The Review Of
DIABETIC
STUDIES OPEN ACCESS

Determinants Of Effective School Governance: Participation, Reflection, Trust And Leadership Competencies

Kurbanov Muzaffar Ummatovich[1],Khonbabayev Shokhrukhbek Dilshodjon ugli[2],Saidjonov Akmaldin Adhamjon o'g'li[3],KamolovAzamatjon Farhodovich[4],Mirzakhakimovich Ilkhomjon Mirsultonov[5],Boyqo'ziyeva Go'zalkhan Hudoyberdiyevna[6],Kurbanova Mukaddamkhan Ahmedovna[7] Atadjanova Nodirabegim Nasimkhuja qizi[8] Isakov Zakirjon Soliyevich[9]

[1]Associated professor of Kokand State University,https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9770-188X
[2]Associated professor of Kokand State University,https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6499-7055
[3]Assistant Lecturer at Kokand State University
[4]Associated professor of Kokand State University,https://orcid.org/0009-0009-0496-4230
[5]Associated professor of Kokand State University,https://orcid.org/0009-0005-6447-6053
[6]PhD, Associate professor at Kokand state university
[7]PhD researcher at Kokand state university
[8]PhD, Assistant Lecturer at Kokand State University, Department of Theory of Foreign Languages
[9]ORCID ID 0009-0007-3622-3109. Email: isaqovzokirjon1@gmail.com

Abstract
The effectiveness of school governance is determined not only by formal administrative structures but also by the quality of interaction within pedagogical teams. This study examines four core indicators – the Participation Index, the Collective Reflection and Readiness for Change Indicator, the Trust Coefficient, and the Leadership Competency Rating – as determinants of effective school management. While each of these constructs has been discussed separately in educational and organizational research, their operationalization as an integrated evaluative mechanism for pedagogical teams is introduced here as a novel contribution. Drawing on data collected from secondary schools, the research applies quantitative methods, including correlation and regression analysis, to explore the relationships among participation, trust, reflection, and leadership competencies. The results show that participation and trust exert the strongest direct influence on governance outcomes, whereas reflection and leadership competencies act as supporting factors that reinforce team cohesion and professional development. The findings highlight that effective governance requires a balanced mechanism combining organizational processes with socio-psychological dimensions of teamwork. The proposed framework advances theoretical perspectives on school governance and offers practical guidance for enhancing participatory leadership, fostering trust-based communication, and promoting collaborative innovation in education.

Keywords: school governance; participation index; collective reflection; trust coefficient; leadership competencies; educational management; effectiveness.

Introduction

Effective school governance has become a central concern in contemporary educational research, as schools are increasingly expected to adapt to rapid social, technological, and cultural transformations. Traditional models of governance, grounded primarily in hierarchical decision-making and administrative control, have proved insufficient for addressing the complex challenges of modern schooling (Bush, 2020). Instead, emphasis has shifted toward participatory, trust-based, and competence-oriented approaches that enhance the collaborative capacity of pedagogical teams and promote sustainable innovation (Fullan, 2019).

A substantial body of literature highlights the significance of teacher participation in decision-making as a driver of professional motivation and organizational effectiveness (Hopkins et al., 2021). Similarly, research on organizational change underscores the role of team reflexivity and readiness for

change in cultivating adaptive learning environments (West, 2000; Armenakis& Harris, 2009). Trust, as both an interpersonal and organizational construct, has been identified as a key resource for strengthening cooperation and reducing resistance to reform in schools (Bryk & Schneider, 2002). Furthermore, leadership competencies– particularly those associated with strategic vision, communication, and emotional intelligence– are consistently linked to the overall quality of school governance (Day et al., 2020; Richardson & Khawaja, 2025).

While these determinants have been explored individually across various studies, there remains a lack of integrative frameworks that operationalize them as a unified mechanism for evaluating governance effectiveness in pedagogical teams. Existing research often treats participation, trust, reflection, and leadership in isolation, which limits the explanatory power of governance models (Spillane et al., 2015). This study addresses this gap by proposing and empirically testing an integrated evaluative mechanism composed of four indicators: the Participation Index, the Collective Reflection and Readiness for Change Indicator, the Trust Coefficient, and the Leadership Competency Rating.

