The Impact of Architecture in the Hospitality Industry: The Decision Choice in the Case of Cyprus Island

Giovanni Ruggieri
University of Palermo - Department of Economics
Economics and Statistics (SEAS), VialedelleScienze
Building 13 – Palermo (Italy)

Koulla Orthodoxou
Observatory of Tourism for Island Economy– OTIE
Via Emerico Amari n. 38– Palermo (Italy)

Abstract

In an increasingly competitive market, hospitality architecture design can be significant for tourism and destinations. This article addresses the role of hotel architecture in tourism destinations and the case of Cyprus Island. The tourist market is dominated by international groups and brands, which develop modern architecture and design for the hotels industry creating a new attraction based on architectural design. This paper examines the role of architecture in hospitality accommodation by considering the demand side. The survey was based on a questionnaire and applied multinomial regression models. The results show that hotel architecture impact can influence the selection of the destination for a visit in a way, but it is not the decisive criterion. A tourist destination choice depends on a bundle of factors, such as the location, budget, and facilities. Therefore, hotel architecture in Cyprus does not seem to influence the visitor's choice significantly. The building facilities and proximity to attractions are more critical factors for tourism on the island.

Keywords: tourist destination, tourism industry, investment decision, hospitality, hotel architecture, travel choice

1. Introduction

During the last decades, extensive research worked on how individuals select a destination for a visit (Kozak, 2001). Destinations embrace different characteristics, which help them distinct from other places (Mistry, 2018). According to Mistry (2018), a destination is a mixture of various attributions ranging from attractions, accommodation, and accessibility to amenities. Visiting the destination depends on tourists 'importance to those characteristics (Mistry, 2018). In his paper, Kozak (2001) also writes that several studies investigated the impact of destination attributes on tourists' intention to revisit.

Sharpley (2000) states that the qualitative features of accommodation supply directly impact tourist destinations to achieve success. He explains that a destination can generally accomplish a noticeable touristic character through buildings or public spaces interventions and architecture. Hassan (2013) claims that tourist places are likely to attract potential guests based on their appearance and construction. On the other hand, accommodation is also an essential part of the tourist experience (Goss-Turner, 1996). This last involves the behaviours and tourism activities, either from backgrounds that originated in the past or from the destination itself (Bastiaansen et al., 2019). With high knowledge access, tourists nowadays are more educated, mature, critical, and ambitious, and they are not pleased to receive or settle for sub-standard customer service (Kandampully, 1997).

Studies in tourism and destination marketing have dealt with individuals' motivation to pursue a trip and choose distinct places to travel (Battour et al., 2011). Many of these studies established over the speculation of "pull" and "push" incentives, which suggest that travelling is initiated both by pushed internal factors and pulled external factors as well (Battour et al., 2011). Dann (1977) described the individual's motivational influences as push factors. These are psychological desires which play a significant role in leading someone to pursue a tourism experience (Kim & Lee, 2002). Some examples embrace being off from personal and social responsibilities, education and dignity accomplishments, distancing from family and other people, and social acceptance (Botha, Crompton & Kim, 1999). Another example is religion, affecting the tourists' choice among alternative destinations (Weidenfeld & Ron, 2008).

On the other hand, a destination's capability to attract visitors is the pull factor (Kim & Lee, 2002). Uysal (1998) classifies this capability as the supply pulling element. Within the same line, Leiper (1979) points out those tourism destinations are short-lived places for a holiday, associated with the destination's unique features. Some examples include the natural and cultural environment, celebration moments and feasts (Kim & Lee, 2002). Another example is the destination's constructed area. Thus, according to Specht (2014), architecture can affect the tourists' choice when deciding where to travel.

Despite Kim and Lee (2002) argument, tourists have specific desires when going on holiday. Mohammad and Som (2010) write that the quality of various services offered at a destination determines the visitors' satisfaction and expectations. Thus, visitors' expectations are important and must be studied (Stevens, 1992). Many studies examined the different characteristics which attract visitors to places (Battour et al., 2011). Within the literature,various destination factors relate to tourists' satisfaction when visiting a site (Kozak, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c). Pizam et al. (1978) argue that the overall level of pride in a place can be understood if the satisfaction levels for each destination feature are determined. Similarly, Rimmington and Yüksel (1998) write that we must evaluate the visitors' impressions of the destination. Reisinger et al. (2009) highlight that it is vital to recognise the primary factors which affect the individual's decision while selecting a destination. In the same line, Kim and Brown (2012) suggested that a destination must be aware of the features which generate positive experiences for visitors because they determine whether someone will revisit the place or not. The literature has demonstrated several different opinions on destination characteristics related to visitors' satisfaction with the site (Kozak, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c). For example, some components are focused on place appeal, visual impact, and fulfilment (Kozak, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c).

Satisfaction is an essential point of view instudying tourist behaviour (Armario, 2008). Some studies look at satisfaction as a sentimental result produced while living an experience (Spreng et al., 1996). Baker and Crompton (2000) indicate the experiential character of satisfaction, meaning that satisfaction is a psychological state of an individual that can only succeed during the interaction with a place. Similarly, research has supported a "cognitive-affective approach", illustrating "satisfaction as an individual's cognitive-affective state" resulting while the individual is interacting with a place (Bosque & Martin, 2008: p. 553).

