.52 | 1.27 | 3.66 | 1.32 | -1.06 | 0.289 |

4.2.2 Location Preferences based on Income

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of income groups of people on their location preferences (Table 6). People across all income groups preferred 'beautiful natural surroundings' (F (3, 366) = 1.244, p<0.294), and 'pleasant weather' (F (3, 366) = 10.257, p<0.01), while being 'close to cultural and historical areas' (F (3, 366) = 2.062, p<0.105) was the other moderate preference.

Table 6: Independent Samples Test for hotel location preferences based on income.

| | | Income | groups | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------|-------------------|------------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 to 3 million | 4 to 6 million | 7 to 9 million | Above 10 million | F | p |
| Affordable neighborhood and surrounding | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 3.5 | 0.479 | 0.70 |
| Beautiful natural surrounding | 4.6 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 4.5 | 1.244 | 0.30 |
| beautiful urban surrounding | 3.9 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.3 | 3.204 | 0.02 |
| close to shopping hubs | 3.8 | 3.7 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 11.152 | 0 |
| close to cultural and historical areas | 4.0 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 4.0 | 2.062 | 0.11 |
| pleasant weather | 4.5 | 4.7 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 10.257 | 0 |
| close to the city centre and vibrating areas | 3.5 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 4.3 | 5.129 | 0.002 |

4.2.3 Location Preferences and Marital Status

Both single and married people preferred 'beautiful natural surrounding' t(419)=1.78, p=0.076, and 'pleasant weather' t(419)=0.05, p=0.96. While single respondents significantly preferred 'beautiful urban surrounding' t(419)=5.77, p< 0.01 (Table 7).

Table 7: Independent Samples Test for hotel location preferences based on marital status

| | Single (| n=285) | Married | (n=135) | + | Sig |
|--|----------|--------|---------|---------|-------|------------|
| | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | ι | (2-tailed) |
| Affordable neighborhood and surrounding | 3.46 | 1.01 | 3.52 | 1.07 | -0.58 | 0.563 |
| Beautiful natural surrounding | 4.61 | 0.64 | 4.48 | 0.74 | 1.78 | 0.076 |
| beautiful urban surrounding | 3.98 | 1.05 | 3.33 | 1.13 | 5.77 | 0 |
| close to shopping hubs | 3.74 | 1.15 | 3.63 | 1.29 | 0.86 | 0.391 |
| close to cultural and historical areas | 3.81 | 1.21 | 4.00 | 0.95 | -1.78 | 0.076 |
| pleasant weather | 4.60 | 0.79 | 4.59 | 0.63 | 0.05 | 0.96 |
| close to the city centre and vibrating areas | 3.65 | 1.28 | 3.41 | 1.29 | 1.80 | 0.072 |

4.3 Perceived Stress

In the analysis of perceived stress, people attributed more to the phrase "I felt that I was rather touchy" (M= 1.47, SD=1.01. Cronbach's Alpha for items on perceived stress was .818 which is strong and acceptable (Taber, 2018). 14 out of 20 factors on perceived stress reported moderate positive correlations, indicating multiple signs of stress existing simultaneously among people (Table 8).

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics and Inter-Item Correlation Matrix for Perceived Stress (n=420)

| | | Mean | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---|
| 1 | I felt I was close to panic | 0.93 | 0.91 | | | | | | | |
| 2 | I was unable to become enthusiastic about anything | 0.93 | 0.91 | 1.00 | | | | | | |
| 3 | I felt I wasn't worth much as a person | 0.58 | 0.85 | .260 | .260 | | | | | |
| 4 | I felt that I was rather touchy | 1.47 | 1.01 | .500 | .500 | .334 | | | | |
| 5 | I was aware of the action of my heart in the | 1.28 | 0.95 | .334 | .334 | 037 | .345 | | | |
| | absence of physical exertion | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | I felt scared without any good reason | 0.96 | 0.98 | .559 | .559 | .229 | .495 | .415 | | |
| 7 | I felt that life was meaningless | 0.95 | 1.08 | .359 | .359 | .289 | .451 | .093 | .577 | |

4.3.1 Perceives Stress and Gender

Female respondents were significantly more stressed as compared to male respondents, in 5 out of 7 given statements (Table 9).