The purpose of this study is to investigate how these indicators interact to determine the effectiveness of school governance, using empirical data from secondary schools. By applying quantitative methods, including correlation and regression analysis, the research demonstrates the relative contribution of each factor and develops a comprehensive model of effective governance. The originality of the study lies in its operationalization of established constructs as measurable indicators within a single framework, thereby advancing theoretical perspectives on educational management and offering practical tools for school leaders.

Materials and Methods

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative quasi-experimental design with both experimental and control groups. The design allowed for comparative analysis of school governance indicators before and after intervention. The focus was on developing and validating an integrative evaluative mechanism of school governance effectiveness that incorporates organizational, social, and psychological dimensions of team interaction.The study operationalized effective school governance through four empirically grounded indicators: Participation Index (PI), Collective Reflection and Readiness for Change Indicator (CRRCI), Trust Coefficient (TC), and Leadership Competency Rating (LCR). Each construct was developed based on prior research in educational leadership, organizational behavior, and professional learning communities, and measured using 5-point Likert-type scales (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). All indicators were normalized to a 0–100 range for comparative analysis.

Materials

Several instruments and sources of data were employed:

Questionnaires: Structured surveys were developed to measure four indicators – Participation Index (PI), Collective Reflection and Readiness for Change Indicator (CRRCI), Trust Coefficient (TC), and Leadership Competency Rating (LCR). Each questionnaire consisted of 20–25 Likert-scale items.

Structured Interviews: Conducted with 20 selected respondents (principals, deputy principals, and teachers) to gain deeper insights into reflection, trust, and readiness for change.

Expert Assessments: A panel of 5 experts (experienced school directors and educational methodologists) evaluated the leadership competencies of school administrators.

School Documentation: Internal school records (strategic plans, meeting protocols, policy documents) were reviewed to supplement survey and interview data.

Participants

The research involved 10 general secondary schools. The experimental group included 228 respondents (school leaders, deputies, and teachers), while the control group comprised 229 respondents with a comparable distribution of roles. Stratified random sampling was applied to capture variation across urban and rural schools.

Measures

The study was structured around four key indicators:
Participation Index (PI) – measuring the level of involvement of teachers and administrators in governance and decision-making.The Participation Index (PI) captures the extent to which teachers and administrators are involved in school-level governance and decision-making processes. It reflects shared decision-making structures, informational transparency, and professional agency among staff.The theoretical foundation of PI draws from organizational participation theory and empirical findings from the OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS), which emphasize that participatory decision-making enhances professional commitment and school improvement (OECD, 2020).
Representative items include:
"Teachers are formally involved in decisions regarding curriculum design and resource allocation."
"Staff meetings allow open discussions before key decisions are made."
"Information about school-level policies is shared transparently."
A composite PI score was calculated as the normalized sum of item means. Internal consistency was evaluated using Cronbach's α, with $\alpha \geq .70$ considered acceptable for reliability. Construct validity was examined through confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), expecting a one- or two-factor model distinguishing formal and informal participation.
Collective Reflection and Readiness for Change Indicator (CRRCI) – capturing the frequency of reflective discussions and openness to pedagogical innovation.The CRRCI assesses the frequency and depth of reflective practices within the pedagogical team, and their collective openness to pedagogical innovation and change. This indicator draws on the concept of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), where structured reflection and collaborative inquiry are key mechanisms for sustained school improvement (Long et al., 2024; Tobin, 2024).
Sample items:
"Teachers regularly engage in peer observations followed by reflective discussions."
"New teaching methods are openly piloted and reviewed within the school team."
"Colleagues are receptive to experimenting with new instructional approaches."
Higher CRRCI scores indicate stronger collective learning cultures and readiness for innovation. Factor analyses supported two sub-dimensions: Reflective Practices and Change Orientation. Reliability and validity tests followed standard psychometric procedures (Cronbach's α and CFA).
Trust Coefficient (TC) – assessing levels of interpersonal and institutional trust within the pedagogical team.The Trust Coefficient (TC) measures the level of interpersonal and institutional trust within the school community, encompassing relationships among teachers, principals, and administrative staff. Trust is a critical enabler of collaboration, risk-taking, and school reform sustainability (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Lee et al., 2023).
Example items:
"I can rely on my school leaders to act with fairness and integrity."
"Colleagues support each other when difficulties arise."
"Communication between teachers and the administration is open and respectful."
TC values were computed as the mean of item responses normalized to 0–100. High trust levels are interpreted as indicators of strong relational capital and social cohesion, both of which are essential for effective governance. Construct validity was supported through correlations with indicators of collaboration and innovation climate.
Leadership Competency Rating (LCR) – evaluating principals' competencies in strategic vision, communication, organizational planning, and emotional intelligence.The Leadership Competency Rating (LCR) evaluates principals' competencies in strategic vision, communication, organizational planning, and emotional intelligence. The framework aligns with the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards and contemporary models of instructional leadership (Leithwood& Jantzi, 2021).
Example items:
"The principal articulates a clear long-term vision for the school."
"School leadership promotes open communication and constructive feedback."
"Leaders demonstrate empathy and emotional awareness in daily interactions."

