Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

International Journal of Hospitality Management

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ijhm

Look before you leap: Comparison and profiles of hotel price determinants in four European markets

Maria D. Illescas-Manzano [a], Sergio Martínez-Puertas [b,*], Manuel Sánchez-Pérez [a], Ann M. Torres [c]

[a] Agrifood Campus of International Excellence (ceiA3). Department of Economics and Business, University of Almeria, Carretera de Sacramento, s/n, 04120 Almeria, Spain
[b] Department of Mathematics, University of Almeria, Carretera de Sacramento, s/n, 04120 Almeria, Spain
[c] J.E. Cairnes School of Business and Economics, University of Galway, Galway, Ireland

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Pricing in the hospitality industry moves between adapting to a global demand and the need to manage locally. This double-edged challenge requires a managerial response based on flexibility and variety but one which is constrained by resources and competitive conditions. Since the sensitivity of each determinant may be different across types of hotels and countries, how hotel managers reach their compromises between determinants and countries remains an unsettled issue. Based on cross-nation methodology, we carry out a comparative analysis of price determinants from hotels in four main international tourist countries. The set of hypotheses developed are tested by estimating a quantile hedonic regression model with data from hotels in four countries. Results indicate that outcomes of pricing decisions differ by the country-of-operation, yielding a managerial profile per country. Also, the study estimates the contribution of the country to hotel pricing.

1. Introduction

Hotel managers' pricing decisions can be understood as being rooted in a complex blend of the hotel's own resources, the local environment, and certain destination specific features. Thus, this study examines how hotels take advantage of differential pricing for various international segments, as the market conditions differ among countries.

The hospitality industry is a key sector in Europe; four countries of Europe (i.e., Spain, France, Italy, and UK) accounted for more than 73,000 hotels in 2021.[1] A comparative analysis of international hospitality management reveals notable differences among countries regarding the problems and challenges associated with the pandemic. Countries and cities did not experience the pandemic's impact in the same way. For example, occupancy rates in America and Asia fell further than in Europe (Statista, 2020a). Perceptions of COVID-19′s effects on the hospitality industry have revealed variations from one country to another due to cultural differences (Shapoval et al., 2021).

From an international perspective, hotel price is also an essential factor for assessing hospitality competitiveness among countries (e.g.,

World Economic Forum, 2019). The literature has extensively discussed international pricing strategies from various perspectives, such as the supply-demand framework (Mattila and Gao, 2016), competitive environment (Becerra et al., 2013), profit maximization (Abrate et al., 2019), online channels (Moro et al., 2018), and channel intermediaries (i.e., travel agencies) (Stangl et al., 2016).

Hotel pricing in an international context demands behavioral analysis of both consumers and hoteliers. The heterogeneity of hotel clientele (Abrate et al., 2012), together with the adoption of P2P platforms (Gibbs et al., 2018), foster a comparative approach to hotel pricing in the international context. At the same time, hoteliers take advantage of differential pricing because various markets have specific customer segments (Yelkur and DaCosta, 2001). There are huge differentials in hotel pricing across different countries ((TheGlobalEconomy.com,)). Extant research about hotels location, though no generalizable, evidence that frequently hotels in the same destination apply similar pricing policies, rather than pursuing individualized pricing policies focused on the specific hotel and tourists' characteristics (Vives and Jacob, 2021). Explanations are related to hotels deal with similar revenue managers or


Table 1
Hotel classification system specificities for each country.

Criteria/Country	Spain	France	Italy	UK	References
Ruling organization	Regional governments	National government	Regional authorities	National government through Visit Britain/Visit England	(UNWTO, June 15, 2019) Minazzi (2010)
Criteria and implementation	261 criteria Mandatory System	246 criteria Voluntary system	55 criteria Mandatory system	498 criteria Voluntary system.	(UNWTO, June 15, 2019) Minazzi (2010)
Frequency of inspections	Only initial and when change of ownership	5 years	Depends on region	Annual	(UNWTO, June 15, 2019)

Fig. 1. Cross-country analysis methodology.

Table 2
Price premium (%) for each country with respect to Spain.

Country	OLS	0.25	0.5	0.75	0.9
France	60.313	60.967	67.536	76.167	70.653
Italy	10.915	7.099	n.s.	15.610	41.046
UK	82.652	77.464	90.035	106.847	108.068

prefer to cooperate with hotels already established in the destination searching for common managerial practices (Woo and Mun, 2020).

Concerning extant literature on pricing determinants in an international context, and despite extensive research on hotel pricing, there is a

lack of studies that have addressed the existence of country-level similarities and differences in the impact that determinants have on price. Assaf et al. (2017) assess the determinants of hotel performance across different destinations, Viglia and Abrate (2017) model price determinants in rural hotels for several markets, Picazo and Moreno-Gil (2018) assess differences in package holidays prices between Mediterranean countries, and Arora and Mathur (2020) analyse differences across emerging and developed markets. The approach adopted in literature has rested on hedonic pricing theory accounting for intra-hotel attributes, hotel type, reputation, contextual factors, and country identification (n.b., see a review of this approach in Arora and Mathur, 2020). Given hotels are 'location bound' (Whitla et al., 2007), with a

Table 3
Global significant effect.

	OLS	Quantile regression			
		0.25	0.5	0.75	0.90
Variable					
H_Dif	$H_0: \varphi_{H\_Dif \times Spain} = \varphi_{H\_Dif \times France} = \varphi_{H\_Dif \times Italy} = \varphi_{H\_Dif \times UK} = \mathbf{0}$				
p-value	0.061*	0.002***	0.028**	0.042**	0.905
Category	$H_0: \varphi_{Cat \times Spain} = \varphi_{Cat \times France} = \varphi_{Cat \times Italy} = \varphi_{Cat \times UK} = \mathbf{0}$				
p-value	2.2E-16***	2.2E-16***	2.2E-16***	2.2E-16***	2.2E-16***
Online_Reputation	$H_0: \varphi_{Online \times Spain} = \varphi_{Online \times France} = \varphi_{Online \times Italy} = \varphi_{Online \times UK} = \mathbf{0}$				
p-value	1.8E-10***	9.1E-7***	1.5E-13***	3.5E-5***	6.7E-6***
Competition	$H_0: \varphi_{Comp \times Spain} = \varphi_{Comp \times France} = \varphi_{Comp \times Italy} = \varphi_{Comp \times UK} = \mathbf{0}$				
p-value	2.2E-16***	2.2E-7***	2.2E-16***	2.2E-16***	9.3E-11***
Distance	$H_0: \varphi_{Agglo \times Spain} = \varphi_{Agglo \times France} = \varphi_{Agglo \times Italy} = \varphi_{Agglo \times UK} = \mathbf{0}$				
p-value	2.5E-7***	1.8E-4***	6.9E-5***	4.7E-5***	9.4E-4***

*p < 0.1
* *p < 0.05
* **p < 0.01

Table 4
Omnibus test for moderating country effect.

