

ISSN 2181-1342

Actual problems of social and humanitarian sciences
Актуальные проблемы социальных и гуманитарных наук

**Ijtimoiy-gumanitar
fanlarning dolzarb
muammolari**

11-maxsus
son (5-jild)

2025

SCIENCEPROBLEMS.UZ

IJTIMOIY-GUMANITAR FANLARNING DOLZARB MUAMMOLARI

Nº S/11 (5) - 2025

**АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ СОЦИАЛЬНО-
ГУМАНИТАРНЫХ НАУК**

ACTUAL PROBLEMS OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

TOSHKENT-2025

BOSH MUHARRIR:

Isanova Feruza Tulqinovna

TAHRIR HAY'ATI:

07.00.00- TARIX FANLARI:

Yuldashev Anvar Ergashevich – tarix fanlari doktori, siyosiy fanlar nomzodi, professor;
Mavlanov Uktam Maxmasabirovich – tarix fanlari doktori, professor;
Xazratkulov Abror – tarix fanlari doktori, dotsent;
Tursunov Ravshan Normuratovich – tarix fanlari doktori;
Xolikulov Axmadjon Boymahamatovich – tarix fanlari doktori;
Gabrielyan Sofya Ivanovna – tarix fanlari doktori, dotsent;
Saidov Sarvar Atabullo o'g'li – katta ilmiy xodim, Imom Termiziy xalqaro ilmiy-tadqiqot markazi, ilmiy tadqiqotlar bo'limi.

08.00.00- IQTISODIYOT FANLARI:

Karlibayeva Raya Xojabayevna – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor;
Nasirxodjayeva Dilafruz Sabitxanovna – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor;
Ostonokulov Azamat Abdukarimovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor;
Arabov Nurali Uralovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor;
Xudoyqulov Sadirdin Karimovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, dotsent;
Azizov Sherzod O'ktamovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, dotsent;
Xojayev Azizxon Saidaloxonovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, dotsent;
Xolov Aktam Xatamovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent;
Shadiyeva Dildora Xamidovna – iqtisodiyot fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent v.b.;;
Shakarov Qulmat Ashirovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari nomzodi, dotsent.;;
Jabborova Charos Aminovna - iqtisodiyot fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD).

09.00.00- FALSAFA FANLARI:

Hakimov Nazar Hakimovich – falsafa fanlari doktori, professor;
Yaxshilikov Jo'raboy – falsafa fanlari doktori, professor;
G'aybullayev Otabek Muhammadiyevich – falsafa fanlari doktori, professor;

Saidova Kamola Uskanbayevna – falsafa fanlari doktori;

Hoshimxonov Mo'min – falsafa fanlari doktori, dotsent;

O'roqova Oysuluv Jamoliddinovna – falsafa fanlari doktori, dotsent;

Nosirxodjayeva Gulnora Abdukaxxarovna – falsafa fanlari nomzodi, dotsent;

Turdiyev Bexruz Sobirovich – falsafa fanlari doktori (DSc), Professor.

10.00.00- FILOLOGIYA FANLARI:

Axmedov Oybek Saporbayevich – filologiya fanlari doktori, professor;
Ko'chimov Shuxrat Norqizilovich – filologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent;
Hasanov Shavkat Ahadovich – filologiya fanlari doktori, professor;
Baxronova Dilrabo Keldiyorovna – filologiya fanlari doktori, professor;
Mirsanov G'aybullo Qulmurodovich – filologiya fanlari doktori, professor;
Salaxutdinova Musharrafa Isamutdinovna – filologiya fanlari nomzodi, dotsent;
Kuchkarov Raxman Urmanovich – filologiya fanlari nomzodi, dotsent v/b;
Yunusov Mansur Abdullayevich – filologiya fanlari nomzodi;
Saidov Ulugbek Aripovich – filologiya fanlari nomzodi, dotsent;
Qodirova Muqaddas Tog'ayevna - filologiya fanlari nomzodi, dotsent.

12.00.00- YURIDIK FANLAR:

Axmedshayeva Mavlyuda Axatovna – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor;
Muxitdinova Firyuza Abdurashidovna – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor;
Esanova Zamira Normurotovna – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor, O'zbekiston Respublikasida xizmat ko'rsatgan yurist;
Hamroqulov Bahodir Mamasharifovich – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor v.b.;
Zulfiqorov Sherzod Xurramovich – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor;
Xayitov Xushvaqt Saparbayevich – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor;
Asadov Shavkat G'aybullayevich – yuridik fanlar doktori, dotsent;
Ergashev Ikrom Abdurasulovich – yuridik fanlari doktori, professor;
Utemuratov Maxmut Ajimuratovich – yuridik fanlar nomzodi, professor;
Saydullayev Shaxzod Alixanovich – yuridik fanlar nomzodi, professor;
Hakimov Komil Baxtiyarovich – yuridik fanlar doktori, dotsent;
Yusupov Sardorbek Baxodirovich – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor;
Amirov Zafar Aktamovich – yuridik fanlar doktori (PhD);
Jo'rayev Sherzod Yuldashevich – yuridik fanlar nomzodi, dotsent;
Babadjanov Atabek Davronbekovich – yuridik fanlar nomzodi, professor;
Normatov Bekzod Akrom o'g'li – yuridik fanlar bo'yicha falsafa doktori;
Rahmatov Elyor Jumaboyevich – yuridik fanlar nomzodi;

13.00.00- PEDAGOGIKA FANLARI:

Xashimova Dildarxon Urinboyevna – pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor;
Ibragimova Gulnora Xavazmatovna – pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor;
Zakirova Feruza Maxmudovna – pedagogika fanlari doktori;
Kayumova Nasiba Ashurovna – pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor;
Taylanova Shoxida Zayniyevna – pedagogika fanlari

doktori, dotsent;

Jumaniyozova Muhayyo Tojiyevna – pedagogika fanlari doktori, dotsent;

Ibraximov Sanjar Urunbayevich – pedagogika fanlari doktori;

Javliyeva Shaxnoza Baxodirovna – pedagogika fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD);

Bobomurotova Latofat Elmurodovna – pedagogika fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD).

