BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 http://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/bg

ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE AND FINANCIAL TRANSPARENCY ON ENHANCING THE VALUE AND INVESTMENT ATTRACTIVENESS OF UZBEK ENTERPRISES

Rafiyeva Zarina Xusanovna
Senior Lecturer, Department of 'Investment and Innovation',
Samarkand Institute of Economics and Service
Ramanova Dilnoza Sabirjanovna
Student of Samarkand institute of economics and service
Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23621057

Abstract. This study examines how corporate governance and financial transparency influence enterprise value and investment attractiveness in Uzbekistan. It explores the relationship between board independence, shareholder protection, internal control, financial disclosure, and investors' assessment of corporate risk. The research combines institutional and regulatory analysis with a review of national academic literature and international corporate governance assessments.

Keywords: corporate governance, financial transparency, enterprise value, investment attractiveness, Uzbekistan, shareholder protection, financial reporting, internal control.

Аннотация. В статье исследуется влияние корпоративного управления и финансовой прозрачности на стоимость и инвестиционную привлекательность предприятий Узбекистана. Рассматриваются защита прав акционеров, независимый контроль, достоверность финансовой отчётности и раскрытие информации. На основе национального законодательства и научных исследований предложены направления совершенствования корпоративного управления и повышения доверия инвесторов.

Ключевые слова: корпоративное управление, финансовая прозрачность, стоимость предприятия, инвестиционная привлекательность, финансовая отчётность, права акционеров.

INTRODUCTION

The value of an enterprise in a modern market economy depends not only on its productive capacity, profitability, and asset base but also on the quality of its governance and the credibility of the information it provides to investors. Corporate governance determines how strategic decisions are made, how managerial authority is supervised, how shareholders exercise their rights, and how conflicts of interest are controlled. Financial transparency complements these arrangements by enabling investors, creditors, and other stakeholders to assess the enterprise's actual financial position, operating performance, and future prospects. When these mechanisms function effectively, they can reduce uncertainty, improve capital allocation, and support sustainable corporate value creation.

The relationship between governance and enterprise value is particularly significant in emerging markets, where ownership structures, institutional arrangements, and capital market practices may differ substantially from those of mature financial systems. In such environments, investors may face difficulties obtaining comparable financial information, evaluating related-party transactions, or determining whether management decisions reflect the interests of all shareholders.

These difficulties increase the perceived risk of investing in a company and may raise its cost of capital.

Uzbekistan provides a relevant setting for investigating these relationships. Economic reforms have sought to modernise corporate management, strengthen capital market institutions, improve financial reporting, and expand opportunities for private investment. The country's legal framework includes legislation governing joint-stock companies and shareholder protection, securities markets, accounting, and corporate governance practices. The national Corporate Governance Code, approved in 2015, recommends internal policies addressing information disclosure, internal control, dividend policy, and conflicts of interest. These measures establish an institutional foundation for improving investor confidence.

The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development's 2025 corporate governance assessment of Uzbekistan reviewed ten major listed companies across sectors including banking, manufacturing, transport, infrastructure, mining, communications, and construction. Its overall assessment recognised legislative progress but identified continuing weaknesses in board independence, internal control, non-financial disclosure, and regulatory enforcement. The report also found that only two of the ten companies reviewed disclosed having audit committees, illustrating the difference that can exist between a regulatory framework and publicly evidenced implementation.

METHODOLOGY

The research employs a qualitative analytical design combining institutional analysis, comparative assessment, conceptual financial modelling, and a review of relevant academic literature. This approach is appropriate because the objective is to evaluate the mechanisms linking governance and transparency to enterprise value rather than to claim a causal relationship from an unavailable firm-level dataset.

The institutional analysis examines Uzbekistan's legal framework for joint-stock companies, shareholder rights, securities markets, accounting, and corporate governance. Particular attention is given to the Law on the Securities Market, adopted in a revised form under Law No. ZRU-387 of 3 June 2015, and the Corporate Governance Code approved in 2015. The legislation governing joint-stock companies and protection of shareholders' rights is also considered because it defines key relationships between shareholders, supervisory bodies, and executive management.