	OLS	Quantile Regression			
		0.25	0.5	0.75	0.9
Variable					
H_Dif	$H_0: \varphi_{H\_Dif \times Spain} = \varphi_{H\_Dif \times France} = \varphi_{H\_Dif \times Italy} = \varphi_{H\_Dif \times UK}$				
p-value	0.092*	0.031**	0.069*	0.031**	No effect
Category	$H_0: \varphi_{H\_Dif \times Spain} = \varphi_{H\_Dif \times France} = \varphi_{H\_Dif \times Italy} = \varphi_{H\_Dif \times UK}$				
p-value	3.9E-10***	4.5E-4***	3.4E-4***	7.5E-5***	0.002***
Online_Reputation	$H_0: \varphi_{H\_Dif \times Spain} = \varphi_{H\_Dif \times France} = \varphi_{H\_Dif \times Italy} = \varphi_{H\_Dif \times UK}$				
p-value	2.5E-4***	0.154	8.4E-6***	0.020**	0.009***
Competition	$H_0: \varphi_{H\_Dif \times Spain} = \varphi_{H\_Dif \times France} = \varphi_{H\_Dif \times Italy} = \varphi_{H\_Dif \times UK}$				
p-value	2.2E-16***	2.7E-7***	2.2E-16***	2.2E-16***	1.2E-8***
Distance	$H_0: \varphi_{H\_Dif \times Spain} = \varphi_{H\_Dif \times France} = \varphi_{H\_Dif \times Italy} = \varphi_{H\_Dif \times UK}$				
p-value	0.009***	0.019**	0.007***	0.120	0.067*

*p < 0.1
* *p < 0.05
* **p < 0.01

Table 5
Percentage impact on price per unit increase for variable and country.

Variable	Spain	France	Italy	UK
OLS				
H_Dif	-20.225*	n.s.	n.s.	n.s
Category	16.181***	23.053***	39.773***	33.058***
Online_Reputation	7.475***	n.s.	n.s.	6.620***
Competition	1.536***	n.s.	-0.215*	-2.323***
Distance	n.s.	-108.102***	-213.181***	-50.508***
P25				
H_Dif	-16.701***	n.s.	n.s.	-65.930***
Category	13.818***	20.850***	23.068***	34.493***
Online Reputation (No moderation)	5.951***			
Competition	1.314***	-1.776**	n.s.	n.s.
Distance	n.s.	-260.444***	-129.483**	-20.430*
P50				
H_Dif	-18.745***	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Category	17.005***	26.312***	32.702***	31.405***
Online Reputation	6.864***	n.s.	n.s.	9.240***
Competition	1.991***	-2.185**	n.s.	-2.928***
Distance	-25.576*	-223.663***	-167.203*	-42.889***
P75				
H_Dif	n.s.	n.s.	42.393***	n.s.
Category	19.635***	24.912***	46.806***	30.306***
Online Reputation	7.505***	n.s.	n.s.	9.582**
Competition	1.987***	n.s.	n.s.	-4.249***
Distance (No moderation)	-46.811			
P90				
H_Dif (Null effect)	n.s.			
Category	22.523***	25.583***	45.480***	30.706***
Online Reputation	7.645***	n.s.	n.s.	9.408**
Competition	1.780***	n.s.	-0.550**	-4.151***
Distance	-42.100***	n.s.	-344.452***	-66.534***

*p < 0.1
* *p < 0.05
* **p < 0.01

confirmed relevance of local factors for explaining hotel performance (Assaf et al., 2017), we propose to enrich the existing approach in two ways: first, from a managerial perspective, by including spatiality and competition factors, and second, from a methodological approach, by adopting a cross-national analysis.

This study undertakes a cross-country analysis of pricing determinants, considering the recommended guidelines for cross-national research (Cadogan, 2010), adopting a more permanent and long-term perspective to avoid mispositioning of the hotel strategy (Melis and Piga, 2017), and assuming the identification of countries as single markets (Arora and Mathur, 2020). To approach the analysis empirically, we carried out comparisons of the effects of price determinants in 2650 hotels in four main European countries according to their hospitality industry, using a quantile regression model to assess effects by different pricing segments. Hence, we rather adopt a long-term pricing perspective (i.e., uniform pricing) instead of a short-term analysis focused on price tactics (i.e., dynamic pricing), to adequately reflect the positioning of each hotel (Mitra, 2020), accounting for the magnitude of tour operators' demand (Vives & Jacob, 2020), and avoiding seasonality bias.

This study aims to provide several contributions to the hospitality literature. First, our study advances a new proposal to reduce the lack of moderators in the investigation of hedonic price models (Arora and Mathur, 2020). Second, given the expansion of international hotels and the need to mitigate the "liability of foreignness" (Woo and Mun, 2020),

this study deals with several markets, overcoming the limitations of previous studies based on a single market on issues such as quality signals-vs-reputation (Abrate and Viglia, 2016), standardization-vs-differentiation (Yu et al., 2014), or agglomeration-vs-competition (Lee and Jang, 2015). This study concludes by providing an economic value of the country effect and outlining a per country generalization of pricing driver behaviors (Cadogan, 2010).

Fig. 2. Variable effect by model and country.

2. Literature background and research questions

2.1. Market price premium

The tourism literature acknowledges the relevance of country image and reputation on tourist behavior. Country image directly affects tourists' visit intentions and indirectly through tourists' beliefs about a country's products (Elliot and Papadopoulos, 2016) and tourists' destination evaluations (Zhang et al., 2018). Additionally, different destinations within a country may be linked to the country's master brand (Harish, 2010).

At the economic level, country economic performance positively influences hotel price levels (Lee, 2011). Focusing on firm behavior, institutional theory (Scott, 2001) supports the relevance of the institutional environment in organizational development. Management research supports the influence of the national economy and country environment on corporate governance practices (Daniel et al., 2012). Hotel literature has indicated country institutional factors affect hotel management behavior and perceived image, even more than the effects of local or industrial issues (Lee et al., 2017).

Hadad et al. (2012) conclude there are differences among developed countries associated with labor productivity, while Assaf and Barros (2013) confirm the impact of hotel ownership and location on hotel efficiency, concluding France, Spain, and the UK are among the countries with the most efficient hotel industries. Papatheodorou (2002) found resorts at Italian destinations are sold at a premium compared to Spanish destinations. Poater and Garriga (2009) observed destinations located in Nordic countries are the most expensive, followed by destinations located in Mediterranean countries, and the cheapest destinations are in Central Europe. Hence, we advance the following hypothesis:

H₁. The country-of-operation influences hotel price.

2.2. Horizontal differentiation and country-of-operation

Hospitality research has highlighted the tension between standardization-vs-differentiation as a dilemma hoteliers must face given the industry's global context (Yu et al., 2014). The expansion of international hotel chains (Woo and Mun, 2020) promotes the standardization of services, especially in developed markets since they can thus attain significant benefits (Yu et al., 2014) but tourists value the

Fig. 3. Effect difference significance between pairs of countries.

hospitality and service received when there is a national identity element in the service provision (Ariffin et al., 2015).