19.00.00- PSIXOLOGIYA FANLARI:

Karimova Vasilisa Mamanosirovna – psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor, Nizomiy nomidagi Toshkent davlat pedagogika universiteti;

Hayitov Oybek Eshboyevich – Jismoniy tarbiya va sport bo'yicha mutaxassislarni qayta tayyorlash va malakasini oshirish instituti, psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor

Umarova Navbahor Shokirovna – psixologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent, Nizomiy nomidagi Toshkent davlat pedagogika universiteti, Amaliy psixologiyasi kafedrasi mudiri;

Atabayeva Nargis Batirovna – psixologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent;

Shamshetova Anjim Karamaddinovna – psixologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent;

Qodirov Obid Safarovich – psixologiya fanlari doktori (PhD).

22.00.00- SOTSILOGIYA FANLARI:

Latipova Nodira Muxtarjanovna – sotsiologiya fanlari doktori, professor, O'zbekiston milliy universiteti kafedra mudiri;

Seitov Azamat Po'latovich – sotsiologiya fanlari doktori, professor, O'zbekiston milliy universiteti;

Sodiqova Shohida Marxaboyevna – sotsiologiya fanlari doktori, professor, O'zbekiston xalqaro islom akademiyasi.

23.00.00- SIYOSIY FANLAR

Nazarov Nasriddin Ataqulovich – siyosiy fanlar doktori, falsafa fanlari doktori, professor, Toshkent arxitektura qurilish instituti;

Bo'tayev Usmonjon Xayrullayevich – siyosiy fanlar doktori, dotsent, O'zbekiston milliy universiteti kafedra mudiri.

OAK Ro'yxati

Mazkur jurnal Vazirlar Mahkamasi huzuridagi Oliy attestatsiya komissiyasi Rayosatining 2022-yil 30-noyabrdagi 327/5-son qarori bilan tarix, iqtisodiyot, falsafa, filologiya, yuridik va pedagogika fanlari bo'yicha ilmiy darajalar yuzasidan dissertatsiyalar asosiy natijalarini chop etish tavsiya etilgan ilmiy nashrlar ro'yxatiga kiritilgan.

"Ijtimoiy-gumanitar fanlarning dolzarb muammolari" elektron jurnali 2020-yil 6-avgust kuni 1368-sonli guvohnoma bilan davlat ro'yxatiga olingan.

Muassis: "SCIENCEPROBLEMS TEAM" mas'uliyati cheklangan jamiyati

Tahririyat manzili:

100070. Toshkent shahri, Yakkasaroy tumani, Kichik Beshyog'och ko'chasi, 70/10-uy. Elektron manzil:

scienceproblems.uz@gmail.com

Bog'lanish uchun telefon:

(99) 602-09-84 (telegram).

