

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN HUMAN CAPITAL EVALUATION: A HUMAN-CENTERED GOVERNANCE PERSPECTIVE

Habibullo Hamidovich Ziyavitdinov

Bukhara state university

Department of “Marketing and management

E-mail: habibziyavitdin@gmail.com

Abstract

This article examined the role of artificial intelligence in human capital evaluation processes. The study analyzed the application of AI technologies in recruitment, performance assessment, professional development planning, and workforce forecasting. The findings demonstrated that artificial intelligence improved data processing speed, enhanced competency identification, and increased the effectiveness of assessing employee development needs. The analysis also confirmed that transparency, fairness, explainability, and human oversight strengthened the reliability of AI-based evaluation systems. Furthermore, the research showed that a human-centered governance approach supported responsible decision-making and improved the quality of strategic workforce management. The study confirmed the growing contribution of AI to the development and evaluation of human capital.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, human capital, competencies, evaluation, human resource management, transparency, fairness, human oversight, strategic management.

Annotatsiya

Mazkur maqolada sun'iy intellektning inson kapitalini baholash jarayonlaridagi o'rni va ahamiyati o'rganildi. Tadqiqotda xodimlarni tanlash, faoliyat samaradorligini baholash, kasbiy rivojlanishni rejalashtirish hamda ishchi kuchiga bo'lgan ehtiyojlarni prognozlashda sun'iy intellekt texnologiyalarining imkoniyatlari tahlil qilindi. Natijalar sun'iy intellekt ma'lumotlarni tezkor qayta ishlash, kompetensiyalarni aniqlash va rivojlantirish ehtiyojlarini baholash samaradorligini oshirganini ko'rsatdi. Shaffoflik, adolatlilik, tushuntiriluvchanlik va inson nazorati tamoyillari sun'iy intellekt asosidagi baholash tizimlarining ishonchliligini ta'minlagani asoslandi. Tadqiqot inson markazli boshqaruv yondashuvi tashkilotlarda strategik qarorlar sifatini yaxshilashga xizmat qilganini tasdiqladi.

Kalit so'zlar: sun'iy intellekt, inson kapitali, kompetensiya, baholash, kadrlar boshqaruvi, shaffoflik, adolatlilik, inson nazorati, strategik boshqaruv.

Аннотация

В статье была исследована роль искусственного интеллекта в процессах оценки человеческого капитала. В ходе исследования были проанализированы возможности применения искусственного интеллекта при подборе персонала,

оценке эффективности деятельности, планировании профессионального развития и прогнозировании потребностей рабочей силы. Полученные результаты показали, что технологии искусственного интеллекта повысили скорость обработки данных, качество выявления компетенций и эффективность оценки потребностей в развитии сотрудников. Также было обосновано, что принципы прозрачности, справедливости, объяснимости и человеческого контроля обеспечили надёжность систем оценки. Исследование подтвердило, что человекоориентированный подход к управлению способствовал повышению качества стратегических решений и развитию человеческого капитала организаций.

Ключевые слова: искусственный интеллект, человеческий капитал, компетенции, оценка, управление персоналом, прозрачность, справедливость, человеческий контроль, стратегическое управление.

INTRODUCTION

Human capital refers to the stock of knowledge, skills, health, experience, and productive capabilities embodied in people. It remains a foundational driver of productivity, organizational competitiveness, poverty reduction, and workforce readiness for future jobs. Recent World Bank evidence emphasizes that human capital is formed not only through education systems but also through homes, neighborhoods, and workplaces; therefore, organizations have a direct responsibility for maintaining and developing the capabilities of their workforce (Holla et al., 2026). In this context, human capital evaluation is no longer limited to the measurement of formal qualifications or past performance. It increasingly involves the assessment of adaptability, learning agility, collaboration, creativity, judgment, and the capacity to work effectively with digital technologies.

