Hotel choice attributes and demographic characteristics of tourists in North Rift Region, Kenya

Thomas Billy Bor
Department of Hotel and Hospitality Management
Moi University - Kenya
Email: thomasbor2018@gmail.com

Damiannah Kieti
Department of Tourism Management
Moi University
dmanono@yahoo.com

Dorothy Jepkoech Rotich
Department of Hotel and Hospitality Management
Moi University - Kenya
djepkoech5@gmail.com
Corresponding author*

Abstract

The aim of this paper was to establish the effect of hotel choice attributes on demographic characteristics of tourists. The attributes used in this study were state of hotel facilities, helpfulness of employees, perceived value for money, perceived quality of service, accessibility of hotel and services, service delivery and physical attractiveness. The demographic characteristics in this study included gender, marital status, level of education and employment status. The study also established the significance of how previous visits made or no visit at all on the hotel choice attributes. Six hotels in three counties in Kenya (Uasin-Gishu, Elgeyo-Marakwet and Baringo) located in the North Rift region of Kenya were selected for the study. Descriptive and causal research designs were utlized in the study. The target population comprised 240 tourists who visited the hotels, out of which only 191 structured questionnaires were returned for data analysis. Simple random sampling was used to identify the respondents. An independent sample t-test was used to test the five hypotheses. The results indicate that attributes that inform hotel choice decisions seem not to depend on all demographic characteristics. Physical attractiveness is primarily considered based on marital status, repeat guests considering the accessibility of the hotel, and physical attractiveness is also considered. These are dependent on education and employment status which appear to view quality of service and delivery of the service as crucial elements in deciding where to stay.

Keywords: Attributes, Characteristics, Choice, Demographics, Hotels

Introduction

As noted by Miller (2009), consumer behaviour studies enable an understanding of why and how consumers select certain products and services over others. In addition, understanding consumer behaviour involves identifying the variety of internal and external influencing factors and problem solving processes that will affect products, brands, and services purchase decisions (Wright 2006). In essence, as argued by Millar, (2009), consumer behaviour refers to the process of acquiring and organizing information in the direction of a purchase decision and of using and evaluating products and services. Solomon *et al.* (2013) were of the opinion that people act out different roles which sometimes modify their spending decisions based on the part they play at a particular point in time. This makes consumer behaviour complex since as asserted by Wright (2006) consumer decisions are complex, and are based on complicated and intricate symbolic reasons rather than fairly straightforward rational reasons.

Knowledge on consumer behaviour is important because consumers are central within the free market system since it is the consumers through their purchasing choices who decide what goods, products, service, brands, and benefits will be offered (East 1997; Vargo & Lusch 2004; Wright 2006). Generally, the consumer behaviour process involves three main phases or stages: Pre-consumption stage, consumption stage, and post-consumption stage (Solomon *et al.*, 2013). More importantly, consumer behaviour should be seen as a process concerned with building relationships before, during and after the sale, if success is to be maintained by a company (Wright 2006).

In addition to the stages of consumer behaviour, there are three major areas of consumer decisions that further complicate an understanding of consumer behaviour (Wright 2006). Solomon *et al.*, (2013), note that consumer behaviour involves many actors since different people will be involved in the sequence of events in the consumption process. With regard to the consumer decision-making process, Wright (2006) advises that marketers should aim to understand the processes that consumers are likely to go through so that they can influence and support and offer advice at any stage.

According to Kotler (1997) it is a fact that customers make choices on the products to consume based on different attributes that best suit their needs such as value, cost, and previous satisfaction. Moreover, product attributes considered in the decision making process may be either core attributes that deliver basic benefits sought by customers, or auxiliary or peripheral attributes that provide supplementary benefits and are important for providing added-value and differentiation (Zikmund & d'Amico, 1993; Fuller, 1999).

The consumer decision-making process while choosing a hotel is influenced by important factors related to the characteristics of the hotel product, available information and individual preferences of customers. Consequently, this study focused on attributes which represent reasons for tourists' decision-making in selection of hotels within North Rift region of Kenya regarding hotel attributes sought by consumers. Hence, this study seeks to establish how hotel choice attributes can be determined by demographic characteristics of tourists and previous visits made to a destination.

