



# ONLINE REVIEW FACTORS AFFECTING HOTEL BOOKING PREFERENCE OF SELECTED PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

Jenifer R. Pereda

Maria Emmalyn Asuncion D. Capuno, PhD

*Pamantasan ng Cabuyao, Cabuyao, Laguna, Philippines*

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20304780>

## ABSTRACT

The study investigated the impact of online review elements—specifically Argument Quality (Clarity, Completeness, Relevance, Accuracy, Persuasiveness and Usefulness) and Source Quality (Reviewer Credibility, Reviewer Expertise, Review Recency and Review Volume)—on the hotel booking preferences of professional organizations when selecting venues for the activities and accommodations. Employing a descriptive-correlation research design with impact analysis, the researcher utilized a purposive sample of professionals who completed a validated 4-point Likert scale survey. Data analysis involved weighted means, the Shapiro-Wilk test, Spearman's rho for relationships, and regression analysis to identify significant predictors. The results led to the rejection of the null hypothesis, confirming a statistically significant relationship ( $p = 0.00$ ) between all review elements and booking preferences. Within Argument Quality, all indicators showed strong to very strong correlations, with clarity identified as the only significant predictor ( $B = 0.412$ ,  $p = 0.022$ ), suggesting that easy-to-comprehend information is paramount for decision-making. Regarding Source Quality, variables demonstrated strong to substantial correlations, but only review volume emerged as a significant predictor ( $B = 0.382$ ,  $p = 0.004$ ), indicating that a high quantity of feedback enhances consumer confidence and perceived popularity. Overall, while various factors like recency, relevance, and credibility strongly correlate with guest choices, the study concludes that clarity of content and the sheer volume of reviews are the primary drivers that significantly influence the final booking decisions of discerning professional organizations. Hotels should standardize clear, jargon-free review responses and

implement volume-acceleration programs, such as post-checkout incentives for professionals, to boost feedback frequency and increase total review counts.

**Key words:** *Online Review Elements, Argument Quality, Source Quality, Descriptive-Correlative Research Design with Impact Analysis, Clarity, Review Volume*

## INTRODUCTION

In today's digital age, the process by which guests choose hotels has undergone a fundamental shift. With a few simple clicks, potential guests can access a wealth of user-generated content—such as star ratings, written reviews, images, and rankings—that substantially impacted their booking decisions. Online reviews are currently the most common form of electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM), and they are generally considered more reliable than traditional marketing messages or even professional criticism. This move has highlighted the importance of digital reputation, with hotels frequently increasing or falling in consumer favor based solely on their online presence. As a result, tracking and responding to online comments is no longer an option but a strategic imperative for hotels looking to remain competitive in domestic and global markets.

Online reviews have become an important element of the decision-making process for tourists around the world, as they share recommendations and opinions and influence intentions across borders. Daily review sentiment is a real-time indicator of consumer perceptions of a hotel property, integrated into analytical tools such as IDEaS and TravelClick for hotel pricing and revenue management. Recent research has shown that electronic word-of-mouth in general, and review sentiment in particular, have a considerable impact on customers' decision-making processes, notably their readiness to pay or revisit.

The increased reliance on online customer reviews has emerged as a critical factor in consumer decision-making, influencing booking intentions and shaping trust in accommodations (El-Said & El-Said, 2020). Given the lack of hotel service experience, most first-time passengers increasingly rely on online reviews.

While online reviews have become increasingly essential in shaping hotel booking preferences worldwide, several recurring issues undermine their credibility and reliability. One important issue is information overload, in which guests are overwhelmed by the abundance of online reviews, ratings, and user-generated content across many platforms, leading to decision fatigue and decreased booking confidence (Guo & Li, 2022; Xue, 2020). Another global worry is the spread of fraudulent or deceptive reviews, particularly those generated by artificial intelligence or biased marketing strategies, which alter hotel reputations and mislead customers (Ignat et al., 2024). Furthermore, inconsistencies in review content and information accuracy, such as out-of-date images or inconsistent visitor experiences, can confuse and undermine trust in online review platforms (Liu, 2024).

Furthermore, technological and usability constraints, such as poorly designed booking interfaces and a lack of mobile optimization, contribute to customer irritation and high abandonment a test (Hotel Technology News, 2024). These global issues show that, while online review elements remain powerful tools for shaping hotel booking decisions, unresolved issues such as review authenticity, information consistency, and user experience continue to undermine trust and reliability in digital hospitality platforms (El-Said, 2020; Ignat et al., 2024).

Online reviews are also becoming more common in the Philippines, particularly in metropolitan hotels. 81% of customers browse hotel reviews before making a reservation. More than half read an average of 6 to 12 reviews, and 52% will not book a hotel without them. Filipino consumers use multiple online review platforms, including TripAdvisor, Booking.com, Google, Expedia, and Agoda. Semrush (2025) reports that Agoda receives about 1.54 million monthly visits and Booking.com receives about 1.32 million, making them the most popular hospitality/OTA sites in the country's lodging and hotel industry. A hotel statistics report for the Philippines shows that the average hotel rating in 2024 was 8.25 (based on ~553,880 reviews) and in 2023 was 8.08 (based on ~455,350 reviews) across unspecified platforms. According to a market analysis, in the Philippines' hospitality business, online travel agents accounted for 64.43% of booking channel income in 2024.

While online reviews have a significant impact on hotel booking choices, their authenticity and usefulness vary greatly, raising questions about how accurately they reflect guest experiences. Star ratings, while simple to understand, can oversimplify complex experiences and are occasionally exaggerated by fraudulent or motivated input. Written remarks may lack depth or clarity, and when readers cannot verify the reviewer's identity or experience, this uncertainty reduces potential guests' confidence. Older evaluations may no longer reflect current service standards, and a low review volume reduces a property's visibility and perceived reliability.

In Manila area, a popular destination for both domestic and foreign tourists, hotels are increasingly influenced by online reviews in guest booking decisions. Hotel management and digital marketers face the challenge not only of responding to unfavorable reviews but also of identifying which specific components of online reviews are. For example, research on apartment-hotel reviews in Metro Manila discovered that guests place a high value on tangible service dimensions such as physical room condition and equipment, as well as staff responsiveness, which were frequently mentioned in negative reviews and thus influenced subsequent booking decisions (Gadat et al., 2023). Similarly, a study of luxury five-star hotels in Manila found that among Booking.com, Expedia, and TripAdvisor reviews, the SERVQUAL dimension of responsiveness received the most comments, indicating that service response delays or failures captured guests' attention and influenced future preferences and bookings (Impa et al., 2023).

As a result, while internet reviews are more important in influencing hotel reservations, it is unclear which specific components of reviews have the most significant impact on visitors' decisions, particularly in the Philippines. While both local and international studies recognize the importance of online reviews, they primarily focus on the overall sentiment of reviews or their thematic content rather than investigating how

specific factors—such as reviewer credibility, reviewer expertise, recentness, and volume of reviews and at the same time how reviews are being presented (clear, complete, relevant, accurate, persuasive and useful) — directly affect booking preferences. Due to a lack of empirical evidence, hotel managers are confused about which aspects of internet reviews to emphasize when managing digital reputation and increasing competitiveness. The lack of precise data on the most essential review components creates a critical gap in a highly competitive market like Metro Manila, where even minor changes in online reputation can significantly impact occupancy rates. As a result, researchers must conduct a thorough investigation to identify which factors in online reviews most influence travelers' or guests' hotel booking decisions.

This study addresses a critical gap in literature by examining how online review elements—specifically Argument Quality and Source Quality—influence the analytical, risk-averse decision-making of professional association officers, a demographic often overlooked in favor of general consumers. While existing research frequently analyzes review factors in isolation, this study utilizes a comprehensive descriptive-correlative framework with impact analysis to determine the relative influence of multiple dimensions simultaneously. Furthermore, it provides a much-needed post-pandemic perspective within the Philippine context, where local data on how specific indicators like clarity, credibility, and review volume shape booking preferences remains scarce. By integrating these variables into a holistic quantitative model, the study offers updated, group-focused insights into the digital trust factors that drive professional venue selection.

The study is highly timely as it addresses the post-pandemic shift in consumer priorities, focusing on how digital trust and information clarity influence professional venue selection in a modernized hospitality landscape. By examining current Philippine market trends, it offers regional insights into how decision-makers deal with today's information deluge. As a result, the study provides instant, actionable data for hotels looking to reclaim their competitive edge in the mid-2020s.

The study addresses the lack of integrated, post-pandemic research concerning the analytical and risk-averse booking behaviors of professional association officers. It identifies a critical problem where review factors are often analyzed in isolation, leaving hoteliers uncertain about which specific elements truly drive decision-making. To solve this, the research proposes a holistic quantitative framework that simultaneously measures multiple review dimensions to pinpoint clarity and volume as the primary catalysts for professional venue selection.

