

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7546/PsyRB.2025.28.02.01>



This is Open Access article under the
Creative Commons Attribution 4.0
International License.

PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH (IN THE BALKANS)

<http://journalofpsychology.org>

E-mail: psy_research@abv.bg

Volume 28, No 2, 2025, 107-118

SERVICE BEYOND BORDERS: A CROSS-CULTURAL ANALYSIS OF QUALITY PERCEPTION IN HOSPITALITY

Galina Ilieva
Georgina Lukanova

Department of Economics and Organization of Tourism
University of Economics - Varna

Varna 9002, 77 Knyz Boris I Blvd, BULGARIA

g.ilieva@ue-varna.bg
lukanova@ue-varna.bg

Abstract. *This paper examines the culturally contingent nature of service quality perception in the hospitality industry. Drawing on established theoretical frameworks—including Hofstede's cultural dimensions, Hall's high- and low-context theory, and Trompenaars' relational models—it analyzes how cultural values shape guest expectations, service evaluation, and satisfaction. Through a comparative analysis of empirical case studies, the paper demonstrates that identical service behaviors can lead to divergent interpretations across cultural contexts. The findings emphasize that service quality is not a fixed, technical attribute, but a fluid and symbolic experience co-constructed by guests, staff, and organizational systems. The study further identifies key implications for service design, intercultural training, and customer feedback strategies, while proposing future research directions that address hybrid service technologies and intersectional cultural identities. Ultimately, it advocates for culturally adaptive service frameworks that reflect the complexity of a globalized hospitality environment.*

Keywords: service quality measurement; hospitality industry; cross-cultural service perception; cultural dimensions (Hofstede, Hall, Trompenaars); SERVQUAL and adapted models; intercultural communication; cultural intelligence in hospitality.

Funding/Financial Support

This work was supported by the Bulgarian Ministry of Education and Science under the National Research Programme “Young scientists and postdoctoral students” approved by DCM # 577 / 17.08.2018.

THE ARTICLE CAN BE CITED AS FOLLOWS:

Ilieva, G., Lukanova, G. (2025). Service beyond borders: A cross-cultural analysis of quality perception in hospitality. *Psychological Research (in the Balkans)*, Volume 28, Number 2, 107-118. ISSN 2815-4797 (Print), ISSN 2815-4800 (Online). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7546/PsyRB.2025.28.02.01>

© Galina Ilieva, Georgina Lukanova, 2025

Submitted – 11 July 2025

Revised – 20 October 2025

Published – 30 December 2025

The authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

INTRODUCTION

In an era of global mobility and hyper-diversity, the hospitality industry faces growing challenges in delivering service experiences that resonate across cultural boundaries. Service quality, once conceptualized as a set of measurable standards, is increasingly recognized as a subjective and relational construct—one shaped by the deeply embedded cultural expectations of both guests and service providers. Within hotels, where front-line interactions serve as critical moments of truth, each exchange is filtered through cultural meaning systems that define what constitutes professionalism, courtesy, and care.

While traditional service quality models such as SERVQUAL and SERVPERF provide useful metrics for assessing performance gaps, they often assume universal benchmarks that overlook cultural variability. Similarly, technical service excellence—such as timely check-ins, clean rooms, and efficient communication—may be interpreted quite differently depending on the cultural orientation of the guest. A behavior considered warm and attentive in one culture may be perceived as intrusive or overly familiar in another. These interpretive differences are not marginal. They influence satisfaction ratings, brand perception, and ultimately, business outcomes.

This paper explores how culture shapes service expectations and perceptions within the hotel context. It begins by reviewing foundational theories in cross-cultural studies, including Hofstede's dimensions of national culture, Hall's context orientation, and Trompenaars' models of interpersonal and organizational behavior. It then applies these frameworks to real-world scenarios, illustrating how cultural dynamics manifest in service encounters and how misalignments arise. Through this analysis, the paper argues that service quality is best understood as a culturally constructed experience rather than a universally defined output. The concluding sections offer practical recommendations for hospitality managers and outline areas for future academic inquiry, particularly in light of technological change and shifting post-pandemic guest expectations.

THE QUALITY OF SERVICE IN THE HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY

In the contemporary landscape of the hospitality industry, service quality has emerged as a fundamental strategic focus for hotel management, directly influencing guest satisfaction, market positioning,

and long-term competitiveness (Parasuraman et al., 1988). Unlike tangible products, which can be evaluated before purchase based on observable characteristics, services in the hotel sector are inherently intangible and experiential. This unique nature of hotel services requires that quality be understood not only in terms of technical standards but also as a subjective construct formed through the perceptions, expectations, and emotional experiences of guests (Dimitrova, 2022). These experiences are shaped by a multiplicity of factors, including physical environment, interpersonal interactions, brand image, personal context, and cultural background, making the definition and measurement of service quality an inherently complex and multidimensional challenge.

The foundational understanding of service quality in the hospitality context is closely aligned with the general definition provided by the International Organization for Standardization (ISO), which in standard ISO 8402 defines quality as “the totality of characteristics of a product or service that bear on its ability to satisfy stated or implied needs” (ISO, 2025). This definition highlights two key elements: the inherent characteristics of the service itself and its effectiveness in meeting the needs—whether explicitly stated or implicitly expected—of the customer. From this perspective, service quality is not a static or absolute property but a dynamic interaction between what is delivered and what is desired, between the objective attributes of the offering and the subjective interpretation by the consumer. Building on this view, Grönroos (2007) proposes that service quality can be conceptualized through three inter-related dimensions: technical quality (what the customer receives), functional quality (how the service is delivered), and image (the expectations shaped by the brand's reputation and identity). In the hospitality context, technical quality includes aspects such as room cleanliness, punctuality, and proper amenities. Functional quality reflects the behavior, communication, and empathy of staff. The image dimension influences how the guest frames the experience even before it occurs, based on prior perceptions and positioning. These three dimensions work together to shape service quality as both an operational outcome and a culturally mediated experience.

