HOW DO THE CUSTOMERS RATE THE HOTELS ON REVIEW SITES: EVIDENCE FROM HURGHADA HOTELS IN EGYPT?

MOHAMED T. A. ABDELMAWGOUD

FACULTY OF TOURISM AND HOTELS, MINIA UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

The aim of this research is to investigate the customer ratings of hotels on online review sites. Accordingly, the data of this research relied on TripAdvisor's customer ratings of the Hurghada hotels in Egypt. The results revealed that the customer's overall rating of hotels is at a very good level with an average of 4.18 (Std. 0.51). The factors of hotel location (4.18 out of 5), service quality (4.18), value for money (4.18), hotel cleanliness (4.12), and room quality (4) are at a very good level. In addition, the customer's overall rating of hotels is significantly correlated to the hotel's distance from the city center (r = 0.373), and the number of reviews (r = 0.363) at a significant level of 0.05. Also, the customer's overall rating of hotels significantly varied according to the level of the hotel's distance from the city center (Mann-Whitney U 1308, Sig. 0.001), and the star rating of hotels (Kruskal–Wallis test 19.496, Sig 0.000). Moreover, the customer's overall rating of hotels does not differ significantly according to the hotel chains (Kruskal–Wallis test 22.11, Sig. 0.076). The regression model between the customer's overall rating of hotels (X) and the customer's rating of hotel location (Y) is as follows: Y = 2.667 + 0.362X. Finally, the implications of this research help marketing managers in the task of customer relationship management.

KEYWORDS: Customer Reviews, Review Sites, Customer Relationship Management

INTRODUCTION

The internet is an effective tool for word-of-mouth communication. Therefore, most customers write about and share their experiences on online review sites (Yoo and Gretzel, 2008). Thence, online customer reviews (or ratings) are increasingly widespread due to some factors that include customers relying heavily on a wide variety of web-based sources prior to make a purchase in the hotel industry (Ghose, 2012; Malbon, 2013), rapid development and customer adoption of technology. These reviews are an important competitive advantage, which they affect the destination image in the mind of customers and the selection of hotels (Yu,

2014). This is critical because the products and services of the hotel industry are high risk and intangible (Quambusch, 2015). Therefore, understanding customers' needs and wants has been a major source of success (Phillips, 2016). Clearly, the hotel industry is at the core of electronic word-of-mouth, which has gained importance with the emergence of new online tools (Pacheco, 2017). Almost 94 percent of customers said that online reviews have convinced them to avoid business, 63 percent of them said that hotels have never responded to their review, and most of them do not really trust hotels with lower than 4-star ratings (ReviewTrackers 1, 2018). Consequently, marketing managers must be smart in the art of dealing with customer's online reviews for maintaining the competitiveness of establishments (Siteminder 1, 2019). The customer's different expectations are a big challenge for hotels. Consequently, marketing managers have to know their customers better (Siteminder, 2020).

Despite the importance of the online customer reviews, there is a great difference between hotels in the extent of realizing this importance. According to the exploratory study, some hotels that do not respond to customer reviews considered posted reviews just positive or negative opinions, and only one hotel considered customer reviews a part of a strategic approach to an ongoing relationship with customers (Park and Allen, 2013). In addition, quantitative customer ratings have received little attention in the hospitality industry. Therefore, online customer ratings should be investigated to fill existing gaps in the literature (Valant, 2015). Moreover, managing online reviews has been widely neglected by the hospitality industry (Tuominen, 2020). Overall, some marketing managers ignore online customer reviews. Therefore, these reviews represent a continuous and critical challenge for hotels, which they lead to the failure of hotels. Accordingly, it is necessary for marketing managers to know and understand how exactly customers online rate hotels in order to achieve a high level of competition. Consequently, the gap of this research represents in the following question: How do customers online rate hotels in Egypt. So, this research is concerned with investigating this point.

LITERATURE REVIEW

ONLINE CUSTOMER REVIEWS

Customers increasingly trend to online reviews in order to choose their hotels. Therefore, the online review is an essential determinant for making decisions in the hotel industry. Several indicators prove this trend. In 2007, more than 87 percent of customers selected their hotels based on customer reviews higher than any other industry (Lipsman, 2007). In addition, more

customers write and share service-related experiences online. This is because the internet is an effective tool for word-of-mouth communication (Yoo and Gretzel, 2008). Customer reviews are changing the way customers shop for goods (Ghose, 2012). So, online shopping is widely used in the hospitality industry (Yang, 2012). Online reviews are a more reliable measure of customer confidence (Park and Allen, 2013). For this reason, when customers make their purchase decisions of products and services, they rely mightily upon customer reviews (Malbon, 2013). Online Customer reviews are increasing in the hotel industry because of rapid development and customer adoption of technology (Yu, 2014).   In addition, review sites embedded in both customer behavior and business models. Due to the high prevalence of review sites, 82 percent of customers read online reviews before their shopping in 2013 (Europarl, 2015), more than 40 percent are more likely to leave a positive review after a great experience at a hotel, and 70 percent will visit TripAdvisor site before making a purchase (Panaflorida, 2017). Generally, review sites have become an integral part of the online marketplace (Khaleghi, 2018).

ReviewTrackers, TripAdvisor, and Siteminder conducted surveys to determine the extent to which customers use review sites. The results revealed that 63.6 percent of customers checked reviews on Google before visiting a business more than any other review site (ReviewTrackers 1, 2018). Customers use online reviews to plan their trips (96 %), depend on reviews before booking a hotel (83%), will not book a hotel that has zero reviews (50 %), will read at least 6-12 reviews before choosing a hotel (79%), and agree that aforethought response to a bad review will improve their hotel impression (85%). Moreover, if the hotels are more attentive to online reviews, they will earn an extra £3.2 billion over the next decade. In addition, with more than two out of three international customers using review sites before making a booking (Siteminder 2, 2019). Approximately 94% of customers chose hotels with a rating of four or higher (TripAdvisor, 2019). In addition, the average rating for a hotel with 11 to 20 reviews is 3.5 out of 5. As a hotel gets more reviews, about 101 or more the average rating climbs to 3.9 out of 5. Hotels with a higher volume of reviews receive a higher ranking than those with fewer reviews (Singh, 2019). Moreover, TripAdvisor is the top review sites in 2019 by 25% (Bassig, 2019). Overall, most customers consult online reviews before making travel arrangements (Tuominen, 2020).

EFFECTS OF ONLINE CUSTOMER REVIEWS

In addition to the widespread availability of online customer reviews, these reviews have strong impacts on hotels. Actually, online reviews are an important competitive advantage, which they affect the hotel image in the mind of customers and the customer selection of the hotel. In other words, customers are more willing to select a hotel with high ratings, which they feel to be more attractive, interesting, or friendly (Yu, 2014). Customers' general attitude towards online customer reviews is positive and that they generally find them honest and credible (Quambusch, 2015). Despite the positive effects of customer reviews on hotels, fake reviews lead to undermine customers' confidence in the integrity of online reviews, and the online market, thus reducing competition (Valant, 2015). Customer reviews are a true reflection of actual customer experiences in hotels. Specifically, positive reviews have the highest impact on customer demand (Phillips, 2016). The right responses not only increase the overall rating of the hotel but revenues as well. If hotels respond to 40% of all reviews, they will see an increase in their revenue. Moreover, if the overall rating of hotel increased by one point, revenue increased by 39 percent (Penaflorida, 2017).