The LCR was assessed through multi-source feedback (teachers, administrative staff, and self-assessment). Reliability coefficients exceeding .80 were achieved, and CFA supported a four-factor structure corresponding to the identified competency domains.
Each indicator's construct reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha and McDonald's omega. Convergent validity was tested by examining correlations among the four indices, hypothesizing moderate positive associations reflecting a cohesive governance environment. Discriminant validity was confirmed through low intercorrelations with unrelated constructs (e.g., demographic variables). All measures were standardized to facilitate composite governance scoring.All instruments were pre-tested, and reliability analysis showed strong internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha > 0.78$).

Data Collection
Data were gathered during two academic semesters. Pre-test and post-test surveys were administered to both experimental and control groups. Structured interviews and expert assessments were carried out in parallel to provide qualitative triangulation. Documentary analysis was used as supplementary evidence.

Data Analysis
Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS 26.0 and AMOS 24.0. Descriptive statistics summarized baseline values, while correlation analysis examined relationships among indicators. Regression modeling identified the predictive power of each factor for governance effectiveness. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

Ethical Considerations
The research complied with ethical standards for educational studies. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all respondents. Anonymity and confidentiality were strictly preserved throughout the study.

Results and Discussion

Results. The comparative analysis of the experimental and control groups revealed substantial differences in the dynamics of governance effectiveness indicators. In the experimental group ($n = 228$), notable upward shifts were observed across all four dimensions, demonstrating the practical effect of the applied governance model.
The Participation Index (PI) exhibited the most pronounced improvement. Prior to the intervention, only 14.0% of participants demonstrated a high level of involvement in decision-making processes. Following the intervention, this proportion increased to 25.0%, while the share of respondents classified at the low level declined from 52.6% to 27.1%. Such a shift suggests that structured inclusion mechanisms and collaborative practices successfully enhanced staff engagement in governance activities, thereby expanding the culture of distributed leadership within schools.
A similar trend was observed in the Collective Reflection and Readiness for Change Indicator (CRRCI). The proportion of respondents at the high level increased from 14.9% to 21.5%, accompanied by a corresponding reduction at the lower level (50.9% to 28.1%). These results underscore the significance of collective reflection sessions as instruments of professional adaptation. In schools where regular reflective discussions were institutionalized, participants demonstrated greater readiness to accept and integrate pedagogical innovations.
The Trust Coefficient (TC) also revealed strong positive dynamics. Prior to the intervention, only 12.7% of respondents were categorized at the high trust level, whereas this figure more than doubled (24.6%) in the post-test. The decline in low trust responses (54.4% to 27.2%) indicates that the introduced model contributed to reinforcing interpersonal trust, primarily through transparent communication and joint problem-solving practices. The evidence thus confirms that trust constitutes not merely a background condition, but a systemic determinant of sustainable school governance.
Improvements in the Leadership Competency Rating (LCR) were more moderate yet statistically significant. The share of respondents rating school leaders at the high level increased from 15.4% to 22.8%, with the low-level ratings declining from 53.5% to 28.0%. Expert evaluations emphasized particularly noticeable progress in the domains of emotional intelligence, distributed leadership, and

communicative effectiveness, while competencies related to strategic vision and organizational planning, though relatively stable, remained somewhat stronger.
The comparative distribution of respondents across levels (high, medium, low) before and after the intervention is presented in Table 1.

