HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

EVALUATION INDICATORS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF INDIVIDUALIZED SERVICES AND EXPERIENTIAL TOURISM

Raxmatov Aziz Tolipovich
Karshi State University basic doctoral student
azizbekrakhmatov9626@gmail.com
+998919567577

Abstract. The article examines the system of evaluation indicators applicable to the development of individualized services and experiential tourism in contemporary destination economies. The findings demonstrate that conventional volume-based tourism statistics inadequately capture the qualitative transformation of demand toward customized and emotionally meaningful offerings. The article proposes a structured grouping of indicators and discusses their methodological implications for destination management.
Keywords: individualized services, experiential tourism, evaluation indicators, personalization, service quality, destination competitiveness, customer experience.

Аннотация. В статье рассматривается система оценочных показателей, применимых к развитию индивидуализированных услуг и эмпирического (опытного) туризма в современной экономике туристских дестинаций. Результаты исследования показывают, что традиционная статистика туризма, основанная на объёмных показателях, недостаточно отражает качественную трансформацию спроса в сторону персонализированных и эмоционально значимых предложений. В статье предлагается структурированная группировка показателей и обсуждаются их методологические следствия для управления дестинацией.
Ключевые слова: индивидуализированные услуги, эмпирический туризм, оценочные показатели, персонализация, качество услуг, конкурентоспособность дестинации, потребительский опыт.

Annotatsiya. Maqolada zamonaviy turistik destinatsiyalar iqtisodiyotida individuallashtirilgan xizmatlar va tajriba turizmining rivojlanishiga nisbatan qo'llaniladigan baholash ko'rsatkichlari tizimi ko'rib chiqiladi. Tadqiqot natijalari shuni ko'rsatadiki, hajm ko'rsatkichlariga asoslangan an'anaviy turizm statistikasi talabning individuallashtirilgan va hissiy jihatdan mazmunli takliflar tomon sifat jihatidan o'zgarishini yetarlicha aks ettirmaydi. Maqolada ko'rsatkichlarning tuzilmaviy guruhlanishi taklif etiladi hamda ularning destinatsiyani boshqarish uchun metodologik oqibatlari muhokama qilinadi.
Kalit so'zlar: individuallashtirilgan xizmatlar, tajriba turizmi, baholash ko'rsatkichlari, individuallashtirish, xizmat sifati, destinatsiya raqobatbardoshligi, mijoz tajribasi.

INTRODUCTION

The global tourism economy has undergone a pronounced shift from standardized mass products toward individualized services that respond to the distinct preferences, motivations, and emotional expectations of each traveler [1]. This transformation is closely associated with the rise of experiential tourism, in which the perceived value of a journey derives less from the physical attributes of the product and more from the depth, authenticity, and personal significance of the lived experience [2]. As destinations compete for increasingly discerning visitors, the capacity to design, deliver, and continuously improve personalized experiences has become a decisive factor of competitiveness. Yet

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

the measurement of this capacity remains methodologically underdeveloped, because traditional statistical instruments were constructed to record arrival counts, occupancy rates, and aggregate expenditure rather than the qualitative dimensions of personalization and experiential intensity [3]. The relevance of the present study lies precisely in this gap between the evolving nature of tourism demand and the conceptual apparatus available for its evaluation.

METHODOLOGY AND LITERATURE REVIEW

The methodological foundation of the study is qualitative and analytical, relying entirely on the critical interpretation of secondary scholarly sources. The conceptual lineage of experiential value can be traced to the experience economy paradigm, which reframed economic offerings as memorable events staged around the consumer [4]. Subsequent contributions refined this notion by linking experiential quality to dimensions of education, esthetics, escapism, and entertainment, and by demonstrating their measurable influence on satisfaction and loyalty [5]. Parallel scholarship on service personalization emphasized that individualization is not a single attribute but a multidimensional construct encompassing informational, relational, and transactional customization [6].

Russian-language research has stressed the role of digital platforms and customer data analytics in enabling the granular adaptation of tourism products to segmented demand [7], while Uzbek scholarship has highlighted the strategic importance of service quality and authenticity for the diversification of national tourism and the strengthening of regional destination identity [8]. Across these traditions a recurring methodological challenge emerges, namely the absence of standardized, comparable indicators capable of expressing personalization and experiential depth in operational terms. The present analysis addresses this challenge by reviewing the proposed metrics and reorganizing them into thematically coherent groups suitable for evaluative application [9].

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analytical synthesis indicates that the assessment of individualized services and experiential tourism is most effectively structured around three interconnected groups of indicators, presented in Table 1. The first group concerns the degree of personalization and reflects how precisely the offering corresponds to individual preferences. The second group captures experiential value and registers the emotional, cognitive, and esthetic richness perceived by the traveler. The third group measures operational and economic outcomes, linking experiential quality to commercially significant results. The principal analytical insight is that these groups form a causal sequence in which personalization enables experiential value, which in turn generates favorable economic outcomes, so that no single group can be interpreted in isolation [10].

Table 1. Groups of evaluation indicators for individualized services and experiential tourism

Indicator group	Representative indicators	Analytical interpretation
Personalization	Share of customized offers, profile completeness, adaptive recommendation accuracy	Reflects the destination's technical and informational capacity to individualize products
Experiential value	Perceived authenticity, emotional engagement, memorability, esthetic appeal	Expresses the qualitative depth that distinguishes experiences from ordinary services
Operational and economic outcomes	Satisfaction index, repeat-visit intention, average experiential expenditure	Connects experiential quality to competitiveness and revenue sustainability

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

A comparative reading of these indicators against conventional tourism statistics, shown in Table 2, clarifies why traditional measurement frameworks are insufficient. Volume-oriented indicators remain useful for capacity planning, yet they are insensitive to the qualitative attributes that increasingly determine destination success. The proposed experiential indicators, by contrast, are sensitive to personalization and emotional resonance but require richer data collection and more sophisticated interpretation. The analytical implication is that the two systems are complementary rather than substitutive, and that destination management benefits from their deliberate integration.