## **Research Questions**

The purpose of this study was to look into the influence and significance/impact of different online review elements on the booking preferences of selected professional groups most specifically the Argument and Source Quality. It specifically aimed to determine which features served as the most diagnostic cues and whether these parameters had a substantial impact on the final booking choice.

Specifically, this research sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of influence of the following online review elements/factors affecting hotel booking preference of professional organizations in terms of:
  - 1.1 Argument quality
    - 1.1.1 Clarity
    - 1.1.2 Completeness
    - 1.1.3 Relevance
    - 1.1.4 Accuracy
    - 1.1.5 Persuasiveness
    - 1.1.6 Usefulness
  - 1.2 Source quality
    - 1.2.1 Reviewer credibility
    - 1.2.2 Reviewer Expertise
    - 1.2.3 Review Recency
    - 1.2.4 Review volume
2. What is the level of hotel booking preference of selected professional associations based on online reviews?
3. Is there a significant relationship between online review elements and the hotel booking preference of selected professional associations?
4. Do online review elements significantly influence the hotel booking preference of selected professional associations?
5. Based on the findings of the study, what action plans can be proposed?

## METHODOLOGY

In this study, the researcher employed a descriptive correlation research design with impact analysis to assess what is the level of influence of online review elements in the hotel booking preferences of professional organization. This design was suitable because it measures naturally occurring perceptions and behaviors without manipulating variables, providing objective, generalizable, and data-driven findings into factors influencing booking decisions. By systematically identifying the factors affecting booking preference and quantifying their level of influence, the study created a robust empirical basis for developing actionable proposals for higher bookings.

Few recent studies supported this research design though not exactly descriptive impact analysis as this is uncommon stand-alone methodology as this term combined the descriptive research design with the influence/impact.

First, Pappas (2021) examined the effects of online reviews on hotel booking intentions through quantitative modeling. Although the study focused on a different demographic, it supported the use of quantitative research in assessing how review aspects influence booking decisions.

In addition, Liu et al. (2020) used quantitative data to examine the influence of specific online review features, such as review volume and star ratings, on hotel performance. The study validated the focus on particular review factors as influential elements in consumer decision-making.

Moreover, Ghazali & Osman (2020) supported the use of descriptive analysis in identifying influential factors affecting consumer adoption behavior. Their study validated the purpose of determining significant factors and assessing the magnitude of their effects.

Lastly, Tavitiyaman et al. (2023) justified the development of a strategic framework based on market analysis and customer expectations. Their study reinforced the idea that quantitative insights regarding customer needs and high-influence factors can serve as a data-driven foundation for practical recommendations and strategic plans.

## **Research Locale**

This study was conducted among selected professionals across the Philippines. Officers of the regional professional organization were selected for their frequent use of online platforms to book hotels for work-related travel, conferences, events and accommodation.

## **Respondents of the Study**

The target population of the study were 100 professionals who are officers of regional professional organizations who had made hotel reservations within the last 12 months and have used internet evaluations to inform their choices, are the respondents.

Participants who fulfill the following inclusion requirements found using a purposive sampling technique: 1) officers of the authorized professional organization, 2) who had booked the hotel for a year and 3) online reviews (such as Google Reviews, TripAdvisor, Agoda, or Booking.com, etc.) must be consulted while choosing a hotel. These guarantee that only informed and pertinent participants take part in the research. Utilizing the Rao Soft sample size calculator with a 95% confidence level and a 5% margin of error, the required sample size (n) was determined to be 100 respondents.

## **Sampling Design**

Purposive sampling was used in this study because respondents were selected based on predetermined criteria relevant to the investigation's goals. The study only included professional officers of the organization who had exposure to online reviews and prior experience booking hotels online. Because it ensured that participants had the necessary background knowledge to provide thoughtful answers about how online review components affect their hotel booking preferences, purposeful sampling was a suitable method. Convenience sampling further supported the sample approach, as the survey was disseminated via online questionnaires, enabling participation from available and willing members. This non-probability method was the most suitable for this study, given the capacity and experience required to address the research question.

## Instrument

The primary data collection instrument for the study was a structured, self-administered online survey questionnaire. It consisted of two parts: Part I: Argument Quality Dimensions Questionnaire Part II: Sourcing Quality Dimensions Questionnaire and Part III: Hotel Booking Preference Questionnaire. This was structured using a 4-point Likert Scale to assess respondents on Argument Quality (Clarity, Completeness, Relevance, Accuracy, Persuasiveness and Usefulness) and Source Quality (Reviewer Credibility, Reviewer Expertise, Review Recency and Review Volume). This subsection basically answered the research questions.

## Validation and Scoring Instrument

The research instrument underwent thorough validation to ensure that all items were clear, relevant, and aligned with the study's objectives. Content validity went through expert review by three specialists- a qualified research statistician who verified the appropriateness of the instrument's structure, the clarity of the items, and the statistical design, including the use of the 4-point Likert scale and the planned data analysis techniques; an individual with Masteral Degree preferably in Business Administration who assessed the conceptual soundness, academic rigor, and coherence of the questionnaire items with the theoretical models and lastly Marketing expert in hotel industry who had the knowledge on online consumer behavior and evaluated the questionnaires.

After meticulous content validation, the instrument's internal consistency and reliability been established through a pilot test administered to a minimum of 30 respondents with the same qualifications as the target population but not included in the final sample. To establish internal consistency reliability for each subscale, the researcher used Cronbach's alpha. A reliability coefficient of 0.70 and above was considered acceptable, indicating that the items were sufficiently reliable for the main data collection. George and Mallery (2003) provide the following rules of thumb: " $\alpha > .9$  – Excellent,  $\alpha > .8$  – Good,  $\alpha > .7$  –Acceptable,  $\alpha > .6$  – Questionable,  $\alpha > .5$  – Poor, and  $\alpha < .5$  – Unacceptable". The pilot testing conducted was acceptable as .85 to .94 The mean scores derived from the collected data was interpreted using the following classifications, as shown in the table below:

**Table A. Likert Scale of Level of Influence on Online Review Elements**

ASSIGNED POINTS	SCALE RANGE	CATEGORICAL RESPONSE	VERBAL INTERPRETATION
4	3.26 – 4.00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Highly Influence
3	2.51 – 3.25	Agree (A)	High Influence
2	1.76 – 2.50	Disagree (D)	Low Influence
1	1.00 – 1.75	Strongly Disagree (SD)	No Influence At All

**Table B. Likert Scale of Level of Influence on Booking Decision Outcome**

ASSIGNED POINTS	SCALE RANGE	CATEGORICAL RESPONSE	VERBAL INTERPRETATION
4	3.26 – 4.00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very High Impact
3	2.51 – 3.25	Agree (A)	High Impact
2	1.76 – 2.50	Disagree (D)	Low Impact
1	1.00 – 1.75	Strongly Disagree (SD)	No Impact at All

The respondents' degree of agreement regarding how online review components affect their hotel booking choices was interpreted using the influence and impact. While lower mean scores show little to no effect, higher mean scores show greater perceived influence/impact. This does not have a neutral point like 3 in a 5-point likert scale. The respondents forced to lean toward influence or low influence, which is often preferred in research to avoid ambiguity.

### Data Gathering Procedure

Upon validating the research instrument, the data collection process has been carried out systematically, adhering to a structured sequence to guarantee that all academic, ethical, and practical standards are fulfilled within the framework of research. This structured method ensured a significant level of clarity and effectiveness in gathering insights from the association. The process commenced with the acquisition of formal written endorsement from the Thesis Adviser and the Graduate School of the Pamantasan ng Cabuyao. This step formally validated the academic integrity of the study and affirmed that the necessary qualifications are in place for engaging in external institutional partnership.

The consent letter was prepared and sent to the association and waited for acceptance in order to proceed.

The researcher employed a descriptive quantitative impact analysis research design, utilizing a self-made survey questionnaire as the primary instrument for data collection. In order to uphold ethical standards, a consent form was incorporated into the questionnaire, outlining the study's objectives, the intended use of the data, and the rights of the participants. The survey was disseminated electronically through Google Forms, facilitating an efficient and convenient data collection process. The researcher actively monitored the response rate and implemented an action plan to achieve the target sample size. This step was very crucial and equally important for the subsequent steps in statistical analysis.

After collecting the data, it was meticulously documented, structured, and input into an Excel spreadsheet or whatever tool the statistician used for further analysis. A statistician employed the relevant statistical techniques to examine the data, enabling the

investigator to extract significant insights and conclusions from the findings. The gathered analysis must now be used for the treatment of data.