The urgency of improving human capital evaluation is reinforced by the accelerating transformation of work. The World Economic Forum (2025) reports that the Future of Jobs Survey 2025 collected the views of more than 1,000 large employers representing over 14 million workers across 22 industry clusters and 55 economies. The report estimates that 39% of workers' existing skill sets are expected to be transformed or become outdated during 2025-2030. It also indicates that if the global workforce were represented by 100 workers, 59 would require training by 2030. These trends mean that organizations need evaluation systems that are more dynamic, evidence-based, and forward-looking than traditional annual appraisals or credential-based screening.

Artificial intelligence has become one of the main technological forces behind this transformation. AI systems can process structured and unstructured data, detect

patterns, classify skills, forecast turnover risk, recommend learning content, and support managerial decision-making across the employee lifecycle. At the same time, AI changes the content of work itself. OECD evidence shows that occupations highly exposed to AI increasingly demand management, business, emotional, cognitive, and digital skills, while the ILO's 2025 refined global index finds that one in four workers is in an occupation with some exposure to generative AI and that clerical occupations continue to show the highest exposure levels (Green, 2024; Gmyrek et al., 2025). Human capital evaluation must therefore assess not only what employees know now but also how effectively they can adapt to technological change.

This article examines the role of AI in human capital evaluation from an organizational and strategic management perspective. The article addresses three research questions: (1) how is AI changing the evaluation of employee and workforce capabilities; (2) what value does AI create for recruitment, performance management, learning, and workforce planning; and (3) what governance conditions are necessary for fair, transparent, and trustworthy AI-based evaluation? The central argument is that AI can substantially improve human capital evaluation, but only when it is embedded in a human-centered governance architecture that preserves accountability, contextual judgment, and employee trust.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The theoretical foundations of human capital were developed by Becker, who conceptualized education, skills, and experience as productive investments that enhance individual and organizational performance [1]. Contemporary studies have expanded this perspective by incorporating digital literacy, adaptability, creativity, collaboration, and lifelong learning capabilities as essential dimensions of human capital [13]. This broader understanding has strengthened the strategic importance of human capital evaluation in modern organizations.

The application of artificial intelligence in human resource management has attracted increasing scholarly attention. Tambe, Cappelli, and Yakubovich emphasized that the successful adoption of AI in HRM depends on data quality, accountability, fairness, and effective governance mechanisms [10]. Similarly, Gong, Fan, and Bartram highlighted that AI contributes to organizational effectiveness by improving workforce management, innovation capacity, and decision-making processes [4].

The role of AI in human capital development and evaluation was extensively examined by Ekuma [2]. The study demonstrated that AI technologies enhanced the identification of employee competencies, supported personalized learning pathways, and improved the assessment of workforce development needs. These findings indicate

that human capital evaluation has increasingly shifted from measuring past performance toward identifying future potential and capability growth.

The relationship between AI and changing workforce skill requirements was analyzed by Green [5] and Gmyrek et al. [3]. Their research showed that technological, analytical, managerial, and interpersonal competencies have become increasingly important in digitally transformed labor markets. Consequently, effective human capital evaluation systems should assess not only existing knowledge and skills but also employees' ability to adapt to technological change and continuous learning environments.

AI-supported recruitment and talent assessment have also become important research areas. Rigotti and Fosch-Villaronga found that AI-based recruitment systems improved candidate screening and competency identification while emphasizing the importance of fairness, transparency, and non-discrimination in algorithmic decision-making [9]. Likewise, Varma, Pereira, and Patel demonstrated that AI-enhanced performance management systems provided continuous evaluation, improved feedback quality, and supported more informed managerial decisions [11].

Workforce planning and strategic talent management have benefited significantly from AI applications. Venugopal et al. showed that AI-driven analytics improved workforce forecasting, talent allocation, succession planning, and employee retention strategies [12]. These capabilities have strengthened the strategic role of human capital evaluation within organizations.