Moreover, an attribute-level concept of satisfaction has developed, within which satisfaction is observed as a reaction to attribute-level assessments (Eusébio& Vieira, 2013). Thus, evaluating satisfaction from a holiday is possible after the holiday production (Fornell, 1992) and when the visitor has completed his trip (Peterson & Wilson, 1992). Consequently, destination characteristics that affect visitor satisfaction impact the place's success. Whether a visitor was happy during his stay or not can be viewed as an indicator of success (Krishnan &Gronhaug, 1979) and a source of competitive advantage (Peters, 1994).

In this context, many researchers studied the link between visitors' fulfilment and the evaluation of destination characteristics (Eusébio and Vieira,2013). According to Eusébio and Vieira (2013), the prosperity of touristic places is related to the visitors' fulfilment from their trip, which successively affects whether they will return and promote the destination to others. Alegre and Garau (2010) examined the power of destinations' characteristics on the desire to revisit and promote the place to friends, finding a positive relationship between visitor fulfilment and the intention to review the site. For instance, research supports that when individuals have enjoyed their holiday, they are more likely to take the same holiday another time (Ross, 1993).

2. Literature Review

Architecture appears to own a fundamental role (Farajizade&Nasiri, 2009). European cities have undergone a considerable transformation because of the increasing number of visitors since the end of the 19[th]century (Fava & Rubio, 2017). Moreover, urban tourism has been growing worldwide since the end of the 20[th]century (Hospers, 2011), and many towns have transformed into places where visitors like to travel for leisure (Löfgren, 2002). Urban tourism is described as visiting cosmopolitan cities and regions (Law, 1996). The main interest is to receive pleasure and relaxation from the destination features and facilities (Page, 1995).

Consequently, the phenomenon of urban tourism has initiated a steady development process in all areas (Timothy & Ioannides, 2011). Successively, being spaces for visitor attraction, cities also enjoy the socio-economic advantages generated by those visitors who come for a holiday and stay overnight (Gratton, Shibli and Coleman, 2006). For example, Al-Saad and Ababneh (2017) write that the Arab nation is treated as one of the most industrial areas globally, hosting over half of its citizens in modern towns and showing for considerable tourism growth (Daher, 2007; Mustafa, 2010).

In the last years, city tourism has become the reason for promoting a city's image and the destination's overall competitiveness (Page & Hall, 2003). The importance of constructed environments became vital to tourism, mainly because of the economic and social contributions they generate through tourism (Scerri et al., 2016). In this context, famous architects started influencing tourism by constructing unique buildings with noticeable architectural designs, especially inthis 20thcentury. According to Godfrey and Gretzel (2016), architects like, for example, the Spanish Canadian Frank Gehry and the Spanish Santiago Calatrava designed structures admired for their appearance rather than their functionality.

Frank Gehry designed the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao, built in the 1990s, to renovate the town and solve the economic challenges that the city was facing (Scerri et al., 2016). Indeed, the benefits of the town were unpredictable (Plaza, 2007). Nowadays, the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao is accepted as the "Bilbao effect" phenomenon because linked to the revitalisation of a town that has suffered economically (Scerri et al., 2016). Another example is the Milwaukee Art Museum, Wisconsin, U.S., designed by Santiago Calatrava, which opened in 2001 to set up something exceptional rather than just extending the prevailing buildings. Further, the Sydney Opera House, Australia, is another example designed by JørnUtzon, famous worldwide, to help the city to enrich its brand image (Ockman, 2004), as it pulls thousands of visitors to Sydney who stays overnight (Scerri et al., 2016).

Architecture plays a considerable role in attracting tourists (Dargahi&Pazhouhanfar, 2014), especially in places designed by architects (Khaksar et al., 2011). Scerri et al. (2016) state that it is difficult to debate tourism without discussing architecture. Architecture's structural, functional, and aesthetic aspects can attract tourists (Scerri et al., 2016). According to Pasgaard (2013), visitors' attitudes and destination location are closely related ideas.

The building's architecture attracts visitors who successively recognise an area by these noticeable landmarks since they become visitor attractions (Scerri et al., 2016). Maitland and Newman (2008) argue that a place mainly attracts individuals due to its architectural structures, culture, and people rather than its tourist attractions. A destination's landscape and natural environment can promote the local image globally (Carmona et al., 2012).

According to Camber (2001), Carl Fisher wanted to build an "American Riviera" for wealthy Americans. Notably, the transformation of Miami Beach was a story of avant-garde architects acting in a liberal system which allowed them to develop extraordinary hotels (Pasgaard, 2013).

Singapore is another example of a successful transformation since its independence in 1965. Since 1965, Singapore has undergone a critical changein its tourism industry (Henderson, 2015). According to Diamond (2005), Singapore's success is society and destination. Henderson (2010) explains that the number of guests to Singapore has been in constant increase over the last years, followed by an increase in tourism revenues (Henderson, 2015). Extensive facilities with advanced technological features were on the leading edge of Singapore's transformation (Henderson, 2008). The all-inclusive and mixed-use facilities for accommodation, shopping, and relaxation were essential (Stevens, 2000). It is possible to argue that tourist attractions have become a critical part of the hotel (Pavia et al., 2016).

