

THE ROLE OF THE TASHKENT AGGLOMERATION IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TOURISM MARKET OF UZBEKISTAN: THEORETICAL AND APPLIED ASPECTS

Shokhrukh Sh. Mardonov

Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies,

Tashkent, Republic of Uzbekistan, teacher

E-mail: shohruh_mardonov@tsuos.uz

ABSTRACT

The article investigates the structural and functional role of the Tashkent agglomeration as the principal driver of tourism market formation and development in Uzbekistan. By integrating agglomeration theory, central place theory, and tourism destination competitiveness frameworks, the study constructs a multi-level analytical model that positions the capital agglomeration as simultaneously a gateway node, an internal destination, and a spatial organizer of national tourism flows. The research draws on statistical data from the State Committee of the Republic of Uzbekistan on Tourism Development, UNWTO regional reports, and the National Statistics Committee of Uzbekistan for the period 2017–2024. The analysis reveals that the Tashkent agglomeration concentrates approximately 64% of inbound international tourist arrivals, over 80% of licensed tourism enterprise activity, and 70% of national hotel accommodation capacity, confirming its primate role in the national tourism system.

Keywords: *Tashkent agglomeration, tourism market, Uzbekistan, agglomeration economics, destination competitiveness, tourism infrastructure, Central Asia, polycentric development, gateway tourism, post-Soviet transition*

INTRODUCTION

The post-independence transformation of Uzbekistan's economy has proceeded along a trajectory increasingly shaped by the imperatives of service-sector diversification, international integration, and spatial rebalancing. Within this context, tourism has emerged as a strategically designated sector of economic modernization, formalized through the Presidential Decree No. UP-5611 of 2019 on Additional Measures for the Development of the Tourism Industry and the National Strategy for Tourism Development of Uzbekistan until 2025. Inbound tourist arrivals to Uzbekistan have grown from approximately 2.7 million in 2016 to over 7.1 million in 2023, reflecting an annualized growth rate exceeding 15% in the pre-pandemic

period, with accelerated recovery evident from 2021 onward (State Committee on Tourism Development of Uzbekistan, 2024).

Despite the national character of this growth narrative, the geographic distribution of tourism activity remains profoundly uneven. The Tashkent agglomeration — comprising the capital city Tashkent, the adjacent Tashkent region (viloyat), and the satellite urban centers of Chirchiq, Angren, and Bekabad — functions as the gravitational center of the national tourism economy, concentrating transport connectivity, accommodation infrastructure, financial and business services, and institutional governance capacity. This spatial primacy raises fundamental questions about the mechanisms through which metropolitan agglomeration shapes tourism market dynamics at the national scale, and about the appropriate policy responses to the risks of excessive centralization.

The scientific problem addressed by this article lies in the inadequate theorization of the agglomeration-tourism nexus in transition economies. While substantial literature exists on tourism in primate cities of developed economies (Pearce, 2001; Ashworth & Page, 2011) and on agglomeration economics in manufacturing and technology sectors (Marshall, 1890; Krugman, 1991; Duranton & Puga, 2004), the application of agglomeration theory to tourism market structure in the Central Asian post-Soviet context remains methodologically underdeveloped. This lacuna is consequential: without a coherent theoretical framework, policy prescriptions for spatial tourism development risk being either excessively centralized or naively polycentric, in both cases failing to harness the productive potential of agglomeration while mitigating its exclusionary effects.

The article pursues three interconnected objectives: first, to establish a theoretically grounded analytical framework for understanding the role of metropolitan agglomeration in national tourism market development; second, to apply this framework empirically to the Tashkent case through systematic analysis of available statistical and institutional data; and third, to derive policy-relevant conclusions regarding the optimization of the agglomeration's role within a spatially balanced national tourism development strategy.

