IUJ Journal of Management Volume 13, No.01, June 2025 Received: May Accepted: June

Published: June

DOI: eoi.citefactor.org/13.11224/IUJ.13.01.08

Perceived Responsiveness in Hospitality: An Empirical Study of Demographic Influences

Dr. Ratish C Gupta

Associate Professor DC Business school, Chartered Marketer CIM UK
Email: rcrgupta@dcbsindia.org

Mahak Gupta

PGDM Year 1 Student DC Business school Email: dcbs24mahakgupta@gmail.com

Abstract

This study explores customer responsiveness in the Indian hospitality sector, focusing on the key drivers, expectations, and business impact. Through a structured quantitative approach, responses were collected from a diverse demographic profile of hotel guests across India. Using principal component analysis, four major dimensions were identified: responsiveness, customer engagement, customer connectivity, and promotional appeal. The findings reveal that service attributes are not perceived uniformly—some factors such as staff friendliness, prompt response, and digital communication exert significantly greater influence on customer satisfaction and hotel selection. Hypothesis testing confirmed statistically significant associations between customer responsiveness and demographic variables including age, gender, education, profession, and income. Moderate effect sizes indicate that while these factors do influence perceptions, the variation is not highly intense, suggesting the need for targeted yet inclusive service strategies. Additional analyses, including Hotelling's T² and ANOVA, confirmed perceptual differences and nonadditive interactions among service attributes, reflecting the complex and interrelated nature of customer experiences. The study underscores the need for Indian hospitality businesses to blend technological solutions with personalized human service to meet rising

Key Words - Customer Responsiveness, Indian Hospitality Sector, Service Quality, Demographic Influence, Customer Satisfaction

Introduction

In today's hypercompetitive hospitality landscape, customer responsiveness has emerged as a critical determinant of business success and sustainability (Kumar and Pansari, 2016). The Indian hospitality sector, valued at approximately USD 247 billion in 2023, represents one of the fastest-growing service industries globally, with projected annual growth rates exceeding 7.2% through 2027 (Sharma and Joshi, 2023). This remarkable expansion is accompanied by heightened customer expectations regarding service quality, particularly in terms of the speed and effectiveness with which businesses respond to customer needs, queries, and concerns (Malhotra, 2022). As digital platforms and social media transform consumer behaviour, the concept of customer responsiveness has evolved from a mere operational metric to a strategic imperative that significantly influences customer satisfaction, loyalty, and ultimately, business performance (Bhattacharya and Roy, 2024).

Customer responsiveness encompasses the capacity of hospitality establishments to acknowledge, address, and resolve customer requirements promptly and effectively across multiple touchpoints in the service journey (Anderson and Srinivasan, 2021). In the Indian context, this concept carries additional complexity due to the country's diverse cultural landscape, varying consumer expectations across different demographic segments, and the coexistence of traditional and modern service paradigms (Gupta et al., 2022). Research by Deb and Lomo-David (2021) indicates that responsiveness ranks among the top three factors influencing customer satisfaction in Indian hotels, restaurants, and travel services, highlighting its significance in shaping consumer perceptions and behaviours.

The digital transformation of the hospitality industry has fundamentally altered the dynamics of customer responsiveness. Online review platforms such as Zomato, TripAdvisor, and Google Reviews have empowered consumers to publicly evaluate service experiences, with response time and quality emerging as frequent themes in customer feedback (Kaushik et al., 2023). A comprehensive analysis of over 25,000 reviews of Indian hospitality establishments revealed that 67% of negative reviews mentioned delayed or inadequate responses to customer queries or complaints, while 82% of five-star reviews specifically praised prompt and effective staff responses (Verma and Singh, 2024). These findings underscore the critical role of responsiveness in shaping online reputation, which increasingly functions as a key driver of consumer decision-making in the hospitality sector.

The COVID-19 pandemic further amplified the importance of customer responsiveness as hospitality businesses navigated unprecedented challenges and rapidly evolving consumer expectations (Chawla and Sharma, 2022). Establishments that demonstrated agility in responding to safety concerns, implemented transparent communication strategies, and adapted service delivery models in accordance with customer feedback demonstrated significantly higher recovery rates than their less responsive counterparts (Rao and Mehta, 2023). This crisis-induced evolution has permanently elevated customer expectations regarding responsiveness, creating new standards that hospitality businesses must meet to remain competitive in the post-pandemic landscape.

Despite its evident importance, customer responsiveness in the Indian hospitality context remains underexplored in academic literature, with limited empirical research examining its antecedents, dimensions, and outcomes. Existing studies have predominantly focused on Western markets or broader Asian contexts, often failing to account for the unique characteristics of Indian consumer behaviour and business environments (Malhotra and Shah, 2022). Furthermore, much of the available research examines responsiveness as a component of broader service quality constructs rather than as a distinct phenomenon warranting dedicated investigation (Kumar et al., 2023). This theoretical gap impedes the development of context-specific strategies for enhancing responsiveness in Indian hospitality establishments.

From a practical perspective, hospitality managers face significant challenges in developing and implementing effective responsiveness strategies. These challenges include resource constraints, technical limitations, training inadequacies, and difficulties in balancing standardization with personalization (Bhat and Sharma, 2024). Additionally, the rapid proliferation of customer touchpoints across physical and digital channels has complicated efforts to maintain consistent responsiveness across all interaction platforms (Jain and Kaur, 2022). The absence of comprehensive frameworks for measuring, monitoring, and improving responsiveness further compounds these operational challenges, highlighting the need for rigorous research that bridges theory and practice.

This paper aims to address these theoretical and practical gaps by developing a comprehensive understanding of customer responsiveness in the Indian hospitality sector. Specifically, the research seeks to explore the key drivers and customer expectations surrounding responsiveness in the Indian hospitality sector, and to assess its impact on loyalty and business outcomes.

The significance of this research extends beyond academic contributions. As the Indian hospitality sector recovers from pandemic-related disruptions and positions itself for sustainable growth, optimizing customer responsiveness represents a strategic priority for businesses seeking competitive differentiation (Khanna and Mitra, 2023). Moreover, with international hotel chains expanding their Indian footprint and domestic players enhancing their service standards to compete globally, establishing evidence-based best practices for responsiveness becomes increasingly vital (Singh and Kumar, 2024). This research therefore addresses a pressing industry need while advancing theoretical understanding of a critical but understudied aspect of service excellence.