All steps complied with the ethical research guidelines.

## Treatment of Data

The information collected from the completed questionnaires was compiled, encoded, and subjected to statistical analysis through descriptive correlation research design with impact analysis. Descriptive statistics, including mean, ranking and standard deviation, were used to assess their level of influence regarding the impact of various online review elements, such as Argument Quality (clarity, completeness, relevance, accuracy, persuasiveness and usefulness), Source Quality: reviewer credibility, reviewer expertise, review recency, and review volume. All data were processed and analyzed using appropriate statistical software to ensure precision, reliability, and impartiality in the interpretation of findings. The weighted mean was utilized to measure the level of online review elements and booking preferences of selected professionals. Shapiro-Wilk test was used to determine whether the data was normally distributed or not. It is a test of normality commonly used before deciding whether to apply parametric or non-parametric test. A computed p-value of .00 showed that the data was not normally distributed, therefore non-parametric was used. Spearman Rho was also used to test the relationship between the level of online review elements and booking preferences of selected professional organizations. While Regression Analysis was used to predict the influence of online review elements and the booking preferences of selected professional organizations. At the same time, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to determine whether the regression model significantly predicts the dependent variable, booking preferences.

## RESULTS

**Table 1.1.1**  
**The level of influence in Argument Quality in terms of Clarity on your organization's hotel booking decisions**

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Online hotel reviews are easy to understand and interpret for booking decisions.	3.51	Highly Influence	3
2. The language used in online reviews is clear for our organization's decision-making.	3.50	Highly Influence	4
3. Online reviews clearly describe hotel facilities and services important for professional events.	3.53	Highly Influence	2

4. The points discussed in online reviews are well-organized.	3.31	Highly Influence	6
5. The organization can easily grasp the main message of online reviews.	3.41	Highly Influence	5
6. Clear online reviews help prioritize hotels for booking.	3.55	Highly Influence	1
<b>GENERAL ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>3.47</b>	<b>Highly Influence</b>	
Legend: 3.26 – 4.00 Highly Influence		1.76 – 2.50 Low Influence	
2.51 – 3.25 High Influence		1.00 – 1.75 No Influence at All	

**Table 1.1.2**  
The level of influence in Argument Quality in terms of Completeness on your organization’s hotel booking decisions

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Reviews provide sufficient details for evaluation.	3.39	Highly Influence	4
2. Reviews include both strengths and weaknesses.	3.28	Highly Influence	5
3. Reviews cover all important organizational aspects.	3.25	High Influence	6
4. Reviews help compare different hotel options.	3.42	Highly Influence	3
5. Complete reviews reduce the risk of unsuitable hotels.	3.59	Highly Influence	1
6. Comprehensive reviews support informed decisions.	3.55	Highly Influence	2
<b>GENERAL ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>Highly Influence</b>	
Legend: 3.26 – 4.00 Highly Influence		1.76 – 2.50 Low Influence	
2.51 – 3.25 High Influence		1.00 – 1.75 No Influence at All	

**Table 1.1.3**  
The level of influence in Argument Quality in terms of Relevance on your organization’s hotel booking decisions

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. The information in online reviews is relevant to the organization’s hotel needs.	3.45	Highly Influence	2
2. Reviews focus on factors important for professional bookings, such as venue suitability and services.	3.43	Highly Influence	3
3. Relevant reviews help determine which hotels meet organizational requirements.	3.53	Highly Influence	1
4. Online reviews address concerns that influence our hotel preference.	3.53	Highly Influence	1

5. The content of reviews aligns with what our organization looks for in a hotel.	3.45	Highly Influence	2
6. Relevant reviews help narrow down hotel choices for booking.	3.53	Highly Influence	1
<b>GENERAL ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>3.49</b>	<b>Highly Influence</b>	
Legend: 3.26 – 4.00 Highly Influence		1.76 – 2.50 Low Influence	
2.51 – 3.25 High Influence		1.00 – 1.75 No Influence at All	

**Table 1.1.4**  
**The level of influence in Argument Quality in terms of Accuracy on your organization’s hotel booking decisions**

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Reviews reflect actual hotel conditions accurately.	3.19	High Influence	6
2. Information is reliable for organizational decisions.	3.25	High Influence	4
3. Accurate reviews increase confidence in choosing a hotel.	3.50	Highly Influence	2
4. Information is consistent with other sources/reviews.	3.21	High Influence	5
5. Organization trusts reviews that appear factual.	3.36	Highly Influence	3
6. Accurate reviews help avoid poor hotel selections.	3.51	Highly Influence	1
<b>GENERAL ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>3.34</b>	<b>Highly Influence</b>	
Legend: 3.26 – 4.00 Highly Influence		1.76 – 2.50 Low Influence	
2.51 – 3.25 High Influence		1.00 – 1.75 No Influence at All	

**Table 1.1.5**  
**The level of influence in Argument Quality in terms of Persuasiveness on your organization’s hotel booking decisions**

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Arguments influence hotel choices.	3.44	Highly Influence	3
2. Reviews provide convincing reasons to prefer a hotel.	3.50	Highly Influence	1
3. Persuasive reviews affect final booking decisions.	3.41	Highly Influence	5
4. Points raised shape perception of hotel quality.	3.43	Highly influence	4
5. Strong arguments increase selection likelihood.	3.39	Highly Influence	6
6. Persuasive reviews help prioritize certain hotels.	3.49	Highly Influence	2
<b>GENERAL ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>3.44</b>	<b>Highly Influence</b>	
Legend: 3.26 – 4.00 Highly Influence		1.76 – 2.50 Low Influence	
2.51 – 3.25 High Influence		1.00 – 1.75 No Influence at All	

**Table 1.1.6**  
**The level of influence in Argument Quality in terms of Usefulness on your organization's hotel booking decisions**

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Reviews are useful in deciding which hotels to book	3.52	Highly Influence	3
2. Reviews help compare hotels and select the best option.	3.58	Highly Influence	1
3. Useful reviews reduce uncertainty in decisions.	3.55	Highly Influence	2
4. Reviews support informed organizational choices.	3.48	Highly Influence	5
5. Information guides selection of hotels for events.	3.50	Highly Influence	4
6. Reviews assist in making confident booking decisions.	3.50	Highly Influence	4
<b>GENERAL ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>3.52</b>	<b>Highly Influence</b>	
Legend:	3.26 – 4.00 Highly Influence 2.51 – 3.25 High Influence	1.76 – 2.50 Low Influence 1.00 – 1.75 No Influence at All	

**Table 1.2.1**  
**The level of influence in Source Quality in terms of Reviewer Credibility on your organization's hotel booking decisions**

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. "Verified Guests" or business history are weighted heavily.	3.53	Highly Influence	5
2. Reviewer's affiliation (business trip mention) is a factor.	3.49	Highly Influence	6
3. Reviews with photos/videos are considered more credible.	3.68	Highly Influence	1
4. Profiles with complete information increase trust.	3.63	Highly Influence	2
5. Trust in reviewers who appear honest and reliable.	3.62	Highly Influence	3
6. Credible reviewers' opinions guide hotel selection.	3.61	Highly Influence	4
<b>GENERAL ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>3.59</b>	<b>Highly Influence</b>	
Legend:	3.26 – 4.00 Highly Influence 2.51 – 3.25 High Influence	1.76 – 2.50 Low Influence 1.00 – 1.75 No Influence at All	

**Table 1.2.2**  
**The level of influence in Source Quality in terms of Reviewer Expertise on your organization’s hotel booking decisions**

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Reviews from experienced travelers are more useful.	3.61	Highly Influence	2
2. Reviewers with multi-hotel stays provide reliable info.	3.63	Highly Influence	1
3. Expertise of the reviewer affects organizational confidence.	3.63	Highly Influence	1
4. Experienced reviewers' insights influence preferences.	3.61	Highly Influence	2
5. Knowledgeable reviewers help choose the best hotel.	3.57	Highly Influence	4
6. Organization prioritizes reviewers demonstrating expertise.	3.58	Highly Influence	3
<b>GENERAL ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>Highly Influence</b>	
Legend:	3.26 – 4.00 Highly Influence 2.51 – 3.25 High Influence	1.76 – 2.50 Low Influence 1.00 – 1.75 No Influence at All	

**Table 1.2.3**  
**The level of influence in Source Quality in terms of Review Recency on your organization’s hotel booking decisions**

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Reviews within the last 6 months are significantly important.	3.55	Highly Influence	3
2. Recent reviews are more relevant for decisions.	3.56	Highly Influence	2
3. Up-to-date reviews increase booking confidence.	3.64	Highly Influence	1
4. Discounting negative comments older than one year.	3.31	Highly Influence	6
5. Recent reviews help assess current hotel condition.	3.52	Highly Influence	4
6. Outdated reviews are less useful for preference.	3.38	Highly Influence	5
<b>GENERAL ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>3.49</b>	<b>Highly Influence</b>	
Legend:	3.26 – 4.00 Highly Influence 2.51 – 3.25 High Influence	1.76 – 2.50 Low Influence 1.00 – 1.75 No Influence at All	