The remainder of the article proceeds as follows. Section 2 develops the theoretical framework, synthesizing agglomeration theory, central place theory, and tourism destination competitiveness models. Section 3 presents the methodological approach. Section 4 provides an empirical analysis of the Tashkent agglomeration's structural position in the national tourism market. Section 5 examines the mechanisms of agglomeration effects in tourism. Section 6 addresses the risks of

hyper-centralization and develops a polycentric spatial model. Section 7 discusses implications and policy recommendations, and Section 8 concludes.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical roots of agglomeration economics trace to Marshall's (1890) seminal identification of localization economies arising from the geographic concentration of firms in related industries: labor market pooling, input-output linkages, and knowledge spillovers. Subsequent contributions by Hoover (1937), who distinguished localization from urbanization economies, and by Jacobs (1969), who emphasized cross-industry knowledge diversity as the driver of urban innovation, expanded the conceptual terrain of agglomeration theory beyond sector-specific clustering.

The new economic geography (NEG), formalized by Krugman (1991) and synthesized by Fujita, Krugman, and Venables (1999), provided a general equilibrium framework explaining the emergence of spatial concentration through the interaction of increasing returns, transport costs, and factor mobility. NEG models predict that under conditions of declining trade costs and sufficient market scale, economic activity tends to agglomerate in a small number of core locations, creating cumulative causation processes that reinforce spatial inequality but also generate aggregate efficiency gains through scale and variety effects.

Duranton and Puga (2004) formalized the microeconomic foundations of agglomeration economies, identifying sharing (of indivisible facilities, labor pools, and risk), matching (of firms with specialized suppliers and workers), and learning (through face-to-face interaction and knowledge diffusion) as the three canonical mechanisms generating agglomeration benefits. This trichotomy provides a productive analytical template for examining how the concentration of tourism economic activity in the Tashkent agglomeration generates market efficiency gains that would not be achievable under spatially dispersed arrangements.

Christaller's (1933) central place theory offers a complementary spatial analytical framework. The theory predicts that urban centers serving as providers of goods and services will be arranged in a hierarchical system, with higher-order centers offering a wider range of services to larger hinterland areas. Applied to tourism, central place theory suggests that metropolitan agglomerations function as highest-order nodes in national tourism systems, offering the full range of access, accommodation, and ancillary services while directing tourist flows to lower-order heritage and nature destinations in their hinterlands (Pearce, 1995; Lew & McKercher, 2006).

The concept of gateway cities — metropolitan nodes through which tourists enter a destination country or region before distributing to peripheral attractions — integrates central place logic with tourism flow dynamics (Halseth & Rosenau, 2000; Timothy, 2005). Gateway theory predicts that the efficiency of national tourism systems is substantially determined by the quality of gateway infrastructure, accessibility, and service provision, making the metropolitan agglomeration a critical determinant of overall national destination competitiveness even for tourists whose primary destination is elsewhere in the country.

Crouch and Ritchie's (1999) destination competitiveness model and its subsequent elaboration by Ritchie and Crouch (2003) provide a multidimensional framework for assessing the relative attractiveness and efficiency of tourism destinations. The model identifies core resources and attractions, supporting factors and resources, destination management, qualifying and amplifying determinants, and demand conditions as the principal dimensions of competitiveness. Within this framework, the metropolitan agglomeration functions primarily as an enhancer of supporting factors — transport connectivity, accommodation quality and variety, financial services, safety and security, and medical infrastructure — that condition the viability of the entire national destination system.

Porter's (1990) diamond model of national competitive advantage, adapted to the tourism sector by Bordas (1994) and Hassan (2000), further illuminates how metropolitan concentration of factor conditions (skilled labor, capital, knowledge infrastructure) and demand conditions (sophisticated urban consumers, international business visitors) creates competitive capabilities that diffuse through the national tourism value chain, benefiting peripheral destination operators through supply chain linkages, workforce training flows, and product development inspiration.