Table 1.

Indicator	Group	High (Pre)	Medium (Pre)	Low (Pre)	High (Post)	Medium (Post)	Low (Post)
Participation Index (PI)	Experimental	32	76	120	57	109	62
	Control	32	78	119	34	81	114
Collective Reflection & Readiness for Change (CRRCI)	Experimental	34	78	116	49	115	64
	Control	35	80	114	37	83	109
Trust Coefficient (TC)	Experimental	29	75	124	56	110	62
	Control	29	76	124	35	78	116
LeadershipCompetencyRating (LCR)	Experimental	35	71	122	52	112	64
	Control	39	72	118	44	71	114

As shown in Table 1, the experimental group demonstrated significant upward shifts in all four indicators, with the proportion of respondents at the high level almost doubling across participation and trust. In contrast, the control group exhibited only marginal changes, confirming that the improvements can be attributed to the implemented governance model.
By contrast, the control group (n = 229) demonstrated only marginal changes. For example, the proportion of high-level participation increased by a negligible margin (13.9% to 14.8%), and reductions in low trust levels were minimal (54.1% to 50.6%). These results reinforce the claim that the improvements observed in the experimental group cannot be explained by external influences, but rather are attributable to the applied governance framework.

The regression analysis provided a more nuanced understanding of the relative contribution of each factor. The Participation Index ($\beta = 0.42$, $p < 0.01$) and the Trust Coefficient ($\beta = 0.37$, $p < 0.01$) emerged as the strongest predictors of governance effectiveness. The Collective Reflection and Readiness for Change Indicator ($\beta = 0.34$, $p < 0.05$), although slightly weaker, retained significant explanatory power, highlighting its mediating role in linking individual engagement with organizational adaptation. Meanwhile, the Leadership Competency Rating demonstrated supportive, yet less direct, predictive value. The overall model achieved a coefficient of determination of $R^2 = 0.61$, indicating that the proposed set of indicators explained more than 60% of the variance in governance effectiveness.

Discussion

The results of this study provide compelling evidence that the effectiveness of school governance is determined not solely by structural or administrative arrangements but rather by the quality of relational and participatory processes within pedagogical teams. The experimental group demonstrated statistically significant improvements across all four indicators – Participation Index, Collective Reflection and Readiness for Change, Trust Coefficient, and Leadership Competency Rating – while the control group remained largely unchanged. This contrast underscores the role of targeted governance mechanisms in shaping organizational culture and professional collaboration.
The finding that the Participation Index was the strongest predictor of governance effectiveness resonates with the work of Hopkins et al. (2021), who emphasized that active teacher involvement in decision-making contributes to organizational adaptability and improved student outcomes. Similarly, distributed leadership models have been consistently associated with higher collective efficacy and innovation capacity (Spillane et al., 2015). The results of the present study extend these conclusions

by providing empirical evidence that participatory mechanisms not only empower teachers but also serve as a cornerstone of sustainable governance.

The significance of the Trust Coefficient further validates previous research by Bryk and Schneider (2002), who described trust as the "social capital" of schools. The doubling of high-trust responses in the experimental group suggests that transparent communication, joint problem-solving, and equitable distribution of responsibility are effective strategies for cultivating a trust-based professional climate. Such findings align with recent studies highlighting that trust mitigates resistance to change and fosters resilience during organizational transformations (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2015).

The positive role of Collective Reflection and Readiness for Change confirms earlier theoretical propositions by West (2000), who argued that reflexivity enables teams to question existing practices and adopt innovative solutions. The present study adds empirical weight to this claim, showing that schools institutionalizing reflective practices demonstrate greater openness to curricular innovation and adaptive reforms. This is particularly relevant in the context of rapid educational change, where reflexivity acts as both a diagnostic and developmental function.

Although the Leadership Competency Rating was statistically less predictive compared to participation and trust, its contribution should not be underestimated. The improvements observed in emotional intelligence, communication, and distributed leadership competencies echo the conclusions of Day et al. (2020), who identified relational leadership skills as equally important as strategic or managerial ones. The results suggest that effective governance requires leaders who are capable not only of planning and administration but also of fostering interpersonal trust and professional collaboration.