Table 9: Independent Samples Test towards perceives stress based on gender.

| | Female | (n=260) | Male (| (n=160) | t | p |
|---|--------|---------|--------|---------|------|-------|
| | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | | |
| I felt I was close to panic | 1.04 | 0.95 | 0.74 | 0.80 | 3.25 | 0.001 |
| I was unable to become enthusiastic about anything | 1.04 | 0.95 | 0.74 | 0.80 | 3.25 | 0.001 |
| I felt I wasn't worth much as a person | 0.64 | 0.88 | 0.48 | 0.80 | 1.79 | 0.075 |
| I felt that I was rather touchy | 1.60 | 1.04 | 1.26 | 0.92 | 3.45 | 0.001 |
| I was aware of the action of my heart in the absence of physical exertion | 1.29 | 1.06 | 1.26 | 0.72 | 0.35 | 0.729 |
| I felt scared without any good reason | 1.08 | 1.04 | 0.77 | 0.83 | 3.26 | 0.001 |
| I felt that life was meaningless | 1.12 | 1.11 | 0.68 | 0.97 | 4.09 | 0 |

4.3.2 Perceives Stress based on People's Income

In terms of their incomes, though people differed widely in their perception, most agreed with the statement 'I *felt I wasn't worth much as a person*' (F (3, 361) = 1.579, p=0.194).

4.3.3 Perceives Stress and Marital Status

In terms of their marital status (Table 10), while singles significantly felt 'touchy' t(419)= .97, p=0.03, the married ones significantly felt 'scared without any good reason' t(419)= -3.52, p=0.001.

Table 10: Independent Samples Test for perceives stress based on income.

| | | Single | | | Married | | + | Sig. |
|--|-----|--------|------|-----|---------|------|-------|------------|
| | N | Mean | SD | N | Mean | SD | ι | (2-tailed) |
| I felt I was close to panic | 275 | 0.87 | 0.83 | 135 | 1.04 | 1.04 | -1.60 | 0.111 |
| I was unable to become enthusiastic | 275 | 0.87 | 0.83 | 135 | 1.04 | 1.04 | -1.60 | 0.111 |
| about anything | | | | | | | | |
| I felt I wasn't worth much as a person | 280 | 0.55 | 0.80 | 135 | 0.63 | 0.95 | -0.80 | 0.424 |
| I felt that I was rather touchy | 280 | 1.57 | 0.96 | 135 | 1.26 | 1.08 | 2.97 | 0.003 |
| I was aware of the action of my heart | 280 | 1.29 | 0.90 | 135 | 1.26 | 1.04 | 0.25 | 0.801 |
| in the absence of physical exertion | | | | | | | | |
| I felt scared without any good reason | 280 | 0.84 | 0.88 | 135 | 1.22 | 1.10 | -3.52 | 0.001 |
| I felt that life was meaningless | 280 | 0.96 | 1.05 | 135 | 0.93 | 1.12 | 0.34 | 0.734 |

5 Discussion

5.1 Hotel Room Preferences

The study attempted to analyze the shift in people's preferences towards their hotel room and location during the COVID-19 phase. The study revealed that participants highly preferred Room#1 with the most natural setting, which is consistent with the findings of Li et al. (2020). No significant correlations were identified between people's hotel room preferences and their perceived stress. Both males and females, people across all income groups, and single and married respondents preferred Room#1. Though single respondents also showed a contrasting significant preference for Room#5 (urban setting).

5.2 Hotel Location Preferences

People across all income groups, and their marital status indicated their preference to live in natural surroundings and pleasant weather conditions while choosing their hotel location, although location preferences did not significantly correlate with people's perceived stress. Females preferred a hotel room with beautiful urban surroundings and close to a shopping hub, while single respondents also preferred beautiful urban surroundings.

5.3 Perceived Stress

More people felt touchy, indicating their emotional weakness. Strong correlations among stress-related factors indicated multiple signs of stress among people, while females felt more stressed. Irrespective of their incomes, people didn't feel their worth much as a person. While singles felt touchy, the married ones felt scared without any good reason.