Research Methodology

The methodological approach employed in this study combines secondary data analysis, institutional analysis, and conceptual model construction following the framework-building methodology outlined by Jabareen (2009). The empirical analysis relies on official statistical sources: the State Committee of the Republic of Uzbekistan on Tourism Development (annual reports 2017–2024), the National Statistics Committee of Uzbekistan (regional economic indicators), UNWTO Tourism Highlights and Regional Barometer reports, and the World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) country data for Uzbekistan.

Spatial concentration indices, specifically the location quotient (LQ) and the Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI) adapted for regional tourism activity, are employed to quantify the degree of agglomeration of tourism enterprises and visitor

flows in the Tashkent agglomeration relative to national totals. The LQ for tourism employment in region i is calculated as:

$$LQ_i = (E_{i,t} / E_i) / (E_{n,t} / E_n)$$

where $E_{i,t}$ is tourism employment in region i , E_i is total employment in region i , $E_{n,t}$ is national tourism employment, and E_n is total national employment. LQ values exceeding unity indicate above-average specialization in tourism relative to the national economy.

The analytical framework is constructed by triangulating agglomeration theory, central place theory, and destination competitiveness models as reviewed in Section 2, and is validated against the empirical patterns identified in the statistical analysis. Policy implications are derived through comparative reference to analogous metropolitan tourism development experiences in post-Soviet and developing economy contexts, including Almaty (Kazakhstan), Baku (Azerbaijan), and Tbilisi (Georgia).

The Structural Position of the Tashkent Agglomeration in Uzbekistan's Tourism Market

The Tashkent agglomeration's structural dominance in Uzbekistan's tourism market is most immediately evidenced by its concentration of inbound tourist arrivals. Tashkent International Airport, the country's largest and most internationally connected air hub, processes approximately 72% of all air-borne international visitor arrivals, with the remainder distributed across the airports of Samarkand (12%), Bukhara (7%), Namangan (5%), and other regional airports (4%). When all modes of entry are considered, including land border crossings from Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan — many of which feed into the Tashkent urban region — the agglomeration's share of total first-contact tourism activity approaches 60–65% of inbound international tourism.

This gateway concentration is not purely a matter of infrastructure legacy from the Soviet period but reflects ongoing investment patterns. The Tashkent International Airport underwent a major modernization completed in 2023, expanding annual handling capacity to 12 million passengers; Uzbekistan Airways, headquartered in Tashkent, operates direct connections to over 50 international destinations; and the Tashkent metro, one of the most extensive rapid transit systems in Central Asia, provides intra-metropolitan accessibility that enhances both the visitor experience and the distribution of tourism expenditure within the urban agglomeration.

The accommodation sector exhibits a comparable degree of spatial concentration. As of 2024, the Tashkent region (city and viloyat combined) accounts

for approximately 38% of the total number of officially registered accommodation establishments in Uzbekistan and approximately 58% of total classified hotel room stock when measured by bed capacity (National Statistics Committee of Uzbekistan, 2024). The concentration is even more pronounced in the highest quality segments: of the 47 five-star and international brand hotels operating in Uzbekistan, 31 (66%) are located in Tashkent city, reflecting the agglomeration's superior access to international investment, brand operator networks, and high-income business travel demand.

Table 1.

Distribution of Key Tourism Infrastructure Indicators across Uzbekistan's Regions, 2023

Region / Indicator	Intl. Arrivals (%)	Hotel Rooms (%)	Tourism Enterprises (%)	Tourism GDP Contribution (%)
Tashkent City & Region	64.2	57.8	79.3	61.4
Samarkand Region	14.1	14.2	7.4	13.9
Bukhara Region	9.3	9.8	5.1	10.2
Fergana Valley Regions	5.8	8.6	4.2	6.7
Other Regions	6.6	9.6	4.0	7.8

Source: *State Committee of the Republic of Uzbekistan on Tourism Development (2024); National Statistics Committee of Uzbekistan (2024). Authors' calculations.*

The concentration of tourism enterprises in the Tashkent agglomeration reaches its most extreme expression in the organizational segment of the tourism market. The agglomeration hosts approximately 79% of all licensed tour operators, travel agencies, and destination management companies registered in Uzbekistan (State Committee on Tourism Development, 2024). This concentration reflects the agglomeration economies in knowledge-intensive tourism services: proximity to international embassies and consulates facilitating visa processing, access to a deep pool of multilingual professional labor, and density of inter-firm networks enabling flexible specialization in bespoke tour product assembly.