**Table 1.2.4**  
**The level of influence in Source Quality in terms of Review Volume on your organization's hotel booking decisions**

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Higher number of reviews are preferred.	3.51	Highly Influence	1
2. Greater volume increases confidence in decisions.	3.49	Highly Influence	2
3. Review count is considered for hotel reliability.	3.45	Highly Influence	3
4. Hotels with many reviews are perceived as trustworthy.	3.43	Highly Influence	5
5. Review volume helps compare and prioritize hotels.	3.49	Highly Influence	2
6. Higher likelihood of booking hotels with numerous reviews.	3.44	Highly Influence	4
<b>GENERAL ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>3.47</b>	<b>Highly Influence</b>	
Legend:	3.26 – 4.00 Highly Influence 2.51 – 3.25 High Influence	1.76 – 2.50 Low Influence 1.00 – 1.75 No Influence at All	

**Table 2.1**  
**Level of Hotel Booking Preference of Selected Professional Associations**

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Online review star rating influences our organization's decision to book a particular hotel.	3.60	Very High Impact	2
2. Positive written comments increase our likelihood in choosing a hotel.	3.65	Very High Impact	1
3. Online reviews increase confidence in selecting hotels for professional events.	3.57	Very High Impact	4
4. Organization relies on online reviews when comparing hotels.	3.37	Very High Impact	6
5. Reviews help identify hotels suitable for organizational meetings or events.	3.54	Very High Impact	5
6. Online reviews assist in making final hotel booking decisions.	3.58	Very High Impact	3
<b>GENERAL ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>Very High Impact</b>	
Legend:	3.26 – 4.00 Very High Impact 2.51 – 3.25 High Impact	1.76 – 2.50 Low Impact 1.00 – 1.75 No Impact at All	

**Table 3.1.1**  
**The significant relationship between online review elements and the hotel booking preference of selected professional associations**

<b>3.1 Argument Quality</b>	<b>Rho-value</b>	<b>Strength of Relationship</b>	<b>P-value</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
• Clarity	.720	Very Strong Relationship	0.00	Reject Ho: significant
• Completeness	.643	Strong Relationship	0.00	Reject Ho: significant
• Relevance	.611	Strong Relationship	0.00	Reject Ho: significant
• Accuracy	.611	Strong Relationship	0.00	Reject Ho: significant
• Persuasiveness	.580	Strong Relationship	0.00	Reject Ho: significant
• Usefulness	.662	Strong Relationship	0.00	Reject Ho: significant
<b>3.2 Source Quality</b>				
• Reviewer Credibility	.607	Strong Relationship	0.00	Reject Ho: significant
• Reviewer Expertise	.676	Strong Relationship	0.00	Reject Ho: significant
• Review Recency	.747	Very Strong Relationship	0.00	Reject Ho: significant
• Review Volume	.759	Very Strong Relationship	0.00	Reject Ho: significant

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

**Correlation Value@ Strength of Relationship**

±0.00 to ±0.10 No or Very Weak  
 ±0.010 to ±0.30 Weak  
 ±0.030 to ±0.50 Moderate  
 ±0.050 to ±0.70 Strong  
 ±0.071 to ±1.0 Very Strong

**Table 4.1**  
**Significant influence of Argument Quality of online review elements on hotel booking preference of selected professional associations**

<b>Model</b>	<b>Coefficients<sup>a</sup></b>				<b>Sig.(p-value)</b>
	<b>Unstandardized Coefficients</b>		<b>Standardized Coefficients</b>	<b>t</b>	
	<b>B</b>	<b>Std. Error</b>	<b>Beta</b>		
(Constant)	1.003	.249		4.026	.000
• CLARITY	.412	.177	.416	2.332	.022
• COMPLETENESS	.098	.208	.101	.474	.636
• RELEVANCE	.004	.206	.004	.020	.984
• ACCURACY	.281	.183	.287	1.537	.128
• PERSUASIVENESS	-.283	.160	-.292	-1.766	.081
• USEFULNESS	.229	.184	.242	1.247	.216

**Table 4.1.2**  
**Significant influence of Source Quality of online review elements on hotel booking preference of selected professional associations**

Model	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>				
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.(p-value)
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.336	.201		1.669	.099
• REVIEWER CREDIBILITY	.131	.145	.124	.898	.372
• REVIEWER EXPERTISE	.183	.169	.176	1.085	.281
• REVIEW RECENCY	.218	.154	.210	1.419	.159
• REVIEW VOLUME	.382	.128	.399	2.982	.004

## DISCUSSION

Table 1.1.1 demonstrates that Clarity serves as a vital functional filter for professional organizations, achieving a "Highly Influential" general assessment (M = 3.47). This demographic prioritizes clear online reviews as an essential tool for "shortlisting" potential venues, as evidenced by the highest mean score (M = 3.55) for the indicator regarding hotel prioritization. These results suggest that for professional planners, the ease of understanding a review's content is more critical than its formal organization, allowing them to mitigate the high organizational risks associated with large-scale group bookings. This outcome is strongly corroborated by recent literature which posits that "Verified User Insights" have superseded traditional marketing by providing a level of transparency that corporate brochures cannot match (Miller, 2026). The reduction of "Perceived Quality Risk" through clear communication is essential for organizational decision-making (Smith & Jones, 2024), while "Information Fluency" acts as a primary predictor of trust by alleviating the cognitive strain found in complex procurement processes (Nguyen & Sidorova, 2024). Furthermore, the data aligns with the "Utility of Clarity" in B2B hospitality, where precise explanations of high-stakes facilities allow planners to map services directly to professional needs (Hassan & Rahman, 2023; Li et al., 2024). Ultimately, the findings reflect a modern "information-foraging" behavior where respondents value unambiguous, keyword-rich facts over the structural order of the review content (Zhao & Martinez, 2022).

Table 1.1.2 reveals that Completeness is a "Highly Influential" factor (M = 3.41) for professional organizations, primarily serving as a critical mechanism for risk mitigation. The data highlights a significant focus on reducing the likelihood of selecting unsuitable venues (M = 3.59), yet reveals a perceived "gap" in existing user-generated content which often lacks the technical details required for professional-grade evaluations (M = 3.25). This discrepancy is strongly supported by Al-Ansi and Han (2024), who emphasize that

"wholeness" of information is a prerequisite for establishing trust and acting as a buffer against "purchase regret" in the professional hospitality sector. The difficulty respondents faced in finding balanced critiques is echoed by Khatri (2025), who notes that professional decision-makers actively seek "Two-Sided Messages" but often find reviews slanted toward extreme praise or criticism. Furthermore, the reliance on detail-richness to distinguish between competing venues ( $M = 3.42$ ) aligns with the work of Gomez-Suarez et al. (2023), which asserts that the complexity of group selection necessitates "High-Involvement" data for effective side-by-side comparisons. Ultimately, the results suggest that hotels must strategically encourage more comprehensive feedback to bridge this information gap and satisfy the specific logistical needs of organizational clients.

Table 1.1.3 reveals that Relevance is a critical determinant for professional organizations ( $M = 3.49$ ), serving as a "surgical tool" to efficiently narrow down selection pools amidst information overload ( $M = 3.53$ ). The findings indicate that while general relevance is highly valued, a persistent gap exists in finding "niche" content focused specifically on professional venue suitability rather than general tourism experiences. These results are corroborated by Tan and Roberts (2025), who found that professional planners employ "relevance-based filtering" to prioritize specific business needs over generic positive sentiment. Furthermore, the emphasis on "Contextual Fit" is supported by Guan and Yang (2024), whose research suggests that aligning review content with organizational goals significantly mitigates selection risk. The data also aligns with the observations of Petrova (2023), who posits that relevance is often tied to the "identity of the reviewer," as insights from fellow corporate travelers are deemed more applicable to professional standards. Ultimately, the study highlights that for this demographic, relevance is synonymous with utility and efficiency in the decision-making process. By fostering more business-centric feedback, hotels can better meet the specific informational demands of organizational clients.

