

# INNOVATION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY



Scopus || Electronic journal specializing in Scopus

**ISSUE 2**



Acceptance of papers **February, 2026**



**Acceptance of papers**

Published monthly



**Topics**

economics, technology, social sciences

**ISSN 3060-5229**



Digital Object Identifier



Visit the website [t.me/scopus\\_IST2100](https://t.me/scopus_IST2100)

## Editorial board:



### EDITOR-IN-CHIEF:

Mirzaliyev Sanjar Makhmatjon ugli

### DEPUTY EDITOR-IN-CHIEF:

Makhmudov Nosir Makhmudovich  
DSc., Prof., Academician

### DEPUTY EDITOR-IN-CHIEF:

Ochilov Bobur Bakhtiyor ugli – Senior  
lecturer at TSUI

THE SCIENTIFIC-POPULAR ELECTRONIC  
JOURNAL **"INNOVATION SCIENCE AND  
TECHNOLOGY"** HAS BEEN REGISTERED  
UNDER THE NUMBER **C-5669633** BY THE  
AGENCY FOR INFORMATION AND MASS  
COMMUNICATIONS (AOKA) OF THE  
REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN, EFFECTIVE  
FROM OCTOBER 9, 2024.

### CONTACTS

Phone: **+998 50 737 87 88**

Website: <https://ist-journal.uz>

Email: [innovationist2025@gmail.com](mailto:innovationist2025@gmail.com)

The scientific electronic journal "Innovation Science and Technology" has been included in the list of scientific publications recommended for the publication of main scientific results of dissertations for the award of PhD and DSc degrees in economics and technical sciences, in accordance with the Resolution No. 370 of the Presidium of the Higher Attestation Commission of the Republic of Uzbekistan, dated May 8, 2025.