Online reviews have convinced approximately 94% of customers to avoid a business, where negative reviews drive them away (ReviewTracker 1, 2018). In addition, review sites are one of the most important sources of customers in the hospitality industry. Specifically, customers are more likely to book a hotel with a higher rating (79 %), not book a hotel without reviews (52 %), and will pay more to stay at a hotel with better ratings rather than better brands. Moreover, hotels that respond to 65% of their reviews receive an average rating 4.15 out of five (Bassig, 2019). Online reviews continue to impact booking decisions, where four out of five customers say that TripAdvisor makes them feel more confident in their booking decisions. In addition, 72 % of customers always read reviews before making decisions on places to stay or eat. Overall, the average worldwide rating on TripAdvisor was 4.22 out of five in 2018 (PRNewswire, 2019).

Customer reviews have a strong impact on the customer selection of hotels (Siteminder 2, 2019). Subsequently customers are willing to pay more for higher rating hotels than premium brands (Pal, 2019). Even a few negative reviews can hurt sales, as a one-point difference on Travelocity's five-point rating scale (from 4.5 to 3.5) can influence hotel room rates by as much as 11% (Siteminder 2, 2019). The number of online reviews has a direct impact on the key performance measures of hotels such as ranking on

websites, overall online reputation score; overall sales; and conversion rates. Moreover, the number of reviews can directly affect the hotel revenue because of a higher volume of customer ratings will improve competitive online position, and encourage potential customers to spend their money (ReviewPro, 2019). If the average score of review is improved by 10 percent, the expected number of bookings increased by 9 percent in the hotels of Europe (Siteminder, 2020). Finally, online reviews affect hotel performance because of significant correlations among hotel performance, number of reviews, and customer ratings (Tuominen, 2020).

ONLINE REVIEW ATTRIBUTES

 Several factors affect customers in their satisfaction and selection of hotels. In this direction, value for money is one of the key predictors for customer satisfaction, which leads to return intentions; the hotel location has the highest mean among performance attributes (Jeong and Jeon, 2008). Higher ratings and lower prices increase the propensity to write reviews (Ogut and Cezar, 2012). According to a study of PWC, the factors of cleanliness, and location tend to be rated most highly via review sites, whereas room quality and value for money are most often the most negative attributes (PWC, 2015). Service quality and customer relationship management are major factors that affect customer satisfaction. Moreover, customers feel appreciated when they realize that the hotel is committed to improving their experience (Mubiri, 2016). Quality of room, internet provision, and building show the highest impact on hotel performance (Phillips, 2016).

The attributes of room quality, service quality, and value for money show a greater correlation with customer satisfaction than other criteria. Therefore, managers should prioritize the staff training and the assessment tools of service quality to guarantee consistent levels of service (Pacheco, 2017). Service is overwhelmingly one of the most important factors while facilities, location, and amenities are significantly less. Therefore, consistent service ensured the highest ratings of hotels across the major review sites (Singh, 2019). Price is by far the most important factor for selecting a hotel, across both well-known and unknown brands. Then, promotions and discounts that represent a real value to the customer is an almost guaranteed way to get a hotel. Moreover, the hotel brand carried a marginal advantage over the hotel attributes (Pal, 2019). The hotel location is an essential factor, which strongly affects a hotel selection decision by 31.5 percent of customers, and creates the hotel competitive advantage (Rivers, et al. 1991). It partially explains the difference in performance between stores (Li and Liu, 2003). Generally, hospitality industry relies

heavily on location because of production and consumption occur simultaneously (Lee, 2010). In addition, location is a very important decision-making factor for customers, and impacts not only demand rate of room, but also revenues. For example, the analysis of coastal hotels in Catalonia shows that hotel location on the beach increases hotel prices on average between 13–17% (Rigall et al., 2011). Location affects hotel ability to draw customers (Ryan, 2011). Moreover, amenities play a major role in the location of tourism activities (Truchet et al. 2011). Particularly, the potential factors contributing to the hotel location choice by customers include star rating, years after opening, service diversification, ownership, agglomeration effect, public service infrastructure, road accessibility, subway accessibility, and accessibility to tourism sites. Consequently, the need for a reliable, unbiased, and objective assessment of hotel location has always been important (Yang et al. 2012).

 The hotel location generally matters more to leisure customers and tends to be more important to older travelers, with a high income (HotelMarketing, 2013). A poor choice of location is sometimes impossible to repair from customer points of view (Entrepreneur, 2015). Consequently, the information of location is critical in determining the performance of hotels and targeting specific market segments. The ideal location of the hotel is associated with the low failure rate, and the high rates of occupancy, room, RevPAR, productivity and efficiency (Yang et al. 2015). Moreover, the decision of hotel location usually represents a large-amount and long run fixed investment (Oner, 2016). Therefore, a good location strategy gives the hotel strategic advantages over its competitor (Obeng et al., 2016). Recently, most customers choose their hotels based on its location (Calirom, 2016). For international customers when choosing a hotel in the United Kingdom, the important factors include the proximity to public transport (83 %), the proximity to cultural locations (80 %), the proximity to restaurants, cafes and bars (77 %), and the proximity to shopping locations (68 %) (Statista, 2017). Obviously, being in the right location is the main factor in a business's success because the location often plays a significant role in a company's profit and overall success (Heil, 2018). Moreover, most customers consider it mandatory for choosing a hotel (Thamesriviera, 2018).

METHODOLOGY

Despite online rating importance, there are limited researches investigated the online customer ratings of hotels in Egypt. Obviously, it is mandatory for marketing managers to know and understand how exactly customers online rate hotels in order to achieve a high level of competition.

Consequently, the gap of this research represents in the following question: How do customers online rate hotels in Egypt. Therefore, the research data depends on the online customer reviews of Hurghada hotels through global review sites such as TripAdvisor. This data is qualitative, as the TripAdvisor site provides hotel ratings based on a five-point scale, where points one refer to terrible, two poor, three average, four very good, and five excellent. There is a difficulty in identifying members of the population. Therefore, it is suitable to choose a non-probability sample such as a convenience sample. The sample includes the TripAdvisor's ratings of 266054 customers who rated their hotel experience in 124 hotels (84.9 %) in Hurghada city during 2019.