3. The Study Area

Islands worldwide based their economic and social development on tourism economies (Sharpley, 2003). Cyprus island is an independent state with over one million people, and it is considered a Mediterranean touristic destination(Andronikou, 1979, 1987; Gillmor, 1989; Ioannides, 1992 and 2002; Lockhart et al., 1993; Witt, 1991). Cyprus has benefited from tourism development (Ioannides, 1992; Ayers, 2000). Tourism holds a decisive role in the island's economy, and, in addition, the accommodation sector plays a solid decisive role in the island's tourism development (Sharpley, 2000). In the last five years, offshore funds have supported the accommodation and tourism sector on the island of Cyprus. In cooperation with Cypriot investors and companies, foreign stakeholders have envisioned creating architectural landmarks to become tourist attractions in their term. Such milestones include the Agia Napa Towers, the Paralimni Marina, the Sofitel Towers in Limassol, the Radisson Hotels in Larnaca, and the Melco Casino in Limassol under study in this work.

The main objective is to explore the role of a particular destination feature, hotel architecture, and how individuals select a destination for a visit. The aims of this article are:

    i.   The hotel architectureis the destination of choice for travellers
    ii.   The hotel'sarchitectural choice for travellers in Cyprus

A questionnaire-based survey was useful to understand the tourist demand-side attitudes towards architecture. The survey technique is considered the most appropriate for collecting factual data and comparison making (Brewster et al., 1996). A standardised questionnaire with 15 questions intended to gather demographic information (e.g., age, gender, nationality), information about the accommodation preferences (e.g., kind of place to stay overnight), and information about the accommodation architecture preferences (e.g., accommodation architectural design and usage). The questionnaire was self-administered; therefore, the respondents avoided being affected by the interviewer, so their answers were closest to their opinions (Zikmund, 1997; Mitchell & Jolley, 1992),encouraging honest answers (Mitchell & Jolley, 1992).

The survey administration was conducted at Larnaca International Airport from the end of January until early February 2020.The distribution covered all daytime slots, and the respondents were selected randomly for 205 valid responses.

The data collection was executed through a questionnaire online, generated using Qualtrics software. A pre-test of the questionnaire was conducted to ensure that the content was clear and understandable and to consider any problems in undertaking the survey. The IBM SPSS software supported the statistical analysis. For both regressions, several socio-economic variables, such as age, gender, place of residence, income, etc., were utilised as independent or explanatory variables to predict a significant relationship between the dependent and independent variables employed. All data collected for this research were anonymously analysed.

4. Data Analysis

The data analysis included 205 interviews with tourists from 31 countries (Table 1). The most significant part of the tourists come from Greece, Russia, and UK with portions of 19% (n=33), 16% (n=28) and 15% (n=26). According to the latest figures published by the statistical service of Cyprus in January 2020, total annual tourist arrivals on the island for 2019 reached 3,976,777 million. By adding the groups of tourists who visited Cyprus for business and other reasons, this expectation was confirmed: 61.2% of tourist participants visited Cyprus for reasons other than leisure. Most tourist participants visited Cyprus for the first time (54.9%, n=94).The months of January and February belong to the low season, and thus it was expected to have more tourists visiting Cyprus for business reasons rather than for leisure.

Tourist participants indicated accommodation (Table 2) and place of stay. Most overnight stays appeared in Nicosia, followed by Limassol and Larnaca,two of the most critical business centres on the island. However, most tourist participants indicated hotels because they visit Cyprus for business reasons.

The survey asked tourists to evaluate the importance of given factors when selecting accommodation. Moreover, the judgment was expressed on a Likert Scale. The factor 'architecture of the building' plays medium or high importance. The element 'building facilities' plays very high importance, whereas for the factor 'proximity to attractions', respondents replied that it plays high and very high while 'safety' is of medium significance. The factor 'the city in which it is built' has very high importance and budget. Table 3compares those factors and shows which the most important ones are. The scoring number would be the sum of these two scales. The budget and building facilities are coming next with 89% and 80% respectively, followed by proximity to attractions with 75%. The architecture of the building and safety are the factors with the lowest importance. Since most of the participants in the sample were business travellers, one might find not surprising the fact that the location received the highest score of importance.

We asked the sample to select the accommodation preferences between given hotels to understand their intentions when planning holidays. It was shown the images of several establishments, and they were asked to choose the establishment they would like to stay in. Their selection was based on the visual impact since no other information was given about the building(Table 4). The majority, 28.29%, selected the Full Moon Hotel, a unique architectural design under construction in Azerbaijan. The Melco Casino under construction in Cyprus was the second higher preference with 20.49%. The Sheraton Huzhou, a hotel located in China, was the third, 13.66%, while the City Seasons Towers Hotel located in Dubai was the fourth most preferred building. Paralimni Marina and Sofitel Towers under construction in Cyprus, the Radisson Larnaca Beach Resort located in Cyprus, Agia Napa Towers under construction in Cyprus, and Radisson Blu Business Hotel located in Cyprus received smaller portions of preference.

After the first preference process, participants received more information about the buildings, names, locations, and descriptions of facilities to re-evaluate the hotel's impact. It was a scale question too, and as a result, a variety of evaluations for each hotel appeared. Participants compared those buildings to understand which had the best visual impact (Table 5).

The Melco Casino is the most preferred by participants in the sample, with an average visual impact score of 86.7%. Sofitel Towers and Paralimni Marina come next with an average moderate visual impact of 85.0% and 81.6%, respectively, followed by Agia Napa Towers with 69.3%. Radisson Larnaca Beach Resort and Radisson Blu Business Hotel had the lowest average visual impact of 54.6% and 48.5%, respectively.

