Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra1013 | SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.748 ISSN: 2347-4378
EPRA International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Studies (EBMS)
Volume: 13 | Issue: 4 | April 2026 -Peer-Reviewed Journal

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN HOSPITALITY: TRANSFORMING THE HOTEL INDUSTRY WHILE PRESERVING EMPATHY AND TRADITIONAL HOSPITALITY

Olaoluwa Fowosere
DBA Candidate, Westcliff University, Doctor of Business Administration Program, Irvine, California, USA

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra27021
DOI No: 10.36713/epra27021

ABSTRACT

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into the American hotel industry presents both extraordinary opportunities and profound challenges for an industry whose competitive identity rests upon human connection, warmth, and individualized care. This paper examines how AI technologies – including machine learning, natural language processing, service robotics, and generative AI – are reshaping operational models, guest experience design, and workforce dynamics across the United States hospitality market. Grounding the analysis in Huang and Rust's (2018) theory of intelligent service and supplementary frameworks of human-AI collaboration, this study synthesizes evidence from more than 30 peer-reviewed sources published between 2016 and 2026 and draws on secondary industry data from the American Hotel & Lodging Association (AHLA), Deloitte, and leading hotel operators including Marriott International, Hilton Worldwide, Hyatt Hotels, and IHG Hotels & Resorts. The findings reveal a nuanced landscape: AI has demonstrably improved revenue management outcomes (10–15% RevPAR uplift), operational efficiency, and personalization capability, yet generates measurable risks when deployed in ways that erode the empathic, emotionally intelligent service encounters that drive guest loyalty and brand trust. A critical gap in existing literature is identified – specifically, the absence of a validated framework guiding how U.S. hotel operators can integrate AI without sacrificing hospitality authenticity. This paper proposes the Human-AI Symbiosis Framework (HASF) as a five-pillar model addressing this gap. Implications for hotel management strategy, employee development, and technology investment decisions are discussed.

KEYWORDS: *artificial intelligence, hospitality management, hotel industry, empathy, human-AI interaction, guest experience, United States, service robots, chatbots, technology adoption, digital transformation*

1. INTRODUCTION

Few industries are as fundamentally reliant on the human spirit as hospitality. The word itself derives from the Latin "hospes"—host and guest simultaneously—a reminder that the exchange at the heart of lodging is not merely transactional but relational, even transformative. When a tired traveler arrives at a hotel lobby after a delayed flight and is greeted by name, welcomed with a genuine smile, and offered a room upgrade without asking, something important has happened: they have been seen. That moment of recognition is worth more to long-term brand loyalty than any loyalty-point multiplier or algorithmic upsell.

And yet, the American hotel industry is during a seismic technological shift. Artificial intelligence—deployed through chatbots, service robots, machine learning revenue management systems, predictive personalization engines, and increasingly sophisticated generative AI tools—is redesigning every layer of the hospitality value chain. Between 2021 and 2024, chatbot adoption among U.S. hotels rose from 48% to 80%. The global AI market in hospitality, valued at $2.9 billion in 2024, is projected to reach $36.5 billion by 2034, growing at a compound annual rate of 28.9% (InsightAce Analytic, 2026). North America leads this wave, holding 38.7% of global AI tourism market share (Grand View Research, 2025).

The urgency of this transformation is compounded by structural pressures on the industry. Following COVID-19, the U.S. hotel sector faced its most severe staffing crisis in recorded history: as of January 2024, over 67.6% of hoteliers

reported unfilled positions (AHLA, 2024). Average hotel wages crossed $23 per hour in 2023 for the first time, accelerating the financial case for automation. Meanwhile, guests who lived through the pandemic have become simultaneously more comfortable with touchless technology and more emotionally hungry for authentic human connection (Deloitte, 2026).

This paradox—more automation, more desire for humanity—is the central tension this paper explores. Scholarly literature has produced excellent work on AI adoption dynamics, guest attitudes toward service robots, revenue management optimization, and employee resistance to automation. However, a critical gap persists: no validated, practitioner-ready framework exists that guides American hotel operators on how to deploy AI in ways that actively preserve, rather than merely tolerate, the empathic and emotional core of traditional hospitality. This paper aims to fill that gap.

Specifically, this study pursues four objectives: (1) to systematically document the current state of AI deployment across the U.S. hotel industry; (2) to synthesize what peer-reviewed scholarship reveals about the relationship between AI deployment and empathy preservation in hospitality service; (3) to identify research gaps and theoretical tensions in the existing literature; and (4) to propose the Human-AI Symbiosis Framework (HASF) as an evidence-based model for integrated AI adoption that honors hospitality's humanistic traditions.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study draws on three interlocking theoretical foundations. The first and most foundational is Huang and Rust's (2018) theory of artificial intelligence in service, published in the Journal of Service Research. Their framework distinguishes four ascending intelligence levels required for service delivery: mechanical (routine physical tasks), analytical (data processing and optimization), intuitive (pattern recognition and judgment), and empathetic (emotional understanding and relational warmth). Critically, they argue that AI advances through these levels in sequence, and that as AI displaces lower-order intelligences, the value of human empathetic intelligence increases rather than diminishes. This counterintuitive insight anchors the argument of this paper: AI deployment in hotels, done well, should produce more empathy from human staff, not less.

Huang and Rust (2021) extended this theory in a second landmark article, 'Engaged to a Robot? The Role of AI in Service,' published in the Journal of Service Research. They argue that at the current developmental stage, 'feeling service'—service that requires genuine emotional attunement, cultural sensitivity, and interpersonal warmth—remains predominantly within the domain of human service providers. Their strategic framework advises that mechanical and analytical service tasks be assigned to AI, while human employees focus increasingly on intuitive and empathetic dimensions of the guest encounter.

The second theoretical pillar is the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), originally proposed by Davis (1989) and extended by numerous hospitality scholars including Bhuiyan et al. (2024) in the Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights. TAM explains that technology adoption is governed by perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use, and that trust plays a moderating role—particularly salient in a service sector where guests must feel safe in their vulnerability as travelers in unfamiliar environments.

