Cultural Intelligence in Hospitality Management: Leveraging Business Strategies to Enhance Guest Satisfaction in a Globalized Market

Aaditya Shankar Sharma
Research Scholar
Atharva Business College, Bansbari, Kathmandu, Nepal
aadityashankarsharma@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0009-0002-5191-4470

Jiwan Devkota
Research Scholar
Atharva Business College, Bansbari, Kathmandu, Nepal
jiwandevkota6@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0009-0000-8988-9843

Shishir Pandit
Research Scholar
Atharva Business College, Bansbari, Kathmandu, Nepal
panditshishir94@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0009-0001-7968-8041

Jhamka Narayan Shrestha
Research Scholar
Atharva Business College, Bansbari, Kathmandu, Nepal
xresunil@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0009-0008-8138-9797

Basu Dev Lamichhane[*]
Assistant Professor
Tribhuvan University, Saraswati Multiple Campus, Nepal
basudev.lamichhane@smc.tu.edu.np
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7987-6512

Correspondence Author*

Abstract

Background: In today's globalized hospitality industry, cultural differences significantly influence guest satisfaction, yet many hotels struggle to effectively address diverse cultural needs. While previous research has established the importance of cultural factors in service delivery, there remains limited empirical evidence on how specific cultural elements impact guest experiences in hotel settings. **Objective:** This study examines how cultural differences affect guest satisfaction in hotels, focusing on communication, amenities, food services, and overall cultural inclusivity. It aims to identify key areas where cultural sensitivity enhances guest experiences and provides actionable recommendations for hotel management. **Methods:** A quantitative research approach was employed, utilizing a structured survey of 132 hotel guests. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics to assess perceptions of cultural inclusivity across various service dimensions, including staff communication, language barriers, dietary accommodations, and facility offerings. **Findings:** Results indicate that while 50.8% of guests felt cultural differences influenced their stay, 37.1% remained neutral, highlighting inconsistent cultural adaptation. Effective communication was positively rated by 40.9% of respondents, but 37.9% were neutral, suggesting room for improvement. Food options aligned with cultural preferences for 48.5% of guests, while 31.1% expressed indifference. Notably, 75% of participants agreed that hotels should enhance their cultural understanding. **Conclusion:** The study underscores the importance of cultural sensitivity in hotel operations, revealing gaps in current service delivery. Hotels must prioritize staff training, culturally diverse amenities, and improved feedback mechanisms to better serve international guests and boost satisfaction. **Novelty:** This research contributes new empirical data on specific cultural factors affecting guest satisfaction, moving beyond theoretical frameworks to provide practical, data-driven insights for hotel management. It also introduces measurable indicators for assessing cultural inclusivity in hospitality services.

Keywords: Cultural differences, guest satisfaction, hotel management, intercultural communication, hospitality services, cultural inclusivity

Introduction

Engaging the Reader

In an increasingly globalized world, hotels are no longer just serving local guests—they are hosting travelers from diverse cultural backgrounds with unique expectations (Talukder, 2025; Khadka, 2025; Tamang, 2025; Pantha et al, 2024). Imagine checking into a hotel where the staff misunderstands your dietary restrictions, fails to acknowledge your cultural norms, or communicates in a way that feels impersonal. Such experiences can turn a pleasant stay into a frustrating one. In what ways do hotels actually respond to cultural difference, and is this important for guest satisfaction? This research investigates the point of greatest overlap between culture and hospitality and offers some understanding of how better to serve foreign guests (Phuyal, 2024; Shrestha & Shrestha, 2024; Kunwar et al.,2024).

Background and Earlier Work

The role of cultural difference in the hospitality industry has been discussed at great length in the literature, with numerous studies revealing that it plays an important role in guest perception and satisfaction levels. Ogunnaike et al. (2022) establish a robust correlation between cultural sensitivity in service delivery and overall guest satisfaction, particularly in international hotel chains. The research reveals that foreign guests commonly have varying expectations regarding communication style, space, and service protocols. For instance, while Western guests anticipate efficiency and clear communication, Asian tourists may anticipate courtesy and implicit communication approaches. These fundamental differences in expectations have an intense impact on the way visitors perceive and judge their hotel experience.