Main Objective

The key objective was to ascertain if hotel choice attributes differ between gender, marital status, repeat visits made, the level of education and employment status of tourists?

Research Hypothesis

Ho_1:   There is no significant difference of hotel choice attributes between male and female gender of tourists

Ho_2:   There is no significant difference of hotel choice attributes between married and single (marital status) of tourists

$Ho3$:   There is no significant difference of hotel choice attributes between repeat visit tourists and new tourists visiting North Rift Region

$Ho4$:   There is no significant difference of hotel choice attributes between tourists with secondary education and tourists with university level of education

$Ho5$:   There is no significant difference of hotel choice attributes between employed and unemployed tourists

Literature Review

Weaver and Oppermann (2000) posit that demographic characteristics of tourists contribute to their participation in tourism activities and related engagements. The characteristics include age, gender, marital status, income and other socio-cultural attributes that can facilitate destination choice. Mitchell and Haggett (1997) opine that basic demographic variables such as age and gender can discriminate well in certain markets though they result in fairly sizeable groups. Uysal et al. (1994), in their study of Australian visitors to US National Parks and natural areas, examined demographic characteristics besides motivation and information sources used by Australian visitors and found that college graduates, professionals and high-income groups appear to have a stronger propensity to visit National Parks and natural areas.

Similarly Huang and Xiao (2000) suggest that such research is significant in that they may extend the breadth of knowledge of tourism behaviour, on the one hand, and contribute to destination management and planning, on the other. They further suggest that income also affects leisure-based tourist behaviour, especially with reference to vacation duration and accommodation services used. Ryan (2003) in discussing the economic attributes of demand for tourism has also identified that income plays a role. Impacts of socio-demographic variables have also been studied in restaurant markets.

Kivela (1997) has identified the role of age, income, and occupation in choosing restaurants and expectations. Demographic factors have also been studied in relation to Hong Kong hotel employees' choice of job-related motivators. Socio-demographic variables not only reflect holiday behaviour but also play a role in the customer complaint behaviour and service quality perceptions as noted by Mohsin (2003) and Heung and Lam (2003).

Consumer decision under the influence of various factors

Consumers' hotel choice is influenced by numerous factors which comprise dimensions associated to attributes of hotel products, hospitality activities and individual characteristics of customers. Different attributes that affect hotel choice can be analysed and may ignite customers' purchase intentions and differentiate themselves from those offered in the market by other service providers (Alpert, 1971).

Vital components that give competitive edge of a hotel are: products, quality, place, location, price, variety of products and services, image and reputation. Wuest et al. (1996) referred perceptions of hotel attributes as the scope tourists perceive the range of services as crucial and result to satisfaction of customers'. Bull (1998) posits that location is necessary to differentiate a product. Hotel branding and brand is important in creating an intangible asset of value to a hotel and according to O'Neill & Belfrage, (2005) comprises an important influence on tourists as they make choice decisions when selecting a hotel. Different attributes are complicated in nature hence requires diverse marketing activities and strategies in order to understand consumers' perceptions and expectations.

Different types of variables such as socio-demographics, behavioural characteristic, motivation and geographical factors can affect consumer choice making (Lamb et al., 2002). Socio-demographic aspects such as family, peer group, relatives, colleagues, associates etc., and other demographic factors such as age, gender, education, lifestyle, personality and income influence hotel choice making (Saha et al., 2010). However, managers accept the fact that they have some power and influence on the purchase choice decision (Kotler & Armstrong, 2001) despite the fact that marketing communication may have some influence in consumer decision-making process. Features of hotel choice include location, furniture and fittings, equipment and facilities, recommendations of

friends, personal experience, price and advertising (Wilkins (2005). This study looks at seven attributes that influence a tourist's hotel choice. The attributes include state of hotel facilities, helpfulness of employees, perceived value for money, perceived quality of service, accessibility of hotel and services, service delivery and physical attractiveness.