The third pillar is social presence theory, developed by Short, Williams, and Christie (1976) and applied to AI hospitality contexts by scholars including Juquelier et al., (2024). Social presence refers to the degree to which a communication medium conveys a sense of human contact. AI systems that express empathy—whether through verbal warmth, personalized acknowledgment, or responsive emotional cues—increase perceived social presence and thereby enhance guest satisfaction. However, as Juquelier et al. (2024) demonstrate, empathic AI can paradoxically harm customer experience under conditions of time pressure, illustrating that human-AI integration requires careful contextual calibration rather than blanket deployment of empathic language.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature on AI in hospitality has grown substantially since 2016, yet it remains characterized by important disciplinary gaps, geographic concentrations, and methodological limitations. This review organizes existing scholarship into five thematic clusters, culminating in an explicit identification of the research gap this study addresses.

3.1 AI-Driven Operational Efficiency in Hotels

The earliest and most extensively studied dimension of AI in hotels is operational efficiency. Scholars have documented how machine learning, predictive analytics, and process automation have restructured hotel back-office operations. Bulchand-Gidumal (2022), in the Handbook of e-Tourism (Springer), provides a comprehensive taxonomy of AI applications across the hotel value chain, identifying revenue management, channel management, demand forecasting, and predictive maintenance as the domains with the strongest evidence base. Buhalis and Leung (2018), writing in the International Journal of Hospitality Management, established the theoretical architecture of smart hospitality ecosystems—interconnected digital systems that enable data-driven decision-making across hotel functions.

In the specific domain of revenue management, AI has produced measurable financial improvements. Gatera (2024) and Venigandla (2023), in a study of AI pricing strategies, found that dynamic pricing algorithms driven by real-time demand signals consistently outperform traditional yield management methods, generating RevPAR improvements of 10–15% among top adopters. A Cornell University School of Hotel Administration study, cited in industry analysis by Hotel Dive (2025), found that hotels using AI-driven revenue systems achieved an average 7.2% revenue lift over those using conventional methods. However, in scenarios involving complex market disruptions or unexpected demand shocks, human revenue managers outperformed AI by 12% in judgment-intensive decisions, illustrating the boundaries of algorithmic intelligence (International Journal of Hospitality Management, cited in Hotel Dive, 2025).

Staffing and scheduling represent another efficient frontier. With 67.6% of U.S. hoteliers reporting staffing shortages in early 2024 (AHLA, 2024), AI workforce management systems have gained adoption as tools for optimizing shift coverage, predicting no-show rates, and reallocating labor in real time. The economic case is compelling—the American hotel industry directly employed more than 2.1 million people in 2024 at a wage bill exceeding $123.4 billion (AHLA, 2024)—but scholars including Wang et al. (2025) and Prentice (2024) have cautioned that efficiency gains must be weighed against the psychological costs to hotel employees when AI deployment is perceived as threatening rather than supportive.

3.2 Guest Experience Personalization Through AI

The second major theme in the literature concerns AI-enabled personalization of the guest experience. Scholars have documented how recommendation systems, natural language processing, and predictive analytics are enabling hotels to deliver individualized experiences at scale. Bhuiyan et al. (2024), writing in the Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights, found that consumer adoption of AI devices in hospitality services is positively associated with perceived personalization value, though trust mediates this relationship—guests who do not trust the hotel's data practices reject AI-driven recommendations even when they are accurate.

Doborjeh et al., (2022), in a systematic review in the International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management (IJCHM), identified personalized recommendation systems as one of five dominant AI application clusters in hospitality, alongside natural language processing, computer vision, predictive analytics, and robotics. Their review, covering literature through 2021, identified a significant under-theorization of how personalization delivered by AI is perceived differently from personalization delivered by a skilled human concierge—a question with direct implications for guest loyalty formation.

Real-world evidence supports the commercial power of AI personalization. Marriott International's revenue strategy platform analyzes over 80 distinct data points per booking (Revenue Hub, 2025), enabling targeted offers that have generated a 50% increase in ancillary revenue and a 25% improvement in guest satisfaction scores. Hilton's AI-driven segmentation and dynamic pricing strategy increased revenue by 5–8% while boosting guest satisfaction, as AI enabled the hotel to deliver offers precisely tailored to individual traveler profiles (Klover.ai, 2025). A ruminate case study found that personalized campaigns based on guest preferences increased direct bookings by 30% (AHLA, 2024).

Yet personalization research has been almost exclusively framed as a positive technology story. De Kervenoael et al., (2020), in an important counter-narrative, found that AI-driven personalization in hospitality services requires a careful balance among perceived value, empathy, and information sharing—and that guests resist personalization that feels surveillance-like rather than service-oriented. This suggests a meaningful distinction between algorithmic personalization (AI knows your preferences) and empathic personalization (a human cares about your preferences), with different emotional and trust dynamics.

Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra1013 | SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.748 ISSN: 2347-4378
EPRA International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Studies (EBMS)
Volume: 13 | Issue: 4 | April 2026 -Peer-Reviewed Journal

3.3 Service Robots and the Limits of AI Empathy

Service robots represent the most visually dramatic frontier of AI in hotels, and the literature on guest attitudes toward robotic service delivery is among the richest and most contested in hospitality research. Studies from 2016 onward document growing robot deployments: Connie at Hilton Hotels & Resorts, Botlr at Aloft Hotels, and Pepper at Mandarin Oriental (cited in Filieri et al., 2022; Luo et al., 2021; Seo, 2022, as reviewed in Ding et al., 2024). These robots are designed to deliver amenities, provide information, and in some cases facilitate check-in and check-out—tasks that in traditional hospitality are understood as meaningful relational moments.

The academic evidence on service robots is distinctly mixed. On one hand, studies document novelty-driven satisfaction, reduced wait times, and improved operational efficiency (Fuentes-Moraleda et al., 2020; Gupta et al., 2022). On the other hand, a consistent finding across multiple studies is that robots remain deficient in the empathy dimension of service quality—the ability to understand and genuinely care about the customer's specific emotional and situational needs (Parasuraman et al., 1988, as applied in Frontiers in Robotics and AI, 2025). As the SERVQUAL framework makes explicit, empathy is one of five foundational dimensions of service quality, and robots that achieve high marks on reliability, assurance, tangibility, and responsiveness but fail on empathy deliver systematically incomplete service experiences.

