

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

SCHOOL OF HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT

A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF TRIPADVISOR REVIEWS: QUANTIFYING GUESTS'
ATTITUDES TOWARDS HOTEL ATTRIBUTES

BROOKE GATTENS
SPRING 2013

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for a baccalaureate degree
in Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Management
with honors in Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Management

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Breffni Noone
Assistant Professor
Thesis Supervisor and Honors Adviser

Andrew Mowen
Associate Professor
Thesis Faculty Reader

* Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

ABSTRACT

User-generated content on sites such as TripAdvisor has gained notable footing in the hotel industry, influencing guests' perceptions and decisions throughout the travel planning process. This study focused on one type of user-generated content, consumer reviews. The content of 3,600 consumer reviews for 120 hotels across 3 major U.S. cities was analyzed to identify the attributes most-often cited by consumers, and those most-frequency discussed in a positive, and negative, light. Differences across hotel class were also assessed. Service, Rooms, and Location emerged as the top three major themes for all hotel classes. Sub-themes such as friendliness and helpfulness of employees were ranked among top positively-mentioned attributes, while noise and shared bathrooms ranked among the top complaints. By performing such content analyses on reviews for their own properties, hoteliers can better understand the expectations and perceptions of their guests, and thus develop strategic plans to create a superior guest experience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures	iii
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
Chapter 2. Literature Review	4
2.1 Past Analyses of Guest-Defined Important Attributes in Hotels	4
2.2 Analyses of User-Generated Content and Guest Perceptions	5
2.3 Content Analyses: Quantifying Guest Perceptions Supplied in UGC	6
Chapter 3. Methodology	10
3.1 Data Source	10
3.2 Hotels Sample	10
3.3 Review Sample	12
3.4 Coding Categories	13
3.5 Coding Process	13
Chapter 4. Results	17
4.1 Overall Major Theme Frequency Rankings by Hotel Class	18
4.2 Top Mentioned “Good” Major Themes by Hotel Class	19
4.3 Top Mentioned “Bad” Major Themes by Hotel Class	19
4.4 Service: Rankings by Sub-themes and Hotel Class	20
4.5 Rooms: Rankings by Sub-themes and Hotel Class	21
4.6 Location: Rankings by Sub-themes and Hotel Class	22
4.7 Food and Beverage: Rankings by Sub-themes and Hotel Class	22
4.8 Bathroom: Rankings by Sub-themes and Hotel Class	23
4.9 General Hotel: Rankings by Sub-themes and Hotel Class	23
Chapter 5. Discussion and Conclusion	37
5.1 Top Three Major Theme Frequency Rankings and Related Sub-themes	37
5.2 Additional Major Theme and Sub-theme Rankings and Implications	41
5.3 Notable Differences in Classes of Hotels	42
5.4 Overall Implications and Conclusion	43
Appendix	45
References	50

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3-1. Hotel Sample Cities	11
Figure 3-2. Class Divisions for Analysis	11
Figure 3-3. Sample Coding	14
Figure 3-4. Sample TripAdvisor Review	15
Figure 3-5. Actual Coding	15
Figure 3-6. Additional Coding Categories	16
Figure 4-1. Overall Major Theme Frequency Rankings by Hotel Class	17
Figure 4-2. Top Mentioned “Good” Major Themes by Hotel Class.....	25
Figure 4-3. Top Mentioned “Bad” Major Themes by Hotel Class	25
Figure 4-4. Service: Rankings by Related Sub-themes and Hotel Class	26
Figure 4-5. Rooms: Rankings by Related Sub-themes and Hotel Class	28
Figure 4-6. Location: Rankings by Related Sub-themes and Hotel Class	30
Figure 4-7. Food: Rankings by Related Sub-themes and Hotel Class	31
Figure 4-8. Bathroom: Rankings by Related Sub-themes and Hotel Class	33
Figure 4-9. General Hotel: Rankings by Related Sub-themes and Hotel Class.....	35

Chapter 1

Introduction

Since the commercialization of the Internet in the mid-1990s, a paradigm shift has occurred in the form and function of customer feedback. This has particularly affected the hospitality industry, where intangible service experiences force consumers to rely on advice from others in the travel-planning process. In the past, a guest would check out of a hotel and simply relay the positive or negative details of his or her experience to close family and friends. In today's world, the ubiquity of the Internet allows that same guest to instantly post a review on user-generated review sites such as TripAdvisor, where it will be easily accessible to millions of users. In this setting, the guest's opinion will not only be far-reaching, but also widely accepted; recent surveys have shown that 70% of customers trust consumer opinions posted online (Nielsen 2009).

This notion of trustworthiness is a major contributor to the success of user-generated content (UGC) in the past decade. Previous studies have found UGC to be more credible than corporate-fueled information due to the motivations behind its creation (Dellarocas 2003). Businesses, in accordance with commonplace marketing tactics, tend to present information in a manner that downplays negative aspects and highlights those that are positive. This is of little perceived benefit to the consumer, who will undoubtedly experience both positive and negative aspects of the product or service provided regardless of what originally influenced their purchasing decisions. User-generated reviews, in turn, tend to be more consumer-oriented, offering honest evaluations of both strengths and weaknesses from first-hand experience

(Schindler and Bickart, 2012). These reviews serve dual functional purposes to their readers, acting as both credible informants and recommenders (Park, Lee, and Han, 2007).

For these reasons, UGC has gained notable footing in the hotel industry, where guests' travel experiences can be considerably affected by their hotel of choice. In the context of travel advice, the pre-purchasing decision was difficult for consumers in the past; their sources of trusted word-of-mouth information were limited to informational reference groups such as family, friends, or coworkers, who may not have had direct experience with the particular hotel or destination (Lessig and Park, 1978). A guest looking to travel to Philadelphia, for example, was constrained to the advice of peers who may have only traveled there once and could only recommend the single hotel in which they had stayed. With TripAdvisor, however, the same prospective guest today can look at reviews from hundreds of hotels in the city and read multiple accounts from a variety of peers for each property. This wide source of opinions allows consumers to engage in informed decision-making and to thereby minimize perceived risk and uncertainty (Bansal and Voyer, 2000). These advantages have made UGC vital in today's industry, where word-of-mouth referrals can account for 40% or more of a hotel's customer mix (Barsky and Frame, 2009).

Recognizing this importance, a reported 90% of hotel managers have agreed that it is important for their staff to monitor and respond to online reviews (Review Trackers, 2013). However, a recent market survey found that 85% of hotels have no guidelines for monitoring, responding to or acting on guest reviews (Barsky and Frame, 2009). The need for the development of such guidelines is apparent; guests are voluntarily offering hoteliers insights into the attributes of the service experiences that they consider to be most salient, and how they perceived those attributes during a hotel stay (Pantelidis, 2010). Studies have begun to analyze UGC for the hospitality industry, ranking important attributes based on quantitative consumer ratings (Zhang and Ye, 2011) or counts of same-word occurrences in consumer reviews (Levy,

Duan, and Boo, 2013; Pantelidis 2010). However, to date, no study has examined potential differences in the attributes that drive positive and negative consumer reviews, nor have they compared differences in these attributes and perceptions across hotels of different classes. This study seeks to address this gap in the literature by addressing the following research questions:

- 1) Which attributes of a hotel experience do guests consider salient enough to mention in online consumer reviews?
- 2) Of the attributes mentioned in consumer reviews, which are cited most-often within positive and negative reviews?
- 3) Do the attributes that are mentioned in positive and negative consumer reviews differ by hotel class?

With a fundamental understanding of the aspects of the hotel experience that are driving positive and negative consumer evaluations within their hotel class, hoteliers will be better able to shape a product and service experience that satisfies their guests. This, in theory, will allow hoteliers to improve future UGC posted for their properties, thereby attracting more guests in the future and providing them with satisfying travel experiences.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1 Past Analyses of Guest-Defined Important Attributes in Hotels

A number of studies have performed analyses to assist in identifying guest attitudes towards, and perceived importance of, service experience attributes, with one of the most established being the concept of satisfiers and dissatisfiers. A survey-based study that asked hoteliers to rank service categories in terms of how often they received compliments and complaints revealed a dissonance in guest perceptions (Cadotte and Turgeon, 1988). Specifically, guests did not seem to evaluate all attributes in the same manner; some were not salient enough to be discussed or even noticed unless they were perceived as extremely above- or below- average compared to expectations. These findings led to the development of a four-fold typology: Satisfiers, Dissatisfiers, Criticals, and Neutrals.. “Satisfiers” are defined as those variables where high performance elicits compliments, but average performance or even absence of the attribute will elicit no notable response, such as an ornate lobby. “Dissatisfiers” are the opposite, defined as variables likely to earn complaints for low performance or absence, but no notable response for average performance, such as parking availability. “Criticals” are variables able to elicit either positive or negative response, dependent on context, such as customer service. Finally, “neutrals” are those factors that do not elicit a positive or negative response, or are not perceived as important. This framework has been used in several studies following its formation as a useful identifier for areas of improvement and guidance for focused resources in hotels (Ramanathan, 2010; Roushdy, 2012).

More recent studies aimed to identify hotel attributes that create value in guests' minds. These "best functional practices" are expected to garner customer loyalty and repeat business (Dubé and Renaghan, 1999; Min, Min, and Chung, 2002). Surveys distributed to frequent hotel users asked guests to identify which factors contribute to their opinion of hotel "favorites" or "best hotels" in their respective markets. Five functional areas emerged as loyalty-drivers: quality of on-site services, quality of personnel, quality of guest-room design and amenities, brand name and reputation, and perceived value (Dubé and Renaghan, 1999). Another study distributed surveys to four- and five-star hotel guests in Australia asking customers to rank certain attributes (Wilkins, Merrilees, and Herington, 2007). This revealed three main areas of service quality similar to those defined in prior studies: physical product, service experience, and quality of food and beverage. Barsky and Labagh (1992), following a survey of hotel guests, identified four attributes of the service experience that are important to customers, in the following order: Employee Attitudes, Location, Rooms, Price, Hotel Facilities, and Reception. Again, these attributes mirrored those identified by hotel guests in previous studies. Note that, for all of these studies, researchers collected data by directly approaching and gathering feedback from guests.

2.2 Analyses of User-Generated Content and Guest Perceptions

Studies involving UGC analyze voluntarily-supplied guest feedback. UGC is a relatively new data source for hospitality operators, and recent studies have been conducted simply to analyze its functional use (Gretzel and Yoo, 2008; Wilson Murphy, and Fierro, 2012). One study investigated how guests use UGC to inform their trip planning process, analyzing data from a survey linked on the TripAdvisor site (Gretzel and Yoo, 2008). Results found that leisure travelers use reviews for several reasons in the trip-planning process: to get inspired in the first stage of planning, to narrow down choices in the middle stage, and to confirm decisions at a later

stage. Reviews were also found to be important in the post-consumption phase, with guests accessing them in order to compare notes with others and share experiences.

With UGC proving to be a prevalent influencing force in all stages of the travel-planning process, the next logical aspect to be examined is the information that it provides. Zhang and Ye (2011) sought to interpret the quantitative information that TripAdvisor offers, analyzing the guest-rankings optionally provided along with consumer reviews. These allow users to rate four pre-defined attributes of Rooms, Location, Cleanliness, and Service on 5-point scales. Zhang and Ye (2011) created a data set with TripAdvisor overall hotel scores and related guest rankings for each of these attributes for each property included. Based on a hedonic pricing model, they performed multiple regressions with these variables of Rooms, Location, Cleanliness and Service in order to estimate an acceptable price point for guests. They found Rooms, Location, and Service to be significant drivers of perceived value. They further extended these findings into a framework modeled after a “hierarchy of needs” (Maslow, 1987) for guests in the hotel industry, with quality of rooms, convenience of location, and service in ascending order of importance of customer lodging needs. This hierarchy is based on hotel class; guests at the one-, two-, and three-star levels of hotels place were found to place higher importance on the basic, tangible specifications of a room in the purchasing decision, while guests at the four- and five-star levels were more likely to relate value to service (Pannell Kerr Forster Associates, 1991).

2.3 Content Analyses: Quantifying Guest Perceptions Supplied in UGC

UGC analysis offers arguably the richest information from consumer reviews (as opposed, for example, to aggregate consumer ratings), though the analysis of this qualitative data is avoided by some due to its “messiness” in interpretation (Pullman, McGuire, and Cleveland, 2005). However, this type of data can lend itself to content analysis, in which words are essentially converted to quantitative form by coding according to a pre-defined framework and

then analyzed. This quantitative data can be analyzed on the basis of frequency, which is associated with managerial significance. One such study analyzed consumer reviews for restaurants in London using the restaurant-oriented site www.london-eating.co.uk (Pantelidis, 2010). Reviews were collected and entered into a content analysis software program in order to capture the most-frequently occurring attributes that guests mentioned in their online reviews. This allowed the researcher to create a preference-structure model of key elements of a meal experience, ranking variables' importance based on word-counts. This model was constructed to allow restaurateurs in that particular market to be able to understand customer desires, highlight areas of importance, and define areas of underperformance that warrant future investigation and correction. What it did not account for was the valence of the reviews (i.e., positive or negative), but only identified whether or not the keyword appeared in the search string.

A similar content analysis was performed for the hotel industry, specifically examining one-star (i.e., the lowest-scoring) reviews for eighty-six Washington, D.C. hotels from ten UGC sites (Levy, Duan, and Boo, 2013). That study sought to identify the largest contributors to guest complaints, in addition to analyzing managerial responses to those complaints. Levy, Duan, and Boo (2013) developed a complaint and response framework for review, then independently evaluated and coded all content. The results allowed them to identify the 10 most frequent “problem areas,” ranked by frequency of occurrence. These results were further analyzed by hotel class, offering a deeper look into the negative attributes considered to be most salient within each hotel class.

While word-count studies are a progressive step in the analysis of UGC, they do not allow for the analysis of word-associated valence, which is arguably one of the most useful insights gained from the nature of this qualitative versus quantitative data (Pullman, McGuire, and Cleveland, 2005). Researchers from the industry suggest two methods using content analysis software to code for meaning. The first utilizes a word-use analysis package (WUAP) such as

Wordstat to perform “data-linking.” This involves first creating and categorizing major themes to build a “dictionary” that the program will then use when it filters the input content data. The software then allows the user to pull text linking two concepts in a co-occurrence analysis to determine why customers mentioned these themes together. It also allows sorting of the data into demographic groupings, such as the “hotel class” divisions mentioned above. Limitations with this method lie in the initial construction of the dictionary; if a new theme arises that was not originally programmed, it will not be coded.