Furthermore, the OECD developed methodological approaches for comparing AI capabilities with human skills and evaluating their complementary roles in organizational performance [7]. This framework provided valuable insights into identifying uniquely human competencies and understanding how AI can support, rather than replace, human decision-making processes.

The reviewed literature indicates that artificial intelligence has enhanced the efficiency, accuracy, and strategic value of human capital evaluation [2]; [4]; [12]. At the same time, scholars consistently emphasized that transparency, fairness, explainability, and human oversight remain essential requirements for ensuring the reliability and legitimacy of AI-based evaluation systems [6]; [8]; [9]. These theoretical and empirical insights formed the foundation for the human-centered governance perspective proposed in this study.

METHODOLOGY

This article uses a conceptual review design. It does not present original survey, interview, or experimental data. Instead, it synthesizes peer-reviewed studies, institutional reports, and regulatory texts related to AI, work, skills, and human capital

evaluation. The review prioritizes publications from 2019 to 2026 because this period captures the rapid expansion of people analytics, the diffusion of generative AI, and the emergence of stronger regulatory responses to algorithmic decision-making.

Sources were selected according to four criteria: direct relevance to human capital theory or HRM; explicit treatment of AI, automation, or people analytics; attention to workforce skills, evaluation, or development; and relevance to governance, fairness, transparency, or regulation. The analytical objective is interpretive rather than statistical. The article integrates findings from management research, labor economics, human resource development, institutional reports, and regulatory documents to construct a coherent framework for AI-based human capital evaluation.

This method is appropriate because the topic is multidimensional. AI-based evaluation cannot be understood only as a technical issue or only as an HR practice. It simultaneously involves algorithmic systems, data governance, managerial decision-making, employee rights, organizational culture, and labor-market transformation.

Recruitment and selection are among the most visible applications of AI in human capital evaluation. AI systems can screen resumes, extract skills from candidate profiles, compare applicant data with job requirements, rank candidates, detect semantic similarity between job descriptions and experience, and support interview analysis. These functions can reduce administrative workload and improve the speed of early-stage selection, especially when organizations face large applicant pools.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

From a human capital perspective, the main advantage of AI in recruitment is that it can identify both explicit and latent indicators of capability. Instead of relying only on degrees, job titles, or years of experience, AI-enabled tools can detect transferable skills, career patterns, and potential role fit. This supports more skill-based hiring and may expand access for candidates whose capabilities are not fully captured by traditional credentials.

However, recruitment is also the domain in which AI-related risks are most visible. Rigotti and Fosch-Villaronga (2024) emphasize that AI-based recruitment may reproduce or amplify social inequalities if training data, model design, or deployment practices are biased. AI systems can also create privacy concerns and reduce candidates' ability to understand or contest decisions. Therefore, AI should not become an unchallengeable gatekeeping mechanism. It should support structured decision-making while preserving human review, documentation, and appeal procedures.

AI is increasingly used in performance management through real-time analytics, digital feedback tools, productivity indicators, and predictive models. Compared with annual appraisal systems, AI-supported evaluation can provide more frequent signals

about performance patterns, goal progress, collaboration, and workload distribution. Varma et al. (2024) show that AI can affect multiple components of performance management by improving data capture, monitoring, feedback, and decision support.

The strategic value of AI in performance evaluation lies in its ability to connect individual contributions with broader organizational outcomes. It can help managers identify performance trends, detect early signs of disengagement or overload, and align employee objectives with business priorities. In knowledge-intensive work, AI can also support the evaluation of project contributions, learning progress, and team-level performance.

At the same time, performance evaluation is never purely objective. It involves interpretation, context, values, and employee dignity. Excessive reliance on AI may create perceptions of surveillance, dehumanization, or unfairness. It may also encourage employees to optimize measurable indicators rather than meaningful value creation. For this reason, AI should provide evidence and alerts, while final evaluative judgment should remain with accountable human decision-makers who can consider context, exceptions, and qualitative contributions.