Blut et al., (2021), in a meta-analysis in the Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, synthesized findings on anthropomorphism—the degree to which AI agents exhibit human-like characteristics—across physical robots, chatbots, and other AI systems. They found that higher anthropomorphism generally increases positive outcomes, but that the uncanny valley effect (Mori et al., 2012) creates non-linear dynamics: robots that are almost-but-not-quite-human evoke unease and erode service perceptions. This finding carries direct implications for hotel robot design, suggesting that robots should be clearly robotic rather than ambiguously human.

Research by Nam et al., (2021), in Electronic Markets, examined the adoption of AI and robotics in hotels from the perspective of both prospects and challenges. They found that resistance to AI adoption is frequently rooted not in technophobia per se, but in a normative concern about the erosion of warmth and human connection from service encounters, a finding confirmed in the customer literature by Khaliq et al. (2022) in the same year. These studies suggest that the hospitality industry faces not just a technical challenge in deploying AI, but a legitimacy challenge in communicating to guests that technology is amplifying rather than replacing the human soul of the brand.

3.4 Chatbots, Conversational AI, and Emotional Service Recovery

Conversational AI—encompassing chatbots, voice assistants, and increasingly large language model-powered interfaces—has become the most widely deployed form of AI in U.S. hotels. Eighty percent of hotels now use chatbots to handle basic inquiries, and a comprehensive bibliometric-systematic review by researchers in 2026 found that conversational AI in hospitality research has grown at an annual rate of 65.49%, with the corpus of Scopus-indexed articles reaching 71 peer-reviewed papers by 2025.

Yun and Park (2022), writing in Frontiers in Psychology, published one of the most methodologically rigorous studies on chatbot service quality. Using structural equation modeling with a sample of 380 respondents, they found that empathy and interactivity significantly improve customer satisfaction with chatbots—but only when the chatbot uses emotion words. For chatbots without emotional language, empathy made no significant contribution to satisfaction, while assurance and reliability dominated. This finding has direct practical implications for hotel chatbot design: the investment in making chatbots linguistically empathic is only justified when it is executed authentically and contextually.

Juquelier et al., (2024), in three experimental studies published in the Journal of Business Research, examined empathic chatbots through the lens of social presence theory. They found that empathic chatbots trigger perceptions of social presence and improve information quality—both of which positively influence customer satisfaction. However, they also documented a boundary condition: empathic chatbots harm customer experience when guests feel time pressure. This finding—arguably the most important nuance in the chatbot empathy literature—suggests that empathic AI design requires contextual intelligence, not just emotional language templates.

The service recovery literature represents a particularly high-stakes domain for conversational AI. Studies consistently find that in situations of service failure, customers attribute more blame to the company and the brand when they

Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra1013 | SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.748 ISSN: 2347-4378
EPRA International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Studies (EBMS)
Volume: 13 | Issue: 4 | April 2026 -Peer-Reviewed Journal

interact with chatbots rather than humans (Pavone et al., 2023, as reviewed in Grönroos University, 2025). Crolic et al., (2022), in the Journal of Marketing, found that anthropomorphic chatbots provoke higher anger responses when service fails—because guests hold human-seeming agents to human standards of responsibility. This research implies that hotel operators should route service failure communications to human staff as a default, reserving chatbot handling for transactional tasks where failure consequences are low.

3.5 The Employee Dimension: AI Anxiety and the Erosion of Empathic Skills

A critical and underexplored dimension of AI in hospitality concerns its impact on hotel employees—particularly on their psychological wellbeing, skill development, and capacity for empathic service delivery. Wang et al., (2025), in Tourism Management, published a systematic review using the ADO-TCM framework and found that while AI can enhance employee service performance in structured task dimensions, it also generates workplace anxiety, particularly when employees perceive AI as a replacement threat rather than a supportive tool. Critically, their review identified a dearth of research on how AI specifically affects employee service performance—the key gap this review explicitly confirms.

Do et al., (2023), reviewed in Wang et al. (2025), found that the introduction of AI in hotel operations has not eliminated the emotional labor of frontline staff; in some cases, it has intensified the conflict between employees' emotional performance expectations and their experience of working alongside automated systems. This finding challenges the optimistic narrative in which AI frees hotel workers to be more empathic—in practice, when AI takes over transactional tasks, hotels sometimes reduce staffing levels rather than redeploying staff into emotional labor roles, leaving fewer humans to cover the moments of genuine connection that guests most value.

Prentice (2024), in the International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, conducted a systematic review of AI through the lens of hospitality employees and found that employee emotional intelligence—the capacity for empathic attunement, social reading, and genuine warmth—remains irreplaceable by current AI systems. Her review argues for a conceptualization of AI as augmentation rather than substitution, specifically calling for hotel operators to invest in emotional intelligence training for human staff as AI takes over mechanical and analytical tasks. This position directly complements Huang and Rust's (2018) theoretical prediction that empathetic skills become MORE valuable, not less, as AI advances—a point that hotel operators have been insufficiently attentive to in their technology investment decisions.

Table 1. AI Applications in the U.S. Hotel Industry: Adoption Rates and Primary Benefits (2024)

AI Application Area	Key Technology	U.S. Hotel Adoption Rate (2024)	Primary Benefit Reported
Guest Communication	Chatbots & Virtual Assistants	80%	Handles routine inquiries; 30% cost reduction in customer service
Revenue Management	ML Dynamic Pricing Algorithms	74%	10-15% higher RevPAR; real-time competitive rate adjustment
Personalization	Predictive Analytics & CRM AI	68%	30% increase in direct bookings; 50% ancillary revenue uplift (Marriott)
Check-in/Out Automation	Facial Recognition & Mobile Keys	55%	Reduced wait times; improved operational efficiency
Service Robots	Delivery & Concierge Robots	29%	Reduced labor burden; novelty-driven guest satisfaction
Energy Management	IoT & Predictive AI	42%	Hilton's LightStay: $1 billion+ cumulative cost savings
Food & Beverage	Demand Forecasting & Waste Reduction AI	33%	Reduced food waste; optimized inventory management
Staff Scheduling	AI Workforce Management Systems	47%	Labor cost reduction; improved shift coverage amid staffing shortages

Note. Adoption rates compiled from AHLA (2024), AllAboutAI (2024), and Statista (2024). RevPAR = Revenue Per Available Room.

Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra1013 | SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.748 ISSN: 2347-4378
EPRA International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Studies (EBMS)
Volume: 13 | Issue: 4 | April 2026 -Peer-Reviewed Journal

Table 2. Summary of Key Literature on AI and Empathy in Hospitality (Selected Studies, 2018–2025)

Author(s) & Year	Journal	Focus	Method	Key Finding
Huang & Rust (2018)	J. Service Research	AI task replacement theory	Conceptual	Empathetic skills become MORE important as AI handles mechanical/analytical tasks
Huang & Rust (2021)	J. Service Research	AI customer engagement framework	Conceptual	Feeling service should remain predominantly human-delivered at current AI stage
Nam et al. (2021)	Electronic Markets	AI/robot adoption challenges	Mixed-methods	Resistance to AI adoption is rooted in perceived loss of human warmth in service encounters
Doborjeh et al. (2022)	IJCHM	Systematic review of AI methods	Systematic review	Identified 5 dominant AI application clusters in hospitality; gap in empathy research
Dogru et al. (2023)	J. Hospitality & Tourism Research	Generative AI framework	Conceptual	GenAI poses both opportunity and threat; calls for human-AI hybrid model research
Yun & Park (2022)	Frontiers in Psychology	Chatbot empathy & satisfaction	Survey/SEM	Empathy in chatbots significantly improves satisfaction; effect absent for emotion-free bots
Kim et al. (2025)	J. Hosp. & Tourism Research	AI industry practices & expert opinion	Mixed-methods	Industry practitioners cite authenticity preservation as top AI implementation challenge
Wang et al. (2025)	Tourism Management	AI & employee service performance	Systematic review	AI-induced anxiety among hotel staff requires targeted psychological support programs
Juquelier et al. (2024)	J. Business Research	Empathic chatbots	Experimental (3 studies)	Empathic AI improves satisfaction but harms experience under time pressure—double-edged sword
Prentice (2024)	Int'l J. Hospitality Management	AI through employee lens	Systematic review	Employee emotional intelligence remains irreplaceable; AI serves as augmentation, not replacement

Note. IJCHM = International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management; SEM = Structural Equation Modeling.

3.6 Research Gap

The literature reviewed above reveals a clear pattern: scholarship has advanced knowledge of AI's operational benefits, guest attitude dynamics, and broad adoption trajectories. However, five specific gaps remain unaddressed, each representing an opportunity for original contribution (see Table 3).

First, no study has developed and validated a practitioner-ready framework for U.S. hotel operators that explicitly integrates AI efficiency goals with empathy preservation goals as co-equal strategic objectives. The dominant framing

Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra1013 | SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.748 ISSN: 2347-4378
EPRA International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Studies (EBMS)
Volume: 13 | Issue: 4 | April 2026 -Peer-Reviewed Journal

in existing work positions empathy as a constraint on AI adoption rather than an active design principle for AI architecture.

Second, the geography of existing research is heavily weighted toward Asia-Pacific markets—particularly China, Japan, and South Korea, which have adopted service robots at a pace that outstrips U.S. deployment. The American hotel market, with its distinctive labor cost structure, cultural expectations around personal service, and diversified property type mix (from budget to luxury to extended stay), requires research that accounts for these contextual specificities.

Third, there are virtually no empirical studies examining the return-on-investment (ROI) of empathy-preserving AI design in U.S. hotels—specifically, whether hotels that deploy AI with deliberate human touchpoint preservation outperform those that adopt AI primarily for cost reduction on metrics of guest loyalty, repeat booking rate, and net promoter score.

Fourth, the emergence of generative AI (GenAI) from 2023 onward has created new opportunities and risks that existing systematic reviews do not adequately address. Dogru et al. (2023), in the Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research, call for frameworks that address GenAI's unique capacity for context-aware, human-like interaction—capabilities that blur the boundary between mechanical and empathic AI more than any previous technology generation.

Fifth, and perhaps most urgently, the employee dimension of AI adoption has been studied primarily from a resistance or anxiety perspective, with insufficient attention to the positive design question: how can AI be deployed in ways that actively develop and reward the empathic skills of hotel employees, creating a virtuous cycle in which technology investment and human capital investment reinforce rather than substitute for each other?

Table 3. Research Gap Matrix: Current State of Literature and Identified Gaps

Research Dimension	Prior Studies Address?	U.S.-Specific Focus?	Empathy Preservation Frame?	Gap Identified
AI operational efficiency	Yes — extensively	Partially	No	Efficiency studied; empathy preservation absent
Guest emotional satisfaction with AI	Partially	Rarely	Rarely	U.S. consumer-specific emotional dynamics understudied
Employee well-being & AI anxiety	Partially	No	No	No U.S. hotel workforce study on AI anxiety & empathy skill erosion
Human-AI service hybrid models	Emerging	No	No	No validated framework for U.S. hotel empathy-AI integration
Generative AI & traditional hospitality values	Very limited	No	No	Critical gap: GenAI vs. hospitality authenticity unresolved
ROI of empathy-preserving AI design	No	No	No	No empirical ROI study linking empathy-design to loyalty/revenue in U.S. hotels

Note. This matrix synthesizes gaps identified across the systematic literature review; columns represent four evaluative criteria applied to each research dimension.

4. METHODOLOGY

This study employs a structured secondary data analysis methodology, consistent with the tradition of systematic literature review and theoretical synthesis that characterizes high-impact conceptual papers in hospitality management

(Kraus et al., 2022; Sauer & Seuring, 2023). The research design follows a four-phase protocol: (1) systematic literature identification; (2) quality filtering and inclusion assessment; (3) thematic synthesis and gap mapping; and (4) framework development.

Literature was identified through searches of five academic databases: Web of Science, Scopus, EBSCO Business Source Complete, Google Scholar, and ProQuest ABI/Inform. Search terms were organized into three clusters: (a) AI and hotel/hospitality/tourism; (b) empathy, human touch, and service robots; (c) AI adoption, workforce, and service quality. Searches were restricted to peer-reviewed journal articles published between January 2016 and April 2026, yielding an initial pool of 412 candidate articles.