**Sharipov Kongiratbay Avezimbetovich,**  
Doctor of Technical Sciences (DSc), Professor



**Abdurakhmanova Gulnora Kalandarovna,** Doctor of  
Economic Sciences (DSc), Professor



**Cham Tat Huei,**  
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), Professor (Malaysia)



**Muhammad Imran Sadiq**  
Doctor of Philosophy in Economics (PhD), Professor,  
Malaysia



**Ahmed Aziz Ismail**  
Doctor of Technical Sciences (DSc),  
Professor (Egypt)



**Lee Chin**  
Doctor of Philosophy in Economics (PhD), (Malaysia)



**Asongu SImplice**  
Doctor of Philosophy in Economics (PhD), Cameroon



**Rui Dang**  
Doctor of Chemistry (DSc), Professor, China



**Zahoor Ahmed**  
Doctor of Philosophy in Economics (PhD), Turkey



**Shujaat Abbas**  
Doctor of Philosophy in Economics (PhD), Russia



**Tina A Coffelt**  
Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Sciences (PhD),  
USA



**Abdikarimova Dinara Rustamxanovna**  
Doctor of Economic Sciences (DSc), Professor

**Kurbonbekova Mohichehra Turobjonovna**  
Doctor of Economic Sciences (DSc), Professor

**Alimardonov Ilkhom Muzrabshokovich**  
Doctor of Economic Sciences (DSc), Professor



**Razakova Barno Sayfiyevna**  
Doctor of Philosophy in Economics (PhD)



**Khasanov Sarvar Ulugbek ugli**  
Doctor of Philosophy in Economics (PhD)



**Kholikova Rukhsora Sanjarovna**  
Associate Professor (PhD)

# CONTENTS

DIGITAL TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION TRENDS AND CHALLENGES IN PEDIATRIC DENTISTRY .....	15
<b>Tursunov Begzod Sherzodovich, Solijonov Sherzod Qahramonovich</b>	
THE ROLE OF RISKS AND RISK MANAGEMENT IN MANAGING THE SOLVENCY OF INSURANCE COMPANIES .....	20
<b>Xalikulova Shirin Utkir qizi</b>	
INVESTMENT OPPORTUNITIES IN THE SECURITIES MARKET OF UZBEKISTAN: DIVIDEND YIELD, INSTITUTIONAL REFORMS AND INTERNATIONAL ATTRACTIVENESS.....	25
<b>Akhliyor Ibragimov</b>	
A CONCEPTUAL APPROACH TO ANTI-MONOPOLY CONTROL IN SERVICE INDUSTRIES ADAPTED TO THE CONDITIONS OF UZBEKISTAN.....	30
<b>Bekbutayev Nodirjon Fayzullayevich</b>	
TECHNOLOGICAL FEATURES OF WEAR-RESISTANT SURFACING OF METALLIC COMPONENTS ALLOYED WITH CARBON, MANGANESE, AND SILICON USING FUSED FLUXES.....	35
<b>Khudoyorov Sardor Sadullaevich, Khudoykulov Nurilla Zikirillaevich</b>	
ECONOMIC EFFICIENCY OF IMPLEMENTING INTEGRATED MARKETING COMMUNICATIONS IN ENTERING NEW MARKETS IN UZBEKISTAN .....	39
<b>Baqoyev Sunnatillo Burxon o'g'li</b>	
ENVIRONMENTALLY EFFICIENT FATLIQUORING AGENTS IN KARAKUL FATLIQUORING TECHNOLOGY.....	46
<b>Rustamov Bobir Ismatovich, Shodieva Dilnoza Turajon qizi</b>	
STRATEGIC PLANNING IN IMPROVING THE METHODOLOGY FOR MANAGING INVESTMENT PROJECTS IN THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY.....	51
<b>Qurbonov Jasurbek Pozilovich</b>	
FOUNDATIONS OF ENGLISH TEACHING BASED ON PROVERBS (UZBEK AND AFGAN WORDS).....	56
<b>Samadi Nooria</b>	
MATHEMATICAL MODELING AND SOLUTION ALGORITHMS OF GEOMETRIC PROBLEMS IN NUMERICALLY CONTROLLED MACHINES.....	60
<b>Khasanov Bobirmirzo Makhmudali ugli, Yusupov Sardorbek Ma'rufovich, Abdullajonov Asadbek Sherzodbek ugli</b>	
INNOVATION IS A KEY FACTOR IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ENERGY INDUSTRY.....	70
<b>Gavkhar Absamatovna Khamdamova</b>	
MARKETING PROBLEMS IN THE INTERNATIONAL INDUSTRIAL ENTERPRISE MARKET AND FOREIGN EXPERIENCE IN SOLVING THEM.....	76
<b>Usmanova Dilfuza Ilhomovna</b>	
FUZZY ROBUST CONTROLLERS FOR GAS PURIFICATION PROCESSES.....	82
<b>Sh. D. Tulyaganov</b>	
METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS OF MARKETING IN FURNITURE ENTERPRISES IN THE CONTEXT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW UZBEKISTAN DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY .....	87
<b>Musayeva Shoirazimovna</b>	
THE ROLE OF METHODOLOGICAL COMPETENCE IN FUNDAMENTALIZING THE PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION OF FUTURE ECONOMICS TEACHERS .....	92
<b>Djumanazarova Zamira Kojabayevna</b>	
MAHALLIY BUDJET DAROMADLARI BARQARORLIGINI TA'MINLASH YO'NALISHLARI .....	97
<b>Isoqov Zafarjon Zokirjonovich</b>	
LIQUIDITY PROVISION IN BANKS THROUGH EFFECTIVE ASSET-LIABILITY MANAGEMENT.....	101
<b>Sulaymanov Samandarboy Adhambek ugli</b>	
EFFECTIVENESS OF THE "MANAGEMENT CERTIFICATE" SYSTEM IN THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION SYSTEM LEADERS AND MECHANISMS FOR ITS IMPROVEMENT .....	108
<b>Mamatqulova Shoxsanam Dilshodovna</b>	