One of the strongest contributions of AI to human capital evaluation is development-oriented assessment. AI can identify skill gaps, recommend learning content, track progress, and personalize development pathways according to employee needs and organizational priorities. This allows evaluation to move from a static assessment of past performance toward a dynamic assessment of future capability.

In rapidly changing labor markets, this developmental function is especially important. The World Economic Forum identifies AI and big data, networks and cybersecurity, technological literacy, creative thinking, resilience, flexibility, agility, curiosity, and lifelong learning as skill areas expected to gain importance. AI-based evaluation systems should therefore assess not only technical skills but also human-centered capabilities that complement digital technologies.

Potential assessment also becomes more precise when AI is used responsibly. Predictive analytics can help organizations estimate which employees are likely to succeed in new roles, who may benefit from targeted development, and which teams require reskilling. Nevertheless, such predictions should be treated as probabilistic signals rather than deterministic judgments. Human review is necessary to prevent algorithmic outputs from narrowing career opportunities or reinforcing historical bias.

AI also strengthens human capital evaluation at the workforce level. It can support retention analysis, succession planning, internal mobility, workforce segmentation, and forecasting of future skill requirements. Venugopal et al. demonstrate that AI and topic modeling can improve workforce planning by identifying HRM themes and supporting more informed decisions about recruitment, retention, and performance management.

At the strategic level, AI shifts human capital evaluation from an individual appraisal function to an organizational capability. It allows managers to evaluate whether the workforce has the right combination of skills, roles, and learning capacity to achieve future objectives. This is particularly important because AI affects occupations unevenly. Some roles face stronger automation pressure, while others become more valuable because they involve judgment, social interaction, creativity, or complex problem-solving.

Strategic evaluation should therefore include role-level AI exposure, reskilling feasibility, succession risk, and the identification of complementary human capabilities. Organizations that evaluate human capital only through current productivity indicators may underestimate future skill gaps. Conversely, organizations that combine AI analytics with strategic workforce planning can improve talent allocation, reduce mismatch, and build organizational agility.

Table 1.

Main domains of AI use in human capital evaluation¹

Domain	AI contribution	Main value	Main risk	Suggested KPI
Recruitment and selection	Skill extraction, candidate screening, job-fit inference	Faster and broader assessment of applicant capability	Bias, privacy violation, opaque rejection	Quality of hire; candidate diversity; selection validity
Performance evaluation	Real-time analytics, feedback support, goal tracking	Continuous evidence for managerial decisions	Surveillance perception, gaming of metrics, dehumanization	Goal attainment; productivity; feedback quality
Learning and development	Skill-gap mapping, personalized learning recommendations	Targeted capability growth and faster reskilling	Over-standardization, narrow skill definitions	Skill gain; learning completion; transfer to job performance
Workforce planning	Retention prediction, succession analytics, internal mobility matching	Strategic talent allocation and workforce agility	Opaque decisions, historical bias, weak accountability	Turnover prediction accuracy; succession readiness; mobility rate

The reviewed literature suggests that AI-based human capital evaluation should be understood as a sequence of connected stages rather than as a single tool. The process begins with data inputs, moves through AI analytics, produces evaluation

¹ Developed by the author based on Tambe et al. (2019), Ekuma (2024), Gong et al. (2025), Varma et al. (2024), and Venugopal et al. (2024).

outputs, informs managerial decisions, and finally affects human capital outcomes. Each stage creates value, but each stage also creates governance risks.

Figure 1 presents a conceptual framework that links analytics and governance. The framework emphasizes that AI creates strategic value when it converts fragmented workforce data into forward-looking capability assessments. However, it also emphasizes that data quality, fairness, explainability, and human oversight must be embedded throughout the process.

Table 2.