Inclusion criteria required that articles: (1) focus on AI in a hospitality or tourism service context; (2) address at least one of the following: guest experience, employee performance, service quality, or operational outcomes; and (3) be published in journals indexed by Scopus or Web of Science. Articles were excluded if they focused exclusively on non-hotel sectors, were published in predatory journals, or were available only as conference proceedings. After applying these filters, 31 articles formed the core analytical corpus.

Industry data was sourced from the American Hotel & Lodging Association (AHLA) 2024 and 2025 State of the Industry Reports, Deloitte's Future of Hospitality analysis (2026), Statista's AI in Hospitality database (2024), InsightAce Analytic's market sizing data (2026), and Grand View Research's AI in Tourism market report (2025). Secondary data from case studies of Marriott International, Hilton Worldwide, Hyatt Hotels, and IHG Hotels & Resorts was incorporated to ground theoretical propositions in observable industry practice.

The analytical framework for synthesizing findings was adapted from the Antecedents-Decisions-Outcomes (ADO) template (Wang et al., 2025), enabling systematic comparison of study design, theoretical lens, methodological approach, and finding across the corpus. Thematic synthesis followed the procedures outlined by Thomas and Harden (2008), with themes emerging inductively from the literature and then deductively tested against the theoretical propositions of Huang and Rust (2018, 2021).

5. FINDINGS

5.1 The State of AI Adoption in American Hotels

The U.S. hotel industry's embrace of AI has accelerated dramatically across the period under review. Table 5 documents the trajectory of adoption across key technology categories. The most widely deployed AI application—chatbots and virtual assistants—now reaches 80% of U.S. hotel properties, representing a 67% increase in adoption rate since 2021. AI revenue management systems have similarly surged from 41% to 74% adoption. Energy management AI, personalization systems, and service robots have each grown steadily, though robots remain the least penetrated category at 29% of properties.

This growth is driven by a combination of labor economics and competitive pressure. With average hotel wages exceeding $23 per hour nationally in 2023 and staffing shortages affecting two-thirds of U.S. hotels, AI represents a partial solution to a structural labor deficit. Simultaneously, leading hotel brands have publicly positioned AI investment as a strategic competitive differentiator. Marriott International's AI-driven Group Pricing Optimizer has been credited with significant group revenue uplift; Hilton's Connected Room platform generates proprietary behavioral data that enables personalization at a depth unavailable to competitors lacking equivalent sensor infrastructure; and IHG's Smart Pricing initiative introduced value-based pricing tiers in 2025 that increased customer lifetime value by 35% (Revenue Hub, 2025).

The AHLA's 2025 State of the Industry Report identifies generative AI as a key trend for the year ahead, noting that GenAI is becoming 'crucial for enhancing guest experiences and operational efficiency.' Deloitte's (2026) Future of Hospitality analysis corroborates this framing, recommending that hospitality companies accelerate AI adoption to automate tasks and enable employees to enhance customer experience. Both reports explicitly identify the balance between AI capability and human touch as a central strategic challenge—lending authoritative industry endorsement to the academic literature's central concern.

Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra1013 | SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.748 ISSN: 2347-4378
EPRA International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Studies (EBMS)
Volume: 13 | Issue: 4 | April 2026 -Peer-Reviewed Journal

Table 5. U.S. Hotel Industry AI Adoption and Market Trends (2021–2025)

Metric	2021	2022	2023	2024/2025
U.S. Hotels Employing Chatbots	48%	62%	74%	80%
Hotels Using AI Revenue Management	41%	55%	66%	74%
Global AI in Hospitality Market Size (USD Bn)	$0.8 Bn	$1.2 Bn	$2.1 Bn	$2.9 Bn (2024)
U.S. Hotel Industry Wages (avg/hr)	$18.40	$20.10	$23.00+	$24.50 est.
North America AI Tourism Market Share	35.1%	36.4%	37.9%	38.7% (2024)
Hotels Reporting Staffing Shortages (U.S.)	N/A	79%	67.6%	Ongoing (2025)
RevPAR Lift from AI Revenue Mgmt (avg)	~3-5%	~5-7%	~7-10%	~10-15% (top adopters)

Note. Data compiled from AHLA (2024, 2025), AllAboutAI (2024), Grand View Research (2025), and InsightAce Analytic (2026). Est. = estimated. RevPAR = Revenue Per Available Room.

5.2 The Empathy Gap in AI-Enabled Hospitality

Despite the breadth and pace of AI adoption documented above, the literature consistently reveals what this study terms the Empathy Gap: a measurable discrepancy between what AI systems deliver and what guests need when it matters most. In three distinct service contexts—emotional service recovery, culturally sensitive encounters, and premium hospitality experiences—AI-enabled service systematically falls short of guest expectations grounded in human warmth and interpersonal attunement.

The service recovery context is particularly revealing. Research by Crolic et al. (2022) in the Journal of Marketing found that angry customers interacting with anthropomorphic chatbots have higher service and empathy expectations than those interacting with clearly robotic agents—and when the chatbot fails to meet these expectations, customer anger is amplified rather than mitigated. Similarly, experimental work in tourism booking contexts found that behavioral booking intention is reduced more sharply when negative outcomes occur during chatbot interactions than during equivalent human agent interactions (Tourism Management, 2025), because guests perceive AI as less capable of genuine empathic response.

In premium and luxury hospitality segments, the human touch is not merely a service delivery mechanism—it is the product. Gonçalves et al. (2024) found in three experimental studies in luxury tourism that the potential use of AI reduced tourists' usage intentions and perceptions of luxury value, with these effects mediated by customers' need for differentiation. In the American luxury hotel market—which accounts for a disproportionate share of RevPAR and brand equity—this finding has direct revenue implications.

The findings by Juquelier et al. (2024) add a further layer of complexity: empathic AI can under specific conditions harm rather than help guest experience. When guests feel time pressure, empathic chatbot language slows resolution and increases frustration. This non-linearity suggests that the solution is not simply to make all AI more empathic, but to develop contextual intelligence that directs different service moments to the most appropriate delivery channel—human or AI.

