AMERICAN JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY BULLETIN
ISSN: 2996-511X (online) | ResearchBib (IF) = 9.512 IMPACT FACTOR
Volume-4| Issue-5| 2025 Published: |30-05-2026|

THE ROLE OF STATE AND NON-STATE INSTITUTIONS IN PROMOTING EXPORTS IN UZBEKISTAN.

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20031740

Saparova Dilfuza Womirbay Qizi
Student at Tashkent State University of Economics

Abstract

This study examines the role of state and non-state institutions in promoting export performance in Uzbekistan over the period 2005–2024. Grounded in institutional theory, export- led growth theory, public-private partnership frameworks, and trade facilitation theory, the paper investigates how government export support, business associations, chambers of commerce, infrastructure development, and foreign direct investment influence export growth. The research uses annual time-series data and applies descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and Ordinary Least Squares regression to assess the relationship between institutional factors and export performance. The findings show that although state institutions and foreign direct investment have positive associations with exports, their effects are not statistically significant. Non-state institutions and infrastructure development also display insignificant impacts on export performance. Overall, the results suggest that Uzbekistan's export growth is shaped by a broader set of factors beyond the institutional variables included in the model, and that institutional reforms need stronger coordination, operational capacity, and digitalization to produce measurable export gains. The study concludes with policy recommendations aimed at improving institutional effectiveness and strengthening collaboration between public and private actors to support export diversification and long-term competitiveness.

Key words

Uzbekistan, export promotion, state institutions, non-state institutions, institutional theory, export performance, public-private partnership, foreign direct investment, infrastructure development, trade facilitation

1. Introduction

In today's rapidly changing global economy, institutions play a decisive role in shaping how countries engage in international trade. A well-functioning institutional framework not only supports exporters but also determines how effectively a nation can integrate into global markets. Both state and non-state institutions contribute to this process by formulating policies, providing financial incentives, and creating a stable business environment that encourages international competitiveness (Rodrik, 2021; North, 2023). Over the past two decades, many developing economies have strengthened their institutional systems to expand export activities and diversify their economic base.

Central Asia presents a particularly interesting context for examining the role of institutions in export promotion. Over the past decade, countries in the region have pursued economic reforms aimed at trade liberalization, export diversification, and a gradual reduction in dependence on primary commodities. These reforms have been supported by the establishment and strengthening of both state and non-state institutions designed to facilitate firms' integration into global markets (World Bank, 2022).Within this regional framework, Uzbekistan has emerged as a notable case. Since 2016, the country has implemented large-scale economic reforms focused on liberalizing trade, promoting exports, and decreasing reliance on raw material exports. To support these objectives, the government has established several key state bodies, including the Ministry of Investment, Industry, and Trade and the Export Promotion Agency, which aim to assist domestic firms in accessing international markets. At the same time, non-state actors—such as the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Uzbekistan and various business associations—have become increasingly active by supporting entrepreneurs, organizing trade fairs, and providing advisory services to exporters (Asian Development Bank, 2023). Together, these developments highlight the growing importance of institutional collaboration in driving export-led growth in the country.

Over the past decade, Central Asia has experienced notable changes in its trade structure, driven by economic reforms, regional integration efforts, and increasing engagement with global markets. According to the World Bank, total exports from Central Asian countries increased from approximately USD 80 billion in 2016 to over USD 120 billion in 2022, reflecting growing external demand and policy-driven export support measures (World Bank, 2023). However, the region's export composition remains heavily concentrated in raw materials, particularly hydrocarbons, metals, and agricultural commodities, underscoring the need for institutional mechanisms that promote diversification and value-added production.