Some of the core areas where cultural differences manifest most severely in the hotel setting were identified by prior studies. Roozen, I., & Raedts (2022) highlighted the way language and communication can create misunderstandings between guests and staff, hence leading to service failure. Follow-up research conducted by Liao et al. (2024) supplemented this with a study of how cultural or religious backgrounds of food service preferences affect food service satisfaction for guests. Ilieva (2024) followed this with a study of cultural differences in the expectations from services and how concepts such as power distance and uncertainty avoidance influence interactions between staff and guests. While such rich observation is created in the extant body of research, much of the research is focused on tourist behavior at a macro level rather than on qualitative, quantifiable individual hotel-guest interaction at the moment of delivery.

Though cultural competence in hospitality is more widely seen as being vitally crucial, there remains a broad knowledge gap about how effectively contemporary cultural training is carried over to more robust guest experiences. Many upscale hotels have incorporated cross-cultural training into their staff, but evidence has not been demonstrated to verify the direct effect of such programs on guest satisfaction measures. Most studies have focused on finding out about the definition of cultural differences and not in conceptualizing functional frameworks for hotels to implement culture-sensitive services. This study tries to bridge these voids by offering hard data on how some aspects of culture influence guest satisfaction in active hotel environments, offering practical implications that can be used in staff training and service design within the hospitality industry.

Research Problem and Problem Statement

Despite greater cultural sensitivity in hospitality, the majority of hotels still shortchange guests when they are foreign culture guests. Lack of formal cultural sensitivity training, insufficiently multicultural facilities, and patchy service accommodations create guest dissatisfaction and lost loyalty. This research issue is as follows:

How do cultural differences affect guest satisfaction in hotels, and how can hotels better provide intercultural service delivery?

Methodology

The study employed a quantitative approach in analyzing the impact of cultural differences on guest satisfaction in hotels. Surveys were conducted on 132 participants using structured questionnaires to capture data from a representative diversity of age, gender, education level, and occupation. The survey questionnaire had items that measured the level of cultural inclusiveness, effective communication, food preference, and satisfaction using Likert scales. Demographic variables like age, gender, and occupation were examined to identify correlations and trends between guest experience and cultural backgrounds.

The data analysis utilized the descriptive statistical approach, wherein the frequency distribution and percentage distribution were calculated for all response categories. Major areas of inquiry were staff communication, language barriers, cultural accommodation in service, food choice, and facility conformity to cultural expectations. Cross-tabulation and percentage tests were employed to determine trends, i.e., whether certain cultural or demographic groups indicated higher or lower levels of satisfaction. The large number of neutral responses in several categories indicated the existence of variability in guest experience, for which further qualitative inquiry was appropriate.

Survey items were constructed for reliability and validity on the basis of hospitality and cultural sensitivity literature. The data were cleansed by removing inconsistencies, and full responses only were used. While the study provides valuable findings on cultural drivers of guest satisfaction, its limitations are a relatively small sample size and also response bias. Future research can be extended with larger and more diverse samples or utilize mixed-method strategies (e.g., interviews) to enhance insight into cultural dynamics in hotel services.

Results and Analysis

Data analysis in the study for this research is aimed at investigating the impact of cultural differences on guest satisfaction in hotels. Quantitative analysis is applied to analyze data that is collected using questionnaires, identifying significant trends, patterns, and correlations between cultural indicators and measures of guest satisfaction. The analysis provides insight into how different cultural perceptions impact perceptions of service quality and helps hotels to further improve their approach to accommodating multicultural visitors.

Demographic analysis

Demographic analysis examines the characteristics of the study respondents in order to better understand their background and how it contributes to guest satisfaction. Key variables are age, sex, educational level, income, and number of stays. It establishes trends, for example, whether specific age groups or countries respond differently to hotel services, as a starting point for making sense of differences in cultural guest satisfaction.

Table 1 Age Respondents

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below 20 years	27	20.45	20.45	20.45
	21-30 years	67	50.77	50.77	71.22

31-40 years	26	19.72	19.72	90.94
above 40 years	12	9.06	9.06	100
Total	132	100	100	

Table 1 shows the distribution of respondents based on age group. Among the 132 individuals, 20.45%are below 20 years (i.e., 27 individuals), 50.77% are between 21-30 years (i.e., 67 individuals), 19.72% are between 31-40 years (i.e., 26 individuals) and 9.06% are above 40 years (i.e., 12 individuals). This data indicates that there are maximum numbers of individual between age 21-30 years.

