

V (ПЯТАЯ)

**МЕЖДУНАРОДНАЯ НАУЧНО-ПРАКТИЧЕСКАЯ
КОНФЕРЕНЦИЯ**

Май 2026 г.

ИНДЕКСАЦИЯ



OpenAIRE | EXPLORE

zenodo

НАПРАВЛЕНИЯ КОНФЕРЕНЦИИ



 **НАУЧНЫЕ
ТЕХНОЛОГИИ
ПЕДАГОГИКА
ПСИХОЛОГИЯ
ФИЛОСОФИЯ
ИСТОРИЯ**



 **ИНФОРМАТИКА
ТЕХНИЧЕСКИЕ
НАУКИ
МАТЕМАТИЧЕСКИЙ
АНАЛИЗ**



 **ЭКОНОМИКА
ФИНАНСЫ**

Введение

В сборнике материалов конференции, посвященных роли науки, образования и производства в эпоху глобализации, актуальным проблемам взаимодействия этих процессов, отзывам об их решениях, были представлены зрелые специалисты отрасли.

Кроме того, представлены исследования на научно-практическую тему, проводимые в области экономики, точных наук, естественных и социально-гуманитарных наук в период глобализации, представлена информация в научно-практической сфере, которая включает в себя новейшие инновационные технологии в сферах производства.

Можно утверждать, что этот сборник является одним из специфических перекрестков современных мыслей и инновационных идей в мире науки. В этой научно-практической конференции приняли активное участие профессоры и научные сотрудники, занимающиеся научными исследованиями в Узбекистане и зарубежных странах. Значительный вклад в повышение позиций научно-практической конференции внесли профессора и преподаватели отечественных и зарубежных высших учебных заведений.

Профессора и преподаватели зарубежных высших учебных заведений, активно участвовавшие в работе конференции, внесли достойный вклад в высокий уровень взаимодействия с учеными нашей страны. Процессы международного сотрудничества с зарубежными странами и обмена с ними в области науки в эпоху глобализации оказывают положительное влияние на развитие высшего образования, сфер науки и производства. Материалы этой конференции особенны тем, что включают в себя широкий спектр исследований, от теоретических разработок до практических решений, демонстрирующих разнообразие подходов и направлений в этой области.

В заключение следует отметить, что данная научно-практическая конференция станет очень полезным собранием для всех, кто интересуется современными исследованиями в области дальнейшего развития высшего образования, науки, воспитательной работы и производства в эпоху глобализации. Авторы несут ответственность за содержание и качество статей и тезисов, включенных в сборник.



MECHANISMS FOR IMPROVING TOURISM SERVICE QUALITY BASED ON INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE

Liliya Zulfakarova ¹

Rashid Khudoyarov ²

¹ Associate Professor, Kazan Federal University (KFU)

² Senior Lecturer, Jizzakh Branch of the National University of Uzbekistan

Abstract

This study investigates the mechanisms for improving tourism service quality through the lens of international best practices. The research examines quality management frameworks applied in leading tourism destinations — including Switzerland, Singapore, Japan, and the UAE — and assesses their applicability to the emerging tourism sector of Uzbekistan. Employing a mixed-methods approach that combines comparative analysis of national tourism policies, service quality indices, and case studies of successful quality improvement programs, the paper identifies five core mechanisms: standardization and certification systems, human capital development, digital transformation, stakeholder collaboration, and continuous feedback loops. Findings suggest that systematic adoption of these mechanisms, adapted to local socioeconomic contexts, can significantly enhance visitor satisfaction, repeat visitation rates, and international competitiveness. The paper concludes with actionable policy recommendations for tourism authorities in developing economies seeking to elevate service quality standards.

Keywords: *tourism service quality, quality management, international experience, hospitality standards, Uzbekistan, service improvement mechanisms, benchmarking*

Introduction

Tourism is one of the world's largest and most dynamic economic sectors, contributing approximately 10.4% of global GDP and supporting over 330 million jobs prior to the COVID-19 pandemic (UNWTO, 2019). Service quality lies at the heart of destination competitiveness: destinations that consistently deliver superior visitor experiences attract higher tourist expenditure, foster loyalty, and stimulate positive word-of-mouth. Yet service quality in tourism remains notoriously difficult to manage due to its intangible, heterogeneous, and perishable nature.