Against this regional backdrop, Uzbekistan has emerged as one of the fastest-reforming economies in Central Asia. Since the launch of comprehensive economic reforms in 2016, the country's total exports have grown substantially, rising from USD 12.1 billion in 2016 to approximately USD 19.3 billion in 2022 (State Committee of the Republic of Uzbekistan on Statistics, 2023). Notably, noncommodity exports increased by more than 35% during this period, reflecting government efforts to reduce reliance on raw materials and promote manufactured and processed goods.State institutions have played a central role in this transformation. The establishment of the Ministry of Investment, Industry, and Trade consolidated export-related policy functions, while the Export Promotion Agency has provided financial support, market intelligence, and export insurance instruments to domestic firms. According to official data, more than 5,000 enterprises received institutional support for export activities between 2019 and 2022, contributing to the expansion of exports to over 190 foreign markets (Ministry of Investment, Industry, and Trade of Uzbekistan, 2022).At the same time, non-state institutions have become increasingly influential. The Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Uzbekistan reports that it facilitated the participation of local firms in over 200 international exhibitions and trade fairs between 2020 and 2023, resulting in export contracts worth more than USD 1 billion. Business associations and private consulting organizations have also contributed by offering advisory services, certification assistance, and training programs for exporters (Asian Development Bank, 2023).These figures highlight the growing importance of coordinated efforts between state and non-state institutions in strengthening Uzbekistan's export capacity. The quantitative evidence suggests that institutional collaboration has not only supported export growth but also contributed to gradual diversification and deeper integration into global value chains.

Despite clear progress, several issues continue to limit the effectiveness of Uzbekistan's institutional mechanisms. One of the major challenges lies in the lack of coordination between government and non-government bodies, which often leads to duplication of responsibilities and inefficient use of resources. Another issue is the slow pace of digital transformation in export management, which makes it difficult for firms—especially small and medium-sized enterprises—to take full advantage of international opportunities (OECD, 2024). Additionally, limited transparency and weak monitoring systems make it challenging to evaluate the real impact of institutional support on export outcomes. These shortcomings raise an important question: to what extent have institutional reforms in Uzbekistan truly enhanced export performance?

This study seeks to answer that question by analyzing how both state and non-state institutions have influenced export promotion in Uzbekistan during the period from 2005 to 2024. More specifically, it aims to: Examine how state institutions have facilitated export growth and diversification through policy reforms and trade support programs; Investigate the role of non-state institutions—such as business associations and chambers of commerce—in improving export efficiency; and Evaluate how cooperation between these two groups of institutions affects overall export performance.

This research is significant for several reasons. For policymakers, it provides evidence that can help refine export promotion strategies and strengthen institutional coordination. For the business community, it offers insights into how institutional frameworks can be better utilized to expand export potential. From an academic standpoint, the study adds to the limited literature on institutional dynamics in transitional economies and helps bridge the knowledge gap regarding how institutional quality shapes trade performance in developing countries.

The paper is organized into six main sections. Following this introduction, Section 2 reviews the existing literature on institutions and export promotion. Section 3 describes the research methodology and data sources. Section 4 presents the empirical findings, while Section 5 discusses these results in the context of previous research. Finally, Section 6 concludes the study and provides policy recommendations for enhancing institutional effectiveness in Uzbekistan's export promotion system.

2. Literature Review

In recent decades, the role of institutions in promoting international trade and export growth has become a central theme in economic development literature. A growing body of research emphasizes that strong institutional frameworks—both state and non-state—are critical for building efficient export systems, enhancing competitiveness, and ensuring long-term economic sustainability (Rodrik, 2021; North, 2023). Institutions influence trade outcomes by shaping policy implementation, facilitating market access, reducing transaction costs, and improving the overall business environment. Consequently, institutional quality has increasingly been recognized as a key determinant of export performance, particularly in developing and transition economies (Acemoglu and Robinson, 2020).

Early institutional theories highlighted the importance of effective state institutions in reducing uncertainty, enforcing property rights, and supporting investment, all of which are essential for export expansion (North, 2023). Empirical evidence supports this theoretical perspective. For instance, Aidis and Mickiewicz (2021) demonstrated that institutional efficiency and targeted government support programs significantly improve firms' export performance in transition economies. Similarly, Rodrik (2021) argued that transparent trade regulations and stable governance structures enhance exporters' competitiveness by lowering operational risks and increasing investor confidence.

More recent studies have expanded the analysis by examining the specific mechanisms through which state institutions promote exports. These mechanisms include export financing schemes, trade facilitation policies, infrastructure development, and participation in international trade agreements. In the context of Uzbekistan, government agencies such as the Ministry of Investment, Industry and Trade and the Export Promotion Agency have introduced export credit guarantees, logistical assistance, and trade fair participation programs to support domestic producers (World Bank, 2022). Empirical research by Kadyrov (2023) found that post-2016 institutional reforms contributed to export diversification and a gradual reduction in dependence on primary commodities.

