Revenue Management Analytics and Managerial Oversight Capability in U.S. Full-Service Hotels: A TOE Framework Analysis

***Salami Abdul Mohammed**

College of Business, Westcliff University, Irvine, California, USA

***Corresponding Author**

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100500003

Received: 28 April 2026; Accepted: 04 May 2026; Published: 21 May 2026

ABSTRACT

Revenue management analytics platforms are now widely deployed in U.S. full-service hotels, automating dynamic pricing, demand forecasting, channel optimization, and total revenue management. This paper examines the relationship between revenue management analytics adoption and managerial oversight capability in U.S. full-service hotel operations, arguing that the economic value of these systems depends critically on the analytical capability of revenue managers to interpret, govern, and override automated outputs, and that current organizational and environmental conditions are systematically failing to develop this capability at the required scale. The paper conducts a literature review of peer-reviewed research on hotel revenue management, human capital theory, and technology adoption, drawing on Human Capital Theory and the Technology-Organization-Environment framework to map five revenue management analytics domains and their oversight requirements, identify barriers to effective oversight, and propose a three-level reskilling framework with explicit implementation parameters covering cost, scalability, and operational feasibility. The principal findings are that barriers to effective oversight are organizational and environmental rather than technological. Revenue management platforms are deployed; the managerial capability to govern them is not. High staff turnover, data fragmentation, algorithm interpretability limitations, absent industry competency mandates, and margin-driven underinvestment are the specific constraints identified. The study situates its findings in the context of an industry generating a nominal record RevPAR of $101.82 [2], where the governance gap is attributable to organizational and environmental constraints rather than to any limitation of the deployed technology. The three-level reskilling framework is benchmarked against existing AACSB and HSMAI competency models and calibrated to operator scale. A proposed empirical validation design using cross-sectional survey methodology and hierarchical regression analysis provides a pathway to primary data confirmation of the framework's hypotheses.

Keywords: Revenue Management Analytics; Hotel Operations; Managerial Oversight Capability; Human Capital Theory; Technology-Organization-Environment Framework

INTRODUCTION

Revenue management has undergone a fundamental transformation in U.S. full-service hotels over the past two decades. What began as a set of structured pricing and inventory control disciplines carried out by trained revenue managers using spreadsheets and historical occupancy data has become, in the largest and most competitive hotel operations, a portfolio of AI-driven analytics platforms that set prices dynamically, forecast demand statistically, allocate inventory across distribution channels algorithmically, and optimize ancillary revenue streams in real time. The global hospitality revenue management and pricing analytics market was valued at approximately $4.1 billion in 2024 and is projected to grow at a compound annual growth rate of 12.6 percent through 2034, reaching $13.1 billion [5]. Within this environment, the hotel revenue management software segment alone was valued at $1.2 billion in 2024 and is forecast to reach $3.5 billion by 2033 at a 12.5 percent compound annual growth rate [13].

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume X Issue V May 2026

The consequence of this deployment trajectory is both an operational opportunity and a governance challenge. The operational opportunity is well documented: hotels deploying advanced revenue management system (RMS) technologies have reported average improvements of 15 to 22 percent in room revenue performance and up to 18 percent improvement in occupancy accuracy [1]. The governance challenge is less studied but equally consequential: the revenue managers responsible for overseeing these systems were trained, promoted, and hired in an environment where pricing, demand forecasting, and channel management decisions were made manually, not algorithmically.

This paper addresses the relationship between revenue management analytics adoption as the independent variable and managerial oversight capability outcomes as the dependent variable in U.S. full-service hotels. The central argument is that the deployment of analytics platforms is necessary but not sufficient for realizing their economic value. The analytical capability of revenue managers to interpret automated outputs, identify algorithm errors, execute justified overrides, and govern data use is the mediating variable that determines whether analytics investment translates into superior hotel performance.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the industry context and establishes the scale of RMS deployment in U.S. full-service hotels. Section 3 develops the theoretical framework. Section 4 reviews the peer-reviewed literature on revenue management analytics domains and their oversight demands. Section 5 maps barriers to effective oversight using the TOE framework. Section 6 proposes a three-level reskilling framework. Section 7 proposes an empirical validation methodology. Section 8 presents a discussion of findings. Section 9 concludes.

Industry Context: Revenue Management Analytics In U.S. Full-Service Hotels

The U.S. Hotel Market and Revenue Recovery

The U.S. hotel industry operates at a scale that makes the management of revenue performance a matter of national economic significance. Hotel market revenue in the United States was estimated at approximately $263 billion in 2024, with the market projected to reach $396 billion by 2030 [10]. Approximately 49,800 hotels and motels were operating in the U.S. as of 2024 [10], directly employing more than 2.1 million workers and paying a record of more than $123 billion in wages and salaries [2]. Total nominal hotel guest spending across lodging, transportation, food and beverage, retail, and other expenses reached $758.6 billion in 2024, nearly 5 percent higher than 2023 and approximately 24 percent above 2019 levels [2].

Revenue performance has reached nominal record levels. The American Hotel and Lodging Association (AHLA) reported that nominal RevPAR reached $101.82 in 2024, up 4 percent from 2023 and more than 17 percent above 2019 levels, with average hotel occupancy expected to reach 63.6 percent [2]. STR's performance data confirmed that 77 percent of global markets increased RevPAR year-over-year in early 2024 [11]. Table 1 below presents key verified industry statistics establishing the market context.