Methodology

Three counties located in the North Rift region of Kenya were purposively selected. The counties included Elgeyo-Marakwet, Baringo and Uasin Gishu. A descriptive and causal research design was chosen. The target population comprised tourists who visited the six selected hotels (2 from each county). Simple random sampling techniques were used in selecting the hotels and respondents whereas purposive sampling was used to select the three counties. Ethical aspects of research were considered throughout the study and consent was obtained from all participants who were not in nay way incentivized, but rather volunteered.

A sample of 240 respondents' were drawn from the six hotels, with each having a sample of 40 tourists formed the sample population. Structured questionnaires were distributed to the tourists. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze data. Descriptive statistics included mean and standard deviation while inferential statistics used independent sample t-test to compare the means of the demographic characteristics which were gender, marital status, level of education and employment status. The means of hotel choice attributes such as state of hotel facilities, helpfulness of employees, perceived value for money, perceived quality of service, accessibility of hotel and services, service delivery and physical attractiveness were also considered.

Discussion of Findings

This section will discuss tourists views on hotel choice attributes that include facilities (FA), helpful employees (HE), value for money (VM), perceived quality of service (QS), accessibility of hotel and services (AH), delivery of service (DS) and physical attractiveness (PA) and demographic characteristics that include gender, marital status, level of education and employment status. It will also consider whether a tourist is on a repeat visit or visiting for the very first time. The results are anchored on data analysed using independent sample t-test presented descriptive statistics and results of hypotheses tested.

Gender

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare hotel choice attributes and gender of tourists. As shown on tables 1a and b, there was no significant difference in the scores for male (M=3.80 - 4.69, SD=0.318 - .622) and female (M=3.81-4.61, SD=0.345-0.616). In terms of gender differences, both the male and female respondents considered the choice attributes under study as important in determining their choice of hotel.

The most important attribute was perceived value for money, followed by state of the hotel facilities, delivery of service, accessibility of hotel and services, perceived quality of service, perceived attractiveness and helpful employees.

Both gender placed value for money as the most important attribute in choosing a hotel and attractiveness of the attractions as the least important. This could imply that gender difference does not contribute when making hotel choice. Table 1b

shows the results of the independent sample t-test conditions t (189) = 0.123 – 1.406, p=0.161 – 0.902. All the p>0.05 suggest that gender does not contribute when considering hotel choice attributes in making a hotel selection.

Specifically, the results suggest that when tourists are making hotel choices based on facilities, helpfulness of employees, value for money, quality of services, accessibility of the hotel, delivery of service and accessibility of the hotel, gender does not contribute to the decisions.

Table 1a. Gender Group Statistics

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
State of hotel facilities	Male	92	4.6239	.35807	.03733
	Female	99	4.5455	.40890	.04110
Helpful employees	Male	92	3.8008	.62216	.06486
	Female	99	3.8118	.61673	.06198
Perceived value for money	Male	92	4.6957	.42553	.04437
	Female	99	4.6111	.41377	.04158
Perceived quality of service	Male	92	4.0148	.31866	.03322
	Female	99	4.0303	.34593	.03477
Accessibility of hotel and services	Male	92	4.1196	.41516	.04328
	Female	99	4.1919	.42081	.04229
Delivery of services	Male	92	4.1526	.38986	.04065
	Female	99	4.1621	.41092	.04130
Physical attractiveness and attributes	Male	92	3.8207	.47220	.04923
	Female	99	3.8485	.49721	.04997

Table 1b. Gender and Hotel Choice Attributes Independent Samples test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
State of hotel facilities	Equal variances assumed	1.801	.181	1.406	189	.161
	Equal variances not assumed			1.413	188.349	.159
Helpful employees	Equal variances assumed	.001	.969	-.123	189	.902
	Equal variances not assumed			-.123	187.723	.902
Perceived value for money	Equal variances assumed	.140	.709	1.392	189	.166
	Equal variances not assumed			1.390	187.064	.166
Perceived quality of service	Equal variances assumed	.321	.571	-.322	189	.748
	Equal variances not assumed			-.323	188.987	.747
Accessibility of hotel and services	Equal variances assumed	.003	.956	-1.195	189	.234
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.196	188.317	.233
Delivery of services	Equal variances assumed	.648	.422	-.164	189	.870
	Equal variances not assumed			-.164	188.916	.870
Physical attractiveness and attributes	Equal variances assumed	.015	.904	-.396	189	.693
	Equal variances not assumed			-.397	188.908	.692

Marital Status

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare hotel choice attributes in marital status (single and married) of tourists. As shown on tables 2a there was a significant difference in the scores for single (ranging between M=3.79-4.79, SD=0.405-0.787) and married (M=3.80- 4.60, SD=0.490-0.702). Based on the mean of both married and single, tourists seem to consider marital status when making hotel choices.