The method of data collection is content analysis. This content provided by the TripAdvisor site, where customers rate online their service-related experience in terms of specific attributes such as hotel location, service quality, room quality, hotel cleanliness, and value for money. The research data collected through the site of TripAdvisor, as it is a successful promoter of the tourism industry because of the tightening of review control on its platform on hotels. As a result, its opinions are a true reflection of actual customer experiences in those hotels (Gil, et al., 2017). In addition, it ranked as the highest website on the list of the most popular review sites by 25% in 2018 (Penaflorida, 2018). According to travelers, TripAdvisor is the world's largest travel platform with roughly 661 million reviews that cover about 7.7 million accommodations, airlines, experiences, and restaurants (Elliott, 2018). Moreover, it helps 490 million travelers for making their best trip, and it is available in 49 markets and 28 languages (PRNewswire, 2019).   This research consists of eleven hypotheses:

- H1: There is no relationship between the customer's overall evaluation of hotels and the number of reviews.
- H2: There is no relationship between the customer's overall evaluation of hotels and the price of the hotel room.
- H3: There is no relationship between the customer's overall evaluation of hotels and the hotel distance from downtown (KM).
- H4: There is no relationship between the customer's overall evaluation of hotels and hotel attributes such as hotel location, service quality, room quality, value for money, and hotel cleanliness.
- H5: There is no relationship between the hotel distance from downtown (KM) and the hotel attributes such as hotel location, service quality, room quality, value for money, and hotel cleanliness.
- H6: The customer's overall evaluation of hotels is not differed according to the star rating of hotels.

- H7: The customer's overall evaluation of hotels is not differed according to the level of hotel distance from downtown.
- H8: The customer's overall evaluation of hotels is not differed according to the chain of hotels.
- H9: The hotel distance from downtown (KM) is not differed according to the star rating of hotels.
- H10: The hotel distance from downtown (KM) is not differed according to the level of hotel distance from downtown.
- H11: The hotel distance from downtown (KM) is not differed according to the chain of hotels.

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS DISCUSSION

1. NORMAL DISTRIBUTION ANALYSIS

The following table (1) shows the normal distribution of research variables using the one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.

Table (1): The Normal Distribution of Research Variables

No	Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	Sig.
1	Overall Rating of Hotel	4.18	0.51	3.55	0.000
2	Hotel Location	4.18	0.38	3.34	0.000
3	Service Quality	4.18	0.53	2.65	0.000
4	Value for Money	4.16	0.46	3.17	0.000
5	Hotel Cleanliness	4.12	0.59	2.71	0.000
6	Room Quality	3.95	0.59	2.69	0.000
7	Hotel Distance from Downtown (KM)	13.95	9.89	1.05	0.216
8	Room Price (LE)	2321.02	1594.05	1.83	0.002
9	No. of Reviews	2145.59	2261.17	2.00	0.001

According to the table (1), the distribution of research variables is no normal distribution except the hotel distance variable (Sig. 0.216) which distributed normally. Therefore, the research depends on the non-parametric tests for research variables that distributed no normally such as Mann-Whitney U and Kruskal–Wallis Tests for measuring the differences

among research variables. While, for hotel distance variable, parametric tests such as One Way ANOVA can be used.

2. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ANALYSIS

Table (2): The Descriptive Statistics of Research Variables

No	Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variance (%)
1	Overall Rating of Hotel	4.18	0.51	12.13
2	Hotel Location	4.18	0.38	8.95
3	Service Quality	4.18	0.53	12.61
4	Value for Money	4.16	0.46	11.11
5	Hotel Cleanliness	4.12	0.59	14.26
6	Room Quality	3.95	0.59	14.99
7	Hotel Distance from Downtown (KM)	13.95	9.89	70.95
8	Room Price (LE)	2321.02	1594.05	68.68
9	No. of Reviews	2145.59	2261.17	94.9

Table (2) shows descriptive statistics of the research variables, where the results revealed that all factors of the hotel rating came at a very good level. The factor of customer's overall rating is at a very good level, on average 4.18 (Std. 0.51). Therefore, the coefficient of variance represents 12.13 % between the customers in the level of rating. This level of the rating is acceptable according to a study of TripAdvisor in 2019 that stated that 94% of customers chose hotels with a rating of four or higher. The factor of hotel location ranked as the first of the customer rating factors with an average 4.18 (Std. 0.38), this is consistent with a study of PWC in 2015 that confirmed that the factor of hotel location tends to be rated most highly via review sites. This result is very important for marketing managers because the ideal hotel location is associated with the rates of low failure, high occupancy, high room, high RevPAR, high productivity and high efficiency (Yang et al. 2015). The location factor gives the hotel strategic advantages over its competitor (Obeng et al., 2016). This is supported by that most customers choose their hotels based on the hotel location (Calirom, 2016), and they considered it mandatory for choosing a hotel (Thamesriviera, 2018). Moreover, the hotel location often plays a significant role in a company's profit and overall success (Heil, 2018). The quality of service ranked as the second factor with an average 4.18 (Std. 0.53). This result is not consistent with a study of Singh in 2019,

which it determined that the quality of service is one of the most important factors compared to the hotel location. In addition, the service quality is a major factor affects customer satisfaction (Mubiri, 2016). The rest of the factors come in order, which includes the value for money ($\bar{X}$ 4.16, S 0.46), the hotel cleanliness ($\bar{X}$ 4.12, S 0.59), and the quality of room ($\bar{X}$ 3.95, S 0.59). Through this, the coefficient of variance is higher between the customers in assessing the hotel cleanliness and the room quality. Consequently, marketing managers need to improve the level of those variables. According to Singh in 2019, the consistent service ensured the highest ratings of hotels across the major review sites. Moreover, the mean of hotel distance from downtown (KM) is 13.95 (S. 9.89). Therefore, the coefficient of variance is large, as it represents 70.95 %. The room price estimated at an average of 2321.02 LE with a standard deviation of 1594.05, and the coefficient of variation is about 68.68 %. Finally, the average of review numbers estimated at 2145.59 with a 2261.17 as standard deviation, so the coefficient of variance (94.9 %) is very large between the hotels.

Table (3): The Descriptive Statistics of Research Variables Based on Hotel Area

No	Area	Frequency		Hotel		Location		Room		Service		Value		Cleanliness	
		No	%	mean	Std	mean	Std	mean	Std	mean	Std	mean	Std	mean	Std
1	Sahl Hashesh	31	25	4.2	0.5	4.2	0.3	4.2	0.6	4.2	0.6	4.2	0.5	4.1	0.6
2	Alsaqalla	21	16.9	3.9	0.7	4.2	0.4	3.6	0.5	3.9	0.6	3.9	0.6	3.8	0.7
3	Algouna	14	11.3	4.2	0.4	4.4	0.3	4	0.4	4.2	0.4	4.1	0.5	4.3	0.4
4	Aldahar	13	10.5	3.9	0.7	4.2	0.4	3.9	0.7	4	0.6	4.2	0.5	3.9	0.8
5	Almamsha	11	8.9	4.4	0.2	4.1	0.4	4.2	0.3	4.3	0.3	4.2	0.3	4.2	0.4
6	Alahyaa	11	8.9	4.3	0.3	3.9	0.4	3.8	0.3	4.1	0.3	4	0.2	4	0.4
7	Makady	10	8	4.4	0.2	4.3	0.3	4.4	0.2	4.7	0.4	4.4	0.2	4.5	0
8	Down Twon	9	7.3	4.3	0.4	3.9	0.4	3.4	0.9	4.3	0.6	4.6	0.2	4.3	0.4
9	Alkowthar	2	1.6	4.5	0	4	0	4.5	0	4.5	0	4.5	0	4.5	0
10	Soma Bay	2	1.6	4.5	0	4.5	0	4.5	0	4.5	0	4.5	0	5.0	0

Table (3) showed that the best rating for hotels is in the areas of Alkowthar and Soma Bay with an average of 4.5 out of 5, which means an excellent level, followed by the areas of Almamsha 4.4, Makady 4.4, Alahyaa 4.3, Downtown 4.3, Sahl Hashesh 4.3, Algouna 4.2, Aldahar 3.9 and Alsaqalla 3.9. Consequently, the hotels farther from the city center have taken a higher rating than the nearby hotels; this shows the strong desire of customers for hotels that are away from the congestion. In addition, the area of Soma Bay has the highest rating in the hotel cleanliness (5), the hotel location (4.5), and the room quality (4.5). Alkowthar is in the room quality (4.5), the area of Makady in the service quality (4.7); and Downtown area in the value for money (4.6). Consequently, the level of rating for these factors is an excellent level in all the mentioned areas.