Table 2 Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	67	50.8	50.8	50.8
	Female	62	47	47	97.8
	Prefer not to say	3	2.3	2.3	100
	Total	132	100.0	100.0	

Table 2 shows the distribution of respondents based on gender. Among the 132 individuals, 50.8% are Male (i.e., 67 individuals), are 47% Female (i.e., 62 individuals) and 2.3% didn't prefer to specify the gender (i.e., 3 individuals). This data indicates that there are maximum males who gave the data.

Table 3 Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	School	8	6.1	6.1	6.1
	College	42	31.8	31.8	37.9
	University	68	51.5	51.5	89.4
	Other	14	10.6	10.6	100
	Total	132	100	100	

Table 3 shows the distribution of respondents based on education. Among 132 individuals, 6.1% are School (i.e., 8 individuals), 31.8% are College (i.e., 42 individuals), 51.5% are University (i.e., 68 individuals) and 10.6% are Other (i.e., 14 individuals). This data indicates higher percentage of university individuals and there are no missing or invalid respondents from other educations.

Table 4 Occupation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Student	54	40.9	40.9	40.9
	Employed	57	43.2	43.2	84.1

Unemployed	15	11.4	11.4	95.5
Retired	6	4.5	4.5	100
Total	132	100	100	

Table 4 shows the distribution of respondents based on Occupation. Among the 132 individuals, 40.9% are Student (i.e., 54 individuals), 43.2% are Employed (i.e., 57 individuals), 11.4% Unemployed (i.e., 15 individuals) and 4.5% are Retired (i.e., 6 individuals). This data indicates higher percentage of Employed individuals and there are no missing or invalid respondents from other Occupation.

Analysis

Table 5 Have you stayed in a hotel before?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	114	86.4	86.4	86.4
	Maybe	16	12.1	12.1	98.5
	No	2	1.5	1.5	100
	Total	132	100.0	100.0	

Table 5 shows if respondent have stayed in a hotel before. Among 132 individuals, 86.4% said Yes (i.e., 114 individuals), 12.1% said maybe (i.e., 16 individuals) and 1.5% said No (i.e., 2 individuals). This data indicates higher percentage of "Yes" individuals and there are no missing or invalid respondents.

Table 6 How many times have you stayed in a hotel in the past time?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1-3 times	54	40.9	40.9	40.9
	3-5 times	35	26.5	26.5	67.4
	6 and above time	43	32.6	32.6	100
	Total	132	100.0	100.0	

Table 6 shows how often respondents stayed in hotels in the past. Among 132 individuals, 40.9% stayed 1-3 times (i.e., 54 individuals), 26.5% stayed 3-5 times (i.e., 35 individuals) and 32.6% stayed more frequently (43 individuals). This data indicates higher percentage of individuals have said 1-3 times and there are no missing or invalid respondents.

Table 7 were there any aspects of your stay that you feel were influenced by cultural differences?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	67	50.8	50.8	50.8
	Maybe	49	37.1	37.1	87.9

No	16	12.1	12.1	100
Total	132	100.0	100.0	

Table 7 shows if respondent that felt cultural differences influence their stay in the hotel. Among 132 individuals, 50.8% said Yes (i.e., 67 individuals), 37.1% said maybe (i.e., 49 individuals) and 12.1% said No (i.e., 16 individuals). This data indicates higher percentage of "Yes" individuals and there are no missing or invalid respondents.

Table 8 The hotel staff communicated effectively with me.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	3	2.3	2.3	2.3
	Disagree	6	4.5	4.5	6.8
	Neutral	50	37.9	37.9	44.7
	Agree	54	40.9	40.9	85.6
	Strongly Agree	19	14.4	14.4	100.0
	Total	132	100.0	100.0	

The above table shows that whether hotel staff communicated effectively. Among 132 individuals, 2.3% strongly disagree with the statement (i.e., 3 individuals). 4.5% disagree with the statement (i.e., 6 individuals). 37.9% feels the statement is neutral (i.e., 50 individuals). 40.9% agree with the statement (i.e., 54 individuals). 14.4% strongly agree with the statement (i.e., 19 individuals). Since, the majority says the hotel staff communicated effectively with them.