Faced with this dilemma of standardization-vs-differentiation, strategic equilibrium theory (Deephouse, 1999) posits hotels balance the differentiation strategy intensity based on country conditions that legitimize the necessary adaptation level. In fact, some specific services provided by hotels have a different impact on price depending on the country (Arora and Mathur, 2020) and standardization can lead to strong price competition among countries (Picazo and Moreno-Gil, 2018).

However, differentiation does not always have a positive impact on hotel performance (Kim et al., 2020). Moreover, it has been confirmed that customers prefer international chains over independent hotels (Gao et al., 2018). Given there is a high penetration of international chains in developed European markets, except for Italy (Horwath HTL, 2018), we propose the following hypothesis:

H₂. There is a moderating effect of the country-of-operation on the negative relationship between differentiation and hotel price.

2.3. Country differences in hotel system categories

Extant hospitality literature has traditionally considered hotel category as the variable with the greatest influence on hotel pricing, showing

a positive impact on price and considered as a proxy for the quality of the hotel as well as a protection factor against price competition (Becerra et al., 2013).

However, hotel category has limitations when it comes to explaining hotel price (Abrate et al., 2011), its impact can be heterogeneous depending on the destination (Mathur, 2019), and it is quite evident that there are differences from one destination to another for the same hotel category (Arora and Mathur, 2020). Additionally, there are multiple hotel classification systems worldwide with different criteria which generate heterogeneity within the same category (Minazzi, 2010; (UNWTO, June 15, 2019)). Table 1 highlights the differences between the classification systems in the four selected countries.

Although hotel classification based on the number of stars is widely used to justify price, the diversity of classification systems among countries can cause heterogeneity in terms of its impact on price, limiting its validity as a proxy for vertical differentiation (Abrate et al., 2011). Moreover, inconsistencies have been found in the regulation of the hotel category in some markets (Núñez-Serrano et al., 2014), which may weaken its intensity as a quality signal. Therefore, the following hypothesis is raised:

H₃. There is a moderating effect of country-of-operation on the positive relationship between star category and hotel price.

Fig. 5. P25% impact on hotel price per percentage increase in *Competition* mean and percentage decrease in *Distance* mean.

2.4. Online reputation and country-of-operation

Online reputation derived from user reviews has experienced a rapid rise as a quality signal in hotel booking (Yang et al., 2018). The factors identified to explain its increasing relevance are the limitations of category as a predictor of price and quality (Abrate et al., 2011), the mismatch between expected quality level and category (Núñez-Serrano et al., 2014), the predominance of physical standards based on establishment rather than service levels (Minazzi, 2010) and the heterogeneous hotel classification systems indicated previously ((UNWTO, June 15, 2019)). Indeed, hotel classification systems reveal a lack of customer opinion integration (Blomberg-Nygard and Anderson, 2016).

Online reputation complements hotel category by reducing possible information asymmetries (Manes and Tchetchik, 2018). Travelers increasingly rely on reputation, using online platforms to seek out the experiences and valuations of others and to share their own (Yang et al., 2018). Consequently, online travel agencies (OTAs) have played a key role in hotels achieving price premiums (Yacouel and Fleischer, 2012). Hoteliers take a more tactical and less strategic approach by incorporating online reputation into their price management (Abrate and Viglia, 2016). Indeed, previous literature confirms the relevance of online reviews to hotel strategy and profitability, which are conditioned by the hotel geographical context (Yang et al., 2018).

In other industries, the moderating role of national culture in the relationship between online reputation and sales has been demonstrated. Particularly, Tang (2017) shows the effect of online reputation is heterogeneous and is affected by the product country-of-origin and by buyers' national cultural aspects, while Lin and Kalwani (2018) suggest national culture moderates the occurrence of online reputation and its

impact on product sales. Additionally, the region of location exerts an influence on the online reputation of the hotels (Banerjee and Chua, 2016) and country moderates the impact of some hotel amenities on customer satisfaction (Moro et al., 2019). Finally, the penetration degree and dependence on OTAs may present differences in European developed markets (Stangl et al., 2016), which may moderate the incorporation of online reputation into price management. To assess whether the national context affects the relevance and consequences of the online reputation, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H₄. There is a moderating effect of the country-of-operation on the positive relationship between online reputation and hotel price.

2.5. Competition environment and country-of-operation

Hospitality literature has identified the friction between two opposite effects on hotel performance: agglomeration-vs-competition (Lee and Jang, 2015) with contradictory findings. Agglomeration theories (McCann and Folta, 2008), which posit the benefits associated with co-location of hotels next to one another, have been empirically supported (Lee and Jang, 2015; Sánchez-Pérez et al., 2019). However, the Industrial Organization theory (Shaked and Sutton, 1982), which posits the negative impact on hotel performance due to an increase in competition, has also received support (Becerra et al., 2013; Lee, 2015).

From an international expansion perspective, this contradiction is a key factor in the investment decisions of international hotels in foreign locations, as they prefer to choose markets where they can achieve advantages (Assaf et al., 2015). Consequently, to alleviate the "liability of foreignness", international hotels seek locations where the positive

Fig. 6. P50% impact on price per percentage increase in *Competition* mean and percentage decrease in *Distance* mean.

externalities due to agglomeration outweigh the negative externalities (Woo and Mun, 2020). However, previous studies have not incorporated an international perspective and are limited to a single market (Becerra et al., 2013; Falk and Hagsten, 2015; Lee and Jang, 2015), even though the prevalence of positive externalities due to agglomeration are dependent on aspects relating to markets, such as demand (Lee and Jang, 2015) and seasonality (Silva, 2016) that can moderate its effect.

Additionality, hotel agglomeration reveals different behavior patterns that require specific analyses based on country (Marco-Lajara et al., 2014). The hotel location is affected by the specific land use of countries (Fang et al., 2019) and hotel development is influenced by urban planning (Luo and Lam, 2016). Since countries differ in their urban planning, we can expect the country can moderate the positive effects of agglomeration, with the hotel industry being the most dependent on locating in urban areas (Melo et al., 2009). Additionally, there is cross-country evidence of the two-way relationship between agglomeration and economic growth of the country (Krugman, 1991) and given our study framework is in developed European markets; we postulate the following hypotheses:

H₅ₐ. There is a moderating effect of the country-of-operation on the positive relationship between numbers of competitors and hotel price.

H₅ᵦ. There is a moderating effect of the country-of-operation on the negative relationship between distance between competitors and hotel price.

3. Methodology

3.1. Variables and models

Hotel information was collected using Veturis.com, an international wholesaler that groups several travel agencies focused on the transient travel market and hence Veturis can be considered like other sources such as OTAs that have been widely considered due to the availability of a wide range of hotel features (Latinopoulos, 2018). The final sample included 2650 hotels from Spain, France, Italy, and the UK.