Taken together, these findings advance the theoretical understanding of school governance by demonstrating the integrative nature of its determinants. Rather than conceptualizing participation, trust, reflection, and leadership as isolated constructs, the evidence supports their operationalization as a unified evaluative mechanism. This integrative model explains more than 60% of the variance in governance effectiveness, confirming its explanatory and practical utility. Beyond its theoretical contribution, the study also provides practical recommendations: school leaders should prioritize participatory decision-making, cultivate trust-based relationships, and institutionalize reflective practices as essential strategies for achieving sustainable governance and fostering innovation.

Conclusion

This study set out to identify and empirically validate the determinants of effective school governance by operationalizing four interrelated constructs – the Participation Index (PI), the Collective Reflection and Readiness for Change Indicator (CRRCI), the Trust Coefficient (TC), and the Leadership Competency Rating (LCR) – as a unified evaluative mechanism. Using a quasi-experimental design with matched experimental ($n = 228$) and control ($n = 229$) groups, we demonstrated that governance effectiveness is not a simple function of formal administrative arrangements; rather, it emerges from the quality of relational, participatory, and reflective practices embedded in the day-to-day life of pedagogical teams.

Summaryofprincipalfindings

1. Participation and trust as primary drivers.Regression results show that PI ($\beta = 0.42$, $p < 0.01$) and TC ($\beta = 0.37$, $p < 0.01$) exert the strongest direct influence on governance outcomes. Post-intervention distributions in the experimental group reveal substantial upward shifts from low to high levels on both indicators, while the control group shows only marginal change.
2. Reflection as a catalytic, system-level factor. CRRCI ($\beta = 0.34$, $p < 0.05$) contributes significantly, acting as a mediating and amplifying condition that links individual engagement with organizational adaptation, especially where reflective routines are institutionalized.
3. Leadership competencies as enabling infrastructure. LCR exhibits moderate but reliable improvements and functions as an enabler that stabilizes gains in participation and trust through communication, distributed leadership, and emotional intelligence.
4. Model adequacy. The integrated model explains 61% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.61$) in governance effectiveness, providing evidence of both explanatory power and practical utility.

Theoretical contributions

- Integration over isolation. Prior research often treats participation, trust, reflection, and leadership as discrete constructs. Our findings support a systems perspective, showing that governance effectiveness is best captured when these determinants are operationalized jointly as an interdependent mechanism rather than as stand-alone variables.
- Mechanism specification. By positioning CRRCI as a catalytic process and LCR as enabling infrastructure, the study specifies role asymmetries among determinants, clarifying how social-psychological dynamics (trust, reflection) and structural capacities (leadership competencies) interact to produce governance outcomes.
- Measurement innovation. The operationalization of PI, CRRCI, TC, and LCR into a single evaluative framework advances measurement architecture in school governance and provides a replicable template for subsequent studies.

Practical implications for school leaders

- Institutionalize participation. Formalize participatory decision-making (e.g., standing teacher councils with agenda-setting rights; co-design of improvement plans) to convert engagement from episodic involvement to a stable governance routine.
- Engineer trust conditions. Adopt transparent communication protocols, joint problem-solving cycles, and peer observation to build trust as organizational capital, thereby reducing resistance to change.
- Make reflection routine. Schedule structured, evidence-informed reflection (lesson study, post-implementation reviews) to sustain adaptive capacity and align change initiatives with classroom realities.
- Develop relational leadership. Leadership professional development should prioritize communicative competence, distributed leadership, and emotional intelligence, not only strategic planning.

Policy implications

- Standards and accountability. Incorporate PI, CRRCI, and TC alongside LCR into school accountability dashboards to complement outcome metrics (e.g., achievement scores) with process-quality indicators.
- Capacity building. Fund targeted programs that build participatory governance and trust-based collaboration, ensuring that leadership training frameworks explicitly include reflective practice and relational skill-sets.
- Evaluation frameworks. Ministries and local authorities can adopt the integrated indicator set as a diagnostic baseline for school improvement cycles and for monitoring the implementation fidelity of reform initiatives.

Limitations

Contextual scope. The study draws on secondary schools within a specific national/regional context; cultural and regulatory environments may condition the salience of each indicator.