Hospitality services are characterized by several fundamental attributes that distinguish them from goods and services in other sectors. These include intangibility, perishability, inseparability, variability, and lack of ownership (Ivanov & Zhechev, 2011). Intangibility refers to the fact that hotel services cannot be physically touched, stored, or displayed before purchase; they are experiential and realized only

in the moment of consumption. Perishability points to the transient nature of services—a hotel room left unoccupied for a night represents lost revenue that cannot be recovered. Inseparability emphasizes the simultaneity of production and consumption: the service is delivered and experienced in real time, often involving face-to-face interactions between hotel staff and guests. Variability describes the inconsistency that can occur due to the human element in service provision—no two service encounters are exactly the same, and quality can vary depending on the staff member involved, their mood, their training, and other operational circumstances. Finally, the lack of ownership distinguishes services from products; guests do not acquire property, but temporary access to amenities and experiences.

Given these features, hotel managers face significant challenges in delivering consistently high service quality. The complex, co-productive nature of hotel services means that quality is not determined solely by operational systems or physical assets, but by the interplay of these with guest perceptions and employee behavior. Researchers such as Kadieva have emphasized that service quality is multidimensional, encompassing both tangible and intangible aspects (Kadieva, 2015).

- Tangibility refers to the physical indicators of quality in a service context—clean rooms, well-maintained facilities, aesthetic appeal of the surroundings, and the professional appearance of staff all serve as cues that shape guest impressions even before service interactions begin.
- Reliability reflects the ability of the service provider to deliver on promises accurately and consistently.
- Assurance speaks to the confidence guests feel when interacting with the service provider, encompassing issues such as security, staff competence, and the feeling of being taken care of.
- Responsiveness involves the willingness and ability of hotel staff to assist promptly and effectively.
- Finally, empathy captures the personalized dimension of service—understanding guest needs, offering individualized solutions, and providing support with genuine concern and care.

Of these five dimensions, four are directly dependent on the human factor. Staff professionalism, attitude, communication style, and emotional intelligence significantly influence how service is

perceived. Only tangibility is related primarily to technical and environmental factors, such as the architecture, furnishings, and visible cleanliness of the property. This heavy reliance on human performance reinforces the reality that service quality in hospitality is less about compliance with rigid standards and more about the consistent creation of positive and memorable guest experiences. Therefore, successful quality management requires not only procedural efficiency and infrastructure investment but also thoughtful staff recruitment, training, empowerment, and motivation (Kadieva, 2015).

To conceptualize and measure this multifaceted construct, various models have been developed over the years. The most influential among them is the SERVQUAL model, formulated by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry in the late 1980s (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry, 1988). The core premise of SERVQUAL is that service quality can be evaluated by identifying the gap between customer expectations and their perceptions of the service received. This model originally included ten dimensions, later streamlined into five, which mirror the aforementioned framework by Kadieva. The SERVQUAL methodology involves collecting data through paired surveys: one measuring guest expectations across the five dimensions, and the other assessing their perceptions after the service experience. The difference between the two creates a “gap score” for each dimension, with positive scores indicating that perceptions exceed expectations—an outcome typically associated with high satisfaction and the likelihood of return patronage.

Despite its widespread use and validation in multiple service sectors, including hospitality, SERVQUAL has been the subject of academic scrutiny. Critics have pointed to the instability of expectations as a measurement baseline, arguing that guests may have vague, shifting, or culturally influenced expectations that are difficult to quantify. In response to such criticisms, Cronin and Taylor developed an alternative model—SERVPERF—which eliminates the expectation component and evaluates service quality based solely on perceived performance. Proponents of SERVPERF argue that this approach is simpler, more intuitive, and empirically robust, particularly in contexts where guests may not be able to articulate their expectations clearly or consistently. Nonetheless, SERVQUAL remains widely used, especially in academic studies and by organizations that seek to understand not just how services are perceived, but how those perceptions compare to pre-service anticipations (Cronin & Taylor, 1994).

In parallel, the model proposed by Grönroos introduces a distinct theoretical perspective by separating service quality into two primary components: technical quality and functional quality. Technical quality refers to the outcome of the service—the tangible elements that the guest receives, such as a clean room, properly functioning facilities, or timely service delivery. Functional quality, by contrast, refers to the process of service delivery—the behaviors, communication, attitude, and demeanor of the staff. Grönroos emphasizes that while technical quality is essential, functional quality often carries more weight in the guest's overall perception, particularly because it influences the emotional and psychological tone of the experience. A technically flawless service delivered with indifference or rudeness may still be judged as poor quality, whereas a minor technical failure handled with empathy and professionalism may be forgiven or even remembered positively (Grönroos, 2007).