Table (4): Descriptive Statistics for the Variables of Distance, Price and Reviews Based on Hotel Area

No	Area	Frequency		Hotel Distance		Room Price		Reviews	
		No	%	Mean	Std	Mean	Std	Mean	Std
1	Sahl Hashesh	31	25	18.7	5.3	2460.8	1572.2	3271.4	2711.4
2	Alsaqalla	21	16.9	5.9	3.5	1890.3	1732.5	2027.6	2061.9
3	Algouna	14	11.3	17.7	5.6	3950.2	1899.8	721	397.8
4	Aldahar	13	10.5	**3.9**	6.1	1599.5	827.9	1741.3	2501.8
5	Almamsha	11	8.9	10.8	6.4	2482.3	816.2	2176.7	2069.6
6	Alahyaa	11	8.9	12.0	2.6	1867.8	1492.5	2272.9	1215.2
7	Makady	10	8	30.7	0.7	2642.1	846.3	3458.3	2536.8
8	Down Twon	9	7.3	6.2	3.7	1179.5	916.2	182.9	290.3
9	Alkowthar	2	1.6	7.8	0	661.8	0	196	0
10	Soma Bay	2	1.6	48.5	0	4757.9	0	1882	0

Table (4) reflects the average distance of hotel from the city center in kilometers, as the closest hotels are in the areas of Aldahar, Alsaqalla and Downtown, while the farthest hotels are in Soma Bay, Makady, Sahl Hashesh, and Algouna areas, respectively. Depending on Table (3), the hotels' rating in the far areas from the city center is higher than the hotels in the near areas. This indicates the influence of the hotel location on the customer ratings. In addition, this indicates that customers prefer the hotels that are located in the far areas from congestion. With regard to the average price of a single room, the highest price of hotels is in Algouna, while the lowest price is for the Al Kawthar area. In addition, the hotel room rates are higher in the far areas from the city center compared to the nearest areas. Finally, the highest number of reviews is for Makady hotels, while the lowest number of reviews is for Alkowthar hotels.

Table (5): The Descriptive Statistics of Research Variables Based on Hotel Chain

No	Chain	Frequency		Location		Hotel		Room		Service		Value		Clean	
		No	%	Mean	Std	Mean	Std	Mean	Std	Mean	Std	Mean	Std	Mean	Std
1	Mercure	1	0.81	4.5	0	4.5	0	4.5	0	4.5	0	4.5	0	4.5	0
2	Hilton	1	0.81	4.5	0	4.5	0	4	0	4	0	4	0	4	0
3	Steigenberger	1	0.81	4.5	0	4.5	0	4.5	0	4.5	0	4.5	0	4.5	0
4	Kempinski	1	0.81	4.5	0	4.5	0	4.5	0	4.5	0	4.5	0	5	0
5	Hilton International	2	1.61	4.3	0.4	4.3	0.4	4.3	0.4	4.3	0.4	4.3	0.4	4.3	0.4
6	Oberoi	1	0.81	4.5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	4.5	0	5	0
7	Princess	1	0.81	3.5	0	3.5	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	3	0
8	Independent	26	20.96	4.1	0.4	3.9	0.6	3.6	0.6	3.9	0.5	4	0.5	3.9	0.7
9	Pickalbatros	4	3.22	4	0.4	4.5	0	4.1	0.3	4.4	0.3	4.4	0.3	4.5	0
10	SunRise	2	1.61	4.5	0	4.5	0	4.3	0.4	4.5	0	4.5	0	4.5	0
11	Jaz Collection	4	3.22	4.1	0.3	4.5	0	4.5	0	4.8	0.3	4.5	0	4.5	0
12	MAK	1	0.81	4	0	0	4	4.5	0	4	0	4	0	4	0
13	Three Corners	1	0.81	4	0	0	4.5	4	0	4.5	0	4	0	4.5	0
14	Sunny Days	2	1.61	4.3	0.4	4	0	4	0.7	4	0	4	0	3.8	0.4
15	Others	76	61.29	4.2	0.4	4.2	0.5	4	0.6	4.2	0.5	4.2	0.5	4.2	0.6

Table (5) shows that the chain of Oberoi has the highest rating (5 out of 5), which means an excellence level. Then, the next chains include Mercure, Hilton, Steigenberger, Kempinski, SunRise, Pickalbatros, Jaz Collection have the rating of 4.5, this means an excellence level. For the hotel attributes, the chain of Oberoi has five in the levels of service quality and room quality. The chains of Mercure, Hilton, Steigenberger, Kempinski, Oberoi, and SunRise have the rating of 4.5 in the level of hotel location. In addition, Mercure, Steigenberger, Kempinski, Oberoi, SunRise, and Jaz Collection have 4.5 in the factor of value. Moreover, the chains of Oberoi and Kempinski have five in the hotel cleanliness. Consequently, the chain of Oberoi excels in most factors of hotel rating.

Table (6): the Descriptive Statistics for the Variables of Distance, Price and Reviews Based on Hotel Chain

No	Chain	Frequency		Hotel Distance		Room Price		Reviews	
		No	%	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.
1	Mercure	1	0.81	14.3	0	1517.4	0	5391	0
2	Hilton	1	0.81	11.1	0	1198.98	0	3936	0
3	Steigenberger	1	0.81	10.5	0	2472.5	0	5080	0
4	Kempinski	1	0.81	48.5	0	4757.95	0	1882	0
5	Hilton International	2	1.61	10.5	12.5	1640.5	355.5	3430	2968.4
6	Oberoi	1	0.81	21.1	0	6105.6	0	1904	0
7	Princess	1	0.81	18.4	0	870.8	0	924	0
8	Independent	26	20.96	8.3	6.98	1307.9	584.4	1183.7	1484.9
9	Pickalbatros	4	3.22	17.4	1.84	3791.1	621.2	2077.8	1406.6
10	SunRise	2	1.61	11.95	7.99	2626.3	6.02	6849.5	536.7
11	Jaz Collection	4	3.22	22.2	11.2	2560.96	1316.8	3491.3	4491
12	MAK	1	0.81	20.4	0	847.69	0	2357	0
13	Three Corners	1	0.81	12.4	0	1490.7	0	3395	0
14	Sunny Days	2	1.61	**3.3**	0.14	1157.9	58.15	1668.5	2270.5
15	Others	76	61.29	15.1	9.9	2608.96	1730.8	2161	2274.9

Table (6) reflects the average distance of hotel from the city center in kilometers, as the closest hotels are in the chains of Kempinski, and Jaz Collection, while the farthest hotels are in Sunny Days chain and Independent hotels respectively. With regard to the average price of a single room, the highest price of hotels is in the chain of Oberoi, while the lowest price is for MAK chain. Finally, the highest number of reviews is for the SunRise chain, while the lowest number of reviews is for the chain of Princess.

3. CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Table (7): The Relationships between the Overall Rating of Hotels with other Variables

Independent Variable	Dependent Variables	R	Sig.	Decision
Overall Rating of Hotel	Service Quality	0.856^{**}	.000	Reject H_0
	Hotel Cleanliness	0.797^{**}	.000	Reject H_0
	Value for Money	0.736^{**}	.000	Reject H_0
	Room Quality	0.699^{**}	.000	Reject H_0
	Hotel Location	0.492^{**}	.000	Reject H_0
	Room Price (LE)	0.410^{**}	.000	Reject H_0
	Hotel Distance from Downtown (KM)	0.373^{**}	.000	Reject H_0
	No of Reviews	0.363^{**}	.000	Reject H_0

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table (7) displays that the level of customer's overall rating is significantly correlated with the factors of service quality (r = 0.856), hotel cleanliness (r = 0.797), value for money (r = 0.736), room quality (r = 0.699) and hotel location (r = 0.492), respectively. In addition, the level of customer's overall rating is correlated with the hotel's distance from the city center (r = 0.373) and the number of reviews (r = 0.363) at the level of 0.05. This result agreed with the study of Tuominen in 2020 that stated there is a correlation between the customer's rating of hotels and the number of

reviews. Based on the above, for increasing the level of customer's overall rating, the previous factors associated with the selection of hotels must be improved.

Table (8): The Relationship between the factors of hotel rating

No.	Variables		R	Sig.	Decision
1	Service Quality	Hotel Cleanliness	0.879	0.000	Reject H_0
2	Service Quality	Value for Money	0.767	0.000	Reject H_0
3	Room Quality	Service Quality	0.764	0.000	Reject H_0
4	Room Quality	Hotel Cleanliness	0.736	0.000	Reject H_0
5	Value for Money	Hotel Cleanliness	0.701	0.000	Reject H_0
6	Hotel Location	Service Quality	0.544	0.000	Reject H_0
7	Room Quality	Value for Money	0.518	0.000	Reject H_0
8	Hotel Location	Hotel Cleanliness	0.517	0.000	Reject H_0
9	Room Price	Hotel Distance	0.475^{**}	0.000	Reject H_0
10	Hotel Location	Value for Money	0.46	0.000	Reject H_0
11	Hotel Distance	Room Quality	0.452	0.000	Reject H_0
12	Hotel Location	Room Quality	0.445	0.000	Reject H_0
13	Hotel Distance	Hotel Cleanliness	0.424	0.000	Reject H_0
14	Hotel Distance	Service Quality	0.395	0.000	Reject H_0
15	Room Price	Room Quality	0.392	0.000	Reject H_0
16	Room Price	Hotel Cleanliness	0.37	0.000	Reject H_0
17	Room Price	Service Quality	0.367	0.000	Reject H_0
18	Room Price	Hotel Location	0.321	0.000	Reject H_0
19	Room Price	Value for Money	0.261	0.000	Reject H_0
20	Hotel Distance	Value for Money	0.259	0.004	Reject H_0
21	Hotel Distance	Hotel Location	0.193^{*}	0.033	Reject H_0

***Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table (8) shows the relationships among the factors of hotel rating. The results revealed that the highest correlation is between the service quality with the hotel cleanliness (r = 0.879), the value for money (r = 0.767), and the room quality (r = 0.764). Also, between the level of hotel cleanliness with the room quality (r = 0.736), and the value for money (r = 0.701) at the level of 0.05. While the lowest correlation is between the hotel distance from the city center with the hotel location (r = 0.193), and the value for money (r = 0.259). In addition, the lowest correlation is between the value for money with the room price (r = 0.261) at level of 0.05.

4. VARIANCE ANALYSIS

Table (9): The Hotel Distance from Downtown across Chains, Stars, and Areas

No	Variables	Categories	Sum of Squares		df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Hotel Distance: from downtown (KM)	Location (Closer or Far)	Between Groups	8362.55	1	8362.55	277.4	0.000
2	Hotel Distance	Hotel Chains	Between Groups	2851.41	14	203.67	2.42	0.006
3	Hotel Distance	Hotel Stars	Between Groups	3220.53	3	1073.51	14.61	0.000

Table (9) shows the hotel distance from downtown (KM) across the hotel chains, stars, and areas using the analysis of variance. The results revealed that the hotel distance varies significantly across the level of the hotel location, whether it is farther or closer to the city center (F 277.37, Sig. 0.000), and across the hotel chains (F 2.42, Sig. 0.006), as well as across hotel stars (F14.61, Sig.0.000).

Table (10): Testing the Research Hypotheses

No.	Null Hypothesis	Test	Test Statistic	Sig.
1	The distribution of hotel rating is the same across distance levels.		1308	0.001
2	The distribution of room price is the same across distance levels.		704	0.000
3	The distribution of hotel distance (KM) is the same across distance levels.	Mann-	0.000	0.000

4	The distribution of reviews is the same across hotel distance levels.	Whitney U	1008	0.000
5	The distribution of hotel location is the same across distance levels.		1597	0.107
6	The distribution of room quality is the same across distance levels.		1003	0.000
7	The distribution of service quality is the same across distance levels.		1172	0.000
8	The distribution of value for money is the same across distance levels.		1371	0.003
9	The distribution of hotel cleanliness is the same across distance levels.		1032	0.000
10	The distribution of overall rating of hotel is the same across stars.		19.496	0.000
11	The distribution of room price is the same across stars.		23.002	0.000
12	The distribution of hotel distance (KM) is the same across stars.		29.371	0.000
13	The distribution of reviews is the same across hotel stars.		60.899	0.000
14	The distribution of hotel location is the same across hotel stars.	Kruskal – Wallis	6.541	0.088
15	The distribution of room quality is the same across hotel stars.		23.170	0.000
16	The distribution of service quality is the same across hotel stars.		16.160	0.001
17	The distribution of value for money is the same across hotel stars.		11.392	0.010
18	The distribution of hotel cleanliness is the same across hotel stars.		11.698	0.008
19	The distribution of overall rating of hotel is the same across chains.		22.110	0.076
20	The distribution of room price is the same across chains.		28.965	0.011
21	The distribution of hotel distance is the same across chains.		22.584	0.067
22	The distribution of reviews is the same across chains.		18.685	0.177
23	The distribution of hotel location is the same across chains.		12.015	0.605
24	The distribution of room quality is the same across chains.		28.937	0.011

25	The distribution of service quality is the same across chains.		22.596	0.067
26	The distribution of value for money is the same across chains.		18.082	0.203

The Significance Level is 0.05

According to table (10), the results of Mann-Whitney U test revealed that the rating of hotel, room price, hotel distance (KM), review numbers, room quality, service quality, value for money, and hotel cleanliness are significantly differed across the levels of hotel distance. In addition, the rating of hotel location does not have significantly differed across the levels of hotel distance. Also, the test of Kruskal-Wallis revealed that the rating of hotel, room price, hotel distance, review numbers, room quality, service quality, value for money, and hotel cleanliness are significantly differed across the star rating of hotel, while, the distribution of hotel location rating is not significantly differed across the star rating of hotel. Moreover, the rating of room price and room quality has significantly differed across the hotel chains. The rating of hotel, hotel distance, review numbers, hotel location, service quality and value for money are not significantly different across the hotel chains.

5. REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Table (11): The Regression Model between the hotel Location with Hotel Distance and Hotel Level

Variables		R	R^2	Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig
Independent	Dependent				B	Std. Error	Beta		
Hotel Distance (KM)	Hotel Location	.193	.037	(Constant)	4.078	.057	.193	71.085	.000
				Distance	.007	.003		2.159	.033
Hotel's Overall rating	Hotel Location	0.492	0.242	(Constant)	2.667	0.245	0.492	10.885	.000
				Hotel's Overall rating	0.362	0.058		6.216	.000

Table (11) shows the coefficient of regression between the hotel location level with the hotel distance and the hotel's overall rating. The results revealed that there is a significant regression between the hotel location level and the hotel distance (r = 0.193, Sig. 0.000) at the 0.05 level, which the regression model of the hotel location level is $\hat{Y} = 4.078 + 0.007X$. In addition, there is a significant regression between the hotel location level and the hotel's overall rating (r = 0.49, Sig. 0.000) at the 0.05 level, in which the regression model of the hotel location level is $\hat{Y} = 2.667 + 0.362X$. Finally, the implications of this research help marketing managers in the task of customer relationship management.

CONCLUSION

This research aims to investigate the customer reviews of hotels on online reviews sites such as TripAdvisor for Hurghada's hotels in Egypt. The research question represented in "how customers online rate hotels on review sites?" By analyzing the results of the study, the results showed that the customer overall rating of hotels is a very good level with an average of 4.18 out of 5 (Std. 0.51). This means that the difference between the customers in the level of hotel rating is 12.13%. Regarding the rest of the hotel attributes, the factors of hotel location 4.18 (Std. 0.53) and quality of service 4.18 (Std. 0.053), value for money 4.18 (Std. 0.46), hotel cleanliness 4.12 (Std. 0.59), and room quality 4 (Std. 0.95) rate at a very good level. Thus, the hotel location and the service quality are the highest rating, while the room quality is the lowest. This requires hotels to improve the level of those variables to ensure a higher level of rating from a very good level to an excellent level through the review websites.

The mean of hotel distance from downtown (KM) is 13.95 (Std. 9.89). Therefore, the coefficient of variance is large, as it represents 70.95 %. The mean of room price is 2321.02 LE with a standard deviation of 1594.05, and the coefficient of variation is about 68.68 %. Finally, the mean number of reviews is 2145.59 with a 2261.17 as standard deviation. Therefore, the coefficient of variance (94.9 %) is very large between hotels. Moreover, the results showed that the best rating for hotels is in the areas of Alkowthar and Soma Bay with an average of 4.5 out of 5, which means an excellent level, followed by the areas of Almamsha 4.4, Makady 4.4, Alahyaa 4.3, Downtown 4.3, Sahl Hashesh 4.3, Algouna 4.2, Aldahar 3.9 and Alsaqalla 3.9. Consequently, the hotels farther from the city center have taken a higher rating than the nearby hotels; this shows the strong desire of customers for hotels that are away from the congestion. For the highest rating in other factors, the area of Soma Bay has the highest rating in hotel cleanliness (5), hotel location (4.5), and room quality (4.5). In addition, Alkowthar is in room quality (4.5); the area of Makady in service quality (4.7); and Downtown area in value for money (4.6). Consequently, the level of rating for these factors is an excellent level in all the mentioned areas.The closest hotels are in the areas of Aldahar, Alsaqalla and Downtown, while the farthest hotels are in Soma Bay, Makady, Sahl Hashesh, and Algouna areas, respectively. Depending on Table (3), the hotels' rating in the far areas from the city center is higher than the hotels in the near areas. This indicates the influence of the hotel location on the customer ratings. In addition, this indicates that customers prefer the hotels that are located in the far areas from congestion. With regard to the

average price of a single room, the highest price of hotels is in Algouna, while the lowest price is for the Al Kawthar area. In addition, the hotel room rates are higher in the far areas from the city center compared to the nearest areas. Finally, the highest number of reviews is for Makady hotels, while the lowest number of reviews is for Alkowthar hotels.

The chain of Oberoi has the highest rating (5 out of 5), which means an excellence level. Then, the next chains include Mercure, Hilton, Steigenberger, Kempinski, SunRise, Pickalbatros, Jaz Collection have the rating of 4.5, this means an excellence level. For the hotel attributes, the chain of Oberoi has five in the levels of service quality and room quality. The chains of Mercure, Hilton, Steigenberger, Kempinski, Oberoi, and SunRise have the rating of 4.5 in the level of hotel location. In addition, Mercure, Steigenberger, Kempinski, Oberoi, SunRise, and Jaz Collection have 4.5 in the factor of value. Moreover, the chains of Oberoi and Kempinski have five in the hotel cleanliness. Consequently, the chain of Oberoi excels in most factors of hotel rating. The closest hotels from the city center in kilometers are in the chains of Kempinski, and Jaz Collection, while the farthest hotels are in Sunny Days chain and Independent hotels respectively. With regard to the average price of a single room, the highest price of hotels is in the chain of Oberoi, while the lowest price is for MAK chain. Finally, the highest number of reviews is for the SunRise chain, while the lowest number of reviews is for the chain of Princess. The level of customer's overall rating is significantly correlated with the factors of service quality (r = 0.856), hotel cleanliness (r = 0.797), value for money (r = 0.736), room quality (r = 0.699) and hotel location (r = 0.492), respectively. In addition, the level of customer's overall rating is correlated with the hotel's distance from the city center (r = 0.373) and the number of reviews (r = 0.363) at the level of 0.05. This result agreed with the study of Tuominen in 2020 that stated there is a correlation between the customer's rating of hotels and the number of reviews. Based on the above, for increasing the level of customer's overall rating, the previous factors associated with the selection of hotels must be improved. In addition, the results revealed that the highest correlation is between the service quality with the hotel cleanliness (r = 0.879), the value for money (r = 0.767), and the room quality (r = 0.764). Also, between the level of hotel cleanliness with the room quality (r = 0.736), and the value for money (r = 0.701) at the level of 0.05. While the lowest correlation is between the hotel distance from the city center with the hotel location (r = 0.193), and the value for money (r = 0.259). In addition, the lowest correlation is between the value for money with the room price (r = 0.261) at level of 0.05.