The literature review incorporates Uzbek research on corporate accounting, reporting quality, investment attractiveness, and governance-related capital valuation. Ergasheva examines the relationship between corporate accounting and financial reporting and the investment attractiveness of companies in Uzbekistan. Urinov's research published in 2025 investigates governance mechanisms associated with the capital value of joint-stock companies, including board independence, dividend policy, and disclosure practices. These contributions provide a national academic basis for evaluating the role of governance and financial reporting in corporate valuation. International institutional evidence is drawn from the EBRD's 2025 assessment of corporate governance in Uzbekistan. The report is used to identify implementation gaps in a defined sample of ten major listed enterprises. The findings are interpreted as evidence about the reviewed companies and not as statistically representative estimates for every enterprise operating in the country.

The analytical framework distinguishes four dimensions. The first is governance quality, including board independence, accountability, shareholder protection, and the management of conflicts of interest. The second is financial transparency, encompassing the completeness, timeliness, comparability, and verifiability of financial information. The third is financial

performance, assessed through profitability, liquidity, leverage, operating cash flow, and capital efficiency. The fourth is enterprise value and investment attractiveness, reflected in market valuation, the cost of capital, access to financing, investor demand, and the capacity to attract long-term investment.

Enterprise value is conceptually evaluated through discounted cash flow analysis, market-based indicators, and accounting-based performance measures. Under a discounted cash flow approach, enterprise value depends on expected future free cash flows, the discount rate, and the assumed long-term growth rate. Governance and transparency may influence both the expected cash flows and the discount rate: effective oversight can improve capital allocation and reduce operational losses, while credible disclosure can lower uncertainty about projected returns.

For listed companies, Tobin's Q, market capitalisation, price-to-book ratios, and return on equity may provide complementary indicators. These measures are not interchangeable. Market capitalisation reflects the market value of equity, while enterprise value accounts for equity and relevant debt and cash positions. Tobin's Q compares the market value of a company with the replacement cost of its assets, although practical estimates often use accounting-based approximations.

No original econometric estimation is claimed in this article. The proposed relationships constitute an analytical framework to guide future empirical testing using company-level data. This distinction is important because observed associations between governance quality and company value may also reflect firm size, industry conditions, ownership concentration, profitability, macroeconomic changes, and the maturity of the capital market.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Corporate governance can be understood as the institutional and organisational system through which an enterprise establishes objectives, allocates decision-making authority, monitors management, and protects the interests of shareholders and other stakeholders. Its economic significance becomes apparent when ownership and management are separated. Shareholders provide capital, while executives make operational and strategic decisions. Since managers may possess more information about the company than outside investors, a potential conflict arises between managerial incentives and shareholders' interests.

Jensen and Meckling (1976) explain this problem through agency theory. Managers may pursue personal benefits, retain excessive cash, undertake inefficient investments, or avoid disclosing information that could reveal weak performance. Such behaviour generates agency costs, including expenditure on monitoring, the loss of value from inappropriate decisions, and the cost of designing incentive arrangements. Corporate governance seeks to reduce these costs through independent supervision, performance-based remuneration, transparent reporting, and enforceable accountability.

For Uzbek enterprises, this theoretical perspective is especially relevant where ownership is concentrated, the state retains an ownership interest, or minority shareholders have limited influence over strategic decisions. Concentrated ownership can improve monitoring because a major shareholder has incentives to supervise management closely. However, it can also create risks if controlling shareholders receive benefits at the expense of minority investors. The effectiveness of governance therefore depends not simply on who owns the company but on whether transactions, voting arrangements, and strategic decisions are subject to appropriate scrutiny.

A properly functioning supervisory board can contribute to enterprise value by evaluating investment proposals, reviewing management performance, monitoring financial risks, and

ensuring that executive decisions are consistent with the company's long-term objectives. Independent board members may contribute specialised knowledge and a more objective assessment of related-party transactions, financing decisions, and strategic acquisitions. Nevertheless, formal independence alone is insufficient. Board members must have access to reliable information, adequate time and expertise, and the practical ability to challenge executive management.

Governance also affects how effectively corporate resources are allocated. Companies that consistently evaluate projects using risk-adjusted returns are less likely to commit capital to investments that fail to generate adequate cash flows. A disciplined investment process can improve return on invested capital and reduce the probability of asset impairment. Over time, these improvements can strengthen free cash flow and increase the value of the enterprise.