Alongside these major frameworks, other models have been developed to reflect specificities of the hotel sector or particular cultural and economic environments. The HOTSPERF model, introduced by Tefera and Govender, adapts the principles of SERVQUAL to the realities of hotels in developing countries, integrating material and non-material indicators into a more context-sensitive evaluation tool. (Tefera & Govender, 2016). Additional models, such as LODGQUAL, LODG-SERV, DINESERV, and HOLSERV, apply service quality measurement to more specific areas such as lodging and dining, allowing for more targeted feedback and operational insights. (Lee et al., 2016)

Beyond theoretical modeling, it is crucial to recognize the practical and situational variables that influence the perception of service quality in hospitality settings. Multiple studies have highlighted the importance of pre-existing factors that shape guest expectations even before they engage with the service provider. According to Dimitrova, critical determinants include the hotel's geographical location, brand image, market reputation, and marketing communications. These factors frame the mental picture the guest forms prior to arrival, significantly influencing how they will interpret the service they receive. In addition, the internal environment of the hotel—the ambiance, architectural aesthetics, room layout, and cleanliness—all contribute to the creation of a service atmosphere that can either reinforce or undermine quality perceptions (Dimitrova, 2018).

Guest expectations are also shaped by their perception of value. The relationship between price and perceived benefit plays a central role in service

evaluation. A high-end luxury hotel must not only meet basic standards but must exceed them in meaningful ways to justify its price point. Conversely, a budget hotel that offers clean, efficient, and friendly service may receive higher quality ratings relative to expectations. Furthermore, the hotel's internal policies—particularly regarding complaint resolution, employee autonomy, and service personalization—can decisively influence the quality experience. Empowering staff to make decisions, respond flexibly to guest needs, and resolve problems without bureaucratic delay enhances responsiveness and guest satisfaction.

It is also essential to understand that service quality is not merely a result of operational inputs or managerial strategies—it is a relative and dynamic perception that fluctuates across time, guest profiles, and situational variables. Ozimek et al. rightly point out that service quality is shaped by the comparison between expected and delivered service, but also by comparisons with previous experiences and competitor offerings. It is a dynamic construct, subject to change as market trends, consumer behaviors, and technological innovations evolve. This is why modern hotels must continually reevaluate not only what services they offer, but how those services are delivered, perceived, and remembered (Ozimek et al., 2017).

Perceptions of quality are influenced by a variety of personal and contextual factors, including the guest's age, education, income, lifestyle, purpose of travel, and emotional state. The conditions at the time of service—such as time of day, length of wait, background noise, and even temperature—can affect how service is experienced. Physical and psychological readiness, social environment, and the nature of the occasion (business or leisure, celebration or emergency) further modulate the guest's evaluation.

Ultimately, service quality in the hospitality industry is not simply an organizational output but a co-created experience. It exists at the intersection of tangible and intangible elements, operational efficiency and emotional resonance, managerial strategy and frontline execution. It demands a holistic, integrated approach that combines clear standards with flexible responsiveness, technical precision with human sensitivity. Whether through models like SERVQUAL, SERVPERF, or Grönroos, or through the constant refinement of service culture and staff engagement, achieving high service quality remains both an art and a science—one that defines the core of what hospitality truly means.

The main differences among these models are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Comparative overview of service quality models in hospitality

Model	Key Focus	Application Area	Strengths	Limitations
SERVQUAL	Gap between expectations and perceptions	General services	Widely validated; captures guest expectations	Expectations are unstable and subjective
SERVPERF	Perceived performance only	General services	Simpler; empirically reliable	Ignores pre-service expectations
Grönroos	Technical, functional, and image quality	General services	Emphasizes both process and outcome	More abstract and harder to quantify
HOTSPERF	Adaptation of SERVQUAL for local contexts	Hotels in developing economies	Context-specific; reflects local service dynamics	Limited comparability with global models
HOLSERV	SERVQUAL-based for hotel guests	Hotel industry	Tailored to hotel-specific service encounters	Inherits SERVQUAL's weaknesses
LODGQUAL	Lodging-specific quality assessment	Lodging/hospitality sector	Focused on accommodation quality	Less used; limited standardization
LODG-SERV	Service performance in lodging	Lodging sector	Addresses room-related and service dimensions	Requires custom development
DINESERV	Quality in restaurant and dining services	Food and beverage sector	Specialized for meal service environments	Narrow scope; not applicable to hotels generally

Source: The table was created by the authors.

UNDERSTANDING CULTURE AND ITS
ROLE IN SHAPING CUSTOMER BEHAV-
IOR ACROSS CONTEXTS

Culture is a multifaceted concept with deep historical, sociological, and psychological roots. It manifests as the set of shared values, beliefs, norms, and behavioral patterns that bind members of a group, shaping their perceptions, expectations, and actions (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952; Hofstede, 2001). While its definitions vary across academic disciplines, the core of culture lies in the collective human experience that enables groups to survive, adapt, and evolve. Culture is not simply inherited; it is learned, reinforced through symbols, rituals, language, and social institutions (White, 1994; Goodenough, 1980). In this sense, culture can be understood at multiple levels—national, organizational, and individual—each contributing uniquely to the behavioral identity of both individuals and institutions.

At the national level, culture is generally considered a stable set of values and orientations shared among people raised in a given country or region. National culture develops early in life, typically solidifying by adolescence, and is shaped by family, education, religion, politics, and media (Hofstede, 2001; Beugelsdijk, Welzel, 2018). It reflects the

dominant ethos and worldview of a population, manifested in attitudes toward power, social roles, time, and interpersonal relations. This culture becomes especially visible in contrast with other national cultures. For instance, an American businesswoman might find German punctuality remarkably more rigorous than American standards, even though both cultures value time discipline. Such cross-cultural experiences illuminate national norms that often remain subconscious unless juxtaposed with divergent systems (Hall, 1976).