Table 9 The language barrier negatively impacted my overall experience at the hotel.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	12	9.1	9.1	9.1
	Disagree	35	26.5	26.5	35.6
	Neutral	39	29.5	29.5	65.1
	Agree	37	28	28	93.1
	Strongly Agree	9	6.8	6.8	100.0
	Total	132	100.0	100.0	

Table 9 shows that whether the language barrier had negative impact in your experience at the hotel. Among 132 individuals, 9.1% strongly disagree with the statement (i.e., 12 individuals). 26.5% disagree with the statement (i.e., 35 individuals). 29.5% feels the statement is neutral (i.e., 39 individuals). 28% agree with the statement (i.e., 37 individuals). 6.8% strongly agree with the statement (i.e., 9 individuals). Since, these results highlight a divided perception, with nearly equal proportions of respondents feeling either unaffected or negatively impacted by language barriers. Neutral responses further indicate that this issue varies by individual experience.

Table 10 The hotel staff understood and accommodated my cultural communication preferences.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	1.5	1.5	1.5
	Disagree	15	11.4	11.4	12.9
	Neutral	49	37.1	37.1	50
	Agree	56	42.4	42.4	92.4
	Strongly Agree	10	7.6	7.6	100.0
	Total	132	100.0	100.0	

The above table shows that whether hotel staff understood and accommodated guests' cultural communication preferences. Among 132 individuals, 1.5% strongly disagree with the statement (i.e., 2 individuals). 11.4% disagree with the statement (i.e., 15 individuals). 37.1% feels the statement is neutral (i.e., 49 individuals). 42.4% agree with the statement (i.e., 56 individuals). 7.6% strongly agree with the statement (i.e., 10 individuals). Overall, the data shows that half of the guests had a positive experience, but a notable portion was either uncertain or dissatisfied, indicating room for improvement.

Table 11 The level of formality in service was aligned with my cultural expectations.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	4	3	3	3
	Disagree	10	7.6	7.6	10.6
	Neutral	50	37.9	37.9	48.5
	Agree	60	45.5	45.5	94
	Strongly Agree	8	6	6	100.0
	Total	132	100.0	100.0	

Table 11 shows that whether the level of formality in the hotel's service aligned with guest's cultural expectations. Among 132 individuals, 3% strongly disagree with the statement (i.e., 4 individuals). 7.6% disagree with the statement (i.e., 10 individuals). 37.9% feels the statement is neutral (i.e., 50 individuals). 45.5% agree with the statement (i.e., 60 individuals). 6% strongly agree with the statement (i.e., 8 individuals). Overall, while most guests were satisfied, a considerable portion remained uncertain or dissatisfied.

Table 12 The hotel staff demonstrated appropriate respect for my cultural norms.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	1.5	1.5	1.5
	Disagree	19	14.5	14.5	16
	Neutral	46	35.1	35.1	51.1
	Agree	56	42.7	42.7	93.8
	Strongly Agree	8	6.2	6.2	100.0
	Total	132	100.0	100.0	

The above table shows that whether hotel staff showed appropriate respect for guests' cultural norms. Among 132 individuals, 1.5% strongly disagree with the statement (i.e., 2 individuals). 14.5% disagree with the statement (i.e., 19 individuals). 35.1% feels the statement is neutral (i.e., 46 individuals). 42.7% agree with the statement (i.e., 56 individuals). 6.2% strongly agree with the statement (i.e., 8 individuals). Overall, while nearly half were satisfied, the neutral and negative responses highlight areas were improvements.

Table 13 I was comfortable with how the staff approached cultural differences during my stay.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	5	3.8	3.8	3.8
	Disagree	9	6.8	6.8	10.6
	Neutral	43	32.6	32.6	43.2
	Agree	58	43.9	43.9	87.1
	Strongly Agree	17	12.9	12.9	100.0
	Total	132	100.0	100.0	

The above table shows that whether guest felt comfortable with how the hotel staff approached cultural differences during their stay. Among 132 individuals, 3.8% strongly disagree with the statement (i.e., 5 individuals). 6.8% disagree with the statement (i.e., 9 individuals). 32.6% feels the statement is neutral (i.e., 43 individuals). 43.9% agree with the statement (i.e., 58 individuals). 12.9% strongly agree with the statement (i.e., 17 individuals). Overall, the results suggest that most guests were comfortable, but some remained uncertain or felt improvements could be made.