The second suggested technique is linguistic analysis using software such as *Aristotle* (Pullman, McGuire, and Cleveland, 2005). This allows the user to examine computer-generated samples of key comment or interview texts, define main attributes, and then create mathematical statements for each idea using Boolean operators along with regular expressions. The software then performs proximity searches to find the word-groupings, thus providing more clarity of meaning in comparison to simple frequency. For example, the combination of “not-AND-dirty” would be a search used for the attribute of “cleanliness.” Limitations in this method mirror those involved with a WUAP; the robustness of coding and results depend on the initial inputs decided upon by the coder.

These types of content analyses will undoubtedly prove to be useful for very large data sets in the future, but are not without limitations. As one study calls attention to, “Even though there are software tools that will ‘scrape’ and analyze the content as it appears and translate it into dashboards that visualize the current discussion, the voice tone and channel that the company adopts in this new marketing meritocracy will be critical” (Wilson, Murphy, and Fierro, 2012). The selection of software-analysis is defended by the complexity and time-consuming nature of hand-coding qualitative data (Pullman, McGuire, and Cleveland, 2005). Though it offers the benefit of speed-of-analysis, it still has the propensity to suffer from lack of true “meaning” based on deficiencies in the original inputs of dictionary word-pairings.

As evidenced from prior studies, past UGC content-analyses for the hotel industry, whether human-coded or software-coded, have simply relied on the frequencies of word occurrence. No studies to date have analyzed both word-counts and the valence, whether positive or negative, associated with specific words or themes, which are currently best-analyzed through human -interpretation and coding. Furthermore, no study of this type has been conducted by hotel class. Levy, Duan, and Boo (2013) only analyzed one-star reviews in the Washington, D.C. market, and Wilkins, Merrilees, and Herington (2007) only studied reviews for luxury hotels. An analysis of this type stands to benefit hoteliers by identifying salient guest-experience attributes as well as satisfiers and dissatisfiers within an entire market. With a more complete understanding of these attributes, hoteliers can better allocate resources to correcting problems areas and upholding or improving offerings of satisfiers to their guests. This will promote more positive reviews on UGC sites, thereby increasing future guest satisfaction and UGC-influenced bookings.

Chapter 3

Methodology

3.1 Data Source

TripAdvisor was chosen as the source for this study due to its prominence as the only publicly traded travel site that features UGC (Savitz, 2011), with over 100 million reviews and over 200 million monthly visitors (TripAdvisor, 2013). It also includes reviews posted on smaller sites such as easytobook.com and brand sites such as BEST WESTERN Plus. The site allows for a search of hotels by city and hotel class—two criteria that were key to this study.

3.2 Hotels Sample

Hotels in major U.S. metropolitan areas were chosen as the main focus of this study due to their abundance of hotels within a focused geographic area. These hotels are more easily compared to one another because they operate in the same market within a higher range of competition. Guests are more apt to choose a city hotel based on features such as price and class rather than simple proximity (i.e. the only hotel within a 20-mile radius).

As shown in Figure 3-1, New York City was chosen as the primary focus of this study since it is the most populated city in the U.S. and has 434 hotels posted on TripAdvisor. In order to achieve a proper sample size within each hotel class analyzed, it was necessary to expand the study to the next two most populated cities within a geographical radius: Philadelphia and Chicago.

Figure 3-1

Hotel Sample Cities			
Rank	City	Population (thousands)	Hotels on TripAdvisor
1	New York, NY	7,323	434
2	Los Angeles, CA	3,485	200
3	Chicago, IL	2,784	166
4	Houston, TX	1,631	432
5	Philadelphia, PA	1,586	84

Source: census.gov, TripAdvisor.com

Sample size was chosen to include 30 hotels within each class category, adding to 120 hotels total. Due to the limited number of 1- and 2- star hotels in the 3 cities analyzed, these hotels were grouped into one class for analysis. Figure 3-2 shows how hotels, for the purpose of this study, were sorted into classes using hotel star ratings that are provided by third-party industry organizations and based on the hotels' comparative levels of offerings (Smith Travel Research, 2013). Since hotel star-ratings include half-stars, each hotel class included hotels from one half-star above the related ranking.

Figure 3-2

Class Divisions for Analysis			
Class	Star Ratings	Class Labels*	Sample Size
1	1-2.5	Economy	30
2	3-3.5	Midscale	30
3	4-4.5	Upscale	30
4	5	Luxury	30
Total			120

*Source: Smith Travel Research

Hotels within each hotel class and city were randomly selected, with the 30 sampled consisting of 20 from New York City and the remaining 10 from Philadelphia and Chicago. These geographical proportions were chosen to reflect the population of hotels within each city, as shown in Figure 3-1. The only criteria considered in the

random selection of hotels was the total number of reviews for any given hotel on TripAdvisor. To ensure that the per-hotel review sample size could be achieved, the lower-limit cut-off was 100 reviews. Appendix 1-1 shows the hotels selected within each hotel class and their related total-review amounts at the date of sample selection (December 20, 2012).

3.3 Review Sample

To determine the number of reviews from each hotel to sample, an analysis was done of 100 reviews from one hotel from each of the four hotel classes. These reviews were read for each hotel and marked with a “saturation point” at which the reviews began to repeat in themes and no new significant information was offered. The overall saturation point was determined to be 25 reviews based on an average of the four saturation points for each class. For the purpose of analysis, the per-hotel sample size was then set at 30 reviews. In order minimize time as a confounding factor, the most-recent cut-off data for reviews collected for each hotel was December 20, 2012; no reviews posted more recently than this date were included in the study. Reviews on TripAdvisor are sorted in descending chronological order by default, so the reviewer searched through reviews until 12/20 or later and began analysis at that point and below.

3.4 Coding Categories

To achieve a detailed, complete analysis of all reviews, it was decided that major themes and related sub-themes should be coded. The reviewer began creating a list in the initial phase of coding, beginning with 10 hotels from Class 1 and continuing until the reviews from 10 hotels in each hotel class were coded. Items mentioned were simply listed and coded, then later divided into encompassing “major themes.” If a new item was encountered that had never been coded before, it was simply added as a category in the list and included in all future review analyses. The complete list of major themes and related sub-themes is included in Appendix 1-2. Every time a sub-theme was coded, its major theme was also coded, thereby marking frequencies for both types of theme.

3.5 Coding Process

The independent researcher coded all 3,600 reviews one hotel at a time. If a major or sub-theme occurred, it was denoted in an Excel spreadsheet as either “g” (good), “b” (bad), or “n” (neutral). This indicated the valence associated with the item. These denotations allowed for counts of overall frequencies to be performed later, as well as counts of each category by valence (i.e., the number of times “front desk interactions” was marked as “good”). Major themes were coded after consideration of the sub-themes; if the opinion was clearly “g” or “b,” it was coded as such, but if there was a mix of “g’s” and “b’s” in the sub-themes the major theme was coded as neutral. For example, if a review read, “Room was okay. The aircon rattled all through the night, and the room was rather dark for my taste. However, we loved the balcony with the high-up view of the


skyscrapers from the 23rd floor, and the room was well-appointed and comfortable,” the coding would be as follows in Figure 3-3:

Figure 3-3

Sample Coding	
Themes	Code
Rooms	n
A/C Heat (Noise)	b
Lighting/Windows	b
View	g
Balcony	g
Floor in Hotel	g
Décor/Furniture	g

An actual TripAdvisor review and its associated coding is presented below in Figures 3-4 and 3-5. An additional category was coded for “Overall Recommendation,” which denoted whether the guest said he/she would recommend the hotel to another and/or return themselves in the future. If this was not explicitly stated but the review had a strong overall tone of “g” or “b”, and the related numerical scores on TripAdvisor indicated it as well, an overall code would be inferred by the coder. For example, a glowing review with all “g’s” and a 5-star review with no specific mention of a future action would still receive a “g” in Overall Recommendation.

Figure 3-4



“Great Stay at Days Inn Chicago!”
 Reviewed December 12, 2012

A friend and I just got back from staying at the Days Inn Chicago. I thought it was a really nice hotel. It was clean, affordable, and convenient. The staff was very friendly and helpful too, which is always a plus. The room wasn't big, but it was perfectly fine for two people, and the bathroom was a decent size with plenty of mirror space. There was a mini fridge, microwave, and safe in the room. I really liked the area the hotel is in. There are two Walgreen's within walking distance of the hotel, and plenty of other places to shop and eat. Akira and Urban Outfitters are right across the street. I preferred this area to the downtown, Michigan Ave area, which was an easy bus ride away as there are several bus stops near the hotel and can get you pretty much where ever you need to go (I use hopstop.com for public transit). The free breakfast was also a bonus for this hotel. If I visit Chicago again, Days Inn will be my go to hotel.

Stayed December 2012, traveled with friends

Figure 3-5

Actual Coding			
Themes	Code	Themes	Code
Cleanliness	g	Amenities	n
Rooms	g	Fridge	n
Price	g	Microwave	n
Service	g	Security	n
Friendly	g	Safe	n
Helpful	g	Location	g
Room	g	Local Attractions	g
Size	n	Local Restaurants/Bars	g
Bathroom	g	Transportation	g
Size	g	Food and Beverage	g
Mirror	g	Complimentary Breakfast	g
Storage	g	Overall Recommendation	g

Additional items that allowed for later analyses were also coded. These are included, and explained, in Figure 3-6.

Figure 3-6

Additional Coding Categories	
Additional Items Coded	Meaning
Booking (Hotel Website)	Guest booked through the hotel's website
Booking (OTA)	Guest booked through an online travel agency
Booking (Package Holiday)	Guest booked via a package holiday (i.e. Groupon Getaways)
Booking (Travel Agent)	Guest booked through a Travel Agent
Cancellation Policy	Guest cancelled a reservation with the hotel
Changed Rooms	Guest changed rooms throughout the stay
Errors from Booking to Arrival	Expectations at booking were not met upon arrival
Guest Chose to Leave Hotel	Guest chose to leave the hotel before reservation was completed
Incident: Sandy	Hurricane Sandy occurred while guest stayed at hotel
Repeat Customer	Guest has stayed in this hotel before and is returning
Service Reconciliation	Guest experienced a problem which the staff resolved/did not resolve
TripAdvisor Ratings	Guest formed an opinion via TripAdvisor ratings before arriving
Upgraded During Stay	Guest received a room upgrade
Website was Misleading	Website advertisements/pictures did not match actual experience

Each review and its coding was entered into a spreadsheet along with the hotel name, city, class, and the reviewer's username. This data, along with the codes, allowed for multiple "cuts" of data analyses.

Chapter 4

Results

Results were analyzed from an aggregated, to increasingly disaggregated, level, beginning with overall major theme frequency rankings by hotel class (Figure 4-1), moving into top mentioned “good” and bad” major themes by hotel class (Figures 4-2 and 4-3), and disaggregating the six top mentioned major themes’ into related sub-themes by valence and hotel class (Figures 4-4 through 4-9).

Figure 4-1

Overall Major Theme Frequency Rankings by Class															
Major Themes	Overall			Class 1			Class 2			Class 3			Class 4		
	Rank	Count	%	Rank	Count	%	Rank	Count	%	Rank	Count	%	Rank	Count	%
Service	1	2861	79%	2	614	68%	2	714	79%	1	759	84%	1	774	86%
Rooms	2	2732	76%	3	613	68%	1	716	80%	2	688	76%	2	715	79%
Location	3	2461	68%	1	651	72%	3	684	76%	3	632	70%	3	493	55%
Food and Beverage	4	1505	42%	11	199	22%	4	441	49%	4	383	43%	4	482	54%
Bathroom	5	1152	32%	4	365	41%	5	264	29%	6	240	27%	6	283	31%
General Hotel	6	1066	30%	10	216	24%	10	196	22%	5	348	39%	5	306	34%
Beds	7	936	26%	8	255	28%	8	227	25%	9	226	25%	7	228	25%
Amenities	8	881	24%	7	258	29%	6	248	28%	8	232	26%	11	143	16%
Noise	9	871	24%	6	261	29%	7	235	26%	7	238	26%	12	137	15%
Price	10	860	24%	5	332	37%	9	206	23%	11	153	17%	9	169	19%
Value	11	524	15%	9	233	26%	11	139	15%	13	81	9%	13	71	8%
Complementary Items	12	479	13%	18	2	0%	12	105	12%	10	166	18%	10	160	18%
ExtraFacilities	13	460	13%	20	0	0%	13	87	10%	12	113	13%	8	208	23%
Elevator	14	276	8%	12	141	16%	15	60	7%	19	29	3%	15	46	5%
Safety and Security	15	247	7%	14	113	13%	14	64	7%	18	30	3%	17	40	4%
Cleanliness	16	233	6%	13	138	15%	19	41	5%	17	37	4%	19	17	2%
Car Service	17	206	6%	20	0	0%	17	55	6%	14	73	8%	13	71	8%
Maintenance	18	204	6%	16	55	6%	16	56	6%	16	49	5%	16	44	5%
Sleep Quality	19	197	5%	15	71	8%	18	44	5%	15	52	6%	18	30	3%
RewardsMember	20	60	2%	18	2	0%	21	14	2%	20	27	3%	20	14	2%
Extra Charges	21	57	2%	17	21	2%	20	19	2%	21	13	1%	22	4	0%
RandomPerks	22	20	1%	20	0	0%	22	2	0%	22	8	1%	21	5	1%

* Class designations are as follows: Class 1 (1-2.5 stars), Class 2 (3-3.5 stars), Class 3 (4-4.5 stars), and Class 5 (5-star)

4.1 Overall Major Theme Frequency Rankings by Hotel Class

As shown in Figure 4-1, the major themes of Service, Location, and Rooms ranked in the top 3 of the attributes mentioned by reviewers, overall and for each class of hotel. Location was the most frequently mentioned attribute for economy hotels, with 72% of guests mentioning it; for all other classes, it ranked in 3rd place. Service ranked in 1st place overall at 79%, ranked 2nd in economy hotels (68%) and midscale hotels (79%) and ranked again as 1st in upscale hotels (84%) and luxury hotels (86%). Rooms ranked in 3rd place for economy hotels (68%), 1st place for midscale hotels (80%), and 2nd place for upscale hotels (76%) and luxury hotels (79%).