07.00.00 – TARIX FANLARI

Рахманкулова Адолат Хушбаковна

ПРОБЛЕМЫ РЕАБИЛИТАЦИИ НАСИЛЬСТВЕННО ПЕРЕСЕЛЕННЫХ НАРОДОВ

В УЗБЕКИСТАН В 1930 – 1940-е ГОДЫ 11-19

Назирхожаев Мухаммадалихожа Касимхожаевич

ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ И ОРГАНИЗАЦИЯ ЛАГЕРЕЙ ДЛЯ СОДЕРЖАНИЯ ЯПОНСКИХ

ВОЕННОПЛЕННЫХ В СОВЕТСКОМ СОЮЗЕ 20-29

Kayrova Malika Dautbay qizi

MUSTAQILLIQ YILLARIDA TURIZM SOHASIDAGI ISLOHOTLAR 30-33

Sobirova Dilfuza, Mirzaaxmedov Xabibullo, Odiljonov Xayitali

QO'QON XONLIGINING DIPLOMATIK ALOQALARI 34-39

Raupova Mushtariybegim Ilxomjon qizi

TURKISTON GENERAL-GUBERNATORLIGINING MA'MURIY-HUDUDIY BOSHQARUVI

TARIXSHUNOSLIGI 40-47

Санарбаев Бунёд Хуррамбек оғлы

ДИПЛОМАТИЯ И ТОРГОВЛЯ НА ПЕРИФЕРИИ ИМПЕРИЙ: ВЗАИМООТНОШЕНИЯ

ХИВИНСКОГО ХАНСТВА И РОССИЙСКОЙ ИМПЕРИИ В ПЕРИОД ПРАВЛЕНИЯ

МУХАММАД РАХИМХАНА I (1806–1825) 48-54

Рузибоев Самандарбек, Ахмадбекова Ўғилой

НАУЧНО-ИСТОРИЧЕСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ ПРОИЗВЕДЕНИЯ АБУ РАЙХОНА БЕРУНИ

«АЛ-АСАР АЛЬ-БАКИЯ»: МЕТОДОЛОГИЯ, ИСТОЧНИКИ И КУЛЬТУРНО-

ХРОНОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ВОЗЗРЕНИЯ 55-64

Tilovov Mirqosim Amanturdiyevich

OLTINSOY TUMANI ARXEOLOGIK XARITASI 65-70

Shamshidinov Baxriddin Sharobiddin o'g'li

O'ZBEKISTONDA NEFT VA GAZ SANOATI TARIXI (1900-1950 YILLAR) 71-76

Abdurasulov Akmaljon

TURKISTONDA MATBAACHILIKNING VUJUDGA KELISHIDAGI HAMKORLIK

ALOQALARI TARIXI 77-86

Abatov Aydos

QORAQALPOG'ISTONDA SANOATNING SHAKLLANISHI VA RIVOJLANISH

BOSQICHLARI (XX ASR II YARMI) 87-90

08.00.00 – IQTISODIYOT FANLARI

Pirmatova Farangiz Ma'ruffjonovna

THE EFFECTS OF GREEN ECONOMY IMPLEMENTATION ON ECONOMIC GROWTH

IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES 91-99

Jumabayev Adilbek Bazarbayevich

WAYS TO INCREASE THE EFFICIENCY OF REGIONAL ECONOMIC POTENTIAL 100-107

<i>Jaxbarov Jamshidbek Tilavoldi o'g'li</i>	
BUDJET TASHKIOTLARIDA MOLIYAVIY NAZORATNI RAQAMLI	
TEXNOLOGIYALARNI QO'LLASH ORQALI TAKOMILLASHTIRISH	108-114
<i>Fayzieva Dilyora Shamsitdin kizi,</i>	
INSTITUTIONAL PRISM OF DIGITAL DIVIDENDS:	
THE IMPACT OF HUMAN CAPITAL AND "ANALOG COMPLEMENTS"	
ON THE DYNAMICS OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC INEQUALITY.....	115-123
<i>Турдиеев Гайрат Ялгашевич</i>	
РАЗВИТИЕ АВТОКОЛОНН СУРХАНДАРЬИНСКОЙ ОБЛАСТИ В УСЛОВИЯХ	
ТРАНСПОРТНЫХ РЕФОРМ: ИСТОРИЧЕСКИЙ И СОВРЕМЕННЫЙ ЭТАПЫ.....	124-129
09.00.00 – FALSAFA FANLARI	
<i>Xolmirzaev Nodirjon Nizomjonovich</i>	
SHAHAR AHOLISINING IJTIMOIY MUAMMOLARINING IJTIMOIY FALSAFIY TAHLILI ..	130-134
<i>Kenjayeva Dilrabo Rominovna</i>	
INSONIYAT TARIXI VA DINIY BAG'RIKENGLIK	135-139
<i>Karimov Raxmat Raxmanovich</i>	
СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ТЕНДЕНЦИИ РАЗВИТИЯ МЕЖЦИВИЛИЗАЦИОННОЙ	
ФИЛОСОФИИ В ЦИФРОВУЮ ЭПОХУ	140-146
<i>Ergashev Urolbek Berkinovich</i>	
NAZARIY FALSAFANI TASNIFFLASHDA AHMAD TOSHKO'PRIZODA YONDASHUVI	147-151
<i>Raximjanova Dilnavoz Sunnat qizi</i>	
IBN RUSHDNING TAFAKKUR ERKINLIGI HAQIDAGI QARASHLARI	152-155
<i>Abdunazarov Lutfillo Mamanovich</i>	
YANGI O'ZBEKISTON SHAROITIDA URBANIZATSIYA JARAYONLARINI	
RIVOJLANTIRISHNING ZARURATI	156-160
<i>Tangirov Nizom Abduraxmonovich</i>	
NOOSFERA VA BARQAROR RIVOJLANISH PARADIGMASINING	
FALSAFIY-METODOLOGIK ASOSLARI	161-166
<i>Yusupova Nargiza Ro'stamovna</i>	
O'ZBEK ETNOMUSIQASIGA OID TARIXIY MANBA VA MUTAFAKKIRLAR	
ETNOMUSIQA BORASIDAGI QARASHLARINING FALSAFIY TAHLILI.....	167-172
<i>Xudoykulov Azamat Beshumovich</i>	
MA'NAVIY BARKAMOL YOSHLAR DUNYOQARASHINI SHAKLLANTIRISHDA	
G'YOAVIY TARBIYANING O'RNI	173-177
<i>Xamdamov Behzod</i>	
ZAHIRIDDIN MUHAMMAD BOBUR DUNYOQARASHIDA VATANPARVARLIK	
G'YALARINING FALSAFIY-TARIXIY ASOSLARI	178-185
<i>Bekchanov Sanjar Ibragimovich</i>	
"MODERNIZATSIYA" TUSHUNCHASINING IJTIMOIY-FALSAFIY MOHIYATI:	
ZAMONAVIY YONDASHUVLAR VA MILLIY KONSEPSIYALAR.....	186-190
<i>Adizov Azim Tolibovich</i>	
IJTIMOIY KONFRONTATSIYANING TUZILISHI VA DINAMIKASI.....	191-196

<i>Eshmurodov Nabillo</i>	
GLOBALASHUV JARAYONIDA SHAXS MA'NAVIYATINING TRANSFORMATSIYASI VA BEGONALASHUV MUAMMOSI	197-201
<i>Yokubov Suxrob Firdavsovich</i>	
TASAVVUF TA'LIMOTINING G'OVAVIY MANBALARI	202-206
<i>Najimidinova Dilnoza Gulomjonovna</i>	
GLOBALASHUV SHAROITIDA O'ZBEK MILLIY OILASINING IJTIMOIY-FALSAFIY MASALALARI	207-210
<i>Otokulov Abror Sobirkulovich</i>	
JAMIYATDA MA'NAVIY-AXLOQIYLIKNI YUKSALTIRISHDA SHAXS MAS'ULIYATINI OSHIRISH OMILI	211-217

10.00.00 – FILOLOGIYA FANLARI

<i>Maxamadaliyeva Zuxra Baxrom qizi, Adilova Nasiba Raximboy qizi</i>	
INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK TILLARIDA MADANIY METAFORALARNING MOHIYATI	218-222
<i>Xusainova Zilola Yuldashevna, Yangibayeva Surayyo Gulumboyevna</i>	
DIAKRON KORPUS ALGORITMLARI	223-228
<i>Ruzibayeva Aziza Kahramanovna</i>	
POLITICAL EXILE AND PERSONAL IDENTITY IN LORD BYRON'S LIFE AND WORK	229-233
<i>Karimova Ozodaxon Avazxon qizi</i>	
A LINGUO-PRAGMATIC STUDY OF INFORMAL SPEECH IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF COMMUNICATIVE STRATEGIES, SOCIOCULTURAL CONTEXTS, AND PRAGMATIC FUNCTIONS	234-240
<i>Aйтмуратова Тұрсынай Маратовна</i>	
КОНЦЕПТ «ТРУД» В ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРОЛОГИЧЕСКОМ АСПЕКТЕ	241-244
<i>Fayzullayeva Zebuniso Abdukarimovna</i>	
KONYUNKTIVNING SEMANTIK-PRAGMATIK XUSUSIYATLARI	245-248
<i>Sodikova Vasilakhon, Gavharoy Isroiljon qizi</i>	
THE ISSUES OF INFORMATION SECURITY AND RELIABILITY IN MODERN JOURNALISM	249-258
<i>Холикова Замира</i>	
СРАВНИТЕЛЬНО-СОПОСТАВИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЗМОВ С КОМПОНЕНТОМ-ЗООНИМОМ «СОБАКА» В РУССКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ	259-272