Urinov's 2025 research on Uzbek joint-stock companies examines governance mechanisms such as independent directors, dividend policy, and corporate disclosure in relation to capital value. This work supports the relevance of governance quality to the valuation debate in Uzbekistan, although its findings should be interpreted within the limitations of the underlying company sample and empirical design. An important implication is that corporate governance should not be measured solely by the existence of a supervisory board, internal regulations, or a formal code of ethics. The more meaningful question is whether these institutions change managerial behaviour and improve economic outcomes. A board that meets regularly but does not challenge unrealistic forecasts or monitor related-party transactions may provide little protection to investors. Conversely, an active board with clear responsibilities can improve the credibility of strategic plans and the quality of resource allocation.

Financial transparency refers to the provision of accurate, complete, timely, and understandable information about an enterprise's financial position, performance, risks, and governance arrangements. It enables external stakeholders to distinguish between companies with comparable reported profits but different levels of financial risk and managerial reliability. The economic mechanism is closely connected to information asymmetry. A company's executives typically have better information about future sales, operational difficulties, financing requirements, and contractual obligations than prospective investors. When information is incomplete, investors may be unable to determine whether reported profitability reflects sustainable operations or temporary accounting effects. They may consequently demand a higher return to compensate for uncertainty.

Financial transparency can reduce this information gap by providing comparable financial statements, cash-flow information, explanations of accounting policies, details of material transactions, and disclosures of financial risks. Independent external audits provide additional assurance that financial statements have been prepared in accordance with the applicable reporting framework. However, an audit does not guarantee the future success of a company or eliminate all possibilities of fraud; its value lies in strengthening confidence in the reported information within the scope of the audit. Ergasheva specifically examines corporate accounting and financial-result reporting as factors influencing investment attractiveness in Uzbekistan. The study reinforces the importance of reporting practices in evaluating companies and attracting investment.

Transparency also improves internal management. When financial information is prepared consistently and reviewed by responsible officers, managers can identify deviations between budgets and actual results, evaluate the profitability of business segments, and monitor working capital. Reporting thus serves two functions: it communicates information to external investors and supports internal control over economic resources. A further consideration is the distinction

between financial and non-financial disclosure. Financial statements provide information about revenues, expenses, assets, liabilities, and cash flows. Non-financial reporting can explain business strategy, environmental exposure, workforce-related risks, corporate ethics, and governance arrangements. Such information may be particularly important when an enterprise's long-term performance depends on energy efficiency, regulatory compliance, environmental obligations, or relationships with suppliers and communities.

The credibility of transparency depends on consistency. Publishing a large volume of information is not necessarily equivalent to providing useful information. Disclosures should be relevant, comparable across reporting periods, supported by evidence, and sufficiently detailed to allow users to evaluate risks. Excessively general statements about sustainability or governance may create an appearance of openness without allowing investors to assess actual performance. For this reason, Uzbek enterprises should regard financial transparency as a continuous management process rather than a periodic compliance exercise. The publication of annual statements should be complemented by timely material disclosures, explanations of significant changes in financial results, accessible investor communications, and clear policies on conflicts of interest.

Corporate governance and financial transparency are mutually reinforcing rather than independent factors. Governance establishes responsibility for preparing and reviewing information, while transparency allows shareholders and supervisory bodies to evaluate whether management is fulfilling its responsibilities. If either mechanism is weak, the overall effectiveness of the system may deteriorate. The valuation implications can be explained through the discounted cash flow model:

$$V = \sum_{t=1}^{n} \frac{FCF_t}{(1+r)^t} + \frac{TV_n}{(1+r)^n} \quad (1)$$

Here, V represents enterprise value, FCF_t is the expected free cash flow in period t, r is the discount rate, and TV_n is the terminal value at the end of the explicit forecast period.

Good governance can improve the expected cash flows in this model by strengthening investment discipline, reducing waste, improving procurement oversight, and encouraging management to focus on economically productive activities. Financial transparency can improve the quality of cash-flow forecasts by allowing investors to evaluate their assumptions more accurately. Both mechanisms may also influence the discount rate by affecting perceptions of governance, reporting, and operational risk. This relationship does not mean that better disclosure automatically increases the market value of every company. Greater transparency can reveal previously hidden liabilities, declining profitability, or weak internal controls. In the short term, the market may respond negatively to such information. Nevertheless, the disclosure of adverse information can improve price discovery and enable investors to allocate capital more efficiently. Long-term value creation depends on addressing the underlying problems, not concealing them.