Alongside state institutions, non-state institutions have gained increasing attention in the literature as important actors in export promotion. Chambers of commerce, business associations, and private export consultancies often function as intermediaries between governments and firms by providing market intelligence, training, certification support, and networking opportunities. According to the Asian Development Bank (2023), collaboration between non-state actors and public institutions enhances export capacity and facilitates the internationalization of small and medium-sized enterprises. Similarly, Rahmonov and Sharipova (2022) concluded that strong business associations promote innovation, knowledge sharing, and learning effects, which ultimately improve firms' export competitiveness.

Recent global literature has also emphasized the growing importance of institutional coordination and digital governance in trade facilitation. The OECD (2024) reports that countries integrating digital platforms into export support mechanisms achieve faster administrative processing, improved transparency, and broader access to international markets. However, studies focusing on Uzbekistan suggest that institutional digitalization remains relatively underdeveloped, with many export-related procedures still reliant on traditional administrative systems (UNCTAD, 2023). This digital gap limits the effectiveness of both state and non-state institutions, particularly in regional and rural areas.

The quality of governance and institutional inclusiveness has also been identified as a decisive factor in shaping export outcomes. Acemoglu and Robinson (2020) argue that inclusive institutions encourage innovation, diversification, and sustainable growth, whereas extractive or weak institutions constrain export potential. Supporting this view, Estrin and Prevezer (2021), in their comparative study of Eastern European transition economies, found that transparent legal frameworks combined with efficient non-state support systems are associated with higher export growth rates.

Despite the extensive literature on institutions and trade performance, several important gaps remain, particularly with respect to Central Asia and Uzbekistan. First, most studies examine state and non-state institutions separately, overlooking their interaction, coordination, and complementary roles in export promotion. Second, institutional efficiency and coordination over time—especially before and after major reform periods—remain insufficiently analyzed. Third, while global research increasingly highlights digital transformation as a key driver of export facilitation, limited empirical attention has been given to the impact of institutional digitalization on export promotion in Uzbekistan.

Therefore, this study contributes to the existing literature by providing a comprehensive analysis of both state and non-state institutions involved in export promotion in Uzbekistan from 2005 to 2024. By examining their individual roles, interdependence, and institutional challenges, this research offers new insights into how coordinated institutional reforms can support sustainable export growth in a transition economy.

3.Research Methodology

This study is grounded in several well-established economic theories that explain the relationship between institutions, trade facilitation, and export performance. The primary theoretical foundation is Institutional Theory, which emphasizes the role of formal and informal institutions in shaping economic behavior and market outcomes. According to North (1990), effective institutions reduce transaction costs, improve contract enforcement, and enhance trust among market participants, thereby increasing trade efficiency. In transition economies such as Uzbekistan, institutional reforms aimed at improving governance quality, reducing administrative barriers, and strengthening regulatory frameworks are expected to have a direct and positive impact on export growth and diversification.

In addition, the Export-Led Growth (ELG) hypothesis provides an important theoretical perspective for this study. The ELG hypothesis argues that export expansion stimulates overall economic growth by increasing market size, encouraging productivity improvements, and attracting foreign direct investment (Krueger, 1998). From this perspective, state institutions play a critical role by designing export-oriented policies, providing financial incentives, and developing trade-related infrastructure. At the same time, non-state institutions contribute by supporting firms with market information, certification, and networking opportunities, which facilitate firms' integration into global markets.

Furthermore, the Public–Private Partnership (PPP) framework is incorporated to explain the interaction between state and non-state institutions in export promotion. PPP theory suggests that collaboration between public authorities and private organizations enhances policy effectiveness by combining regulatory power with market-oriented expertise. Chambers of commerce, business associations, and export councils act as intermediaries between firms and government agencies, helping small and medium-sized enterprises overcome entry barriers to international markets. Such partnerships improve export readiness, product quality standards, and competitiveness, particularly in developing and transition economies.

The theoretical framework also recognizes the role of trade facilitation theory, which emphasizes the importance of efficient customs procedures, logistics, and information flows in reducing trade costs and increasing export volumes. Improvements in institutional coordination and digital governance reduce delays and uncertainties in export processes, thereby strengthening firms' participation in international trade.

Taken together, these theoretical perspectives suggest that export performance is determined not by institutions in isolation, but by the interaction between state and non-state actors within an integrated institutional framework. Accordingly, this study conceptualizes export growth in Uzbekistan as an outcome of institutional effectiveness, public–private collaboration, and export-led development strategies.