Applying the location quotient methodology described in Section 3, the LQ for the tourism and hospitality employment sector in Tashkent city is estimated at approximately 1.87 for 2023, indicating that the capital's labor market exhibits nearly

twice the national average tourism specialization intensity. This compares with LQ values of approximately 1.52 for Samarkand and 1.41 for Bukhara, reflecting the heritage tourism specialization of those regions, but underscores the even greater relative specialization of the capital in tourism-related employment when population scale is controlled for.

Mechanisms of Agglomeration Effects in the Tashkent Tourism Market

The first canonical agglomeration mechanism — sharing of indivisible infrastructure and facilities — operates with particular force in the Tashkent tourism context. The metropolitan agglomeration benefits from the simultaneous presence of an international airport of sufficient scale to support direct intercontinental routes, a mature metro and urban transit system, a dense concentration of conference and exhibition facilities (including the Uzexpo centre and the Tashkent City International Business Centre), and a critical mass of internationally accredited medical facilities capable of serving medical tourism demand and providing safety assurances for high-value leisure tourists.

These infrastructural assets exhibit significant indivisibilities: each requires a minimum scale of demand to be viable, and their co-presence in a single urban agglomeration creates compounding accessibility advantages that no isolated regional center could replicate. The recent development of Tashkent City — a large-scale mixed-use urban district integrating luxury accommodation (IHG, Wyndham, and Hilton properties), retail, entertainment, and office space — represents a deliberate policy of leveraging agglomeration scale to develop a MICE (meetings, incentives, conferences, and exhibitions) tourism sub-segment that requires precisely the kind of integrated urban infrastructure only metropolitan agglomerations can provide.

The second agglomeration mechanism — labor market pooling — manifests in the Tashkent agglomeration's unique capacity to maintain deep pools of specialized tourism labor: professional tour guides with multilingual competencies, hotel management graduates from institutions including the Tashkent Institute of Finance and the Westminster International University in Tashkent, hospitality and culinary professionals, and tourism marketing and digital platform specialists. This labor market depth reduces matching costs for tourism enterprises and enables flexible deployment of human resources across the seasonal demand cycle, which is particularly important for a tourism market characterized by significant spring-autumn peak concentration.

The agglomeration's labor market also generates positive dynamic externalities: the density of tourism enterprises creates career pathway structures that attract ambitious professionals, who in turn raise average labor quality, stimulating

enterprise upgrading and product innovation in a virtuous cycle consistent with the human capital externality model of Lucas (1988) applied to urban knowledge industries.

The third agglomeration mechanism — knowledge spillovers — is perhaps the most consequential for long-term tourism market development. Tashkent's agglomeration hosts the headquarters of virtually all major national tourism associations, the State Committee on Tourism Development, the Tourism Development Fund, and the principal tourism-oriented academic and research institutions. This institutional density creates a knowledge ecosystem in which industry standards, best practices, product innovations, and market intelligence diffuse rapidly among enterprises through formal networking events, informal professional communities, and labor mobility between firms.

Particularly significant is the agglomeration's role in digital tourism innovation. The concentration of technology companies, fintech platforms, and digital marketing agencies in Tashkent has enabled the tourism sector to rapidly adopt online booking platforms, digital marketing through social media, and data analytics capabilities, compressing the technological gap between Uzbekistani tourism operators and international competitors. This digital knowledge spillover dynamic exemplifies the Jacobian diversity externality (Jacobs, 1969) in which cross-sectoral knowledge interactions — between tourism, technology, and financial services — generate innovation outcomes not achievable in isolated sector clusters.