AI-enabled human capital evaluation framework¹

Stage	Core elements	Evaluation output	Governance checkpoint
1. Data inputs	Employee records; resumes; performance data; learning data; collaboration and engagement signals	Integrated human capital data foundation	Legality, relevance, accuracy, representativeness, data minimization
2. AI analytics layer	Skill extraction; pattern recognition; predictive modeling; anomaly detection; capability clustering	Analytical insight into current and future capability	Model validity, fairness testing, explainability, documentation
3. Evaluation outputs	Performance indicators; skill gaps; learning potential; promotion readiness; retention risk; succession suitability	Evidence for managerial interpretation	Avoid deterministic interpretation; check for adverse impact
4. Managerial decisions	Recruitment; promotion; development planning; internal mobility; rewards; workforce redesign	Actionable HR and strategic decisions	Human review, contextual judgment, decision communication
5. Human capital outcomes	Productivity; better talent allocation; faster reskilling; stronger retention; workforce agility	Organizational value creation	Continuous monitoring, employee feedback, appeal and correction mechanisms

The effectiveness of AI in human capital evaluation depends heavily on governance. Langer and Konig argue that opacity is a defining feature of algorithm-based HRM and that transparency must be considered from the perspective of several stakeholders, including users, affected employees or candidates, deployers, developers, and regulators. This is especially important because human capital evaluation affects employment opportunities, promotion prospects, rewards, and access to development resources.

The regulatory environment is also becoming stricter. Regulation (EU) 2024/1689, known as the Artificial Intelligence Act, classifies many AI systems used

¹ Developed by the author.

in employment, worker management, and access to self-employment as high-risk when they are used for recruitment, selection, promotion, termination, task allocation, monitoring, or evaluation. This means that AI-based human capital evaluation is not only a technological innovation issue; it is also a compliance, accountability, and fundamental-rights issue.

A human-centered governance model should therefore include six interrelated controls: data audit, model validation, fairness testing, human review, decision communication, and appeal or correction mechanisms. These controls reduce the probability that AI systems will reinforce bias, produce opaque decisions, violate privacy, or weaken organizational trust.

Table 3.
Governance controls for trustworthy AI-based human capital evaluation¹

Governance control	Purpose	Practical requirement	Risk mitigated
Data audit	Ensure that input data are lawful, relevant, accurate, and representative	Document data sources; remove irrelevant variables; test for missingness and imbalance	Historical bias; privacy violation; invalid inference
Model validation	Check whether the AI system performs reliably for its intended HR purpose	Test predictive accuracy; compare with baseline methods; validate across employee groups	Unreliable prediction; false confidence
Fairness testing	Detect unequal or discriminatory effects	Conduct adverse-impact analysis and subgroup performance testing	Discrimination; unequal career opportunity
Explainability	Make decisions understandable to managers and affected individuals	Provide interpretable reasons, model documentation, and decision logs	Opacity; weak trust; inability to contest outcomes
Human oversight	Preserve accountable judgment and contextual interpretation	Assign trained reviewers; require meaningful approval for consequential decisions	Rubber-stamping; over-automation
Appeal and correction	Allow errors to be challenged and corrected	Create review channels; correct data; retrain or adjust models when needed	Uncorrected harm; loss of legitimacy
Continuous monitoring	Maintain performance and compliance over time	Run periodic audits; track drift; update policies and models	Model drift; regulatory non-compliance

The evidence reviewed in this article indicates that AI improves human capital evaluation in three major ways. First, it expands the informational basis of assessment

¹ Developed by the author based on Langer and Konig (2023), Rigotti and Fosch-Villaronga (2024), and Regulation (EU) 2024/1689.

by integrating structured and unstructured data. Second, it increases temporal sensitivity by enabling continuous or near-real-time evaluation rather than relying exclusively on periodic appraisal cycles. Third, it strengthens strategic foresight by supporting predictive analysis of skills, mobility, retention, and future workforce needs.

These advantages are especially valuable in environments characterized by technological disruption and skill instability. Traditional evaluation systems often measure what employees have done in the past, while AI-supported systems can help identify what employees may be able to learn, where they may contribute next, and what organizational interventions may improve future performance. This makes AI relevant not only for HR departments but also for strategic management.