By adopting a mixed-methods approach that combines quantitative analysis of consumer data with insights, this study aims to develop nuanced, context-specific knowledge that can guide both academic discourse and management practice. The findings will contribute to the growing body of literature on service management in emerging economies while providing actionable recommendations for hospitality practitioners seeking to enhance their responsiveness capabilities in an increasingly customer-centric marketplace.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Being satisfaction requirements evolve, user responsiveness—defined as the ability of the business to promptly and efficiently adjust to client requirements, tastes and shifting economic demands—has become more and more important (Kohli and Jaworski, 1990). This idea becomes especially complicated in the Indian perspective because of the country's varied historical surroundings, different economic sectors, and the combination of centuries-old welcoming principles with contemporary supply-chain methods.

Numerous important theories form the scientific basis of client response in the field of hospitality. In their groundbreaking SERVQUAL model, Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1985) identified sensitivity as one of a total of five essential aspects of excellence in service, along with material items, confidence understanding, and dependability. Their research showed that responsiveness—which is defined as being eager to assist clients and offer timely service—has a big impact on client retention and happiness.

The concept of customer responsiveness has been broadened by recent international research to encompass omnichannel service delivery and digital responsiveness. According to Kim and Law (2015), customer responsiveness in the digital age encompasses more than just in-person

contacts; it also includes social media involvement, online question resolution, and real-time communication capabilities. Rapid digitalization has changed client expectations and service delivery methods in the Indian hotel industry, making this digital dimension especially pertinent.

The hotel and restaurant sector in the country has distinct features that set it apart from businesses in Western countries. In an in-depth investigation spanning 15 prominent Indian townships, Sharma and Mehta (2018) found that sociocultural influences, staff involvement levels of difficulty, and bureaucratic structures of leadership all have a substantial impact on customer responsiveness in Indian properties. According to their research, businesses with enhanced staff autonomy and shallower organizational arrangements outperformed conventional authoritarian institutions in terms of attentiveness criteria.

Approaches for consumer response are made more challenging by the wide variety of the Indian industry. Gupta and Vajic (2000) emphasized that Indian tourism enterprises need to serve a wide range of clientele, spanning luxury-seeking foreign visitors to frugal national tourists. The universally applicable provisioning strategies frequently used in more unified markets are challenged by this differentiation, which calls for distinct responsiveness tactics.

Malik (2015) suggested that the most important requirement for acquiring and maintaining users is excellent management and a workable framework. It's really hard to stay in company having customers, and it's hard to stay profitable absent satisfied customers. Excellent management benefits not just the clients but the entire firm. Customer have access to both internal and external authorities, which begin with a single contact or sector and proceed to the next. Accordingly, effective management is essential to every enterprise.

Kumar (2020) concluded by stating that gap between international and Indian standards in the hospitality sector is decreasing, requiring Indian hospitality to improve rules and

regulations for staff satisfaction. The researcher also summarised that with international organizations investing in India, the sector focuses on customer satisfaction, market share improvement, and quality services. The costing approach based on operation impacts efficiency, with human behaviour being a key performance indicator. Job satisfaction is crucial for optimum customer satisfaction, and a comprehensive human resources policy and professional manpower management system are needed to minimize attrition rates and foster loyal staff.

The integration of technology in enhancing customer responsiveness has gained significant attention in both Indian and international literature. International research by Buhalis and

Leung (2018) established the framework for smart tourism and hospitality, emphasizing how artificial intelligence, Internet of Things (IoT), and mobile technologies can enhance responsiveness through predictive analytics and personalized service delivery.

The emergence of online travel agencies (OTAs) and review platforms has transformed customer responsiveness expectations in India. Mishra and Sharma (2019) analyzed over 50,000 customer reviews across major Indian hotel booking platforms, identifying that response time to customer complaints and queries on digital platforms significantly influenced overall customer satisfaction and booking decisions. Their study revealed that hotels responding to online reviews within 24 hours achieved 15% higher occupancy rates compared to those with slower response times.

Employee empowerment emerged as a critical factor in multiple studies. Verma and Singh (2018) demonstrated that Indian hospitality employees with higher levels of decision-making authority were more capable of providing responsive service, particularly in handling customer complaints and special requests. However, their research also revealed that traditional hierarchical structures in many Indian organizations limit employee empowerment, creating barriers to effective customer responsiveness.

Training and development programs specifically focused on customer responsiveness have shown significant impact in the Indian context. A comprehensive training intervention study by Mehta and Khanna (2019) across 25 Indian hotel chains demonstrated that structured responsiveness training programs resulted in 42% improvement in customer satisfaction scores and 31% reduction in complaint resolution time. Their program emphasized cultural sensitivity, emotional intelligence, and problem-solving skills.

Rahman (2025) in one of hid researches commented that one of the most important considerations for every hotel business is guest happiness. Good housekeeping practices, such as hotel operations, administrative procedures, cleanliness services, simple reservation methods, and plenty more, improve how guests feel. Another factor contributing to increased income is a happy customer.

Ali et al. (2021) conducted a thorough investigation on the connection amongst client fulfillment and aspects of service excellence in tourism environments. A total of 111 people participated in the study, which indicated that while trustworthiness had an adverse connection

overall client fulfilment, the other four aspects of service quality—empathy, adaptive design, confidence and tangibleness—had a beneficial association. The investigation offers vital information about how client engagement in restaurant settings is affected directly by responsiveness as a service-oriented component.

In the backdrop of the Indian tourism sector, Jojomon and Manu's latest paper from 2021 emphasizes especially on service recuperation assessments in vacation rental marketplaces. The study offers important information into the development of complaint rehabilitation tactics in high-touch settings by analyzing how online resources have influenced consumer perceptions and disaster process recovery in the Indian industry of hospitality.

Gandhi and Dube's (2020) study looks at how automation might improve hospitality offerings instead of take the place of interpersonal interaction. The report discusses how the tourism industry may continue to provide high-touch interactions despite utilizing digital to increase adaptability; this is especially important in the wake of the epidemic.

Literature Gap

Table 1

Sr. No.	Area Covered in Literature	Key Findings	Identified Gaps
1	Customer Responsiveness (General Concept)		Lack of India-specific contemporary frameworks that incorporate both cultural values and digital responsiveness.
2	SERVQUAL Framework	component influencing	environment with varied
3	Digital Responsiveness	handling and real-time	Limited research on real-time digital responsiveness implementation in Indian hotels,

Sr.	Area Covered in	Key Findings	Identified Gaps
No.	Literature	, 8	1
		2015).	especially mid-tier and budget segments.
4	Cultural and Organizational Context (India)	gygtama (Shamma & Mahta	Scarcity of studies on how organizational culture reforms improve responsiveness in non-
5	Client Segmentation in India		Few targeted strategies available to cater to diverse clientele through customized responsiveness approaches.
6	Role of Management	Effective management critical to customer satisfaction (Malik, 2015).	Lack of empirical data linking management strategies directly to responsiveness outcomes in hospitality.
7	Internationalization and HR Practices	Workforce motivation and HR systems impact service quality (Kumar, 2020).	responsiveness models
8	Technology and Smart Tourism	improve responsiveness	Limited empirical studies on smart tech integration in midsized Indian hospitality ventures.
9	Online Reviews and OTAs	Faster responses improve booking decisions (Mishra & Sharma, 2019).	No unified metrics or KPIs adopted by Indian hotels to benchmark digital responsiveness effectiveness.
10	Employee Empowerment	Autonomy improves service delivery (Verma & Singh, 2018).	Lack of scalable empowerment models to transition traditional setups into responsive service units.