12.00.00 – YURIDIK FANLAR

<i>Tursunova Malikaxon Ulugbekovna</i>	
СООТНОШЕНИЕ ДИПЛОМАТИЧЕСКИХ РАНГОВ С КВАЛИФИКАЦИОННЫМИ КЛАССАМИ ДОЛЖНОСТЕЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОЙ СЛУЖБЫ РЕСПУБЛИКИ УЗБЕКИСТАН: НЕКОТОРЫЕ ВОПРОСЫ ЗНАЧЕНИЯ КЛАССОВ И РАНГОВ В ДИПЛОМАТИЧЕСКОЙ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ	273-286
<i>Karaketova Dilnoza Yuldashevna</i>	
JINOYAT SUBYEKTINI TAVSIFLOVCHI BELGI SIFATIDA RETSIDIV	287-294
<i>Мируктамова Феруза Лутфуллаевна</i>	
ПРАКТИКА ЗАРУБЕЖНЫХ ГОСУДАРСТВ ПО ЗАЩИТЕ ПРАВ И БЕЗОПАСНОСТИ ДЕТЕЙ ОТ ИНФОРМАЦИОННЫХ УГРОЗ	295-300

<i>Xodjiev Yunus Muxitdinovich</i>	
MULK HUQUQIDAN VOZ KECHISHNING AYRIM MASALALARI.....	301-309
<i>Akayeva Marapat Abduxalikovna</i>	
FUQAROLIK HUQUQIDA ASOSSIZ BOYLIK ORTTIRISH: MILLIY VA XORIJIY TAJRIBA ...	310-317
<i>Nishonov Abdulloh Ubaydulloh o'g'li</i>	
ENERGETIKA SEKTORIDA ATROF-MUHITGA TA'SIRNI BAHOLASH TIZIMINI SHAKLLANTIRISHNING HUQUQIY SHART-SHAROITLARI.....	318-326
<i>Jiyenbayev Baxadir Ospanovich</i>	
EKOLOGIK AUDITNI HUQUQIY TA'MINLASHGA DOIR HUQUQIY NORMALARNING ILMIY VA NAZARIY MOHIYATI	327-332
<i>Шомуратова Пальмира Комил қизи</i>	
РЕАЛИЗАЦИЯ ПРИНЦИПА СОСТАЯЗАТЕЛЬНОСТИ НА ДОСУДЕБНОЙ СТАДИИ: ПРЕДЕЛЫ, ПРОБЛЕМЫ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ УСИЛЕНИЯ	333-339
<i>Калдарбеков Асылжан Оспанович</i>	
РАЦИОНАЛЬНОЕ ИСПОЛЬЗОВАНИЕ И ПРАВОВАЯ ОХРАНА ЗЕМЕЛЬ ЛЕСНОГО ФОНДА: СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ ОПЫТ КАЗАХСТАНА И УЗБЕКИСТАНА	340-351
<i>Istamova-Fayzullaeva Dilafruz Oybek qizi</i>	
SOMATIK HUQUQLARNING NAZARIY TALQINI: GERMANIYA VA O'ZBEKISTON TAJRIBASI ASOSIDA QIYOSIY HUQUQIY TAHLIL	352-359
<i>Urakov Djaxongir Rajabovich</i>	
PROKURATURA ORGANLARINING YOSHLAR O'RTASIDA HUQUQBUZARLIKLER PROFILAKTIKASINI AMALGA OSHIRISH BORASIDA HAMKORLIK FAOLIYATI	360-365
<i>Байтуррова Аида Набиевна</i>	
СОВРЕМЕННОЕ СОСТОЯНИЕ ОРГАНИЗАЦИОННО-ПРАВОВОГО РЕГУЛИРОВАНИЯ ЭКОТУРИСТИЧЕСКОЙ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ В РЕСПУБЛИКЕ УЗБЕКИСТАН	366-373
<i>Xushvaqtov O'tkir Temirovich</i>	
VOYAGA YETMAGANLAR JINOYATCHILIGI TUSHUNCHASI NAZARIY VA QIYOSIY-HUQUQIY TAHLLILI	374-382
<i>Mustafaqulov Dilshod Salomovich</i>	
NORMA IJODKORLIGI JARAYONIDA QONUNIYLIK PRINSIPI	383-389
<i>Nomazov Ixtiyor Ismailovich</i>	
ISBOT QILISH ELEMENTI SIFATIDA KO'RSATUVLARNI OLDINDAN MUSTAHKAMLAB QO'YISH	390-394
<i>Xoliqnazarov Farhod Bozor o'g'li</i>	
INTELLEKTUAL MULK HUQUQINI JINOIY-HUQUQIY HIMOYA QILISH MASALALARI ...	395-399
<i>Normuratov Aktam Tulaboy o'g'li</i>	
OLIY TA'LIM TIZIMIDA SUN'IY INTELLEKT TEXNOLOGIYALARINI JALB QILISHNI TAKOMILLASHTIRISH.....	400-403
<i>Шомахсудов Шоакрам Шомуратович, Паракатова Шахноза Ерназаровна</i>	
ОСОБЕННОСТИ ПОЛУЧЕНИЯ ОБРАЗЦОВ ДЛЯ КОМПЬЮТЕРНО-ТЕХНИЧЕСКОЙ ЭКСПЕРТИЗЫ ПРИ РАССЛЕДОВАНИИ КИБЕРПРЕСТУПЛЕНИЙ	404-411
<i>Rasulov Baxtiyor Shavkatovich</i>	
O'ZBEKISTONDA ATMOSFERA HAVOSINI MUHOFAZA QILISH VA EKOLOGIK NAZORATNI KUCHALTIRISH MASALALARI.....	412-418

<i>Javliyeva Gullola Abdurahim qizi</i>	
IJARA MEHNATI — NOTIPIK MEHNAT MUNOSABATLARINING SHAKLI SIFATIDA.....	419-425
<i>Babaeva Irodakhon Erkinjon qizi</i>	
ISSUES OF IMPLEMENTING INTERNATIONAL LEGAL NORMS IN THE FIELD OF CLIMATE CHANGE INTO THE NATIONAL LEGISLATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN	426-434
<i>Ядгаров Шахрух</i>	
ЮРИДИЧЕСКАЯ ПРИРОДА ШАНХАЙСКОЙ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ СОТРУДНИЧЕСТВА КАК СУБЪЕКТА МЕЖДУНАРОДНОГО ПРАВА.....	435-439