All participants in the sample were given another scenario of planning their holidays/trips, selecting the hotel with supplementary information. The hotel's choices are now based only on the sixth Cyprus Architecture establishments. Comparing the building preferences in the two scenarios, in some cases, the percentages do not significantly differ if we think proportionally, as in the case of the Melco Casino. However, in other cases, the level of preference showed a considerable change, as in the case of Agia Napa Towers. While Agia Napa Towers was in low preference in the first scenario, it appeared to have a high preference in the second scenario. Participants selected the accommodation based not only on the visual impact of the hotel but also on other factors such as the building facilities and its location. It is possible to argue that a hotel selection is based on a bundle of factors, not only on building architecture or visual impact. This argument can also explain the percentage change of the participants who made no selection (from 7.32% in the previous question now increased to 31.71%). When selecting accommodation, other factors play a role, too, such as the city of placement, building facilities and reason for travel.

A second step to verify the first research hypothesis is about the HotelArchitecture Choice for Holidays. The question analysed is the following:

Imagine that you are planning your holidays and you can choose your accommodation among the above hotels. Please complete the following statement: "I definitely want to go to the hotel_____".
The abovementioned aspects were considered dependent variables for the multinomial logistic regression model. Moreover, a 3-step procedure was applied.
Step 1: Multiple models were created by including each independent variable separately. Then, the significance level coefficient was below 0.05; the independent variable was included in a final model with multiple independent variables.
Step 2: A mixed model was created by including the significant independent variables identified in step 1.
Step 3: This mixed model was checked for significance. The not significant independent variables identified were removed from the model. In some cases, independent variables that were significant if used separately were not significant when combined with other variables. The mixed model created in step 3 is the final one.
Tables 6 and 7show several socio-economic variables, such as age, gender, place of residence, income, etc., used as independent or explanatory variables.

The following model includes the independent variables Leisure and 4-5 star. They are both significant (<0.05) and with a positive coefficient. This means that people travelling for leisure or staying in a 4–5-star hotel are more likely to select the Melco Casino Resort rather than none of the hotels. We can accept model 13 (version 2) as the final model for this analysis because all the independent variables have a significant coefficient below 0.05.
A second step to verify the second research hypothesis is about the Hotel Choice for Holidays in Cyprus Island. The question analysed is the following:

Imagine you are planning a similar vacation/trip to Cyprus with the same characteristics of the trip you just have had. Which hotel would you choose for your accommodation?

The above aspects were dependent variables for a multinomial logistic regression model. Therefore,a 3-step procedure was applied. This model, used to analyse the question,includes the independent variables Leisure and 4-5-star. They are both significant (<0.05) and with a positive coefficient. It means that people travelling for leisure or staying in a 4-5-star hotel are more likely to select the Melco Casino Resort rather than none of the hotels.

The top 3 classifications are relevant (e.g., "Absolutely Nice" + "Very Nice" + "Nice") to provide a score for each of the three attributes of Nice, Exciting and Trendy. Then, was calculated an average as an overall score of the visual impact of each hotel (Table 8). Although Sofitel Towers and Melco Casino Resort receive similar scores, the selection percentage differs. This information shows that the hotel selection is not related to the visual impact.

Agia Napa Towers andParalimni Marina, Agia Napa Towers received a much lower visual impact score. In contrast, Paralimni Marina, which received 81.6% visual impact, was selected by just 4.9% of the respondents. The reference category is "None of them", meaning that the output will indicate the likelihood of choosing each hotel instead of not selecting any of them.

5. Discussion and Conclusions

Given the growing number of urban tourists, the variety of tourism flows, and the tourism phenomenon's complexity, touristic destinations are in a battle of rivalry trying to pull in more guests. In this context, many goals are trying to invest in new accommodation facilities and unique architecture (Konrad, D., 2010) that will catch one's eye and interest in visiting the destination (Beerli, A. and Martin, J.D., 2004). According to Sainz (2012), architecture can affect an individual's understanding of a touristic place, and it has the power to "re-image a city".

Starting from this consideration, the main findings of this article are the following. The hotel choice preferences are with the hotel place (City), budget, facilities, proximity to attractions, and the hotel architecture aspects. The hotel's architecture is considered necessary with high and very high for about 47% of the participants in the sample. This percentage is considerably low regarding the other attributes. It means that the hypothesis that hotels architecture influences the selection of the destination for a visit is not verified. Consideringthosestatistics, we can argue that although architecture can influence the selection of the destination for a holiday in a way, it is not the decisive criterion. The destination choice has a bundle of factors, shaped mainly by the experience a visitor would like to have and his needs during that experience. Most participants were business travellers, and the critical attribute is the location of their business city and their budget. Business facilities assume a central role in influencing hotel choice.

A second finding of the article is related to the role of hotel architecture in selecting accommodation in Cyprus. Most of the respondents, 37%, preferred the Melco Casino Resort, whereas 32% chose none. Agia Napa Towers Hotel received about 13% and Radisson Larnaca Beach Resort 8%. By combining the choice impact with the evaluation of the building's visual impact, we can have an in-depth understanding of the concept of architecture. Therefore, hotel architecture in Cyprus does not seem to influence the visitor's choice significantly. Thus, the hypothesis is not confirmed,and building facilities and proximity to attractions are the most critical factors.

The findings also allowed drawing insights for the policymakers. Half of the tourist participants responded that 'building facilities' play an essential role in selecting accommodation. The six tourism accommodations involved in the study represent infrastructures with multiple uses. Perhaps policymakers on the island should focus the development strategy efforts on such infrastructures. Cengiz (2010) argues that identifying the attributes and reasons behind travelling to a particular destination can improve business strategies and decisions. Cyprus is an island known for its sun-sea tourism product; however, an opportunity is to reposition and differentiate the destination through consistent strategies focusing on the quality (Farmaki, A., 2012).