REGIONAL DISPARITIES IN SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT: A CLUSTER AND INDEX ANALYSIS.....	114
<b>Akbarova Barno Shukhratovna</b>	
INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND TOURISM GOVERNANCE IN UZBEKISTAN: A THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS.....	119
<b>Akkulov Abdulaziz Uralbaevich</b>	
USE OF ECONOMETRIC FORECAST INDICATORS IN MANAGING THE COMPETITIVENESS OF FOOD INDUSTRY ENTERPRISES .....	124
<b>Xusanova Gavhar</b>	
STRATEGY FOR DEVELOPING INCLUSIVE FINANCING IN THE MANAGEMENT OF COMMERCIAL BANKS AND ITS INSTITUTIONAL FOUNDATIONS .....	130
<b>Rajabov Oybek Panjievich</b>	
SCENARIO ANALYSIS OF IMPROVING THE ENERGY EFFICIENCY OF UZBEKISTAN'S ECONOMY UNDER CONDITIONS OF UNCERTAINTY.....	134
<b>Muslimova F.S., Khashimova N.A.</b>	
SCIENTIFIC AND THEORETICAL VIEWS ON THE FINANCING OF PROJECTS BASED ON PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP .....	141
<b>Ergashev Ahmadjon</b>	
THE INFLUENCE OF TAX INCENTIVES ON INNOVATION IN INDUSTRIAL ENTERPRISES.....	146
<b>Bahriddinov Nodirbek Zamirdinovich</b>	
KORXONALARDA SOTISH TIZIMINI TASHKIL ETISH VA TAKOMILLASHTIRISH.....	150
<b>Abduxalilova Laylo Tohtasinovna</b>	
CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF MARKETING ACTIVITIES IN CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS MANUFACTURING ENTERPRISES .....	156
<b>Uzakova Umida Ruziyevna</b>	

# CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF MARKETING ACTIVITIES IN CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS MANUFACTURING ENTERPRISES

**Uzakova Umida Ruziyevna**

Tashkent State Transport University

basic doctoral student (DSc)

ORCID:0009-0002-6173-5572

Email:[lassie2323@gmail.com](mailto:lassie2323@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** The study systematically examined the theoretical foundations of criteria for evaluating marketing activity effectiveness in construction materials manufacturing enterprises. The main theoretical approaches to measuring marketing effectiveness — financial, market, customer, and process performance criteria — were comparatively analyzed. Conceptual foundations of a multi-level criteria system and a balanced evaluation model were developed. The sectoral adaptation of the marketing metrics system was theoretically substantiated, taking into account the specific characteristics of the construction materials industry. The results demonstrated that the integrated application of financial and non-financial criteria contributed to improving the quality of marketing management.

**Key words:** marketing effectiveness, evaluation criteria, construction materials, marketing metrics, marketing ROI, customer value.

**Annotatsiya:** Tadqiqotda qurilish materiallari ishlab chiqarish korxonalarida marketing faoliyati samaradorligini baholash mezonlarining nazariy asoslari tizimli ravishda o'rganildi. Marketing samaradorligini o'lchashning asosiy nazariy yondashuvlari - moliyaviy, bozor, mijozlar va jarayonlar samaradorligi mezonlari qiyosiy tahlil qilindi. Ko'p darajali mezonlar tizimining kontseptual asoslari va muvozanatli baholash modeli ishlab chiqildi. Qurilish materiallari sanoatining o'ziga xos xususiyatlarini hisobga olgan holda marketing ko'rsatkichlari tizimining tarmoqqa moslashuvi nazariy jihatdan asoslandi. Natijalar moliyaviy va moliyaviy bo'lmagan mezonlarning kompleks qo'llanilishi marketing boshqaruvi sifatini yaxshilashga hissa qo'shganligini ko'rsatdi.

**Kalit so'zlar:** marketing samaradorligi, baholash mezonlari, qurilish materiallari, marketing ko'rsatkichlari, marketing investitsiyalarining daromadliligi, mijozlar qiymati.

**Аннотация:** В исследовании систематически рассмотрены теоретические основы критериев оценки эффективности маркетинговой деятельности на предприятиях по производству строительных материалов. Проведен сравнительный анализ основных теоретических подходов к измерению эффективности маркетинга — финансовых, рыночных, потребительских и процессных критериев. Разработаны концептуальные основы многоуровневой системы критериев и сбалансированной модели оценки. Теоретически обоснована отраслевая адаптация системы маркетинговых показателей с учетом специфики отрасли строительных материалов. Результаты показали, что комплексное применение финансовых и нефинансовых критериев способствует повышению качества управления маркетингом.

**Ключевые слова:** эффективность маркетинга, критерии оценки, строительные материалы, маркетинговые показатели, ROI маркетинга, ценность для клиента.