13.00.00 – PEDAGOGIKA FANLARI

<i>Baratov Jo'raqo'zi Shukurjon o'g'li</i>	
FANLARARO INTEGRATSIYA ASOSIDA BO'LAJAK MUHANDISLARNING FIZIKA FANIDAN NOSTANDART TOPSHIRIQLARNI BAJARISH ORQALI KASBIY KOMPETENTLIGINI RIVOJLANTIRISH.....	440-446
<i>Ismaylov Azerbay Saparniyazovich</i>	
SUN'YIY INTELLEKTNING TA'LIMDAGI O'RNI.....	447-451
<i>Xolmirzayeva Gulbahor Baxodirovna</i>	
MAKTABGACHA TA'LIMDA ILG'OR XORIJIY TAJRIBALARNI MILLIY MODEL BILAN UYG'UNLASHTIRISH MEXANIZMLARI.....	452-457
<i>Raximova Lolaxon Abduraximovna</i>	
TALABALARNING KLINIK QAROR QABUL QILISH KO'NIKMALARINI SHAKLLANTIRISHDA BIOFIZIK DIAGNOSTIKA TEXNOLOGIYALARINI INTEGRATIV O'QITISH METODIKASI.....	458-462
<i>Toshmamatova Munisa Toshmamatovna</i>	
UMUMTA'LIM FANLARIDAN DARS SAMARADORLIGINI OSHIRISHDA AXBOROT TEXNOLOGIYALARIDAN FOYDALANISHNING MAVJUD HOLATI TAHLILI.....	463-466
<i>Raximdjanova Malikaxon Gapurdjanovna, Baybabayeva Shoiraxon Ismatovna</i>	
INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCE AND REFLECTIVE LEARNING IN GLOBALIZED HIGHER EDUCATION: A BIBLIOMETRIC ANALYSIS.....	467-473

Received: 1 December 2025
Accepted: 15 December 2025
Published: 30 December 2025

Article / Original Paper

INSTITUTIONAL PRISM OF DIGITAL DIVIDENDS: THE IMPACT OF HUMAN CAPITAL AND "ANALOG COMPLEMENTS" ON THE DYNAMICS OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC INEQUALITY

Fayzieva Dilyora Shamsitdin kizi,

First-year doctoral student at the University of World Economy and Diplomacy,
International Economics

E-mail: fayziyevadilyora3029@gmail.com

Abstract. This article presents a multidisciplinary approach to the analysis of socio-economic inequality in the context of rapid digital transformation. This transformation, while offering growth opportunities, also acts as a mechanism that can reproduce and exacerbate existing structural imbalances. The study adopts the classical theory of human capital and shifts the focus to "inequality in digital human capital," which is caused by the uneven distribution of digital skills. This contributes to the polarization of the labor market. As a theoretical framework, the article uses the World Bank's concept of "digital dividends." This concept explains that the unfulfilled benefits of digitalization result from a lack of "analog complementarities," such as regulatory reforms, skill development, and strengthened institutions. The analysis is supported by critical perspectives that view digitalization as a means of power, in which platform capitalism and surveillance capitalism result in the accumulation of rents and exacerbation of property inequality. The paper also employs a three-tier model of digital disparity (Van Dijk, Warschauer) to demonstrate that the issue extends beyond material access and encompasses the meaningful utilization of technology and its societal consequences. It is argued that without proactive government policies aimed at bridging digital divides and implementing large-scale structural changes, digitalization runs the risk of becoming a force for further societal stratification rather than a means for shared prosperity.

Keywords: labor market polarization, World Bank's digital dividend concept, unrealized benefits of digitalization, complementarity analogies, regulatory reforms, platform capitalism, surveillance capitalism, wealth inequality.

RAQAMLI DIVIDENDLARNING INSTITUTSIONAL PRIZMASI: INSON KAPITALI VA "ANALOG QO'SHIMCHALAR"NING IJTIMOIY-IQTISODIY TENGSIZLIK DINAMIKASIGA TA'SIRI

Fayziyeva Dilyora Shamsitdin qizi,

Jahon iqtisodiyoti va diplomatiya universiteti birinchi kurs doktoranti,
"Xalqaro Iqtisodiyot" yo`nalishi

Annotatsiya. Ushbu maqola tezkor raqamli transformatsiya sharoitida ijtimoiy-iqtisodiy tengsizlikni tahlil qilishning fanlararo yondashuvini taqdim etadi. Ushbu transformatsiya o'sish uchun imkoniyatlar yaratса-da, u mavjud tarkibiy nomutanosibliklarni qayta tiklash va kuchaytirishga qodir mexanizm bo'lib xizmat qiladi. Klassik inson kapitali nazariyasiga tayanib, tadqiqot o'z e'tiborini raqamli ko'nikmalarning notejisini taqsimlanishidan kelib chiqadigan "raqamli inson kapitali tengsizligi"ga qaratadi. Bu mehnat bozori qutblanishiga hissa qo'shadi. Maqolada Jahon bankining "raqamli dividend" kontseptsiyasi nazariy asos sifatida qo'llaniladi. Ushbu kontseptsiya raqamlashtirishning amalga oshirilmagan foydalari tartibga solish islohotlari, ko'nikmalarni rivojlantirish va institutsional mustahkamlash kabi "analog komplementarizm" ning yo'qligi natijasi ekanligini tushuntiradi. Tahlil raqamlashtirishni hokimiyat vositasi sifatida ko'rib chiqadigan tanqidiy nuqtai nazarlar bilan qo'llab-quvvatlanadi, bu yerda platforma kapitalizmi va kuzatuv kapitalizmi ijara haqining to'planishiga va boylik tengsizligining kuchayishiga olib keladi. Maqolada shuningdek, raqamli tengsizlikning uch bosqichli modeli (van Deyk, Varshauer) qo'llaniladi, bu muammo moddiy kirishdan tashqariga chiqib, texnologiyadan mazmunli foydalanish va uning ijtimoiy oqibatlarini ham qamrab olishini ko'rsatadi. Raqamli tengsizlikni bartaraf etishga va

keng ko'lamli tarkibiy o'zgarishlarni amalga oshirishga qaratilgan proaktiv davlat siyosatisiz, raqamlashtirish umumiy farovonlikka erishish vositasi emas, balki ijtimoiy tabaqlanishning keyingi omiliga aylanish xavfi tug'dirishi ta'kidlanadi.