The dependent variable **Price,** in accordance with previous studies (Hung et al., 2010; Lee, 2015; Zhang et al., 2011) is the yearly average daily rate (ADR) for a standard double room during the year 2017 because it measures the current price paid per room for each lodging establishment and it is free of price variations caused by seasonal effects, distribution channels and events (Lee, 2015). **Price** is log-transformed to consider a semi-logarithmic model (Latinopoulos, 2018). For a continuous variable, the coefficient multiplied by 100 provides the percentage impact on price while, for a dummy variable, the percentage effect is computed by $100 \bullet (e^{\beta i}-1)$ (Halvorsen and Palmquist, 1980).

The following control variables, that have been widely considered in previous literature, are included in the hedonic price model: *Size=Number of hotel rooms* (Becerra et al., 2013); *Age=Hotel construction year* (Falk and Hagsten, 2015); *Hotel type* (aparthotel, hotel, and hostel), with aparthotel used as the reference (Falk and Hagsten, 2015); *N_Serv =Total number of services offered* (Latinopoulos, 2018) and *Urban_Hotel* (a dummy variable for urban hotels) (Falk and Hagsten, 2015).

The price determinants for regression analysis are:

Fig. 7. P75% impact on price per percentage increase in *Competition* mean and percentage decrease in *Distance* mean.

- *Country dummy variables.* We included three dummy variables for France, Italy, and the UK (i.e., Spain is the reference) to control any unobservable difference between countries which may influence hotel price (hotel management, country economic performance, country international tourist arrivals).

- *H_Dif.* This variable measures the horizontal differentiation in the service space between hotels located in the same commercial zone from 0 (minimum differentiation) to 1 (maximum differentiation) with a measure based on the angular separation (Jaffe, 1986) as follows:

$$(H\_Dif)_i = 1 - \max_{\substack{j \in A_i \\ j \neq i}} \left(\frac{V_i \bullet V_j}{\|V_i\| \bullet \|V_j\|} \right)$$

where A_i is the commercial area of hotel i and V_i is a vector with 71 dummy variables that represent the services offered by hotel i that includes hotel style, sport activities and food services.

- *Category.* This variable measures the official star rating of the hotel, from one to five stars and is the services quality indicator officially assigned by the corresponding agencies (Becerra et al., 2013).

- *Online_Reputation.* This variable, based on a reputational approach (Zhang et al., 2011) represents the yearly average online rating from customers of each hotel. Each partner agency of Veturis group shows on its website the average rating given to each hotel. Veturis only allows real guests to post an online review after their hotel stay

(Sanchez-Lozano et al., 2021) and hence it ensures a reliable and genuine measure of the online reputation.

- *Competition.* Each hotel's competition was computed by the number of lodging establishments within the same commercial area as the hotel divided by the logarithm of the number of overnight stays in the city where the hotel is located. (Sources: National Statistical Offices of all countries).

- *Distance.* For each hotel this variable provides the average distance in kilometers, from hotels located in the same area divided by the area -in square kilometers, of the city (Sources: National Statistical Offices of all countries) where the hotel is located (Becerra et al., 2013).

Table A.1 (Appendix A) contains the summary statistics for continuous variables and hotel distribution by country and hotel type.

We used moderated multiple regression (MMR), due to the advantages over alternative modeling (Schepers, 2016) to consider the following hedonic price models:

Null_Model : $\ln Price_i = \alpha_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{6} \rho_j C_{ij} + \sum_{h=1}^{3} \gamma_h D_{ih} + \sum_{j=1}^{5} \omega_j X_{ij} + \varepsilon_i$

Alternative_Model: $\ln Price_i = \alpha_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{6} \rho_j C_{ij} + \sum_{h=1}^{3} \gamma_h D_{ih} + \sum_{h=1}^{4}$

$$\times \sum_{j=1}^{5} \varphi_{hj} D_{ih} X_{ij} + \varepsilon_i$$

where C_j are the control variables, D_h the country dummy variables, X_j

P90

Fig. 8. P90% impact on price per percentage increase in *Competition* mean and percentage decrease in *Distance* mean.

the independent variables and ε_i is the random error. *Alternative_Model* considers interactions with all countries.

The *Alternative_Model* requires homocedasticity across countries, confirmed by the Breusch-Pagan test (Rosopa et al., 2016) (*p*-value=0.635). To prevent multicollinearity with interactions terms, we standardized the exogenous variables subtracting the respective mean. The variance inflation factors (VIF) did not detect multicollinearity problems since all values were below 4.52 (Kennedy, 2008).

The estimation methods were OLS and quantile regression (Koenker, 2005). The latter makes it possible to analyze which independent variables have a non-constant effect on the conditional distribution of price and may be more efficient than OLS under non-normality of residuals (Koenker, 2005). Shapiro-Wilk and Shapiro-France tests confirmed the non-normality of the residuals for OLS. We conducted estimations with the Barrodale-Roberts method (Koenker, 2005) at the 25th, 50th, 75th and 90th percentiles due to the positive asymmetry of the hotel price sample distribution (skewness value 9.70). Pseudo R^2 value (Koenker and Machado, 1999) was considered for goodness of fit. For OLS and quantile regressions, standard errors were estimated by bootstrap methods (Davison and Hinkley, 1997; Feng et al., 2011). Fig. 1 summarizes the statistical analysis implemented with R software version 4.1.2.

4. Results

The first step was to analyze the overall moderating country effect through the significance of the *Alternative_Model* against the *Null_Model* (Fig. 1). The F-test for OLS and the Wald test (Koenker, 2005) for quantile regression confirm an overall moderating country effect ($p < 0.001$). Table A.2 (Appendix A) shows the *Null_Model* (only 25th and 75th percentiles) and *Alternative_Model* estimation.

Regarding main country effect (**H₁**), we performed a global test for significance of all coefficients corresponding to *Country dummy variables* with the *Alternative_Model* that confirmed the main country effect in all models ($p < 0.001$). As Fig. 1 depicts, we analyzed the differences between countries through cross-country pair comparison tests (results available on request to corresponding author).

Results showed the UK has the highest country effect, being significantly different from all other countries. French effect is significantly higher than Spain and Italy, except at 90th percentile where Italy and France do not show significant differences, whereas Italian effect is significantly stronger than Spain except at the 50th percentile, where both countries have the same effect. Due to the standardization of the exogenous variables, the main country effect is equivalent to the price premium in each country for hotels with mean values in the price determinants with respect to the Spanish price. Table 2 shows the percentage increase with respect to hotel price in Spain due to the main country effect (Halvorsen and Palmquist, 1980).

To test the hypotheses **H₂-H₅ₐ₋ᵦ**, we analyzed whether each exogenous variable has a significant effect (Fig. 1) through an omnibus test for null interactions associated with each variable (Schepers, 2016). Table 3 shows results from the omnibus test for each independent variable and confirm a significant effect on price for all variables, except *H_Dif* at the 90th percentile**.** Thus, differentiation has no impact on price for upscale hotels in all countries. The remainder of analysis excludes *H_Dif* at this percentile.

Next, we contrasted the moderating country effect for each explanatory variable with a significant joint effect through a global test for equality of interactions (Schepers, 2016). Table 4 shows results from the global test for moderating country effect.