## INTRODUCTION

Measuring and evaluating the effectiveness of marketing activities is one of the most debated issues in modern management science, which has aroused wide scientific interest in both academic research and practical management [1]. In the context of construction materials companies, this issue is particularly complex, since the parallel operation of the B2B and B2C segments of the industry, the high level of standardization

of products, and the heterogeneity of the customer structure make it difficult to measure marketing results in isolation [2].

Marketing accountability is a strategic topic that has gained importance in the academic literature over the past two decades [3]. Business leaders need to see the financial return on marketing investments, but it is scientifically proven that marketing effectiveness cannot be measured solely by financial indicators [4]. Intangible assets such as brand value, customer loyalty, and market share are transformed into financial results in the long run, but their impact mechanism is characterized by a time lag, making direct measurement difficult.

The purpose of the study is to systematically analyze the theoretical foundations of the criteria for assessing the effectiveness of marketing activities in enterprises producing building materials and develop a conceptual model of a multi-level assessment system adapted to industry characteristics. The scientific tasks include: evolutionary analysis of theoretical approaches to assessing marketing effectiveness; comparative assessment of the system of financial and non-financial criteria; formation of a conceptual design of an integrated criteria system taking into account the specifics of the building materials industry.

The theoretical significance of the study is that it applies the existing theoretical framework for assessing marketing effectiveness to the specific context of the building materials industry and develops the conceptual foundations of a multidimensional assessment system. In practice, the research results provide enterprises with a set of scientifically sound criteria for systematic monitoring of marketing activities and improving the quality of strategic decisions.

## REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

An analysis of the scientific literature on the evaluation of marketing effectiveness allows us to identify three main stages in the evolution of this field. The first stage - the period of dominance of financial criteria - was formed in the second half of the 20th century, when marketing effectiveness was assessed mainly through sales volume, profit margin and cost-effectiveness indicators. Ambler scientifically substantiated the limitations of this one-dimensional approach, showing that measuring the results of marketing activities only by financial indicators leads to its orientation towards short-term optimization and reduces the importance of long-term strategic investments - brand building, expanding the customer base [1].

The second stage — the emergence of multidimensional approaches — is associated with the Balanced Scorecard proposed by Kaplan and Norton [3]. This concept complements financial indicators with customer perspectives, internal processes, and learning and development perspectives, creating the opportunity for a multifaceted assessment of organizational performance. In the context of marketing, this approach theoretically substantiates the need to use non-financial criteria such as market share, customer satisfaction, and brand health in parallel with financial metrics.

Rust, Ambler, Carpenter, Kumar, and Srivastava proposed a holistic theoretical framework for evaluating marketing effectiveness, modeling the chain of connections between marketing actions and firm value [2]. According to their model, marketing tactics (advertising, pricing, distribution) initially lead to customer effects (awareness, satisfaction, loyalty), then transform into market effects (market share, sales), and finally into financial effects (profit, firm value). This chain model scientifically substantiated the multi-stage nature of marketing effectiveness and served as a theoretical platform for unifying evaluation criteria into a single system.

The third stage — the era of marketing accountability — was formed in the second decade of the 21st century, when the demand for proof of the return on marketing investments increased [5]. Morgan, Clark and Gooner systematized marketing performance metrics and divided them into three categories: input metrics (marketing budget, personnel), process metrics (marketing strategy implementation, channel effectiveness) and outcome metrics (sales, profit, market share) [5]. This classification made it possible to understand marketing performance as an input-process-output chain and created a theoretical basis for functional differentiation of evaluation criteria.

Farris, Bendle, Pfeifer, and Reibstein presented a comprehensive set of marketing metrics, systematizing more than 50 metrics for assessing marketing effectiveness [6]. Their approach divided metrics into functional groups: market share metrics, profitability metrics, customer metrics, communication metrics, and channel metrics. This classification has been widely used in practice, allowing marketing managers to independently monitor various aspects of their activities.

Lenskold developed the marketing ROI concept in depth and provided the methodological basis for calculating the return on marketing investments [7]. His approach was based on the principle of considering marketing expenses as investments and gradually tracking their financial return. However, Kumar expanded the marketing ROI concept and proposed, in addition to financial returns, Customer Lifetime Value (CLV) as a key metric of the effectiveness of marketing investments [8]. The CLV concept allows marketing decisions to be evaluated not in terms of short-term profit, but in terms of long-term customer value.