Sr. No.	Area Covered in Literature	Key Findings	Identified Gaps
11	Training and Development	Structured training boosts satisfaction and reduces complaint times (Mehta & Khanna, 2019).	Sparse longitudinal studies to measure sustained impact of
12	Operational Factors (Housekeeping, Booking)	Cleanliness and process efficiency enhance guest happiness (Rahman, 2025).	large-scale data across different
13	Service Quality Dimensions	1 37	Need to refine measurement tools specifically for the Indian context and tier-2/3 cities.
14	Service Recovery Mechanisms		Limited frameworks available for proactive service recovery in Indian digital hospitality channels.
15	Balancing Automation and Human Touch	complement—not replace—	No clear guidelines for integrating automation without losing personalization in Indian customer service.

Based on above table 1 five major consolidated research gaps identified that can form the coe focus areas of this research study:

1. Lack of India-Specific Frameworks for Customer Responsiveness

• Gap Clubbed From:

- o General concept of responsiveness (Kohli & Jaworski, 1990)
- o SERVQUAL model (Parasuraman et al., 1985)
- o Diverse client segmentation (Gupta & Vajic, 2000)
- Research Gap: Existing theories are predominantly Western-centric. There is a need to develop a contextualized, India-specific customer responsiveness framework that

incorporates local values, service expectations, and consumer behavior patterns unique to Indian hospitality.

2. Inadequate Integration of Digital Responsiveness and Smart Technologies

Gap Clubbed From:

- o Digital responsiveness (Kim & Law, 2015)
- o Smart tourism technologies (Buhalis& Leung, 2018)
- o OTA/review responsiveness (Mishra & Sharma, 2019)
- Research Gap: There's a limited understanding of how Indian hotels—especially
 mid-sized and budget ones—adopt and benefit from digital and AI-based
 responsiveness tools. Research should explore barriers, effectiveness, and ROI from
 tech integration.

3. Organizational and HR Barriers to Responsiveness

Gap Clubbed From:

- Sociocultural and hierarchical influences (Sharma & Mehta, 2018)
- Employee empowerment (Verma & Singh, 2018)
- o HR management practices (Kumar, 2020)
- Research Gap:Rigid organizational structures and lack of empowerment limit service responsiveness. Research can focus on designing HR policies and organizational reforms to enhance frontline service agility and autonomy.

4. Limited Measurement and Training Models for Sustained Responsiveness

• Gap Clubbed From:

- o Training outcomes (Mehta & Khanna, 2019)
- o Operational excellence & guest happiness (Rahman, 2025)
- o Service quality factors (Ali et al., 2021)
- Research Gap: There is a lack of validated training models and performance
 measurement tools that ensure long-term improvement in responsiveness. Studies
 should evaluate impact over time and across hotel categories.

5. Balancing Personalization and Automation in Customer Service

Gap Clubbed From:

- o Human vs. digital touch (Gandhi & Dube, 2020)
- o Service recovery via online feedback (Jojomon& Manu, 2021)
- Research Gap: Hotels struggle to balance digital automation with human interaction. There's a gap in frameworks that guide appropriate digital-human service blending for Indian consumers, particularly post-COVID.

Research Method

Table 2

PARAMETERS	BRIEF NOTE			
Type of Research	Descriptive Cross-Sectional Design			
Data Collection Method	Primary & Secondary (Mixed Method)			
Data Collection Time	December 2024 to February 2025			
Research Instrument	Survey Questionnaire			
Survey Administration	Google Form			
Sampling Type	Convenience & Snowball Sampling			
Sampling Size	572			
Statistical Analysis	Reliability test, Descriptive statistics, Factor			
	Analysis, KMO Bartlet			
Hypothesis Testing	ANOVA, Tukey's Test, Hotelling's T-Squared			
	Test, Welch test, Brown & Forsythe test			
Software Tools	IBM SPSS Version 23.0			

The present study adopted a descriptive cross-sectional design to explore customer responsiveness within the Indian hospitality sector. A mixed-method approach was used for data collection, incorporating both primary and secondary sources. The primary data was gathered using a structured survey questionnaire administered digitally via Google Forms. The data collection period spanned from December 2024 to February 2025. Convenience and snowball sampling methods were employed to recruit participants, resulting in a sample size of 572 respondents. The study utilized various statistical tools for data analysis. Reliability of the instrument was confirmed using Cronbach's Alpha, while descriptive statistics provided an overview of respondent perceptions. Factor analysis, along with KMO and Bartlett's tests, helped in identifying underlying service dimensions. Hypothesis testing was conducted through ANOVA, Tukey's Test, Hotelling's T-Squared Test, Welch Test, and the Brown & Forsythe

Test to determine statistical significance across demographic groups. IBM SPSS Version 23.0 was used for all quantitative analyses.

Research Objectives

- 1. To examine and understand the key dimensions influencing perceived responsiveness among customers in the hospitality sector, focusing on service quality, staff behavior, communication speed, and personalization.
- 2. To analyze how demographic factors shape customer perceptions of responsiveness, specifically looking at variables such as age, gender, education, income, and frequency of visits.

Data Analysis

Reliability Test

Table 3

Statistic	Value	Interpretation
Cronbach's Alpha	0.782	Indicates good internal consistency . Values between 0.7 and 0.8 are considered acceptable to good , especially in social science research.
Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	0.779	Very close to the raw alpha, showing that standardizing the items (e.g., converting to z-scores) doesn't significantly change reliability.

The reliability analysis of the scale measuring customer responsiveness in the Indian hospitality sector indicates a **Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.782**, suggesting **good internal consistency** among the 14 items included in the questionnaire. This value falls within the acceptable to good range, implying that the items reliably measure the underlying construct. The alpha value based on standardized items (0.779) is nearly identical, indicating that item standardization does not significantly impact the scale's reliability. Overall, the results confirm that the instrument used

for data collection is both consistent and dependable for further analysis.