The results revealed that the hotel distance varies significantly across the level of the hotel location, whether it is farther or closer to the city center (F 277.37, Sig. 0.000), and across the hotel chains (F 2.42, Sig. 0.006), as well as across hotel stars (F14.61, Sig.0.000). The results of Mann-Whitney U test revealed that the rating of hotel, room price, hotel distance (KM), review numbers, room quality, service quality, value for money, and hotel cleanliness are significantly differed across the levels of hotel distance. In addition, the rating of hotel location does not have significantly differed across the levels of hotel distance. Also, the test of Kruskal-Wallis revealed that the rating of hotel, room price, hotel distance, review numbers, room quality, service quality, value for money, and hotel cleanliness are significantly differed across the star rating of hotel, while, the distribution of hotel location rating is not significantly differed across the star rating of hotel. Moreover, the rating of room price and room quality has significantly differed across the hotel chains. The rating of hotel, hotel distance, review numbers, hotel location, service quality and value for money are not significantly different across the hotel chains.

The results revealed that there is a significant regression between the hotel location level and the hotel distance (r = 0.193, Sig. 0.000) at the 0.05 level, which the regression model of the hotel location level is $\hat{Y} = 4.078 + 0.007X$. In addition, there is a significant regression between the hotel location level and the hotel's overall rating (r = 0.49, Sig. 0.000) at the 0.05 level, in which the regression model of the hotel location level is $\hat{Y} = 2.667 + 0.362X$. Finally, the implications of this research help marketing managers in the task of customer relationship management.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCHES

This research aims to study the online customer reviews using the site of TripAdvisor for Hurghada's hotels in Egypt during 2019. Since the customers of this city want to relax, it is better to conduct other studies on various tourist destinations with different tourist patterns using different review websites.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Marketing managers should pay attention to online customer reviews on review websites and respond to them continuously.
2. Utilizing customer positive reviews as a competitive advantage for hotels

3. The level of customer rating for hotels must be improved from a very good to an excellent level. This change requires a well-studied plan to achieve this goal.
4. The level of service quality must be improved, especially the levels of cleanliness and room quality because the variance level is high among the customers in their rating. By improving these factors, hotels can get higher ratings on global review sites.
5. New hotels should be built in the places far from the city center, especially in the case of customers who want to relax and enjoy the beauty of nature.
6. The customer's overall rating of the hotel location is at a good level, which it considered a low rating, and this requires marketing managers to study the customer preferences in relation to hotel location and the reasons of low ratings.
7. The customer preference for the hotels that are far from the city center is greater than the hotels near the center, and this indicates the desire of customers to calm down and search for uncrowned places. This requires investors when wanting to set up hotels, to focus on customer desires and to stay away from crowded places.
8. It is necessary for the ministry of tourism and investment to evaluate the proposed places to establish hotels in order to comply with the needs and requirements of customers regarding the hotel location.

REFERENCES

Bassig, M., (2019) "How to Respond to TripAdvisor Reviews: With Review Response Examples", Retrieved from: https://www.reviewtrackers .com/blog/tripadvisor-respond-reviews/

Calirom, (2016) "What Are the Most Important Factors in Choosing a Hotel?" Retrieved from http://www.calirom.ro/en/blog/what-are-the-most-important-factors-in-choosing-a-hotel, 13/9/2018.

Elliott, C., (2018) "These Are the Best Hotel Review Sites in the World", Retrieved from https://www.forbes.com/sites/christopherelliott/ 2018/09/09/these-are-the-best-hotel-review-sites-in-the-world/#125c0c837fbd

Entrepreneur, (2015) "10 Things to Consider When Choosing a Location for Your Business", Retrieved from https://www.entrepreneur .com/slideshow/299849

Europarl (2015) "Online consumer reviews: The case of misleading or fake reviews", Retrieved from http://www.europarl.europa. eu/thinktank /en/document.html?reference=EPRS_BRI(2015)571301

Ghose, A., Ipeirotis, P., and Li, B., (2012) "Designing Ranking Systems for Hotels on Travel Search Engines by Mining User-Generated and Crowd sourced Content", Marketing Science, Vol. 31, No. 3, PP. 493–520, Retrieved from http://pages.stern.nyu.edu/~aghose/travelsearch.pdf

Gil, A., Barandalla, J., and Idoeta, C., (2017) "Online corporate reputation in the hotel industry: the case of TripAdvisor", Esic Market Economics and Business Journal, Vol. 48, Iss. 3, PP 579-593, Retrieved from https://www.esic.edu/documentos /revistas /esicmk/1515770910_I.pdf

Heil, K., (2018) "Location Strategy", Retrieved from https://www.referenceforbusiness.com/management/Int-Loc/Location-Strategy.html

Hotelmarketing, (2013) "Study: How guests select hotels around the world", Retrieved from http://www.hotelmarketing.com/index.php/ content/article/study_how_guests_select_hotels_around_the_world, at 13/9/2018.

Jeong, M., and Jeon, M., (2008) "Customer Reviews of Hotel Experiences through Consumer Generated Media (CGM)", Journal of Hospitality & Leisure Marketing 17(1):121-138, Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233056990_Customer_Rev iews_of_Hotel_Experiences_Through_Consumer_Generated_Media _CGM

Khaleghi, R., Cannon, K., and Srinivas, R., (2018) "A Comparative Evaluation of Recommender Systems for Hotel Reviews", SMU Data Science Review, Vol. 1, No. 4, Retrieved from https://scholar.smu.edu/datasciencereview/vol1/iss4/1/

Lee, K., Kim H., and Lee, D., (2010) "The Determinants of Factors in FIT Guests' Perception of Hotel Location". Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 17: 167-174. Retrieved from https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S14476770000 00760

Li, Y. and Liu, L., (2003) "Assessing the impact of retail location on store performance: A comparison of Wal-Mart and Kmart stores in Cincinnati", Applied Geography, 32: 591-600. Retrieved from https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S01436228110 0141X

Lipsman, A. (2007) "Online consumer-generated reviews have significant impact on offline purchase behavior", ComScore, Retrieved from http://www.comscore.com/Insights/PressReleases/2007/11/Online-Consumer-Reviews-Impact-Offline-Purchasing-Behavior

Malbon, J (2013) "Taking Fake Online Consumer Reviews Seriously", Journal of Consumer Policy, 2013, vol. 36, Iss. 2, 139-157, Retrieved from https://econpapers.repec.org/article/kapjcopol/v_3a36_3ay_3a2013_3ai_3a2_3ap_3a139-157.htm

Mubiri, J., (2016) "Customer Satisfaction in Hotel Services: Case-Lake Kivu Serena Hotel", Retrieved from https://www.theseus.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/114578/Mubiri%20Joleen%20thesis.pdf?sequence=1

Obeng, E., Luchs, R., Inman, J., and Hulland, J. (2016) "Survival of the fittest: How competitive service overlaps and retail format impact incumbent's vulnerability to new entrants". Journal of Retailing, 92 (4):383–396. Retrieved from https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022435916300215