Following Fig. 1, for those variables with a significant effect and significant country moderation (Tables 3 and 4), Table A.2

Fig. 9. Country price premium (%) as a function of each determinant.

(*Alternative_Model*) shows in which countries the variable effect is significant. For countries with significant variable effect, Table 5 shows the percentage impact on price per unit increase of the variable in each country. As Tables 3 and 4 show, *H_Dif* at the 90th percentile was excluded from this analysis. For *Online_Reputation* at 25th percentile and *Distance* at 75th percentile, Table 5 only shows the percentage change due to the variable effect without moderation from *Null_Model*. Similarly, Fig. 2 illustrates the impact of each variable in each country. Finally, for variables with moderating country effect, we performed multiple comparisons between pairs for those countries where the specific variable has a significant effect (Fig. 3).

Concerning *H_Dif*, Table 4 shows moderation by country in its impact in all models except at the 90th percentile (upscale hotels), so **H₂** is broadly confirmed. For OLS and lower midscale hotels (50th percentile)

H_Dif has a null effect in all countries except in Spain where *H_Dif* has a significantly negative effect (Table 5, Fig. 2). For economy hotels (25th percentile), *H_Dif* only has a significant negative effect in Spain and the UK where these hotels can reach a price premium through the standardization.

In most cases, the effect of *H_Dif* is null or negative. Only for Italian upper midscale hotels (75th percentile), the effect is significantly positive whereas in the other countries, its impact is not significant. Consequently, services standardization is not counterproductive for hotel pricing and differentiation only allows prices to be increased in Italian upper midscale hotels.

Category has a significant overall difference in the impact on price due to the country for all models, which confirms **H₃** (Table 4). Since *Category* effect is always positive (Table 5, Fig. 2), the moderation only

Fig. 4. OLS percentage impact on price per percentage increase in *Competition* mean and percentage decrease in *Distance* mean.

influences its intensity. The stronger effect happens in Italy and the UK without significant differences (Fig. 3), except at 75th and 90th percentiles where Italy has the stronger effect. The lowest effect occurs in Spain, except at the 75th and 90th percentiles where Spain and France have similar effect. Thus, the hotel category is confirmed as a quality signal but without global validity (Arora and Mathur, 2020) since even in developed markets its effect can show considerable differences.

Regarding *Online_Reputation*, its effect is moderated by country except for economy hotels (Table 4), where the positive effect is the same for all countries (Table 5, Fig. 2) so H_4 is broadly confirmed. Since its effect is positive or null, the moderation only influences the effect intensity. *Online_Reputation* produces the same significantly positive effect in Spain and the UK in all models (Fig. 3). The French and Italian effects are null except for the economy hotels, as mentioned above. Therefore, there are differences in the extent of influence of online reputation on price in the countries analyzed.

Regarding *Competition*, there is a significant moderating country effect in all models (Table 4), so H_{5a} is confirmed. The Spanish effect is positive (Table 5, Fig. 2) with significant differences with the rest of countries (Fig. 3) where the effect is null or negative. In the UK, the effect is significantly negative for all models except at 25th percentile. The Italian effect is negative only for OLS and 90th percentile. In France, only at 25th and 50th percentiles the effect is negative. In all other cases, the effect is null. Thus, the country moderation influences both the intensity and the valence of the effect. Among countries with significantly negative effect, only for OLS and 90th percentile there are significant differences between Italy and the UK.

Concerning *Distance*, its effect is moderated by country in all models except at 75th percentile (Table 4) which broadly confirms H_{5b} (Table 4). In all countries, *Distance* has the same negative effect for upper midscale hotels (i.e., the shorter the distance to competitors, the higher the price) (Table 5, Fig. 2) whereas in all other cases the effect is

negative or null in all countries, so the moderation only influences the effect intensity. For OLS, only the difference between the UK and Italy is significant (Fig. 3). For economy hotels, the UK has a significantly lower effect intensity than France and Italy. For 50th percentile, only the differences between Spain and France and between UK and France are significant. Finally, for upscale hotels the strongest effect occurs in Italy, followed by the UK and Spain with significant differences for all pairs comparisons.

To analyze the existence of a global agglomeration effect (i.e., positive impact on price due to an increase in *Competition* and a decrease in *Distance*), Figs. 5 to 9 display the percentage impact on price due to a percentage increase in *Competition* mean and percentage decrease in *Distance* mean.

Fig. 4 to 9 show that there is a global agglomeration effect (red area) in Spain and Italy in all cases, in France for OLS and 25th percentile, and in the UK only for economy hotels. On the other hand, the blue area suggests a global competition effect (i.e., negative effect due to an increase in *Competition* and a decrease in *Distance*) in French economy hotels and in the UK in all cases except for economy hotels, since there is only a positive impact on price if the distance can decrease considerably for small rises in competition (red area). Finally, the global agglomeration effect is null for French upscale hotels.

Spain has the strongest global agglomeration effect in all cases, followed by Italy except for the 75th percentile, where the Italian and French effects do not show a significant difference. On the other hand, the global competition effect shows greater intensity in the UK except for economy hotels, since in the UK there is an agglomeration effect and in France a competition effect.

Given the heterogeneous impact of some determinants due to the country, the overall market price premium with respect to Spain (i.e., the percentage increase in price due to the market for hotels with the same characteristics) may be heterogeneous. In case of a significant

country moderation for a specific determinant X_j, following Halvorsen and Palmquist (1980), we computed the market price premium with respect to Spanish hotels as a function of X_j (i.e., other explanatory variables ceteris paribus) as follows:

$$CountryPricePremium(\%) = \frac{Price_{Country} - Price_{Spain}}{Price_{Spain}} \times 100$$
$$= \left(\exp\left(\gamma_{Country} + (\varphi_{Countryj} - \varphi_{Spainj}) \bullet X_j \right) - 1 \right) \times 100$$

where $\gamma_{Country}$ denoted the main country effect and $\varphi_{Country\ j}$ denotes the coefficient for X_j in the specific country. Otherwise, the market price premium is the main country effect. Spain is taken as base since it is the country with the lowest main country effect in all models.

Fig. 9 displays for all models the country price premium as a function of each determinant. Given that differentiation is not moderated by the country for upscale hotels, the price premium remains at the values provided by Table 2 whereas for 75th percentile is similar in the case of France and the UK but not for Italy, whose price premium can improve considerably through high differentiation. For OLS and 50th percentile the price premium for all countries respect to Spain are negatively influenced by standardization, which is similar for economy hotels, except in the UK, where the standardization allows to reach higher price premiums compared to the rest of countries.

Concerning Category, Fig. 9 shows the UK price premium is the highest in most cases and the heterogeneity of the Italian price premium that it is negative with respect to Spain for 1- and 2-star hotels and it is positive from 3 to 5-star hotels (except at 50th percentile where price premium is positive from 4-stars hotels). Even for upscale hotels, it is higher than the French price premium for 5-star hotels.

