

# THE ROLE OF STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT IN ENHANCING TOURISM DESTINATION COMPETITIVENESS

**Choriyev Farrux Xamroyevich**

Researcher at Bukhara State University

## Abstract

This comprehensive study examines the critical role of strategic management in enhancing tourism destination competitiveness within the contemporary global tourism landscape. As international tourism continues to evolve amid increasing competition, technological disruption, and changing consumer preferences, destinations must adopt sophisticated strategic approaches to maintain and improve their competitive positions. This research employs a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative analysis of destination competitiveness indicators with qualitative case study examination of successful strategic interventions. The study analyzes data from 45 tourism destinations across different development stages, examining the relationship between strategic management practices and competitive performance outcomes. Findings reveal that destinations implementing comprehensive strategic management frameworks demonstrate significantly higher competitiveness scores across multiple dimensions including infrastructure development, marketing effectiveness, sustainability practices, and stakeholder coordination. The research identifies five critical success factors for strategic destination management: integrated planning systems, dynamic capability development, stakeholder engagement mechanisms, innovation orientation, and adaptive governance structures. Results indicate that strategic management implementation can improve destination competitiveness indices by 23-47% over five-year periods when properly executed. The study contributes to theoretical understanding of destination competitiveness determinants while providing practical frameworks for destination management organizations seeking to enhance their competitive positions in increasingly challenging market environments.

**Keywords:** strategic management, destination competitiveness, tourism development, competitive advantage, destination management organizations, sustainable tourism, strategic planning.

## Annotatsiya

Ushbu keng qamrovli tadqiqot zamonaviy global turizm muhitida turistik destinatsiyalarning raqobatbardoshligini oshirishda strategik boshqaruvning hal qiluvchi rolini tahlil qiladi. Xalqaro turizm raqobatning kuchayishi, texnologik o'zgarishlar va iste'molchi xulq-atvoridagi transformatsiyalar sharoitida jadal rivojlanib borar ekan, destinatsiyalar o'z raqobat pozitsiyalarini saqlab qolish va mustahkamlash uchun murakkab strategik yondashuvlarni joriy etishga majbur bo'lmoqda. Tadqiqot aralash metodologiyaga asoslanib, turistik manzillar raqobatbardoshligi ko'rsatkichlarining miqdoriy tahlilini muvaffaqiyatli strategik aralashuvlarga oid sifatli keys-tahlillar bilan uyg'unlashtiradi. Ish doirasida turli rivojlanish bosqichidagi 45 ta turistik destinatsiya bo'yicha ma'lumotlar tahlil qilinib, strategik boshqaruv amaliyotlari bilan raqobatbardoshlik natijalari o'rtasidagi

bog'liqlik o'rganildi. Tadqiqot natijalari shuni ko'rsatadiki, kompleks strategik boshqaruv tizimlarini joriy etgan turistik manzillar infratuzilma rivoji, marketing samaradorligi, barqarorlik amaliyotlari va manfaatdor tomonlar o'rtasidagi muvofiqlashtirish kabi bir nechta yo'nalishlar bo'yicha yuqori raqobatbardoshlik ko'rsatkichlariga erishmoqda. Tadqiqot strategik turistik manzil boshqaruvida beshta muhim muvaffaqiyat omilini aniqlaydi: integratsiyalashgan rejalashtirish tizimlari, dinamik imkoniyatlarni rivojlantirish, manfaatdor tomonlarni jalb etish mexanizmlari, innovatsion yo'nalganlik hamda moslashuvchan boshqaruv tuzilmalari. Natijalar shuni ko'rsatadiki, strategik boshqaruvni to'g'ri amalga oshirish besh yillik davrda turistik manzil raqobatbardoshlik indekslarini 23–47 foizga oshirishi mumkin. Tadqiqot turistik manzil raqobatbardoshligining nazariy asoslarini boyitadi hamda tobora murakkablashib borayotgan bozor sharoitida o'z mavqeyini mustahkamlashga intilayotgan destinatsiya boshqaruv tashkilotlari uchun amaliy strategik model va tavsiyalarni taklif etadi.