However, due to the participants' significant heterogeneity and the small size of the sample, it was not feasible to recognise primary relationships between visitors' segments and those hotels. Similar research can have future applications by using a larger sample size and taking place in several seasons.

Bibliography

－ Armario, E.M., 2008. Tourist satisfaction: an analysis of its antecedents.In*Universidad, Sociedad y Mercados Globales*(pp. 367-382). AsociaciónEspañola de Dirección y Economía de la Emp   resa (AEDEM).
－ Alegre, J. and Garau, J., 2010. Tourist satisfaction and dissatisfaction. *Annals of tourism research*, *37*(1), pp.52-73.
－ Al-Saad, S.A. and Ababneh, A., 2017. Concept, opportunities and challenges of urban tourism in the Arab world: Case studies of Dubai, Cairo and Amman. *Turizam: međunarodniznanstveno-stručničasopis*, *65*(3), pp.361-375.
－ Andronikou, A., 1979. Tourism in Cyprus. In E. de Kadt (ed.) Tourism: Passport to Development? (pp. 237–64) New York: OUP.
－ Andronikou, A., 1987. Development of tourism in Cyprus: Harmonisation of tourism with the environment. Nicosia: Cosmos.

− Ayers, R., 2000. Tourism as a passport to development in small states: The case of Cyprus. *International Journal of Social Economics*, *27*(2), pp.114-133.

− Baker, D.A. and Crompton, J.L., 2000. Quality, satisfaction and behavioral intentions. *Annals of tourism research*, *27*(3), pp.785-804.

− Bastiaansen, M., Lub, X.D., Mitas, O., Jung, T.H., Ascenção, M.P., Han, D.I., Moilanen, T., Smit, B. and Strijbosch, W., 2019. Emotions as core building blocks of an experience. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*.

− Battour, M., Ismail, M.N. and Battor, M., 2011. The impact of destination attributes on Muslim tourists' choice. *International Journal of tourism research*, *13*(6), pp.527- 540.

− Beerli, A. and Martin, J.D., 2004. Factors influencing destination image. *Annals of tourism research*, *31*(3), pp.657-681.

− Botha, C., Crompton, J.L. and Kim, S.S., 1999. Developing a revised competitive position for Sun/Lost city, South Africa. *Journal of Travel Research*, *37*(4), pp.341- 352.

− Bosque, I.R. and San Martín, H., 2008. Tourist satisfaction a cognitive-affective model. *Annals of tourism research*, *35*(2), pp.551-573.

− Brewster, C., Tregaskis, O., Hegewisch, A. and Mayne, L., 1996. Comparative research in human resource management: A review and an example. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *7*(3), pp.585-604.

− Camber, D., 2001. Foreword. In: Schulman, A.T. &Lejeune, J.F. (eds.) The Making of Miami Beach: 1933 – 1942. The Architecture of Lawrence Murray Dixon. Rizzoli.

− Carmona, M., Heath, T., Oc, T. and Tiesdell, S., 2012. *Public places-Urban spaces*. Routledge.

− Cengiz, E., 2010. Measuring customer satisfaction: must or not. *Journal of Naval Science and Engineering*, *6*(2), pp.76-88.

− Daher, R., 2007. Tourism, heritage, and urban transformations in Jordan and Lebanon: Emerging actors and global-local juxtapositions. *Tourism in the Middle East: Continuity, change and transformation*, pp.263-307.

− Dann, G.M., 1977. Anomie, ego-enhancement and tourism. *Annals of tourism research*, *4*(4), pp.184-194.

− Dargahi, S. and Pazhouhanfar, M., 2014. The Role of Hotel Architecture in Tourists Attraction

− Development. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences: Proceedings*, *3*(4), pp.276-288.

− Diamond, J., 2005. *Collapse: How societies choose to fail or succeed*. Penguin.

− Eusébio, C. and Vieira, A.L., 2013. Destination attributes' evaluation, satisfaction and behavioural intentions: A structural modelling approach. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, *15*(1), pp.66-80.

− Farajirad, A., &Nasiri, J., 2009. Tourism Geography of Tehran and Architecture's and Urban's Role in Developing it. *Journal of Human Geography, 2*(1), pp.73-84.

− Farmaki, A., 2012. A supply-side evaluation of coastal tourism diversification: the case of Cyprus. *Tourism Planning & Development*, *9*(2), pp.183-203.

− Fava, N. and Rubio, S.P., 2017. From Barcelona: The pearl of the Mediterranean to bye-bye Barcelona. In *Tourism in the City* (pp. 285-295). Springer, Cham.

− Fornell, C., 1992. A national customer satisfaction barometer: The Swedish experience. *Journal of marketing*, *56*(1), pp.6-21.

− Gillmor, D.A., 1989. Recent tourism development in Cyprus. *Geography*, *74*(3), pp.262-265.

− Godfrey, A. and Gretzel, U., 2016. The Use of Modern Architecture in City Marketing, *Travel and Tourism Research Association: Advancing Tourism Research Globally*, *33*.

− Goss-Turner, S., 1996. The accommodation sector. *Introduction to hospitality operations*, pp.21-35.