Food and Beverage ranked in 4th place overall (42%) and for midscale (49%), upscale (43%), and luxury (54%). However, Food and Beverage ranked 11th for economy hotels (42%). This is likely due to the fact that most hotels at this level do not offer food and beverage services at their properties.

Bathrooms came after Food and Beverage in terms of listed importance, ranking the highest of all classes at 4th place in economy hotels (41%). It ranked in 5th place overall (32%) and for midscale hotels (29%), and 6th place for upscale hotels (27%) and luxury hotels (31%).

Other rankings worth noting from this analysis are: Extra Charges, which included drip pricing, ranked last (22nd) or second-to-last (21st) in all cases. Complimentary Items' frequency of mentions, as expected, increased along with class (which determines offerings), moving from 18th place in economy hotels (<1%), 12th place in midscale hotels (12%), to 10th place in upscale (18%) and luxury hotels (18%). Sleep Quality, which is related to the major themes of Beds and Noise, ranked low on the list overall (15th place and 8% at its highest in economy hotels), but Beds (7th place overall at 26%) and Noise (9th place overall at 24%) ranked higher. Price ranked the highest in 5th place for economy hotels (37%); its next highest rank was 9th place in midscale hotels (23%) and upscale hotels (19%).

4.2 Top Mentioned “Good” Major Themes by Class

Location and Service were the top two ranking “good” attributes across the board (Figure 4-2). Location ranked in 1st place for economy hotels (68%) and midscale hotels (71%), and 2nd place for luxury hotels (66% and 69%). It ranked 2nd overall at 65%. Rooms ranked in 3rd place for all divisions, mentioned by 53% overall and reached its highest frequency at 59% for midscale hotels.

Price ranked in 8th place overall (15%), 4th place for economy hotels (29%), 8th place for midscale hotels (16%), and did not achieve high ranking for upscale or luxury hotels. Value ranked in 5th place in economy hotels (19%), and did not rank overall or in any other classes.

General Hotel ranked 5th place overall (21%), 9th place in midscale hotels (15%), and 5th place in upscale hotels (31%) and luxury hotels (28%). It did not rank in Economy hotels.

Complimentary Items did not rank overall or in economy or midscale hotels, and ranked in 8th place for upscale hotels (17%) and 10th place for luxury hotels (10%). Keep in mind that these usually increase in offering along with star-class, and are generally not offered in economy hotels and very limited in midscale hotels.

4.3 Top Mentioned “Bad” Major Themes by Class

Food and Beverage ranked as a top “good” attribute in Figure 4-2, but it also ranked as a top “bad” category in Figure 4-3. It ranked in 6th place overall (6%), 4th place for midscale hotels (7%), 6th place for upscale hotels (6%), and 7th place for luxury hotels (3%). It did not rank in economy hotels—as mentioned above, food and beverage services are typically not offered in this class.

Bathrooms ranked at 3rd place overall (8%), 2nd place in economy hotels (16%), 5th place in midscale hotels (7%) and upscale hotels (6%), and 3rd place again in luxury hotels (6%).

Elevators ranked as the 6th top “bad” attribute in economy hotels (12%) and 10th place overall (4%), but did not rank in any of the other classes. Many hotels sampled for economy hotels did not have elevators; rather, they were considered “walk-ups,” with guests required to carry luggage upstairs themselves.

Rooms were a top-ranked complaint in all hotel classes, being listed as 1st place overall (11%), in economy hotels (24%), and luxury hotels (7%), and 2nd place for midscale hotels (9%) and upscale hotels (8%). Note that Rooms also ranked high in Figure 4-2.

Noise ranked in 4th place overall (8%), in 3rd place for economy, midscale, and upscale hotels, and in 2nd place for luxury hotels. Cleanliness ranked as the 9th source of complaints for economy hotels (7%), and did not rank in the top 10 overall, or for midscale or luxury hotels. Comparing Figure 4-2 and 4-3, the complaint percentages were much smaller than the compliment percentages; this is in accordance with the overall distribution of reviews from the study, which was approximately 70% good reviews and 30% bad reviews. Complaint percentages were the largest for economy hotels in this dataset.

4.4 Service: Rankings by Sub-theme and Hotel Class

The top 3 service attributes were consistent overall and for all hotel classes: Friendliness/Attitudes of staff ranked in 1st (47% overall), Helpfulness of staff ranked in 2nd (43% overall), and Front Desk Interactions ranked in 3rd (17% overall; Figure 4-4). Specific Employees, which was coded if a guest mentioned an employee by name, came in 4th overall (10%), and Speed of Service came in 5th overall (10%).

Payment Process ranked highest at 9th place in economy hotels, with 24 mentions overall, 23 of which were complaints. It ranked 17th in midscale hotels, with 17 mentions overall, 12 of which were complaints. For all hotels, it ranked in 16th place, with 5 compliments and 66 complaints. Honesty followed a similar pattern overall, with 42 total mentions, 8 “good,” 29 “bad,” and 5 “neutral.” The mention of staff going “Above and Beyond” came in 12th place overall, with 139 total mentions, all of which were “good.”

Concierge increased in rank along with class; from 18th in economy hotels, to 15th in midscale hotels, to 11th in upscale hotels, to 4th in luxury hotels. Note that the position of concierge within a hotel is very rare in economy hotels, and more commonplace in upscale and luxury hotels.

4.5 Rooms: Rankings by Sub-theme and Hotel Class

Room Size ranked in 1st place overall and for economy, midscale, and upscale hotels, and 2nd place for luxury hotels (Figure 4-5). Note from Figure 4-5 that, in each class, the percentages of “good” and “neutral” mentions for Room Size were higher than that of “bad.”

View and Floor in Hotel both ranked in the top 5 overall, and had the highest frequency percentages in upscale and luxury hotels. These two attributes often were mentioned together, as the view often improved along with the number of the floor in the hotel.

The attributes of Aircon/Heat in terms of Temperature and Noise (separately coded) were most frequently mentioned as “bad” attributes overall and for every class. This is also the case for Carpet/Floor and Walls/Ceilings. Smoking Odor, as well, was mentioned 19 times overall—18 of which were complaints and 1 of which was neutral.

The Renovated category was coded as “good” if the guest noticed and complimented a recent renovation, and “bad” if the guest said that the rooms were in need of renovation.

“Neutral” was coded if the guest mentioned the state of the room in terms of renovation but was apathetic. This theme came in 8th place overall, with 260 mentions; 82 were “good,” 150 were “bad,” and 28 were “neutral.”

Décor/Furniture ranked 2nd or 3rd in every class, with the highest counts occurring in luxury hotels (253 “good,” 24 “bad,” 3 “neutral”).

4.6 Location: Rankings by Sub-themes and Class (Appendix 1-8)

Nearby Attractions ranked in 1st place overall and for every class. 40% of guests mentioned it overall, and 39% of these mentions were “good” (Figure 4-6). Transportation ranked in 2nd place overall and for economy, midscale, and upscale hotels, and in 3rd place for luxury hotels. Parking ranked in 5th place overall; this attribute was coded only if the guest mentioned parking specifically as a pro or con of the location itself. Other items involved with Parking were coded in the major theme of Car Service. Every sub-theme in this category had high proportions of “good” mentions; “bad” or “neutral” rankings never exceeded 1%.

4.7 Food and Beverage: Rankings by Sub-themes and Class

Complimentary Breakfast ranked 1st overall and in economy and midscale hotels, 3rd in upscale hotels, and 9th in luxury hotels (Figure 4-7). Restaurant ranked in 1st place for upscale and luxury hotels, 15th in economy hotels (where restaurants are often not included in hotels), and 3rd in midscale hotels.

Seating was mentioned most often as a complaint, with 71 total mentions, 51 of which were “bad.” This was also true for Prices; it was mentioned 136 times overall, 35 of which were “bad.” Menu Variety ranked in 2nd place for economy hotels and 2, but 9th and 10th for upscale

and luxury hotels. Room Service increased in rank along with hotel class, peaking at 5th place in luxury hotels. This is expected, as Room Service increases in offering as class increases.

4.8 Bathroom: Rankings by Sub-themes and Class

The major sub-themes for Bathrooms differed noticeably from economy hotels to all other classes (Figure 4-8). Shared Bathrooms were only mentioned for economy hotels, for which they came in 2nd place. They were mentioned 100 times, of which 29 were “good,” 46 were “bad,” and 25 were “neutral.” Cleanliness came in 1st place for economy hotels, with 138 total mentions; 77 were “good,” 59 were “bad,” and 2 were “neutral.”

For the remaining three classes, the top two mentioned sub-themes were Shower and Size of the bathroom itself. In each class, responses were fairly evenly split between “good” and “bad” codings.

4.9 General Hotel: Rankings by Sub-themes and Hotel Class

The Décor/Style/Look and Feel of the hotel ranked 1st place overall and in every class, with 455 of 597 total mentions coded as “good” (Figure 4-9). Lobby ranked in 3rd place for economy hotels, and 2nd place overall and for midscale, upscale, and luxury hotels. Mentions of the hotel feeling “Like Home” increased along with class, ranking in 3rd place for upscale and luxury hotels.

Interior/Hallways ranked 3rd overall, with 91 total mentions, of which 20 were “good,” 66 were “bad,” and 5 were “neutral.” Odor was mentioned 38 times overall, of which 6 were “good,” 31 were “bad,” and 1 was “neutral.”

Figure 4-2

Top Mentioned "Good" Major Themes By Hotel Class														
Overall			Class 1			Class 2			Class 3			Class 4		
Themes	Count	%	Themes	Count	%	Themes	Count	%	Themes	Count	%	Themes	Count	%
Service	2361	66%	Location	616	68%	Location	642	71%	Service	654	73%	Service	665	74%
Location	2327	65%	Service	457	51%	Service	585	65%	Location	591	66%	Location	623	69%
Rooms	1919	53%	Rooms	269	30%	Rooms	528	59%	Rooms	499	55%	Rooms	478	53%
Food and Beverage	1056	29%	Price	260	29%	Food and Beverage	289	32%	Food and Beverage	283	31%	Food and Beverage	361	40%
General Hotel	745	21%	Value	170	19%	Beds	187	21%	General Hotel	275	31%	General Hotel	256	28%
Beds	728	20%	Bathroom	158	18%	Bathroom	162	18%	Beds	199	22%	ExtraFacilities	219	24%
Bathroom	696	19%	Beds	146	16%	Amenities	159	18%	Bathroom	157	17%	Bathroom	196	22%
Price	536	15%	Food and Beverage	123	14%	Price	147	16%	Complementary Items	152	17%	Beds	132	15%
Amenities	476	13%	Amenities	114	13%	General Hotel	132	15%	Noise	136	15%	Noise	87	10%
Noise	457	13%	Noise	104	12%	Noise	131	15%	Amenities	116	13%	Complementary Items	86	10%

Figure 4-3

Top Mentioned "Bad" Major Themes By Hotel Class														
Overall			Class 1			Class 2			Class 3			Class 4		
Themes	Count	%	Themes	Count	%	Themes	Count	%	Themes	Count	%	Themes	Count	%
Rooms	406	11%	Rooms	213	24%	Service	83	9%	Amenities	77	9%	Rooms	64	7%
Service	341	9%	Bathroom	142	16%	Rooms	77	9%	Rooms	69	8%	Noise	55	6%
Bathroom	300	8%	Noise	136	15%	Noise	65	7%	Noise	69	8%	Bathroom	54	6%
Noise	300	8%	Service	132	15%	Food and Beverage	64	7%	Service	62	7%	Price	47	5%
Amenities	282	8%	Amenities	110	12%	Bathroom	62	7%	Bathroom	51	6%	Service	46	5%
Food and Beverage	212	6%	Elevator	105	12%	Amenities	49	5%	Food and Beverage	50	6%	Amenities	45	5%
Price	181	5%	General Hotel	103	11%	Price	39	4%	Price	39	4%	Food and Beverage	30	3%
General Hotel	178	5%	Beds	94	10%	General Hotel	36	4%	Maintenance	36	4%	Value	24	3%
Beds	164	5%	Cleanliness	59	7%	Beds	32	4%	Value	29	3%	ExtraFacilities	23	3%
Elevator	147	4%	Value	52	6%	Value	32	4%	Sleep Quality	28	3%	Car Service	0	0%