Nevertheless, AI does not eliminate the social and ethical dimensions of evaluation. Decisions about merit, potential, fit, and fairness remain embedded in organizational values and power relations. If AI systems are poorly designed or weakly governed, they may reproduce bias, intensify surveillance, or reduce employees to data profiles. This risk is particularly serious when algorithmic outputs are treated as neutral facts rather than as model-based estimates shaped by data quality, design assumptions, and institutional choices.

The most appropriate model is therefore complementarity rather than substitution. AI should improve the evidence available to managers, but it should not remove human responsibility for consequential decisions. Human capital evaluation is strongest when AI provides analytical insight, managers provide contextual judgment, and organizations provide transparent governance mechanisms. In this model, AI becomes a capability for responsible decision support rather than a mechanism of automated control.

For managers, the main implication is that AI adoption in human capital evaluation should begin with clear decision purposes. Organizations should specify whether an AI system is intended to support recruitment, performance feedback, learning recommendations, retention analysis, or workforce planning. Vague implementation increases the risk of invalid measurement and weak accountability.

For HR departments, AI requires stronger data governance. Employee data should be collected and processed only when it is relevant, lawful, accurate, and explainable. HR specialists also need new competencies in people analytics, algorithmic fairness, data interpretation, and ethical risk management.

For employees and candidates, trustworthy AI requires transparency and contestability. Individuals affected by AI-supported evaluation should receive understandable explanations, have opportunities to correct inaccurate data, and be able to request human review when decisions affect employment or career progression.

This article is conceptual and therefore does not provide original empirical testing. Its conclusions are based on the synthesis of existing research and institutional evidence. Future studies should test the proposed framework using organizational case studies, surveys, experiments, or longitudinal workforce data.

Further research is also needed on sectoral and regional differences in AI-based human capital evaluation. The effects of AI may differ across public and private organizations, large and small firms, high-income and developing economies, and knowledge-intensive and service-oriented sectors. Another promising direction is the empirical measurement of employee trust, perceived fairness, and acceptance of AI-supported HR decisions.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Artificial intelligence is becoming a powerful instrument for evaluating human capital. It helps organizations measure skills more dynamically, identify developmental needs earlier, personalize learning interventions, and align workforce decisions with long-term strategic objectives. In recruitment, performance management, learning and development, and workforce planning, AI can substantially improve the depth, speed, and relevance of evaluation.

However, the article also shows that the quality of AI-based evaluation depends on governance conditions. Bias, opacity, privacy violations, regulatory non-compliance, and over-automation can undermine both fairness and organizational legitimacy. For this reason, AI should be embedded in a human-centered model that combines data quality control, fairness auditing, explainability, meaningful human oversight, appeal mechanisms, and continuous monitoring.

The future of human capital evaluation is not “AI instead of humans.” It is AI with accountable human judgment. Organizations that understand this distinction will be better positioned to use AI as a strategic, ethical, and development-oriented capability for strengthening human capital.

REFERENCES

1. Becker, G. S. (1993). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education* (3rd ed.). University of Chicago Press.
2. Ekuma, K. (2024). Artificial intelligence and automation in human resource development: A systematic review. *Human Resource Development Review*, 23(2), 199-229. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15344843231224009>
3. Gmyrek, P., Berg, J., Kaminski, K., Konopczynski, F., Ladna, A., Nafradi, B., Rosłaniec, K., & Troszynski, M. (2025). *Generative AI and jobs: A refined global index of occupational exposure* (ILO Working Paper No. 140). International Labour Organization. <https://doi.org/10.54394/HETP0387>