− Gratton, C., Shibli, S. and Coleman, R., 2006. The economic impact of major sports events: a review of ten events in the U.K. *The Sociological Review*, *54*(2_suppl), pp.41-58.

− Hassan, A., 2013. Perspective analysis and implications of visitor management–experiences from the Whitechapel Gallery, London. *Anatolia*, *24*(3), pp.410-426.

− Henderson, J., 2008. Visitor attraction development in East Asia. In *Managing Visitor Attractions* (pp. 115-127). Routledge.

− Henderson, J.C., 2010. New visitor attractions in Singapore and sustainable destination development. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, *2*(3), pp. 251- 261.

− Henderson, J.C., 2015. Destination development and transformation: 50 years of tourism after independence in Singapore. *International Journal of Tourism Cities, 1*(4), pp. 269-281.

– Ioannides, D., 1992. Tourism development agents: The Cypriot resort cycle. *Annals of tourism research*, *19*(4), pp.711-731.

– Ioannides, D., 2002. Tourism development in Mediterranean islands: opportunities and constraints. *Island tourism and sustainable development: Caribbean, Pacific and Mediterranean experiences*, pp.67-89

– Kandampully, J., 1997. Quality service in tourism. *Hospitality, tourism and leisure management*, p.5.

– Khaksar, A., Tahmouri, A. and Hoseinrazavi, S., 2011. The Reciprocal Effect of Architecture and Tourism: The Sustainability Approach. *Journal of Tourism Hospitality and Culinary Arts, 2*(3).

– Kim, A.K. and Brown, G., 2012. Understanding the relationships between perceived travel experiences, overall satisfaction, and destination loyalty. *Anatolia*, *23*(3), pp.328-347.

– Kim, S.S. and Lee, C.K., 2002. Push and pull relationships. *Annals of tourism research*, *29*(1), pp.257-260.

– Konrad, D., 2010. Collecting the icon or: Semiotics of tourism. *The tourist city Berlin: Tourism & architecture. Salenstein: Braun*, pp.227-235.

– Kozak, M., 2001a. Repeaters' behaviour at two distinct destinations. *Annals of tourism research*, *28*(3), pp.784-807.

– Kozak, M., 2001b. Comparative assessment of tourist satisfaction with destinations across two nationalities. *Tourism Management*, *22*(4), pp.391-401.

– Kozak, M., 2000c. A critical review of approaches to measure satisfaction with tourist destinations. *Tourism Analysis*, *5*(2-3), pp.191-196.

– Krishnan, S. and Gronhaug, K., 1979. A Multi Attribute Approach to Consumer Satisfaction with a Professional Program. *Refining concepts and measures of consumer satisfaction and complaining behavior*, pp.86-90.

– Law, C.M., 1996. Tourism in British provincial cities: a tale of four cities. *Tourism in British provincial cities: a tale of four cities,* pp.179-205.

– Leiper, N., 1979. The framework of tourism: Towards a definition of tourism, tourist, and the tourist industry. *Annals of tourism research*, *6*(4), pp.390-407.

– Lockhart, D.G., Drakakis-Smith, D.W. and Schembri, J. eds., 1993. *The development process in small island states* (pp. 228-246). London: Routledge.

– Löfgren, O., 2002. *On holiday: A history of vacationing* (No. 6). Univ of California Press.

– Maitland, R. and Newman, P., 2008. Visitor-host relationships: conviviality between visitors and host communities. *City Spaces–Tourist Places: Urban Tourism Precincts, New York and London: Elsevier*, pp.223-242.

– Mistry, R.B., 2018. Influence of Destination Attributes Importance to Tourists' Satisfaction-Gujarat Tourism. *Amity Journal of Management Research, 3*(1), pp.14- 26.

– Mitchell, M., & Jolley, J. (1992). Research design explained. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.

– Mohammad, B.A. and Som, A.P., 2010. An examination of satisfaction on tourism facilities and services in Jordan. *Anatolia*, *21*(2), pp.388-392.

– Mustafa, M.H., 2010. Tourism and globalisation in the Arab world. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, *1*(1).

– Ockman, J., 2004. New politics of the spectacle: "Bilbao" and the global imagination. *Architecture and tourism*, pp.227-240.

– Page, S.J., 1995. *Urban tourism*. Routledge.

– Pavia, N., Floricic, T. and Cerovic, M., 2016. Specialised hotel as a tourist attraction 1. In *Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality Management in Opatija. Biennial International Congress. Tourism & Hospitality Industry* (p. 250). University of Rijeka, Faculty of Tourism & Hospitality Management.

– Pasgaard, J.C., 2013. Tourism-dominated spaces–the strategic potential of hotel lobbies. *Athens Journal of Tourism.*

– Peters, G., 1994. *Benchmarking customer service*. Financial times/Pitman Pub.

– Peterson, R.A. and Wilson, W.R., 1992. Measuring customer satisfaction: fact and artifact. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, *20*(1), p.61.

– Pizam, A., Neumann, Y. and Reichel, A., 1978. Dimensions of tourist satisfaction with a destination area. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *5*(3), pp.314-322.

– Plaza, B., 2007. 'The Bilbao effect (Guggenheim Museum Bilbao)', *MUSEUM News*, *86*(5), pp. 1-7.

– Reisinger, Y., Mavondo, F.T. and Crotts, J.C., 2009. The importance of destination attributes: Western and Asian visitors. *Anatolia*, *20*(1), pp.236-253.