Figure 4-4

Service: Rankings by Related Sub-themes and Hotel Class																													
Subthemes	Overall										Class 1								Class 2										
	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%		Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%		Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%
Service	1	1694	1506	148	40	47%	42%	4%	1%		1	399	334	59	6	47%	42%	4%	1%		1	509	452	45	12	57%	50%	5%	1%
Friendliness/Attitudes	1	1694	1506	148	40	47%	42%	4%	1%		1	399	334	59	6	47%	42%	4%	1%		1	509	452	45	12	57%	50%	5%	1%
Helpfulness	2	1559	1323	213	23	43%	37%	6%	1%		2	372	291	78	3	43%	37%	6%	1%		2	484	412	66	6	54%	46%	7%	1%
Front Desk Interactions	3	613	460	112	41	17%	13%	3%	1%		3	99	64	32	3	17%	13%	3%	1%		3	153	110	32	11	17%	12%	4%	1%
Specific employees	4	373	350	16	7	10%	10%	0%	0%		5	60	56	3	1	10%	10%	0%	0%		4	95	90	5	0	11%	10%	1%	0%
Speed of Service	5	357	230	103	24	10%	6%	3%	1%		6	49	27	22	0	10%	6%	3%	1%		6	86	60	23	3	10%	7%	3%	0%
Accommodating	6	342	316	25	1	10%	9%	1%	0%		4	65	60	5	0	10%	9%	1%	0%		5	91	81	9	1	10%	9%	1%	0%
Porters	7	274	232	34	8	8%	6%	1%	0%		14	8	7	1	0	8%	6%	1%	0%		8	59	44	14	1	7%	5%	2%	0%
Recommendations	8	230	214	16	0	6%	6%	0%	0%		7	47	43	4	0	6%	6%	0%	0%		7	61	58	3	0	7%	6%	0%	0%
Concierge	9	221	188	23	10	6%	5%	1%	0%		18	5	1	4	0	6%	5%	1%	0%		15	22	19	2	1	2%	2%	0%	0%
Welcoming	10	200	190	8	2	6%	5%	0%	0%		11	21	18	3	0	6%	5%	0%	0%		9	51	47	4	0	6%	5%	0%	0%
Available/Attentive	11	156	115	33	8	4%	3%	1%	0%		10	22	12	9	1	4%	3%	1%	0%		13	26	22	4	0	3%	2%	0%	0%
"Above and beyond"	12	139	139	0	0	4%	4%	0%	0%		14	8	8	0	0	4%	4%	0%	0%		10	39	39	0	0	4%	4%	0%	0%
Professional	12	139	112	27	0	4%	3%	1%	0%		8	26	17	9	0	4%	3%	1%	0%		12	28	22	6	0	3%	2%	1%	0%
Special Occasion Recognized	14	103	91	9	3	3%	3%	0%	0%		20	3	3	0	0	3%	3%	0%	0%		16	19	16	2	1	2%	2%	0%	0%
Early check-in	15	94	69	12	13	3%	2%	0%	0%		14	8	6	1	1	3%	2%	0%	0%		11	31	22	4	5	3%	2%	0%	1%
Payment Process	16	74	5	66	3	2%	0%	2%	0%		9	24	1	23	0	2%	0%	2%	0%		17	17	2	12	3	2%	0%	1%	0%
Remember Customers	17	67	65	2	0	2%	2%	0%	0%		22	1	1	0	0	2%	2%	0%	0%		19	7	6	1	0	1%	1%	0%	0%
Luggage storage	18	50	44	4	2	1%	1%	0%	0%		13	9	8	1	0	1%	1%	0%	0%		14	23	22	0	1	3%	2%	0%	0%
Honesty	19	42	8	29	5	1%	0%	1%	0%		12	16	3	13	0	1%	0%	1%	0%		18	13	2	9	2	1%	0%	1%	0%
Butler	20	15	4	3	8	0%	0%	0%	0%		23	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%		24	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Languages	21	14	6	7	1	0%	0%	0%	0%		14	8	4	4	0	0%	0%	0%	0%		20	2	0	1	1	0%	0%	0%	0%
Quality Assurance Check	22	9	7	2	0	0%	0%	0%	0%		23	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%		20	2	2	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Fulfilled personal requests	23	7	6	1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%		23	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%		24	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Policies	24	6	1	5	0	0%	0%	0%	0%		19	4	1	3	0	0%	0%	0%	0%		20	2	0	2	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Room given away	25	5	1	4	0	0%	0%	0%	0%		20	3	0	3	0	0%	0%	0%	0%		23	1	0	1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Figure 4-4 (continued)

Service: Rankings by Related Sub-themes and Hotel Class (continued)																											
Subthemes	Overall										Class 3					Class 4											
	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%
Service		2861	2361	341	159	79%	66%	9%	4%																		
Friendliness/Attitudes	1	1694	1506	148	40	47%	42%	4%	1%	1	448	414	26	8	50%	46%	3%	1%	1	338	306	18	14	38%	34%	2%	2%
Helpfulness	2	1559	1323	213	23	43%	37%	6%	1%	2	397	361	30	6	44%	40%	3%	1%	2	306	259	39	8	34%	29%	4%	1%
Front Desk Interactions	3	613	460	112	41	17%	13%	3%	1%	3	205	166	28	11	23%	18%	3%	1%	3	156	120	20	16	17%	13%	2%	2%
Specific employees	4	373	350	16	7	10%	10%	0%	0%	4	138	129	7	2	15%	14%	1%	0%	8	80	75	1	4	9%	8%	0%	0%
Speed of Service	5	357	230	103	24	10%	6%	3%	1%	5	99	73	18	8	11%	8%	2%	1%	5	123	70	40	13	14%	8%	4%	1%
Accommodating	6	342	316	25	1	10%	9%	1%	0%	6	95	89	6	0	11%	10%	1%	0%	7	91	86	5	0	10%	10%	1%	0%
Porters	7	274	232	34	8	8%	6%	1%	0%	7	94	87	5	2	10%	10%	1%	0%	6	113	94	14	5	13%	10%	2%	1%
Recommendations	8	230	214	16	0	6%	6%	0%	0%	8	73	72	1	0	8%	8%	0%	0%	11	49	41	8	0	5%	5%	1%	0%
Concierge	9	221	188	23	10	6%	5%	1%	0%	11	51	48	1	2	6%	5%	0%	0%	4	143	120	16	7	16%	13%	2%	1%
Welcoming	10	200	190	8	2	6%	5%	0%	0%	9	60	58	1	1	7%	6%	0%	0%	9	68	67	0	1	8%	7%	0%	0%
Available/Attentive	11	156	115	33	8	4%	3%	1%	0%	12	46	33	12	1	5%	4%	1%	0%	10	62	48	8	6	7%	5%	1%	1%
"Above and beyond"	12	139	139	0	0	4%	4%	0%	0%	10	53	53	0	0	6%	6%	0%	0%	13	39	39	0	0	4%	4%	0%	0%
Professional	12	139	112	27	0	4%	3%	1%	0%	14	44	39	5	0	5%	4%	1%	0%	12	41	34	7	0	5%	4%	1%	0%
Special Occasion Recognized	14	103	91	9	3	3%	3%	0%	0%	13	45	41	2	2	5%	5%	0%	0%	15	36	31	5	0	4%	3%	1%	0%
Early check-in	15	94	69	12	13	3%	2%	0%	0%	15	24	19	1	4	3%	2%	0%	0%	16	31	22	6	3	3%	2%	1%	0%
Payment Process	16	74	5	66	3	2%	0%	2%	0%	17	15	1	14	0	2%	0%	2%	0%	17	18	1	17	0	2%	0%	2%	0%
Remember Customers	17	67	65	2	0	2%	2%	0%	0%	16	21	20	1	0	2%	2%	0%	0%	14	38	38	0	0	4%	4%	0%	0%
Luggage storage	18	50	44	4	2	1%	1%	0%	0%	18	13	11	2	0	1%	1%	0%	0%	21	5	3	1	1	1%	0%	0%	0%
Honesty	19	42	8	29	5	1%	0%	1%	0%	19	7	2	2	3	1%	0%	0%	0%	20	6	1	5	0	1%	0%	1%	0%
Butler	20	15	4	3	8	0%	0%	0%	0%	22	1	1	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	18	14	3	3	8	2%	0%	0%	1%
Languages	21	14	6	7	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	21	3	1	2	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	22	1	1	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Quality Assurance Check	22	9	7	2	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	19	7	5	2	0	1%	1%	0%	0%	23	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Fulfilled personal requests	23	7	6	1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	24	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	19	7	6	1	0	1%	1%	0%	0%
Policies	24	6	1	5	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	24	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	23	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Room given away	25	5	1	4	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	22	1	1	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	23	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Figure 4-5

Rooms: Rankings by Sub-themes and Hotel Class																											
Subthemes	Overall									Class 1								Class 2									
	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%
Rooms	2732	1919	406	407	76%	53%	11%	11%		613	269	213	131	76%	53%	11%	11%		716	528	77	111	80%	59%	9%	12%	
Room Size	1	1384	775	278	331	38%	22%	8%	9%	1	352	114	141	97	38%	22%	8%	9%	1	386	209	63	114	43%	23%	7%	13%
Décor/Furniture	2	831	641	126	64	23%	18%	4%	2%	3	127	56	52	19	23%	18%	4%	2%	2	201	167	22	12	22%	19%	2%	1%
View	3	718	573	71	74	20%	16%	2%	2%	7	58	35	15	8	20%	16%	2%	2%	4	133	95	14	24	15%	11%	2%	3%
Comfortable	4	413	395	13	5	11%	11%	0%	0%	10	55	52	3	0	11%	11%	0%	0%	3	143	137	4	2	16%	15%	0%	0%
Floor in hotel	5	406	232	29	145	11%	6%	1%	4%	7	58	14	11	33	11%	6%	1%	4%	6	119	70	9	40	13%	8%	1%	4%
Location in Hotel	6	344	170	105	69	10%	5%	3%	2%	4	89	36	46	7	10%	5%	3%	2%	5	124	67	30	27	14%	7%	3%	3%
Aircon/Heat (Temp.)	7	265	80	170	15	7%	2%	5%	0%	2	133	42	84	7	7%	2%	5%	0%	9	57	15	40	2	6%	2%	4%	0%
Renovated	8	260	82	150	28	7%	2%	4%	1%	5	69	14	51	4	7%	2%	4%	1%	7	70	35	24	11	8%	4%	3%	1%
Lighting/Windows	9	247	130	99	18	7%	4%	3%	1%	6	64	6	56	2	7%	4%	3%	1%	8	62	36	23	3	7%	4%	3%	0%
Storage	10	173	99	65	9	5%	3%	2%	0%	11	53	19	30	4	5%	3%	2%	0%	11	56	39	15	2	6%	4%	2%	0%
Aircon/Heat (Noise)	11	117	6	103	8	3%	0%	3%	0%	9	57	5	50	2	3%	0%	3%	0%	12	37	1	32	4	4%	0%	4%	0%
Kitchenette	12	100	90	6	4	3%	3%	0%	0%	16	11	11	0	0	3%	3%	0%	0%	9	57	53	1	3	6%	6%	0%	0%
Carpet/Floor	13	80	15	62	3	2%	0%	2%	0%	12	39	5	32	2	2%	0%	2%	0%	15	13	4	8	1	1%	0%	1%	0%
Walls/Ceilings	14	77	12	64	1	2%	0%	2%	0%	14	30	0	30	0	2%	0%	2%	0%	13	15	7	7	1	2%	1%	1%	0%
Odor	15	61	9	48	4	2%	0%	1%	0%	13	33	2	30	1	2%	0%	1%	0%	13	15	2	11	2	2%	0%	1%	0%
Balcony/Patio	16	28	25	3	0	1%	1%	0%	0%	18	3	3	0	0	1%	1%	0%	0%	17	8	6	2	0	1%	1%	0%	0%
Technology Controls	17	25	18	7	0	1%	1%	0%	0%	19	1	1	0	0	1%	1%	0%	0%	19	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Smoking Odor	18	19	0	18	1	1%	0%	1%	0%	17	4	0	4	0	1%	0%	1%	0%	16	11	0	10	1	1%	0%	1%	0%
Sink In-room	18	19	14	1	4	1%	0%	0%	0%	15	16	12	1	3	1%	0%	0%	0%	18	3	2	0	1	0%	0%	0%	0%
Window Seating Area	20	13	11	2	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	19	1	1	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	19	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Figure 4-5 (continued)

Rooms: Rankings by Sub-themes and Hotel Class (continued)																											
Subthemes	Overall									Class 3									Class 4								
	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%
Rooms		2732	1919	406	407	76%	53%	11%	11%	688	499	69	120	76%	55%	8%	13%	715	623	47	45	79%	69%	5%	5%		
Room Size	1	1384	775	278	331	38%	22%	8%	9%	1	362	213	57	92	40%	24%	6%	10%	2	284	239	17	28	32%	27%	2%	3%
Décor/Furniture	2	831	641	126	64	23%	18%	4%	2%	2	223	165	28	30	25%	18%	3%	3%	3	280	253	24	3	31%	28%	3%	0%
View	3	718	573	71	74	20%	16%	2%	2%	3	208	168	15	25	23%	19%	2%	3%	1	319	275	27	17	35%	31%	3%	2%
Comfortable	4	413	395	13	5	11%	11%	0%	0%	5	129	121	6	2	14%	13%	1%	0%	5	86	85	0	1	10%	9%	0%	0%
Floor in hotel	5	406	232	29	145	11%	6%	1%	4%	4	130	88	5	37	14%	10%	1%	4%	4	99	60	4	35	11%	7%	0%	4%
Location in Hotel	6	344	170	105	69	10%	5%	3%	2%	6	96	51	21	24	11%	6%	2%	3%	10	35	16	8	11	4%	2%	1%	1%
Aircon/Heat (Temp.)	7	265	80	170	15	7%	2%	5%	0%	9	38	8	25	5	4%	1%	3%	1%	8	37	15	21	1	4%	2%	2%	0%
Renovated	8	260	82	150	28	7%	2%	4%	1%	7	69	14	48	7	8%	2%	5%	1%	7	52	19	27	6	6%	2%	3%	1%
Lighting/Windows	9	247	130	99	18	7%	4%	3%	1%	8	58	36	12	10	6%	4%	1%	1%	6	63	52	8	3	7%	6%	1%	0%
Storage	10	173	99	65	9	5%	3%	2%	0%	10	28	11	14	3	3%	1%	2%	0%	9	36	30	6	0	4%	3%	1%	0%
Aircon/Heat (Noise)	11	117	6	103	8	3%	0%	3%	0%	13	20	0	18	2	2%	0%	2%	0%	17	3	0	3	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Kitchenette	12	100	90	6	4	3%	3%	0%	0%	16	3	1	2	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	11	29	25	3	1	3%	3%	0%	0%
Carpet/Floor	13	80	15	62	3	2%	0%	2%	0%	11	22	5	17	0	2%	1%	2%	0%	16	6	1	5	0	1%	0%	1%	0%
Walls/Ceilings	14	77	12	64	1	2%	0%	2%	0%	11	22	3	19	0	2%	0%	2%	0%	14	10	2	8	0	1%	0%	1%	0%
Odor	15	61	9	48	4	2%	0%	1%	0%	18	2	2	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	13	11	3	7	1	1%	0%	1%	0%
Balcony/Patio	16	28	25	3	0	1%	1%	0%	0%	14	14	14	0	0	2%	2%	0%	0%	17	3	2	1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Technology Controls	17	25	18	7	0	1%	1%	0%	0%	19	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	12	24	17	7	0	3%	2%	1%	0%
Smoking Odor	18	19	0	18	1	1%	0%	1%	0%	15	4	0	4	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	19	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Sink In-room	18	19	14	1	4	1%	0%	0%	0%	19	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	19	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Window Seating Area	20	13	11	2	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	16	3	1	2	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	15	9	9	0	0	1%	1%	0%	0%

