Current Travel Standards Fail Current Travelers

The industry's data model captures 18 dimensions. Travelers make decisions across 400. That gap is why search results feel broken.

* * *

The hospitality industry has a data problem. Not a lack of data. A lack of the *right* data.

Research by Ekinci and Hosany has demonstrated that travelers evaluate destinations based on personality dimensions and emotional alignment, factors that drive choice behavior more powerfully than functional attributes like amenities or star ratings. Yet every major booking platform collects the same limited information: location, price, star rating, dates, amenities. They compete on interface design, loyalty programs, and advertising spend. But underneath, they're all working from the same limited playbook that ignores how travelers actually make decisions.

The assumption has been that better algorithms applied to existing data will eventually solve traveler matching. That assumption is wrong. The ceiling isn't computational. It's structural. The data itself is insufficient.

Travel businesses that want to differentiate, whether platforms, hosts, or destination marketers, need to stop optimizing within current constraints and start collecting entirely new dimensions of information.

* * *

The Standard Everyone Follows (And Its Limits)

Schema.org is the closest thing the web has to a universal data language. Developed collaboratively by Google, Microsoft, Yahoo, and Yandex, it provides structured markup that helps search engines understand content. For hotels and lodging, schema.org defines how properties should describe themselves in machine-readable format.

This is the foundation most travel platforms build on, either directly or through its influence on industry data practices.

Schema.org recognizes 6 explicit lodging business types: Hotel, Motel, Hostel, Bed and Breakfast, Resort, and Campground.

Beyond property type, the standard offers roughly 12 meaningful matching properties: amenity features, pet policies, star rating, check-in and check-out times, number of rooms, available languages, price range, smoking policies, and a handful of others.

Total matchable dimensions: approximately 18.

This isn't a criticism of schema.org. It was designed for search engine comprehension, not traveler compatibility. The problem is that the travel industry has treated this baseline as a ceiling rather than a floor.

* * *

What 18 Dimensions Can't Capture

Consider what happens when a traveler searches for accommodation.

They can filter by location, date, price, and star rating. They might narrow by amenities like free WiFi, a pool, or pet-friendliness. The platform returns dozens or hundreds of results that match these criteria.

But here's what the traveler actually wanted to know:

Is this place quiet or social? Will other guests be families with young children or couples on romantic getaways? Does the host expect guests to be self-sufficient, or is there concierge-level attention? Is the vibe rustic and unplugged, or modern and connected? Can someone with mobility limitations navigate comfortably? Is this a place where a solo traveler in their 50s seeking a contemplative retreat would feel at home?

None of these questions have a field in the standard data model.

The traveler compensates by reading reviews. They scan for signal buried in narrative: "perfect for our anniversary," "kids loved the pool," "felt very secluded," "host was hands-off." They cross-reference travel blogs, ask friends, look at photos hoping to infer atmosphere. This process takes hours and still produces mismatches.

The data exists. It's in the host's head. It's in the traveler's preferences. There's simply no structured connection point between them.

* * *

The Independent Property Trap

For hosts, the consequences are even more severe.

A working ranch in Montana and a glamping site in Texas both get compressed into "Campground" or pushed into the generic "LodgingBusiness" category. A monastery retreat center has no structured way to communicate "contemplative atmosphere, digital detox environment, sacred setting." A boutique inn with 8 rooms and a transformative guest experience gets ranked below a highway hotel with better SEO.

When differentiation can't be expressed in data, it doesn't exist to the algorithm.

This leaves independent properties with two competitive levers: price and star rating. Both favor chains. A 4-star independent hotel competing on price against a 4-star branded property will lose. The brand has volume, recognition, and loyalty program

lock-in. The independent's advantages, the ones that actually matter to the right traveler, are invisible to the system.

The result is a self-reinforcing cycle. Mismatched guests book because the property appeared in search results that were technically correct but experientially wrong. They arrive expecting something different. They leave reviews that reflect the mismatch, not the property's actual quality. Those reviews hurt future visibility. The property either discounts further or exits the platform ecosystem entirely.

This is how lexical entrenchment works. Marketing has conditioned travelers to search in branded categories: "boutique hotel," "luxury resort," "bed and breakfast." Properties that don't fit neatly into these boxes become invisible, not because they lack quality, but because they lack vocabulary.

* * *

Rethinking the Data Model

What would hospitality look like if the data model actually reflected how travelers make decisions?

Start with property types. Instead of 6 categories, consider 25:

Tent Camping, Glamping, RV Camping,	Conference/Meeting Facility, Lodge, Inn,	Resort, Boutique Hotel, Extended Stay,
Motel, Hotel, Rustic Cabin,	Condo, Treehouse, Train Car,	Farm Stay, Ranch, Monastery/Retreat
Comfort Cabin, Bed and Breakfast, Private Home,	Luxury Property, Vacation Rental, Hostel,	Castle/Historic Estate

Each of these represents a distinct traveler expectation. A guest booking a farm stay wants something fundamentally different from one booking a boutique hotel, even if both are 4-star rated and similarly priced.