- Rimmington, M. and Yüksel, A., 1998. Tourist satisfaction and food service experience: Results and implications of an empirical investigation. *Anatolia*, *9*(1), pp.37-57.
- Ross, G.F., 1993. Destination evaluation and vacation preferences. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *20*(3), pp.477-489.
- Sainz, M.A., 2012. (Re) Building an Image for a City: Is A Landmark Enough? Bilbao and the Guggenheim Museum, 10 Years Together 1. *Journal of applied social psychology*, *42*(1), pp.100-132.
- Scerri, M., Edwards, D. and Foley, C., 2016. The value of architecture to tourism. In *Proceedings of 26th Annual CAUTHE Conference* (pp. 1-21).
- Sharpley, R., 2000. The influence of the accommodation sector on tourism development: lessons from Cyprus. *International journal of hospitality management*, *19*(3), pp.275-293.
- Sharpley, R., 2003. Tourism, modernisation and development on the island of Cyprus: Challenges and policy responses. *Journal of sustainable tourism*, *11*(2-3), pp.246-265.
- Specht, J., 2014. *Architectural tourism: building for urban travel destinations*. Springer.
- Spreng, R.A., MacKenzie, S.B. and Olshavsky, R.W., 1996. A reexamination of the determinants of consumer satisfaction. *Journal of marketing*, *60*(3), pp.15-32.
- Stevens, B.F., 1992. Price value perceptions of travelers. *Journal of travel research*, *31*(2), pp.44-48.
- Stevens, T., 2000. The future of visitor attractions. *Travel and Tourism Analyst*, *1,* pp. 61-85.
- Timothy, D. and Ioannides, D., 2011. *Tourism in the USA: A spatial and social synthesis*. Routledge.
- Uysal, M., 1998. The determinants of tourism demand. *The economic geography of the tourist industry: A supply-side analysis*, *79*.
- Weidenfeld, A.D.I. and Ron, A.S., 2008. Religious needs in the tourism industry. *Anatolia*, *19*(2), pp.357-361.
- Witt, S.F., 1991. Tourism in Cyprus: balancing the benefits and costs. *Tourism Management*, *12*(1), pp.37-45.
- Zikmund, W.G., 1997. Business Research Methods Florida.

Tables

Table. 1: sample characteristics

Item	percentage	n
Participant profile		
Male	*58.5%*	*120*
Female	*41.5%*	*85*
Age 36-45	*30%*	*62*
Age 26-35	*24%*	*48*
Age 46-55	*18%*	*37*
Full-time employed people	*78%*	*160*
University degree	*44.9%*	*92*
Master's or PhD degree	*27.8%,*	*57*
Tertiary level of education	*23.4%*	*48*
Participant's typology		
Business reasons	*35.8%*	*62*
Leisure	*38.7%*	*67*
Other reasons (conferences, educational, medical)	*25.4%,*	*44*
Length of stay		
2-3 days	*17.3%*	*30*
4 - 5 days	*15.6%,*	*27*
7 days	*24.9%*	*43*

Table. 2: sample economic and accommodation characteristics

Item	*Percentage*	*N*
Household income		
Less 1,000.00 Euro	*21.5%*	*44*
From 1,001.00 and 1,500.00 Euro	*16.1%*	*33*
From 2,501.00 and 3,000.00 Euro	*15.6%*	*32*
Over 3,000.00 Euro	*23.4%*	*48*
Expenditure		
0.00 to 50,00	*11.7%*	*20*
51.00 to 100.00 Euro	*20.5%*	*35*
151.00 to 200.00 Euro	*11.1%,*	*19*
More 200.00 Euro	*9.9%*	*17*
Accommodation type		
4-5 star hotels	*33.5%,*	*57*
1-3 star hotels	*25.3%*	*43*
Room or holiday residence	*16.5%*	*28*
Friends and Family	*5,9%*	*10*

Table 3 – Factors importance for accommodation choice

Factors when selecting accommodation	Very low	Low	Medium	High	Very High	Total	Sum High-Very High	High-Very High
The architecture of the building	13	28	50	52	28	171	80	47%
Building facilities	4	9	21	51	86	171	137	80%
Proximity to attractions	5	6	31	69	60	171	129	75%
Safety	15	35	60	33	28	171	61	36%
City in which it is built	0	1	2	15	153	171	168	98%
Budget	2	5	12	36	116	171	152	89%

Table 4 – The hotel selection

Hotels	State	n	%	Web
Full Moon	Azerbaijan	58	28.29	www.marriott.com/en-us/hotels/wuxsi-sheraton-huzhou-hot-spring-resort/
Sheraton Huzhou	China	28	13.66	www.hotelindubai.top
City Seasons towers	Dubai	20	9.76	www.cityofdreamsmed.com.cy
Melco Casino	Cyprus	42	20.49	www.sofitel.accor.com/united-kingdom/index.en.shtml
Sofitel Towers	Cyprus	10	4.88	https://paralimnimarina.com
Paralimni Marina	Cyprus	17	8.29	www.marinaayianapa.com/towers-luxury-apartments
Agia Napa Towers	Cyprus	5	2.44	www.radissonhotels.com/en-us/hotels/radisson-resort-larnaca
Radisson Larnaca Beach Resort	Cyprus	8	3.90	www.radissonhotels.com/en-
Radisson Blu Business	Cyprus	2	0.98	us/hotels/radisson-blu-larnaca