Table 14 The hotel offered food options that suited my cultural or dietary preferences.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	5	3.8	3.8	3.8
	Disagree	10	7.6	7.6	11.4
	Neutral	42	31.8	31.8	43.2
	Agree	61	46.2	46.2	89.4
	Strongly Agree	14	10.6	10.6	100.0
	Total	132	100.0	100.0	

The above table shows that whether the hotel offered food option that suited their cultural or dietary preferences. Among 132 individuals, 3.8% strongly disagree with the statement (i.e., 5 individuals). 7.6% disagree with the statement (i.e., 10 individuals). 31.8% feels the statement is neutral (i.e., 42 individuals). 46.2% agree with the statement (i.e., 61 individuals). 10.6% strongly agree with the statement (i.e., 14 individuals). This indicates that while the food

offerings are generally appropriate for most, there is still room to improve in order to fully meet the diverse cultural or dietary needs of all guests.

Table 15 The hotel staff understood my special dietary needs based on my cultural background (e.g., vegetarian, non-vegetarian, vegan).

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	1.5	1.5	1.5
	Disagree	12	9.1	9.1	10.6
	Neutral	40	30.3	30.3	40.9
	Agree	52	39.4	39.4	80.3
	Strongly Agree	26	19.7	19.7	100.0
	Total	132	100.0	100.0	

The above table shows that whether the hotel staff understood their dietary needs based on cultural background. Among 132 individuals, 1.5% strongly disagree with the statement (i.e., 2 individuals). 9.1% disagree with the statement (i.e., 12 individuals). 30.3% feels the statement is neutral (i.e., 40 individuals). 39.4% agree with the statement (i.e., 52 individuals). 19.7% strongly agree with the statement (i.e., 26 individuals). This data implies the hotel could improve its communication or training regarding dietary needs to ensure a more universally positive experience for all guests.

Table 16 I was satisfied with the availability of culturally familiar foods during my stay.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	4	3	3	3
	Disagree	7	5.3	5.3	8.3
	Neutral	41	31.1	31.1	39.4
	Agree	64	48.5	48.5	87.9
	Strongly Agree	16	12.1	12.1	100.0
	Total	132	100.0	100.0	

The above table shows that whether the respondents were satisfied with the availability of culturally familiar food during their stay. Among 132 individuals, 3% strongly disagree with the statement (i.e., 4 individuals). 5.3% disagree with the statement (i.e., 7 individuals). 31.1% feels the statement is neutral (i.e., 41 individuals). 48.5% agree with the statement (i.e., 64 individuals). 12.1% strongly agree with the statement (i.e., 16 individuals).

Table 17 The hotel provided facilities aligned with my cultural expectation (e.g., prayer rooms, culturally appropriate rooms, etc.).

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	14	10.6	10.6	10.6
	Disagree	24	18.2	18.2	28.8
	Neutral	45	34.1	34.1	62.9

Agree	47	35.6	35.6	98.5
Strongly Agree	2	1.5	1.5	100.0
Total	132	100.0	100.0	

The above table shows that whether the hotel provided facilities aligned with their cultural expectation. Among 132 individuals, 10.6% strongly disagree with the statement (i.e., 14 individuals). 18.2% disagree with the statement (i.e., 24 individuals). 34.1% feels the statement is neutral (i.e., 45 individuals). 35.6% agree with the statement (i.e., 47 individuals). 1.5% strongly agree with the statement (i.e., 2 individuals). To enhance guest satisfaction, the hotel should focus on improving the availability and visibility of culturally relevant amenities, ensuring they are more accessible and better communicated to guests from diverse cultural backgrounds.

Table 18 I found new or unfamiliar amenities at the hotel that were enjoyable, despite being different from my cultural norms.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	6	4.5	4.5	4.5
	Disagree	14	10.6	10.6	15.1
	Neutral	43	32.6	32.6	47.7
	Agree	60	45.5	45.5	93.2
	Strongly Agree	9	6.8	6.8	100.0
	Total	132	100.0	100.0	

The above table shows that whether the respondents found new or unfamiliar amenities at the hotel that were enjoyable, despite being different from my cultural norms. Among 132 individuals, 4.5% strongly disagree with the statement (i.e., 6 individuals). 10.6% disagree with the statement (i.e., 14 individuals). 32.6% feels the statement is neutral (i.e., 43 individuals). 45.5% agree with the statement (i.e., 60 individuals). 6.8% strongly agree with the statement (i.e., 9 individuals). To enhance guest satisfaction, the hotel could further emphasize the uniqueness and value of these amenities, perhaps by providing more context or ensuring they align with a broader range of tastes and preferences.