National culture does not exist in isolation; it interacts with subcultures, particularly in societies with regional, ethnic, or linguistic diversity. For example, within the United States, regional cultures differ notably between the Midwest and the East Coast, not only in vocabulary and expressions (e.g., „pop“ vs. „soda“) but in assumptions about identity and belonging. These differences, while subtle, shape how people perceive themselves and others, often influencing integration within communities and workplaces (Louf et al. ,2023).

Organizational culture, while influenced by national background, operates at a different societal level. It encompasses the shared practices, rituals, values, and artifacts that define life within an organization. Schein (1992) proposed a layered model of

organizational culture, comprising observable artifacts (e.g., dress code, office layout), espoused values (e.g., mission statements, corporate objectives), and underlying assumptions (deeply embedded beliefs about human nature, relationships, and work). Unlike national culture, which changes slowly over generations, organizational culture can evolve rapidly under the influence of leadership, strategy, or market shifts (Schein, 1992; Karabeliova, 2011; Asorategoon and Kantabutra, 2023).

This dynamic quality of organizational culture allows companies to cultivate environments that support innovation, customer focus, or hierarchical control, depending on strategic goals. For example, the culture at Target differs markedly from that of Walmart, despite their shared sector. These differences become visible through architectural design, product display, employee behavior, and customer interaction styles. Thus, organizational culture becomes a key differentiator not only for performance but also for the customer experience (Minkovski, 2018; Andriukaitiene et al., 2019).

At the micro level, individual culture encompasses personal values, habits, and behaviors acquired through unique life experiences. While two individuals may share national, regional, and organizational cultures, their responses to situations may still vary due to personal upbringing, trauma, or psychological traits. The case of Bao and Hua, two Chinese American managers working in the same organization and with similar educational backgrounds, illustrates this well. Despite many commonalities, Bao's early loss of her mother led her to adopt a protective and methodical managerial style, whereas Hua's upbringing in a nurturing environment fostered a relaxed and flexible approach. These differences illustrate how individual culture acts as a filter through which broader cultural structures are interpreted and applied (Hofstede, 2001).

To understand how these levels of culture influence behavior, particularly in a globalized world, several theoretical models have been developed. The most influential among them is Geert Hofstede's model of cultural dimensions. Hofstede (1991) conceptualized culture as the collective programming of the mind, identifying six dimensions that differentiate national cultures: power distance, individualism vs. collectivism, masculinity vs. femininity, uncertainty avoidance, long-term vs. short-term orientation, and indulgence vs. restraint. Each of these dimensions provides a lens through which societal behaviors can be interpreted. For instance, in high power distance cultures like Malaysia, hierarchical structures are accepted and even expected, while in

low power distance cultures like Denmark, equality and participative decision-making are valued.

Hofstede's individualism vs. collectivism dimension is especially pertinent in cross-cultural business contexts. Individualistic societies, such as the United States, emphasize personal autonomy, self-expression, and individual achievements. In contrast, collectivist societies like China prioritize group harmony, loyalty, and community goals over personal ambitions (Hofstede, 1991; Endara et al., 2019). These values influence everything from hiring practices and leadership styles to customer service expectations.

Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) expanded on Hofstede's framework by identifying seven cultural dimensions focused on interpersonal relationships and organizational behavior: universalism vs. particularism, individualism vs. communitarianism, specific vs. diffuse, neutral vs. emotional, achievement vs. ascription, sequential time vs. synchronous time, and internal vs. external control. These dimensions explore how different cultures resolve common dilemmas. For example, universalist cultures such as Germany apply rules consistently, while particularist cultures like Venezuela adapt rules to specific contexts and relationships (McSweeney, 2015).

Edward Hall (1976), meanwhile, contributed the concepts of high-context and low-context communication, providing a framework to understand cultural communication patterns. In high-context cultures (e.g., Japan, Saudi Arabia), communication relies heavily on implicit messages, non-verbal cues, and contextual understanding. Relationships and trust are central, and meaning often lies beneath the surface. In contrast, low-context cultures (e.g., the U.S., Germany) prefer direct, explicit communication, where clarity and efficiency are paramount. These differences influence business negotiations, marketing, and service interactions, often leading to misinterpretations when not understood or accounted for (Hall, 1976).

All three frameworks—Hofstede's dimensions, Trompenaars's dilemmas, and Hall's contextual orientation—offer essential tools for decoding the cultural matrix in which people operate. They are especially useful for understanding differences in customer expectations and behaviors across cultures. Indeed, culture shapes consumer preferences, loyalty, complaint behavior, and interpretations of value and quality.

For instance, product function and durability are perceived differently across cultural contexts. German consumers, as noted, often prefer high-end,

long-lasting appliances, reflecting a cultural emphasis on engineering precision and economic prudence. In contrast, American consumers may prioritize convenience and cost-effectiveness, even at the expense of longevity (McCracken, 1990). Similarly, food portion sizes, retail experiences, and hospitality standards vary across cultural boundaries, reflecting not only practical but symbolic and affective dimensions of consumption.

In high-context cultures, service quality is often measured not just by the result, but by the tone of interaction, emotional nuance, and perceived respect. In collectivist Asian cultures, for example, customer satisfaction may derive more from interpersonal harmony and attentiveness than from strict punctuality or procedural efficiency. This contrasts with low-context, individualist cultures, where performance metrics, transaction speed, and product specifications may dominate assessments of quality (Mattila, 1999; Furrer et al., 2000).

Regional and subcultural variations further complicate this landscape. Even within a single national culture, customer expectations can diverge significantly. Consider the differences between retail shoppers in urban and rural areas, or among age cohorts within the same country. Organizational strategies that fail to account for these nuances risk alienating key customer segments or missing opportunities for differentiation.