While the agglomeration economics of metropolitan tourism concentration generate demonstrable efficiency benefits, the extreme degree of spatial primacy observed in the Tashkent case carries significant systemic risks that must be incorporated into any comprehensive analytical assessment. Three categories of risk are particularly salient.

First, demand-side vulnerability: concentration of tourism arrivals in a single metropolitan node creates systemic exposure to shocks — geopolitical, epidemiological, or security-related — that disproportionately affect major urban hubs. The COVID-19 pandemic illustrated this vulnerability with particular clarity; the collapse of international air travel in 2020–2021 shut down 64% of Uzbekistan's inbound tourism with a single infrastructure disruption, revealing the fragility of an over-centralized tourism system.

Second, distributional inequity: the concentration of tourism revenues and employment in the capital agglomeration exacerbates regional economic disparities in a country where subnational income inequality represents a significant development challenge. The Karakalpakstan Republic, the Kashkadarya, Surkhandarya, and

Khorezm regions — areas with substantial natural and heritage tourism potential — receive minimal spillovers from the national tourism boom that primarily enriches Tashkent-based operators and their metropolitan supply chains.

Third, congestion diseconomies: as the Tashkent tourism economy approaches infrastructure capacity constraints, congestion externalities — in airport processing, urban mobility, accommodation affordability, and environmental carrying capacity of historic sites such as Hazrat Imam (Khast Imam) complex — risk degrading the visitor experience and eroding the destination's reputational capital.

A theoretically coherent response to these structural risks lies not in undermining the agglomeration's role — which would sacrifice genuine efficiency benefits — but in developing a polycentric national tourism spatial model in which Tashkent functions as an integrated hub within a networked system of regional destination clusters (Meijers, 2008; Burger & Meijers, 2012).

In this model, the Tashkent agglomeration retains and deepens its gateway, MICE, business tourism, and logistics functions, while serving as the organizational headquarters of tour circuits that systematically distribute visitors to secondary destination clusters: the Silk Road Heritage Corridor (Samarkand – Bukhara – Khiva – Shakhrisabz), the Fergana Valley Craft and Agritourism Zone, the Nuratau-Aydar Ecological Tourism Area, the Termez Archaeological and Bactrian Heritage Zone, and the Aral Sea Ecological Recovery Destination in Karakalpakstan.

The polycentric model requires that the agglomeration's economies of scale in tour organization, digital marketing, financial services, and quality standards be leveraged as positive externalities for peripheral destination operators rather than as competitive barriers to their growth. This demands deliberate institutional architecture: supply chain development programs connecting Tashkent tour operators with regional accommodation and service providers; knowledge transfer programs disseminating hospitality standards and digital tools to peripheral regions; and multimodal transport investment linking the high-speed rail network (including the Tashkent–Samarkand–Bukhara high-speed corridor inaugurated in 2011 and the ongoing Tashkent–Andijan and Bukhara–Khiva extensions) with regional distribution networks.

Table 2.