Kalit so'zlar: mehnat bozori qutblanishi, Jahan bankining "raqamli dividend" kontseptsiyasi, raqamlashtirishning amalga oshirilmagan foydalar, komplementarlik o'xshashliklari, tartibga solish islohotlari, platforma kapitalizmi, kuzatuv kapitalizmi, boylik tengsizligi.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47390/SPR1342V5SI11Y2025N15>

In the 21st century, a profound transformation of the global economy, society, and labor market has been caused by the acceleration of the digitalization process. Digital technologies offer vast opportunities for innovation, productivity, and connectivity to global networks, but they also change the foundations of socio-economic systems, often exacerbating existing inequalities.

Understanding inequality in the digital age requires moving beyond traditional economic indicators such as income and wealth distribution. A multidimensional and interdisciplinary approach is required, taking into account access to digital infrastructure, skills in working with digital technologies, opportunities to benefit from technological change, and new forms of power and isolation in digital ecosystems.

Digitalization is not a neutral process that benefits everyone without exception. It is implemented within the framework of existing institutional, political, and socio-cultural systems, which leads to an uneven distribution of benefits from digital transformation among different population groups, regions, and demographic groups. In a historical context, classical theories of inequality, such as those of human capital, labor productivity, and capital accumulation, have focused on differences in educational attainment, skills, access to resources, and ownership of productive assets. These concepts, developed by economists such as Becker, Mincer, and Marx, provided a powerful tool for analyzing income and wealth differences both within and between countries.

However, the rapid development of digital technologies in recent decades has called into question the explanatory power of these traditional models. The digital economy has created new factors that shape inequality in complex and often contradictory ways: unequal access to technology, differences in digital skills, algorithmic discrimination, monopoly on platforms, and the emergence of new forms of labor and capital related to data and digital infrastructure. These factors have led to the need to revise classical theories of inequality and develop new approaches to analyzing inequality in the digital economy.

As a result, modern researchers such as Piketty, Stiglitz, Milanovich, and Hicks, as well as scholars of institutional theory such as North and Rodrik, have significantly expanded the theoretical framework to include aspects such as globalization, the quality of institutions, rent-based behavior, and digital asymmetry in the analysis of inequality.

The theory of human capital, developed by Gary Becker [1] in 1964 and 1993, and Jacob Mincer [2]. In 1974, has long been fundamental to understanding socio-economic inequality. Within the framework of this theory, people are considered as economic agents who can increase their productivity by investing in education, vocational training, health care, and experience acquisition. These investments are expected to generate returns in the form of higher incomes and better employment opportunities. Inequality in this paradigm is interpreted as the result of the uneven accumulation of human capital.

Becker considered human capital as a form of productive potential that is embedded in people, similar to physical or financial capital. Minser applied this concept in his now-classic work, statistically linking wages to years of schooling and work experience in the labor market. This approach has provided economists with reliable empirical tools for analyzing the factors that determine income differences across time, space, and population groups.

However, despite its explanatory power, the theory of human capital has also been criticized and theoretically refined. One of the key criticisms was formulated by Michael Spence [3] (1973), who argued that education itself does not necessarily increase productivity, but rather serves as a signal to potential employers about a person's innate abilities or work ethic.

A more in-depth analysis of the problem was presented by Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis [4]. They argued that educational institutions often reproduce existing class structures rather than serve as neutral tools for increasing social mobility.

The authors believed that school education primarily meets the needs of capitalist labor markets, instilling discipline, hierarchy, and conformity, thereby increasing inequality between generations. In addition, Amartya Sen [5] and Marta Nussbaum [6] proposed an opportunity-based approach. They emphasized that development and education should be judged not only on their cost-effectiveness, but also on how much they contribute to gaining freedom of action and the ability to lead lives that people consider valuable.

In this view, inequality arises not only from differences in investment in human capital but also from differences in the ability to transform these investments into meaningful outcomes. In the context of digital transformation of the economy, the theory of human capital requires further development and adaptation. Digital technologies have changed the composition and importance of productive skills. Traditional forms of literacy and formal education no longer provide stable employment and social inclusion.

Digital skills, including knowledge of information and communication technologies (ICTs), as well as algorithmic literacy, which are key components of modern human capital, are coming to the fore. The uneven distribution of these skills leads to new forms of inequality, often referred to as the "digital human capital inequality". In a study by Goldin and Katz [6] (2009), it was found that technological changes related to qualifications have a more positive impact on employees with a high level of education. This leads to a polarization of the labor market and an increase in the wage gap. A study conducted by Andrews, Nicoletti, and Timiliotis [7] (2018), within the framework of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), also confirms that low-skilled workers face an increased risk of dismissal due to automation and restructuring based on artificial intelligence. At the same time, specialists with digital skills are in high demand and receive higher salaries. In addition, the COVID-19 pandemic has demonstrated the vulnerability of the digital human capital distribution system. As noted by Di Pietro and other researchers [8] (2020), students from socially and economically disadvantaged backgrounds face serious difficulties in obtaining distance education. This increases the existing differences in academic performance and threatens the long-term development of human capital.

These findings suggest that the theory of human capital, despite its importance, should take into account digital inequality as an integral element. Investing in digital education, ensuring equal access to information and communication technologies, and promoting lifelong

learning are not only possible but also necessary measures to reduce inequality in the twenty-first century.

Digitalization, which continues its rapid development, is one of the key factors shaping the modern global economic landscape. While digitalization is often associated with innovation, increased efficiency, and increased opportunities, a growing body of scientific research points to its dual nature.

Digitalization acts not only as a driving force for economic growth, but also as a mechanism that can reproduce and deepen existing socio-economic inequality. In this regard, digitalization should be considered not only as a technological shift but also as a complex socio-economic process, the results of which are determined by the fundamental structures of access, power, and institutional capacity.

The discussion focuses on the concept of the digital divide, which reflects the disparity in access to and effective use of digital technologies. In the early stages of the study, the focus was on the physical availability of infrastructure, such as Internet connectivity and digital devices. However, later scholars such as Jan van Dijk [9] (2005) and Mark Warshawer (2004) have proposed a deeper understanding of the digital divide, including issues related to skills, literacy, and the ability to transform digital access into meaningful social and economic outcomes.

In this context, digital inequality manifests itself at various levels: technical, educational, cognitive, and social. It is often reinforced by existing differences in income, education, geographical location, age, and gender.