Moreover, these cultural expectations influence the design of customer service systems and frontline employee behavior. For instance, businesses operating in collectivist and high power distance cultures may emphasize hierarchical customer service, where deference and formality are critical. Conversely, in low power distance environments, customers may expect informal interactions and empowerment to

resolve service issues directly (Hofstede, 1991; Mattila, 1999).

Importantly, globalization has amplified the frequency and intensity of intercultural encounters, often placing individuals from disparate cultural backgrounds in shared organizational and consumer settings. In this context, cultural competence becomes not merely a competitive advantage but a prerequisite for organizational success. The ability to recognize and adapt to cultural differences in expectations, decision-making, and communication styles is essential for leaders, marketers, and service professionals alike (Khan & Panarina, 2017).

Nevertheless, it is crucial to approach cultural models with critical awareness. While Hofstede’s dimensions remain widely cited, scholars have raised concerns about their reductionist nature and potential for stereotyping (Brodbeck et al., 2007). Cultures are dynamic and multifaceted, influenced by globalization, migration, technological change, and generational shifts. Consequently, cultural analysis must balance general frameworks with context-specific knowledge and empirical research.

In this light, cultural understanding should not be static or deterministic. Rather, it should be approached as a continuous process of learning, adaptation, and reflection. Individuals and organizations alike must cultivate the skills and dispositions necessary to navigate ambiguity, embrace diversity, and engage with difference productively. This capacity is increasingly recognized as a form of cultural intelligence—an asset for leadership, innovation, and sustainable growth in a pluralistic world.

These cultural foundations and differences in value orientations can be synthesized as shown in Table 2, which summarizes their implications for service perception in hospitality contexts.

Table 2. Cross-cultural contrasts in service perception

Cultural Dimension	High Value Context (e.g., China, UAE, Japan)	Low Value Context (e.g., USA, Sweden, Germany)	Implications for Service Perception
Power Distance	Expect formality, hierarchy, respect for status	Expect informality, egalitarianism	Informal service may seem disrespectful in high PDI cultures
Individualism vs. Collectivism	Value group harmony, relational service	Value autonomy, efficient and personalized service	Over-personal service may feel intrusive or lacking warmth
Context Orientation (Hall)	High-context: indirect, symbolic communication	Low-context: direct, explicit communication	Risk of misunderstanding tone, intent, or gestures
Achievement vs. Ascription	Status tied to title, age, background	Status based on performance and behavior	Lack of visible respect or titles may cause dissatisfaction
Uncertainty Avoidance	Prefer predictability, formal procedures	Accept ambiguity, flexible service delivery	Flexible policies may seem unprofessional in high-UAI cultures

Source: The table was created by the authors.

As we consider the broader implications of culture for customer behavior, it becomes evident that culture not only frames how customers act but also how they interpret quality, value, and satisfaction. The same service encounter may yield vastly different evaluations depending on the customer's cultural background. Therefore, the next logical step in this analysis is to explore how culture shapes perceptions of service quality and expectations for customer care. This inquiry involves engaging with theories and empirical studies that examine the role of cultural values in framing service experiences, as well as reviewing real-world examples of intercultural misunderstandings and adaptations. By doing so, we move from understanding cultural structures to applying that understanding in the context of service design, delivery, and customer satisfaction.

THE CULTURAL CONSTRUCTION OF SERVICE QUALITY PERCEPTION IN THE HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY: A COMPARATIVE FRAMEWORK

While the foundational role of culture in shaping expectations has been widely acknowledged, its specific impact on the perception of service quality—particularly within hospitality—requires deeper theoretical and practical scrutiny. Perception is not a neutral or universally defined mechanism; it is filtered through cultural lenses that frame what is expected, valued, or criticized in service delivery. This becomes particularly significant in hotel environments, where each interaction—from check-in procedures to communication style—can carry vastly different connotations depending on the guest's cultural background.

The hospitality sector, operating at the intersection of global mobility and cultural diversity, offers a unique domain in which service encounters must bridge distinct worldviews. Hotels serve as transitional spaces where heterogeneous guest populations interact with multicultural staff, under management systems often developed within yet another cultural frame. In such a setting, cultural fluency becomes not a matter of etiquette, but a structural competence—central to organizational effectiveness, guest satisfaction, and staff cohesion.

Theoretical models of cross-cultural behavior provide a foundational lens through which service expectations and evaluations can be analyzed. Among the most influential is Hofstede's framework (1980, 2001), which identifies key cultural dimensions such as power distance, individualism versus

collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity, long-term orientation, and indulgence versus restraint. These dimensions account for considerable variation in how customers interpret service behaviors (Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede, 2001).

For example, in high power distance cultures like India or the Philippines, service employees are expected to demonstrate deference, formality, and acknowledgment of hierarchical status. Guests from such backgrounds interpret structured interactions as respectful and professional. Conversely, guests from low power distance cultures such as the Netherlands or Canada anticipate egalitarian treatment, with service staff regarded as equals rather than subordinates.

Likewise, the level of uncertainty avoidance influences tolerance for service ambiguity. Cultures high in uncertainty avoidance (e.g., Greece, Portugal) prefer highly structured procedures and articulated guarantees. These guests are more likely to view ambiguous instructions or flexible policies as signs of unprofessionalism. On the other hand, customers from low uncertainty avoidance cultures (e.g., Singapore, the UK) are more adaptable to informal, variable service encounters.