Figure 4-6

Location: Rankings by Related Sub-themes and Hotel Class

Subthemes	Overall										Class 1								Class 2										
	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%		Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%		Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%
Location	2461	2327	36	97	68%	65%	1%	3%			651	616	12	23	68%	65%	1%	3%			684	642	9	33	76%	71%	1%	4%	
Nearby attractions	1	1448	1409	9	30	40%	39%	0%	1%		1	363	353	3	7	40%	39%	0%	1%		1	414	404	3	7	46%	45%	0%	1%
Transportation	2	727	684	26	17	20%	19%	1%	0%		2	236	226	5	5	20%	19%	1%	0%		2	262	255	2	5	29%	28%	0%	1%
Nearby restaurants/bars	3	700	685	6	9	19%	19%	0%	0%		3	191	190	0	1	19%	19%	0%	0%		3	212	205	5	2	24%	23%	1%	0%
Neighborhood	4	317	260	31	26	9%	7%	1%	1%		4	122	97	15	10	9%	7%	1%	1%		4	98	78	11	9	11%	9%	1%	1%
Parking	5	98	57	29	12	3%	2%	1%	0%		5	52	25	21	6	3%	2%	1%	0%		5	28	20	4	4	3%	2%	0%	0%

Figure 4-6 (continued)

Location: Rankings by Related Sub-themes and Hotel Class (continued)

Subthemes	Overall										Class 3								Class 4										
	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%		Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%		Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%
Location	2461	2327	36	97	68%	65%	1%	3%			632	591	8	33	70%	66%	1%	4%			493	478	7	8	55%	53%	1%	1%	
Nearby attractions	1	1448	1409	9	30	40%	39%	0%	1%		1	414	402	3	9	46%	45%	0%	1%		1	257	250	0	7	29%	28%	0%	1%
Transportation	2	727	684	26	17	20%	19%	1%	0%		2	171	152	12	7	19%	17%	1%	1%		3	58	51	7	0	6%	6%	1%	0%
Nearby restaurants/bars	3	700	685	6	9	19%	19%	0%	0%		2	171	167	0	4	19%	19%	0%	0%		2	126	123	1	2	14%	14%	0%	0%
Neighborhood	4	317	260	31	26	9%	7%	1%	1%		4	55	45	3	7	6%	5%	0%	1%		4	42	40	2	0	5%	4%	0%	0%
Parking	5	98	57	29	12	3%	2%	1%	0%		5	18	12	4	2	2%	1%	0%	0%		5	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Figure 4-7

Food: Rankings by Sub-themes and Hotel Class																											
Subthemes	Overall									Class 1								Class 2									
	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%
Food and Beverage	1505	1056	212	237	42%	29%	6%	7%		199	123	44	32	42%	29%	6%	7%		441	289	64	88	49%	32%	7%	10%	
Complimentary Breakfast	1	524	371	86	67	15%	10%	2%	2%	1	132	80	39	13	15%	10%	2%	2%	1	261	189	28	44	29%	21%	3%	5%
Restaurant (in general)	2	517	364	57	96	14%	10%	2%	3%	15	2	1	1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	3	81	51	10	20	9%	6%	1%	2%
Bar (in general)	3	351	268	25	58	10%	7%	1%	2%	4	19	11	4	4	10%	7%	1%	2%	4	80	56	6	18	9%	6%	1%	2%
F&B Staff	4	269	194	67	8	7%	5%	2%	0%	4	19	10	6	3	2%	1%	1%	1%	5	53	33	19	1	6%	4%	2%	0%
Food	5	191	166	13	12	5%	5%	0%	0%	15	2	1	0	1	5%	5%	0%	0%	10	22	19	3	0	2%	2%	0%	0%
Menu Variety	6	190	113	41	36	5%	3%	1%	1%	2	37	20	15	2	5%	3%	1%	1%	2	93	56	16	21	10%	6%	2%	2%
Breakfast	7	185	123	21	41	5%	3%	1%	1%	3	27	18	3	6	5%	3%	1%	1%	6	51	27	6	18	6%	3%	1%	2%
Room Service	8	157	122	26	9	4%	3%	1%	0%	10	6	2	1	3	4%	3%	1%	0%	9	28	18	7	3	3%	2%	1%	0%
Prices	9	136	33	85	18	4%	1%	2%	1%	13	4	3	1	0	4%	1%	2%	1%	7	41	12	22	7	5%	1%	2%	1%
Drinks	10	100	83	12	5	3%	2%	0%	0%	15	2	2	0	0	3%	2%	0%	0%	11	21	16	3	2	2%	2%	0%	0%
Seating	11	71	14	51	6	2%	0%	1%	0%	12	5	1	4	0	2%	0%	1%	0%	8	40	11	26	3	4%	1%	3%	0%
Café	12	51	46	1	4	1%	1%	0%	0%	9	7	6	0	1	1%	1%	0%	0%	12	16	13	1	2	2%	1%	0%	0%
Coffee & Tea	13	47	38	6	3	1%	1%	0%	0%	6	13	11	1	1	1%	1%	0%	0%	14	15	13	1	1	2%	1%	0%	0%
Food/Drink Vouchers	14	45	22	19	4	1%	1%	1%	0%	10	6	5	1	0	1%	1%	1%	0%	12	16	6	10	0	2%	1%	1%	0%
Food amounts	15	36	22	14	0	1%	1%	0%	0%	7	8	4	4	0	1%	1%	0%	0%	14	15	11	4	0	2%	1%	0%	0%
Bar atmosphere	16	26	24	1	1	1%	1%	0%	0%	13	4	3	0	1	1%	1%	0%	0%	17	8	7	1	0	1%	1%	0%	0%
Entertainment	17	22	21	0	1	1%	1%	0%	0%	20	0	0	0	0	1%	1%	0%	0%	18	7	7	0	0	1%	1%	0%	0%
Breakfast Room	18	16	8	4	4	0%	0%	0%	0%	15	2	1	1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	16	10	6	3	1	1%	1%	0%	0%
Room Service (food)	19	14	12	2	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	20	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	21	3	2	1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Happy hour	20	12	12	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	20	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	20	4	4	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Appetizers/Snacks	21	11	11	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	20	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	24	1	1	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Waffle maker	22	10	6	4	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	15	2	1	1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	18	7	5	2	0	1%	1%	0%	0%
Honor-system	23	7	7	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	20	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	26	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Bar décor	24	6	5	0	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	20	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	21	3	2	0	1	0%	0%	0%	0%
Allergies/Spec. Diet	25	5	2	3	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	20	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	24	1	0	1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Utensils/Glassware	25	5	1	4	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	7	8	6	2	0	7%	5%	2%	0%	21	3	0	3	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Tea room	27	2	2	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	20	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	26	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Figure 4-7 (continued)

Food: Rankings by Sub-themes and Hotel Class (continued)																											
Subthemes	Overall									Class 3							Class 4										
	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%
Food and Beverage	1505	1056	212	237	42%	29%	6%	7%		383	283	50	50	43%	31%	6%	6%		482	361	54	67	54%	40%	6%	7%	
Complimentary Breakfast	1	524	371	86	67	15%	10%	2%	2%	3	86	70	11	5	10%	8%	1%	1%	9	45	32	8	5	5%	4%	1%	1%
Restaurant (in general)	2	517	364	57	96	14%	10%	2%	3%	1	174	116	18	40	19%	13%	2%	4%	1	230	176	28	26	26%	20%	3%	3%
Bar (in general)	3	351	268	25	58	10%	7%	1%	2%	2	109	86	5	18	12%	10%	1%	2%	2	143	115	10	18	16%	13%	1%	2%
F&B Staff	4	269	194	67	8	7%	5%	2%	0%	4	69	54	12	3	8%	6%	1%	0%	3	139	101	34	4	15%	11%	4%	0%
Food	5	191	166	13	12	5%	5%	0%	0%	5	66	55	7	4	7%	6%	1%	0%	4	101	91	3	7	11%	10%	0%	1%
Menu Variety	6	190	113	41	36	5%	3%	1%	1%	9	39	22	6	11	4%	2%	1%	1%	10	21	15	4	2	2%	2%	0%	0%
Breakfast	7	185	123	21	41	5%	3%	1%	1%	6	44	28	8	8	5%	3%	1%	1%	6	63	50	4	9	7%	6%	0%	1%
Room Service	8	157	122	26	9	4%	3%	1%	0%	8	41	31	8	2	5%	3%	1%	0%	5	82	71	10	1	9%	8%	1%	0%
Prices	9	136	33	85	18	4%	1%	2%	1%	6	44	12	28	4	5%	1%	3%	0%	8	47	6	34	7	5%	1%	4%	1%
Drinks	10	100	83	12	5	3%	2%	0%	0%	10	26	23	3	0	3%	3%	0%	0%	7	51	42	6	3	6%	5%	1%	0%
Seating	11	71	14	51	6	2%	0%	1%	0%	15	7	0	6	1	1%	0%	1%	0%	11	19	2	15	2	2%	0%	2%	0%
Café	12	51	46	1	4	1%	1%	0%	0%	11	25	25	0	0	3%	3%	0%	0%	18	3	2	0	1	0%	0%	0%	0%
Coffee & Tea	13	47	38	6	3	1%	1%	0%	0%	12	16	11	4	1	2%	1%	0%	0%	18	3	3	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Food/Drink Vouchers	14	45	22	19	4	1%	1%	1%	0%	13	15	9	2	4	2%	1%	0%	0%	13	8	2	6	0	1%	0%	1%	0%
Food amounts	15	36	22	14	0	1%	1%	0%	0%	15	7	7	0	0	1%	1%	0%	0%	16	6	0	6	0	1%	0%	1%	0%
Bar atmosphere	16	26	24	1	1	1%	1%	0%	0%	19	4	4	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	12	10	10	0	0	1%	1%	0%	0%
Entertainment	17	22	21	0	1	1%	1%	0%	0%	15	7	7	0	0	1%	1%	0%	0%	13	8	7	0	1	1%	1%	0%	0%
Breakfast Room	18	16	8	4	4	0%	0%	0%	0%	24	1	1	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	18	3	0	0	3	0%	0%	0%	0%
Room Service (food)	19	14	12	2	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	14	9	8	1	0	1%	1%	0%	0%	22	2	2	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Happy hour	20	12	12	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	18	5	5	0	0	1%	1%	0%	0%	18	3	3	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Appetizers/Snacks	21	11	11	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	19	4	4	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	16	6	6	0	0	1%	1%	0%	0%
Waffle maker	22	10	6	4	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	25	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	24	1	0	1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Honor-system	23	7	7	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	25	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	15	7	7	0	0	1%	1%	0%	0%
Bar décor	24	6	5	0	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	21	2	2	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	24	1	1	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Allergies/Spec. Diet	25	5	2	3	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	21	2	0	2	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	22	2	2	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Utensils/Glassware	25	5	1	4	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	25	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	26	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Tea room	27	2	2	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	21	2	2	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	26	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Figure 4-8

Bathroom: Rankings by Sub-themes and Hotel Class																											
Subthemes	Overall								Class 1								Class 2										
	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%
Bathroom		1152	696	300	156	32%	19%	8%	4%	365	158	142	65	32%	19%	8%	4%	264	162	62	40	29%	18%	7%	4%		
Shower	1	321	177	116	28	9%	5%	3%	1%	4	65	19	40	6	9%	5%	3%	1%	1	88	57	25	6	10%	6%	3%	1%
Size	2	317	199	70	48	9%	6%	2%	1%	5	64	24	22	18	9%	6%	2%	1%	2	78	38	26	14	9%	4%	3%	2%
Cleanliness	3	233	134	93	6	6%	4%	3%	0%	1	138	77	59	2	6%	4%	3%	0%	3	41	23	17	1	5%	3%	2%	0%
Towels	4	157	104	45	8	4%	3%	1%	0%	3	69	44	22	3	4%	3%	1%	0%	4	38	25	8	5	4%	3%	1%	1%
Bath	5	140	100	31	9	4%	3%	1%	0%	13	14	4	8	2	4%	3%	1%	0%	9	17	8	5	4	2%	1%	1%	0%
Products Available	6	132	102	23	7	4%	3%	1%	0%	7	27	18	7	2	4%	3%	1%	0%	6	30	25	4	1	3%	3%	0%	0%
Décor	7	121	95	21	5	3%	3%	1%	0%	14	10	7	2	1	3%	3%	1%	0%	5	34	22	9	3	4%	2%	1%	0%
Shared bathroom	8	100	29	46	25	3%	1%	1%	1%	2	100	29	46	25	3%	1%	1%	1%	22	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Hot Water	9	84	27	50	7	2%	1%	1%	0%	6	45	14	30	1	2%	1%	1%	0%	7	25	11	12	2	3%	1%	1%	0%
Toilet	10	80	22	41	17	2%	1%	1%	0%	8	25	3	20	2	2%	1%	1%	0%	10	14	1	5	8	2%	0%	1%	1%
Water Pressure	11	79	36	39	4	2%	1%	1%	0%	12	16	3	11	2	2%	1%	1%	0%	8	23	16	7	0	3%	2%	1%	0%
Robes/Slippers	12	64	53	8	3	2%	1%	0%	0%	16	5	5	0	0	2%	1%	0%	0%	17	4	2	2	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Renovated	13	53	23	26	4	1%	1%	1%	0%	11	20	12	8	0	1%	1%	1%	0%	13	9	3	4	2	1%	0%	0%	0%
Sink	14	48	24	17	7	1%	1%	0%	0%	15	6	2	4	0	1%	1%	0%	0%	11	13	4	6	3	1%	0%	1%	0%
Showerhead	15	41	19	20	2	1%	1%	1%	0%	21	1	0	1	0	1%	1%	1%	0%	12	10	6	3	1	1%	1%	0%	0%
Storage	16	39	16	20	3	1%	0%	1%	0%	17	4	2	2	0	1%	0%	1%	0%	15	6	1	5	0	1%	0%	1%	0%
Hairstyling	17	38	21	14	3	1%	1%	0%	0%	10	23	10	12	1	1%	1%	0%	0%	13	9	7	1	1	1%	1%	0%	0%
Mirror	18	37	27	6	4	1%	1%	0%	0%	18	3	1	2	0	1%	1%	0%	0%	17	4	2	2	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Lighting	19	30	20	10	0	1%	1%	0%	0%	18	3	2	1	0	1%	1%	0%	0%	19	3	3	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Private Bath	20	27	20	2	5	1%	1%	0%	0%	8	25	18	2	5	1%	1%	0%	0%	20	2	2	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
TV	21	23	21	2	0	1%	1%	0%	0%	22	0	0	0	0	1%	1%	0%	0%	21	1	1	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Ventilation	22	11	0	10	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	18	3	0	2	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	16	5	0	5	0	1%	0%	1%	0%
View	23	4	4	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	22	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	22	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Figure 4-8 (continued)