French and Italian price premium decreases as the level of online reputation increases (Fig. 9) and Italian price premium can even be negative. Thus, French, and Italian high reputation hotels command smaller market price premium than low reputation ones, which usually attain the highest price premium, except for economy hotels which command static price premium due to lack of moderation. The price premium for UK midscale and upscale hotels is positively influenced by online reputation while for OLS it is negatively influenced.

Regarding *Competition*, all countries suffer a decrease in the price premium respect to Spain, which can become negative for high values of *Competition*. The sharp falls in French economy and lower midscale hotels and British hotels (except for economy hotels) stand out.

Concerning *Distance,* price premium respect to Spain is stable for 75th percentile in all countries due to lack of moderation. For all other models, premiums in all countries can improve respect to Spain by locating in crowded areas, except for French upscale hotels whose price premium experiences a strong increase as *Distance* increases.

5. Conclusions and limitations

Prior research has shown the relevance of both international competitiveness and the image of hotels (Lee et al., 2017) as well as their local knowledge and adaptation to countries of operation (Woo and Mun, 2020). Also, the overall relevance of online information for travelers (Yang et al., 2018) and due to the utmost relevance of location and spatial concentration decisions (Marco-Lajara et al., 2014), we base on cross-nation methodology to elucidate the differential effects of strategic hotel pricing decisions depending on the country-of-operation. Thus, we performed a comparative analysis with a wide dataset of hotels in four countries. Our findings are based on a quantile regression analysis that contemplates heterogeneous effects over price distribution. We provide a new perspective to hotel pricing research by showing how country can moderate some relationship(s) between determinants and price even in developed markets.

5.1. Theoretical implications

Firstly, our work encompasses several markets, which has allowed us to analyze in a broader context the role played by each price determinant in a more universal way finding out which determinants have a more globalized role, and which are more local in hotel pricing management in developed markets, thus surpassing limitations from previous studies. Second, our study contributes to reducing the lack of moderator identification in previous hotel price hedonic studies (Arora and Mathur, 2020) and highlights the moderating role of the country in the effect intensity of some determinants and even its valence, which allows us to delve deeper into the country-level differences. Additionally, our results expand on the previous studies (Arora and Mathur, 2020) that confirm the existence of a price premium associated with the country, providing us with a novel finding that this premium is not homogeneous for all hotels in the same country and its magnitude can depend on reputational attributes, location in relation to competitors, and the services on offer.

Regarding the standardization-vs-differentiation confrontation (Yu et al., 2014), given that the effect of differentiation in most cases is negative or null, it is confirmed that the service standardization in developed markets is a determinant that allows either to increase prices (economy hotels in UK and Spanish lower midscale hotels), or to provide benefits by saving the cost of implementing additional services or offering them for free (Lin, 2017). Only in the Italian upper midscale hotels does the differentiation of services allow prices to be increased, which may be supported by the lower penetration of international chains in this market (Horwath HTL, 2018).

As expected, the global role of hotel category as a quality signal to reduce information asymmetry ((Belver-Delgado et al., 2021); Manes and Tchetchik, 2018) is confirmed. Although, the intensity of its effect is moderated by country, which can be partly explained by its different regulation, even in developed markets (Table 1). In Spain, it has lost significant validity, which may be due to the inconsistency in the regulations (Núñez-Serrano et al., 2014).

The heterogeneity in the degree of online reputation incorporation in price management is verified, except for economy hotels. The UK is the market with the strongest inclusion of online reputation as price determinant, followed by Spain, which partly compensates the loss of validity of Spanish category as a quality signal (Manes and Tchetchik, 2018), being a less strategic and more tactical market whereas in the UK, the incorporation of online reputation in price management has not reduced the validity of the category. France and Italy are purely strategic markets (except for economy hotels) that only consider category as a reputational signal (Abrate and Viglia, 2016).

Finally, regarding agglomeration-vs-competition confrontation (Becerra et al., 2013; McCann and Folta, 2008), results show that in developed markets, the benefits from locating close to competitors outweigh the negative effects of competition, except in French economy and lower midscale markets and in the UK markets (except in economy hotels). Thus, both intensity and valence of the global agglomeration effect is moderated by the country. Given the null or negative role of differentiation in services, our results extend previous studies about which agglomerations are more beneficial (Lee and Jang, 2015), since they confirm that undifferentiated hotel agglomerations can obtain more benefits than differentiated ones in developed markets, except for the case of Italian upper midscale hotels for which differentiated agglomerations are more beneficial.

5.2. Managerial implications

First, hotel managers and international chains that operate in developed markets must bet on undifferentiated service offers with respect to competitors, except for those that operate in the Italian upper midscale market. Additionally, they must locate near to competitors due to the benefits that they can obtain relating to price (with the exceptions

noted above). Second, given the relevant role that the agglomeration effect has on the investment decisions of international chains, the Spanish and Italian hotel markets are the most attractive regarding the decision about investing in new properties in developed markets. On the contrary, France (for economy and lower midscale hotels) and the UK are the least attractive markets due to the global competition effect. Finally, hotel managers operating in the UK and Spain must implement a more dynamic and tactical price management, incorporating online reputation compared to the more static nature of the French and Italian market and Italian (except for economy hotels) (Abrate and Viglia, 2016). These insights allow us to propose a differentiated pricing dashboard for each country and price cluster (Fig. 2).

5.3. Limitations and future research

This study includes some limitations that can direct future research. First, the countries included have a tourism sector with a high level of competitiveness (World Economic Forum, 2019). Future research should consider other less competitive developed markets to strengthen the results obtained from our work through a global understanding of the moderating role of country in the impact of price determinants.

Second, the study provides evidence of the moderation role of country on price determinants through a simplistic incorporation of dummy variables. Future research could explore alternative ways of examining the specific national factors that influence price determinants. Third, our study shows the heterogeneity effect of online reputation on price according to country, but future research should incorporate the origin of customers' online reviews since its effect is influenced by cultural and national customer aspects (Tang, 2017). Finally, our study has considered annual prices assuming a static approach for hotel price, future research should consider the incorporation of the dynamic nature of hotel price.

Acknowledgments

Appendix A. Supporting information

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found in the online version at doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2022.103401.