Table 1: U.S. Hotel Industry and Revenue Management System Market: Key Statistics (2024)

Metric	**Data Point**	**Source**
U.S. hotel market revenue (2024)	**$263 billion USD**	SiteMinder (2026)
Number of operating U.S. hotels (2024)	**Approximately 49,800**	SiteMinder (2026)
U.S. hotel direct employment (2024)	**More than 2.1 million**	AHLA (2024)
Total hotel guest spending: lodging, food, transport (2024)	**$758.6 billion**	AHLA (2024)
Nominal RevPAR, U.S. average (2024)	**$101.82 (record nominal high)**	AHLA (2024)
Average U.S. hotel occupancy (2024)	**63.6%**	AHLA (2024)
RevPAR year-over-year growth (2023)	**4.8% above 2022**	AHLA (2024)
Global hospitality RMS market value (2024)	**$4.1 billion USD**	Global Market Insights (2024)
Global hospitality RMS market CAGR (2025–2034)	**12.6%**	Global Market Insights (2024)

Projected global RMS market value (2034)	**$13.1 billion USD**	Global Market Insights (2024)
Hotel RMS software market value (2024)	**$1.2 billion USD**	Verified Market Reports (2025)
Projected RMS software market growth (2033)	**$3.5 billion USD at 12.5% CAGR**	Verified Market Reports (2025)
Hotels reporting increased RMS budget allocations (2024)	**More than 58%**	360 Research Reports (2026)
Revenue improvement reported by RMS-adopting hotels	**15–22% in room revenue performance**	360 Research Reports (2026)

Sources: AHLA (2024) State of the Hotel Industry Report; Global Market Insights (2024); Verified Market Reports (2025); SiteMinder (2026); 360 Research Reports (2026); STR (2024).

Figure 1 below illustrates the growth trajectory of the global hospitality revenue management and pricing analytics market, demonstrating the rapid expansion of technology investment that is reshaping revenue oversight demands for hotel managers.

Figure 1: Global Hospitality Revenue Management and Pricing Analytics Market: Verified Endpoint Values (USD Billion)

Year	Global Hospitality RMS Market Value (Source: Global Market Insights, 2024)
2024	$4.1 billion (directly stated in source) [5]
2034	$13.1 billion projected at 12.6% CAGR (directly stated in source) [5]

Source: Global Market Insights (2024) [5]. Note: Only values directly stated in the source are shown. Intermediate year projections were removed as they represent author-calculated interpolations not directly stated in the cited source.

Figure 2 illustrates the trajectory of U.S. hotel RevPAR and occupancy performance from the pre-COVID baseline through the 2024 nominal high, providing the operational context within which revenue management analytics are now deployed.

Figure 2: U.S. Hotel RevPAR and Occupancy Performance (Selected Years)

Period	Nominal RevPAR (USD)	Occupancy Rate	Data Status
2019 (Pre-COVID Baseline)	~$87.00 (derived: AHLA 2024 states 2024 RevPAR is 17%+ above 2019 levels [2])	65.8% (STR, as reported in industry sources)	Approximate: not directly stated in AHLA 2024
2023	$97.84 [2]	62.9% [2]	Directly stated in AHLA (2024) [2]
2024 (Record Nominal High)	$101.82 [2]	63.6% [2]	Directly stated in AHLA (2024) [2]

Sources: AHLA (2024) [2]. Note: $97.84 (2023) and $101.82 (2024) are directly stated in AHLA (2024). The 2019 approximate value is derived from the AHLA statement that 2024 RevPAR exceeds 2019 levels by more than 17 percent. The 2019 occupancy figure (65.8%) is sourced from STR industry reporting, not directly from AHLA (2024).

The Analytics Transformation in Revenue Management

The transformation of hotel revenue management from a human judgment-intensive function to an analytics-governed function has been underway since the early applications of yield management from the airline industry [7]. What has accelerated in the current decade is the sophistication, automation level, and data integration depth of deployed platforms. More than 58 percent of hospitality groups reported increased dependence on automated pricing tools in 2024 due to unpredictable booking patterns and seasonal

fluctuations [1]. Cloud-based RMS deployments represent approximately 58 percent of all global installations, reducing the capital barrier for mid-scale operators while expanding the analytics governance demands on their management teams [1].

Kimes [7], in a widely cited study drawing on a survey of 487 revenue management professionals, identified that the future of hotel revenue management would be substantially more strategic and technology-driven, with function space representing a new frontier and algorithmic pricing models having a major impact. The intervening decade has confirmed this trajectory. What the literature has not systematically addressed is the corresponding development of managerial analytical capability required to govern these systems effectively. Ivanov and Zhechev [6], in their critical review of hotel revenue management research, identified the RM team's analytical competency as one of the core elements of an effective revenue management system, noting that RM software helps managers by giving suggestions but also influences the decision-making process in ways that require analytical engagement to be productive rather than passive.

Theoretical Framework

Two theoretical frameworks organize this analysis. Figure 3 presents the conceptual framework mapping their application to the study's independent and dependent variables.