Bathroom: Rankings by Sub-themes and Hotel Class (continued)																											
Subthemes	Overall									Class 3									Class 4								
	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%
Bathroom		1152	696	300	156	32%	19%	8%	4%	240	157	51	32	27%	17%	6%	4%	283	219	45	19	31%	24%	5%	2%		
Shower	1	321	177	116	28	9%	5%	3%	1%	2	56	33	19	4	6%	4%	2%	0%	1	112	68	32	12	12%	8%	4%	1%
Size	2	317	199	70	48	9%	6%	2%	1%	1	87	62	12	13	10%	7%	1%	1%	2	88	75	10	3	10%	8%	1%	0%
Cleanliness	3	233	134	93	6	6%	4%	3%	0%	3	37	24	10	3	4%	3%	1%	0%	14	17	10	7	0	2%	1%	1%	0%
Towels	4	157	104	45	8	4%	3%	1%	0%	11	13	12	1	0	1%	1%	0%	0%	6	37	23	14	0	4%	3%	2%	0%
Bath	5	140	100	31	9	4%	3%	1%	0%	4	34	22	11	1	4%	2%	1%	0%	3	75	66	7	2	8%	7%	1%	0%
Products Available	6	132	102	23	7	4%	3%	1%	0%	5	33	30	1	2	4%	3%	0%	0%	5	42	29	11	2	5%	3%	1%	0%
Décor	7	121	95	21	5	3%	3%	1%	0%	6	32	27	4	1	4%	3%	0%	0%	4	45	39	6	0	5%	4%	1%	0%
Shared bathroom	8	100	29	46	25	3%	1%	1%	1%	20	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	22	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Hot Water	9	84	27	50	7	2%	1%	1%	0%	16	6	1	4	1	1%	0%	0%	0%	17	8	1	4	3	1%	0%	0%	0%
Toilet	10	80	22	41	17	2%	1%	1%	0%	12	12	1	7	4	1%	0%	1%	0%	8	29	17	9	3	3%	2%	1%	0%
Water Pressure	11	79	36	39	4	2%	1%	1%	0%	7	21	8	13	0	2%	1%	1%	0%	12	19	9	8	2	2%	1%	1%	0%
Robes/Slippers	12	64	53	8	3	2%	1%	0%	0%	8	19	14	2	3	2%	2%	0%	0%	7	36	32	4	0	4%	4%	0%	0%
Renovated	13	53	23	26	4	1%	1%	1%	0%	9	18	3	13	2	2%	0%	1%	0%	18	6	5	1	0	1%	1%	0%	0%
Sink	14	48	24	17	7	1%	1%	0%	0%	17	5	3	1	1	1%	0%	0%	0%	9	24	15	6	3	3%	2%	1%	0%
Showerhead	15	41	19	20	2	1%	1%	1%	0%	13	11	3	8	0	1%	0%	1%	0%	12	19	10	8	1	2%	1%	1%	0%
Storage	16	39	16	20	3	1%	0%	1%	0%	9	18	8	9	1	2%	1%	1%	0%	16	11	5	4	2	1%	1%	0%	0%
Hairstyling	17	38	21	14	3	1%	1%	0%	0%	18	4	3	1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	20	2	1	0	1	0%	0%	0%	0%
Mirror	18	37	27	6	4	1%	1%	0%	0%	15	10	6	2	2	1%	1%	0%	0%	11	20	18	0	2	2%	2%	0%	0%
Lighting	19	30	20	10	0	1%	1%	0%	0%	13	11	6	5	0	1%	1%	1%	0%	15	13	9	4	0	1%	1%	0%	0%
Private Bath	20	27	20	2	5	1%	1%	0%	0%	20	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	22	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
TV	21	23	21	2	0	1%	1%	0%	0%	20	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	10	22	20	2	0	2%	2%	0%	0%
Ventilation	22	11	0	10	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	19	1	0	1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	20	2	0	2	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
View	23	4	4	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	20	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	19	4	4	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Figure 4-9

General Hotel: Rankings by Sub-themes and Hotel Class																													
Subthemes	Overall										Class 1								Class 2										
	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%		Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%		Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%
General Hotel	1066	745	178	143	30%	21%	5%	4%		216	82	103	31	30%	21%	5%	4%			196	132	36	28	22%	15%	4%	3%		
Décor/Style/Look & Feel	1	597	455	76	66	17%	13%	2%	2%		1	101	42	42	17	17%	13%	2%	2%		1	101	80	11	10	11%	9%	1%	1%
Lobby	2	291	198	43	50	8%	6%	1%	1%		3	41	22	14	5	8%	6%	1%	1%		2	80	45	22	13	9%	5%	2%	1%
Interior/Hallways	3	91	20	66	5	3%	1%	2%	0%		2	58	8	48	2	3%	1%	2%	0%		6	8	1	5	2	1%	0%	1%	0%
Size of Hotel	4	89	42	18	29	2%	1%	1%	1%		4	25	5	12	8	2%	1%	1%	1%		4	20	8	5	7	2%	1%	1%	1%
"Like home"	5	71	69	1	1	2%	2%	0%	0%		8	5	4	1	0	2%	2%	0%	0%		5	12	12	0	0	1%	1%	0%	0%
Clientele	6	70	47	14	9	2%	1%	0%	0%		6	19	9	6	4	2%	1%	0%	0%		3	25	17	7	1	3%	2%	1%	0%
Oasis	7	39	39	0	0	1%	1%	0%	0%		12	0	0	0	0	1%	1%	0%	0%		12	1	1	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Odor	8	38	6	31	1	1%	0%	1%	0%		4	25	1	24	0	1%	0%	1%	0%		7	6	1	5	0	1%	0%	1%	0%
Decorations (Holiday)	9	33	29	3	1	1%	1%	0%	0%		9	2	1	1	0	1%	1%	0%	0%		9	5	5	0	0	1%	1%	0%	0%
Exterior	10	28	12	11	5	1%	0%	0%	0%		7	15	5	8	2	1%	0%	0%	0%		7	6	3	1	2	1%	0%	0%	0%
Pets Allowed	11	26	21	3	2	1%	1%	0%	0%		9	2	0	2	0	1%	1%	0%	0%		14	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Brand transition	12	13	0	3	10	0%	0%	0%	0%		12	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%		14	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Fireplace	13	12	11	0	1	0%	0%	0%	0%		12	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%		11	2	2	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Courtyard	14	10	10	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%		12	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%		9	5	5	0	0	1%	1%	0%	0%
Signage	15	7	0	6	1	0%	0%	0%	0%		12	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%		14	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Lighting	15	7	1	5	1	0%	0%	0%	0%		11	1	0	1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%		14	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Garden	17	4	4	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%		12	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%		12	1	1	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Go Green	18	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%		12	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%		14	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Figure 4-9 (continued)

General Hotel: Rankings by Sub-themes and Hotel Class (continued)																												
Subthemes	Overall										Class 3						Class 4											
	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%		Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%	Rank	T	g	b	n	T%	g%	b%	n%
General Hotel	1066	745	178	143	30%	21%	5%	4%		348	275	23	50	39%	31%	3%	6%		306	256	16	34	34%	28%	2%	4%		
Décor/Style/Look & Feel	1	597	455	76	66	17%	13%	2%	2%		1	206	171	11	24	23%	19%	1%	3%	1	189	162	12	15	21%	18%	1%	2%
Lobby	2	291	198	43	50	8%	6%	1%	1%		2	78	59	5	14	9%	7%	1%	2%	2	92	72	2	18	10%	8%	0%	2%
Interior/Hallways	3	91	20	66	5	3%	1%	2%	0%		7	13	8	4	1	1%	1%	0%	0%	7	12	3	9	0	1%	0%	1%	0%
Size of Hotel	4	89	42	18	29	2%	1%	1%	1%		4	23	15	0	8	3%	2%	0%	1%	4	21	14	1	6	2%	2%	0%	1%
"Like home"	5	71	69	1	1	2%	2%	0%	0%		3	27	26	0	1	3%	3%	0%	0%	3	27	27	0	0	3%	3%	0%	0%
Clientele	6	70	47	14	9	2%	1%	0%	0%		11	6	5	0	1	1%	1%	0%	0%	5	20	16	1	3	2%	2%	0%	0%
Oasis	7	39	39	0	0	1%	1%	0%	0%		5	20	20	0	0	2%	2%	0%	0%	6	18	18	0	0	2%	2%	0%	0%
Odor	8	38	6	31	1	1%	0%	1%	0%		13	5	2	2	1	1%	0%	0%	0%	13	2	2	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Decorations (Holiday)	9	33	29	3	1	1%	1%	0%	0%		6	16	14	1	1	2%	2%	0%	0%	9	10	9	1	0	1%	1%	0%	0%
Exterior	10	28	12	11	5	1%	0%	0%	0%		15	2	0	2	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	10	5	4	0	1	1%	0%	0%	0%
Pets Allowed	11	26	21	3	2	1%	1%	0%	0%		9	12	10	1	1	1%	1%	0%	0%	7	12	11	0	1	1%	1%	0%	0%
Brand transition	12	13	0	3	10	0%	0%	0%	0%		7	13	0	3	10	1%	0%	0%	1%	16	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Fireplace	13	12	11	0	1	0%	0%	0%	0%		10	10	9	0	1	1%	1%	0%	0%	16	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Courtyard	14	10	10	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%		16	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	10	5	5	0	0	1%	1%	0%	0%
Signage	15	7	0	6	1	0%	0%	0%	0%		11	6	0	5	1	1%	0%	1%	0%	14	1	0	1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Lighting	15	7	1	5	1	0%	0%	0%	0%		13	5	0	4	1	1%	0%	0%	0%	14	1	1	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Garden	17	4	4	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%		16	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	12	3	3	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Go Green	18	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%		16	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	16	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Chapter 5

Discussion

5.1 Top Three Major Theme Frequency Rankings and Related Sub-themes

This study corroborates previous research findings that the top three major attributes of importance to guests are Service, Location, and Rooms (Zhang and Ye, 2011; Barsky and Labagh, 1992). The class divisions and valence attached to these attributes and their related sub-themes reveal several useful insights. To begin, the prevalence of location as both a major theme and a major source of “good” reviews affirm the notion in the lodging industry that location is paramount in terms of competitive advantage (Zhang and Ye, 2011). This was, perhaps, especially apparent in this data sample, since guests in major metropolitan areas are more likely to value the convenience of walking distance to attractions or public transportation. Evidence from sub-theme analysis supports this, with location to nearby attractions (40% frequency with 39% “good”) and transportation (20% frequency and 19% “good”) ranking in first and second place overall. Results from this study found that each sub-theme encompassed by Location was mentioned with a clear majority of “good” rankings; “bad” and “neutral” percentages never exceeded 1%. This is perhaps because guests, when booking the property, took location into account and their experiences affirmed a good location. It also suggests that Location was a satisfier to guests in this sample. Hoteliers can use this information to their advantage at different stages of business strategy. If they are looking to build a new property, location selection should be of utmost consideration in order to build long-lasting competitive advantage. If they are trying

to attract guests to an existing property, they could market aspects of their location in a positive light; for example, advertising a “serene, quiet neighborhood away from the stress of the city” or a “bustling location just steps from Times Square.” If the existing location is inconvenient, the hotel could provide ancillary services that decrease this concern, such as complimentary guest shuttles to nearby attractions. Note that, in this study, Location ranked 3rd for midscale, upscale, and luxury hotels but 1st for economy hotels, which contradicts prior research findings that location is not important to guests in the economy segment (Zhang and Ye, 2011). This top ranking could support the idea that guests in this segment place higher consideration on the most basic aspects of their stay, including convenience to local attractions and activities.

The attribute of Service, which ranked in first place overall, offers a wealth of information via sub-theme examination. The top three themes were consistent across all classes, suggesting that guests from this sample all valued the same things regardless of class. The friendliness and attitudes of employees ranked first overall, with 1,694 total mentions (47%), 1,506 of which were positive. This was followed closely with the 2nd top sub-theme, helpfulness, which was mentioned 1,559 times, 1,323 of which were positive. It is worth note that these often occurred within the same clause in context, with sentences such as, “From the warm, friendly and very helpful greeting when we arrived, we knew it would be a good stay” (Review #1269). The frequent pairing of these two themes suggests that guests who see staff members as helpful also perceive them as friendly, and vice versa.

Front desk interactions ranked third overall within Service, which is not surprising considering every guest must interact with these employees at least once throughout his or her stay. This theme was often coded along with speed of service, which ranked in fifth place overall. Payment process, as well, was always double-coded with front desk interactions, since front desk employees handle this transaction; it was almost always coded as a complaint (66 “bad” codings out of 74 total mentions). Front desk interactions and the aforementioned themes

combine together to form “moments of truth” for overall guest opinions of the hotel. Consider the following review:

“The most disturbing thing about our stay was how we were greeted, which was not in a friendly way. We took the elevator up to reception with our suitcases, found no one at the desk, but overheard an animated conversation. A woman got up and we clearly felt as if we were interrupting her and she said to us, "Can I help you with something?" in a quick annoyed kind of manner as if we were bothering her. It was not the greeting I expected especially as there would be little else we would be doing in "reception" with luggage than checking in or inquiring about a place to stay if we didn't have a reservation (but we did). There was then some confusion about the cost of the room and again the woman who greeted us was not super friendly but instead said "well, if there's a problem take it up with the manager." Of course the manager wasn't around. It turned out to be a misunderstanding about how they calculated the cost, but I felt that the person should have been more polite. [...] First impressions are lasting...so this hotel definitely needs to work on its greeting; we were put off and didn't feel that we'd made the right choice initially. This could have been avoided simply by having a politeness policy for greeting guests. (Review #1271).”

The most frequently occurring Service sub-themes from this study are exemplified in the sample review above. Potential future guests may likely read this type of comprehensive negative review during the travel-planning process and use it to inform their choices. With the knowledge that employee attitudes, helpfulness, front desk interactions, and payment processes are salient attributes in guests' minds, hoteliers can train employees to meet and exceed guest expectations in these areas and thereby earn positive feedback. They can also take note of guest suggestions such as the “politeness policy” mentioned above and put them into action.

Rooms' position as a top-ranking attribute is not surprising, as this represents the most tangible part of the guests' experience. Several sub-themes within rooms emerged as salient attributes, the most prominent of which was room size, ranking in first place across the board. As this study examined metropolitan hotels, many of the rooms were small; however, the majority of mentions of room size were "good" and "neutral" rather than bad. Many guest comments excused this, such as, "The rooms are cleverly designed and modern but there is no getting away from the fact that they are small. However as you are staying there to visit New York you are only in the room for overnight before up and out again to explore the City (Review #1123)."