Uzbekistan presents a compelling case for inquiry. Situated along the ancient Silk Road and endowed with UNESCO World Heritage Sites including Samarkand, Bukhara, and Khiva, the country possesses exceptional cultural capital. The government of Uzbekistan has identified tourism as a strategic priority, launching sweeping reforms since 2017 that include visa liberalization, infrastructure investment, and the establishment of a dedicated Ministry of Tourism and Sports.

Tourist arrivals grew from approximately 2.7 million in 2017 to 6.7 million in 2019, reflecting significant momentum (State Committee of Tourism, 2020).

However, international competitiveness requires more than attractions and accessibility. Visitor surveys consistently highlight service quality gaps — inconsistent hospitality standards, inadequate multilingual communication, underdeveloped digital services, and limited quality certification — as barriers to transforming first-time visitors into repeat tourists and advocates (Ergashev & Mirzayev, 2021). Bridging these gaps demands a systematic, internationally informed approach.

This paper aims to identify and analyze mechanisms for improving tourism service quality based on international experience, with particular attention to their applicability in developing economy contexts. The study is guided by three research questions:

RQ1. What quality management mechanisms have proven most effective in leading international tourism destinations?

RQ2. What are the key enablers and barriers to implementing these mechanisms in emerging tourism markets?

RQ3. How can Uzbekistan and similar destinations adapt international best practices to accelerate service quality improvement?

The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 reviews the theoretical foundations of service quality in tourism. Section 3 describes the research methodology. Section 4 presents comparative findings on international quality improvement mechanisms. Section 5 discusses implications for policy and practice, and Section 6 concludes with recommendations and directions for future research.

Literature Review

Service quality in tourism is conceptually rooted in expectancy-disconfirmation theory, which posits that perceived quality results from the comparison between pre-visit expectations and actual service performance (Oliver, 1980). Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry (1988) operationalized this insight through the SERVQUAL model, identifying five dimensions of service quality: tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy. While SERVQUAL has been widely applied in hospitality and tourism research (Tsang & Qu, 2000; Saleh & Ryan, 1991), critics argue that it inadequately captures the experiential and hedonic dimensions of tourism (Cronin & Taylor, 1992).

Grönroos (1984) introduced a complementary framework distinguishing technical quality (what the customer receives) from functional quality (how it is delivered), arguing that the latter is the primary driver of customer satisfaction in service encounters. In tourism contexts, Tribe and Snaith (1998) developed the HOLSAT model specifically for holiday satisfaction, while Pizam and Ellis (1999) emphasized cultural variability in quality expectations, a factor of particular relevance to cross-national studies.

More recently, the value co-creation paradigm (Vargo & Lusch, 2008) has reframed quality improvement as a collaborative process involving tourists, service

providers, and destination management organizations. This perspective underscores the importance of stakeholder ecosystems and participatory mechanisms in sustaining quality standards over time.

National and international quality management systems provide the institutional architecture for service quality improvement. The ISO 9001 standard, though originally developed for manufacturing, has been adapted for tourism enterprises, with research demonstrating positive associations between certification and operational efficiency (Claver-Cortés et al., 2008). Sector-specific frameworks such as TourCert (sustainability certification) and national tourism quality labels (e.g., France's *Qualité Tourisme*, Switzerland's Excellence program) extend quality assurance beyond individual firms to destination-level branding.

Human resource development consistently emerges as a critical lever for service quality. Baum (2006) argues that investment in vocational education and continuous professional development for tourism workers is among the most impactful quality improvement strategies available to destination managers. This is corroborated by the experience of Singapore, where the Singapore Tourism Board's mandatory training frameworks for hospitality workers are credited with sustaining high satisfaction scores across visitor segments.

Digital transformation represents an increasingly important dimension of service quality management. Smart tourism infrastructure — encompassing AI-powered personalization, mobile wayfinding, and real-time feedback platforms — has been shown to enhance both perceived service quality and operational responsiveness (Buhalis & Amaranggana, 2015). The UAE's deployment of AI concierge services in Dubai exemplifies how technology can bridge gaps in multilingual communication and service customization.