References

Abrate, G., Viglia, G., 2016. Strategic and tactical price decisions in hotel revenue management. Tour. Manag. 55, 123–132.
Abrate, G., Capriello, A., Fraquelli, G., 2011. When quality signals talk: Evidence from the Turin hotel industry. Tour. Manag. 32, 912–921.
Abrate, G., Fraquelli, G., Viglia, G., 2012. Dynamic pricing strategies: Evidence from European hotels. Int. J. Hosp. Manag. 31 (1), 160–168.
Abrate, G., Nicolau, J.L., Viglia, G., 2019. The impact of dynamic price variability on revenue maximization. Tour. Manag. 74, 224–233.
Ariffin, A.A.M., Nameghi, E.N.M., Soon, Y.K., 2015. The relationships between national identity, hospitality, and satisfaction among foreign hotel guests. J. Travel Tour. Mark. 32 (6), 778–793.
Arora, S.D., Mathur, S., 2020. Hotel pricing at tourist destinations–A comparison across emerging and developed markets. Tour. Manag. Perspect. 35, 100724.
Assaf, A.G., Barros, C.P., 2013. A global benchmarking of the hotel industry. Tour. Econ. 19 (4), 811–821.
Assaf, A.G., Josiassen, A., Agbola, F.W., 2015. Attracting international hotels: Locational factors that matter most. Tour. Manag. 47, 329–340.
Assaf, A.G., Josiassen, A., Woo, L., Agbola, F.W., Tsionas, M., 2017. Destination characteristics that drive hotel performance: A state-of-the-art global analysis. Tour. Manag. 60, 270–279.
Banerjee, S., Chua, A.Y.K., 2016. In search of patterns among travellers' hotel ratings in TripAdvisor. Tour. Manag. 53, 125–131.
Becerra, M., Santalo, J., Silva, R., 2013. Being better vs. being different: Differentiation, competition, and pricing strategies in the Spanish hotel industry. Tour. Manag. 34, 71–79.

Belver-Delgado, T., San-Martín, S., Hernández-Maestro, R.M., 2021. The influence of website quality and star rating signals on booking intention: Analyzing the moderating effect of variety seeking. Span. J. Mark. -ESIC 25 (1), 3–28.
Blomberg-Nygard, A., Anderson, C.K., United Nations World Tourism Organization, 2016. United Nations World Tourism Organization Study on Online Guest Reviews and Hotel Classification Systems: An Integrated Approach. Serv. Sci. 8 (2), 139–151.
Cadogan, J., 2010. Comparative, cross-cultural, and cross-national research: A comment on good and bad practice. Int. Mark. Rev. 27 (6), 601–605.
Daniel, S.J., Cieslewicz, J.K., Pourjalali, H., 2012. The impact of national economic culture and country-level institutional environment on corporate governance practices theory and empirical evidence. Manag. Int. Rev. 52 (3), 365–394.
Davison, A.C., Hinkley, D.V., 1997. Bootstrap Methods and their Application, Vol. 1. Cambridge University Press,.
Deephouse, D.L., 1999. To be different, or to be the same? It's a question (and theory) of strategic balance. Strateg. Manag. J. 20 (2), 147–166.
Elliot, S., Papadopoulos, N., 2016. Of products and tourism destinations: An integrative, cross-national study of place image. J. Bus. Res. 69 (3), 1157–1165.
Falk, M., Hagsten, E., 2015. Modelling growth and revenue for Swedish hotel establishments. Int. J. Hosp. Manag. 45, 59–68.
Fang, L., Li, H., Li, M., 2019. Does hotel location tell a true story? Evidence from geographically weighted regression analysis of hotels in Hong Kong. Tour. Manag. 72, 78–91.
Feng, X., He, X., Hu, J., 2011. Wild bootstrap for quantile regression. Biometrika 98 (4), 995–999.
Gao, B., Li, X., Liu, S., Fang, D., 2018. How power distance affects online hotel ratings: The positive moderating roles of hotel chain and reviewers' travel experience. Tour. Manag. 65, 176–186.
Gibbs, C., Guttentag, D., Gretzel, U., Yao, L., Morton, J., 2018. Use of dynamic pricing strategies by Airbnb hosts. Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag. 30 (1), 2–20.
Hadad, S., Hadad, Y., Malul, M., Rosenboim, M., 2012. The economic efficiency of the tourism industry: a global comparison. Tour. Econ. 18 (5), 931–940.
Halvorsen, R., Palmquist, R., 1980. The interpretation of dummy variables in semilogarithmic equations. Am. Econ. Rev. 70 (3), 474–475.
Harish, R., 2010. Brand architecture in tourism branding: the way forward for India. J. Indian Bus. Res. 2 (3), 153–165.
Horwath, H.T.L., 2018. Eur. chains Hotels Rep. 2018 (Available at). ⟨https://corporate.cms-horwathhtl.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2018/11/HHTL_2018-EU-CHAINS-REPORT.pdf⟩.
Hung, W.T., Shang, J.K., Wang, F.C., 2010. Pricing determinants in the hotel industry: Quantile regression analysis. Int. J. Hosp. Manag. 29 (3), 378–384.
Institut National de la Statistique et des Études Économiques (INSEE), 2021, Établissements d'hébergements touristiques en 2021. Retrieved from: ⟨https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/fichier/2012688/TCRD_018.xlsx⟩.
Instituto Nacional de Estadistica (INE), 2021, Hotel industry in Spain. Retrieved from: ⟨https://www.ine.es/dyngs/INEbase/en/categoria.htm?c=Estadistica_P&cid=1254735576863⟩.
Jaffe, A.B., 1986. Technological Opportunity and Spillovers of R & D: Evidence from Firms' Patents. Profits, Mark. Value Am. Econ. Rev. 76 (5), 984–1001.
Kennedy, P., 2008. A Guide to Econometrics, 6th ed..,. Blackwell, Malden, MA.
Kim, M., Roehl, W., Lee, S.K., 2020. Different from or similar to neighbors? An investigation of hotels' strategic distances. Tour. Manag. 76, 103960.
Koenker, R., 2005. Quantile Regression. Cambridge University Press, New York.
Koenker, R., Machado, J.A.F., 1999. Goodness of fit and related inference processes for quantile regression. J. Am. Stat. Assoc. 94 (448), 1296–1310.
Krugman, P., 1991. Increasing returns and economic geography. J. Political Econ. 99 (3), 483–499.
Latinopoulos, D., 2018. Using a spatial hedonic analysis to evaluate the effect of sea view on hotel prices. Tour. Manag. 65, 87–99.
Lee, C.G., 2011. The determinants of hotel room rates: Another visit with Singapore's data. Int. J. Hosp. Manag. 30, 756–758.
Lee, S.A., Oh, H., Hsu, C.H.C., 2017. Country-of-operation and brand images: evidence from the Chinese hotel industry. Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag. 29 (7), 1814–1833.
Lee, S.K., 2015. Quality differentiation and conditional spatial price competition among hotels. Tour. Manag. 46, 114–122.
Lee, S.K., Jang, S., 2015. Conditional agglomeration externalities in lodging markets. J. Hosp. Tour. Res. 39 (4), 540–559.
Lin, H.-C., Kalwani, M.U., 2018. Culturally contingent electronic word-of-mouth signaling and screening: A comparative study of product reviews in the United States and Japan. J. Int. Mark. 26 (2), 80–102.
Lin, S., 2017. Add-on policies under vertical differentiation: why do luxury hotels charge for internet while economy hotels do not? Mark. Sci. 36 (4), 610–625.
Luo, J.M., Lam, C.F., 2016. A qualitative study of urbanization effects on hotel development. J. Hosp. Tour. Manag. 29, 135–142.
Manes, E., Tchetchik, A., 2018. The role of electronic word of mouth in reducing information asymmetry: An empirical investigation of online hotel booking. J. Bus. Res. 85, 185–196.
Marco-Lajara, B., Claver-Cortés, E., Úbeda-García, M., 2014. Business agglomeration in tourist districts and hotel performance. Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag. 26 (8), 1312–1340.
Mathur, S., 2019. Hotel pricing at popular US tourist destinations. Tour. Recreat. Res. 44 (2), 247–256.
Mattila, A.S., Gao, Y., 2016. An examination of popular pricing and price framing techniques in the hospitality industry and directions for future research. Int. J. Revenue Manag. 9 (2–3), 175–185.
McCann, B.T., Folta, T.B., 2008. Location matters: where we have been and where we might go in agglomeration research. J. Manag. 34 (3), 532–565.