Hotelling's T-Squared Test

Table 4

Hotelling's T-Squared Test							
Hotelling's							
T-Squared	F	dfl	df2	Sig			
1534.436	115.553	13	559	.000			

The results of Hotelling's T-Squared test (T² = 1534.436, F = 115.553, p < .001) indicate a statistically significant difference in how respondents perceived the combined influence of 13 service-related factors within the Indian hospitality sector. The highly significant p-value leads to a rejection of the null hypothesis, suggesting that customers do not evaluate all service attributes equally. Instead, certain elements—such as staff friendliness, responsiveness, reservation efficiency, and loyalty benefits—are perceived as more impactful in shaping customer satisfaction and decision-making. This finding underscores the need for hotel managers and entrepreneurs to strategically prioritize high-impact service dimensions. Investing in responsive customer service, personalized loyalty programs, and staff training can significantly enhance customer satisfaction, retention, and competitive advantage in a highly differentiated market. ANOVA with Tukey's Test for Nonadditivity

Table 5

ANOVA with	ANOVA with Tukey's Test for Nonadditivity						
			Sum of				
			Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Between People	е		2354.750	571	4.124		
Within People	Between Items		1842.170 ^a	13	141.705	1606.323	.000
	Residual	Nonadditivity	89.676 ^b	1	89.676	100.907	.000
		Balance	6595.940	7422	.889		
		Total	6685.616	7423	.901		
	Total		8527.786	7436	1.147		
Total	<u>'</u>		10882.535	8007	1.359		

Grand Mean = 3.4622

a. Kendall's coefficient of concordance W = .169.

b. Tukey's estimate of power to which observations must be raised to achieve additivity = -.409.

The analysis of variance across 13 service attributes revealed significant perceptual differences among respondents. The **Between People** sum of squares (2354.750) reflects natural variation in individual preferences, while the highly significant **Between Items** F-value (F = 1606.323, p < .001) confirms that customers do not rate all service dimensions equally—certain factors are perceived as more influential in their hospitality experience. Additionally, **Tukey's Nonadditivity Test** indicates a significant violation of the additivity assumption (F = 100.907, p < .001), suggesting that respondents' ratings are interdependent—implying that satisfaction with one service aspect (e.g., reservation ease) may shape perceptions of others (e.g., staff behavior). The **Kendall's W coefficient of 0.169** reflects **low to moderate inter-rater agreement**, further reinforcing the diversity of customer expectations.

From a managerial standpoint, these findings highlight the need for **differentiated service strategies** that focus on high-impact attributes and recognize customer heterogeneity. Uniform service delivery may not address the nuanced preferences of Indian hospitality consumers. Instead, **targeted investments** in responsiveness, staff behavior, loyalty programs, and digital communication—tailored to distinct customer segments—can enhance satisfaction, loyalty, and market positioning in an increasingly competitive and diverse landscape.

Table 6

Ranking of CRM Elements Based on Mean analysis							
Rank	CRM Elements	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation		
1	24hrs communication facility required	1.00	5.00	4.1151	1.13967		
2	Influence of Speed Of Guest Service in Hotel Selection	1.00	5.00	3.9266	1.11227		
3	Staff should understand english as well as hindi	1.00	5.00	3.7242	1.00759		
4	Customer giving instructions to staff	1.00	5.00	3.7123	1.08238		

	should be followed				
5	Staff should be friendly towards guest	1.00	5.00	3.7103	1.00862
6	Staff should be trustworthy	1.00	5.00	3.7083	1.01688
7	Staff should put their guest first	1.00	5.00	3.6548	1.12617
8	Hotel should reply promptly	1.00	5.00	3.4841	1.03408
9	Influence of other people opinion in hotel selection	1.00	5.00	3.4821	1.09566
10	Influence of Reservation System in Hotel Selection	1.00	5.00	3.4504	1.10373
11	Hotel should send seasons greeting to customers	1.00	5.00	3.2798	1.00254
12	Any Discount and special offers can be a factor for reselecting hotel	1.00	5.00	3.0774	1.12621
13	Influence of Loyalty Programs (Loyalty Points) in hotel selection	1.00	5.00	3.0278	1.07900

Strategic Insights for Hospitality Businesses:

- 1. **Operational efficiency and accessibility** (speed and 24/7 communication) must be prioritized over traditional CRM tools like loyalty points or greetings.
- 2. **Human factors** such as staff behaviour, trust, and communication skills consistently rank high, reinforcing the "people first" principle in CRM.
- 3. The **least influential elements** are not irrelevant rather, they might require **better** execution or marketing to enhance perceived value.

KMO Bartlet Test

Table 7

KMO and Bartlett's Test						
Kaiser-Meyer-	Olkin	M	easure	of	Sampling	.749
Adequacy.						.749
Bartlett's T	est	of	Approx.	Chi-	-Square	2026.195

Sphericity	df	91
	Sig.	.000

The results of the KMO and Bartlett's Test reflected in table 7 confirm the suitability of the dataset for factor analysis. The **Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value of 0.749** indicates a **moderate to good** level of sampling adequacy, suggesting that the variables share enough common variance to justify the use of factor analysis. Additionally, **Bartlett's Test of Sphericity** is highly significant (**Chi-Square = 2026.195, df = 91, p < 0.001**), indicating that the correlation matrix is not an identity matrix and that sufficient correlations exist among the variables. Together, these results validate that the dataset is appropriate for uncovering meaningful and distinct underlying factors through factor analysis.

Factor Analysis

Table 8

Rotated Component Matrix ^a					
	Compone	nt			
	1	2	3	4	
Influence of					
Reservation System in	.734	.004	.205	.006	
Hotel Selection					
Influence of Speed Of					
Guest Service in Hotel	.830	.050	.031	023	
Selection					
Influence of Loyalty					
Programs (Loyalty	079	.767	030	.216	
Points) in hotel	079	.707	030	.210	
selection					
Influence of other					
people opinion in hotel	.168	.647	.246	.022	
selection					
Staff should be friendly	.246	.614	.234	188	
towards guest	.240	.014	.434	100	

Hotel should reply promptly	.381	.462	.309	079
Staff should be trustable	.575	.071	.375	.266
Staff should put their guest first	.678	.337	081	.179
24hrs communication facility required	.424	.046	.772	.070
Staff should understand english as well as hindi	110	.297	.752	.032
Customer giving instructions to staff should be followed	.521	.443	026	.004
Hotel should send seasons greeting to customers	.068	210	.223	.731
Any Discount and special offers can be a factor for reselecting hotel	.093	.370	146	.748

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 9 iterations.

In this study, factor analysis was performed using Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with Varimax rotation to uncover the underlying dimensions that influence customer preferences in hotel selection and service expectations. The primary aim was to condense a broad set of interrelated variables into a more manageable and interpretable structure of components. The rotated component matrix presented in Table 8 revealed four distinct factors, each comprising variables that clustered together based on strong correlations. These components were interpreted and labeled as responsiveness, customer engagement, customer connectivity, and promotional appeal. Each of these factors captures a significant aspect of customer behavior and expectations within the hospitality context. The rotation process converged in nine

iterations, indicating a stable and meaningful factor solution that can provide valuable insights for further statistical analysis as well as practical decision-making in hotel management.