Figure 3: Conceptual Framework - Revenue Management Analytics Adoption and Managerial Oversight Capability

Dimension	**INDEPENDENT VARIABLE**	**DEPENDENT VARIABLE**
Variable	**Revenue Management Analytics Adoption**	**Managerial Oversight Capability Outcomes**
Components	• Dynamic pricing systems • Demand forecasting platforms • Channel optimization tools • Rate intelligence dashboards • Total revenue management platforms	• Ability to interpret algorithm outputs • Justified override capability • Forecasting error identification • Cross-department analytics communication • Data governance literacy
Theoretical Lens	TOE Framework [12]: Technology, Organization, Environment dimensions moderating adoption and capability development	Human Capital Theory [4, 9]: Investment in analytical skills generates returns to both manager and organization

Source: Developed by the author from Becker [4]; Schultz [9]; Tornatzky and Fleischer [12]; Nikopoulou et al. [8].

Human Capital Theory

Human Capital Theory [4, 9] provides the foundational economic rationale for treating revenue management analytical capability as a workforce investment with measurable returns. Becker's (1964) formalization of the theory established that investments in worker capabilities generate returns to both the individual and the employing organization. Applied to hotel revenue management, the theory generates a clear prediction: operators whose revenue management staff develop the capability to effectively interpret, challenge, and govern algorithmic outputs will generate superior performance outcomes, including RevPAR yield, occupancy accuracy, channel profitability, and ancillary revenue capture, compared to operators whose staff passively accept automated recommendations without analytical engagement.

The theory also explains why this investment is systematically underprovided in the current operating environment. In competitive labor markets with mobile workforces, employers bear the risk that training investment benefits a future employer. This mobility problem is particularly acute in hotel revenue management, where revenue managers frequently move between properties and chains, and where AHLA (2024) reported that more than 67.6 percent of survey respondents experienced staffing shortages in early 2024. The result is a structural underinvestment in analytical capability that is individually rational for each operator but collectively suboptimal for the industry.

Technology-Organization-Environment Framework

The Technology-Organization-Environment framework [12], applied to hospitality digital transformation by Nikopoulou et al. [8], explains the variation in analytical oversight capability across different hotel operating contexts. The technological dimension identifies the availability, sophistication, and interpretability of revenue management analytics systems and their oversight tools. The organizational dimension identifies internal capacity constraints: most full-service hotel operators outside the major branded chains lack dedicated revenue analytics teams, structured training programs, and the stable management workforces that make systematic capability development viable. The environmental dimension identifies the external pressures and incentive conditions shaping investment decisions: competitive pressure from analytically sophisticated major chains, the absence of regulatory mandates for analytics literacy, and margin pressure that prioritizes immediate cost reduction over capability development.

Together, these two frameworks explain the central pattern this paper documents: revenue management analytics adoption in U.S. full-service hotels is generating oversight demands that current organizational and environmental conditions are systematically failing to meet, despite the economic rationale for investing in the required capabilities.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Revenue Management Analytics Domains And Oversight Demands

Mapping the Analytics Domains

Revenue management analytics in U.S. full-service hotels operate across five distinct but interconnected domains. The oversight demands they generate vary by automation level, consequence of manager disengagement, and the specific analytical skills required to maintain effective governance. Table 2 maps these domains and their oversight implications.

Table 2: Revenue Management Analytics Domains and Managerial Oversight Demands in U.S. Full-Service Hotels

Analytics Domain	System Function	Performance Metrics Affected	Oversight Capability Required	Risk Level
Dynamic Pricing and Rate Intelligence	Machine learning algorithms continuously adjust room rates based on demand signals, booking pace, competitor rates, and event calendars	Revenue yield per available room; competitive positioning; ADR accuracy	Requires managers to interpret demand signals, evaluate algorithm rationale, and execute justified overrides when contextual factors are missed by the system	**Very High**
Demand Forecasting	Statistical and machine learning models process historical booking data, cancellation patterns, and external demand signals to project rental volumes by room type and time window	Inventory allocation accuracy; overbooking prevention; staffing demand calibration	Managers must evaluate forecast confidence intervals, identify model underperformance during anomalous events, and adjust inventory controls accordingly	**High**
Channel Optimization	Automated distribution management systems allocate inventory across OTAs, GDS, direct booking, and corporate channels based on commission cost, demand segment, and rate parity rules	Net revenue per booking; cost per acquisition; channel contribution margin	Managers must understand parity obligations, evaluate channel performance data, and govern rate integrity across distribution points	**High**

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume X Issue V May 2026

Total Revenue Management	Analytics platforms extending beyond room revenue to optimize food and beverage, spa, event space, parking, and ancillary services using demand and capacity data	Gross operating profit per available room (GOPPAR); ancillary revenue yield	Managers must interpret multi-revenue-centre dashboards and coordinate pricing decisions across departments	**Medium-High**
Customer Segmentation Analytics	CRM platforms and loyalty analytics segment guests by booking behavior, price sensitivity, preferences, and lifetime value to generate targeted offers and personalization recommendations	Revenue per transaction; customer lifetime value; loyalty enrollment rates	Managers must apply segmentation outputs appropriately, govern data use under GDPR and CCPA, and avoid compliance violations in offer targeting	**Medium**

Sources: Synthesized from Kimes [7]; Ivanov and Zhechev [6]; Nikopoulou et al. [8]; AHLA (2024); Global Market Insights (2024).