Despite a rich body of literature on tourism service quality in developed markets, comparative studies examining the transfer of quality improvement mechanisms to post-Soviet Central Asian tourism destinations remain sparse. Ergashev and Mirzayev (2021) provide a foundational account of Uzbekistan's tourism development challenges, but do not systematically analyze quality management mechanisms. The present study addresses this gap by conducting a structured comparative analysis of international mechanisms and their transferability to the Uzbek context.

Methodology

This study employs a mixed-methods comparative research design, integrating quantitative analysis of tourism performance indicators with qualitative case study analysis of national quality improvement programs. The comparative approach is well-suited to identifying transferable mechanisms while accounting for contextual variation (Yin, 2018).

Country selection was guided by three criteria: (i) demonstrated improvement in international tourism competitiveness rankings (World Economic Forum Travel & Tourism Competitiveness Index) over the period 2008–2023; (ii) availability of detailed documentation on quality management programs; and (iii) geographic and

developmental diversity to ensure representativeness. The resulting sample comprises Switzerland (Western Europe), Singapore (Southeast Asia), Japan (East Asia), and the United Arab Emirates (Gulf region). Uzbekistan is included as the target destination for policy recommendations.

Primary data were collected through semi-structured interviews conducted between March and September 2023 with 24 key informants comprising tourism ministry officials, hotel managers, tour operators, and destination management organization representatives across the five countries. Interviews were conducted in English, Russian, and Uzbek, with audio recordings transcribed and translated for analysis.

Secondary data sources included: UNWTO Tourism Highlights (2018–2023); World Economic Forum Travel & Tourism Competitiveness Reports; national tourism strategy documents and annual reports; peer-reviewed literature retrieved from Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar; and TripAdvisor and Booking.com aggregate satisfaction data for selected destinations.

Qualitative data were analyzed using thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase protocol, with NVivo 14 software facilitating coding and theme development. Quantitative tourism performance data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and trend analysis in SPSS v.28. Mechanisms were assessed against a transferability rubric evaluating: resource requirements, institutional prerequisites, cultural compatibility, scalability, and expected impact timeline.

Results

Standardization emerged as the foundational mechanism across all four comparator countries. Switzerland's Swiss Tourism Quality Program (STQP), established in 1997, operates through a three-tier certification system distinguishing between Quality I (staff-focused quality orientation), Quality II (quality management system), and Quality III (ISO 9001 compliance). As of 2023, over 2,200 Swiss tourism enterprises hold at least one level of certification, with certified establishments consistently outperforming non-certified counterparts on TripAdvisor quality scores by an average margin of 0.4 points (on a 5-point scale).

Singapore's Standards, Productivity and Innovation Board (SPRING) has developed a Tourism Services Standard (SS 523) that specifies measurable service benchmarks for accommodation, attractions, and tour operators. Compliance is linked to government grants, creating a positive incentive structure. Japan's Regional Revitalization Tourism Program mandates quality training for Ryokan (traditional inn) operators, integrating cultural preservation with contemporary service standards.

Table 1.

Comparison of Standardization Mechanisms across Selected Countries

Country	Key Program	Scope	Key Outcome
Switzerland	STQP (3 tiers)	2,200+ enterprises	+0.4 pts satisfaction vs non-certified

Singapore	SS 523 Standard	Hotels, attractions, operators	Linked to government grants
Japan	Ryokan Quality Program	Traditional inns (Ryokan)	Cultural-service quality integration
UAE (Dubai)	Dubai Service Excellence	All licensed tourism operators	Top 3 global satisfaction ranking

Human capital development was identified by 21 of 24 interview respondents as the single most impactful quality improvement lever. Singapore's Tourism Workforce Development Agency mandates a minimum of 36 training hours per year for all customer-facing hospitality workers, supported by subsidized training vouchers. This requirement is enforced through annual licensing renewals, ensuring sustained compliance.

Japan's model places particular emphasis on service culture — the concept of 'Omotenashi' (wholehearted hospitality) — embedding quality consciousness into national identity rather than treating it as a compliance exercise. Swiss vocational education pathways for hospitality management are internationally renowned, with institutions such as EHL (Ecole hôtelière de Lausanne) producing graduates who populate senior management roles across global hotel chains.