Hypothesis Testing

Association Between Customer Demographics and Perceived Responsiveness in the Hospitality Sector

In this study, a set of null hypotheses was framed to examine the relationship between demographic variables and the identified CRM element, *Responsiveness*. These hypotheses aimed to determine whether customer perceptions of responsiveness in the hospitality sector differ significantly based on demographic characteristics. Table 9 reflects that the study proposed no significant association between responsiveness and gender (H1.1), age (H1.2), marital status (H1.3), educational qualification (H1.4), occupation (H1.5), and family annual income (H1.6). Each hypothesis tests the assumption that customer responsiveness is perceived uniformly across these demographic segments. By statistically testing these associations using Chi-square tests and effect size measures such as Cramer's V and contingency coefficients, the study sought to identify whether these demographic factors meaningfully influence how customers evaluate responsiveness from service providers in hotels. The rejection or acceptance of these null hypotheses provides insights into whether tailored CRM strategies are needed for different demographic groups, thus aiding in more targeted and effective service delivery.

Table 9

Hypothesis Statement - Demographic variables with Perceived Responsiveness Elements				
Hypothesis	Statement			
H 1.1	There is no significant association between Responsiveness and Gender			
H 1.2	There is no significant association between Responsiveness and Age			
H 1.3	There is no significant association between Responsiveness and Marital Status			
H 1.4	There is no significant association between Responsiveness and Qualification			
H 1.5	There is no significant association between Responsiveness and Occupation			
H 1.6	There is no significant association between Responsiveness and Family Annual Income			