Dynamic Pricing and Rate Intelligence

Dynamic pricing represents the analytics domain where the gap between system capability and managerial oversight capacity is most consequential and has been most extensively studied. Kimes [7] identified dynamic pricing as the central strategic lever in hotel revenue management and noted that the future would be driven by analytical pricing models requiring managers to understand demand signals rather than simply accept rate recommendations. The progression she foresaw has materialized: hotels deploying AI-driven dynamic pricing tools reported revenue per available room improvements of 15 to 22 percent on average [1].

However, the value realized from these systems depends on the quality of human oversight. A revenue manager who cannot interpret a demand forecast cannot identify when the algorithm is pricing a high-demand event window below market rate, losing revenue that cannot be recovered after the booking window closes. A manager who cannot recognize that a pricing model is responding to anomalous data, a temporary competitor pricing error, an event that has moved, or a data quality failure in the property management system, cannot execute a justified override. Ivanov and Zhechev [6] documented that RM software provides suggestions on price amendments, but that how the revenue manager engages with those suggestions determines whether the system's analytical power is deployed effectively or passively accepted without scrutiny.

Demand Forecasting and Inventory Optimization

Demand forecasting platforms process historical booking data, cancellation rates, no-show patterns, lead time distributions, and external demand signals to project room demand by type, rate tier, and time window. The forecasting capability of modern hotel RMS platforms has expanded substantially with machine learning approaches. Ivanov and Zhechev [6] documented that demand forecasting is the analytical function most directly connected to the goal-setting and inventory control stages of the revenue management process, and that the quality of forecasting outputs determines the effectiveness of all downstream pricing and allocation decisions.

The oversight challenge in demand forecasting is that modern models generate confidence-interval predictions that require analytical literacy to interpret correctly. A manager who understands only the point estimate the single projected demand number without understanding the model's confidence range, the conditions under which it was trained, or the events it cannot capture, cannot identify when the model is systematically underperforming. During major events, anomalous weather, or competitor market exits, demand forecasting models calibrated on historical data can produce systematically incorrect predictions, and the value of human oversight lies precisely in recognizing and correcting these errors before they propagate into inventory and pricing decisions.

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume X Issue V May 2026

Channel Optimization and Rate Parity Management

Channel optimization analytics govern the allocation of room inventory across online travel agencies, global distribution systems, direct booking channels, and corporate accounts based on commission costs, demand segment characteristics, and rate parity obligations. The complexity of channel management has increased substantially with the proliferation of digital booking platforms, increasing the complexity of channel allocation decisions that revenue managers must oversee.

Managerial oversight in channel management requires understanding of rate parity requirements, commission cost structures, and the interaction between channel allocation and demand segmentation. A manager who cannot interpret channel performance data, cost per acquisition, channel contribution margin, segment distribution cannot identify when automated channel allocation decisions are favoring high-commission channels at the expense of net revenue yield. The regulatory environment, particularly under GDPR and CCPA, also creates compliance demands that require analytical literacy to navigate, as Nikopoulou et al. [8] documented in their analysis of digital transformation compliance requirements in hospitality.

Total Revenue Management and Ancillary Analytics

Total revenue management extends the analytics framework beyond room revenue to food and beverage, spa, event space, parking, and ancillary services. Kimes [7] identified function space as the new frontier of revenue management, and the intervening years have seen major hotel chains deploy analytics platforms designed to optimize gross operating profit per available room (GOPPAR) rather than RevPAR alone.

The oversight demands of total revenue management are qualitatively more complex than those of room revenue management, because they require managers to interpret multi-revenue-centre dashboards, coordinate pricing decisions across departments, and understand the interaction effects between room pricing and ancillary demand. A revenue manager trained exclusively in rooms-based yield management may have insufficient analytical foundation to govern these integrated systems effectively, creating oversight gaps that can reduce the profitability gains the technology is designed to deliver.

Toe Framework Analysis: Barriers To Effective Analytical Oversight

Applying the Technology-Organization-Environment framework of Tornatzky and Fleischer [12] to the revenue management analytics oversight problem reveals that the principal barriers constraining effective oversight are not technological but organizational and environmental. The analytics platforms required to generate value are deployed at most full-service hotel operators. The organizational architecture required to develop and sustain the human oversight capability is not. Table 3 maps the specific barriers identified across the three TOE dimensions.

Table 3: TOE Framework Analysis - Barriers to Effective Revenue Management Analytics Oversight in U.S. Full-Service Hotels

TOE Dimension	Barrier	Manifestation in Full-Service Hotel Operations	Severity
Technological	**Algorithm interpretability limitations**	Revenue management and demand forecasting algorithms at major hotel chains are often proprietary and insufficiently transparent. Managers cannot understand why specific pricing recommendations are generated, making meaningful oversight difficult even when analytical skills exist [6, 7]	**High**
Technological	**Data fragmentation across hotel systems**	Property management systems, channel management platforms, revenue management software, and CRM tools frequently operate in silos. Managers cannot apply analytical skills when the data environment prevents integrated visibility across demand, pricing, and inventory streams [8]	**High**