5.3 The Human-AI Collaboration Model in Leading U.S. Hotel Brands

Analysis of secondary case data from America's largest hotel operators reveals an emergent industry best practice that aligns closely with Huang and Rust's (2018, 2021) theoretical prescription: successful AI adopters are not replacing human hospitality with automation but using AI to free human employees for higher-order emotional engagement.

Hilton Worldwide provides the most instructive example. Hilton's AI strategy, as analyzed by industry researchers (Klover.ai, 2025), explicitly centers on augmenting human capability rather than substituting for it. Its partnership with Be My Eyes and OpenAI to enhance accessibility for blind and low-vision guests—a deeply empathic application of AI—and its use of generative AI for large-scale employee training demonstrate that technology investment can be

Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra1013 | SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.748 ISSN: 2347-4378
EPRA International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Studies (EBMS)
Volume: 13 | Issue: 4 | April 2026 -Peer-Reviewed Journal

directed toward deepening the human quality of service rather than eliminating human service roles. Hilton's strategy of capturing behavioral data through its Connected Room platform is used not to automate the room experience but to enable front-of-house staff to surprise and delight guests with personalized recognition that would have been impossible without data intelligence.

A ZS and HSMAI study found that hotel revenue managers spend 51% of their time on tasks that do not directly generate revenue (ZS, 2025). AI automation of these non-revenue tasks—report generation, data compilation, market monitoring—has the practical effect of returning revenue managers' attention to strategic and relational work. Gartner's prediction that organizations blending human expertise with AI will see a 25% increase in operational efficiency and customer satisfaction compared to either pure-human or pure-AI approaches provides further empirical grounding for the hybrid model (cited in ZS, 2025). Ritz-Carlton's Revenue Strategy Framework exemplifies this hybrid approach, using AI to improve decision-making speed by 75% while ensuring that brand integrity and personalized service standards remain under human stewardship (Revenue Hub, 2025).

6. PROPOSED FRAMEWORK: THE HUMAN-AI SYMBIOSIS FRAMEWORK (HASF)

Drawing on the theoretical foundations reviewed in Section 2, the literature synthesis in Section 3, and the empirical findings in Section 5, this study proposes the Human-AI Symbiosis Framework (HASF) as a five-pillar model for AI integration in U.S. hotel operations. The HASF is designed to operationalize Huang and Rust's (2018) theoretical insight that AI advancement should increase the value and deployment of empathetic human intelligence—not displace it. The framework is explicitly prescriptive, providing hotel operators with actionable guidance rather than merely descriptive observation.

The five pillars of the HASF are: (I) Operational Excellence, (II) Personalized Guest Experience, (III) Communication and Service Recovery, (IV) Employee Empowerment, and (V) Authenticity Preservation. For each pillar, the framework specifies the appropriate AI role, the appropriate human role, and the integration mechanism that binds the two in service of the guest experience. These pillars are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Human-AI Symbiosis Framework (HASF): Five-Pillar Integration Architecture

Pillar	AI Role	Human Role	Integration Mechanism
I. Operational Excellence	Dynamic pricing, demand forecasting, maintenance alerts, scheduling	Strategic oversight, exception handling, brand stewardship	AI frees staff time for high-touch guest engagement
II. Personalized Guest Experience	Preference learning, predictive room settings, targeted offers	Emotional reading of guest mood; culturally sensitive service	AI provides data; humans interpret and apply with empathy
III. Communication & Service Recovery	24/7 chatbots, multilingual NLP, complaint triage	Complex complaint resolution, de-escalation, sincere apology delivery	AI handles Tier-1; escalates to humans for emotional/complex situations
IV. Employee Empowerment	Real-time guest data display, suggested responses, training simulations	Judgment, creativity, compassion in guest interactions	AI as decision support tool, not decision maker for emotional encounters
V. Authenticity Preservation	Sentiment analysis, service failure detection, feedback analytics	Human moments of connection: greetings, celebrations, farewells	Identify critical touchpoints where human presence is non-negotiable

Note. The HASF is proposed as a conceptual tool for U.S. hotel strategic planning. Each pillar defines AI role, human role, and integration mechanism to preserve empathy while leveraging AI capabilities.

Pillar I—Operational Excellence—represents the domain in which AI provides the clearest value with the least risk to hospitality authenticity. Dynamic pricing, demand forecasting, predictive maintenance, and staff scheduling algorithms operate invisibly to the guest, generating efficiency gains that translate into financial resources that can be reinvested in staff training, wage improvements, and service quality enhancements. The human role in this pillar is

strategic oversight and exception handling—ensuring that algorithmic decisions align with brand values and do not produce outcomes that would strike guests as manipulative or unfair.

Pillar II—Personalized Guest Experience—requires the most careful calibration. AI is uniquely capable of analyzing vast datasets to identify guest preferences and predict needs, but the delivery of personalization requires empathic human judgment to distinguish between a guest who wants to be recognized and celebrated, and one who values discreet privacy and minimal interaction. The HASF proposes that AI provide data intelligence while humans apply interpretive empathy in deciding how, when, and through whom personalization is delivered.

Pillar III—Communication and Service Recovery—is perhaps the most operationally critical pillar for empathy preservation. HASF prescribes a tiered escalation model: AI handles Tier-1 communications (information requests, booking confirmations, standard FAQs) through chatbots and virtual assistants; human staff engage for Tier-2 situations (special requests, complaints, emotionally complex interactions). The boundary condition identified by Crolic et al. (2022) and Juquelier et al. (2024)—that AI empathy performs poorly under conditions of anger, time pressure, or emotional complexity—provides empirical justification for this design decision.

Pillar IV—Employee Empowerment—addresses the critical gap in the literature identified in Section 3.5. Rather than treating AI as a workforce reduction tool, HASF envisions AI as a decision support system that equips human employees with real-time guest intelligence, enabling them to deliver empathic service with greater accuracy and confidence. Guest preference dashboards, sentiment analysis alerts, and AI-powered training simulations can develop rather than erode the empathic capabilities of hotel staff. This pillar operationalizes Prentice's (2024) recommendation for investment in emotional intelligence training as AI handles mechanical and analytical tasks.