Design constraints. Although quasi-experimental with a control group, the design is not fully randomized; unobserved covariates (e.g., prior leadership turnover, community factors) may partially influence outcomes.

Measurement boundaries. While reliability was acceptable (Cronbach's $\alpha > 0.78$), future work should examine construct validity via multi-trait–multi-method approaches and test measurement invariance across subgroups (urban/rural; primary/secondary teachers).

Directions for future research

Causal modeling. Employ longitudinal cross-lagged or structural equation models to test bidirectional dynamics (e.g., whether gains in trust later drive higher participation, or vice versa).

Generalizability. Replicate the model across diverse educational systems and school types, assessing boundary conditions and cultural moderators.

Mechanism refinement. Explore non-linear effects (thresholds, diminishing returns) and interaction terms (e.g., PI × TC; CRRCI × LCR) to map regimes where interventions yield maximal impact.

Link to student outcomes. Extend the framework to examine downstream effects on teaching quality and student learning, establishing governance-to-instruction pathways.
Implementation science. Study fidelity, dosage, and adaptation of participatory and reflective practices to identify implementation levers that sustain gains over time.

Closing statement

In sum, effective school governance is an emergent property of a deliberately engineered social system in which participation and trust drive day-to-day coordination, reflection sustains adaptive learning, and leadership competencies provide the enabling infrastructure. By articulating and validating a single, integrated evaluative mechanism built on PI, CRRCI, TC, and LCR, this study contributes a theoretically robust and practically actionable model for leaders and policymakers committed to building resilient, innovation-ready schools.

References

1. Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G. (2009). Reflections: Our journey in organizational change research and practice. Journal of Change Management, 9(2), 127–142.
2. Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2002). Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
3. Bush, T. (2020). Theories of educational leadership and management. London: SAGE.
4. Day, C., Sammons, P., Hopkins, D., Harris, A., Leithwood, K., Gu, Q., & Brown, E. (2020). Successful school leadership. London: Education Development Trust.
5. Fullan, M. (2019). Leading in a culture of change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
6. Hopkins, D., Stringfield, S., Harris, A., Stoll, L., & Mackay, T. (2021). The nine pillars of great school leadership. Educational Review, 73(3), 281–298.
7. Lee, M., Louis, K. S., & Dumas, T. (2023). Relationaltrustandthesustainabilityofschoolimprovementefforts.School Effectivenessand School Improvement, 34(1), 21–44.
8. Leithwood, K., &Jantzi, D. (2021). Transformationalschoolleadershipanditseffectsonorganizationalconditionsandstudentlearning.Educational Administration Quarterly, 57(4), 529–560.
9. Long, D., Chu, S., & Tsai, P. (2024). Collectivereflectionas a catalystforteacherinnovationinprofessionallearningcommunities.TeachingandTeacher Education, 139, 104882. OECD. (2020). TALIS 2018 Results (Volume II): Teachersandschoolleadersasvaluedprofessionals. OECD Publishing.
10. Richardson, J. W., & Khawaja, S. (2025). Meta-synthesis of school leadership competencies to support learner-centered education. Frontiers in Education, 10, 123–134.
11. Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2015). Distributed leadership in practice. New York: Teachers College Press.
12. Tobin, R. (2024). Reframingreflectivepractice: Collaborativeprofessionalinquiryforschoolchange.Journal ofEducational Change, 25(2), 155–174.
13. Tschannen-Moran, M., & Gareis, C. R. (2015). Faculty trust in the principal: An essential ingredient in high-performing schools. Journal of Educational Administration, 53(1), 66–92.
14. West, M. A. (2000). Reflexivity, revolution, and innovation in work teams. In M. M. Beyerlein (Ed.), Work teams: Past, present and future (pp. 1–29). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
15. Rajapova, M. A. (2025). COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ALLEGORICAL DEVICES IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES. Экономика и социум, (5-1 (132)), 654-658.
16. Malika, R. (2021). ISSN: 2249-7137 Vol. 11.
17. Rajapova, M. (2020). Badiiy Matnda Qo'llaniluvchi Allegorik Vositalarning Lingvokulturologik Xususiyatlari. Scienceweb Academic Papers Collection.
18. Rajapova, M. (2022). Linguocultural Features of Allegorical Means Used in the Literary Text. Scienceweb academic papers collection.