**Kalit so'zlar:** strategik boshqaruv, destinatsiya raqobatbardoshligi, turizmni rivojlantirish, raqobat ustunligi, destinatsiya boshqaruv tashkilotlari, barqaror turizm, strategik rejalashtirish.

#### **Аннотация**

В данном комплексном исследовании анализируется ключевая роль стратегического управления в повышении конкурентоспособности туристских дестинаций в условиях современного глобального туристского пространства. В условиях усиления международной конкуренции, технологических трансформаций и изменений потребительских предпочтений туристские дестинации вынуждены применять более сложные и продуманные стратегические подходы для сохранения и укрепления своих конкурентных позиций. В исследовании используется смешанная методология, сочетающая количественный анализ показателей конкурентоспособности дестинаций с качественным кейс-анализом успешных стратегических интервенций. В рамках работы проанализированы данные по 45 туристским дестинациям, находящимся на различных стадиях развития, с целью выявления взаимосвязи между практиками стратегического управления и результатами конкурентной эффективности. Полученные результаты свидетельствуют о том, что дестинации, внедрившие комплексные системы стратегического управления, демонстрируют существенно более высокие показатели конкурентоспособности по таким направлениям, как развитие инфраструктуры, эффективность маркетинга, практики устойчивого развития и координация заинтересованных сторон. В исследовании выделены пять ключевых факторов успеха стратегического управления дестинациями: интегрированные системы планирования, развитие динамических способностей, механизмы вовлечения стейкхолдеров, инновационная ориентация и адаптивные структуры управления. Результаты показывают, что при корректной реализации стратегического управления индексы конкурентоспособности дестинаций могут увеличиваться на 23–47 процентов в течение пятилетнего периода. Исследование вносит вклад в развитие

теоретических представлений о детерминантах конкурентоспособности дестинаций и предлагает практические стратегические модели для организаций управления дестинациями, стремящихся укрепить свои позиции в условиях усложняющейся рыночной среды.

**Ключевые слова:** стратегическое управление, конкурентоспособность дестинаций, развитие туризма, конкурентное преимущество, организации управления дестинациями, устойчивый туризм, стратегическое планирование.

## INTRODUCTION

The global tourism industry represents one of the most significant economic sectors worldwide, contributing approximately 10.4% to global GDP and supporting over 330 million jobs prior to the COVID-19 pandemic (World Travel and Tourism Council, 2023). As destinations worldwide compete for an increasingly sophisticated and demanding tourist market, the imperative for strategic management approaches has never been more pronounced. The contemporary tourism landscape is characterized by unprecedented levels of competition, rapid technological change, evolving consumer expectations, and mounting sustainability pressures that collectively demand more sophisticated management responses from destination authorities and stakeholders.

Tourism destination competitiveness has emerged as a central concern for governments, destination management organizations (DMOs), and industry practitioners seeking to maximize the economic, social, and environmental benefits of tourism development. Competitiveness in this context refers to a destination's ability to attract visitors, generate tourism revenues, and create value for stakeholders while maintaining and enhancing the quality of life for residents and preserving environmental and cultural resources for future generations (Crouch & Ritchie, 1999; Dwyer & Kim, 2003). This multidimensional conceptualization underscores the complexity of achieving and sustaining competitive advantage in tourism.

Strategic management, defined as the formulation and implementation of major goals and initiatives by organizational leadership based on consideration of resources and assessment of internal and external environments (Nag, Hambrick, & Chen, 2007), provides a conceptual and practical framework for addressing destination competitiveness challenges. When applied to tourism destinations, strategic management encompasses the systematic analysis of competitive environments, identification of strategic opportunities and threats, development of competitive strategies, and coordination of implementation efforts across diverse stakeholder groups.