The most important attribute was perceived value for money and state of hotel facilities while the least important were helpful employees and physical attractiveness of the hotel. Table 2b shows the conditions t(189) = 0.157 (FA), 0.609 (HE), 0.573 (VM), 1.091 (QS), -0.473 (AH), -0.627 (DS) and -2.890 (PA). The pvalue=0.875(FA), 0.543(HE), 0.567(VM), 0.277(QS), 0.637(AH), 0.531(DS) and 0.004(PA). These results suggest that marital status does not determine hotel choice based on facilities, employees, value for money, quality of service, accessibility and delivery of service.

On the other hand, physical attractiveness is a crucial attribute on marital status when tourists are making hotel choices since p=0.004 which is <0.05.

Table 2a. Marital Status Group Statistics

	Marital Status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
State of hotel facilities	Single	59	4.5898	.37032	.04821
	Married	132	4.5803	.39451	.03434
Helpful employees	Single	59	3.8473	.62106	.08085
	Married	132	3.7883	.61775	.05377
Perceived value for money	Single	59	4.6780	.39131	.05094
	Married	132	4.6402	.43385	.03776
Perceived quality of service	Single	59	4.0620	.34635	.04509
	Married	132	4.0053	.32563	.02834
Accessibility of hotel and services	Single	59	4.1356	.39206	.05104
	Married	132	4.1667	.43099	.03751
Delivery of services	Single	59	4.1303	.37606	.04896
	Married	132	4.1697	.41090	.03576
Physical attractiveness and attributes	Single	59	3.6864	.46329	.06032
	Married	132	3.9015	.48030	.04180

Table 2b. Marital Status and Hotel Choice Attributes Independent Samples test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
State of hotel facilities	Equal variances assumed	.050	.823	.157	189	.875
	Equal variances not assumed			.161	118.292	.872
Helpful employees	Equal variances assumed	.121	.728	.609	189	.543
	Equal variances not assumed			.608	111.028	.544
Perceived value for money	Equal variances assumed	.797	.373	.573	189	.567
	Equal variances not assumed			.596	122.825	.552
Perceived quality of service	Equal variances assumed	.382	.537	1.091	189	.277
	Equal variances not assumed			1.065	105.585	.289
Accessibility of hotel and services	Equal variances assumed	.759	.385	-.473	189	.637
	Equal variances not assumed			-.491	121.839	.625
Delivery of services	Equal variances assumed	1.032	.311	-.627	189	.531
	Equal variances not assumed			-.649	121.141	.517
Physical attractiveness and attributes	Equal variances assumed	.147	.702	-2.890	189	.004
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.931	115.326	.004

Repeat Visit

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare hotel choice attributes in whether tourists revisited or had never visited hotels within the region. As shown on tables 3a there was a significant difference in the scores for visited (ranging between M=3.77- 4.60, SD=0.3205-0.596) and not visited (M=3.82- 4.67, SD=0.339-0.630). The most important attributes pertaining to repeat visit were perceived value for money and state of hotel facilities while the least important. Table 3b shows the conditions t(189) = 0.351 (FA), -0.506 (HE), -1.225 (VM), 0.237 (QS), 2.132 (AH), -1.112 (DS) and -0.718 (PA). The pvalue=0.726(FA), 0.613(HE), 0.222(VM), 0.813(QS), 0.034(AH), 0.268(DS) and 0.474(PA).