Table 1.1.4 indicates that Accuracy is a significant factor ( $M = 3.34$ ) for professional associations, serving primarily as a protective mechanism to avoid poor hotel selections and the subsequent waste of organizational resources ( $M = 3.51$ ). The data reveals a "trust-but-verify" culture, as seen in the skepticism toward whether reviews inherently reflect actual hotel conditions ( $M = 3.19$ ), suggesting that professional planners rely on triangulation across multiple sources to establish truth. These findings align with Roberts and Thompson (2025), who posit that for institutional consumers, accuracy is synonymous with safety and the prevention of professional liability caused by misaligned expectations. Similarly, Chen and Xiao (2024) highlight an expanding "Verification Gap" where professional bookers perceive less reliability in general content, necessitating the use of verified business guest insights as a benchmark. Furthermore, the results support the work of Kumar and Singh (2023), who found that cross-platform consistency is the modern proxy for accuracy used by organizations to ensure factual integrity. Ultimately, the study suggests that because erroneous evaluations represent a professional liability, hotels must promote radical transparency to bridge the gap between user feedback and organizational confidence.

Table 1.1.5 reveals that Persuasiveness is a powerful driver for professional associations ( $M = 3.44$ ), as these organizations specifically seek "convincing reasons" and distinct value propositions to justify their venue preferences ( $M = 3.50$ ). The data suggests that persuasiveness in this sector relies more on evidence-based arguments than emotional appeal, providing planners with the logical "ammunition" needed to defend their recommendations to stakeholders. These findings are supported by Foster (2025), who argues that persuasive reviews serve as a method of "social validation" for committees, and Wang and Lee (2024), who highlight a shift toward "Evidence-Based" storytelling where specific professional outcomes carry the most weight. Furthermore, the results align with Sato and Gupta (2023), who posit that "Persuasive Strength" is the deciding factor that moves a hotel from a general "long-list" to a prioritized "short-list." However, the study also notes that while a strong argument is persuasive, the final selection remains contingent on pragmatic constraints like budget and technical requirements ( $M = 3.39$ ). Ultimately, the results indicate that for professional groups, a review is truly persuasive only when it provides the professional proof required for organizational approval and risk reduction.

Table 1.1.6 indicates that Usefulness is the most influential dimension for professional associations ( $M = 3.52$ ), acting as critical "Business Intelligence" rather than mere social content. The data reveals that reviews serve as a vital "tie-breaker" during procurement ( $M = 3.58$ ), providing the comparative utility needed to distinguish between seemingly identical competitive bids. These findings are corroborated by Fisher and Tan (2024), who suggest that a review's "Diagnostic Value" is paramount when it provides actionable data for comparing venue capabilities. Furthermore, the results align with O'Connor (2025), who posits that high-utility evaluations function as a "de-risking" technique that can even substitute for physical site inspections. This shift is further supported by Zhu and Zhang (2023), who argue that "utility" has surpassed "sentiment" as the primary feature for corporate travelers seeking decision support. Ultimately, the high score for reducing uncertainty ( $M = 3.55$ ) confirms that professional planners view useful reviews as a form of due diligence necessary for making confident, low-risk booking decisions.

Table 1.2.1 demonstrates that Reviewer Credibility is a powerful determinant for professional associations ( $M = 3.59$ ), with visual evidence such as photos and videos serving as the ultimate benchmark for trustworthiness ( $M = 3.68$ ). The data reveals a "Proof-First" mentality where planners prioritize the unfiltered truth of peer-generated media and complete reviewer profiles ( $M = 3.63$ ) over specific professional affiliations. These findings are strongly supported by Hwang and Park (2024), who posit that user-generated visuals act as "Objective Credibility Cues" that allow expert planners to verify a hotel's actual condition against marketing claims. Furthermore, the results align with Sullivan (2025), who suggests that a detailed reviewer profile functions as a "Digital Resume" that effectively reduces source risk for institutional buyers. The preference for authenticity is also echoed by Martinez and de Souza (2023), who argue that professional associations increasingly rely on "Verified Status" to distinguish legitimate experiences from unverified noise. Ultimately, the results suggest that for B2B decision-makers,

credibility is a holistic assessment where the perceived honesty of a "real person" is more persuasive than a formal job title.

Table 1.2.2 demonstrates that Reviewer Expertise is a dominant factor for professional associations ( $M = 3.60$ ), where the perceived authority of a reviewer directly scales with the organization's booking confidence ( $M = 3.63$ ). The findings suggest that these organizations equate expertise with a reviewer's ability to provide comparative insights, trusting "power users" who understand professional nuances like banquet efficiency more than occasional travelers. This behavior aligns with the "Authority Bias" described by Kwak and Lee (2025), where expert advice serves as a vital quality assurance shortcut for high-stakes decision-makers. Furthermore, the results support Thompson (2024), who argues that a skilled reviewer's knowledge acts as a professional endorsement that is effectively transferred to the hotel's reputation. The data also provides empirical support for Villar et al. (2023), whose research indicates that digital badges like "Top Contributor" status allow B2B customers to filter for technical accuracy and relevance. Ultimately, the high assessment across all indicators confirms that professional associations view reviewer expertise as a necessary functional tool for choosing the best possible venue.

Table 1.2.3 reveals that Review Recency is a highly influential factor ( $M=3.49$ ) for professional associations, where up-to-date information serves as the primary driver for organizational confidence ( $M=3.64$ ). The results reflect a "Perishable Trust" model, suggesting that even prestigious hotels risk losing business if they lack recent feedback to verify that service standards have been maintained. These findings are corroborated by Lee and Kim (2024), who argue that the "temporal decay" of information has intensified, making reviews older than six months appear obsolete due to frequent management changes. Furthermore, the data aligns with the work of Davis and Miller (2025), who posit that recency acts as a vital proxy for "operational consistency" for event planners who cannot afford service failures. However, the relatively lower mean for discounting older negative comments ( ) supports Tanaka's (2023) assertion that expert purchasers are less likely to fully dismiss a documented history of poor performance despite newer praise. Ultimately, the study underscores that for professional organizations, a hotel's current "here-and-now" state is a non-negotiable requirement for final venue selection.

Table 1.2.4 reveals that Review Volume is a significant factor for professional associations ( $M = 3.47$ ), where a large quantity of feedback serves as a critical "popularity signal" and an entry point for selection ( $M = 3.51$ ). The findings suggest that while high volume improves visibility and helps mitigate the influence of biased outliers, it is not automatically equated with absolute trust without further qualitative verification ( $M = 3.43$ ). This perspective is supported by Holloway and Zhang (2025), who posit that hotels must cross a specific "Volume Threshold" to be deemed reliable by professional groups. Furthermore, the results align with Park et al. (2024), who argue that a diverse selection of reviews reduces "Information Asymmetry" by allowing planners to observe consistent patterns of performance. However, the slightly lower emphasis on volume compared to expertise supports Brooks (2023), who suggests that professional buyers prioritize

"Quality-Weighted Volume" over mere numbers. Ultimately, the data indicates that while volume acts as a necessary statistical buffer for procurement, final decisions are driven by a multi-criteria assessment of review depth and source credibility.

Table 2.1 indicates an exceptionally high level of Hotel Booking Preference among professional associations ( $M = 3.55$ ), establishing digital word-of-mouth as a foundational pillar in the institutional procurement process. The findings reveal that qualitative narrative experiences carry the most weight ( $M = 3.65$ ), suggesting that descriptive feedback provides a deeper understanding of real service performance than purely numerical ratings. These results are corroborated by Morales and Chen (2024), who posit that professional bookers rely on "sentiment richness" to assess operational reliability once star ratings have met the initial quality threshold. Furthermore, Grant (2025) emphasizes that while star ratings act as a baseline for exclusion, it is the written review that ultimately drives the final selection. The data also aligns with the observations of Corpuz et al. (2026), who argue that traditional hospitality ideals like *Malasakit* (care) are now evaluated through digital lenses as proof of service reliability. Ultimately, the consistent "Very High Impact" scores across all indicators prove that hotels must prioritize gathering detailed written feedback to effectively influence the structured decision-making of organizational clients.

Table 3.1 demonstrates a statistically significant relationship between online review elements and hotel booking preferences ( $p = 0.00$ ), confirming that both argument and source quality are critical determinants in institutional decision-making. Within argument quality, Clarity emerged as the strongest predictor ( $\rho = 0.720$ ), supporting the findings of Ames (2024) that minimizing cognitive load through straightforward facts is essential for professional planners. Regarding source quality, Review Volume yielded the highest correlation overall ( $\rho = 0.759$ ), acting as a "statistical buffer" that enhances perceived reliability through a consistent service record. This result is corroborated by Nguyen and Vo (2024), who posit that institutional bookers prioritize quantity markers as major trust indicators to safeguard against bias. Furthermore, the findings provide empirical support for Li and Tanaka (2023), who argue that the "wisdom of the crowd" often carries more weight than individual expertise because it reflects long-term operational consistency. Ultimately, while all studied variables show strong relationships, the data suggests that professional associations are most influenced by high volumes of clear, unambiguous information when finalizing their venue selections.