6 Conclusion

The survey was performed during the post-Covid phase on tourist preferences for hotel accommodation and location. The majority of the people preferred Room#1 for its natural

surroundings, though single respondents also preferred Room#5 for its urban setting. People favoured natural surroundings and pleasant weather conditions for considering hotel locations. Females and singles preferred beautiful urban surroundings, though females additionally preferred locations close to shopping hubs.

The findings reveal that during covid crisis, natural surroundings and pleasant weather conditions were the most important factors in determining hotel room and location preferences among people. This could be due to the fact that, despite their desire to go out of their homes, people chose to remain in isolated locations with more nature and away from people in order to avoid infection.

7 Availability of Data and Material

Data can be made available by contacting the corresponding author.

8 References

- Adam, I. and Amuquandoh, F. E. (2013). Dimensions of hotel location in the Kumasi Metropolis, Ghana. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 8. DOI: 10.1016/j.tmp.2013.05.003.
- Albaladejo, I. P. and Diaz-Delfa, M. T. (2009). The effects of motivations to go to the country on rural accommodation choice: A hybrid discrete choice model. *TOURISM ECONOMICS*. DOI: 10.1177/1354816620912062.
- Aruan, D. T. H. and Felicia, F. (2019). Factors influencing travelers' behavioral intentions to use P2P accommodation based on trading activity: Airbnb vs Couchsurfing. *International journal of culture, tourism and hospitality Research*.
- Assaf, A. and Scuderi, R. (2020). COVID-19 and the recovery of the tourism industry. SAGE UK: England.
- Attila, A. T. (2016). The impact of the hotel industry on the competitiveness of tourism destinations in Hungary. *Journal of Competitiveness*, 8(4), p. 85.
- Bakar, N. A. and Rosbi, S. (2020). Effect of Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) to tourism industry. *International Journal of Advanced Engineering Research and Science*, 7(4), pp. 189–193.
- Bigné, J. E., Mattila, A. S. and Andreu, L. (2008). The impact of experiential consumption cognitions and emotions on behavioral intentions. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 22(4). doi: 10.1108/08876040810881704.
- Blake, A. and Sinclair, M. T. (2003). Tourism crisis management: US response to September 11. *Annals of tourism research*, 30(4), 813–832.
- Brouder, P. (2020). Reset redux: possible evolutionary pathways towards the transformation of tourism in a COVID-19 world. *Tourism Geographies*, 22(3). DOI: 10.1080/14616688.2020.1760928.
- Chen, K.-H. and Yang, H.-Y. (2010). Appraising the economic impact of the "opening up to mainland Chinese tourist arrivals" policy on Taiwan with a tourism-CGE model. *Asia Pacific Journal of tourism research*, 15(2), 155–175.
- Chou, T. Y., Hsu, C. L. and Chen, M. C. (2008). A fuzzy multi-criteria decision model for international tourist hotels location selection. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27(2). DOI: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2007.07.029.
- Chu, R. K. S. and Choi, T. (2000) An importance-performance analysis of hotel selection factors in the Hong