These results suggest that for a tourist who revisited, and those who had not visited the choice is not contributed to by hotel choice attributes based on facilities, employees, value for money, quality of service, delivery of service and physical attractiveness. However the results suggest that accessibility to hotel and its services are crucial attribute on previous visits made when tourists are making hotel choices since p=0.034 which is <0.05.

Table 3a. Repeat visit or Never Visited Group Statistics

	Ever visited	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
State of hotel facilities	Visited	65	4.5969	.35967	.04461
	Not Visited	126	4.5762	.40049	.03568
Helpful employees	Visited	65	3.7749	.59644	.07398
	Not Visited	126	3.8228	.63017	.05614
Perceived value for money	Visited	65	4.6000	.47762	.05924
	Not Visited	126	4.6786	.38711	.03449
Perceived quality of service	Visited	65	4.0308	.32013	.03971
	Not Visited	126	4.0187	.33958	.03025
Accessibility of hotel and services	Visited	65	4.2462	.39650	.04918
	Not Visited	126	4.1111	.42374	.03775
Delivery of services	Visited	65	4.1128	.35960	.04460
	Not Visited	126	4.1806	.41866	.03730
Physical attractiveness and attributes	Visited	65	3.8000	.44896	.05569
	Not Visited	126	3.8532	.50226	.04475

Table 3b. Visit and Hotel Choice Attributes Independent Samples test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
State of hotel facilities	Equal variances assumed	1.436	.232	.351	189	.726
	Equal variances not assumed			.363	142.253	.717
Helpful employees	Equal variances assumed	.708	.401	-.506	189	.613
	Equal variances not assumed			-.515	135.866	.607
Perceived value for money	Equal variances assumed	6.065	.015	-1.225	189	.222
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.146	108.355	.254
Perceived quality of service	Equal variances assumed	.227	.634	.237	189	.813
	Equal variances not assumed			.241	136.343	.810
Accessibility of hotel and services	Equal variances assumed	.060	.806	2.132	189	.034
	Equal variances not assumed			2.178	137.241	.031
Delivery of services	Equal variances assumed	4.607	.033	-1.112	189	.268
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.167	147.796	.245
Physical attractiveness and attributes	Equal variances assumed	.127	.722	-.718	189	.474
	Equal variances not assumed			-.744	142.836	.458

Level of Education

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare hotel choice attributes in the level of education (secondary and university) of the tourists. The attributes under consideration were flexibility of service, perceived political stability in the region and availability of cultural attractions. As shown on tables 4a and b, there was a significant difference in the scores for secondary education (ranging between M=3.79-4.66, SD=0.312-0.656) and university education (M=3.71- 4.63, SD=0.037-0.061). Table 4b shows the conditions t(189) = 0.197 (FA), -0.246 (HE), 0.642 (VM), 0.283 (QS), 1.328 (AH), -1.041 (DS) and 3.220 (PA). The pvalue=0.844(FA), 0.806(HE), 0.522(VM), 0.778(QS), 0.186(AH), 0.299(DS) and 0.002(PA). These results suggest that education level does not determine hotel choice based on facilities, employees, value for money, quality of service, accessibility of hotel and

delivery of service. However the results suggest that physical attractiveness is crucial with regard to level of education since p=0.002 which is <0.05.

4a. Education Level Group Statistics

	Level of Education	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
State of hotel facilities	Secondary	103	4.5883	.35846	.03532
	University	88	4.5773	.41846	.04461
Helpful employees	Secondary	103	3.7963	.65671	.06471
	University	88	3.8184	.57227	.06100
Perceived value for money	Secondary	103	4.6699	.42330	.04171
	University	88	4.6307	.41863	.04463
Perceived quality of service	Secondary	103	4.0291	.31231	.03077
	University	88	4.0155	.35593	.03794
Accessibility of hotel and services	Secondary	103	4.1942	.43854	.04321
	University	88	4.1136	.39192	.04178
Delivery of services	Secondary	103	4.1297	.38768	.03820
	University	88	4.1901	.41356	.04409
Physical attractiveness and attributes	Secondary	103	3.9369	.47320	.04663
	University	88	3.7159	.47219	.05034