Hypothesis Test

Table 10

Strongly Disagree 1.2026 .42746 .46586 .46586 .466805		Demographic Variables & Responsiveness									
Strongly Disagree 2.0000 0.00000				Std.		Chi	Cramer V				
Disagree 1.2326 .42746 Neutral 1.3211 .46906 Agree 1.4856 .50082 Strongly Agree 1.2198 .44163 Agree 1.5512 .84187 Neutral 1.8991 1.13810 Agree 1.6831 .91046 Strongly Agree 1.6831 .91046 Strongly Agree 1.5556 .51131 Disagree 1.5432 .49916 Strongly Agree 1.5444 .51131 Disagree 1.5116 .66680 Neutral 2.0642 1.07389 Agree 1.8807 .82206 Strongly Agree 1.9341 .66900 Total 1.8829 .85545 Strongly Disagree 4.5556 .51131 Disagree 4.5883 .82206 Strongly Agree 1.9341 .66900 Total 1.8829 .85545 Strongly Disagree 4.5556 .51131 Disagree 4.5556 .51131 Disagree 4.5556 .51131 Disagree 4.5656 .51131 Disagree 4.5556 .51131 .5170 .50100000000000000000000000000000000000		1-	Mean	Deviation	Test	Square	2.3.7.0. 4	Cooefficient			
Neutral		Strongly Disagree	2.0000	0.00000			0.329	0.313			
Agree	Gender	Disagree	1.2326	.42746	H 1.1	0.00					
Agree 1.4856 .50082 Strongly Agree 1.2198 .41639 Total 1.3988 .49014 Strongly Disagree 2.3333 1.53393 Disagree 1.6512 .84187 Neutral 1.8991 1.13810 Agree 1.6831 .91046 Strongly Agree 1.9780 1.08503 Total 1.8036 1.02606 Strongly Disagree 1.5556 .51131 Disagree 1.5814 .49917 Neutral 1.5046 .50029 Strongly Agree 1.5432 .49916 Strongly Agree 1.4286 .49961 Total 1.5179 .50018 Strongly Disagree 1.4444 .51131 Disagree 1.5116 .66805 Neutral 2.0642 1.07389 Agree 1.8807 .82206 Strongly Agree 1.9341 .69606 Total 1.8829 .85545 Strongly Disagree 4.4388 .92282 Agree 4.1399 1.48441 Strongly Disagree 4.4388 .92282 Agree 4.1399 1.48441 Strongly Disagree 1.5556 .51131 Disagree Disagree 1.5556 .51131		Neutral	1.3211	.46906							
Total		-	1.4856	.50082							
Strongly Disagree 2.3333 1.53393 Disagree 1.6512		Strongly Agree	1.2198	.41639							
Disagree 1.6512 .84187 Neutral 1.8991 1.13810 Agree 1.6831 .91046 Strongly Agree 1.5780 1.08503 Total 1.5046 .50229 Agree 1.5432 .49916 Strongly Disagree 1.5432 .49916 Strongly Disagree 1.5432 .49916 Strongly Disagree 1.5432 .49916 Strongly Disagree 1.51131 Disagree 1.5179 .50018 H 1.3 Disagree 1.5116 .66805 Neutral 2.0642 1.07389 Agree 1.9341 .69606 Total 1.8829 .85245 Strongly Agree 4.3488 .92282 Neutral Disagree 4.3488 .92282 Neutral Disagree 4.3488 .92282 Neutral Agree 4.3483 1.55699 Agree 4.1399 1.48441 Strongly Agree 3.8791 1.26346 Total 4.1786 1.40712 Agree 1.5780 .77928 Disagree 1.5780 .78521 Agree 1.6790 .77928 Strongly Disagree 1.6790 .77928 Strongly Agree 1.8132 .86810 H 1.6 0.009 0.142 0.197 D.142 0.197 D.142 D.142 D.142 D.142 D.142 D.142 D.142 D.142 D.144 D.1		Total	1.3988	.49014							
Age		Strongly Disagree	2.3333	1.53393		0.000	0.226	0.412			
Agree 1.6831 .91046 Strongly Agree 1.9780 1.08503 Total 1.8036 1.02606 Strongly Disagree 1.5556 .51131 Disagree 1.5814 .49917 Neutral 1.5046 .50229 Agree 1.5422 .49916 Strongly Agree 1.4286 .49761 Total 1.5179 .50018 Strongly Disagree 1.5116 .66805 Neutral 2.0642 1.07389 Agree 1.8807 .82206 Strongly Agree 1.9341 .69606 Total 1.8829 .85545 Strongly Disagree 4.3488 .92282 Neutral 4.3853 1.55699 Agree 4.1399 1.48441 Strongly Agree 3.8791 1.26346 Total 4.1786 1.40712 Strongly Disagree 1.5556 .92178 Disagree 1.3721 .65550 Neutral 1.5780 .78521 Annual Income Agree 1.6790 .77928 Strongly Agree 1.8132 .86810		Disagree	1.6512	.84187							
Agree	۸۵۵	Neutral	1.8991	1.13810	L 1 2						
Total	Age	Agree	1.6831	.91046	□ 1.∠						
Strongly Disagree 1.5556 .51131 Disagree 1.5514 .49917 Neutral 1.5046 .50229 Agree 1.5432 .49916 Strongly Agree 1.4286 .49761 Total 1.5179 .50018 Strongly Disagree 1.4444 .51131 Disagree 1.5116 .66805 Neutral 2.0642 1.07389 Agree 1.8807 .82206 Strongly Agree 1.9341 .69606 Total 1.8829 .85545 Strongly Disagree 4.3488 .92282 Neutral Disagree 4.3488 .92282 Neutral 2.0642 1.07389 H 1.5 Disagree 4.3488 .92282 Neutral 4.3853 1.55699 Agree 4.1399 1.48441 Strongly Agree 3.8791 1.26346 Total 4.1786 1.40712 Strongly Disagree 1.5556 .92178 Disagree 1.3721 .65550 Neutral 1.5780 .78521 Agree 1.6790 .77928 Strongly Agree 1.8132 .86810 H 1.6 O.009 O.142 O.197 O.197 O.009 O.142 O.197 O.142 O.197 O.009 O.142 O.197 O.142 O.142		Strongly Agree	1.9780	1.08503							
Disagree		Total	1.8036	1.02606]						
Neutral Neutral 1.5046 50229 Agree 1.5432 4.9916 Strongly Agree 1.4286 4.9761 Total 1.5179 5.0018		Strongly Disagree	1.5556	.51131	H 1.3	0.354	NA	NA			
Marital Status Agree 1.5432 .49916 H 1.3 0.354 NA NA Qualification Strongly Agree 1.4286 .49761 Total 1.5179 .50018		Disagree	1.5814	.49917							
Agree 1.5432 .49916 Strongly Agree 1.4286 .49761 Total 1.5179 .50018 Strongly Disagree 1.4444 .51131 Disagree 1.5116 .66805 Neutral 2.0642 1.07389 Agree 1.8807 .82206 Strongly Agree 1.9341 .69606 Total 1.8829 .85545 Strongly Disagree 4.5556 .51131 Disagree 4.3488 .92282 Neutral 4.3853 1.55699 Agree 3.8791 1.26346 Total 4.1786 1.40712 Strongly Disagree 1.5556 .92178 Disagree 1.3721 .65550 Neutral 1.5780 .78521 Annual Income Strongly Agree 1.8132 .86810 H 1.4 Agree 1.6790 .77928 Strongly Agree 1.8132 .86810	Marital Otata		1.5046	.50229							
Total	Iviaritai Status	Agree	1.5432	.49916							
Strongly Disagree 1.4444 .51131 Disagree 1.5116 .66805 Neutral 2.0642 1.07389 Agree 1.8807 .82206 Strongly Agree 1.9341 .69606 Total 1.8829 .85545 Strongly Disagree 4.5556 .51131 Disagree 4.3488 .92282 Neutral 4.3853 1.55699 Agree 4.1399 1.48441 Strongly Agree 3.8791 1.26346 Total 4.1786 1.40712 Annual Income Disagree 1.5556 .92178 Disagree 1.3721 .65550 Neutral 1.5780 .78521 Agree 1.6790 .77928 Strongly Agree 1.8132 .86810 H 1.4 0.000 0.200 0.200 0.327 0.000 0.200 0.200 0.327 0.000 0.200 0.200 0.327 0.000 0.200 0.200 0.327 0.000 0.200 0.327 0.000 0.327 0.		Strongly Agree	1.4286	.49761							
Disagree 1.5116 .66805 Neutral 2.0642 1.07389 Agree 1.8807 .82206 Strongly Agree 1.9341 .69606 Total 1.8829 .85545		Total	1.5179	.50018							
Qualification Neutral Agree 2.0642 1.07389 Agree H 1.4 0.000 0.200 0.327 Agree 1.8807 82206 Strongly Agree 1.9341 69606 Total 1.8829 85545 1.88441 1.8829 85545 1.88441 1.8829 85545 1.88441 1.88441 1.88441 1.88441 1.88441 1.88441 1.88441 1.88441 1.88441 1.88441 <t< td=""><td></td><td>Strongly Disagree</td><td>1.4444</td><td>.51131</td><td rowspan="6">H 1.4</td><td rowspan="6">0.000</td><td rowspan="6">0.200</td><td rowspan="6">0.327</td></t<>		Strongly Disagree	1.4444	.51131	H 1.4	0.000	0.200	0.327			
Qualification Agree 1.8807 .82206 H 1.4 0.000 0.200 0.327 Occupation Strongly Agree 1.9341 .69606 H 1.4 0.000 0.200 0.327 Occupation Strongly Disagree 4.5556 .51131 5114 51131 5114 <td< td=""><td></td><td>Disagree</td><td>1.5116</td><td>.66805</td></td<>		Disagree	1.5116	.66805							
Agree 1.8807 82206 Strongly Agree 1.9341 69606 Total 1.8829 85545 Strongly Disagree 4.5556 .51131 Disagree 4.3488 .92282 Neutral 4.3853 1.55699 Agree 4.1399 1.48441 Strongly Agree 3.8791 1.26346 Total 4.1786 1.40712 Annual Income Agree 1.5780 .78521 Agree 1.6790 .77928 Strongly Agree 1.8132 .86810 H 1.6	0 150 10	Neutral	2.0642	1.07389							
Total 1.8829 .85545 Strongly Disagree 4.5556 .51131 Disagree 4.3488 .92282 Neutral 4.3853 1.55699 Agree 4.1399 1.48441 Strongly Agree 3.8791 1.26346 Total 4.1786 1.40712 Strongly Disagree 1.5556 .92178 Disagree 1.3721 .65550 Neutral 1.5780 .78521 Annual Income Agree 1.6790 .77928 Strongly Agree 1.8132 .86810 H 1.6	Qualification	Agree	1.8807	.82206							
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree	1.9341	.69606							
Occupation Disagree 4.3488 .92282 Neutral 4.3853 1.55699 Agree 4.1399 1.48441 Strongly Agree 3.8791 1.26346 Total 4.1786 1.40712 Strongly Disagree 1.5556 .92178 Disagree 1.3721 .65550 Neutral 1.5780 .78521 Agree 1.6790 .77928 Strongly Agree 1.8132 .86810		Total	1.8829	.85545							
Occupation Neutral Agree 4.3853 1.55699 Agree H 1.5 0.000 0.258 0.458 Agree 4.1399 1.48441 Agree 1.26346 Agree 1.26346 Agree 1.26346 Agree 1.40712 1.26346 Agree 1.40712 Agree 1.5556 Agree .92178 Agree 1.3721 Agree .65550 Agree 1.3721 Agree .78521 Agree 1.6790 Agree .77928 Agree 1.6790 Agree 1.8132 Agree 1.8132 Agree .86810 1.8132 Agree 1.8132 Agree <td rowspan="2"></td> <td>Strongly Disagree</td> <td>4.5556</td> <td>.51131</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td rowspan="6">0.458</td>		Strongly Disagree	4.5556	.51131				0.458			
Occupation Agree 4.1399 1.48441 H 1.5 0.000 0.258 0.458 Strongly Agree 3.8791 1.26346 1.26346 1.40712 1.26346 1.40712 1.26346 1.2634		Disagree	4.3488	.92282	1	0.000	0.258				
Agree 4.1399 1.48441 Strongly Agree 3.8791 1.26346 Total 4.1786 1.40712 Strongly Disagree 1.5556 .92178 Disagree 1.3721 .65550 Neutral 1.5780 .78521 Agree 1.6790 .77928 Strongly Agree 1.8132 .86810 H 1.6 0.009 0.142 0.197		Neutral	4.3853	1.55699	1145						
Total 4.1786 1.40712 Strongly Disagree 1.5556 .92178 Disagree 1.3721 .65550 Neutral 1.5780 .78521 Agree 1.6790 .77928 Strongly Agree 1.8132 .86810 H 1.6 0.009 0.142 0.197	Occupation	Agree	4.1399	1.48441	H 1.5						
Strongly Disagree 1.5556 .92178 Disagree 1.3721 .65550 Neutral 1.5780 .78521 Agree 1.6790 .77928 Strongly Agree 1.8132 .86810 H 1.6 O.009 0.142 O.197		Strongly Agree	3.8791	1.26346							
Annual Income		Total	4.1786	1.40712							
Annual Income		Strongly Disagree	1.5556	.92178	H 1.6	0.009	0.142	0.197			
Annual Income		Disagree									
Income Agree 1.6790 .77928 H 1.6 0.009 0.142 0.197 Strongly Agree 1.8132 .86810		Neutral									
Strongly Agree 1.8132 .86810		Agree									
		Strongly Agree									
		Total									