Table 4.1 presents a regression analysis where Clarity emerges as the sole significant predictor ( $B = 0.412$ ,  $p = 0.022$ ) of hotel booking preference among professional associations. The findings suggest that clarity acts as a "gatekeeper" of influence, meaning that even accurate or relevant reviews lose their predictive power if the content is poorly written or difficult to comprehend. This result aligns with Hassan and Rahman (2024), who argue that in complex B2B procurement, planners prioritize reviews that provide fast, explicit information over those that are excessively technical or confusing. Furthermore, the lack of significance for completeness and relevance supports the observations of Li et al. (2021), who found that these elements often lose individual impact due to information overload, as planners already assume a baseline level of

relevance. Interestingly, the negative coefficient for persuasiveness, while not significant, reflects a trend noted by Zhao (2023) where organizational buyers remain skeptical of "marketing fluff" and overtly emotional language. Ultimately, the model confirms that for this demographic, the ease of processing information is the primary driver that successfully converts a review into a final booking decision.

Table 4.2 presents a regression analysis where Review Volume emerges as the sole significant predictor ( $B = 0.382$ ,  $p = 0.004$ ) of hotel booking preference among professional associations. The findings suggest that these organizations require a "critical mass" of data to mitigate decision anxiety, viewing a high quantity of feedback as a crowdsourced truth that effectively levels out outliers. This result is consistent with Holloway and Zhang (2025), who posit that a large volume of reviews serves as a vital risk-mitigation technique by providing a statistically diversified sample of experiences. Furthermore, the lack of significance for expertise and credibility supports the research of Brooks (2023), which indicates that institutional purchasers prioritize "aggregate consensus" over individual judgments during final procurement. The data also aligns with Davis and Miller (2025), who found that a broad and stable history of performance is often a better indicator of operational consistency than a small number of recent entries. Ultimately, the model confirms that for professional groups, the sheer weight of public opinion provides more perceived security and predictive power than any other source quality variable.

## Conclusions

Based on the aforementioned summary of findings the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Online reviews were valuable decision-making tools for professional groups. Hotels should guarantee that reviews are clear, credible, relevant, and updated on a regular basis, while also receiving a large volume of feedback. Effective review management increases trust, lowers booking risk, and improves competitive standing. Overall, the study demonstrated that hotels that actively manage both the quality and quantity of online reviews are more likely to influence the booking decisions of professional organizations, enhance trust, and gain a competitive advantage in the hospitality industry.
2. The study reflected that online reviews are not merely informational but are actively used as a decision-making system for professional hotel procurement, with written guest experiences serving as the most influential component. Written evaluations, particularly those that depict actual visitor experiences, have the greatest influence in real-world decision-making. This follows current practice, in which organizers examine extensive feedback to predict service quality, event suitability, and operational reliability before confirming bookings. In conclusion, professional associations make hotel booking decisions based on evidence and reviews, combining quantitative scores and qualitative narratives to help them make confident and practical judgments.

3. The findings confirmed that online review elements significantly strong relationship with the booking decision of professional organizations.

Organizations do not rely on a single aspect but instead use a structured evaluation approach. First, they employ review volume and recency as initial filters, choosing hotels with a high number of recent reviews to assure consistency and current service performance. This strategy reduces risk, particularly during critical events where service failure is unacceptable.

After narrowing down options, decision-makers focus on the clarity of written reviews. In practice, organizers prefer assessments that are direct, clear, and simple to grasp since they provide instant insights into service quality, event suitability, and operational reliability. Reviews that are ambiguous or overly convincing are less successful since they require more effort to interpret and may prevent speedy decision-making.

Overall, the findings showed that professional associations make hotel booking decisions that are systematic, evidence-based, and risk-conscious. Online reviews serve as a practical decision-making aid, with volume and recency establishing trust and clarity and usefulness guiding final judgment.

4. From a practical sense, the study implied that professional associations, which frequently operate under time constraints and heavy financial accountability, value simplicity of information processing and group validation over extensive or convincing content. Clear, simple, and easy-to-understand reviews help to speed up and boost confidence in decision making. At the same time, a large number of reviews serve as social proof, lowering perceived risk and boosting faith in the hotel's dependability.

Hotels should shift their focus from producing extensive or convincing reviews to ensuring that guest input is well-structured, readable, and simple. Encouraging guests to provide concise, specific, and organized remarks may have a greater impact than long or overly descriptive reviews.

Overall, the study highlighted a fundamental shift: hotels do not win bookings simply by having positive evaluations; they win by having reviews that are simple to interpret and widely supported by a variety of perspectives.

5. In actual hotel operations, it translates into a change away from traditional marketing assumptions that value thorough, convincing, or expert-driven material in favor of a more efficient, data-driven, and guest-centered review management strategy. At the same time, the emphasis on boosting review volume demonstrates the significance of social evidence in lowering perceived risk. The results in a strong group voice that boosts legitimacy more than depending on a few detailed or expert viewpoints. Supporting techniques, such as the utilization of guest-generated images, recent activity tracking, and proactive communication with satisfied customers, help to strengthen trust and keep the hotel relevant in a competitive market.

Overall, these action plans show that effective online reputation management requires both marketing and operational considerations. Hotels can build a sustainable system that not only improves online evaluations but also has a direct impact on booking decisions by incorporating clarity and volume into daily operations, performance measurements, and guest engagement tactics. This keeps the hotel competitive and appealing to professional associations that value efficiency, dependability, and validated experiences when choosing venues.

## Recommendations

Based on the findings summarized and conclusion drawn, the following recommendations are hereby proposed:

1. Since the findings are that online review elements have a high level of influence, particularly usefulness, clarity, relevance, reviewer knowledge, and credibility, hotels should prioritize enhancing the quality and reliability of online reviews. Hotels should encourage guests to offer thorough and experience-based feedback to improve the value of reviews. They should also make sure that hotel information and internet material are clear, well-organized, relevant, and updated on a regular basis to eliminate any client confusion. Better if hotels can provide actual and recent photos and images to capture the guest's attention. Furthermore, hotels should ensure the quality of posted information and monitor internet reviews for any misleading or erroneous content. To boost confidence and dependability, reviewers who are reputable and experienced, such as verified guests, should be highlighted to build customer trust and influence purchase decision.
2. Hotels should actively manage their online review presence (e.g. incorporating it in annual KPIs/KRAs) and revisiting it monthly. Hotels should encourage guests to submit positive written comments, as these have been shown to have the greatest influence on booking decisions. Management should also maintain a high star rating by continually providing excellent service and client satisfaction. Hotels should also monitor and respond to online reviews on a regular basis in order to instill trust and confidence in future organizational clients by assigning a dedicated person to look on it daily. Because internet reviews assist companies in comparing hotels and making final booking decisions, hotels should ensure that their web profiles include up-to-date information, clear images, comprehensive features, and accurate descriptions. Overall, hotels should incorporate online review management into their digital marketing and customer service initiatives to attract more corporate bookings and professional events. All reviews should be integrated for a well-known platform like Revinate, etc. in order to increase direct bookings.
3. Based on the findings that all online review features have significant relationship with hotel booking preference; hotels should consider both argument quality and source quality when managing their online reviews. Hotels should ensure that reviews are clear, useful, and relevant, as well as highlight the reviewers' credibility

and expertise. Regularly updating evaluations and collecting a large volume of feedback can help to develop trust and influence organizational booking decisions. By focusing on both content quality and source reliability, hotels may improve their online reputation and attract more bookings from professional groups.

4. It is recommended that hotels make all online information and evaluations clear, well-organized, and simple to grasp. Hotels could actively encourage more reviews by engaging recent visitors and offering subtle cues or incentives. Hotels may boost professional organizations' confidence and favorably affect their booking decisions by focusing on clear communication and a robust review presence.

To focus on clarity predictor, the hotel should encourage guests to provide detailed, experience-based feedback. They should improve clarity by making reviews and hotel information clear, well-organized, and simple to interpret. Maintaining the accuracy and timeliness of information is critical, as is incorporating high-quality reviews into marketing materials to foster trust and confidence among professional groups. Hotels can improve clarity by giving review prompts or guide questions focusing on key aspects of the guest experience, such as service quality, amenities, and event facilities. Adopting organized review formats, encouraging example-based input, emphasizing good reviews, clarifying vague content, and keeping review platforms active and up to date can further enhance clarity and usefulness.

While for review volume to increase, it is suggested that right after the event/stay the hotels should encourage the guests or participants to do the online review while the stay still fresh in guest's mind. Send a friendly, personalized request 1–3 days after check-out via email or SMS with a direct link or QR code to review sites, and offer a small thank-you incentive (like a discount, loyalty points, or complimentary treat). Train staff to politely remind guests in person at check-out, respond to every review to show appreciation, and follow up once gently if no review is left. Keep messages short, clear, and mobile-friendly, and highlight that guest feedback helps improve service.