Then layer on classification systems that capture the dimensions current standards ignore:

Ambience 26 aspects	**Purpose** 26 aspects	**Lifestyle preferences** 26 aspects
Cultural/Attire expectations 26 aspects	**Adventure Level** 26 aspects	**Medical and Accessibility** 26 aspects
Amenities 26 aspects	**Orientation and Inclusivity** 23 aspects	**Event Venue capabilities** 22 aspects
Dining Experience 22 aspects	**Dining Style** 26 aspects	**Meeting Facilities** 22 aspects
Language Preferences 26 aspects	**Group Size** 15 aspects	**Age Considerations** 14 aspects

Total classification aspects: approximately 368. Combined with 25 property types: roughly 393 potential matching dimensions.

The ratio compared to the industry standard: 22 to 1.

* * *

From Filtering to Matching

This isn't about adding more filter checkboxes to a search interface. Adding 393 filters would be unusable.

The shift is from filtering to matching. Filtering asks: "Does this property meet my minimum criteria?" Matching asks: "How compatible is this property with who I am as a traveler?"

Filtering produces lists of technically acceptable options. Matching produces ranked recommendations based on lifestyle alignment.

The difference in conversion is substantial. Industry average booking conversion from search results hovers around 5 to 8 percent. A well-matched recommendation, where the traveler profile aligns with the property profile across multiple dimensions, can achieve conversion rates of 75 percent or higher.

This is the business case for new data. Not just better traveler experience, though that matters. Better economics for hosts and platforms alike.

* * *

The Collection Challenge (Solved)

The obvious objection: collecting this data is hard.

Travelers don't want to fill out 400-question surveys before booking a hotel. Hosts don't have time to populate dozens of profile fields. Any system requiring extensive upfront input will fail.

This is the conventional wisdom. It's also wrong.

The assumption that comprehensive profiling requires lengthy forms reflects a failure of interface design, not a fundamental limitation. With a dynamic, non-linear approach, both travelers and hosts can complete their lifestyle preferences in under a few minutes.

The key is giving users control. No inference. No assumptions based on browsing behavior. No algorithms guessing what someone might prefer based on past bookings. The user directly selects their preferences across classifications, in whatever order makes sense to them, skipping what doesn't apply, drilling into what matters.

This approach produces cleaner data than inference ever could. A system guessing that a traveler prefers "Tranquil" ambience because they once booked a quiet property might be wrong. Perhaps that was a trip for a specific purpose. Perhaps their preferences have changed. Perhaps the booking was made by someone else. Inference introduces noise.

Direct user input, made frictionless through thoughtful design, produces signal.

The profile is also alterable at any time. Preferences shift. A traveler planning a solo contemplative retreat has different priorities than when planning a family celebration trip. A host renovating their property or shifting their target market can update their profile to reflect the change. The system stays current because the user keeps it current.

Real-time updates mean matching quality improves with every interaction, not through machine learning on aggregated behavior, but through explicit user intent.

The collection problem was never about traveler or host willingness. It was about asking the right questions in the right way.

* * *

What This Means for Travel Businesses

For platforms: the opportunity is differentiation through matching quality rather than inventory size or advertising spend. A platform that consistently delivers better-matched results earns traveler loyalty independent of price competition.

For hosts: the opportunity is visibility to the right travelers rather than all travelers. A property that clearly communicates "who it's for" attracts guests predisposed to love it and filters out those who would be disappointed.

For destination marketers: the opportunity is moving beyond "visit our region" campaigns toward "visit our region if you're this kind of traveler." Targeted messaging based on lifestyle alignment outperforms generic promotion.

For the industry overall: the opportunity is reversing the commoditization spiral that has compressed margins and homogenized experiences. When differentiation can be expressed in data, it can be valued in the market.

* * *

The Path Forward

The current standard gave us 18 dimensions. That was sufficient for getting properties indexed by search engines. It is not sufficient for matching travelers to experiences.

393 dimensions is not a final number. It's a demonstration that the design space is far larger than the industry has explored. More dimensions may be useful. Some may prove redundant. The point is that the ceiling assumed by current practice is artificial.

Travel businesses that continue optimizing within the 18-dimension constraint will continue competing on price and brand. Those willing to think outside the box, to collect new data, to build matching systems on expanded dimensions, will build competitive advantages that algorithms alone cannot replicate.

The data exists. The technology exists. What's required is the willingness to move beyond standards designed for a different purpose and build the data model that hospitality actually needs.

* * *

Mark Wray is CEO and Co-Founder of Travelese, developing next-generation traveler-host matching systems based on expanded lifestyle compatibility dimensions.