The room view and floor within the hotel both ranked within the top five room sub-themes, and were both most-often cited as "good." As stated above, these often occurred together, since the higher floors in city hotels tend to offer better views. These themes were most prominent in upscale and luxury hotels, where guests seem to value "luxury" aspects such as a view more than the basic accommodations valued by economy and midscale customers. This finding suggests that view and/or floor in hotel may serve as an acceptable rate fence, with customers in higher classes willing to pay more for this feature. Décor and furniture of rooms also ranked the highest in luxury hotels, reinforcing the suggestion that customers in this segment devote more attention to more specific tangible items such as color scheme and furniture quality.

Major complaints emerging from room sub-themes were Aircon/Heating system temperature and noise, which were almost always coded as sources of complaints. "Bad" codings for these attributes meant that the systems were either broken or unreasonably noisy, thereby negatively affecting guest comfort in terms of temperature and sleep quality. Carpets, floors, walls and ceilings were also often cited as "bad," meaning that the guest noticed wear and tear and suggested that the rooms were in need of renovations. Hoteliers can take note of these often-cited negative attributes and devote more attention to addressing these problems with small-scale maintenance, such as tightening loose bolts or panels on an aircon unit to decrease noise. Doing

so could easily decrease negative mentions within reviews and, as a result, improve overall guest perceptions.

5.2 Additional Major Theme and Sub-theme Rankings and Implications

Food and Beverage ranked in 4th place overall for those hotels that offered it (within midscale, upscale, and luxury hotels). Sub-themes of note within this category are Complimentary Breakfast and Menu Variety. Complimentary Breakfast was ranked first overall and first within the economy, midscale, and upscale hotel classes. It was most cited within midscale hotels, where a complimentary breakfast is often a determinant in purchasing decision for guests. Menu variety ranked 2nd place in this class, as well, and was often coded along with the breakfast; guests with “good” comments complimented the spread of the breakfast, while those with “bad” comments rebuked the perceived minimal offerings. This suggests that guests, especially within midscale hotels, consider the breakfast to be a salient attribute within the experience; thus, hoteliers stand to benefit from monitoring its reception in guest opinion and constantly considering quality improvements.

Within the major theme of Bathrooms, the most notable complaint was for Shared Bathrooms. This sub-theme was only coded for economy hotels, and it ranked as 2nd place within this division, clearly demonstrating itself as a major source of dissatisfaction. Many hotels in this class featured these shared bathrooms rather than more common private facilities, and this was often a source of surprise for guests. While hoteliers in these properties cannot change the design of their buildings, they could attempt to improve these ratings by making it very clear pre-booking that these bathrooms are shared, thus avoiding a sense of guest “shock” and dissatisfaction upon arrival.

The décor/style/look and feel of the hotel in general ranked 1st place overall and within every class in the General Hotel category, with the highest frequencies in upscale hotels (206 overall at 23%) and luxury hotels (189 overall at 21%). The sub-themes of “lobby” and “like home” also increased in salience along with class, ranking 2nd and 3rd, respectively in upscale and luxury hotels. This suggests that guests in the luxury segment tend to place more attention on the overall atmosphere of the hotel than guests from economy and midscale hotels.

5.3 Notable Differences by Hotel Class

The findings of this study seem to support some qualities within the hierarchy of needs constructed by Zhang and Ye (2011). Guests within economy and midscale hotels tend to value the basic, tangible aspects of a room, as evidenced by the following review:

“It's really bedroom, a room with a small bed, a place to lay your body sleep at night.

There are few shared bathroom to have yourself cleaned. You'll get this kind of room if only you order the room with the cheapest rate ever: \$45 for 5th floor male dorm. If you only need a place to sleep after a day long [of] enjoying New York City, who cares? (Review #100).”

Guests in luxury segments, in turn, take greater notice of attributes such as décor, furniture, view, and the height of the floor within the hotel, as well as the offerings of complimentary items. This is evidenced in the following review from a luxury hotel:

“One of the best hotel experiences I've ever had in my life. Front desk clerk was very friendly and gave me us a room on the 29th floor looking towards the Delaware River.

Gorgeous view. For a building that is 80 years old, they've done a great job with making it feel modern while still keeping the historic aspects intact. Every afternoon they had warm apple cider and fresh water in the lobby. They even have a nice aroma that they

pump throughout the hotel that you notice as soon as you walk in. [...] I will definitely stay here again and recommend to all of my friends. (Review #2419)”

These “luxury” attributes may be accepted among guests as rate fences due to their greater perceived salience within these hotel classes.

Other notable differences between economy/midscale classes and luxury classes involve the level of service. While friendliness, helpfulness, front desk, and timeliness rank rather equally among all classes, more personalized attributes such as being remembered specifically by name and having staff members go “above and beyond” for guests increase in importance along with class. These findings corroborate past research which suggests that luxury segment guests value aspects such as “being treated as the center of attention” and “being recognized in the lobby” as more important (Wilkins, Merrilees, and Herrington, 2006). Service, regardless of lower-level subthemes, however, proved to reign supreme across all classes in this sample; this suggests that it should be enforced as highly important to staff-members in every property. It seems to be the major force of moments-of-truth in the overall guest opinion. As one guest noted in a complaint for an economy hotel property,

“I think most travelers, like me, would trade a few amenities for consistent and reliable service, so as to not have a "situation" that could single-handedly ruin a travel experience. Unfortunately, that was the case here (Review 2498).”

5.4 Overall Implications and Conclusion

The results of this study revealed not only the major attributes the guest discuss in online reviews, but also the meanings that they attach to them. By quantifying this qualitative data, the researcher was able to develop ranking of attribute themes and sub-themes according to the frequencies within their comments. This ranking identified sources of guest complaints and

satisfaction and highlighted areas of improvement for hoteliers to consider in future strategy formulation and resource allocation. While this study provides an important illustration of insights that can be gained through a content analysis of UGC, it also provides an approach or method to synthesize and use UGC data to improve hotel services at the single-hotel level. This is particularly aided by the inclusion of valence in this synthesis. One hotel sampled in this study, for example, had complaints by over 40% of guests concerning malfunctioning key-cards. While these results would not build to a significance based on the levels of disaggregation in this study, they would clearly indicate a problem if analyzed just for that hotel. If managers from that property were to monitor their UGC in the manner outlined in this research, they would clearly see that keycards emerge as a major source of guest dissatisfaction and negative word-of-mouth that is being shared with potential guests. Prompt attention to this matter, including both corrections of the actual problem and responses to negative UGC promising that this concern has been eradicated, could improve negative guest perceptions of the property and perhaps lead to increased future bookings.

Hoteliers in today's rapidly expanding world of UGC stand to benefit from performing such analyses for reviews at their property level, constantly identifying areas of guest satisfaction and areas for improvement. By identifying and addressing these salient attributes, these properties can improve the content of future guest reviews, thereby improving their image in the eyes of potential guests considering them in the pre-purchasing decision stage. These guests could sequentially become part of the aforementioned 40% and higher proportions of guests who booked the hotel because they were influenced by word-of-mouth sources. With the growing popularity and demonstrated trust with which guests view UGC, this proportion of influenced customer mix stands to increase in the future. Hoteliers stand to benefit by proactively analyzing UGC and applying this free source of guest feedback to future business strategies and practices.

Appendix

Appendix 1-1

Hotels Coded in Sample				
Class	City	Stars	Hotel Name	Total Reviews
Class 1				
	NYC	1.0	The Murray Hill Inn	225
	NYC	1.0	Royal Park Hotel	179
	NYC	1.5	Hotel Carter	2,393
	NYC	1.0	The Amsterdam Inn	111
	NYC	1.0	Hotel Riverside Studios	406
	NYC	2.0	The Jane	553
	NYC	2.0	Broadway at Times Square Hotel	979
	NYC	2.0	Sohotel	601
	NYC	2.0	Chelsea Savoy Hotel	289
	NYC	2.0	Comfort Inn Manhattan	949
	NYC	1.5	World Hotel	115
	NYC	1.0	Sun Bright Hotel	106
	NYC	1.0	Latham Hotel	798
	NYC	2.0	Comfort Inn Lower East Side	374
	NYC	2.0	Hotel 31	1,082
	NYC	2.5	Wolcott Hotel	888
	NYC	2.0	Off SoHo Suites	155
	NYC	2.5	Park 79 Hotel	745
	NYC	2.5	Hotel Azure	134
	NYC	2.0	The Gershwin Hotel	858
	NYC	2.5	Marrakech Hotel on Broadway	724
	PHL	2.0	Days Inn Philadelphia Convention Center	184
	PHL	2.5	BEST WESTERN Center City Hotel	225
	PHL	2.0	Rodeway Inn Center City	174
	PHL	2.5	Holiday Inn Express Philadelphia Midtown	394
	PHL	2.0	Microtel Inn & Suites by Wyndham Philadelphia Airport	348
	PHL	2.5	Skyview Plaza Hotel & Suites	148
	CHG	2.0	Days Inn Chicago	577
	CHG	2.0	Travelodge Chicago Downtown	504
	CHG	2.0	Carlton Inn Midway	236
Class 2				
	NYC	3.5	Distrikt Hotel	2,003
	NYC	3.0	Candlewood Suites NYC Times Square	685
	NYC	3.0	Hampton Inn Madison Square Garden	651
	NYC	3.5	Best Western PLUS President Hotel at Times Square	1,119
	NYC	3.0	The Mave	390
	NYC	3.0	Ramada Eastside	519
	NYC	3.0	Holiday Inn Express New York City Fifth Ave	506
	NYC	3.0	Edison Hotel Times Square	3,200
	NYC	3.5	The Belvedere	2,988

NYC	3.5	Affinia Manhattan	3,390	
NYC	3.5	Wyndham Garden Chinatown	115	
NYC	3.5	Fitzpatrick Grand Central Hotel	756	
NYC	3.0	Fairfield Inn and Suites Manhattan/Chelsea	205	
NYC	3.0	Pod 39	323	
NYC	3.0	Ace Hotel NYC	632	
NYC	3.0	Wellington Hotel	2,979	
NYC	3.5	The Lombardy	160	
NYC	3.0	Residence Inn by Marriott Times Square New York	1,068	
NYC	3.5	Courtyard by Marriott New York Manhattan/Midtown East	950	
NYC	3.0	Hampton Inn Manhattan-SoHo	728	
PHL	3.0	The Independent	379	
PHL	3.5	Latham Hotel	114	
PHL	3.0	Courtyard Philadelphia Downtown	629	
PHL	3.0	The Windsor Suites	402	
PHL	3.5	Philadelphia Marriott Downtown	902	
CHG	3.5	Amalfi Hotel Chicago	1,044	
CHG	3.0	Hampton Majestic Chicago Theatre District	667	
CHG	3.0	BEST WESTERN PLUS Hawthorne Terrace Hotel	195	
CHG	3.5	Wyndham Blake Chicago	685	
CHG	3.0	Holiday Inn Chicago Downtown	250	
<hr/>				
Class				
3	NYC	4.5	Casablanca Hotel Times Square	2,461
	NYC	4.0	Andaz Wall Street	962
	NYC	4.0	Hilton Times Square	1,832
	NYC	4.0	InterContinental New York Barclay	2,208
	NYC	4.0	Le Parker Meridien	2,520
	NYC	4.5	JW Marriott Essex House New York	974
	NYC	4.0	Carlton Hotel, Autograph Collection	1,134
	NYC	4.0	Millenium Hilton	1,653
	NYC	4.0	The New Yorker Hotel	4,040
	NYC	4.0	Hudson New York	3,523
	NYC	4.0	Hotel Giraffe	1,492
	NYC	4.0	The Bryant Park Hotel	1,260
	NYC	4.0	The Muse Hotel New York	1,374
	NYC	4.0	Smyth Hotel - A Thompson Hotel	345
	NYC	4.0	On The Ave Hotel	2,483
	NYC	4.0	Renaissance New York Hotel 57	430
	NYC	4.0	W New York - Downtown	377
	NYC	4.5	SoHo Grand Hotel	852
	NYC	4.0	The Helmsley Park Lane	1,298
	NYC	4.0	Doubletree Hotel Metropolitan - New York City	1,975
	PHL	4.0	Hotel Palomar Philadelphia - a Kimpton Hotel	970
	PHL	4.0	Rittenhouse 1715, a Boutique Hotel	271
	PHL	4.0	Omni Hotel at Independence Park	548
	PHL	4.0	Loews Philadelphia Hotel	934
	PHL	4.0	Sheraton Philadelphia Society Hill Hotel	181
	CHG	4.0	The Talbott Hotel	707
	CHG	4.0	Hotel Burnham - a Kimpton Hotel	717
	CHG	4.5	James Chicago	1,030
	CHG	4.0	Hotel Lincoln	228
	CHG	4.0	Hyatt Chicago Magnificent Mile	139

Class				
4	NYC	5.0	Crosby Street Hotel	274
	NYC	5.0	Trump SoHo New York	1,225
	NYC	5.0	Greenwich Hotel	225
	NYC	5.0	The Mark	254
	NYC	5.0	The Setai Fifth Avenue	542
	NYC	5.0	The Chatwal	376
	NYC	5.0	Trump International Hotel and Tower	408
	NYC	5.0	The Surrey	564
	NYC	5.0	The Plaza Hotel	518
	NYC	5.0	The Towers of the Waldorf Astoria	369
	NYC	5.0	The St. Regis New York	373
	NYC	5.0	The Pierre, A Taj Hotel, New York	306
	NYC	5.0	Mandarin Oriental, New York	506
	NYC	5.0	Four Seasons Hotel New York	406
	NYC	5.0	The Peninsula New York	352
	NYC	5.0	Conrad New York	403
	NYC	5.0	Gansevoort Meatpacking NYC	706
	NYC	5.0	ONE UN New York	1,453
	NYC	5.0	The Ritz-Carlton New York, Battery Park	772
	NYC	5.0	The Carlyle, a Rosewood Hotel	256
	PHL	5.0	The Rittenhouse Hotel	324
	PHL	5.0	Four Seasons Hotel Philadelphia	579
	PHL	5.0	Ritz-Carlton Philadelphia	392
	CHG	5.0	Trump International Hotel and Tower Chicago	782
	CHG	5.0	Four Seasons Hotel Chicago	561
	CHG	5.0	The Peninsula Chicago	508
	CHG	5.0	The Ritz-Carlton Chicago (A Four Seasons Hotel)	621
	CHG	5.0	Park Hyatt Chicago	427
	NYC	5.0	Hotel Plaza Athenee New York	191
	NYC	5.0	Gramercy Park Hotel	349