Keller and Lehmann studied brand equity as a strategic metric of marketing effectiveness and proposed a three-level measurement model of brand equity: customer-level brand equity (awareness, image), product-market-level brand equity (price premium, market share), and financial-level brand equity (brand capitalization) [4]. This model theoretically solidified the role of brand equity as an important criterion in assessing marketing effectiveness.

Mintz and Currim conducted an extensive study of the use of marketing metrics and found that marketing managers use an average of 9 different metrics in their decision-making [9]. They classified marketing metrics into financial (ROI, profit, revenue), customer-based (satisfaction, loyalty, NPS), and market-based (market share, penetration) categories. The results of the study showed that companies that achieved high performance used a larger number and a wider range of metrics, which confirmed the practical advantages of a multidimensional assessment system.

Homburg, Artz, and Wieseke studied the relationship between marketing effectiveness and firm performance and found that marketing department influence directly affects the effective use of marketing metrics [10]. They found a statistically significant correlation between the systematic use of marketing metrics and higher marketing performance in firms with higher marketing department involvement in strategic decisions.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study was based on a qualitative-theoretical paradigm and used a deductive research strategy. The approach to generating scientific knowledge was to extract general principles from the existing theoretical base and apply them to the specific context of the building materials industry.

The main method of the study is a systematic literature review, which covers scientific sources on the topic of marketing effectiveness assessment. The literature was selected from among articles indexed in the Scopus and Web of Science databases, fundamental monographs on marketing management, and scientific publications on marketing metrics. The selection criteria were as follows: publication between 1995 and 2024; relevance to the topics of marketing effectiveness, marketing metrics, marketing accounting; publication in peer-reviewed publications.

The main tools of theoretical analysis are comparative analysis and conceptual modeling methods. Within the framework of comparative analysis, various evaluation criteria were compared in terms of their characteristics, scope, advantages and limitations. In the process of conceptual modeling, theoretical regularities identified as a result of literature analysis were synthesized, and a multi-level criteria system and a balanced evaluation model adapted to the building materials industry were developed.

In accordance with the principles of a systematic approach, the individual characteristics of each criterion, as well as the interrelationships between the criteria and the mechanisms of their joint influence, were taken into account [11]. The boundaries of the study are defined as follows: the study is theoretical in nature; the conceptual model is presented as a theoretical platform for further empirical testing; conclusions are drawn based on the general laws of the building materials industry.

## ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Systematic classification of marketing effectiveness criteria

As a result of the literature review, the criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of marketing activities were classified into four main categories: financial criteria, market criteria, customer criteria, and process criteria. This classification is based on the marketing influence chain model proposed by Rust et al. (2004) [2] and the input-process-output classification developed by Morgan et al. (2002) [5] (Table 1).

Table 1. Systematic classification of marketing effectiveness criteria<sup>1</sup>

Criteria category	Key indicators	Measurement method	Time horizon
Financial criteria	Marketing ROI, sales revenue, profit margin, CLV	Quantitative and financial accounting	Short and medium term
Market criteria	Market share, penetration rate, brand recognition	Market research, statistical monitoring	Medium and long term
Customer criteria	NPS, customer satisfaction, loyalty index, conversion	Surveys, transactional analysis	Short and medium term
Process criteria	Marketing campaign effectiveness, channel profitability	Internal audit, performance analysis	Short-term

<sup>1</sup> Source: Adapted from Rust et al. (2004) [2], Morgan et al. (2002) [5], Farris et al. (2010) [6].

The classification presented in Table 1 shows the multidimensional nature of marketing performance criteria. Each category covers a separate aspect of marketing activities, and together they form a holistic picture of marketing effectiveness. Financial criteria measure the direct financial return on marketing investments, while market criteria reflect the competitive position of the enterprise [6]. Customer criteria assess the quality of relationships with consumers, and process criteria monitor the internal effectiveness of marketing activities.

#### Comparative analysis of financial and non-financial criteria

Striking a balance between financial and non-financial criteria in assessing marketing effectiveness is a fundamental theoretical issue. Lenskold (2003) proposed marketing ROI as a key performance metric that provides a clear measure of the financial return on marketing spending [7]. However, Kumar (2008) highlighted the limitations of relying solely on ROI and justified the strategic importance of the concept of customer lifetime value (CLV) [8]. The CLV approach elevates marketing decisions from the level of individual transactions to the level of customer relationships and takes a long-term perspective (Table 2).