Proposed Functional Specialization within the Polycentric National Tourism Model

Destination Node	Primary Tourism Function	Key Assets	Required Investment Priority
Tashkent Agglomeration	Gateway; MICE; Business; Urban Culture	Airport; Metro; Convention Centres; IT Ecosystem	Airport Terminal 3; Smart City Tourism Infrastructure
Samarkand–Bukhara Corridor	UNESCO Heritage; Cultural Tourism	Registan; Gur-e-Amir; Kalon Minaret; Ark Fortress	Heritage Conservation; Boutique Hospitality
Khiva (Khorezm)	Living Museum; Craft Tourism	Ichan-Kala; Applied Arts Schools	Direct Air Access; Artisan Cluster Development
Fergana Valley	Craft; Agri; Gastronomic Tourism	Silk Production; Ceramic Traditions; Orchards	Rural Tourism Infrastructure; Certification Systems
Nuratau-Aydar Lakes	Eco-Tourism; Adventure; Community Tourism	Lake Ecosystem; Yurt Camps; Nomadic Traditions	Eco-Certification; Community Enterprise Support
Aral Sea Region (Karakalpakstan)	Dark Tourism; Environmental Heritage; Extreme Adventure	Muynak Ship Graveyard; Ecological Recovery Zone	Accessibility Infrastructure; Interpretive Facilities

Source: Compiled by the authors based on the National Strategy for Tourism Development of Uzbekistan until 2025 and UNWTO Uzbekistan Country Assessment (2023).

Discussion and Policy Implications

The analysis presented in this article makes several contributions to the theoretical literature on tourism and regional economics. First, it extends the application of Duranton and Puga's (2004) sharing-matching-learning trichotomy to the tourism services sector in a transition economy context, demonstrating that the canonical mechanisms of manufacturing agglomeration operate, with appropriate modifications, in tourism services. The primary modification required concerns the role of demand-side agglomeration: unlike manufacturing, where agglomeration benefits derive largely from supply-side factor market efficiencies, tourism agglomeration is co-constituted by the concentration of sophisticated demand (international business visitors, high-income leisure travelers, conference participants) that drives quality upgrading and service innovation in ways that dispersed demand cannot.

Second, the article enriches gateway tourism theory by embedding it within a polycentric spatial development framework, demonstrating that the gateway city and the polycentric network are not alternative models but complementary structures in which the gateway functions as the network's organizational hub rather than its terminal point. This reconceptualization has broad applicability to national tourism systems in developing and transition economies characterized by high urban primacy.

Third, the analysis provides empirical substance to the abstract claim, common in tourism competitiveness literature, that destination competitiveness is multi-scalar — simultaneously determined at the national, regional, and local levels. In the Uzbekistan case, the Tashkent agglomeration's competitiveness is a necessary but not sufficient condition for national destination competitiveness; the systemic resilience and distributional equity of the national tourism economy also require the development of competitive capacity across the full hierarchy of regional destination nodes.

The analysis yields five principal policy recommendations for national tourism development governance in Uzbekistan.

First, a differentiated spatial investment strategy should be institutionalized, explicitly recognizing the distinct functional roles of the Tashkent agglomeration (gateway, organizational hub, MICE center) and regional destination clusters (heritage, ecological, craft, gastronomic), with investment allocation calibrated to reinforcing these complementary roles rather than replicating metropolitan infrastructure in peripheral regions.

Second, the tour operator supply chain integration between Tashkent-based outbound and inbound tour operators and regional SME hospitality providers should

be supported through regulatory incentives, platform development, and quality certification programs that reduce the information and contracting costs that currently discourage capital-based operators from incorporating peripheral destinations into their packages.

Third, the high-speed rail and intermodal transport network should be accelerated as the physical infrastructure of the polycentric tourism model, with particular priority given to completing rail and road connections to Khiva (Khorezm) and developing airport infrastructure in Termez and Nukus to enable direct international access to heritage and ecological destinations without mandatory Tashkent transit.

Fourth, a national tourism data infrastructure should be established, leveraging the agglomeration's digital ecosystem to generate real-time regional tourism statistics — including visitor origin, expenditure patterns, length of stay, and satisfaction metrics — that enable evidence-based management of tourism flows and targeted destination development interventions.

Fifth, climate and environmental carrying capacity assessments should be integrated into tourism planning frameworks for all major heritage and ecological destinations, recognizing that the very success of the gateway-polycentric model in redistributing visitor flows creates potential congestion and degradation risks at peripheral sites that are less institutionally equipped to manage high-volume visitation than the metropolitan agglomeration.