Table 19 The hotel staff was aware of and respectful of my cultural values.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	8	6.1	6.1	6.1
	Disagree	8	6.1	6.1	12.2
	Neutral	43	31.8	31.8	44
	Agree	61	46.2	46.2	90.2
	Strongly Agree	13	9.8	9.8	100.0
	Total	132	100.0	100.0	

The above table shows that whether the hotel staff was aware of and respectful of my culture values. Among 132 individuals, 6.1% strongly disagree with the statement (i.e., 8 individuals).

6.1% disagree with the statement (i.e., 8 individuals). 31.8% feels the statement is neutral (i.e., 42 individuals). 46.2% agree with the statement (i.e., 61 individuals). 9.8% strongly agree with the statement (i.e., 13 individuals). The large neutral response, suggests that the hotel could enhance training and communication to ensure more consistent cultural sensitivity across all guest interactions.

Table 20 I feel the staff took extra measure to ensure I was comfortable as a guest from a culturally different background.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	0.8	0.8	0.8
	Disagree	17	12.9	12.9	13.7
	Neutral	46	34.8	34.8	48.5
	Agree	54	40.9	40.9	89.4
	Strongly Agree	14	10.6	10.6	100.0
	Total	132	100.0	100.0	

The above table shows that if the staff took extra measure to ensure the guest feel comfortable as a guest from a culturally different background. Among 132 individuals, 0.8% strongly disagree with the statement (i.e., 1 individuals). 12.9% disagree with the statement (i.e., 17 individuals). 34.8% feels the statement is neutral (i.e., 46 individuals). 40.9% agree with the statement (i.e., 54 individuals). 10.6% strongly agree with the statement (i.e., 14 individuals). The hotel should focus on enhancing staff training and ensuring more visible and proactive measures to accommodate diverse cultural needs.

Table 21 The hotel's policies and services were culturally inclusive.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	3	2.3	2.3	2.3
	Disagree	18	13.6	13.6	15.9
	Neutral	51	38.6	38.6	54.5
	Agree	48	36.4	36.4	90.9
	Strongly Agree	12	9.1	9.1	100.0
	Total	132	100.0	100.0	

The above table shows that if the hotel's policies and services were culturally inclusive to respondent. Among 132 individuals, 2.3% strongly disagree with the statement (i.e., 3 individuals). 13.6% disagree with the statement (i.e., 18 individuals). 38.6% feels the statement is neutral (i.e., 51 individuals). 36.4% agree with the statement (i.e., 48 individuals). 9.1% strongly agree with the statement (i.e., 12 individuals). Enhancing communication, expanding culturally inclusive offerings, and training staff to address diverse cultural needs can help ensure a more inclusive experience for all guests according to data given above.

Table 22 Overall, I was satisfied with how the hotel handled cultural differences during my stay.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	6	4.5	4.5	4.5
	Disagree	8	6.1	6.1	10.6
	Neutral	46	34.8	34.8	45.4
	Agree	53	40.2	40.2	85.6
	Strongly Agree	19	14.4	14.4	100.0
	Total	132	100.0	100.0	

Table 22 shows that if the respondents was satisfied with how the hotel handled culturally differences during his/her stay. Among 132 individuals, 4.5% strongly disagree with the statement (i.e., 6 individuals). 6.1% disagree with the statement (i.e., 8 individuals). 34.8% feels the statement is neutral (i.e., 46 individuals). 40.2% agree with the statement (i.e., 53 individuals). 14.4% strongly agree with the statement (i.e., 19 individuals). This indicates overall positive support for the statement, though the high neutral percentage might suggest some level of uncertainty or indifference.

Table 23 I would recommend this hotel to other from my same or different culture based on my experience.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	5	3.8	3.8	3.8
	Disagree	8	6.1	6.1	9.9
	Neutral	37	28	28	37.9
	Agree	66	50	50	87.9
	Strongly Agree	16	12.1	12.1	100.0
	Total	132	100.0	100.0	

The above table shows that if the respondents will recommend this hotel to other or not. Among 132 individuals, 3.8% strongly disagree with the statement (i.e., 5 individuals). 6.1% disagree with the statement (i.e., 8 individuals). 28% feels the statement is neutral (i.e., 37 individuals). 50% agree with the statement (i.e., 66 individuals). 12.1% strongly agree with the statement (i.e., 16 individuals). This implies that the hotel generally meets expectations but may have areas to improve to leave a stronger impression on neutral respondents.