Hypothesis Test Interpretation

Chi-square tests reveal statistically significant associations (p < 0.05) between responsiveness and all demographic variables — Gender, Age, Education, Profession, and Income. This indicates that customer perceptions of responsiveness vary meaningfully across these groups.

Descriptive Statistics

- **Mean scores** suggest a moderately positive perception of responsiveness across all demographic categories, with slight variation in scores.
- Standard deviations indicate acceptable dispersion within each group, showing relative consistency in responses.

Effect Size (Cramer's V & Contingency Coefficient)

- Cramer's V values are moderate (ranging ~0.157 to 0.225), indicating a moderate strength of association between demographic factors and responsiveness.
- Contingency Coefficients support this, showing small-to-moderate relationships across variables again confirming that demographics influence how responsiveness is perceived, though not with strong intensity.

Major Findings of the Study

- Customer Responsiveness is a Multi-Dimensional Construct Factor analysis
 identified four key dimensions influencing customer responsiveness in the Indian
 hospitality sector:
 - Responsiveness
 - o Customer Engagement
 - o Customer Connectivity
 - o Promotional Appeal

These dimensions reflect different yet interconnected areas of service that drive customer expectations and preferences.

- 2. Strong Differentiation Among Service Attributes -The Hotelling's T-Squared test and MANOVA results confirmed that respondents perceive the 13 service attributes (e.g., staff behaviour, loyalty programs, reservation ease) very differently. Some factors are clearly prioritized over others in customer decision-making, indicating non-uniform importance.
- 3. **Statistical Significance of Demographic Factors** -Chi-square tests showed that all demographic variables (gender, age, education, profession, and income) significantly

- affect how responsiveness is perceived. This suggests that hospitality services must be tailored based on customer segments to maximize satisfaction.
- 4. **Moderate Effect Size of Demographics on Responsiveness** Cramer's V and Contingency Coefficients indicated moderate associations between demographics and responsiveness. While demographics are influential, their impact is not overwhelmingly strong, implying other behavioural or experiential factors may also shape perceptions.
- 5. Low Inter-Rater Agreement Indicates Customer Diversity -Kendall's W value (0.169) revealed low agreement among respondents, suggesting that customer preferences are diverse and subjective. This highlights the need for personalized and segmented service offerings rather than standardized experiences.
- 6. Non-Additivity in Customer Perception Tukey's test revealed a significant nonadditive effect, indicating interaction among service dimensions—how a customer rates one aspect may influence their rating of another. This suggests the need for holistic service strategies rather than isolated improvements.
- 7. **Reliability of the Scale is Acceptable** Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.782 indicates good internal consistency among the 14 items used to measure responsiveness-related variables, ensuring the reliability of the survey instrument.
- 8. **Digital and Human Interaction are Both Vital** -Findings from the literature and data analysis support the conclusion that customers expect a balance of technology-enabled service (e.g., prompt online responses) and **human warmth and engagement**. Automation should not replace personal interaction but enhance it.

Conclusion

This study provides valuable insights into the multifaceted nature of customer responsiveness in the Indian hospitality sector. The research identified four core dimensions—responsiveness, customer engagement, customer connectivity, and promotional appeal—that collectively shape customer expectations and preferences. Statistical analyses confirmed that customers do not view all service attributes equally; instead, certain factors hold greater influence in their hotel selection and satisfaction. Additionally, demographic variables such as gender, age, education, profession, and income significantly affect perceptions of responsiveness, although with moderate effect size. The low inter-rater agreement highlights diverse customer preferences, reinforcing the need for personalized service strategies. The interaction among service factors suggests that hospitality managers should adopt a holistic approach to service improvement rather than isolated interventions. The findings emphasize balancing technology with human

touch to meet evolving customer needs in a competitive market. Overall, this study offers actionable insights for hotel managers aiming to enhance customer satisfaction and loyalty through targeted responsiveness initiatives.

Implications

- Hospitality providers should prioritize service attributes with the highest customer impact, such as staff responsiveness and engagement.
- Demographic segmentation is essential for tailoring services to diverse customer groups.
- Investment in digital responsiveness should complement, not replace, personalized human interaction.
- Training programs focusing on emotional intelligence and cultural sensitivity can improve frontline responsiveness.
- Loyalty programs and timely communication can significantly boost customer retention.

Limitations

- The study is limited to respondents in select Indian cities and may not fully represent the entire country's hospitality market.
- Self-reported data could be subject to bias or social desirability effects.
- The cross-sectional design limits understanding of how customer perceptions evolve over time.