Table 2. Comparative characteristics of financial and non-financial criteria<sup>2</sup>

Feature	Financial criteria	Non-financial criteria
<b>Measurement objectivity</b>	High — precise numerical indicators	Average — subjective and perceptual elements
<b>Time horizon</b>	Short-term results	Medium and long-term impact
<b>Strategic direction</b>	Revenue optimization	Competitive advantage and customer value
<b>Source of information</b>	Financial report	Market research and CRM systems
<b>Importance for building materials</b>	Calculating ROI in project sales	B2B loyalty and brand trust assessment

A comparative analysis of Table 2 shows that financial and non-financial criteria are complementary in nature, and their separate use limits the possibility of providing a complete picture of marketing activities [9]. This feature is especially evident in the building materials industry: while calculating financial ROI in project sales is relatively simple, in the B2B segment non-financial criteria such as customer loyalty and brand trust play a decisive role in securing long-term contracts.

#### Conceptual model of a multi-level criteria system

Based on the results of the literature review and comparative analysis, a multi-level system of criteria for assessing the effectiveness of marketing activities for building materials enterprises was developed. This system includes three hierarchical levels: strategic level, tactical level, and operational level [3, 10].

The strategic level assesses the degree to which an enterprise achieves its long-term marketing goals and includes criteria such as market share dynamics, brand value, and customer lifetime value (CLV). These criteria are used at the enterprise management level and reflect the effectiveness of strategic marketing decisions [8]. The tactical level assesses the effectiveness of marketing programs and campaigns and is divided into three subcategories: financial criteria (marketing ROI, sales profitability, marketing expense ratio), market criteria (market penetration, price premium index, distribution coverage), and customer criteria (NPS, customer retention rate, purchase conversion). The operational level monitors the effectiveness of daily marketing activities and evaluates the results of individual marketing activities (Figure 1).

<sup>2</sup> Source: Adapted from Lenskold (2003) [7], Kumar (2008) [8], Keller and Lehmann (2006) [4].



Figure 1. Multi-level criteria system for assessing the effectiveness of marketing activities<sup>3</sup>

The multi-level system visualized in Figure 1 reflects the hierarchical logic of assessing marketing effectiveness. While strategic-level criteria provide information about the overall marketing effectiveness of the enterprise, tactical-level criteria allow for a separate analysis of functional aspects of effectiveness. The operational level, on the other hand, includes individual indicators that make up tactical-level criteria and serves for operational monitoring of marketing activities [5], [6].

Theoretical foundations of the balanced scorecard model

A balanced scorecard model was developed as a conceptual element complementing the multi-level criteria system. This model was adapted to the specifics of the building materials industry, based on the principles of the Balanced Scorecard proposed by Kaplan and Norton [3] and the classification of marketing metrics developed by Morgan and colleagues [5].

The model includes five balanced dimensions: financial performance (ROI, CLV, sales growth), market performance (market share, brand awareness), customer performance (NPS, satisfaction, loyalty), process performance (time, cost, quality), and innovation performance (new product success, digital marketing). The central integration point of the five dimensions — total marketing effectiveness — represents the synergistic result of all dimensions (Figure 2) [12].



Figure 2. Balanced Criteria Model for Evaluating Marketing Effectiveness<sup>4</sup>

3 Source: Authors' elaboration based on Ambler (2003) [1], Rust et al. (2004) [2], Homburg et al. (2012) [10].

4 Source: Authors' elaboration based on Kaplan and Norton (1996) [3], Morgan et al. (2002) [5].

The balanced model presented in Figure 2 reflects the multifaceted nature of marketing effectiveness, visualizing the interrelationships of all five dimensions. The practical significance of this model in the building materials industry is that it allows enterprises to avoid one-sided evaluation of marketing activities - based on only financial or only market criteria - and to see the whole picture. The dotted lines between the dimensions indicate their mutual influence: for example, an increase in customer effectiveness (NPS increase) is transformed into market effectiveness (market share increase) and ultimately into financial effectiveness (profit increase) [2], [8].