Table 5 – Hotel Architecture Visual Impact

Hotels in Cyprus	Nice	Exciting	Trendy	Sum (Nice+ Exciting+ Trendy)	Average Visual Impact
Melco Casino	89.3	84.9	85.9	260.1	86.7%
Sofitel Towers	91.7	87.8	75.6	255.1	85.0%
Paralimni Marina	90.7	82.0	72.2	244.9	81.6%
Agia Napa Towers	71.7	62.0	74.1	207.8	69.3%
Radisson Larnaca Beach Resort	76.6	44.4	42.9	163.9	54.6%
Radisson Blu Business Hotel	58.5	41.5	45.4	145.4	48.5%

Table 6 – Hotel Architecture choice decision

		B	St. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp (B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp (B)	
								Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Full Moon Hotel	Intercept	-1.474	2.294	.413	1	.520			
	Q7_recoded	1.160	.729	2.536	1	.111	3.191	.765	13.308
	Q15_fi_dummy_Single	-.114	1.262	.008	1	.928	.892	.075	10.589
Melco Casino Resort	Intercept	-1.519	2.306	.434	1	.510			
	Q7_recoded	1.265	.733	2.980	1	.084	3.544	.842	14.909
	Q15_fi_dummy_Single	-1.098	1.271	.746	1	.388	.334	.028	4.028
Agia Napa Towers	Intercept	-.152	3.084	.002	1	.961			
	Q7_recoded	.437	.999	.192	1	.662	1.548	.219	10.964
	Q15_fi_dummy_Single	-19.562	6299.740	.000	1	.998	3.193E-009	.000	.[b]
Paralimni Marina	Intercept	-2.905	2.439	1.418	1	.234			
	Q7_recoded	1.475	.752	3.844	1	.050	4.372	1.000	19.103
	Q15_fi_dummy_Single	-2.357	1.453	2.630	1	.105	.095	.005	1.635
Radisson Blu Business Hotel	Intercept	-24.270	4.044	36.019	1	.000			
	Q7_recoded	1.597	.999	2.556	1	.110	4.939	.697	34.993
	Q15_fi_dummy_Single	17.722	.000	.	1	.	49707836.48	49707836.48	49707836.48
Sofitel Towers	Intercept	-4.909	2.688	3.335	1	.068			
	Q7_recoded	1.605	.770	4.345	1	.037	4.978	1.101	22.514
	Q15_fi_dummy_Single	-.292	1.504	.038	1	.846	.746	.039	14.228
Sheraton Huzhou	Intercept	-1.278	2.342	.298	1	.585			
	Q7_recoded	1.040	.740	1.974	1	.160	2.830	.663	12.077
	Q15_fi_dummy_Single	-.765	1.300	.347	1	.556	.465	.036	5.942
City Seasons Towers Hotel	Intercept	-.113	2.342	.002	1	.961			
	Q7_recoded	.698	.747	.872	1	.351	2.009	.464	8.692
	Q15_fi_dummy_Single	-.779	1.291	.364	1	.546	.459	.037	5.765

[a] **The reference category is: None of them.**

[b] **Floating-point overflow occurred while computing this statistic. Its value is therefore sent to system missing.**

Table 7 – Architecture of Hotel choice decision when on holiday on Cyprus Island

		B	St. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp (B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp. (B)	
								Lower Bound	Upper Bound
4. Melco Casino Resort	Intercept	-.914	.276	10.940	1	.001			
	Q4dummy_Leisure	1.013	.437	5.376	1	.020	2.753	1.170	6.481
	Q6dummy_4_5star	3.135	.651	23.166	1	.000	22.991	6.414	82.416
1.Agia Napa Towers	Intercept	-2.635	.518	25.894	1	.000			
	Q4dummy_Leisure	1.626	.635	6.564	1	.010	5.082	1.465	17.629
	Q6dummy_4_5star	3.053	.808	14.263	1	.000	21.184	4.344	103.314
2.ParalimniMarina	Intercept	-3.306	.670	24.346	1	.000			
	Q4dummy_Leisure	1.933	.752	6.608	1	.010	6.910	1.583	30.171
	Q6dummy_4_5star	3.243	.895	13.124	1	.000	25.608	4.430	148.028
5.Sofitel Towers	Intercept	-4.403	1.106	15.845	1	.000			
	Q4dummy_Leisure	1.061	.977	1.179	1	.278	2.888	.426	19.598
	Q6dummy_4_5star	4.692	1.262	13.832	1	.000	109.112	9.203	1293.642
6.Radisson Larnaca Beach Resort	Intercept	-2.493	.516	23.357	1	.000			
	Q4dummy_Leisure	1.897	.648	8.576	1	.003	6.663	1.872	23.708
	Q6dummy_4_5star	1.937	.902	4.613	1	.032	6.938	1.185	40.642
ᵃThe reference category is: None of them.									

Table 8 - Average Visual Impact and Hotel Selection

Hotels	Nice	Exciting	Trendy	Average Visual Impact	Hotel Selection
Sofitel Towers	91.7	87.8	75.6	85.0%	37.1%
Agia Napa Towers	71.7	62.0	74.1	69.3%	12.7%
Radisson Larnaca Beach Resort	76.6	44.4	42.9	54.6%	8.3%
Melco Casino	89.3	84.9	85.9	86.7%	4.9%
Paralimni Marina	90.7	82.0	72.2	81.6%	4.9%
Radisson Blu Business Hotel	58.5	41.5	45.4	48.5%	0.5%
None of them					31.7%