Appendix 1-2

Major Theme and Sub-theme Coding Categories

Value	Toilet
Price	Towels
Location	TV in Bathroom
Rooms	Ventilation
A/C and Heat (Noise)	View
A/C and Heat (Temperature)	Water Pressure
A/C Controls	Water Temperature
Balcony/Patio	Cleanliness
Carpet/Floor	Bed Bugs
Comfortable	Frequency/Timing of Housekeeping
Décor/Furniture	Hotel (in general)
Floor in hotel	Housekeeping Staff
Kitchenette	Pests (rodents, cockroaches)
Lighting/Windows	Pet allergies (fur)
Location in Hotel (in terms of noise)	Rooms
Nearby attractions	Maintenance
Nearby restaurants/bars	Service
Neighborhood	"Above and beyond" duty
Odor	Accommodating
Parking	Availability/ Attentiveness
Renovated or Needs Renovation	Butler
Sink In-room	Check-in/Check-out/Reception Desk
Size	Concierge
Smoking odor	Early Check-in/Late Check-out
Storage Space	Friendliness/General Attitudes
Transportation	Fulfilled personalized requests
View	Helpfulness
Walls/Ceilings	Honesty
Window Seating Area	Languages Spoken
Bathroom	Luggage storage
Bath	Payment Process
Cleanliness	Porters/Bell-hops/Doormen
Décor	Professional
Hairstyling Equipment	Quality Assurance (email or phone)
Lighting	Recommendations
Mirror	Remember customers by name
Private Bath	Special Occasion Recognized
Products/Amenities Available	Specific employees (by name)
Renovated	Timeliness/Speed of service
Robes/Slippers	Welcoming
Shared bathroom	Bed
Shower	Cleanliness
Showerhead	Comfort
Sink	Linens
Size	Mattress
Storage	Pillow concierge

Pillows	Odor
Size	Pet policy
Turn-down Service	Pets Allowed
Sleep Quality	Signage
Noise	Size of Hotel
Amenities	Smoking Allowed
Alarm Clock/Radio	Elevator
Cell Phone Reception	Entertainment/Music
Computer	Size
Digital TV (advanced)	Stairs/Carrying Luggage
DVD Player	Wait Time
Electricity	Security
Espresso/Advanced Drink Machines	Clientele (other hotel guests)
Free phone calls	Illegal Activity
Fridge	Keys
Gaming systems	Privacy
Ice in room	Safe/Deposit Box
Ice Machine	Safety (Hazards)
iPads	Safety Box Room
iPod dock	Security Staff
Iron	Theft
Microwave	Extra Charges
Minibar	Food and Beverage
Mirror(s) in-room	Allergies
Movies on-demand	Appetizers/Snacks
Newspaper	Bag meals
No WiFi	Bar (atmosphere)
Phone	Bar (décor)
Reading Lights	Bar (Entertainment)
Stove	Bar (food)
Tea/Coffee Maker & Supplies	Bar (Honor-system)
Toaster	Bar (Hours)
TV	Bar (in general)
Utensils/Glassware	Bar (Staff)
Vending Machines	Breakfast (complimentary)
WiFi (Connection)	Breakfast (non-complimentary)
WiFi (Free or charged)	Breakfast Hours
Writing paper/pen	Breakfast Room
General Hotel	Café
"Like home"	Coffee & Tea
Brand transition	Dinner
Clientele	Drinks
Courtyard	F&B Staff Friendliness/Attitudes
Décor/Style/Look & Feel	Food (in general)
Decorations (Special Occasion)	Food amounts
Exterior	Food/Drink Vouchers
Fireplace	Happy hour
Garden	Menu Variety
Interior/Hallways	Prices
Lighting	Private Room
Lobby	Restaurant (Atmosphere)
Oasis	Restaurant (Cleanliness)

Restaurant (Décor)	Newspaper/Periodical
Restaurant (Food)	Pastries/Biscuits/Fruits
Restaurant (in general)	Pencils
Restaurant (Size)	Personal Note (Manager)
Room Service	Returning Customer Presents
Seating	Shoe Polishing
Service Charges	Snacks
Tea room	Social Media Vouchers/Perks
Utensils/Glassware	Special Occasion Cakes/Card/Wine/etc.
Waffle maker	Stuffed Animal
Wine Selection	Tote bags
Extra Facilities	Travel cups
Barbershop/Blow-dry Bar	Umbrellas
Business center/Computer area	Water Bottles/Sodas
Cinema	Weather Report
Concierge Lounge	Welcome Drink
Convenience Store	Wine bottle/Champagne bottle
Drawing Room	Wine/Cheese/Snacks (Social Hour)
Gym	Car Service
Gym (Fitness Passes Elsewhere)	Calling a Car
Gym (Juice Bar)	Free Shuttle
Gym (Personal Trainer)	Parking Charges
Gym (Yoga Mats)	Valet service
Jacuzzi/Hot Tub	Random Perks
Kitchen for Guests	Bicycles
Laundry	Customer Appreciation Night
Library	iPad rentals
Lounges	Promotional Activities
Lounges (Hours)	Rewards Member
Massage	Recognized & Received Perks
Meeting Room	Additional Items Coded
Meeting Room (Décor)	Booking (Hotel Website)
Meeting Room (Service)	Booking (OTA)
Meeting Room (Views)	Booking (Package Holiday)
Outdoor Balcony	Booking (Travel Agent)
Pool	Cancellation Policy
Pool (Design/Quality)	Changed Rooms
Pool (Fees)	Errors from Booking to Arrival
Pool (Rooftop)	Guest Chose to Leave Hotel
Reception Hall	Repeat Customer
Rooftop	Service Reconciliation
Smoking Areas	TripAdvisor Ratings Considered Before Arrival
Spa	Upgraded During Stay
Tea Room	Website was Misleading
Complementary Items	Overall Recommendation (Recommend/Will Return)
Children's toys	
Chocolates	
Cookies/Brownies	
Flowers	
Free Coffee & Tea	
Gym (Complementary Pass)	
Hot Water (for tea)	

REFERENCES

- Bansal, H.S., and Voyer, P.A. (2000). Word-of-mouth processes within a services purchase decision context. *Journal of Service Research*, 3(2), 166-177. doi: 10.1177/109467050032005
- Barsky, J.D., & Frame, C. (2009, August 28). Handling online reviews: Best practices. *Hospitality net*. Retrieved from <http://www.hospitalitynet.org/news/4043169.html>
- Barsky, J.D., Labagh, R., 1992. A strategy for customer satisfaction. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 32-40.
- Cadotte, E.R., and Turgeon, N. (1988). Key factors in guest satisfaction. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 28(4), 44-51. doi: 10.1177/001088048802800415
- Dellarocas, C. (2003). The digitization of word of mouth: Promise and challenges of online feedback mechanisms. *Management Science*, 49(10), 1407-1424. doi: 10.1287/mnsc.49.10.1407.17308
- Dubé, L., & Renaghan, L. M. (1999). Building customer loyalty. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 40(5), 78,5-88,5. doi: 10.1016/S0010-8804(99)80236-5
- Gretzel, U., & Yoo, K. H. (2008). Use and impact of online travel reviews. (pp. 35-46). Vienna: Springer Vienna. doi: 10.1007/978-3-211-77280-5_4
- Lessig, V.P., & Park, C. W. (1978). Promotional perspectives of reference group influence: Advertising implications. *Journal of Advertising* (Pre-1986), 7(000002), 41-41. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/208474225?accountid=13158>
- Levy, S., Duan, W., and Boo, S. (2013). An analysis of one-star online reviews and responses in the Washington, D.C., lodging market. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 54(1), 49-63. doi: 10.1177/1938965512464513

- Maslow, A.H. (1987). *Motivation and personality* (3rd ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Min, H., Min, H., and Chung, K. (2002). Dynamic benchmarking of hotel service quality. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 16(4), 302-321. doi: 10.1108/08876040210433211
- Nielsen (2009). Global advertising consumers trust real friends and virtual strangers the most. Retrieved April 1, 2012, from <http://www.nielsen.com/us/en/newswire/2009/global-advertising-consumers-trust-real-friends-and-virtual-strangers-the-most.html>.
- Pannell Kerr Forster Associates, (1991). *The Corporate Hotel User*. PKFA, London.
- Pantelidis, I. S. (2010). Electronic meal experience: A content analysis of online restaurant comments. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 51(4), 483-491. doi: 10.1177/1938965510378574
- Park, D.-H., Lee, J. and Han, I. (2007). "The effect of on-line consumer reviews on consumer purchasing intention: the moderating role of involvement", *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, Vol. 11 No. 4, pp. 125-48.
- Pullman, M., McGuire, K., and Cleveland, C. (2005). Let me count the words: Quantifying open-ended interactions with guests. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 46(3), 323-343. doi: 10.1177/0010880405276309
- Ramanathan, R. (2010). E-commerce success criteria: Determining which criteria count most. *Electronic Commerce Research*, 10(2), 191-208. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10660-010-9051-3>
- Review Trackers. (2013). Tripadvisor reaches 100 million reviews, shares more numbers on why reviews matter. *Review Trackers*, Retrieved from <http://www.reviewtrackers.com/tripadvisor-reaches-100-million-reviews-shares-numbers-reviews-matter/>

- Roushdy, A. S. (2012). Factors affecting customer satisfaction and employee satisfaction in the hotel industry in Egypt (A comparative study). *The Business Review*, Cambridge, 20(1), 327-338. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1040636076?accountid=13158>
- Savitz, E. (2011, December 13). TripAdvisor: Benchmark says buy; bullish on travel ads. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/ericsavitz/2011/12/13/tripadvisor-benchmark-says-buy-bullish-on-travel-ads/>
- Schindler, R. M., & Bickart, B. (2012). Perceived helpfulness of online consumer reviews: The role of message content and style. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 11(3), 234-243. doi: 10.1002/cb.1372
- Smith Travel Research. (2013). *Glossary: A guide to our terminology*. Retrieved from <http://www.strglobal.com/Resources/Glossary.aspx>
- TripAdvisor. (2013). Fact sheet. http://www.tripadvisor.com/PressCenter-c4-Fact_Sheet.html (accessed April 1, 2013).
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). *United states census 2010: Interactive population map*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/2010census/popmap/>
- Wilkins, H., Merrilees, B., & Herington, C. (2007). Towards an understanding of total service quality in hotels. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 26(4), 840-853. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2006.07.006
- Wilson, A., Murphy, H., and Fierro, J.C. (2012). Hospitality and travel: The nature and implications of user-generated content. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 53(3), 220-228. doi: 10.1177/1938965512449317
- Zhang, Z., Ye, O., and Law, R. (2011). Determinants of hotel room price. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 23(7), 972-981. doi: 10.1108/095961111111167551

EDUCATION

The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA

Graduation: May 2013

- B.S. in Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Management; Minor in Spanish
- Concentrations in Revenue Management and Consulting

RELEVANT COURSEWORK

- STAT 500—Applied Statistics
- STAT 501—Regression Methods
- HRIM 483—Revenue Management
- RPTM 530—Research Methods in Leisure Studies

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Penn State Biology Department, University Park, PA; *Multimedia Specialist*

June 2010 - Present

- Worked with Dr. Blair Hedges to create a collection of 300+ scientific illustrations for the *TimeTree* iPhone application
- Developed multimedia content for CaribNature.org, CaribMaps.org, Blindsnakes.org, and CaribHerp.org
- Translated English to Spanish content for educational video essays
- Managed species collection databases with Microsoft Access and plotted geographical data in GoogleEarth

Mercer, Philadelphia, PA; *Human Capital Consulting Intern*

June 2012—Aug. 2012

- Assisted with projects in all areas of Human Capital; Specialized in sales compensation modeling in Excel
- Worked on the National Intern Team to develop a company-wide presentation on Employers of Choice
- Developed a visual tool using Tableau that scans for HR trends among top U.S. employers
- Researched historical correlations between ISS reports and shareholder say-on-pay votes

The Penn Stater Conference Center and Hotel, State College, PA; *Student*

July 2011 – Dec. 2011

- Cleaned guest room and public space areas as a Guest Room Attendant; Monitored information through PMS
- Shadowed and assisted employees and managers during a 15-week, 50-hour rotation through Front Desk, Housekeeping, Maintenance, and Safety and Security

The Daily Collegian, State College, PA; *Graphic Designer*

Sept. 2008 – Oct. 2009

- Worked with editors and reporters to create informational graphics; Researched and organized statistical information
- Designed pages for daily newspaper and weekly magazine; Used Adobe Photoshop, Illustrator, and Quark Xpress

Hershey Entertainment and Resorts, Hershey, PA; *Restaurant Supervisor*

Mar. 2005 – Aug. 2009

- Trained new employees and delegated daily tasks to 15-25 person staff; Cleaned, opened, and closed restaurant
- Ordered daily stock; Prepared food and served customers on the front line
- Counted, documented, and handled revenue; Monitored employee breaks and labor hours

Junta de Beneficiencia de Guayaquil, Guayaquil, Ecuador; *Medical Translator*

Nov. 2008

- Traveled and worked with surgeons from the Penn State Hershey Medical Center as they performed pro-bono heart surgeries for impoverished children; Translated between residents and patients during preliminary exams
- Interviewed families in a free clinic to document medical history; Comforted children during pre- and post-operations

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CLUBS

Penn State Dance Marathon (THON)

Fall 2008 – Spring 2013

Hospitality Captain – Administrative Assistant (2012), Logistics (2013)

- Largest student-run philanthropy in the world; raises over \$10.6 million a year for children with cancer
- Administrator for a 20-member Captain committee; maintained group website and posted Meeting Minutes
- Interviewed, selected, and led 22-member Hospitality committee; conducted weekly meetings and coordinated events
- Designed, ordered, and distributed Captain and All-Committee merchandise; handled over \$12,000 in cash
- Secured food donations from local and national businesses for THON 5K, Family Carnival, and THON Weekend

Schreyer Honors College, *SHOtime Orientation Mentor*

Fall 2008 – Present

- Mentored incoming Schreyer students throughout a week-long orientation event
- Assisted peers with move-in and provided campus tours; Led group information sessions and scholar discussions