The cost-of-capital channel is also important. Investors generally assess expected returns in relation to the risks they bear. Where governance is weak, minority shareholders may fear that their interests will not be protected, while lenders may face greater uncertainty about financial reporting and repayment capacity. These concerns can increase financing costs or restrict access to capital. Credible disclosure and effective monitoring can mitigate some of these concerns, although macroeconomic instability, currency exposure, sector risk, and monetary conditions remain important determinants of financing costs. For companies seeking foreign investment, these issues

are particularly consequential. International investors often compare investment opportunities across jurisdictions and require sufficiently reliable information to assess risk-adjusted returns. Transparent governance arrangements can make an Uzbek enterprise easier to evaluate against international peers and reduce the additional analytical effort required to understand its financial position.

Uzbekistan's corporate governance framework combines company law, securities regulation, accounting requirements, and governance recommendations. The Law on Joint-Stock Companies and Protection of Shareholders' Rights establishes an important legal basis for shareholder rights and corporate decision-making. The Law on the Securities Market, in its revised form adopted under Law No. ZRU-387 of 3 June 2015, regulates relationships involving securities, including shares and bonds. These laws are relevant to investor protection, the functioning of capital markets, and the availability of information needed for investment decisions. The Corporate Governance Code approved in 2015 provides a framework for improving governance practices. It recommends internal documents addressing information policy, internal control, dividend policy, and the handling of conflicts of interest. These instruments can help companies establish consistent procedures and clarify the responsibilities of management and oversight bodies.

The legal framework should be complemented by effective implementation. A disclosure requirement has limited value if information is difficult to access, published too late, or presented in a form that prevents meaningful comparison. Similarly, an internal audit function may exist formally but fail to provide effective assurance if it lacks resources or access to the supervisory board. Governance reforms must therefore address not only the content of legal rules but also the quality of corporate compliance and the practical independence of oversight. The EBRD's 2025 assessment provides a concrete indication of this implementation challenge. In its review of ten major listed companies, the report found that only two disclosed having audit committees and that only one disclosed committee composition. It also characterised internal control arrangements as underdeveloped and unevenly implemented, while acknowledging improvement relative to the previous assessment. These findings relate to the assessed sample and should not be generalised mechanically to all Uzbek enterprises. Nevertheless, they identify a significant issue: formal governance structures do not always translate into publicly evidenced and independently accountable oversight.

The practical implications extend beyond compliance. An audit committee that effectively reviews financial reporting, communicates with external auditors, and oversees internal control can identify weaknesses before they develop into substantial financial losses. Clear procedures for related-party transactions can reduce conflicts of interest. Accessible shareholder information can improve participation in corporate decisions. Each mechanism can strengthen the reliability of corporate information and the protection of invested capital. State-owned and state-influenced enterprises require particular attention because they may have multiple objectives, including commercial profitability, employment, strategic-sector responsibilities, and public-service obligations. These objectives are not necessarily incompatible, but they must be clearly distinguished. When commercial and public policy objectives are not transparently disclosed, investors may struggle to assess costs, returns, and management accountability. Explicit performance targets and clear disclosure of public-service obligations can improve both governance and valuation.

Table 1

Analytical framework for assessing governance and financial transparency[1]

Assessment dimension	Core indicators	Expected economic mechanism	Potential valuation effect
Board effectiveness	Independent representation, meeting quality, strategic oversight	Improves managerial accountability and investment decisions	Stronger expected cash flows and lower perceived governance risk
Shareholder protection	Voting rights, dividend policy, related-party transaction controls	Reduces the risk of minority shareholder expropriation	Greater investor confidence and potentially stronger equity valuation
Financial transparency	Timeliness, completeness, comparability, disclosure of material risks	Reduces information asymmetry and uncertainty	More reliable valuation and potentially lower required returns
Audit and internal control	External audit quality, internal audit capacity, audit committee effectiveness	Improves reporting reliability and risk detection	Reduced expected losses and greater credibility of reported performance
Financial performance	ROE, ROIC, operating cash flow, leverage, liquidity	Demonstrates profitability and financial sustainability	Supports valuation when returns are sustainable and risks are controlled
Investor relations	Accessible reports, timely announcements, responsive communication	Reduces information costs and improves market understanding	Potentially broader investor participation and improved access to capital

The framework shows why enterprise value should be evaluated through a combination of governance indicators and financial outcomes. A high return on equity, for example, may indicate efficient capital use, but it can also reflect excessive leverage or a small equity base. Similarly, a low price-to-book ratio may indicate undervaluation, but it may also reflect weak growth prospects or substantial financial risk. Financial ratios must therefore be interpreted alongside governance quality, disclosure reliability, and industry conditions.