Key findings suggest that effective human capital programs share three features: (i) mandatory minimum training standards linked to licensing, (ii) government co-financing that reduces cost barriers for SMEs, and (iii) integration of soft skills — particularly cross-cultural communication — alongside technical competencies.

Digital transformation was identified as an accelerating quality improvement mechanism in all four comparator countries. The UAE's 'Smart Dubai' initiative has integrated AI chatbots, real-time translation services, and predictive analytics into visitor journey management, reducing average complaint resolution time from 72 to 8 hours. Singapore's SingapoRediscovered campaign leveraged mobile applications for personalized itinerary recommendations, contributing to a 23% increase in average tourist expenditure per visit during 2021–2022.

Japan has deployed IoT-enabled queue management systems at major attractions, significantly reducing wait times and improving visitor flow. Switzerland's MySwitzerland platform provides multilingual digital concierge services, with real-time availability data for accommodation and attractions. Across all cases, digital systems served dual purposes: enhancing visitor experience and generating operational data that enables evidence-based quality improvement.

Coordinated stakeholder collaboration was identified as essential to sustaining quality improvements beyond individual firm initiatives. Switzerland's cantonally structured destination management organizations facilitate public-private cooperation on infrastructure, training, and marketing, distributing both costs and benefits equitably. Japan's Regional Tourism Quality Consortia bring together local

governments, hospitality operators, transport companies, and cultural institutions around shared quality improvement roadmaps.

The UAE's 'One Tourism Voice' framework standardizes communication between the Department of Economy and Tourism, hotel associations, airline partners, and attractions operators, enabling rapid, coordinated responses to quality incidents. This institutional architecture proved critical during the COVID-19 recovery, enabling the UAE to restore visitor confidence faster than regional competitors.

All four comparator countries have institutionalized continuous feedback mechanisms that close the loop between visitor experience and service improvement. Singapore mandates quarterly visitor satisfaction surveys for all licensed hotels, with results published on a government portal to inform consumer choice and incentivize improvement. Switzerland's Mystery Visitor Program, in which trained evaluators conduct unannounced inspections using standardized protocols, provides objective quality benchmarks independent of online review platforms.

Japan's 'Kanzen Kanko' (total tourism) initiative integrates complaint data, online reviews, and mystery visitor reports into annual destination quality reports shared with all registered operators. These reports identify systemic quality gaps and enable targeted interventions. Across all cases, the transparency of quality data — shared publicly rather than held internally — was identified as a crucial driver of competitive improvement.

Discussion

Uzbekistan's tourism sector possesses several enabling conditions for the adoption of international quality improvement mechanisms. Government commitment is high, as evidenced by the Tourism Development Strategy 2025, which explicitly targets international accreditation of 500 tourism enterprises. The 2019 Tourism Law established a legal framework for quality regulation, and the National Tourism Rating system (introduced 2020) provides a nascent standardization infrastructure.

However, three structural challenges require attention. First, the tourism SME sector — which accounts for approximately 78% of tourism enterprises — faces capacity constraints in absorbing training and certification costs without co-financing support. Switzerland's experience demonstrates that government co-financing of certification audits (covering 50% of costs for SMEs) significantly accelerates adoption. Second, Uzbekistan's multilingual service deficit — particularly in English, German, and Chinese — represents a priority gap given the source market composition of current and target visitors. Third, institutional coordination between the Ministry of Tourism, regional hokimiyats (administrations), and private operators remains fragmented, limiting the effectiveness of destination-level quality initiatives.

Based on transferability assessment, the mechanisms are recommended in the following priority sequence for Uzbekistan and similar emerging destinations. In the

immediate term (Year 1–2), standardization and certification — beginning with accommodation and tour operators — should be prioritized, as these generate visible quality signals to international tourists at relatively low institutional cost. Simultaneously, a mandatory training program modeled on Singapore's framework should be launched with co-financing for SMEs.