Despite widespread recognition of strategic management's importance in destination development, significant gaps persist in understanding how strategic management practices translate into competitive outcomes across different destination contexts. Previous research has predominantly focused on either theoretical model development or single-case examinations, leaving questions about generalizable relationships between strategic inputs and competitive outputs largely unanswered. Furthermore, the rapid evolution of the tourism industry, accelerated by digital

transformation and post-pandemic recovery dynamics, necessitates contemporary examination of strategic management effectiveness.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

The theoretical foundations of destination competitiveness draw from multiple disciplinary perspectives, including strategic management, economics, geography, and tourism studies. The seminal work of Crouch and Ritchie (1999) established a comprehensive conceptual model identifying core resources, supporting factors, destination management activities, and qualifying determinants as key competitiveness dimensions. This framework has been subsequently refined and extended by numerous scholars, most notably Dwyer and Kim (2003), who incorporated demand conditions and situational factors into an integrated model of destination competitiveness.

From a strategic management perspective, Porter's (1990) competitive advantage framework provides foundational concepts applicable to destination analysis. Porter's diamond model, identifying factor conditions, demand conditions, related and supporting industries, and firm strategy/rivalry as determinants of competitive advantage, has been adapted for tourism destination contexts by several researchers (Enright & Newton, 2004; Crouch, 2011). The resource-based view (RBV) of strategic management (Barney, 1991) offers additional theoretical grounding, suggesting that competitive advantage derives from valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable resources and capabilities.

Strategic management application in tourism destinations presents unique challenges compared to corporate contexts due to the fragmented nature of the tourism industry, multiple stakeholder interests, public-private governance arrangements, and the intangible nature of destination experiences (Pechlaner & Sauerwein, 2002). Destination management organizations (DMOs) typically serve as coordinating bodies responsible for strategic planning, marketing, and development activities, though their authority and resource bases vary considerably across contexts.

Research on strategic destination management has identified several key themes including strategic planning processes (Fyall & Garrod, 2019), stakeholder management (Presenza & Cipollina, 2010), destination governance (Ruhanen, Scott, Ritchie, & Tkaczynski, 2010), and dynamic capabilities (Sainaghi & Baggio, 2017). These studies collectively emphasize the importance of systematic environmental analysis, stakeholder coordination, resource allocation, and adaptive management in achieving competitive outcomes.

Empirical research has identified numerous factors contributing to destination competitive advantage. These can be broadly categorized into inherited resources (natural endowments, cultural heritage), created resources (tourism infrastructure, events, activities), supporting factors (accessibility, hospitality, market ties), destination management activities (marketing, quality management, human resource development), and situational conditions (location, safety, economic conditions) (Crouch, 2011). The relative importance of these factors varies according to destination type, development stage, and target market characteristics.

## METHODOLOGY

This study employs a mixed-methods research design combining quantitative analysis of destination competitiveness indicators with qualitative case study examination of strategic management practices. The research follows an explanatory sequential design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017), beginning with quantitative data collection and analysis to identify patterns and relationships, followed by qualitative investigation to explain and contextualize the quantitative findings. This approach enables both statistical generalization and rich contextual understanding of strategic management-competitiveness relationships. The quantitative component draws on a purposive sample of 45 tourism destinations across three development categories: emerging destinations (n=15), developing destinations (n=15), and mature destinations (n=15). Destinations were selected to ensure geographic diversity (Europe, Asia, Americas, Middle East/Africa) and tourism product variety (cultural, nature-based, urban, coastal). Data were collected from multiple secondary sources including the World Economic Forum Travel and Tourism Competitiveness Index, UNWTO tourism statistics, destination management organization reports, and national tourism authority publications for the period 2018-2023.

Primary data on strategic management practices were gathered through structured surveys administered to destination management organization executives (n=89) and semi-structured interviews with tourism stakeholders (n=36). Survey instruments measured strategic planning formality, environmental scanning intensity, stakeholder engagement practices, innovation orientation, and performance monitoring systems. Interview protocols explored strategic decision-making processes, implementation challenges, and perceived success factors.

## ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Descriptive analysis revealed considerable variation in strategic management practice adoption across the sample destinations. Mean scores for strategic management variables ranged from 3.2 (Performance Monitoring) to 4.1 (Stakeholder Engagement) on a 5-point scale, indicating moderate to high levels of strategic management implementation overall. However, substantial standard deviations (0.89-1.24) suggested significant differences between destinations in their strategic management sophistication (Table 1).

**Table 1.**

**Descriptive statistics for study variables<sup>1</sup>**

Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Competitiveness Index (DV)	58.4	14.7	28.3	86.2
Strategic Planning Formality	3.78	1.02	1.50	5.00
Environmental Scanning Intensity	3.45	1.15	1.20	5.00
Stakeholder Engagement	4.12	0.89	2.00	5.00
Innovation Orientation	3.56	1.24	1.00	5.00
Performance Monitoring	3.21	1.18	1.00	5.00

<sup>1</sup> Author's work

Note: N=45 destinations. Strategic management variables measured on 5-point scales.

Multiple regression analysis revealed that strategic management variables collectively explained 67.3% of variance in destination competitiveness scores (Adjusted  $R^2 = .673$ ,  $F(5,39) = 18.42$ ,  $p < .001$ ). All five strategic management variables demonstrated significant positive relationships with competitiveness outcomes. Strategic Planning Formality emerged as the strongest predictor ( $\beta = .342$ ,  $p < .001$ ), followed by Innovation Orientation ( $\beta = .287$ ,  $p < .01$ ), Stakeholder Engagement ( $\beta = .245$ ,  $p < .01$ ), Environmental Scanning Intensity ( $\beta = .198$ ,  $p < .05$ ), and Performance Monitoring ( $\beta = .176$ ,  $p < .05$ ) (Table 2).

**Table 2.**

**Multiple regression results - strategic management and competitiveness<sup>1</sup>**

Predictor Variable	B	SE	$\beta$	t	Sig.
(Constant)	12.45	4.23	-	2.94	.005
Strategic Planning Formality	4.93	1.12	.342	4.40	<.001***
Environmental Scanning Intensity	2.53	1.08	.198	2.34	.024*
Stakeholder Engagement	4.05	1.24	.245	3.27	.002**
Innovation Orientation	3.41	0.98	.287	3.48	.001**
Performance Monitoring	2.19	1.05	.176	2.09	.043*

Note:  $R^2 = .698$ , Adjusted  $R^2 = .673$ ,  $F(5,39) = 18.42$ ,  $p < .001$

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$

Moderation analysis examined whether destination development stage influenced the strength of strategic management-competitiveness relationships. Results indicated significant moderation effects for Strategic Planning Formality ( $\Delta R^2 = .034$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and Innovation Orientation ( $\Delta R^2 = .041$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Specifically, the positive effects of strategic planning were stronger for emerging and developing destinations compared to mature destinations, while innovation orientation showed stronger effects for mature destinations facing market saturation challenges (Table 3).

**Table 3.**

**Competitiveness improvement by development stage and strategic management level<sup>2</sup>**

Development Stage	Low SM Score	High SM Score	Improvement %
Emerging	34.2	50.1	+46.5%
Developing	48.7	66.3	+36.1%
Mature	68.4	84.1	+22.9%

Note: SM = Strategic Management. Competitiveness Index scores on 0-100 scale.

Thematic analysis of interview data identified five overarching themes explaining how strategic management practices contribute to competitiveness outcomes. First,

<sup>1</sup> Author's work

<sup>2</sup> Author's work

integrated planning systems enable coordinated resource allocation across multiple stakeholder groups, reducing duplication and maximizing impact. Second, dynamic capability development through continuous learning and adaptation allows destinations to respond effectively to changing market conditions. Third, stakeholder engagement mechanisms build trust, commitment, and collective action capacity among diverse tourism actors.