Ogut, H., and Cezar, A., (2012) "The Factors Affecting Writing Reviews in Hotel Websites", 8th International Strategic Management Conference, Pocedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences 58, 980 -986, Retrieved from https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/82363788.pdf

Oner, O., (2016) "Retail productivity: The effects of market size and regional hierarchy", Papers in Regional Science, retrieved from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/pirs.12268

Pacheco, L., (2017) "Customer satisfaction in Portuguese hotels: evidence for different regions and hotel segments", Tourism Analysis, Vol. 22, PP. 337–347, Retrieved from http://repositorio.uportu.pt/jspui/bitstream/11328/1984/1/PAGES%20337-347.pdf

Pal, A., (2019) "The Big Decision: How Travelers Choose Where to Stay", Retrieved from https://discover.expediapartnercentral.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Whitepaper_The-Big-Decision_March-2019.pdf

Park, S., and Allen, J., (2013) "Responding to Online Reviews: Problem Solving and Engagement in Hotels", Cornell Hospitality Quarterly 54(1) 64–73, Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.878.8024&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Penaflorida II, R., (2017) "How to Create an Effective Hotel Reputation Management Strategy", https://www.reviewtrackers.com/blog/hotel-reputation-management/

Penaflorida II, R., (2018) "The 22 Hotel Review Sites You Should Monitor", Retrieved from https://www.reviewtrackers .com/blog/hotel-review-sites/

Phillips, P., Barnes, S., Zigan, K., and Schegg, R., (2016) "Understanding the Impact of Online Reviews on Hotel Performance: An Empirical Analysis", Journal of Travel Research, 56(2), Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/291164180_Understanding _the_Impact_of_Online_Reviews_on_Hotel_Performance_An_Empi rical_Analysis

PRNewswire (2019) "Online Reviews Remain a Trusted Source of Information When Booking Trips, Reveals New Research", retrieved from https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/online-reviews-remain-a-trusted-source-of-information-when-booking-trips-reveals-new-research-300885097.html

PWC (2015) "Online reputations: Why hotel reviews matter and how hotels respond?" Retrieved from https://www.pwc.com/m1/ en/publications/online-reputations-why-hotel-reviews-matter.html

Quambusch, N., (2015) "Online customer reviews and their perceived trustworthiness by consumers in relation to various influencing factors", Retrieved from https://essay.utwente.nl/68513/1/ Quambusch_BA_MB.pdf

ReviewPro (2019),"How to Encourage Guest Reviews for your Hotel", Retrieved from https://www.reviewpro.com/wp-content/uploads /pdf/en-guide-increasing-reviews.pdf

ReviewTrackers 1 (2018) "2018 ReviewTrackers Online Reviews Survey", Retrieved from https://www.reviewtrackers.com/reports/online-reviews-survey/

Rigall, R., Modest, F., Ballester, R., Saló, A., Ariza, A., and Espinet, M., (2011) "The effects of beach characteristics and location with respect to hotel prices". Griffith University, Brisbane: ADT, Tourism Management, 32, 1150 –1158, retrieved from https://www. sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S026151771000213X

Rivers, J., Toh, S., and Alaoui, M., (1991) "Frequent-stayer programs: the demographic, behavioral, and attitudinal characteristics of hotel steady sleepers". Journal of Travel Research, 30(2), 41–45.retrieved

from   http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/00472875910-3000209?journalCode=jtrb

Ryan, B. (2011) "Evaluating Lodging Opportunities", The University of Wisconsin-Extension", Retrieved from https://fyi.uwex.edu/downtown-market-analysis/analysis-of-opportunities-by-sector/lodging

Singh, R., (2019) "Behind the Scenes of Hotel Review Sites: Four Things Hotels Can do to Improve their Ratings", retrieved from https://www.hospitalitynet.org/opinion/4094294.html

Siteminder 1 (2019) "How to handle online guest reviews of your hotel", Retrieved from https://www.siteminder.com/r/marketing/hotel-online-reviews/how-to-handle-online-guest-reviews-of-your-hotel/#

Siteminder 2 (2019) "How to influence travelers: Why reviews are the golden egg at your hotel", Retrieved from https://www.siteminder.com/r/marketing/hotel-online-reviews/influence-travellers-reviews-hotel/

Siteminder (2020) "Hotel reviews: How to manage online guest reviews at your property", Retrieved from https://www.siteminder.com/r/hotel-reviews-manage-online-property/

Statista, (2017) "Most important factors when choosing a hotel in the United Kingdom (UK) 2017" Retrieved from https://www.statista.com/statistics/707265/factors-important-when-choosing-a-hotel-in-the-uk , at 13/9/2018.

Thamesriviera, (2018) "4 Important Factors to Consider When Choosing a Hotel", retrieved from https://thamesriviera.com/4-important-factors-consider-choosing-hotel, at 13/9/2018.

Tripadvisor (2019) "Online Reviews Remain a Trusted Source of Information When Booking Trips, Reveals New Research", retrieved from: http://ir.tripadvisor.com/node/16851/pdf

Truchet, S., Callois, J., and Piguet, V., (2011) "Amenities and location of hotels: a micro-economic model and estimations", ERSA conference HYPERLINK "https://econpapers.repec.org/paper/wiwwiwrsa/"papers from European Regional Science Association, retrieved from https://econpapers.repec.org/paper/wiwwiwrsa/ersa10p904.htm

Tuominen, P., (2020) "The Influence of TripAdvisor Consumer-Generated Travel Reviews on Hotel Performance", University of Hertfordshire Business School, Presented at the 19th annual Frontiers in Service

Conference, retrieved from https://uhra.herts.ac.uk/bitstream /handle/2299/7612/S128.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Valant, J., (2015) "Online consumer reviews: the case of misleading or fake reviews", EPRS: European Parliamentary Research Service, retrieved from https://www.eesc.europa.eu/sites/default/files /resources/docs/online-consumer-reviews---the-case-of-misleading- or-fake-reviews.pdf

Yang, Y., Tang, J., Luo, H., and Law, R., (2015) "Hotel location evaluation: A combination of machine learning tools and web GIS", International Journal of Hospitality Management, 47/supp/C"Vol. 47, PP 14-24, retrieved from https://www.sciencedirect .com/science/article/abs/pii/S0278431915000316

Yang, Y., Wong, K., and Wang, T., (2012) "How do hotels choose their location? Evidence from hotels in Beijing", International Journal of Hospitality Management, 3"VolHYPERLINK "https://www. sciencedirect.com/science/journal/02784319/31/3".HYPERLINK "https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/02784319/31/3" 31, IssHYPERLINK "https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/ 02784319/31/3".HYPERLINK "https://www.sciencedirect.com/ science/journal/ 02784319/31/3" 3, PP 675-685, retrieved from https://www. sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0278431911001472 ?via%3Dihub

Yoo, K., and Gretzel, U., (2008) "What motivates consumers to write online travel reviews?" Information Technology & Tourism, Vol. 10 pp. 283–295,retrieved from http://ro.uow.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi? article =2589&context=commpapers

Yu, W., (2014) "The effects of hotel performance characteristics on customer online ratings", retrieved from https://lib.dr. iastate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=5001&context=etd