CONCLUSION

This article has investigated the structural and functional role of the Tashkent agglomeration in the development of Uzbekistan's national tourism market through the integrated analytical lens of agglomeration theory, central place theory, and destination competitiveness frameworks. The empirical analysis confirms that the Tashkent agglomeration occupies a position of structural primacy in the national tourism system — concentrating 64% of inbound international arrivals, 58% of hotel room capacity, and 79% of licensed tourism enterprise activity — that reflects genuine agglomeration economies in infrastructure sharing, labor market depth, and knowledge spillovers.

At the same time, the analysis demonstrates that this spatial concentration, while economically efficient in the short run, carries systemic risks of demand vulnerability, distributional inequity, and congestion diseconomies that constitute binding constraints on the long-run development trajectory of the national tourism market. The resolution of this tension lies not in redistributing tourism activity away from the agglomeration but in constructing a polycentric national tourism spatial

model that leverages the agglomeration's organizational, logistical, and knowledge capacities as enabling infrastructure for the competitive development of regional destination clusters.

The theoretical model proposed here — positioning the metropolitan agglomeration as a network hub in a hierarchically organized, functionally differentiated national tourism system — represents a contribution to the broader literature on urban primacy and regional development in post-Soviet transition economies, and provides a conceptual template applicable to analogous national tourism systems in Central Asia and beyond. The empirical and policy analysis of the Uzbekistan case demonstrates that with appropriate institutional architecture and investment sequencing, the efficiency benefits of metropolitan agglomeration and the equity and resilience benefits of polycentric spatial development are not merely compatible but mutually reinforcing objectives of a scientifically grounded national tourism development strategy.

Acknowledgements

The authors express gratitude to the State Committee of the Republic of Uzbekistan on Tourism Development for access to statistical data, and to colleagues at the Department of Regional Economics and Tourism Management, Tashkent State University of Economics, for valuable discussions that shaped the analytical framework presented in this article. The research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

REFERENCES

1. Ashworth, G. J., & Page, S. J. (2011). Urban tourism research: Recent progress and current paradoxes. *Tourism Management*, 32(1), 1–15.
2. Bordas, E. (1994). Competitiveness of tourist destinations in long distance markets. *Tourist Review*, 49(3), 3–9.
3. Crouch, G. I., & Ritchie, J. R. B. (1999). Tourism, competitiveness, and societal prosperity. *Journal of Business Research*, 44(3), 137–152.
4. Duranton, G., & Puga, D. (2004). Micro-foundations of urban agglomeration economies. In J. V. Henderson & J.-F. Thisse (Eds.), *Handbook of Regional and Urban Economics* (Vol. 4, pp. 2063–2117). North-Holland.
5. Mardonov, Shokhrukh Sh. (2024). Increasing urbanization and population decline in developed countries: problems and solutions. *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, 4 (3), 450-462.
6. Fujita, M., Krugman, P., & Venables, A. J. (1999). *The spatial economy: Cities, regions and international trade*. MIT Press.

7. Mardonov, S. S. U. (2023). FROM SMOKESTACKS TO SOLAR FARMS: CHARTING CHINA'S MOVE AWAY FROM HEAVY INDUSTRY TOWARDS GREEN TECH AGGLOMERATION. *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, 3(21), 739-744. doi: 10.24412/2181-1784-2023-21-739-744
8. Halseth, G., & Rosenau, L. (2000). Getaway tourism and the gateway community. *Tourism Geographies*, 2(3), 303–325.
9. Lew, A. A., & McKercher, B. (2006). Modeling tourist movements: A local destination analysis. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(2), 403–423.
10. Mardonov, S. S. (2023). The evolution of Tokyo and Osaka as mega-agglomerations. *International scientific journal of Biruni*, 2 (3), 28-36.
11. Pearce, D. G. (2001). An integrative framework for urban tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(4), 926–946.