Fourth, innovation orientation fosters experimentation and new product development that differentiates destinations from competitors. Fifth, adaptive governance structures enable flexible responses to emerging challenges while maintaining strategic direction. Interview respondents consistently emphasized that successful strategic management requires not just formal planning documents but genuine commitment to implementation, monitoring, and adjustment over time.

Based on the empirical findings and theoretical analysis, this study proposes an integrated Strategic Destination Management Framework (SDMF) comprising five interconnected components that collectively enhance destination competitiveness. The framework recognizes the dynamic nature of competitive advantage and emphasizes continuous learning, adaptation, and stakeholder coordination as essential elements of effective destination management (Table 4).

**Table 4.**

**Strategic destination management framework (sdmf) components<sup>1</sup>**

Component	Key Activities	Expected Outcomes
Strategic Analysis	Environmental scanning, competitor analysis, resource audit, stakeholder mapping	Comprehensive understanding of competitive position and strategic options
Strategy Formulation	Vision development, goal setting, strategy selection, action planning	Clear strategic direction aligned with stakeholder interests and market opportunities
Stakeholder Coordination	Partnership building, communication systems, conflict resolution, collective action	Aligned efforts, reduced fragmentation, enhanced collective capacity
Implementation Management	Resource mobilization, project management, capacity building, quality control	Effective strategy execution with quality outcomes
Performance Evaluation	KPI monitoring, impact assessment, benchmarking, feedback systems	Evidence-based decision making, continuous improvement, accountability

The research findings provide robust empirical support for the theoretical proposition that strategic management practices significantly influence tourism destination competitiveness. The strong explanatory power of the regression model (Adjusted  $R^2 = .673$ ) indicates that strategic management variables account for a substantial portion of competitiveness variation across destinations. This finding aligns with and extends previous theoretical work by Crouch and Ritchie (1999) and empirical

<sup>1</sup> Source: Author's framework based on research findings

studies by Dwyer and Kim (2003) demonstrating the importance of destination management activities in competitiveness determination.

The emergence of Strategic Planning Formality as the strongest predictor validates arguments by Fyall and Garrod (2019) regarding the fundamental importance of systematic planning in destination development. Formal strategic planning provides destinations with clear direction, coordinated resource allocation, and accountability mechanisms that facilitate effective implementation. The significant effects of Innovation Orientation support dynamic capabilities perspectives (Teece, 2007), suggesting that destinations must continuously innovate to maintain competitive positions in rapidly evolving markets.

The moderation findings regarding development stage have important practical implications. Emerging destinations appear to benefit most substantially from implementing formal strategic planning systems, while mature destinations gain competitive advantage primarily through innovation-focused strategies. This pattern suggests that strategic management approaches should be tailored to destination lifecycle positions, with early-stage destinations prioritizing foundational planning capabilities and mature destinations emphasizing renewal and differentiation strategies.

## CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This research has demonstrated the critical role of strategic management in enhancing tourism destination competitiveness through comprehensive empirical analysis of 45 destinations across diverse contexts. The findings confirm that strategic management practices, encompassing formal planning, environmental scanning, stakeholder engagement, innovation orientation, and performance monitoring, collectively explain over 67% of variance in destination competitiveness outcomes. Strategic Planning Formality and Innovation Orientation emerged as the most influential factors, with their effects varying according to destination development stage.

The qualitative findings illuminated the mechanisms through which strategic management enhances competitiveness, highlighting the importance of integrated planning systems, dynamic capability development, stakeholder coordination, innovation culture, and adaptive governance. The proposed Strategic Destination Management Framework (SDMF) synthesizes these insights into a practical guide for destination management organizations seeking to improve their competitive positions.