- Kong hotel industry: a comparison of business and leisure travellers. *Tourism management*, 21(4), 363–377.
- Darini, M. and F. Khozaei (2016). The study of factors affecting customer satisfaction with the three-star hotels in Dubai. *International Journal of Advanced Engineering, Management & Science* 2(2): 239373.
- Dušek, R. and Sagapova, N. (2021). Effect of the COVID-19 global pandemic on tourists' preferences and marketing mix of accommodation facilities case study from Czech Republic', *SHS Web of Conferences*, 92. DOI: 10.1051/shsconf/20219201009.
- Edgard, M. M. and Iraci, de S. J. o (2011). Consumers attribute analysis of economic hotels: An exploratory study. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(21). DOI: 10.5897/ajbm10.250.
- Fawzy, A. (2010). Business travelers' accommodation selection: a comparative study of two international hotels in Cairo. *International journal of hospitality & tourism Administration*, 11(2), 138–156.
- Fotiadis, A., S. Polyzos, et al. (2021). "The good, the bad and the ugly on COVID-19 tourism recovery." *Annals of Tourism Research* 87: 103117.
- Greenberg, N. *et al.* (2020) 'Managing mental health challenges faced by healthcare workers during covid-19 pandemic', *bmj*, 368.
- Gruber, J. et al. (2021) 'Mental health and clinical psychological science in the time of COVID-19: Challenges, opportunities, and a call to action', *American Psychologist*, 76(3), 409p.
- Hall, C. M., Scott, D. and Gössling, S. (2020) 'Pandemics, transformations and tourism: be careful what you wish for', *Tourism Geographies*, 22(3), 577–598.
- Heung, V. C. S. (2000) 'Satisfaction levels of mainland Chinese travelers with Hong Kong hotel services', International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 12(5), 308–315.
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2020) 'The "war over tourism": challenges to sustainable tourism in the tourism academy after COVID-19', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29(4), 551–569.
- Hinton, P., McMurray, I. and Brownlow, C. (2014) SPSS Explained, SPSS Explained. doi: 10.4324/9781315797298.
- Kar, S. K. *et al.* (2020) 'Coping with mental health challenges during COVID-19', in *Coronavirus disease* 2019 (COVID-19). Springer, 199–213.
- Kaushal, V. and Srivastava, S. (2021) 'Hospitality and tourism industry amid COVID-19 pandemic: Perspectives on challenges and learnings from India', *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 92, p. 102707.
- Kelley, B. (2012) American Generation Y and the hotel of 2030, UNLV Thesis. University of Nevada.
- Khozaei, F., G. Nazem, et al. (2016). "Factors predicting travelers' satisfaction of three to five star hotels in Asia, an online review." International Journal of Research in Tourism and Hospitality 2(2): 30-41.
- Kock, F. et al. (2020) 'Understanding the COVID-19 tourist psyche: The evolutionary tourism paradigm', *Annals of tourism research*, 85, p. 103053.
- Lee, S. K. and Jang, S. C. (2011) 'Room rates of U.S. airport hotels: Examining the dual effects of proximities', *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(2). doi: 10.1177/0047287510362778.
- Li, Z. et al. (2020) 'Seeing the invisible hand: Underlying effects of COVID-19 on tourists' behavioral

- patterns', Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 18, p. 100502.
- Liu, L. *et al.* (2015) 'Why Dwell in a Hutongtel? Tourist Accommodation Preferences and Guest Segmentation for Beijing Hutongtels', *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 17(2), 171–184. doi: 10.1002/jtr.1975.
- Lockyer, T. (2005). Understanding the dynamics of the hotel accommodation purchase decision. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 17(6). doi: 10.1108/09596110510612121.
- Mccleary, K. W., Weaver, P. A. and Hutchinson, J. C. (1993) 'Hotel Selection Factors as They Relate to Business Travel Situations', *Journal of Travel Research*, 32(2). doi: 10.1177/004728759303200206.
- McKercher, B. and Chon, K. (2004) 'The over-reaction to SARS and the collapse of Asian tourism', *Annals of tourism research*, 31(3), p. 716.
- McKibbin, W. and Fernando, R. (2020) 'The economic impact of COVID-19', *Economics in the Time of COVID-19*, 45(10.1162).
- Nazneen, S., Hong, X. and Ud Din, N. (2020) 'COVID-19 crises and tourist travel risk perceptions', *Available at SSRN 3592321*.
- Pechlaner, H. and Frehse, J. (2010) 'Financial crisis and tourism', in *Trends and Issues in Global Tourism* 2010. Springer, 27–38.
- Qiu, R. T. R., J. Park, et al. (2020). "Social costs of tourism during the COVID-19 pandemic." *Annals of Tourism Research* 84: 102994.
- Ranasinghe, R. et al. (2020) 'Tourism after corona: Impacts of COVID 19 pandemic and way forward for tourism, hotel and mice industry in Sri Lanka', Hotel and Mice Industry in Sri Lanka (April 22, 2020).
- Raymond K.S. Chu, T. C. (2000) 'An importance-performance analysis of hotel selection factors in the Hong Kong hotel industry: A comparison of business and leisure travellers', *Tourism Management*, 21(4), 363–377.
- Rutynskyi, M. and Kushniruk, H. (2020) 'The impact of quarantine due to COVID-19 pandemic on the tourism industry in Lviv (Ukraine)', *Problems and perspectives in management*, 18(2), p. 194.
- Seyitoğlu, F. and Ivanov, S. (2021) 'Service robots as a tool for physical distancing in tourism', *Current issues in tourism*, 24(12), 1631–1634.
- Sohrabi, B. et al. (2012) 'An exploratory analysis of hotel selection factors: A comprehensive survey of Tehran hotels', *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31(1), 96–106.
- Taber, K. S. (2018) 'The Use of Cronbach's Alpha When Developing and Reporting Research Instruments in Science Education', *Research in Science Education*, 48(6), 1273–1296. DOI: 10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2.
- Uğur, N. G. and Akbıyık, A. (2020) 'Impacts of COVID-19 on global tourism industry: A cross-regional comparison', *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 36, p. 100744.
- Wang, L. *et al.* (2020) 'The differences in hotel selection among various types of travellers: A comparative analysis with a useful bounded rationality behavioural decision support model', *Tourism Management*, 76, p. 103961.
- Wang, M. *et al.* (2021) 'Chinese residents' preferences and consuming intentions for hotels after COVID-19 pandemic: a theory of planned behaviour approach', *Anatolia*, 32(1), 132–135.