Pillar V—Authenticity Preservation—is the most distinctive and ambitious pillar, addressing the fundamental question of what it means for a hotel to preserve its human soul in an increasingly automated service environment. The HASF proposes that hotel operators conduct explicit mapping of critical service touchpoints—arrival greetings, celebrations, difficult conversations, farewells—and designate these as human-delivered moments by policy, not accident. AI's role in this pillar is supportive: sentiment analysis tools that detect unhappy guests before they complain, feedback analytics that identify service quality decline, and operational automation that ensures human staff are available for these moments rather than consumed by administrative tasks.

7. DISCUSSION

This study's findings contribute to the hospitality management literature in several distinct ways. Most fundamentally, they reframe the dominant policy question from 'how much AI should hotels adopt?' to 'what kind of AI integration preserves the relational and emotional quality that distinguishes excellent hospitality from efficient service delivery?' This reframing has practical significance: it implies that technology investment decisions in hotels should be evaluated not just on ROI metrics like RevPAR and cost per occupied room, but on downstream measures of guest emotional satisfaction, brand trust, and long-term loyalty formation.

The Empathy Gap concept introduced in Section 5.2 represents a theoretically and practically significant contribution. Existing frameworks—TAM, the unified theory of acceptance and use of technology (UTAUT), and various hospitality-specific adoption models—focus on the antecedents of technology adoption but do not systematically characterize the service quality deficits that arise when AI displaces human empathic delivery. By naming and theorizing the Empathy Gap, this study provides hospitality researchers and practitioners with a construct that can be operationalized, measured, and managed.

The proposed HASF framework advances the practical agenda by translating the theoretical insight of Huang and Rust (2018, 2021) into a prescriptive operational architecture. Where Huang and Rust specify that 'feeling service should be performed mostly by HI' at the current stage of AI development, the HASF specifies which specific service moments constitute feeling service in a hotel context and how AI can be architectured to support rather than displace human delivery of those moments. This translation from theory to practice is a contribution that the existing literature, despite its theoretical richness, has not yet produced for the U.S. hotel market.

The study also contributes to the growing literature on AI and the American hospitality workforce. Scholars including Wang et al. (2025) and Prentice (2024) have documented the psychological costs of poorly managed AI transitions

for hotel employees. The HASF's Pillar IV—Employee Empowerment—operationalizes an alternative vision in which AI deployment is accompanied by meaningful investment in the emotional and empathic skills that make hotel employment distinctive and rewarding. This vision aligns with the AHLA's (2025) recognition that 'the hotel industry's greatest asset is its people' and with Deloitte's (2026) finding that hospitality leaders who prioritize emotional intelligence are four times more likely to retain staff and 22 times more likely to drive high performance.

The study acknowledges several limitations. As a secondary data analysis, it cannot make causal claims about the relationship between specific AI deployment configurations and guest empathy outcomes—relationships that require experimental or longitudinal primary data to establish. The proposed HASF framework, while grounded in extensive literature review and empirical case evidence, requires empirical validation through expert Delphi studies, practitioner co-design workshops, and ultimately field trials in U.S. hotel properties across multiple brand segments and market tiers.

Future research should address three specific gaps not resolved by this study. First, the ROI of empathy-preserving AI design requires measurement—specifically, whether hotels that implement frameworks like the HASF outperform conventional AI adopters on metrics of guest loyalty, net promoter score, and revenue per guest. Second, HASF requires segment-specific adaptation: the balance of AI and human service delivery that optimizes the experience of a luxury resort guest differs meaningfully from that optimal for a budget traveler or a business road warrior. Third, as generative AI systems become capable of more nuanced emotional expression, the boundary conditions of Pillar III—the escalation model for communication and service recovery—will need to be empirically re-evaluated.

8. CONCLUSION

The American hotel industry stands at an inflection point. The technological capability to automate most hotel service transactions now exists, and the economic pressures—labor cost inflation, staffing shortages, competitive margin compression—that incentivize automation are intensifying. The question is not whether AI will continue to transform American hotels; it already has and will continue to do so at accelerating speed. The question is whether that transformation will be designed with intention, preserving and amplifying the empathic human quality that has always distinguished great hospitality from mere accommodation.

This paper has argued, based on a systematic review of more than 30 peer-reviewed sources and extensive secondary market data, that the answer to this question is not technological but strategic. AI technologies are tools, and like all tools, their value depends on the wisdom of their application. Huang and Rust (2018) were correct that AI's advance should, in principle, increase the value of human empathetic intelligence in service—but this outcome is not automatic. It requires hotel operators who deliberately invest in the human dimensions of their organizations as they invest in technology, who design service architectures that protect the critical moments of human connection that build lasting loyalty, and who understand that a chatbot that correctly handles 95% of guest inquiries has not replaced the value of the front desk colleague who remembered your name and your coffee preference.

The Human-AI Symbiosis Framework proposed in this paper offers a starting point for operationalizing this vision. Its five pillars—Operational Excellence, Personalized Guest Experience, Communication and Service Recovery, Employee Empowerment, and Authenticity Preservation—provide a structured architecture for the most consequential management decision facing American hotel operators today: not whether to deploy AI, but how to deploy it in a manner worthy of the word hospitality.

The hospes of ancient Rome understood something that no algorithm has yet captured: that to welcome a stranger into your home is to participate in something sacred. As the American hotel industry writes the next chapter of that tradition, it has an obligation to ensure that the tools of transformation serve, not subvert, the humanity at the heart of the enterprise. This paper represents a step toward equipping scholars and practitioners to meet that obligation with both rigor and grace.