Organizational	**High staff turnover limiting training ROI**	Hotels experience significant turnover in revenue management roles. The mobility problem identified by Becker [4] applies directly: operators bear the full cost of analytical training while receiving only a partial return before trained staff move to competitors [2]	**Very High**
Organizational	**Analytics skill gaps among revenue management staff**	Revenue managers in full-service hotels were trained and hired in an environment where manual pricing and spreadsheet-based forecasting were the standard. The analytical capability required to govern algorithmic systems differs substantially from the skills developed in previous career stages [7]	**Very High**
Organizational	**Absence of structured analytics development programs**	Most hotel operators lack formal revenue analytics training programs for their operations staff. The AACSB [3] has identified analytics competency as a core business education standard, but this standard has not been systematically translated into operational training within hotel organizations	**High**
Environmental	**Absence of industry-wide analytics competency standards**	No regulatory body or industry association has established mandatory analytics competency requirements for hotel revenue management roles. Without external mandates, analytics training investment remains discretionary and vulnerable to budget pressure [12]	**High**
Environmental	**Competitive pressure asymmetry**	Major branded chains have invested substantially in analytics platforms and dedicated revenue management teams. Independent and smaller hotel operators face the oversight challenge without the internal resources to develop comparable capability, creating a structural disadvantage [8]	**Medium**
Environmental	**Margin pressure and cost-constrained training investment**	Full-service hotels operate with significant fixed costs from property, labor, and food and beverage operations. Margin pressure reduces discretionary capital available for workforce development, systematically underinvesting in analytics oversight capability [2]	**High**

Sources: Synthesized from Becker [4]; Tornatzky and Fleischer [12]; Kimes [7]; Ivanov and Zhechev [6]; Nikopoulou et al. [8]; AHLA (2024); AACSB [3].

Technological Barriers

The primary technological barriers to effective oversight are algorithm interpretability limitations and data fragmentation. Revenue management algorithms deployed by major hotel chains are often proprietary and insufficiently transparent. Managers receive rate recommendations or demand forecasts without access to the underlying model logic, making it difficult to evaluate whether the recommendation is appropriate to the current context or whether the forecast is reliable under current conditions. Ivanov and Zhechev [6] noted this challenge in their documentation of how RM software influences manager decision-making, observing that the recommendations themselves can substitute for analytical engagement when managers lack the capability to interrogate them.

Data fragmentation compounds the interpretability challenge. Property management systems, channel management platforms, revenue management software, and customer relationship management tools frequently operate without full integration, creating analytical blind spots that prevent managers from seeing the complete demand and pricing picture even when they have the skills to interpret it. Nikopoulou et al. [8], in their analysis of digital transformation barriers in hospitality, identified data infrastructure limitations as one of the primary organizational constraints on effective technology adoption.

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume X Issue V May 2026

Organizational Barriers

The organizational barriers are the most consequential constraints on effective oversight, and they reflect the structural dynamics predicted by Human Capital Theory. High staff turnover in revenue management roles is both the most pervasive and the most economically damaging barrier. AHLA (2024) reported that the U.S. hotel industry remained approximately 225,000 employees below its 2019 staffing levels despite three years of recovery [2], with ongoing staffing shortages continuing to constrain workforce development investment. The mobility problem identified by Becker [4] is directly operative: the operator who invests in developing a revenue manager's analytical capability to govern algorithmic pricing systems bears the full training cost, while the risk of that investment benefiting a competitor through staff departure is high.

Analytical skill gaps among revenue management staff reflect the cohort problem created by the pace of technology adoption. Revenue managers who entered the profession before the current generation of AI-driven RMS platforms were deployed were trained in manual yield management, spreadsheet-based forecasting, and rules-based pricing. The analytical capability required to govern machine learning demand models, interpret confidence intervals, and execute data-governed override decisions is substantially different from the skills that defined effective revenue management practice a decade ago. AACSB [3] has identified analytics competency as a core business education standard, but this standard has not been systematically translated into operational training within hotel organizations.

Environmental Barriers

The environmental barriers reflect the absence of external incentives that would drive individual operators to invest in analytics oversight capability development. No regulatory body or major industry association has established mandatory analytics competency requirements for hotel revenue management roles. Without external mandates, investment remains discretionary and vulnerable to the margin pressures that characterize full-service hotel operations. The structural reality is that full-service hotels operate with significant fixed costs, including property, labor, food and beverage, and capital expenditure, that constrain the discretionary budget available for workforce development even when the operator recognizes the value of analytics capability investment.

The competitive pressure asymmetry identified by Nikopoulou et al. [8] is also operative. Major branded hotel chains have invested substantially in centralized revenue analytics teams, proprietary RMS platforms, and structured training programs for their revenue management workforce. Independent and smaller full-service operators face the same analytics governance challenge without the institutional resources to address it at comparable scale, creating a structural disadvantage in the oversight capability competition that cannot be resolved through technology acquisition alone.

A Three-Level Reskilling Framework For Revenue Management Analytics Oversight

Based on the TOE analysis in Section 5 and the oversight demands documented in Section 4, Table 4 proposes a three-level reskilling framework for revenue management analytics oversight, calibrated to full-service hotel operators at different organizational scales and RMS deployment levels.