- Wang, Y. et al. (2020) 'Health care and mental health challenges for transgender individuals during the COVID-19 pandemic', *The Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology*, 8(7), 564–565.
- Yang, Y., Mao, Z. and Tang, J. (2018) 'Understanding Guest Satisfaction with Urban Hotel Location', Journal of Travel Research, 57(2). doi: 10.1177/0047287517691153.
- Yang, Y., Zhang, H. and Chen, X. (2020) 'Coronavirus pandemic and tourism: Dynamic stochastic general equilibrium modeling of infectious disease outbreak', *Annals of tourism research*, 83, p. 102913.
- Žabkar, V., Brenčič, M. M. and Dmitrović, T. (2010) 'Modelling perceived quality, visitor satisfaction and behavioural intentions at the destination level', *Tourism management*, 31(4), 537–546.
- Zenker, S. and Kock, F. (2020) 'The coronavirus pandemic–A critical discussion of a tourism research agenda', *Tourism management*, 81, p. 104164.



Dr. Mohammad Saquib is an Associate Professor at Department of Architecture, Faculty of Architecture & Ekistics, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi, India. His key research interests include Architectural Research, Architecture Education, Public Interest Design, Social Sustainability, and Architectural History.



Dr. Asif Ali is an Associate Professor at Architecture Section, University Polytechnic, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, India. He got his PhD degree in Architecture from School of Housing, Building & Planning, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia. His research focuses on Architecture, Architectural history, and Building Sciences.



Dr. Atikah Fukaihah Amir is a Program Coordinator of Landscape Architecture at Faculty of Architecture, Planning, and Surveying, in Universiti Teknologi MARA Perak Branch, Seri Iskandar campus, Malaysia. She obtained a PhD degree in Landscape Technology from School of Housing, Building & Planning, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia. Her research interest are Green Wall, Plants Carbon Sequestration, Plants Disease & Pest, Building Thermal Performance and Passive Design.



Dr. Fatemeh Khozaei is an Associate Professor at Department of Architectural Engineering, Dhofar University, Salala, Sultanate of Oman. She got her PhD degree in Architecture from School of Housing, Building & Planning, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia. Her research focuses on Design, Tourism, Social Sustainability, and Hospitality Design.



Dr. Yasser Arab is a an assistant professor at Department of Architectural Engineering, College of Engineering, Dhofar University, Oman. He obtained his Bachelor of Architecture from Ittihad Private University, Aleppo, Syria. He obtained his Master's and PhD in Sustainable Architecture from Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM), Penang, Malaysia. His research focused on the Environment Performance of Residential High-Rise Buildings' Façade in Malaysia. He is a Registered Architect in the Syrian Engineers Union. He is very active in research and publication, he published over 50 journal papers, book chapter and conference proceeding.