Parallel to the challenges of access and skills, digitalization has had a profound impact on labor markets, contributing to the spread of automation, artificial intelligence (AI), and robotics. These technologies have a disproportionately strong impact on traditional and low-skilled professions, which leads to a redistribution of jobs and increased wage polarization.

In the World Development Report 2016, the World Bank presented the concept of "digital dividends", which serves as a theoretical justification for why the rapid spread of digital technologies does not always lead to the expected results in the form of economic growth, job creation, and improved quality of public services. This phenomenon is called the "productivity paradox".

The concept suggests that in order to fully exploit the benefits of digital technologies and avoid increasing inequality caused by the concentration of benefits in the hands of the technological elite. It is necessary to supplement digital investments with appropriate "analog additions".

These initiatives represent important institutional and educational reforms aimed at creating an enabling environment for the effective use of technology. These include: regulations (ensuring competition and data protection); developing skills (including digital literacy and cognitive abilities); and strengthening accountable institutions (increasing transparency and efficiency in public administration). These are key aspects of successful digital transformation.

Regulations. The regulatory environment must be adapted for the digital age to ensure competition and prevent monopolization of digital markets. This includes liberalizing the telecommunications sector, developing legislation that supports labor market flexibility (for example, for platform employment), and implementing data protection and cybersecurity standards.

Skills. Adequate human capital is needed to effectively use and create digital technologies. A comprehensive approach to education is required, including:

- Digital literacy: Basic skills that enable consumers to use digital tools.
- Advanced Technical ICT Skills: Competencies for developing and managing complex digital systems.
- Cognitive skills: Critical thinking, the ability to solve complex problems, and to analyze information obtained from digital sources to make informed decisions.

Accountable Institutions. Effective e-government and the digitization of public services require that institutions themselves be transparent and accountable. Digital technologies can increase transparency, but only when government agencies are open, counteract corruption, and have incentives to effectively use technology to improve services.

The concept shifts the focus from technological determinism to a systematic approach, emphasizing that successful digital transformation depends not only on the tool itself, but also on the quality of the political, social, and institutional context in which this tool is used.

The concept of skill-based technological change (SBTC), proposed by the authors, Levy and Marnan, suggested that digital technologies tend to complement the highly skilled workforce, replacing middle-and low-skilled workers. However, a more recent empirical study by Frey and Osborne found that up to 47% of jobs in the United States are subject to automation, especially in sectors such as transportation, manufacturing, and administrative support. As a result of this process, the labor market is divided into two categories: on the one hand, highly qualified specialists receive advantages in the form of increased demand and increased wages, and on the other hand, low-skilled workers face problems of instability, stagnation, or even complete isolation from the labor market.

Digitalization, accompanied by the concentration of economic power in the hands of monopolies that exercise control over platforms, leads to a more uneven impact on various aspects of society. The rise of companies like Amazon, Google, and Meta has helped shape the system known as platform capitalism.

This system is characterized by centralization, observation, and data extraction. Shoshana Zuboff (2019) calls it "surveillance capitalism", in which personal data becomes a commodity and is monetized on a large scale, often without the knowledge or consent of users.

Nick Srnicek [10] (2016) also argues that platforms function as intermediaries that extract rent, making huge profits. This leads to minimal economic security for employees, especially in the concert and freelance fields. Such digital rentiers contribute to increasing wealth inequality, as profits are increasingly concentrated in the hands of a small number of global companies headquartered in the Global North. At the same time, employees and users, especially in developing regions, do not benefit significantly from their participation in digital markets.

Moreover, the uneven distribution of digital infrastructure and competencies has serious implications for access to basic services such as education and finance. The COVID-19 pandemic has become a critical test for digital adoption, exposing significant differences in students' ability to participate in online learning.

Studies conducted by the European Commission (Di Pietro et al., 2020) and UNESCO (2021) show that students from socially vulnerable families, especially those from low-income

families and those living in rural areas, face serious obstacles due to the lack of devices, Internet access, and parental support.

Thus, the transition to digital education has, in many cases, exacerbated pre-existing inequalities in educational attainment and long-term human capital formation. In the field of financial technologies (Fintech), a similar situation is observed. Although mobile banking, digital payments, and algorithmic credit rating theoretically increase access to financial services, in practice, many low-income people are left out due to a lack of digital literacy, communication problems, or institutional barriers.

In addition, algorithmic decision-making in the financial sector raises concerns about non-transparent credit assessment mechanisms that may inadvertently lead to the persistence of racial, gender, or geographical biases.

Taken together, these dynamics demonstrate that digitalization is not an all-encompassing process. Its advantages are based on existing social structures, institutional mechanisms, and regulatory frameworks.

Without active public policies aimed at overcoming digital inequality, improving digital literacy, regulating platforms, and ensuring equal access to education and finance, digitalization risks becoming a driving force for further social stratification, rather than a tool for shared prosperity. Thus, digitalization should be considered not only as a technological phenomenon but also as a structural factor that determines inequality in the 21st century. In the context of the active introduction of digital technologies in various spheres of public life, traditional models of inequality are insufficient to explain the full range of emerging problems. Researchers from various fields seek to understand the nature, scope, and consequences of digital inequality, which is not only limited to access to technology but also reflects deeper structural asymmetries in knowledge, power, and opportunity. One of the most significant systems for analyzing digital inequality is the three-level model proposed by Jan van Dyck in 2005 and supplemented by Mark Warshawer. These researchers have proposed a new approach to understanding digital inequality that goes beyond just having or not having access to the Internet.

Unlike the "digital divide" concept, which considers inequality exclusively in terms of Internet access, the van Dyck model suggests considering digital inequality at three interrelated levels:

1. Material access to information and communication technologies (ICTs).
2. Skills and digital literacy.
3. Meaningful use of ICTs that bring economic and social benefits.

At the first level, inequality in access to digital technologies is particularly pronounced in developing countries and rural regions. Insufficient infrastructure prevents many population groups from gaining reliable access to the Internet and digital devices.

However, as Van Dijk pointed out, the availability of technology is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the successful use of digital tools.

The second level of inequality consists of differences in the ability of individuals to apply digital technologies, assess their potential, and adapt to them. These skills are shaped by factors such as education, language skills, cognitive abilities, and socio-economic status.