4. Gong, Q., Fan, D., & Bartram, T. (2025). Integrating artificial intelligence and human resource management: A review and future research agenda. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 36(1), 103-141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2024.2440065>
5. Green, A. (2024). Artificial intelligence and the changing demand for skills in the labour market (OECD Artificial Intelligence Papers No. 14). OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/88684e36-en>
6. Langer, M., & König, C. J. (2023). Introducing a multi-stakeholder perspective on opacity, transparency and strategies to reduce opacity in algorithm-based human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 33(1), 100881. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2021.100881>
7. OECD. (2023). AI and the future of skills, Volume 2: Methods for evaluating AI capabilities. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/a9fe53cb-en>
8. Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). Official Journal of the European Union.
9. Rigotti, C., & Fosch-Villaronga, E. (2024). Fairness, AI and recruitment. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 53, 105966. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2024.105966>
10. Tambe, P., Cappelli, P., & Yakubovich, V. (2019). Artificial intelligence in human resources management: Challenges and a path forward. *California Management Review*, 61(4), 15-42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619867910>
11. Varma, A., Pereira, V., & Patel, P. (2024). Artificial intelligence and performance management. *Organizational Dynamics*, 53(1), 101037. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2024.101037>
12. Venugopal, M., Madhavan, V., Prasad, R., & Raman, R. (2024). Transformative AI in human resource management: Enhancing workforce planning with topic modeling. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), 2432550. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2432550>
13. Holla, A., Schady, N., & Silva, J. (Eds.). (2026). Building human capital where it matters: Homes, neighborhoods, and workplaces. World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-2277-3>
14. World Economic Forum. (2025). The future of jobs report 2025. World Economic Forum.



Marketing

ilmiy, amaliy va ommabop jurnali

Muharrir:

Ingliz tili muharriri:

Rus tili muharriri:

Musahhih:

Sahifalovchi va dizaynerlar:

Xakimov Ziyodulla Axmadovich

Tursunov Boburjon Ortiqmirzayevich

Kaxramonov Xurshidjon Shuxrat o'g'li

Karimova Shirin Zoxid qizi

Sadikov Shoxrux Shuxratovich

Abidjonov Nodirbek Odijon o'g'li

2026-yil, may, 5-son

© Materiallar ko'chirib bosilganda "Marketing" ilmiy, amaliy va ommabop jurnali manba sifatida ko'rsatilishi shart. Jurnalda bosilgan material va reklamalardagi dalillarning aniqligiga mualliflar mas'ul. Tahririyat fikri har vaqt ham mualliflar fikriga mos kelavermasligi mumkin. Tahririyatga yuborilgan materiallar qaytarilmaydi.

Mazkur jurnalda maqolalar chop etish uchun quyidagi havolalarga murojaat qilish mumkin. Ilmiy maqola, ommabop maqola, reklama, hikoya va boshqa ilmiy-ijodiy materiallar yuborishingiz mumkin.

Materiallar va reklamalar pullik asosda chop etiladi.

Elektron pochta:

info@marketingjournal.uz

Bot:

[@marketingjournalbot](https://t.me/@marketingjournalbot)

Tel.:

+998977838464, +998939266610

Jurnalning rasmiy sayti: <https://marketingjournal.uz>

Marketing jurnali O'zbekiston Respublikasi Oliy ta'lim, fan va innovatsiyalar vazirligi huzuridagi **Oliy attestatsiya komissiyasi rayosatining 2024-yil 04-oktabrdagi 332/5 sonli qarori** bilan milliy ilmiy nashrlar ro'yxatiga kiritilgan



"Marketing" ilmiy, amaliy va ommabop jurnali 2024-yil 15-martdan O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti Administratsiyasi huzuridagi Axborot va ommaviy kommunikatsiyalar agentligi tomonidan **C-5669517** reyestr raqami tartibi bo'yicha ro'yxatdan o'tkazilgan. **Litsenziya raqami: №240874**



"Marketing" ilmiy, amaliy va ommabop jurnalining xalqaro darajasi: **9710**. GOCT 7.56-2002 "Seriya nashrlarning xalqaro standart raqamlanishi" davlatlataro standartlari talablari. **Berilgan ISSN tartib raqami: 3060-4621**