Table 4: Three-Level Revenue Management Analytics Oversight Reskilling Framework for U.S. Full-Service Hotels

Reskilling Level	Target Workforce	Core Competencies	Delivery Mechanisms
Level 1: Analytical Literacy	All revenue management staff: coordinators, revenue analysts, and department managers regardless of seniority	Reading and questioning outputs from RMS dashboards; interpreting demand forecasts and booking pace reports; recognizing anomalous algorithm outputs; understanding RevPAR, ADR, and occupancy as governed by the system rather than set manually	Revenue management system training integrated into onboarding; demand forecasting dashboard interpretation modules; rate intelligence briefing sessions

Level 2: Human-AI Collaboration and Override Skills	Revenue managers, area managers, and senior property managers at operators with fully deployed analytics platforms	Identifying when RMS pricing recommendations are contextually inappropriate; executing overrides with documented operational rationale; explaining algorithm logic to general managers and ownership groups; connecting signals across pricing, demand, and channel systems	Internal coaching by revenue management specialists; scenario-based simulation using live booking and demand data; structured case studies drawn from real override decisions
Level 3: Algorithmic Governance and Ethics	Regional directors, VP revenue management, operations directors, and corporate staff responsible for analytics oversight across portfolios	Evaluating RMS performance over extended periods; identifying systematic bias or data quality failures in automated recommendations; applying GDPR and CCPA data governance principles to personalization and segmentation analytics; making vendor selection and AI deployment decisions	Executive education programs aligned with AACSB [3] analytics standards; data governance certification programs; industry association governance frameworks

Sources: Framework developed by the author from Becker [4]; Schultz [9]; Tornatzky and Fleischer [12]; Kimes [7]; Nikopoulou et al. [8]; AACSB [3].

Implementation Feasibility: Cost, Scalability, and Operational Challenges

The three-level reskilling framework is designed with specific implementation cost, timeline, and scalability parameters calibrated to the operational realities of U.S. full-service hotel operators at different scales. Table 5 presents these parameters.

Table 5: Implementation Feasibility Parameters for the Three-Level Reskilling Framework

Reskilling Level	**Target Operator Scale**	**Estimated Cost per Property**	**Implementation Timeline**	**Key Operational Challenges**
Level 1: Analytical Literacy	All operators , independent and chain; 100+ rooms	$2,000 to $5,000 per property annually (onboarding integration + materials)	3 to 6 months for initial rollout; ongoing quarterly refreshers	High staff turnover requires continuous re-onboarding; time constraints on frontline staff limit training hours
Level 2: Human-AI Collaboration	Mid-scale operators (200+ rooms) with deployed RMS platforms; regional clusters of smaller properties	$8,000 to $20,000 per property annually (specialist coaching + simulation tools)	6 to 12 months for scenario library development and coaching program; ongoing case study updates	Scarcity of internal coaching specialists at mid-scale properties; difficulty sourcing live override case data; variable management buy-in
Level 3: Algorithmic Governance	Large branded chains (500+ rooms) and regional portfolio operators; multi-property independent groups	$25,000 to $60,000 per portfolio annually (executive education + certification programs)	12 to 24 months for full governance program deployment; board-level policy adoption required	Requires executive sponsorship; GDPR and CCPA compliance complexity varies by state and brand; vendor cooperation for algorithm transparency

Sources: Note: Cost ranges are illustrative order-of-magnitude estimates developed by the author. They are not drawn from verified primary cost data and should be treated as indicative parameters pending empirical validation. Framework structure sources: AHLA [2]; Becker [4]; Nikopoulou et al. [8]; AACSB [3].

Level 1: Operational Analytics Literacy

Level 1 establishes the non-negotiable baseline. Every revenue management staff member working with an AI-enabled RMS should be able to read utilization and demand dashboards, understand what a dynamic pricing recommendation means and what demand signal is driving it, evaluate a forecasting output for basic plausibility against observed booking pace, and recognize when a channel report indicates a distribution problem that requires intervention. This is not advanced data science training. It is the entry-level analytical literacy that effective oversight of deployed revenue management systems requires, and its absence at even the operational level creates the conditions for systematic errors to accumulate without detection.

The delivery mechanisms for Level 1 are primarily internal: revenue management system training integrated into onboarding, demand forecasting dashboard interpretation modules embedded in regular operations briefings, and rate intelligence sessions conducted by revenue management specialists for property teams. The investment required is modest relative to the oversight risk created by its absence. AHLA (2024) documented that the industry's ongoing staffing shortages make retention-oriented training investment a strategic priority as well as an analytical governance tool.

Level 2: Human-AI Collaboration and Override Capability

Level 2 builds the collaboration capability that research on AI adoption in hospitality identifies as the critical gap at the branch and area management level [8]. The ability to identify when a revenue management algorithm is generating contextually inappropriate pricing, override that recommendation with documented operational rationale, and communicate that reasoning to general managers, ownership groups, and revenue management centers represents the specific oversight function that AI-enabled hotel revenue management requires of its operational managers.

The practical challenge of override capability is that it requires both analytical understanding of the algorithm's logic and contextual knowledge of the factors the algorithm cannot capture, such as a conference that changed its dates, a competitor that temporarily closed for renovation, a leisure demand spike connected to a local festival that the model's training data predates. Building override capability requires scenario-based simulation using live booking and demand data, structured case studies drawn from real override decisions, and internal coaching relationships between senior revenue management specialists and property-level managers.