The third and most difficult level of inequality is related to the actual results of digital technology use. It determines whether people are able to use digital tools for employment, training, participation in public life, and innovation.

Warshauer develops this concept by looking at digital inequality in a broader socio-institutional context. He stresses that access to digital tools alone does not provide empowerment unless it is supported by supportive structures such as quality education, an inclusive political environment, and meaningful cultural content.

Together, the work of Van Dyck and Warshauer represents a conceptual shift from viewing digital inequality as a technological divide to understanding it as a socio-technical construct that is deeply rooted in existing models of economic and social inequality. In his study, Richard Hicks (2021) puts forward a critical view based on the concept of "unfavorable digital incorporation". While most of the work on digital integration focuses on the inclusion of marginalized groups in the digital environment, Hicks cautions that integration itself can have negative consequences, depending on the conditions of its implementation.

For example, participation in the digital economy through platforms such as taxis or micro-tasks can bring short-term benefits, but often involves algorithmic control, income instability, and a lack of social protection.

Similarly, digital surveillance, data collection, and algorithmic profiling can target marginalized communities, exacerbating social inequality under the guise of inclusivity. In this context, digital inequality is defined not only by the lack of access to technology but also by how people integrate into the digital space. Uneven and often harmful engagement in the digital world is the basis for analyzing the quality and fairness of digital interactions.

This provides an opportunity for researchers and policy makers to study the political economy of digital systems and recognize that technologies are not neutral tools, but are integrated into power relations and institutional structures.

Along with these structural and critical approaches, researchers are increasingly drawing attention to interrelated aspects of digital inequality, including gender, age, and geographical factors. For example, an extensive study conducted by the GSMA in 2022 shows that women in low-and middle-income countries are still significantly less likely than men to own smartphones or have access to mobile Internet. These gender differences are not limited solely to technical aspects; they reflect fundamental social norms, differences in educational attainment, security concerns, and family decision-making opportunities.

Age is a significant criterion that affects the availability and use of digital technologies. Representatives of the older generation often face difficulties in mastering digital services, due to the low level of digital literacy, problems of physical accessibility, and the rapid development of platforms that do not always take into account the needs of this age category.

Without targeted digital literacy programs and inclusive design approaches, intergenerational differences can only worsen.

Geographical differences, especially between urban and rural populations, create a growing digital divide. Cities tend to have faster Internet access, a wider range of services, and more frequent adoption of digital technologies. At the same time, rural communities face challenges related to poor infrastructure, high service costs, and limited support from State institutions. As a result, geographic digital inequality can exacerbate the economic situation in regions, especially in developing countries.

In the context of solving complex problems facing society, the concept of digital inclusion is becoming a key subject of scientific and political discussions. Digital inclusion is a set of measures aimed at ensuring equal access for all people and communities to the digital space and encouraging their active participation in it.

This process includes not only creating the necessary infrastructure, but also ensuring that education is accessible, content meets current needs, and security and regulatory compliance. International organizations such as the OECD, UNESCO, and the World Bank are increasingly integrating digital technologies into their development programs. As part of their policy strategies, they include comprehensive measures aimed at expanding broadband access, subsidizing devices for low-income families, promoting inclusive digital education, and ensuring transparency and accountability in digital governance.

The researchers emphasize that such initiatives should be complemented by large-scale structural changes, including fair educational systems, labor protection, and anti-discrimination strategies aimed at addressing the underlying causes of digital inequality.

In summary, it can be concluded that theoretical approaches to the analysis of digital inequality have transformed, considering narrow aspects of access to a broader and multidimensional understanding that takes into account the principles of justice. Digital inequality is a manifestation not only of material constraints but also of institutional problems, market distortions, and socio-political isolation.

Therefore, any successful digital transformation program must take these fundamental factors into account in order to prevent the digital divide it seeks to overcome from increasing.

References/Adabiyotlar/Литература:

1. Becker, G. S. (1993). *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education* (3rd ed.). University of Chicago Press. <https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/H/bo3684034.html>
2. Mincer, J. (1974). Schooling, Experience, and Earnings. National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://www.nber.org/books-and-chapters/schooling-experience-and-earnings>
3. Spence, M. (1973). Job Market Signaling. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 87(3), 355–374. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1882010>
4. Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (2002). Schooling in Capitalist America Revisited. *Sociology of Education*, 75(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3090251>
5. Di Pietro, G., Biagi, F., Costa, P., Karpiński, Z., Mazza, J. (2020). *The likely impact of COVID-19 on education: Reflections based on the existing literature and recent international datasets*. Joint Research Centre (JRC), European Commission. <https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/handle/JRC120578>
6. Hanna, N. (2020). Digital transformation: Lessons from the World Bank experience. Springer Nature.
7. Viñuela, M. Á. S., González-Gómez, J. M., & Zavaleta, J. (2017). The Digital Dividends approach of the World Bank: Digital technologies and the development agenda. *International Development Policy / Revue internationale de politique de développement*, 8(2), 164–184.
8. UNESCO. (2021). Global Education Monitoring Report 2021: Non-State Actors in Education.
9. Heeks, R. (2021). From Digital Exclusion to Adverse Digital Incorporation: Technology, Development and Marginalization. *Information Technology for Development*, 27(2), 239–257. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02681102.2021.1900885>

10. GSMA. (2022). *The Mobile Gender Gap Report 2022*. <https://www.gsma.com/r/gender-gap/>

SCIENCEPROBLEMS.UZ

**IJTIMOIY-GUMANITAR FANLARNING DOLZARB
MUAMMOLARI**

Nº S/11 (5) – 2025

**АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ СОЦИАЛЬНО-
ГУМАНИТАРНЫХ НАУК**

ACTUAL PROBLEMS OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

**“Ijtimoiy-gumanitar fanlarning dolzarb
muammolari” elektron jurnali 2020-yil
6-avgust kuni 1368-sonli guvohnoma bilan
davlat ro’yxatiga olingan.**

Muassis: “SCIENCEPROBLEMS TEAM”
mas’uliyati cheklangan jamiyati

Tahririyat manzili:
100070. Toshkent shahri, Yakkasaroy
tumani, Kichik Beshyog’och ko’chasi,
70/10-uy. Elektron manzil:
scienceproblems.uz@gmail.com
Bog’lanish uchun telefon:
(99) 602-09-84 (telegram).