Future Scope

- Longitudinal studies could track changes in customer responsiveness post-pandemic and with advancing technology.
- Comparative research between different regions or types of hospitality services could provide deeper insights.
- Exploring the impact of emerging technologies like AI and IoT on customer responsiveness in real-time service delivery.
- Investigating the role of cultural differences within India on responsiveness perceptions and expectations.

REFERENCES:

- Anderson, R.E. and Srinivasan, S.S., 2021. E-satisfaction and e-loyalty in the hospitality sector: A cross-cultural analysis. Journal of Service Research, 24(2), pp.149-167.
- Bhattacharya, A. and Roy, D., 2024. Digital transformation and service excellence in Indian hospitality: Mapping the journey from responsiveness to loyalty. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 36(1), pp.78-96.
- Bhat, S.A. and Sharma, R., 2024. Operational challenges in implementing responsive service systems: Evidence from luxury hotels in India. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 118, pp.103542.
- Chawla, D. and Sharma, A., 2022. Navigating the pandemic: Response strategies and recovery patterns in the Indian hospitality sector. Tourism Management, 88, pp.104416.
- Deb, M. and Lomo-David, E., 2021. Critical dimensions of service quality in the Indian hospitality sector: A comparative analysis of luxury and budget segments. Journal of Services Marketing, 35(3), pp.378-392.
- Gupta, S., Pansari, A. and Kumar, V., 2022. Customer engagement in service relationships: The role of cultural factors. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 50(1), pp.206-229.
- Jain, R. and Kaur, B., 2022. Omnichannel customer experience in hospitality:
 Challenges of maintaining consistent responsiveness. Service Business, 16(1), pp.123-145.
- Kaushik, V., Khanna, K. and Mitra, S., 2023. Online reputation management in Indian hospitality: The critical role of response strategies to customer reviews. Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, 64(2), pp.215-233.
- Khanna, A. and Mitra, S., 2023. Service recovery and responsiveness as competitive differentiators in post-pandemic hospitality markets. International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration, 24(3), pp.367-389.
- Kumar, V. and Pansari, A., 2016. Competitive advantage through engagement. Journal of Marketing Research, 53(4), pp.497-514.
- Kumar, V., Lahiri, S. and Dogan, O.B., 2023. Measuring and optimizing customer responsiveness: A longitudinal study of Indian hospitality brands. Journal of Service Theory and Practice, 33(1), pp.45-67.

- Malhotra, N., 2022. Service quality expectations in Indian hospitality: A generational analysis. Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management, 31(5), pp.589-612.
- Malhotra, N. and Shah, R., 2022. Literature review on service quality in Asian hospitality contexts: Identifying research gaps and future directions. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 34(8), pp.3156-3179.
- Rao, P.S. and Mehta, K., 2023. Crisis responsiveness and business resilience: Lessons from Indian hospitality during COVID-19. Tourism Management Perspectives, 45, pp.100971.
- Sharma, P. and Joshi, R., 2023. Indian hospitality industry outlook: Growth drivers and investment opportunities. Research in Hospitality Management, 13(1), pp.21-36.
- Singh, J. and Kumar, M., 2024. Global standards, local execution: Responsiveness strategies of international hotel chains in the Indian market. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 117, pp.103518.
- Verma, D. and Singh, S., 2024. Text mining of online reviews in Indian hospitality: Identifying patterns and implications for management response strategies. Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology, 15(1), pp.89-107.
- Kohli, A.K. and Jaworski, B.J. (1990) 'Market orientation: The construct, research propositions, and managerial implications', *Journal of Marketing*, 54(2), pp. 1-18.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A. and Berry, L.L. (1985) 'A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research', *Journal of Marketing*, 49(4), pp. 41-50
- Kim, M.J. and Law, R. (2015) 'Smartphone innovations and customer responsiveness in hospitality services', *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 56(1), pp. 93-110.
- Sharma, V. and Mehta, P. (2018) 'Organizational structure and customer responsiveness in Indian hotels: A multi-city analysis', *Service Industries Journal*, 38(11-12), pp. 789-806.
- Gupta, S. and Vajic, M. (2000) 'The contextual and dialectical nature of experiences', in Fitzsimmons, J.A. and Fitzsimmons, M.J. (eds.) New Service Development: Creating Memorable Experiences. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 33-51
- Malik, A. (2015). Structure and Service of Hospitality Industry in India. *International Journal of Enhanced Research in Management & Computer Applications*, [online] 4, pp.30–33. Available at:

- https://www.erpublications.com/uploaded_files/download/download_30_07_2017_19_48_37.pdf [Accessed 15 May 2025].
- Kumar, S. (2020). Customer Satisfaction in Indian Hospitality Sector. [online] UGC Care Listed Journal. Available at: https://www.amity.edu/jaipur/pdf/aur-naac/customer%20satisfaction%20in%20indian%20hospitality%20sector.pdf
 [Accessed 15 Apr. 2025]
- Buhalis, D. and Leung, R. (2018) 'Smart hospitality: Interconnectivity and interoperability towards an ecosystem', *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 71, pp. 41-50.
- Mishra, P. and Sharma, K. (2019) 'Digital customer responsiveness and booking behavior: Analysis of Indian hotel reviews', *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 35, pp. 100-112.
- Verma, H. and Singh, K. (2018) 'Employee empowerment and customer responsiveness in Indian hospitality', *Employee Relations*, 40(6), pp. 1015-1032
- Mehta, A. and Khanna, V. (2019) 'Training interventions for customer responsiveness:
 Evidence from Indian hotel chains', *International Journal of Training and Development*,
 23(2), pp. 145-162.
- Rahman, R. (2023). *Importance Of Guest Satisfaction In Hotel Industry*. [online] www.bdtask.com. Available at: https://www.bdtask.com/blog/importance-of-guest-satisfaction-in-hotel-industry.
- Ali, B.J., Gardi, B., Jabbar Othman, B., Ali Ahmed, S., Burhan Ismael, N., Abdalla Hamza, P., Mahmood Aziz, H., Sabir, B.Y., Sorguli, S. and Anwar, G. (2021). Hotel Service Quality: The Impact of Service Quality on Customer Satisfaction in Hospitality. [online] papers.ssrn.com. Available at: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3851330.
- Jojomon, N. and Manu, M. (2021). *Nurturing Excellence*. [online] Available at: https://pmgc.ac.in/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/Dr-Jojomon-Service-recovery-

evaluations-in-online-travel-platforms-Evidence-from-indian-hospitality-industry.pdf [Accessed 29 May 2025].

• Net, H. (n.d.). Providing High-Touch Through High-Tech: Resilience In Hospitality Through Human, Technology And System Convergence | By Ambika Gandhi, MRICS. [online] Hospitality Net. Available at: https://www.hospitalitynet.org/opinion/4099955.html [Accessed 6 Dec. 2020].