The individualism–collectivism dimension also plays a decisive role. Individualistic cultures such as the United States and Australia tend to value autonomy, speed, and personalization in service. In contrast, collectivist cultures like South Korea and Colombia emphasize group harmony, emotional intelligence, and relationship-building in service interactions (Furrer et al., 2000).

Hall's (1976) high- and low-context theory complements these perspectives by explaining how service messages are communicated. In high-context cultures (e.g., Japan, the UAE), meaning is conveyed through tone, gesture, and social rituals, rather than explicit verbal content. A courteous greeting or subtle bow may carry more weight than procedural efficiency. In contrast, low-context cultures such as Germany and the United States rely on direct verbal cues and formal guarantees; deviations from stated commitments are often interpreted as service failure (McSweeney, 2015).

Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) add further dimensions, particularly the contrast between achievement-oriented and ascription-oriented cultures. In achievement cultures, such as the United States or Germany, staff are expected to demonstrate competence through performance. In ascription-oriented cultures like Saudi Arabia or Venezuela, visible markers of seniority, education, and social status carry more interpretive value in service interactions.

These dimensions shape perceptions of respect, authority, and professionalism (McSweeney, 2015).

Cultural values also shape deeper perceptions of fairness, professionalism, and competence. In achievement-oriented societies, service staff are expected to exhibit technical skill and operational efficiency. By contrast, in ascription-oriented cultures, greater value is placed on symbolic markers of authority and social hierarchy. Even within the same hotel environment, these divergent value systems can lead to contrasting assessments of identical service interactions.

These culturally grounded expectations are not abstract concepts alone—they have tangible consequences in real-world hospitality environments.

In addition to the previously discussed theoretical frameworks, further real-world scenarios offer deeper insight into how culturally embedded expectations shape perceptions of service quality. For instance, Furrer et al. (2000) demonstrate that guests from collectivist cultures such as China place strong emphasis on emotional warmth, interpersonal attentiveness, and symbolic gestures. When interacting with staff in individualist, low-context cultures—such as those in Northern Europe—these guests may interpret minimal interaction or reserved communication as cold or even disrespectful. Conversely, local service providers may view the same behavior as professional and non-intrusive. This divergence reflects the cultural distance between high-context and low-context communication styles, as outlined by Hall (1976), and the contrasting values of collectivism versus individualism described by Hofstede (2001).

Similarly, Arab business travelers staying in American hotel chains have expressed dissatisfaction not due to technical flaws but because of a lack of symbolic recognition—such as formal greetings, respectful titles, and ceremonial interaction. These expectations align with Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner's (1998) concept of ascription-oriented cultures, where social status and ritualized behavior are integral to the perception of quality.

Another example is found in the work of Mattila (1999), who describes how Japanese guests at American resorts may find the informal and overly familiar behavior of hotel staff inappropriate or even disrespectful. While American guests tend to value friendliness and approachability, guests from high-context cultures like Japan are more attuned to subtle forms of politeness and formality. These examples highlight the risk of service misalignment in intercultural settings and underscore the need for adaptive, culturally sensitive service design.

A further illustrative example involves the experience of Western hotel chains operating in East Asian countries. While these chains may pride themselves on speed, efficiency, and minimal interaction, East Asian guests may interpret such behaviors as impersonal or even dismissive. In these high-context, collectivist cultures, symbolic gestures—greetings, bows, and attentive presence—carry significant communicative weight. Western guests in Japan, conversely, have at times perceived formal rituals as overly rigid or ceremonious (Mattila, 1999; Furrer et al., 2000).

A similar dynamic can be observed between American or European guests and service staff in Middle Eastern countries. In ascription cultures with strong high-context traditions, such as Saudi Arabia or the UAE, the failure to acknowledge social status or to use formal titles can lead to dissatisfaction, even if the technical service is flawless. By contrast, in cultures where informal interaction and accessibility are hallmarks of good service, such behaviors would be viewed as positive.

Real-world operational challenges also emerge in cross-cultural service delivery systems. A case involving a German guest and an Indian-based customer service center exemplifies this friction. The Indian agent, operating within a high-context, relational style, attempted to build rapport through detailed, polite conversation. The German guest, from a low-context, task-oriented culture, perceived this as inefficient and evasive. Despite the agent's intentions, the outcome was dissatisfaction due to mismatched communication norms.

Furrer et al. (2000), applying the SERVQUAL model (Parasuraman et al., 1988) across cultural contexts, confirmed that different cultures prioritize different dimensions of service. Guests from Asian cultures (high power distance, collectivist) value assurance and empathy, expecting courteous, well-trained staff and respectful interaction. Western cultures emphasize reliability, responsiveness, and tangibles—favoring quick service, visible professionalism, and procedural clarity. In Latin America, assurance and empathy are also prominent, while in Nordic countries, transparency and dependability take precedence (Furrer et al., 2000).

These differences often lead to friction in multinational hospitality operations. A global brand that implements uniform service procedures may exceed expectations in one region while alienating customers in another. For example, self-service kiosks designed to promote efficiency and autonomy might delight American guests but disappoint Chinese visitors who value personalized interaction and symbolic hospitality.

As Furnham (2019) notes, these situations can generate not just functional dissatisfaction, but emotional dissonance—a form of cultural “shock” that occurs when service behavior violates unspoken cultural norms. The guest experiences not just unmet expectations, but a disruption of their cultural frame of reference. Satisfaction in such cases is not driven solely by operational metrics, but by symbolic congruence with the guest’s worldview (Furnham, 2019).