In the medium term (Year 3–5), digital transformation investments should target multilingual digital concierge infrastructure and real-time feedback platforms, leveraging the country's growing mobile internet penetration rate (72% in 2023). Stakeholder coordination frameworks should be formalized through public-private tourism quality councils at the regional level. In the long term (Year 5+), systematic feedback programs including Mystery Visitor and quarterly visitor satisfaction surveys should be institutionalized, with public reporting to drive competitive improvement.

This study makes three theoretical contributions. First, it extends the service quality literature by synthesizing international best practices into a coherent, sequenced framework applicable to emerging tourism destinations — an underserved category in existing scholarship. Second, the transferability rubric developed here provides a replicable tool for policy analysts assessing the applicability of tourism quality mechanisms across diverse national contexts. Third, the findings affirm the value co-creation perspective: quality improvement is most sustainable when it engages tourists, operators, and destination authorities as active participants rather than passive recipients of regulation.

These findings also have implications for the SERVQUAL framework. Across all comparator countries, the responsiveness dimension — characterized by fast, personalized, and digitally enabled service recovery — emerged as the most differentiating quality factor for international tourists. This suggests that future quality measurement instruments for cross-cultural tourism contexts should weight responsiveness more heavily than traditional SERVQUAL formulations.

Conclusion

This study has identified and analyzed five core mechanisms for improving tourism service quality based on international experience: standardization and certification, human capital development, digital transformation, stakeholder collaboration, and systematic feedback. Analysis of Switzerland, Singapore, Japan, and the UAE reveals that these mechanisms are most effective when implemented as an integrated, sequenced program rather than as isolated interventions, and when aligned with the institutional capacities and cultural context of the destination.

For Uzbekistan, the findings point to a clear and actionable reform pathway. Prioritizing co-financed certification programs and mandatory hospitality training in the near term, while building toward digital service transformation and institutionalized quality feedback systems, offers a realistic route to closing service quality gaps with leading competitor destinations. The country's strong government commitment, rich cultural heritage, and improving infrastructure provide a favorable foundation for this trajectory.

The study carries several limitations. The sample of four comparator countries, while diverse, cannot capture the full range of international quality improvement approaches. Interview data are subject to informant bias, and the rapidly evolving nature of digital tourism technology means some findings may require updating within a five-year horizon. Future research should conduct longitudinal analysis of quality improvement outcomes in Uzbekistan following policy implementation, and extend comparative analysis to Central Asian regional peers including Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan.

Tourism service quality is not a destination amenity — it is a discipline. Countries that institutionalize quality management as a strategic priority, rather than leaving it to market forces alone, consistently achieve superior tourism outcomes. The mechanisms identified in this study offer a proven, adaptable toolkit for any destination committed to that priority.

References:

1. Baum, T. (2006). Human resource management for tourism, hospitality and leisure: An international perspective. Thomson Learning.
2. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
3. Buhalis, D., & Amaranggana, A. (2015). Smart tourism destinations: Enhancing tourism experience through personalisation of services. In I. Tussyadiah & A. Inversini (Eds.), *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 2015* (pp. 377–389). Springer.
4. Claver-Cortés, E., Pereira-Moliner, J., Tarí, J. J., & Molina-Azorín, J. F. (2008). TQM, managerial factors and performance in the Spanish hotel industry. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 108(2), 228–244.
5. Cronin, J. J., & Taylor, S. A. (1992). Measuring service quality: A reexamination and extension. *Journal of Marketing*, 56(3), 55–68.
6. Ergashev, I., & Mirzayev, O. (2021). Development of tourism in Uzbekistan: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Central Asian Studies*, 14(2), 45–63.
7. Grönroos, C. (1984). A service quality model and its marketing implications. *European Journal of Marketing*, 18(4), 36–44.
8. Oliver, R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17(4), 460–469.
9. 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.
10. Pizam, A., & Ellis, T. (1999). Customer satisfaction and its measurement in hospitality enterprises. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 11(7), 326–339.
11. Saleh, F., & Ryan, C. (1991). Analysing service quality in the hospitality industry using the SERVQUAL model. *Service Industries Journal*, 11(3), 324–343.
12. State Committee of Tourism of Uzbekistan. (2020). Annual tourism report 2019. Tashkent: Government of Uzbekistan.