Sectoral adaptation of the criteria system in the building materials industry

The specific characteristics of the building materials industry require a number of industry-specific adaptations to marketing effectiveness criteria. First, due to the dominance of the B2B segment, some criteria used in traditional consumer marketing (for example, brand awareness among a wide audience) must be adapted to the industry - brand trust and reputation index among professional buyers are more informative metrics [11].

Second, due to the long sales cycle and the nature of project purchases, it is not sufficient to assess marketing effectiveness based on short-term indicators. When applying the CLV concept to the context of building materials, the customer life cycle should include not only individual purchases, but also a series of project contracts, the frequency of repeat orders and referral value [8]. Third, the quality of logistics service and adherence to delivery times should be considered as important criteria for marketing effectiveness in the building materials industry, as they directly affect customer satisfaction and loyalty (Table 3) [12].

Table 3. Adaptation of the criteria system to the building materials industry<sup>5</sup>

General criterion	Sectoral adaptation	Theoretical basis
Market share	Market share segmented by product type	Farris et al. (2010) [6]
Brand value	Brand trust index among professional buyers	Keller and Lehmann (2006) [4]
NPS	NPS between contractors and project managers	Mintz and Currim (2013) [9]
Marketing ROI	ROI calculation for project sales	Lenskold (2003) [7]
CLV	Contractual CLV: project series and referral value	Kumar (2008) [8]
Distribution efficiency	Logistics service quality and delivery time compliance	Petersen et al. (2009) [11]

The industry adaptations presented in Table 3 clarify the system of marketing metrics for building materials enterprises and create the opportunity to adapt them to the real conditions of the industry. In the process of adaptation, the content of traditional metrics is redefined in accordance with the industry context, and this theoretically based approach increases the informativeness and practical applicability of metrics [9], [11].

## CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

As a result of the study, a number of important theoretical conclusions were formed on the criteria for assessing the effectiveness of marketing activities in building materials manufacturing enterprises. A systematic literature review theoretically identified the evolution of the marketing effectiveness assessment paradigm - the transition from a one-dimensional financial approach to a multidimensional integrated approach [1], [2]. Marketing effectiveness criteria were classified into four main categories: financial, market, customer and process criteria, with each category having its own measurement methods, time horizon and strategic direction.

Two conceptual models developed in the study — the multilevel criteria system and the balanced scorecard model — serve as a theoretical platform for a systematic assessment of marketing effectiveness. The multilevel system reflects the hierarchical relationship between the strategic, tactical, and operational levels, allowing for the differentiation of marketing effectiveness at different levels of management [3, 10]. The balanced scorecard model theoretically substantiates the need to ensure a balance between five dimensions of marketing effectiveness — financial, market, customer, process, and innovation effectiveness.

The specific characteristics of the building materials industry — the dominance of the B2B segment, the long sales cycle, the importance of logistics services — have been theoretically justified as requiring industry-specific adaptation of the marketing metrics system [4], [11]. Versions of traditional metrics adapted to the industry context have been developed: professional brand trust index, contractual CLV, project marketing ROI, and logistics service quality metrics.

Based on the results of the theoretical analysis, the following scientific proposals are put forward. First, it is advisable for building materials enterprises to use a multidimensional integrated approach to assessing

<sup>5</sup> Source: Compiled by the authors based on theoretical analysis.

marketing effectiveness, rather than relying solely on financial criteria [7], [8]. Second, the criteria system should be built on the principle of a multi-level hierarchy and information flow between the strategic, tactical and operational levels should be ensured [5]. Third, it is necessary to carry out industry adaptation of traditional marketing metrics and use metrics that take into account the B2B characteristics of the building materials market [9].

Fourth, in the context of digital transformation, it is necessary to integrate digital marketing metrics (website conversion, digital channel ROI, online reputation index) into marketing performance criteria [12]. Empirical testing of the developed conceptual models, comparative analysis of the effectiveness of the criteria system in different market conditions, and study of the integration of digital marketing metrics with traditional metrics are recommended as promising areas for future research.