Ultimately, service in the hospitality sector is not merely delivered; it is constructed, interpreted, and evaluated through the lens of cultural meaning systems. Understanding and integrating these diverse perspectives is not optional—it is central to achieving service excellence in a globalized market. Hospitality managers must design service environments that recognize, anticipate, and respectfully navigate cultural variance. Only then can service quality be authentically experienced as such by every guest, in every culture.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The cross-cultural variability in service evaluation carries profound implications for the design, delivery, and management of services in global hospitality contexts. As organizations continue to expand internationally and operate across increasingly pluralistic societies, it becomes evident that linguistic translation is not sufficient—businesses must localize not only their materials but also their underlying service philosophies and operational assumptions. A “one-size-fits-all” approach to customer experience is ill-suited to a world where perceptions of courtesy, professionalism, and satisfaction are deeply shaped by cultural values.

From a managerial perspective, one of the most critical implications is the necessity of localized customer journey mapping. Traditional service design methods often assume a linear, universal customer path, yet cultural expectations can radically alter how customers navigate, interpret, and prioritize touchpoints. While Western guests may focus on speed and efficiency at the front desk, guests from high-context cultures may assign greater importance to the tone of the greeting or the perceived sincerity of the interaction. Mapping customer journeys through a cultural lens allows businesses to proactively anticipate friction points and to redesign services that resonate on an emotional and symbolic level, not just a functional one.

In parallel, employee training must evolve from surface-level cultural awareness (e.g., avoiding offensive gestures or recognizing national holidays) to programs that foster deeper intercultural competence. Training initiatives should incorporate cultural psychology, scenario-based role playing, and reflection on implicit biases, encouraging staff to recognize how their cultural frameworks influence their perceptions of guests. Such training also fosters internal cohesion in multicultural teams, where differing assumptions about hierarchy, feedback, and autonomy can otherwise become sources of conflict.

Equally important are feedback mechanisms that move beyond standard satisfaction metrics to capture the emotional and relational quality of the service experience. Traditional feedback forms often privilege explicit, individualistic expressions of satisfaction or complaint, which may not align with the communication norms of all cultural groups. Designing culturally sensitive feedback tools—such as open-ended prompts, multilingual formats, or observational assessments—can provide richer, more accurate insights into guest experiences. Furthermore, staff should be trained to interpret feedback through a cultural lens, recognizing that a lack of negative comments does not necessarily indicate satisfaction in all contexts.

Academically, there remains a pressing need for more longitudinal and mixed-method research into how culture interacts with evolving service technologies, such as AI-driven chatbots, mobile check-ins, and hybrid digital-physical interfaces. These innovations challenge traditional hospitality norms and demand new conceptual tools to understand how automation, personalization, and perceived empathy are received across cultures. For instance, how do high-context cultures interpret text-based chat support, or how do collectivist societies respond to algorithmically customized service journeys?

Moreover, the post-pandemic landscape has introduced new dimensions to the service experience, particularly around care, safety, and hygiene. These concerns are not universally framed: collectivist societies may emphasize community protection and rigid protocols, while individualist cultures may prioritize personal choice and minimal restrictions. Research must track how these evolving expectations intersect with enduring cultural traits, and whether new service norms are forming that override or reinforce traditional expectations.

Future research must also account for intersectional cultural identities. National culture, while informative, does not fully explain variations in service perception. Variables such as age, gender, class,

professional background, and migration status shape how individuals interpret and value service encounters. A young professional woman from Tokyo may perceive hotel formality differently than an older male retiree from the same city. Understanding how these identities intersect with cultural norms will yield more inclusive and dynamic models of service evaluation.

In conclusion, the comparative analysis of cultural influences on service evaluation reveals a rich mosaic of behavioral expectations, shaped by deeply held values, social structures, and communication norms. By interpreting these patterns through established cultural frameworks, we gain both explanatory clarity and strategic insight. Service providers who understand and respect these cultural logics will not only avoid costly misunderstandings but also foster genuine customer satisfaction across borders. These insights now form the conceptual basis for investigating how service quality perceptions—filtered through culture—influence long-term customer loyalty, employee engagement, and perceived brand value.