Melis, G., Piga, C.A., 2017. Are all online hotel prices created dynamic? An empirical assessment. Int. J. Hosp. Manag. 67, 163–173.

Melo, P.C., Graham, D.J., Noland, R.B., 2009. A meta-analysis of estimates of urban agglomeration economies. Reg. Sci. Urban Econ. 39 (3), 332–342.

Minazzi, R., 2010. Hotel classification systems: a comparison of international case studies. Acta Univ. Danub. Œcon. 6 (4), 64–86.

Mitra, S.K., 2020. An analysis of asymmetry in dynamic pricing of hospitality industry. Int. J. Hosp. Manag. 89, 102406.

Moro, S., Rita, P., Oliveira, C., 2018. Factors influencing hotels' online prices. J. Hosp. Mark. Manag. 27 (4), 443–464.

Moro, S., Batista, F., Rita, P., Oliveira, C., Ribeiro, R., 2019. Are the States United? An Analysis of U.S. Hotels' Offers Through TripAdvisor's Eyes. J. Hosp. Tour. Res. 43 (7), 1112–1129.

Núñez-Serrano, J.A., Turrion, J., Velázquez, F.J., 2014. Are stars a good indicator of hotel quality? Assymetric information and regulatory heterogeneity in Spain. Tour. Manag. 42, 77–87.

Papatheodorou, A., 2002. Exploring competitiveness in Mediterranean resorts. Tour. Econ. 8 (2), 133–150.

Picazo, P., Moreno-Gil, S., 2018. Tour operators' marketing strategies and their impact on prices of sun and beach package holidays. J. Hosp. Tour. Manag. 35, 17–28.

Poater, A., Garriga, A., 2009. Tourism in European cities: insights into the dynamics of weekend hotel accommodation. Tour. Econ. 15 (1), 41–86.

Rosopa, P.J., Schroeder, A.N., Doll, J.L., 2016. Detecting Between-Groups Heteroscedasticity in Moderated Multiple Regression with a Continuous Predictor and a Categorical Moderator: A Monte Carlo Study. SAGE Open 6 (1), 1–14.

Sanchez-Lozano, G., Pereira, L.N., Chavez-Miranda, E., 2021. Big data hedonic pricing: Econometric insights into room rates' determinants by hotel category. Tour. Manag. 85, 104308.

Sánchez-Pérez, M., Illescas-Manzano, M.D., Martínez-Puertas, S., 2019. Modelling hotel room pricing: A multi-country analysis. Int. J. Hosp. Manag. 79, 89–99.

Schepers, J., 2016. On regression modelling with dummy variables versus separate regressions per group: Comment on Holgersson et al. J. Appl. Stat. 43 (4), 674–681.

Scott, W.R. (2001). Institutions and organizations. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Shaked, A., Sutton, J., 1982. Relaxing price competition through product differentiation. Rev. Econ. Stud. 49 (1), 3–13.

Shapoval, V., Hägglund, P., Pizam, A., Abraham, V., Carlbäck, M., Nygren, T., Smith, R. M., 2021. The COVID-19 pandemic effects on the hospitality industry using social systems theory: A multi-country comparison. Int. J. Hosp. Manag. 94, 102813.

Silva, R., 2016. Competition and demand effects of geographic distance to rivals. Serv. Ind. J. 36 (1–2), 37–57.

Stangl, B., Inversini, A., Schegg, R., 2016. Hotels' dependency on online intermediaries and their chosen distribution channel portfolios: Three country insights. Int. J. Hosp. Manag. 52, 87–96.

Statista, 2020a, Hotels in Italy. Retrieved from: ⟨https://www.statista.com/statistics/785495/number-of-hotels-in-italy-by-rating/⟩.

Statista, 2020b, Hotels in the United Kingdom (UK). Retrieved from: ⟨https://www.statista.com/study/39198/hotels-in-the-united-kingdom-uk-statista-dossier/⟩.

Tang, L., 2017. Mine your customers or mine your business: the moderating role of culture in online word-of-mouth reviews. J. Int. Mark. 25 (2), 88–110.

TheGlobalEconomy.com. Compare countries with annual data from official sources. Available at: https://www.theglobaleconomy.com/compare-countries/.

UNWTO (United Nation World Tourism Organization), 2015, Hotel Classification systems: recurrence of criteria in 4 and 5 star hotels. Available from http://cf.cdn.unwto.org/sites/all/files/pdf/hotel_classification_systems_recurrence_of_criteria_in_4_and_5_star_hotels_0.pdf (accessed June 15, 2019).

Viglia, G., Abrate, G., 2017. When distinction does not pay off-Investigating the determinants of European agritourism prices. J. Bus. Res. 80, 45–52.

Vives, A., Jacob, M., 2021. Dynamic pricing in different Spanish resort hotels. Tour. Econ. 27 (2), 398–411.

Whitla, P., Walters, P.G., Davies, H., 2007. Global strategies in the international hotel industry. Int. J. Hosp. Manag. 26 (4), 777–792.

Woo, L., Mun, S.G., 2020. Types of agglomeration effects and location choices of international hotels in an emerging market. Tour. Manag. 77, 104034.

World Economic Forum, 2019, The Travel and Tourism Competitiveness Report 2019. Available from ⟨https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_TTCR_2019.pdf⟩ (accessed January 15, 2022).

Yacouel, N., Fleischer, A., 2012. The role of cybermediaries in reputation building and price premiums in the online hotel market. J. Travel Res. 51 (2), 219–226.

Yang, Y., Park, S., Hu, X., 2018. Electronic word of mouth and hotel performance: A meta-analysis. Tour. Manag. 67, 248–260.

Yelkur, R., DaCosta, M.M.N., 2001. Differential pricing and segmentation on the Internet: the case of hotels. Manag. Decis. 39 (4), 252–262.

Yu, Y., Byun, W.-H., Lee, T.J., 2014. Critical issues of globalisation in the international hotel industry. Curr. Issues Tour. 17 (2), 114–118.

Zhang, J.R., Wu, B.H., Morrison, A.M., Tseng, C., Chen, Y.C., 2018. How country image affects tourists' destination evaluations: A moderated mediation approach. J. Hosp. Tour. Res. 42 (6), 904–930.

Zhang, Z., Ye, Q., Law, R., 2011. Determinants of hotel room price: An exploration of travelers' hierarchy of accommodation needs. Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag. 23 (7), 972–981.