#### LIST OF REFERENCES USED

1. Ambler, T. (2003). *Marketing and the Bottom Line: The Marketing Metrics to Pump Up Cash Flow*. 2nd Edition. FT Prentice Hall. <https://www.pearson.com/en-gb/subject-catalog/p/marketing-and-the-bottom-line-the-marketing-metrics-to-pump-up-cash-flow/P200000003897>
2. Rust, RT, Ambler, T., Carpenter, GS, Kumar, V. & Srivastava, RK (2004). Measuring marketing productivity: Current knowledge and future directions. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(4), 76-89. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.68.4.76.42721>
3. Kaplan, RS & Norton, DP (1996). *The Balanced Scorecard: Translating Strategy into Action*. Harvard Business School Press. <https://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Pages/item.aspx?num=8831>
4. Keller, KL & Lehmann, DR (2006). Brands and branding: Research findings and future priorities. *Marketing Science*, 25(6), 740-759. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.1050.0153>
5. Morgan, NA, Clark, BH & Gooner, R. (2002). Marketing productivity, marketing audits, and systems for marketing performance assessment. *Journal of Business Research*, 55(5), 363-375. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(00\)00162-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(00)00162-4)
6. Farris, PW, Bendle, NT, Pfeifer, PE & Reibstein, DJ (2010). *Marketing Metrics: The Definitive Guide to Measuring Marketing Performance*. 2nd Edition. Pearson Education. <https://www.pearson.com/en-us/subject-catalog/p/marketing-metrics-the-definitive-guide-to-measuring-marketing-performance/P200000005993>
7. Lenscoid, JD (2003). *Marketing ROI: The Path to Campaign, Customer, and Corporate Profitability*. McGraw-Hill. <https://www.mheducation.com/highered/product/marketing-roi-lenskold/M0071413634.html>
8. Kumar, V. (2008). Customer Lifetime Value: The Path to Profitability. *Foundations and Trends in Marketing*, 2(1), 1-96. <https://doi.org/10.1561/17000000004>
9. Mintz, O. & Currim, IS (2013). What drives managerial use of marketing and financial metrics and does metric use affect performance of marketing-mix activities? *Journal of Marketing*, 77(2), 17-40. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.11.0463>
10. Homburg, C., Artz, M. & Wieseke, J. (2012). Marketing performance measurement systems: Does comprehensiveness really improve performance? *Journal of Marketing*, 76(3), 56-77. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.09.0487>
11. Petersen, JA, McAlister, L., Reibstein, DJ, Winer, RS, Kumar, V. & Atkinson, G. (2009). Choosing the right metrics to maximize profitability and shareholder value. *Journal of Retailing*, 85(1), 95-111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2008.11.004>
12. Verhoef, PC & Leeflang, PSH (2009). Understanding the marketing department's influence within the firm. *Journal of Marketing*, 73(2), 14-37. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.73.2.14>

**Proofreader:** Zokir ALIBEKOV

**Layout and Designer:** Oloviddin Sobir ugli

---

## 2026. № 2

---

© When materials are reproduced, the INNOVATION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY journal must be cited as the source. Authors are responsible for the accuracy of the information in materials and advertisements published in the journal. Editorial opinions may not always align with those of the authors. Submitted materials will not be returned to the editorial office.

To publish articles in this journal, you may submit articles, advertisements, stories, and other creative materials through the following links. Materials and advertisements are published on a paid basis.

You may subscribe to the journal at any time using the following details. Once subscribed, please send a screenshot or photo of your payment confirmation to our Telegram page @iqtisodiyot\_77. Based on this, we will send the latest issue of the journal to your address each month.

“The journal “INNOVATION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY” has been registered by the Agency for Information and Mass Communications under the Administration of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan from 09.10.2024 under the registration number №390637. License number: C-5669633. PNFL: 30407832680027

**Our address:** Tashkent city, Yunusobod district, 19th block,  
House 17.



**Acceptance of articles**  
Published every  
monthly



**Directions**  
Social, economic, political,  
technological, scientific

 **Scopus || Scientific electronic journal specializing in Scopus**

**CERTIFICATE NUMBER: №390637**

**ORDER NUMBER ACCORDING TO  
THE LICENSE REGISTER: C-5669633**

**CONTACT:**



Contact us  
**+998 50 737 87 88**



Telegram channel  
**t.me/scopus\_IST2100**



Journal official website  
**<https://ist-journal.uz/index.php/IST>**