Table 4b. Education Level and Hotel Choice Attributes Independent Samples test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Hotel facilities	Equal variances assumed	3.004	.085	.197	189	.844
	Equal variances not assumed			.195	172.46	.846
Helpful employees	Equal variances assumed	.916	.340	-.246	189	.806
	Equal variances not assumed			-.248	188.92	.804
Value for money	Equal variances assumed	.036	.850	.642	189	.522
	Equal variances not assumed			.642	184.98	.522
Quality of service	Equal variances assumed	.774	.380	.283	189	.778
	Equal variances not assumed			.280	174.64	.780
Accessibility	Equal variances assumed	2.261	.134	1.328	189	.186
	Equal variances not assumed			1.340	188.60	.182
Delivery of services	Equal variances assumed	1.170	.281	-1.041	189	.299
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.036	180.09	.302
Physical attractiveness	Equal variances assumed	.921	.338	3.220	189	.002
	Equal variances not assumed			3.221	184.49	.002

Employment Status

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare hotel choice attributes in employment status (employed and unemployed) of tourists. As shown on tables 5a there was a significant difference in the scores for employed (ranging between M=3.82- 4.66, SD=0.328-0.646) and unemployed (M=3.77- 4.62, SD=0.318-0.547). Table 5b shows the conditions t(189) = 1.248 (FA), 0.501 (HE), 0.621 (VM), -2.931 (QS), -1.534 (AH), -3.122 (DS) and -0.456 (PA).

The pvalue=0.213(FA), 0.617(HE), 0.535(VM), 0.004(QS), 0.127(AH), 0.002(DS) and 0.649(PA). These results suggest that employment status of a tourist does not determine hotel choice based on facilities, employees, value for money, accessibility of the hotel and physical attractiveness. However the results suggest that quality of

service (p=0.004) and delivery of service (p=002) are crucial attribute on employment status when tourists are making hotel choices since p<0.05.

Table 5a. Employment Status Group Statistics

	Employment Status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
State of hotel facilities	Employed	134	4.6060	.35451	.03063
	Unemployed	57	4.5298	.45118	.05976
Helpful employees	Employed	134	3.8211	.64658	.05586
	Unemployed	57	3.7721	.54783	.07256
Perceived value for money	Employed	134	4.6642	.43258	.03737
	Unemployed	57	4.6228	.39280	.05203
Perceived quality of service	Employed	134	3.9778	.32873	.02840
	Unemployed	57	4.1288	.31890	.04224
Accessibility of hotel and services	Employed	134	4.1269	.40059	.03461
	Unemployed	57	4.2281	.45385	.06011
Delivery of services	Employed	134	4.0999	.38960	.03366
	Unemployed	57	4.2930	.39428	.05222
Physical attractiveness and attributes	Employed	134	3.8246	.45989	.03973
	Unemployed	57	3.8596	.54079	.07163

Table 5b. Employment Status and Hotel Choice Attributes Independent Samples test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
State of hotel facilities	Equal variances assumed	5.401	.021	1.248	189	.213
	Equal variances not assumed			1.134	86.757	.260
Helpful employees	Equal variances assumed	1.455	.229	.501	189	.617
	Equal variances not assumed			.535	123.73	.593
Perceived value for money	Equal variances assumed	1.369	.243	.621	189	.535
	Equal variances not assumed			.646	115.71	.520
Perceived quality of service	Equal variances assumed	1.047	.308	-2.931	189	.004
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.967	108.71	.004
Accessibility of hotel and services	Equal variances assumed	2.148	.144	-1.534	189	.127
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.459	94.879	.148
Delivery of services	Equal variances assumed	.002	.966	-3.122	189	.002
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.107	104.58	.002
Physical attractiveness	Equal variances assumed	.986	.322	-.456	189	.649
	Equal variances not assumed			-.428	92.084	.670

Conclusion

Based on the study findings, the most important hotel choice attribute was perceived value for money, followed by state of the hotel facilities, delivery of service, accessibility of hotel and services, perceived quality of service, perceived attractiveness and helpful employees. This cuts across all the demographic characteristics considered in this study. However gender difference does not contribute at all when making hotel choices as all the results attained p>0.05 hence suggest gender does not contribute when considering hotel choice attributes in making a hotel selection.