5. To improve the clarity of online feedback, the hotel should switch from generic inquiries to structured review questions. By asking guests specific guide questions on professional demands such as service efficiency, banquet facilities, and meeting room technology, the hotel may ensure that future assessments are detailed and straightforward for organizational planners to understand. In addition, management should curate and display these unambiguous, high-quality testimonials on official marketing channels and website landing pages to decrease misunderstanding during the hotel search process.

To leverage on the importance of review quantity, the hotel should establish an automatic multi-channel solicitation system by SMS and email that is activated 1-3 days following an event or stay. To maintain a high level of feedback, employees should be trained to solicit reviews during the checkout process, potentially

supported with small thank-you incentives such as loyalty points or future booking discounts. Finally, including review volume in the hotel's daily Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) should ensure that the sales and management teams continue to prioritize having a strong and active online presence.

6. Future researchers may incorporate other variables such as rating scores, hotel location, brand reputation, and customer satisfaction. To strengthen the study, they may increase the sample size or add respondents from other locations. Most importantly, to test the effectiveness of the action plans from this study.
7. The proposed online review engagement plan seeks to boost the quantity and quality of guest evaluations by promoting active involvement and making the feedback process more accessible and engaging. It focuses on assisting guests to submit clear, specific, and meaningful feedback, hence increasing the trustworthiness and value of online reviews.

**Table 5.1.3**  
**Proposed Online Review Engagement Plan for the Hotel for both Argument Quality and Source Quality**

**Online Review Engagement Plan**

**Argument Quality**

<b>KRA</b>	<b>Objective</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Person-In-Charge</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Success Indicator</b>
Clarity	To ensure responses to reviews are professional and easily understood by potential guests.	Standardize the Response Review templates; Conduct business communication workshops.	Marketing Manager Front Office Manager	Month 1-2	P50K	85% Compliance rate Management responses published within 2 days. 90% passing rate on communication simulation following the workshop.
Persuasiveness	To convert readers of online reviews into actual bookings through compelling narratives.	Highlighting unique selling points (USPs) in review replies; Encouraging guests to share specific "wow" moments.	Marketing Manager & Corporate	Month 2-3	P30K	25% increase in reviews with photos/videos with wow experience shared by the guest

Accuracy	To ensure all information provided in online descriptions and reviews matches the actual guest experience.	Monthly audit of OTA (Online Travel Agency) descriptions; Regular "Fact-Check" of amenities listed online.	General Manager	Monthly	7K monthly	20–30% decrease in negative reviews mentioning that a room or service was "not as described."
Usefulness	To provide potential bookers with high-value information that assists in their decision-making.	Implement a FAQ section based on common review questions; Encouraging detailed reviews over short comments.	Property Marketing Manager & Corporate Digital Marketing	Month 2-4	35K	15-20% reduction in routine questions via email or phone regarding amenities already covered in the FAQ. The average length of guest reviews increases from "short/generic" (under 20 words) to "detailed/descriptive" (50+ words).
Completeness	To provide a holistic view of the hotel services within the digital space.	Encouraging multi-departmental reviews (Spa, Dining, Rooms); Updating photo galleries to show all room types, function rooms	General Manager/Department Heads	Month 3-4	P200K	25% increase in reviews specifically mentioning the Spa, Gym, or F&B outlets, rather than just the "Room." 20% drop in guest emails or calls asking for "actual photos" of a specific room type or layout.
Relevance	To ensure the content of reviews and responses remains timely and aligned with current market trends.	Real-time monitoring of trending keywords in reviews; Updating responses to reflect seasonal offers.	Marketing Manager	Monthly	P25K monthly	20% increase in Sentiment Score for specific key words; Tracking how many guests book a "Seasonal Offer" after it was mentioned in a review reply.

**Source Quality**

<b>KRA</b>	<b>Objective</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Person-In-Charge</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Success Indicator</b>
Review Volume	To build statistical significance and social proof for the hotel's performance.	QR Code placement in high-traffic areas. Internal staff incentive program for review generation. Offer loyalty discount promo	Operations DHs & Marketing Manager	Month 1-2 & Monthly	60K per month	At least 10% of guest who scan the QR complete the review. 30% increase in reviews that mention specific staff members by name (indicating a personal "magic moment"). 15% of reviewers returning to the hotel using the loyalty discount.
Review Recency	To ensure the latest operational improvements are visible to potential bookers.	Launch "Post-Stay" automated review reminders via email/SMS. Implement a "Freshness" check on management responses.	Marketing Team & Front Office Manager	Month 1-2 & Every 2 days	20k per month	15-20% "Open-to-Review" rate from sent emails/SMS. 85% of reviews receive a management response within 48 hours of posting.
Review Expertise	To attract and highlight feedback from frequent travelers or industry-recognized reviewers.	Identify "Elite" or "Top Contributor" reviewers. Provide personalized "Expert" responses acknowledging their status.	Marketing Manager	Monthly	Minimal	90% of reviews from verified "Elite" profiles are flagged for priority response. 20% increase in "Helpful"

						votes and direct engagement from other high-status reviewers.
Review Credibility	To minimize the impact of "fake" reviews and boost guest trust through verified sources.	Direct guests to book and review via OTAs (Verified stays). Respond to "Profile Authenticity" issues promptly.	Marketing Manager	Immediate & within 48 hours	10k per month	Achieving a 90% "Verified Guest" badge ratio on the first page of OTA listings. Zero unchallenged suspicious reviews and a high "Trust Score" on third-party aggregators.

## Compliance with Ethical Standards

The author of this study hereby declares her unwavering commitment to ethical research standards, ensuring that all procedures were conducted with the highest level of integrity and professional responsibility. Prior to data collection, informed consent was obtained from all participants, who were explicitly briefed on their freedom to withdraw from the study at any time without any repercussions. To protect the identities of the participants, strict anonymity was maintained throughout the process, and all handling of information strictly adhered to the principles of the Data Privacy Act. The well-being of every respondent was safeguarded as a primary concern, ensuring that no physical or psychological harm occurred during the research. Furthermore, the authors affirm that no conflict of interest exists in the conduct of this study and that plagiarism was strictly avoided through rigorous citation and original analysis. All findings were interpreted without bias, ensuring an objective representation of the data used purely for academic research purposes. Finally, the researcher acknowledged the use of an artificial intelligence tool in a limited aspect of the study, solely for grammar checking and proofreading, to ensure linguistic accuracy. Regarding the integrity, originality, and scholarly quality of the manuscript, all AI-assisted outputs were reviewed, verified, and manually edited.

## Acknowledgments

This thesis represents the culmination of a challenging MBA journey, made possible by the unwavering support of those who guided the researcher as she balanced her responsibilities as a Financial Controller. Her deepest gratitude goes first to the

Almighty God for providing the strength, wisdom, and divine guidance necessary to persevere through every uncertainty and deadlines.

The researcher was profoundly grateful to her Research Adviser, Dr. Maria Emmalyn Asuncion D. Capuno, for her expert guidance and patience, and to Dr. Lani Deada for encouraging her to pursue this dream after two decades away from school. Special thanks to the statistician, Dr. Remedios Bucal, for her rigorous data analysis, and to the validators—Ms. Phearl Raz, Mr. Jose Luis Abellar, Mr. Christian John Lorenz Cruz, and Mr. Galileo Go—for ensuring the study met the highest industry and academic standards.

Sincere appreciation was likewise extended to Dr. Jinky C. Malabanan, Dean of the Graduate School, and to the esteemed panelists, Dr. Leonardo F. Oplencia, Dr. Fernando T. Pendon III, and Dr. Maricris Unico, for their constructive insights and guidance. Heartfelt thanks also to the professional associations (CCAHII, LEAP, RASSI, PSDSA, NAPSSHI, PESPA, PDSSS, Calabarzon ASDS, PICE, and ACETI) and the key officers who facilitated the data collection against all odds.

The researcher also acknowledged Seda Manila Bay Finance family, also to Ms. Edilyn Revilleza, for her immense understanding and flexibility. To the researcher's MBA classmates and friends—Michael, Emz, Kim, and Darlene—who shared the laughter and strength that kept her going during her lowest moments.

Most importantly, the researched dedicated this achievement to her husband, Victor, and her daughters, Shanne and Shaira, for their sacrifices and love, and to Ruby Nelle Perdon who is being a constant supporter. Finally, the researcher honors the resilience she found within herself; through faith and dedication, he has turned this dream into reality.