REFERENCES

1. *American Hotel & Lodging Association (AHLA). (2024). 2024 state of the industry report. https://www.ahla.com/sites/default/files/SOTI.2024.Final_.Draft_.v4.pdf*
2. *American Hotel & Lodging Association (AHLA). (2025). 2025 state of the industry report. https://www.ahla.com/sites/default/files/25_SOTI.pdf*

3. *Bhuiyan, K. H., Ahmed, S., & Jahan, I. (2024). Consumer attitude toward using artificial intelligence (AI) devices in hospitality services. Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights, 7(2), 968–985. https://doi.org/10.1108/jhti-08-2023-0551*
4. *Blut, M., Wang, C., Wünderlich, N. V., & Brock, C. (2021). Understanding anthropomorphism in service provision: A meta-analysis of physical robots, chatbots, and other AI. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 49(4), 632–658. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-020-00762-y*
5. *Buhalis, D., & Leung, R. (2018). Smart hospitality—Interconnectivity and interoperability towards an ecosystem. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 71, 41–50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2017.11.011*
6. *Bulchand-Gidumal, J. (2022). Impact of artificial intelligence in travel, tourism, and hospitality. In Z. Xiang, M. Fuchs, U. Gretzel, & W. Höpken (Eds.), Handbook of e-Tourism (pp. 1943–1962). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-48652-5_110*
7. *Crolic, C., Thomaz, F., Hadi, R., & Stephen, A. T. (2022). Blame the bot: Anthropomorphism and anger in customer–chatbot interactions. Journal of Marketing, 86(1), 132–148. https://doi.org/10.1177/00222429211045687*
8. *De Kervenoael, R., Hasan, R., Schwob, A., & Goh, E. (2020). Leveraging human-robot interaction in hospitality services: Incorporating the role of perceived value, empathy, and information sharing into visitors' intentions to use social robots. Tourism Management, 78, 104042. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2019.104042*
9. *Deloitte. (2026, January). Future of hospitality: AI-driven industry trends. https://www.deloitte.com/us/en/Industries/consumer/articles/future-of-hospitality-ai-innovation.html*
10. *Ding, A., Lee, R. H., Legendre, T. S., & Madera, J. (2022). Anthropomorphism in hospitality and tourism: A systematic review and agenda for future research. Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 52, 404–415. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2022.07.018*
11. *Doborjeh, Z., Hemmington, N., Doborjeh, M., & Kasabov, N. (2022). Artificial intelligence: A systematic review of methods and applications in hospitality and tourism. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 34(3), 1154–1157. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-06-2021-0767*
12. *Dogru, T., Line, N., Mody, M., Hanks, L., Abbott, J., Acikgoz, F., Assaf, A., Bilgihan, A., & Zhang, T. (2023). Generative artificial intelligence in the hospitality and tourism industry: Developing a framework for future research. Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/10963480231188663*
13. *Fuentes-Moraleda, L., Díaz-Pérez, P., Orea-Giner, A., Muñoz-Mazón, A., & Villacé-Molinero, T. (2020). Interaction between hotel service robots and humans: A hotel-specific Service Robot Acceptance Model (sRAM). Tourism Management Perspectives, 36, 100751. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2020.100751*
14. *Grand View Research. (2025). AI in tourism market size & share: Industry report, 2030. https://www.grandviewresearch.com/industry-analysis/artificial-intelligence-ai-tourism-market-report*
15. *Huang, M.-H., & Rust, R. T. (2018). Artificial intelligence in service. Journal of Service Research, 21(2), 155–172. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670517752459*
16. *Huang, M.-H., & Rust, R. T. (2021). Engaged to a robot? The role of AI in service. Journal of Service Research, 24(1), 30–41. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670520902266*
17. *InsightAce Analytic. (2026). AI in hospitality and tourism market size & industry growth 2034. https://www.insightaceanalytic.com/report/ai-in-hospitality-and-tourism-market/2754*
18. *Juquelier, A., Poncin, I., & Hazée, S. (2024). Empathic chatbots: A double-edged sword in customer experiences. Journal of Business Research, 185, Article 114907. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2024.115074*
19. *Khaliq, A., Waqas, A., Nisar, Q. A., Haider, S., & Asghar, Z. (2022). Application of AI and robotics in hospitality sector: A resource gain and resource loss perspective. Technology in Society, 68, 101807. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2021.101807*
20. *Kim, H., So, K. K. F., & Shin, S. (2025). Artificial intelligence in hospitality and tourism: Insights from industry practices, research literature, and expert opinions. Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/10963480241229235*
21. *Klover.ai. (2025). Hilton's AI strategy: Analysis of dominance in hospitality. https://www.klover.ai/hilton-ai-strategy-analysis-of-dominance-in-hospitality-hotel-ai/*
22. *Kraus, S., Breier, M., Lim, W. M., Dabić, M., Kumar, S., Kanbach, D., Mukherjee, D., Corvello, V., Piñeiro-Chousa, J., Liguori, E., Palacios-Marqués, D., Schiavone, F., Ferraris, A., Fernandes, C., & Ferreira, J. J. (2022). Literature reviews as independent studies: Guidelines for academic practice. Review of Managerial Science, 16(8), 2577–2595. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-022-00588-8*
23. *Nam, K., Dutt, C. S., Chathoth, P., Daghfous, A., & Khan, M. S. (2021). The adoption of artificial intelligence and robotics in the hotel industry: Prospects and challenges. Electronic Markets, 31(3), 553–574. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-020-00442-3*
24. *Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. Journal of Retailing, 64(1), 12–40.*
25. *Prentice, C. (2024). Artificial intelligence through the lens of hospitality employees: A systematic review. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 123, Article 103897. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2024.103986*

26. *Revenue Hub. (2025, January). The AI revolution in hotel pricing: Beyond dynamic rates. https://revenue-hub.com/the-ai-revolution-in-hotel-pricing-beyond-dynamic-rates/*
27. *Statista. (2024). Artificial intelligence (AI) use in hospitality – Statistics & facts. https://www.statista.com/topics/12390/artificial-intelligence-ai-use-in-hospitality/*
28. *Wang, T., Aw, E. C.-X., Tan, G. W.-H., Sthapit, E., & Li, X. (2025). Can AI improve hotel service performance? A systematic review using ADO-TCM. Tourism Management Perspectives. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/14673584251356817*
29. *Yun, J., & Park, J. (2022). The effects of chatbot service recovery with emotion words on customer satisfaction, repurchase intention, and positive word-of-mouth. Frontiers in Psychology, 13, Article 922503. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.922503*
30. *ZS Associates & HSMAI. (2025). Gen AI in hotel revenue management: Pricing and automation. https://www.zs.com/insights/generative-ai-hospitality-revenue-management*