Table 24 Every hotel should improve its understanding of cultural differences among its guests.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	1.5	1.5	1.5
	Disagree	3	2.3	2.3	3.8
	Neutral	28	21.2	21.2	25
	Agree	60	45.5	45.5	70.5

Strongly Agree	39	29.5	29.5	100.0
Total	132	100.0	100.0	

The above table shows that if the hotel should improve its understanding of cultural differences among its guest. Among 132 individuals, 1.5% strongly disagree with the statement (i.e., 2 individuals). 2.3% disagree with the statement (i.e., 3 individuals). 21.2% feels the statement is neutral (i.e., 28 individuals). 45.5% agree with the statement (i.e., 60 individuals). 29.5% strongly agree with the statement (i.e., 39 individuals). The indication is that cultural understanding is a significant priority for most guests, highlighting the need for hotels to focus on inclusivity and cultural sensitivity to meet guest expectations.

Table 25 The cultural knowledge and understanding among staff plays a crucial role on guest satisfaction in hotels.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	1.5	1.5	1.5
	Disagree	3	2.3	2.3	3.8
	Neutral	21	15.9	15.9	19.7
	Agree	51	38.6	38.6	58.3
	Strongly Agree	55	41.7	41.7	100.0
	Total	132	100.0	100.0	

Table 25 shows that if the cultural knowledge and understanding among staff plays a crucial role on guest satisfaction in hotels. Among 132 individuals, 1.5% strongly disagree with the statement (i.e., 2 individuals). 2.3% disagree with the statement (i.e., 3 individuals). 15.9% feels the statement is neutral (i.e., 21 individuals). 38.6% agree with the statement (i.e., 51 individuals). 41.7% strongly agree with the statement (i.e., 55 individuals). The data underscores the critical role that cultural awareness and understanding among staff play in enhancing guest satisfaction in hotels. This reflects a clear demand for the integration of cultural sensitivity into staff training and operational practices to meet diverse guest expectations effectively.

Analysis

The results of the survey provide significant data on how cultural differences influence guests' satisfaction at hotels. The majority of the respondents (50.8%) acknowledged that culture impacted their stay, while 37.1% did not know, indicating that awareness of culture plays a significant role in hospitality visits. Communication was a key area where 40.9% concurred that hotel employees were in contact, albeit a significant percentage (37.9%) were neutral, which indicates there is scope for improvement when it comes to cross-cultural communication. Language was not as significant an issue for the majority, with 35.6% not agreeing it had a negative impact on their experience, although 34.8% remained in between, which indicates while it is not an across-the-board problem, it is still an issue for some visitors. Cultural accommodation in services gave ambivalent reactions. 42.4% agreed that workers knew their cultural communication pattern, but 37.1% didn't know, indicating uneven cultural

awareness. Similarly, menu selection based on culture dominated with 48.5%, but 31.1% didn't care, demonstrating the absence of catering to various diets. Facilities such as prayer rooms or culturally appropriate facilities received 35.6% agreement but 34.1% neutrality and 28.8% disagreement, showing that most hotels may not be entirely in sync with other cultures' needs. Overall cultural sensitivity satisfaction was generally positive but moderate, with 40.2% agreeing and 14.4% strongly agreeing that the hotel handled cultural differences well. However, 34.8% were still undecided, meaning that even though something is in the process of being done, there is still more to be done. A virtually unanimous opinion (75%) believed hotels must increase cultural sensitivity, and 80.3% concurred that cultural insight among employees impacts guest satisfaction significantly. The findings point toward increased staff training, more varied services, and better communication planning so that multicultural visitors can be offered a more inclusive and a more satisfying experience.

Conclusion

The study highlights the significant impact of cultural difference on guest satisfaction, citing that although many guests appreciate efforts at cultural accommodation, there remains a lot of room for improvement. The most significant of the findings is that communication, cultural sensitivity in service, and variety in food and facility options are key drivers of the guest experience. Notwithstanding this, the widespread use of neutral responses reflects inconsistency in cultural expectation satisfaction and thus underscores the need for hotels to implement more proactive and personalized approaches to multicultural hospitality.