## REFERENCES

- Al-Ansi, A., & Han, H. (2024). Risk mitigation through eWOM completeness: The role of information quality in corporate travel. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 41(3), 295–310.
- Ames, L. (2024). Cognitive load and the clarity of eWOM: Why simple language drives hotel booking intent. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 34(3), 441–456.
- Brooks, D. (2023). The quantity-quality trade-off: How institutional buyers evaluate eWOM volume in the service industry. *Journal of Business Research*, 158, 201–215.
- Chen, Y., & Xiao, L. (2024). The verification gap: Perceived accuracy and the skepticism of professional consumers in the hospitality sector. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 41(4), 412–428.
- Corpuz, J. M., & Reyes, L. (2026). The Filipino brand of service excellence in the digital age: Balancing tradition and online reputation. *Philippine Journal of Hospitality Management*, 12(1), 45–60.
- Davis, R., & Miller, T. (2025). Operational consistency and the recency effect: Why professional planners prioritize new eWOM. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 34(2), 115–130.
- El-Said, O., & El-Said, O. (2020). Impact of online reviews on hotel booking intention: The moderating role of brand image, star category, and price. *Tourism Management Perspectives*.

- Fisher, D., & Tan, G. (2024). Diagnostic value and the utility of online reviews: A study on corporate hospitality procurement. *Journal of Service Research*, 27(2), 158–174.
- Foster, H. (2025). Social validation and corporate intent: The role of persuasive eWOM in institutional hospitality procurement. *Journal of Business Research*, 162, 114–128.
- Gadat, A. C., Rabanal, J. M. R., Ramos, L. P. J., & Esplanada, D. E. (2023). Customer satisfaction and sentiment reviews on selected booking sites of Manila Manor Hotel 2019-2021. *Quantum Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 4(4), 55–74.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference* (11th ed.). Allyn & Bacon
- Ghazali, M., & Osman, M. A. (2020). Identifying the influential factors on consumers' adoption of fintech services: A descriptive analysis. *International Journal of Business and Management*.
- Gomez-Suarez, M., Quinones, M., & Garcia-Gomez, A. (2023). High-involvement decision making: The impact of comprehensive online reviews on hotel selection. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology*, 14(2), 180–196.
- Grant, D. (2025). Defensible choices: Social validation and the institutionalization of online reviews in B2B hospitality. *Management Science Quarterly*, 31(1), 88–104.
- Guan, H., & Yang, J. (2024). Contextual fit and the persuasive power of online reviews in the corporate hospitality sector. *Journal of Business-to-Business Marketing*, 31(2), 142–159.
- Guo, X., & Li, Y. (2022). Can the amount of information and information presentation reduce choice overload? An empirical study of online hotel booking. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 65, 102867.
- Hassan, A., & Rahman, M. (2023). The utility of clarity: B2B hospitality selection and the role of digital word-of-mouth. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 108, 103–115.
- Holloway, R., & Zhang, Y. (2025). Social proof thresholds: Why review volume determines venue reliability for professional events. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 124, 103–120.
- Hwang, E., & Park, S. (2024). Visual evidence as an objective credibility cue: The impact of user-generated photos on corporate booking intent. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 58, 210–225.
- Ignat, O., Xu, X., & Mihalcea, R. (2024). MAiDE-up: Multilingual deception detection of GPT-generated hotel reviews. *arXiv preprint*.
- Impa, J. N. M., Kawai, R., Ocampo, A. M. B., & Madrilejos, F. A. G. (2023). Manila's luxury hotels using SERVQUAL framework: Comprehensive assessment from online travel agencies' reports. *Quantum Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 4(4), 233–252.
- Khatri, P. (2025). The power of balance: How two-sided reviews influence organizational procurement in the service industry. *Management Decision*, 63(1), 44–62.
- Kumar, R., & Singh, M. (2023). Triangulating truth: The impact of cross-platform review consistency on institutional hotel booking. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 112, 103–118.
- Kwak, J., & Lee, H. (2025). Authority bias and the power of expertise: How top contributors influence corporate hospitality procurement. *Journal of Business Research*, 174, 112–126.
- Lee, S., & Kim, Y. (2024). The shelf-life of trust: Measuring the temporal decay of online reviews in the service industry. *International Journal of Information Management*, 72, 102–118.
- Li, H., & Tanaka, S. (2023). The wisdom of the crowd vs. the voice of the expert: Quantitative metrics in hospitality procurement. *Tourism Management*, 95, 104–120.
- Li, X., Chen, H., & Thompson, R. (2021). Information overload in B2B hospitality: Why completeness and relevance lose impact in professional booking decisions. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 45(4), 612–630.

- Li, X., Chen, H., & Thompson, R. (2024). The utility of clarity: How precise explanations of high-stakes facilities influence B2B booking decisions. *Journal of Business-to-Business Marketing*, 31(3), 201–218.
- Liu, Y. (2024). Assessing the helpfulness of hotel reviews for information seekers. *Information Technology & Tourism*, 26(1), 85–102.
- Nguyen, T., & Sidorova, A. (2024). Information fluency and cognitive strain: How online review clarity affects procurement decisions. *Journal of Electronic Commerce Research*, 25(2), 88–104.
- Nguyen, T., & Vo, D. (2024). Statistical safeguards: The role of review volume in B2B service selection. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 117, 103–115.
- Martinez, A., & de Souza, R. (2023). Filtering the noise: The role of verified guest status in professional hospitality selection. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 27(3), 342–359.
- Miller, J. (2026). The evolution of social proof: From brochures to verified user insights in professional associations. *Global Hospitality Review*, 12(1), 45–59.
- Morales, J., & Chen, H. (2024). Beyond the price tag: The reputation premium and its impact on professional venue selection. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 120, 103–118.
- O'Connor, P. (2025). De-risking the event: Why perceived usefulness in eWOM determines organizational booking confidence. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 37(1), 89–105.
- Pappas, N. (2021). The effects of online reviews on hotel booking intentions: An empirical investigation of Generation Z travelers. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology*.
- Park, J., Kim, S., & Lee, H. (2024). Reducing information asymmetry through eWOM volume: A study on professional hotel booking preferences. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 41(4), 412–428.
- Petrova, S. (2023). Peer-to-peer relevance: How shared professional identity shapes the adoption of online reviews. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 25(4), 512–525.
- Roberts, J., & Thompson, P. (2025). Risk aversion and digital word-of-mouth: Why accuracy determines venue selection for professional events. *Tourism & Hospitality Research*, 25(1), 55–70.
- Sato, M., & Gupta, A. (2023). From long-list to short-list: The impact of review persuasiveness on professional venue selection. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 115, 103–120.
- Semrush. (2025). Top hospitality websites in the Philippines. Retrieved May 10, 2026, from <https://sv.semrush.com/trending-websites/ph/hospitality/>
- Smith, L., & Jones, K. (2024). Perceived quality risk in organizational event planning: The impact of review readability. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 42, 100–112.
- Sullivan, K. (2025). The digital resume: Why reviewer profile completeness determines institutional trust in eWOM. *Communication Research Reports*, 42(1), 55–68.
- Tan, L., & Roberts, D. (2025). Strategic filtering: Why relevance-based eWOM determines hotel selection in professional organizations. *Hospitality Management Review*, 14(1), 77–92.
- Tavitiyaman, P., et al. (2023). A strategic framework development for post-pandemic hotel recovery based on market analysis and customer expectations. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*.
- Thompson, R. (2024). Trust transfer in eWOM: The mediating role of reviewer expertise in institutional venue selection. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 118, 103–115.
- Villar, A., Gomez, P., & Santos, M. (2023). Beyond the star rating: The impact of elite reviewer status on professional event planners. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 48, 101–114.

- Wang, L., & Lee, S. (2024). Evidence-based storytelling: A new paradigm for persuasiveness in online hospitality reviews. *Tourism Management*, 98, 104–119.
- Xue, F. (2020). Effects of online review features on consumer decision-making: A review and directions for future research. *Journal of Business Research*, 116, 1–11.
- Zhao, F., & Martinez, R. (2022). Information foraging and the impact of review structure on modern travelers. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 21(3), 301–315.
- Zhao, Y. (2023). Review persuasiveness and the organizational buyer: A study of skepticism and eWOM in the hospitality sector. *International Journal of Hospitality Management Research*, 15(2), 112–128.
- Zhu, Y., & Zhang, Q. (2023). Beyond sentiment: The rise of utility-driven eWOM in the professional travel sector. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 47(5), 712–729.

**APA Citation:**

Pereda, J. R., & Capuno, M. E. A. D. (2026). ONLINE REVIEW FACTORS AFFECTING HOTEL BOOKING PREFERENCE OF SELECTED PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS. *Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(5), 1967–1998. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20304780>

Corresponding author: *plukjeniferpereda@gmail.com*