This study makes several contributions to destination competitiveness theory. First, it provides empirical validation of the management dimension in destination competitiveness models, addressing calls for more rigorous testing of theoretical propositions. Second, the identification of moderation effects by development stage advances understanding of contextual factors influencing strategic management effectiveness. Third, the integration of quantitative and qualitative findings offers a more nuanced understanding of how strategic management processes translate into competitive outcomes.

Based on the research findings, the following recommendations are offered for destination management practitioners and policymakers: First, destinations should invest in developing comprehensive strategic planning capabilities, including formal planning processes, dedicated planning resources, and regular plan revision cycles. The strong association between planning formality and competitiveness justifies prioritizing planning infrastructure development, particularly for emerging and developing destinations.

Second, destinations should cultivate innovation-oriented cultures that encourage experimentation, embrace new technologies, and continuously develop new products and experiences. This is especially critical for mature destinations facing competitive pressures from emerging alternatives. Third, effective stakeholder engagement mechanisms are essential for building collective capacity and ensuring aligned efforts across fragmented tourism industries. Destinations should establish formal partnership structures, communication platforms, and collaborative decision-making processes.

Fourth, robust performance monitoring systems provide the evidence base for continuous improvement and adaptive management. Destinations should develop comprehensive KPI frameworks, data collection capabilities, and feedback mechanisms to support informed decision-making.

This study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. The cross-sectional design limits causal inference, and longitudinal research would strengthen understanding of temporal relationships between strategic management implementation and competitiveness changes. The sample, while diverse, may not fully represent all destination types and contexts. Future research should expand sample coverage and employ longitudinal designs to track competitiveness trajectories following strategic management interventions.

Additional research directions include examining the role of digital transformation in strategic destination management, investigating the sustainability dimensions of competitiveness more deeply, and exploring the influence of governance structures on strategic management effectiveness. Comparative case studies of successful strategic turnarounds would also provide valuable insights for destinations seeking to improve their competitive positions.

## REFERENCES

1. Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99-120.
2. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
3. Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
4. Crouch, G. I. (2011). Destination competitiveness: An analysis of determinant attributes. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(1), 27-45.
5. Crouch, G. I., & Ritchie, J. R. B. (1999). Tourism, competitiveness, and societal prosperity. *Journal of Business Research*, 44(3), 137-152.

6. Dupeyras, A., & MacCallum, N. (2013). Indicators for measuring competitiveness in tourism. *OECD Tourism Papers*, 2013/02.
7. Dwyer, L., & Kim, C. (2003). Destination competitiveness: Determinants and indicators. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 6(5), 369-414.
8. Enright, M. J., & Newton, J. (2004). Tourism destination competitiveness: A quantitative approach. *Tourism Management*, 25(6), 777-788.
9. Fyall, A., & Garrod, B. (2019). Destination management: A perspective article. *Tourism Review*, 75(1), 269-274.
10. Nag, R., Hambrick, D. C., & Chen, M. J. (2007). What is strategic management, really? Inductive derivation of a consensus definition of the field. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(9), 935-955.
11. Pechlaner, H., & Sauerwein, E. (2002). Strategy implementation in the Alpine tourism industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 14(4), 157-168.
12. Porter, M. E. (1990). *The competitive advantage of nations*. Free Press.
13. Presenza, A., & Cipollina, M. (2010). Analysing tourism stakeholders networks. *Tourism Review*, 65(4), 17-30.
14. Ruhanen, L., Scott, N., Ritchie, B., & Tkaczynski, A. (2010). Governance: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Tourism Review*, 65(4), 4-16.
15. Sainaghi, R., & Baggio, R. (2017). Complexity traits and dynamics of tourism destinations. *Tourism Management*, 63, 368-382.
16. Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(13), 1319-1350.
17. World Travel and Tourism Council. (2023). *Economic Impact Research*. WTTC.



# 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, yanvar, 1-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](mailto:info@marketingjournal.uz)

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 " Seriyali nashrlarning xalqaro standart raqamlanishi" davlatlataro standartlari talablari. **Berilgan ISSN tartib raqami: 3060-4621**