Level 3: Algorithmic Governance and Data Ethics

Level 3 addresses the governance and ethics dimension that becomes operationally significant at the regional and corporate management level. As hotel operators deploy RMS platforms that collect extensive customer data, generate algorithmic assessments of segment behavior, and make automated decisions affecting room allocation and pricing across hundreds of thousands of annual transactions, the managers responsible for overseeing those systems require the capability to evaluate whether the systems are functioning appropriately, identify systematic failures or biases, and ensure that data use complies with applicable privacy regulations.

AACSB [3] has identified data governance and analytics ethics as core competencies for business graduates operating in data-intensive environments. The translation of this standard into hotel revenue management governance programs requires executive education frameworks that address both the technical dimensions of RMS performance evaluation and the regulatory dimensions of customer data governance under GDPR and CCPA. The research on AI adoption barriers in hospitality documented by Nikopoulou et al. [8] identifies governance frameworks as one of the environmental enablers that can accelerate effective analytics adoption at the organizational level.

PROPOSED EMPIRICAL VALIDATION METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The conceptual and theoretical analysis developed in this paper generates a set of testable predictions that require empirical validation to establish the causal relationships between AI adoption, staff analytical

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume X Issue V May 2026

capability, and labor productivity outcomes in U.S. full-service hotel operations. The proposed validation design follows a two-phase approach: a cross-sectional survey of hotel revenue management professionals to measure adoption levels and oversight capability, followed by a regression analysis linking self-reported capability measures to objectively available hotel performance indicators.

Phase 1 proposes a structured survey instrument administered to revenue managers, area managers, and vice presidents of revenue management at a stratified sample of at least 300 U.S. full-service hotel properties, stratified by property scale (under 200 rooms, 200 to 400 rooms, and over 400 rooms) and affiliation type (branded chain versus independent). The survey would measure AI adoption level using a composite index of deployed analytics domains, adoption stage, and annual AI investment intensity as a percentage of total technology budget. Oversight capability would be measured using a validated multi-item scale covering dashboard interpretation proficiency, override decision confidence, algorithm error identification ability, and data governance awareness, drawing on established competency assessment frameworks aligned with AACSB [3] analytics standards.

Analytical Approach

Phase 2 would use hierarchical multiple regression to test the five hypotheses developed from the conceptual framework. The dependent variable of labor productivity would be operationalized as revenue per labor hour, using reported RevPAR performance and STR competitive index scores matched to survey respondents' properties. Staff analytical capability would be entered as a moderating variable in the second regression block to test whether it strengthens the AI adoption-productivity relationship as predicted by Human Capital Theory [4, 9]. Property scale and market segment would serve as control variables.

As a complement to the survey design, a multiple case study of four to six full-service hotel properties representing different positions on the AI adoption and oversight capability axes would provide qualitative depth. Case study data would include structured interviews with revenue managers, documentation review of override decision logs, and analysis of RMS performance audit reports. The case study design would test whether the TOE barriers identified in Table 3 manifest in the specific patterns predicted by the theoretical framework, and whether the three-level reskilling interventions generate the oversight capability improvements the model predicts. Together, these two validation phases would transform the conceptual framework into an empirically grounded theory of AI-enabled revenue management governance in U.S. full-service hotels.

DISCUSSION

This paper addresses four questions raised by the gap between AI deployment and managerial oversight capability in U.S. full-service hotel revenue management. Each finding carries implications for hotel operators, industry associations, and researchers that are directly linked to measurable performance outcomes.

First, the oversight gap produces a quantifiable revenue loss. Hotels deploying RMS technologies without adequate managerial oversight capability leave documented performance gains unrealized. The 15 to 22 percent room revenue improvement reported by RMS-adopting hotels [1] represents the upper bound of the performance distribution. Properties operating with analytical oversight deficits, where managers passively accept algorithmic recommendations without interpretation or override, capture only a fraction of this gain. For an industry generating a nominal record RevPAR of $101.82 [2] across more than 49,800 properties [10], the aggregate revenue foregone through suboptimal analytics governance is substantial, though its precise magnitude requires the empirical validation proposed in Section 7.

Second, the TOE framework analysis confirms and extends Nikopoulou et al.'s [8] finding that organizational and environmental dimensions dominate adoption effectiveness. Their survey of 502 hoteliers found digital maturity and financial resource availability as primary adoption determinants [8]. This paper extends that finding to the governance dimension: the same organizational constraints that limit adoption also limit the development of oversight capability after deployment. Deployment and governance are distinct investment problems with distinct failure modes, requiring operators to address both in sequence rather than treating platform acquisition as the terminal investment.

Third, comparing the three-level reskilling framework with analogous models in the hospitality and management literature reveals a distinctive contribution. Existing hospitality training frameworks, such as the competency-based models embedded in AACSB [3] accreditation standards and the revenue management professional certification programs offered by HSMAI, address analytical skills at the individual career level rather than at the organizational oversight governance level. The three-level framework proposed here differs by being calibrated to the organizational governance problem of AI oversight, not to individual career development, and by being sequenced to the deployment depth of the specific analytics platforms the operator has deployed. Where Ivanov and Zhechev [6] identified analytical competency as a system-level requirement without specifying a development pathway, and where Kimes [7] identified the need for strategic analytical capability without addressing the organizational architecture for building it, this paper provides that architecture in directly implementable form.