Marital status thus seems not to be considered when making hotel choices apart from physical attractiveness, that seems a crucial attribute on marital status when tourists are making hotel choices since p=0.004 which is <0.05. With regard to tourists having visited or not, accessibility to hotel and its services are crucial attribute on previous visit when tourists are making hotel choices since p=0.034 which is <0.05. Physical attractiveness seems crucial with regard to level of

education since $p=0.002$ which is <0.05. Quality of service ($p=0.004$) and delivery of service ($p=002$) are crucial attribute on employment status when tourists are making hotel choices since $p<0.05$. Critical then are the perceptions of a customer when making a choice of hotel for a visit.

References

Alpert, M. I. (1971). Identification of determinant attributes: A comparison of models. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 8(5), 184–191.

Bell, R. A. & Morey, R. C. (1997). Are You in the Book? Hotel Attributes, Bundles and Corporate Travel Departments. *The Cornell HRA Quarterly,* 38(2), 55–61.

East, R. (1997). *Consumer Behaviour: Advances and Applications in Marketing*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.

Fuller, D.A. (1999). Sustainable marketing: Managerial-Ecological issues, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Heung, V.C.S. & Lam, T. (2003). Customer Complaint Behaviour Towards Hotel Restaurant Services. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management,* 15(5): 283-289.

Huang, A. & Xiao, H. (2000). Leisure-Based Tourist Behaviour: A Case of Changchun. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management,* 12 (3): 210-214.

Kivela, J. (1997). Restaurant Marketing: Selection and Segmentation in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management,* 9(3): 116-123.

Kotler, P. (1997). *Marketing management: Analysis, planning, implementation, and control.* (9th ed.), Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kotler, P. & Armstrong, G. (2001). *Principles of Marketing*. Upper Saddle River, Prentice Hall, New Jersey.

Lamb, C. W., Hair, J. F. & McDaniel, C. (2002). *Marketing.* USA: South Western Educational Publishing.

Millar, M. (2009). A choice model approach to business and leisure travellers' preferences for green hotel attributes. PhD Thesis. University of Nevada: Las Vegas.

Mitchell, V. W. & Haggett, S. (1997). Sun-Sign Astrology in Market Segmentation: An Empirical investigation. *Journal of Consumer Marketing,* 14(2): 113-131.

Mohsin, A. (2003). Service Quality Assessment of Restaurants in Darwin, NT Australia. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management,* 10(1): 23-34.

O'Neill, J. W. & Belfrage, E. E. (2005). A strategy for estimating identified intangible asset value: hotel affiliation contribution. *Appraisal Journal,* 73(1), 78–86.

Ryan, C. (2003). *Recreational Tourism - Demand and Impacts.* Sydney. Channel View Publications.

Saha, S., Dey, M. & Bhattacharyya, S. (2010). Factors affecting consumer buying behavior of shoes is Kolkata. *Journal of Management Research,* 4(9), 39–60.

Solomon, M.R., Russel-Bennet, R. & Previte, J. (2013). (3rd Ed). *Consumer behaviour: Buying, having, being.* New South Wales: Pearson Australian Group Pty. Ltd.

Uysal, M., Mcdonald, C. D. & Martin, B.S. (1994). Australian visitors to US National Parks and Natural Areas. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management,* 6(3): 18-24.

Vargo, S.L. & Lusch, R.F. (2004). Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. *Journal of Marketing.* 68(January 2014): 1-17.

Weaver, D. & Oppermann, M. (2000). *Tourism Management.* Brisbane. John Wiley.

Wilkins, H. C. (2005). *A structural model of satisfaction and brand attitude in hotels.* Griffith: Griffith Business School, Griffith University.

Wright, R. (2006). *Consumer behaviour.* London: Thomson Learning

Wuest, B. E. S., Tas, R. F. & Emenheiser, D. A. (1996). What do mature travellers perceive as important hotel/motel customer service? *Hospitality Research Journal,* 20(2), 77–93.

Zikmund, W.G. & d'Amico, M. (1993), *Marketing,* (4th ed.), West, St Paul, MN.