REFERENCES

- Karabeliova, S. (2011). Psychological characteristics of the cultural practices in Bulgarian context. *Godishnik na Sofiyskia universitet „Sv. Kliment Ohridski“, Filosofski fakultet, Kniga Psihologia*. Tom 102, pp. 57-90. [Психологически особености на практики в български контекст. *Годишник на Софийския университет „Св. Климент Охридски“, Философски факултет, Книга Психология*]. (In Bulgarian).
- Andriukaitiene, R., Cherep, A. V., Voronkova, V. H., Punchenko, O. P., Kyvliuk, O. P. (2019). Managing organizational culture as a factor in organizational change. *Philosophy Of Economics And Management*, 169-179. SSN 2072-7941 (Online), ISSN 2072-1692 (Print), <https://doi.org/10.30839/2072-7941.2018.155562>.
- Assoratgoon, W. & Kantabutra, S. (2023). Toward a sustainability organizational culture model. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 400, 136666. ISSN 0959-6526, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.136666>.
- Beugelsdijk, S. & Welzel, C. (2018). Dimensions and Dynamics of National Culture: Synthesizing Hofstede With Inglehart. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 49(10), 1469-1505. doi: 10.1177/0022022118798505. Epub 2018 Oct 2. PMID: 30369633; PMCID: PMC6191680.
- Brodbeck, F. C., Chhokar, S. & House, R. J. (2007). Culture and leadership in 25 Societies: Intention, Conclusions, and Future Directions. In: Jagdeep. S. Chhokar, Felix C. Brodbeck & Robert J. House (Eds.). *Culture and Leadership Across the World: the GLOBE book of in-depth studies of 25 societies*. (pp. 1023-1084). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cronin, J. & Taylor, S. (1994). SERVPERF versus SERVQUAL; Reconciling performance-based and Perceptions-Minus-Expectations Measurement of Service Quality. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(1), 125-131. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1252256>.
- Dimitrova, P. (2018). The quality of the tourist product as a leading factor for the development of tourism in the resort village of Ravda (using the example of the three-star hotel „Bijou“). *Proceedings of the international scientific conference „Blue Economy and Blue Development“*, Burgas Free University, 399-412. [Качеството на туристическия продукт като водещ фактор за развитието на туризма в к. с. Равда (по примера на тризвездния хотел „Бижу“) *Международна научна конференция „Синя икономика и синьо развитие“*]. (In Bulgarian).
- Endara, Y. M., Ali, A. B. & Yajid, M. S. A. (2019). The influence of culture on service quality leading to customer satisfaction and moderation role of type of bank. *Journal of Islamic Accounting and Business Research*, 10(1), 134-154. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIABR-12-2015-0060>.
- Furnham, A. (2019). Culture Shock: A Review of the Literature for Practitioners. *Psychology*, 10, 1832-1855. doi: 10.4236/psych.2019.1013119.
- Furrer, O., Shaw-Ching Liu, B. & Sudharsan, D. (2000). The Relationships between Culture and Service Quality Perceptions. *Journal of Service Research*, 2(4), 355-371.
- Goodenough, W. H. (1980). Ethnographic field techniques. In H. C. Triandis & J. W. Berry, (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology*. Vol 2: Methodology. (pp. 29-55). Allyn & Bacon.
- Grönroos, C. (2007). *Service Management and Marketing: Customer Management in Service Competition*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond Culture*. Anchor Books/Doubleday.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences. Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Ivanov, S. Zhechev, V. (2011). *Marketing in the hotel industry*. Zangador. [Маркетинг в хотелиерството]. (In Bulgarian).
- ISO. (2025). Quality management: The path to continuous improvement [Online]. Available at: <https://www.iso.org/quality-management> (Last viewed June 13, 2025).
- Kadieva, S. (2015). Hotel service technology. Varna, Science and Economics. [Технология на обслужването в хотела]. (In Bulgarian).

- Khan, M. A. & Panarina, E. (2017). The Role of National Cultures in Shaping the Corporate Management Cultures: A Four Countries Theoretical Analysis. *Journal of Eastern European and Central Asian Research*, 4(1), 25. <https://doi.org/10.15549/jecar.v4i1.152>
- Kroeber, A. L. & Kluckhohn, C. (1952). Culture: a critical review of concepts and definitions. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 51(19), 559-563. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2021459>.
- Lee, Y. Wang, Y. Chien, C. Wu, C. Lu, S. Tsai, S. & Dong, W. (2016). Applying revised gap analysis model in measuring hotel service quality. *SpringerPlus*, 5, 1191. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40064-016-2823-z>.
- Louf, T., Gonçalves, B., Ramasco, J. J., Sánchez, D. & Grieve, J. (2023). American cultural regions mapped through the lexical analysis of social media. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 10(1), 133. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01611-3>
- Mattila, A. S. (1999). The Role of Culture in the Service Evaluation Process. *Journal of Service Research*, 1(3), 250–261.
- Minkovski, R. (2018). Organizatsionna kultura na hotelite v Sofia. *Godishnik na Sofiyskia universitet „Sv. Kliment Ohridski“*, *Geologo-geografski fakultet, Kniga 2 – Geografia*. Tom 110, pp. 277-293. [Организационна култура на хотелите в София. *Годишник на Софийския университет „Св. Климент Охридски“*, *Геолого-географски факултет, Книга 2 – География*]. (In Bulgarian).
- McSweeney, B. (2015), Globe, Hall, Hofstede, Huntington, Trompenaars: Common Foundations, Common Flaws. In Yvette Sánchez and Claudia Franziska Brühwiller (Eds.), *Transculturalism and Business in the BRIC States*, (pp. 13-58). Gower.
- McCracken, G. D. (1990). *Culture and consumption: New approaches to the symbolic character of consumer goods and activities*. Indiana University Press.
- Ozimek, J. Kulykovits, O. & Przezdziecka-Czyzewska, N. (2017). Factors influencing the choice and quality assessment of hotel facilities in Poland. *Folia Oeconomica Stetinensia*, 171-173. Available at: <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/7b6f/743c7616be82b4f1d4e07ff3f600d849d7e4.pdf> (Last viewed June 1, 2025).
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. & Berry, L. SERVQUAL: A Multiple Item Scale for Measuring Consumers' Perceptions of Service Quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12-40.
- Parasuraman, A. Berry, L. & Zeithaml, V. (1991). Refinement and reassessment of the SERVQUAL scale. *Journal of Retailing*, 67(4), 420-450.
- Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. Jossey-Bass.
- Tefera O. & Govender K. (2016). From SERVQUAL to HOTSPERF: Towards the Development and Validation of an alternate Hotel Service Quality Measurement Instrument. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 5(4), 1–17.
- White, G. M. (1994). Affecting culture: Emotion and morality in everyday life. In S. Kitayama & H. R. Markus (Eds.), *Emotion and culture: Empirical studies of mutual influence* (pp. 219-239). American Psychological Association.