Fourth, the coordination failure documented through the Human Capital Theory lens has measurable industry-wide consequences. If the training investment problem cannot be solved at the individual operator level because of staff mobility, the aggregate productivity loss to the U.S. hotel industry from analytics oversight deficits is substantial. With RevPAR projected to continue growing and AI-driven RMS platforms becoming the industry standard, the systematic gap between platform capability and manager oversight capability represents a national-scale human capital allocation failure in an industry that directly employs 2.1 million workers and generates $123 billion in annual wages [2]. Hotel associations, workforce development agencies, and the U.S. hospitality management education sector all have institutional roles in addressing this failure that go beyond what individual operators can accomplish in isolation.

CONCLUSION

This systematic review examined the relationship between revenue management analytics adoption as the independent variable and managerial oversight capability outcomes as the dependent variable in U.S. full-service hotels. Four conclusions stand out.

Revenue management analytics adoption in U.S. full-service hotels is generating specific and consequential oversight demands across five domains: dynamic pricing and rate intelligence, demand forecasting and inventory optimization, channel optimization, total revenue management, and customer segmentation analytics. In each domain, this paper has documented the specific analytical competency required for effective oversight and the specific revenue failure that occurs when that competency is absent. The highest-risk domains are dynamic pricing and demand forecasting, where automation levels are highest and the operational consequence of manager disengagement is irreversible revenue loss.

The barriers to effective analytical oversight are organizational and environmental rather than technological. The revenue management platforms are deployed. The managerial capability to govern them is not being developed at the speed or scale that effective governance demands. High staff turnover, data fragmentation across hotel systems, algorithm interpretability limitations, absent industry competency mandates, and margin-driven underinvestment in training are the specific constraints that a coordinated industry response must address.

The progressive widening of the gap between analytics deployment and oversight capability in hotel revenue management is not a technology problem. It is a human capital investment problem, predictable from first principles by Human Capital Theory [4, 9] and explicable by the organizational and environmental barriers mapped by the TOE framework [12, 8]. The economic case for closing this gap is strong: hotels deploying RMS technologies have reported 15 to 22 percent improvements in room revenue performance [1], but realizing and sustaining these gains requires the managerial capability to recognize when the system is wrong, not only when it is right.

The three-level reskilling framework proposed provides a practical, sequenced pathway from baseline revenue analytics literacy through human-AI collaboration skills to algorithmic governance capability. Future empirical research should assess the relationship between measurable revenue management oversight capability levels and RevPAR, GOPPAR, and channel profitability outcomes, with particular attention to the performance

differential between operators with structured oversight capability development programs and those relying on passive system adoption.

Declarations

Use of AI Technology: The author used Claude (Anthropic) to assist with drafting, structural editing, reference verification, and language revision during the preparation of this manuscript. All content, arguments, citations, and conclusions were reviewed and verified by the author. The author takes full responsibility for the integrity of the work.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Human Participants: This research did not involve human participants. No informed consent declaration is required.

REFERENCES

1. 360 Research Reports. (2026). Hotel revenue management system market. 360 Research Reports. https://www.360researchreports.com/market-reports/hotel-revenue-management-system-market-208889
2. American Hotel and Lodging Association (AHLA). (2024). 2024 state of the hotel industry report. American Hotel and Lodging Association. https://www.ahla.com/sites/default/files/SOTI.2024.Final_.Draft_.v4.pdf
3. Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). (2020). 2020 guiding principles and standards for business accreditation. AACSB International. https://www.aacsb.edu/-/media/documents/accreditation/2020-aacsb-business-accreditation-standards-june-2023.pdf
4. Becker, G. S. (1964). Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education. University of Chicago Press.
5. Global Market Insights. (2024). Hospitality revenue management and pricing analytics market. Global Market Insights. https://www.gminsights.com/industry-analysis/hospitality-revenue-management-and-pricing-analytics-market
6. Ivanov, S., & Zhechev, V. (2012). Hotel revenue management: A critical literature review. Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal, 60(2), 175–197.
7. Kimes, S. E. (2011). The future of hotel revenue management. Journal of Revenue and Pricing Management, 10(1), 62–72.
8. Nikopoulou, M., Kourouthanassis, P., Chasapi, G., Pateli, A., & Mylonas, N. (2023). Determinants of digital transformation in the hospitality industry: Technological, organizational, and environmental drivers. Sustainability, 15(3), 2736. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15032736
9. Schultz, T. W. (1961). Investment in human capital. American Economic Review, 51(1), 1–17. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1818907
10. SiteMinder. (2026). Top hotel industry statistics: Guide for hotels in 2026. SiteMinder. https://www.siteminder.com/r/hotel-industry-statistics/
11. STR. (2024). Weekly insights on global hotel industry performance (multiple reports, January–September 2024). STR Global. https://www.hotelnewsresource.com
12. Tornatzky, L. G., & Fleischer, M. (1990). The processes of technological innovation. Lexington Books.
13. Verified Market Reports. (2025). Hotel revenue management software market. Verified Market Reports. https://www.verifiedmarketreports.com/product/hotel-revenue-management-software-market/