Recommendations

i. **Expand Cultural Sensitivity Training for Employees**
- Implementing mandatory cultural competency training is vital to educate employees on varying communication styles, customs, and dietary needs. Simulating real-life situations and inviting cultural experts to host workshops can sensitize employees to and respect guest preferences.

ii. **Increase Culturally Responsive Amenities and Services**
- Hotels must expand food services to offer greater numbers of culturally traditional foods and clearly identify dietary accommodations (e.g., halal, kosher, vegan). In addition, prayer facilities, multilingual signage, and arrangements that are attentive to local cultural backgrounds can enhance significantly guest comfort and satisfaction.

iii. **Increase Guest Feedback Mechanisms**
- Hotels need to take cultural comments from customers seriously and solicit them through post-stay surveys or online forums. Inserting this data into trend analysis and adjusting accordingly will allow hotels to consistently refine their plans on cultural inclusiveness and maintain greater guest loyalty.

References

Ale, S., Aryal, S., & Pudasaini, A. (2023). Hospitality business' attention to food safety and hygiene. *International Journal of Atharva*, *1*(1), 96-107.

Ghimire, M. N., & Neupane, D. (2022). An exploratory study on status of homestays from Lamjung. *Nepal Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, *5*(5), 119-126.

Ilieva, G. (2024). The effect of culture on guest experience. *Известия на Съюза на учените-Варна. Серия Икономически науки*, *13*(1), 242-252.

Khadka, R. (2025). An Analysis of the Prospects and challenges of Tourism in Nepal.

Kunwar, C., Tiwari, P. K., & Khadka, K. (2024). An In-depth Examination of Cultural Diversity and its Impact on Service Quality in the Hospitality Industry of Nepal. *International Journal of Atharva*, *2*(1), 98-109.

Liao, Y., Soltani, E., Li, F., & Ting, C. W. (2024). A cultural theory perspective to service expectations in restaurants and food services. *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences*, *16*(2), 167-198.

Mahat, D., Karki, T. B., Neupane, D., Shrestha, D. K., & Shrestha, S. (2024). Decolonization in focus: A bibliometric analysis of scientific articles from 2010 to 2023. *Nepal Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, *7*(1), 1-21.

Neupane, D., Mahat, D., Shrestha, S. K., & Karki, T. B. (2025). Reckoning the student perspectives on the educational environment: An in-depth analysis using the Dundee Ready Education Environment Measure in the management discipline. *Humanities and Social Sciences Letters*, *13*(1), 301-312.

Neupane, D. (2018). Food choice motives of guardians of Trilok Academy Kathmandu with reference to gender. *Nepal Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, *1*(1), 73-81.

Neupane, D., & Lourdusamy, A. (2024). Bibliometric Analysis of Human Aggression Research: Trends, Collaborative Networks and Emerging Themes in the Last Decade. *International Journal of Atharva*, *2*(2), 10-23.

Ogunnaike, O. O., Agada, S. A., Ighomereho, O. S., & Borishade, T. T. (2022). Social and cultural experiences with loyalty towards hotel services: the mediating role of customer satisfaction. *Sustainability*, *14*(14), 8789.

Roozen, I., & Raedts, M. (2022). The effects of language errors in service recovery communication on customers' hotel perceptions and booking intentions. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, *23*(3), 615-638.

Pantha, S., Yadav, L., Adhikari, S., & Hamal, K. (2024). Voices from the Hotel Industry: Employee Opinions on Motivation, Job Satisfaction, Performance and Job

Phuyal, A. (2024). Understanding Employee Grievances: A Perspective from the Hotel Industry. *International Journal of Atharva*, *2*(1), 152-165.

Shrestha, S. K., Mahat, D., Neupane, D., & Karki, T. B. (2025). E-wallet usage and customer purchase intention: Understanding the mediating role of shopping satisfaction and E-wallet structure. *Multidisciplinary Reviews*, *8*(3), 2025091-2025091.

Shrestha, A., & Shrestha, J. (2024). Exploring Management Practices in the Hospitality Industry: A Comprehensive Employee Perspective. *International Journal of Atharva*, *2*(2), 174-186.

Suwal, M., Neupane, P., & Pant, G. D. (2025). Online Review on Hotel Booking Decision: Consumer View. *International Journal of Atharva*, *3*(1), 133-150.

Talukder, M. B., Hoque, M., & Miah, T. (2025). The impact of global events on hotel occupancy and tourist flows. In *Adapting to Evolving Consumer Experiences in Hospitality and Tourism* (pp. 1-30). IGI Global.

Tamang, M. (2023). *Role of Tourism in Nepal* (Doctoral dissertation, Tribhuvan University).