[1] Author's work

A rigorous assessment of corporate governance should connect institutional practices with measurable financial outcomes. This requires a multidimensional approach because no single indicator adequately captures enterprise value, operational efficiency, financial stability, and investor confidence. Return on equity (ROE) measures the profit generated relative to shareholders' equity. Return on invested capital (ROIC) evaluates the returns generated by the capital employed in business operations. Operating cash flow helps determine whether reported earnings translate into actual cash generation. Debt ratios and interest coverage provide information about financial vulnerability. When these measures are considered together, they offer a more complete picture of corporate performance than accounting profit alone.

Market-based indicators are equally important for listed companies. Market capitalisation reflects the market value of equity, while Tobin's Q provides a conceptual relationship between market valuation and the asset base. Changes in these indicators may reflect investor expectations about profitability, risk, governance quality, and future growth. However, market movements also respond to interest rates, exchange-rate fluctuations, commodity prices, political developments, and broader economic conditions. Consequently, an empirical assessment of Uzbek enterprises should avoid attributing every increase in market value to improvements in governance. A more credible design would compare companies across several reporting periods and control for industry, size, leverage, profitability, ownership structure, and macroeconomic conditions. Where sufficient observations are available, panel regression analysis could examine whether improvements in disclosure quality or board independence are associated with changes in valuation indicators.

The expected coefficients on governance quality and financial transparency are positive if better governance and more credible reporting improve valuation, conditional on the other variables. However, these signs are hypotheses to be tested, not established results for the entire Uzbek corporate sector. Reverse causality is also possible: companies with higher market values may have greater resources to invest in governance and reporting systems.

Ergasheva's research on corporate accounting and investment attractiveness and Urinov's work on governance and capital value provide relevant starting points for developing such company-level research in Uzbekistan. Future studies would benefit from a transparent dataset containing governance disclosures, audited financial statements, ownership characteristics, and market valuation measures over multiple years.

The findings support an integrated approach to governance reform. The first priority is to strengthen the practical independence and competence of supervisory boards. Board members should possess relevant financial, legal, sectoral, and risk-management expertise. Their responsibilities should include challenging investment assumptions, evaluating executive performance, reviewing related-party transactions, and monitoring the implementation of strategic plans. Board effectiveness should be assessed by the quality of its decisions and oversight, not simply by the number of meetings held.

The second priority is to improve financial reporting and disclosure practices. Enterprises should publish clear annual financial statements, explain material changes in profitability and liquidity, disclose significant risks, and provide consistent information about ownership and governance. Where applicable, reporting under International Financial Reporting Standards can improve comparability for international investors. However, the adoption of a reporting standard must be accompanied by competent implementation, appropriate accounting systems, and independent assurance.

The third priority is to strengthen internal control and audit oversight. Internal audit should be sufficiently independent from the activities it evaluates and should have a clear reporting

relationship with the relevant oversight body. Audit committees should possess appropriate financial expertise and access to external auditors. Their responsibilities should include reviewing significant accounting judgements, monitoring control deficiencies, and examining the management of conflicts of interest. These measures directly address weaknesses identified in the EBRD's 2025 assessment.

The fourth priority is to develop effective investor relations. Companies should make financial reports, material announcements, shareholder meeting information, dividend policies, and governance documents easy to access. Investor communications should provide consistent explanations of strategic priorities and financial performance. A well-organised investor relations function reduces the effort required to understand a company and can improve the quality of dialogue between management and capital providers.

The fifth priority is to align managerial incentives with long-term value creation. Performance-based remuneration should incorporate indicators such as sustainable cash-flow generation, return on invested capital, risk-adjusted profitability, and progress against strategic objectives. Incentives based exclusively on short-term accounting profits can encourage excessive risk-taking or the postponement of necessary expenditure. A balanced framework should reward durable operating performance and responsible risk management.

Finally, governance reforms should reflect differences among enterprises. Large listed companies may require sophisticated investor relations systems, specialised audit committees, and extensive disclosure arrangements. Smaller private enterprises may achieve meaningful improvements through standardised accounting systems, clear separation of financial responsibilities, regular independent reviews, and reliable management reporting. The objective should be proportionate governance that improves accountability without creating unnecessary administrative costs.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the relationship between corporate governance, financial transparency, enterprise value, and investment attractiveness in Uzbekistan. The analysis indicates that these factors are economically interconnected through several mechanisms: the reduction of information asymmetry, the limitation of managerial opportunism, the improvement of capital allocation, the strengthening of financial reporting reliability, and the reduction of perceived investment risk.