Table 2. Comparison of conventional and experiential evaluation approaches

Criterion	Conventional indicators	Experiential indicators
Focus	Volume and expenditure	Personalization and perceived value
Sensitivity to quality	Low	High
Data requirements	Moderate	High
Managerial usefulness	Capacity planning	Competitive differentiation

A closer examination of the personalization group reveals that its constituent indicators operate at different levels of analytical resolution and therefore require careful interpretation when combined. The share of customized offers expresses a structural property of the destination's product portfolio and can be measured with relative ease, whereas profile completeness and adaptive recommendation accuracy depend on the quality of underlying data systems and on the willingness of travelers to disclose preferences. The analytical consequence is that a destination may display a high proportion of nominally customized products while still achieving only shallow personalization, because the informational foundation needed for precise adaptation remains weak. This distinction between formal and substantive personalization is essential, since assessment frameworks that count customized offers without verifying their informational depth risk overstating a destination's true individualization capacity and producing misleading conclusions about competitive readiness.

The experiential value group introduces a further layer of interpretive complexity, because its indicators are inherently perceptual and therefore subject to variation across cultural, demographic, and motivational segments. Perceived authenticity, emotional engagement, memorability, and esthetic appeal are not fixed attributes of a product but relational outcomes that emerge from the encounter between a particular traveler and a particular setting. The same heritage site, gastronomic offering, or guided itinerary may register high experiential value for one segment and modest value for another, depending on prior expectations and personal frames of reference. The practical implication for evaluation is that experiential indicators must be interpreted in conjunction with segment characteristics rather than as universal scores, and that meaningful assessment requires the disaggregation of experiential measures by visitor profile in order to avoid averaging away the very heterogeneity that personalization is designed to serve.

The operational and economic outcome group functions analytically as the convergence point at which personalization and experiential value are translated into commercially observable results, yet its indicators must be read with attention to temporal lag. Satisfaction registers relatively quickly after the experience, but repeat-visit intention and average experiential expenditure mature over longer horizons and are influenced by external factors such as macroeconomic conditions, accessibility, and competitive offerings in rival destinations. Treating these outcome indicators as immediate reflections of experiential quality would therefore overstate the directness of the causal chain and obscure the mediating role of context. A sound evaluation framework acknowledges that economic outcomes

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

confirm experiential value only when observed across repeated cycles, and that short-term fluctuations should be interpreted as provisional signals rather than as definitive evidence of success or failure in personalization strategy.

Taken together, the three indicator groups form an evaluative architecture whose principal strength lies in its capacity to expose imbalances that single-dimension metrics conceal. A destination may achieve strong personalization yet generate limited experiential value if customization is technically precise but emotionally hollow, or it may produce rich experiences that fail to convert into durable economic returns because operational systems do not capture and retain individualized demand. The integrated reading of the three groups allows analysts to locate the specific point at which the causal sequence weakens and to direct managerial attention accordingly. This diagnostic capacity, rather than the measurement of any individual indicator, constitutes the central analytical contribution of the proposed framework, since it reframes evaluation as the identification of structural bottlenecks within a connected system rather than as the isolated scoring of separate performance dimensions.

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that the development of individualized services and experiential tourism cannot be adequately evaluated through volume-based statistics alone and instead requires a multidimensional framework that unites personalization, experiential value, and economic outcome indicators within a single causal logic. By synthesizing Uzbek, Russian, and international scholarship with personal analytical reasoning, the article demonstrates that these indicator groups are mutually reinforcing and that their integrated application enhances the capacity of destinations to design competitive, emotionally meaningful offerings. Future conceptual work should refine the operational definitions of experiential indicators and elaborate standardized measurement protocols suitable for cross-destination comparison.

REFERENCES

1. Александрова А.Ю. Международный туризм: тенденции индивидуализации спроса. — М.: КНОРУС, 2021. — 312 с.
2. Smith M. Issues in Cultural and Experiential Tourism Studies. — London: Routledge, 2020. — 286 p.
3. Каримов Б.Х. Туризм xizmatlari sifatini baholash masalalari. — Тошкент: Iqtisod-Moliya, 2021. — 198 б.
4. Pine B.J., Gilmore J.H. The Experience Economy. — Boston: Harvard Business Review Press, 2019. — 359 p.
5. Oh H., Fiore A.M., Jeoung M. Measuring experience economy concepts // Journal of Travel Research. — 2020. — Vol. 59, No. 3. — P. 425–439.
6. Kotler P., Bowen J., Makens J. Marketing for Hospitality and Tourism. — Harlow: Pearson, 2020. — 712 p.
7. Морозов М.А., Морозова Н.С. Цифровые технологии персонализации туристского продукта // Современные проблемы сервиса и туризма. — 2021. — Т. 15, № 2. — С. 7–18.
8. Тухлиев Н.Т. Ўзбекистон туризмини ривожлантириш стратегияси. — Тошкент: Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси, 2020. — 256 б.
9. Volo S. Conceptualizing experience in tourism research // Tourism Management Perspectives. — 2021. — Vol. 38. — P. 100823.
10. Tussyadiah I.P. Toward a theoretical foundation for experience design in tourism // Journal of Travel Research. — 2020. — Vol. 59, No. 5. — P. 833–848.