Corporate governance creates value when supervisory boards exercise meaningful oversight, shareholder rights are protected, conflicts of interest are controlled, and management decisions are evaluated against clearly defined objectives. Financial transparency reinforces these arrangements by allowing shareholders, creditors, and potential investors to assess the company's actual financial condition and future prospects. Together, these mechanisms can improve access to financing and support the sustainable creation of enterprise value.

The Uzbek regulatory framework provides a foundation for these improvements through legislation governing joint-stock companies, shareholder protection, securities markets, and corporate governance practices. The Corporate Governance Code also identifies important areas for internal policies, including information disclosure, internal control, dividend policy, and conflicts of interest. Nevertheless, the EBRD's 2025 assessment of ten major listed companies demonstrates that implementation gaps remain, particularly in audit committee disclosure, board oversight, internal control, and non-financial reporting. These findings emphasise the need to move beyond formal compliance toward effective corporate accountability.

The principal contribution of the study is an integrated assessment framework connecting governance arrangements and reporting quality with financial performance and valuation indicators.

The framework can support future company-level research using market-based measures, accounting ratios, disclosure scores, and longitudinal financial data. Its proposed relationships should be tested empirically before causal conclusions are drawn about the magnitude of governance effects in Uzbekistan. For policymakers, the priority is to strengthen the implementation and enforcement of existing requirements, improve the quality of corporate disclosure, and promote meaningful supervisory independence. For company executives, governance should be treated as a strategic investment rather than a compliance cost. For investors, governance quality and transparency should be assessed alongside profitability, liquidity, leverage, and growth prospects.

Ultimately, the investment attractiveness of Uzbek enterprises depends not merely on the amount of information they publish or the formal structures they establish, but on the credibility of their disclosures and the effectiveness of their decision-making. Enterprises that combine reliable financial reporting, accountable leadership, effective internal controls, and sustainable investment strategies will be better positioned to earn investor confidence and create long-term economic value.

REFERENCES

1. Boronov, B. (2020). Improvement of investment accounting in Uzbekistan. Journal of Advanced Research in Dynamical and Control Systems, 12(6), 1069–1079. https://doi.org/10.5373/JARDCS/V12I6/S20201133
2. Ergasheva, S. T. (2024). Principles of corporate accounting and reporting on financial results to increase the investment attractiveness of companies: International experience and perspective of Uzbekistan. Economics and Innovative Technologies, 12(2). https://doi.org/10.55439/EIT/vol12_iss2/a6
3. European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. (2025). Uzbekistan corporate governance report. https://www.ebrd.com/content/dam/ebrd_dxp/assets/pdfs/legal-reform/corporate-governance/sector-assessment/u-w/2025%20Uzbekistan%20Corporate%20Governance%20Report.pdf
4. Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. Journal of Financial Economics, 3(4), 305–360. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(76)90026-X
5. Republic of Uzbekistan. (2015). Law on the securities market (Law No. ZRU-387, 3 June 2015, revised edition). LexUZ. https://lex.uz/docs/2662541
6. Republic of Uzbekistan. (2015). Corporate Governance Code. State Assets Management Agency of the Republic of Uzbekistan. https://davlat.uz/en/davaktiv/sections/view/6336
7. Republic of Uzbekistan. (2016). Law on Accounting (Law No. ZRU-404, 13 April 2016). National Database of Legislation, LexUZ. https://lex.uz
8. Republic of Uzbekistan. (2014). Law on amendments and supplements to the Law on Joint-Stock Companies and Protection of Shareholders' Rights. LexUZ. https://admin.uz-potash.uz/uploads/page/file/68f71ba401e18.1761024932.pdf
9. Urinov, B. N. (2025). Application of good corporate governance tools to increase capital value of joint-stock companies: Empirical evidence and modeling. Economics and Innovative Technologies, 13(2). https://doi.org/10.55439/EIT/vol13_iss2/658
10. Urinov, B. N. (2025). Enhancing the capital value of joint-stock companies through good corporate governance: A methodological approach. American Journal of Business Management, Economics and Banking, 35, 39–43. https://americanjournal.org/index.php/ajbmeb/article/view/2851

11. World Bank. (n.d.). Business extent of disclosure index (0 = less disclosure to 10 = more disclosure). World Development Indicators. https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/IC.BUS.DISC.XQ