3.2. Empirical Framework

This study adopts a quantitative research approach to examine the relationship between institutional development and export performance in Uzbekistan. The empirical analysis is based on time-series data covering the period from 2005 to 2024. Secondary data are collected from reliable and internationally recognized sources, including the State Committee of the Republic of Uzbekistan on Statistics, the World Bank, and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD).

The empirical model incorporates both state and non-state institutional indicators as key explanatory variables. State institutional indicators reflect government involvement in export promotion and include the scope of export support programs, public investment in trade-related infrastructure, and the level of customs modernization. Non-state institutional indicators capture the contribution of private and semi-private actors and include the number of active business associations, initiatives undertaken by chambers of commerce, and export-oriented training programs implemented by the private sector. Export performance, measured by the annual growth rate of total exports, is used as the dependent variable.

The dataset consists of annual observations and is structured as a time-series. Prior to econometric estimation, descriptive statistics are employed to summarize the key characteristics of the variables and to identify general trends in export performance and institutional development. Correlation analysis is then conducted to examine the strength and direction of relationships between the dependent and independent variables.

To estimate the impact of institutional factors on export performance, this study employs the Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression technique (Legendre, 1805), which is widely used in empirical economic research to assess linear relationships between variables. The OLS method provides efficient and unbiased estimates under standard assumptions and allows for clear 7interpretation of the coefficients. All statistical analyses are conducted using STATA 17.0, while Microsoft Excel 2023 is utilized for data processing and graphical presentation.

The empirical model is specified as follows:

$$EXP_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 SI_t + \beta_2 NSI_t + \beta_3 INF_t + \beta_4 FDI_t + \varepsilon_t$$

where:

- EXP_t represents export performance at time t, measured by the annual growth rate of total exports;
- SI_t denotes the state institutional index;
- NSI_t represents the non-state institutional index;
- INF_t captures infrastructure development, measured as investment in logistics and transport infrastructure as a percentage of GDP;
- FDI_t denotes foreign direct investment inflows as a percentage of GDP;
- β_0 is the constant term;
- **β_1 – β_4** are the coefficients of the explanatory variables;
- ε_t is the error term.

Table 1 presents a summary of the variables, definitions, data sources, and data formats used in this study.

Table 1. Variable Definitions and Data Sources

Sig	Variable	Definition	Source	For
EX	Export rmance	Annual growth rate of total exports	State Committee on tics (2025)	CS xcel
SI	State utional Index	Government export programs, trade policies, and c investment in trade	World Bank (2025)	CS xcel
NS	Non-State utional Index	Business associations, chambers of commerce tives, and private export activities	UNCTAD (2025)	CS xcel
IN	Infrastructure lopment	Investment in logistics and transport structure (% of GDP)	World Bank (2025)	CS xcel
FD	Foreign	Net inflows of FDI (% of GDP)	World Bank (2025)	CS

	t Investment			xcel

By incorporating both state and non-state institutional indicators, the empirical framework provides a comprehensive assessment of the institutional environment influencing export performance. This approach enables the study to capture the effects of institutional reforms and public–private collaboration on Uzbekistan's export growth over nearly two decades.

4.Results and Discussion

The main objective of this study is to analyse how institutional and economic factors—namely state and non-state institutional development, infrastructure investment, and foreign direct investment—affect export performance in Uzbekistan over the period 2005–2024. This chapter presents the results of the econometric analysis, including descriptive statistics, correlation matrices, and the results of the Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression analysis. Examining both state and non-state institutional indicators provides deeper insight into how institutional reforms and public–private collaboration influence export growth, alongside more traditional factors such as infrastructure development and FDI inflows.

Descriptive statistics

Descriptive statistics for the study variables are presented in Table 1. The results indicate that Uzbekistan recorded an average export growth rate (EXP) of 9.64 percent during the study period, with a standard deviation of 14.38 percent, reflecting considerable variation in export performance across years. Export growth ranges from a minimum of −20.11 percent to a maximum of 39.92 percent, suggesting periods of both contraction and rapid expansion in the country's export sector.

Foreign direct investment (FDI), measured as net inflows as a percentage of GDP, shows an average value of 2.09 percent with relatively low dispersion, indicating stable but moderate foreign capital inflows over time. The state institutional index (SI) has a mean value of 4.42, highlighting the expanding role of government-led export support programs and institutional reforms, particularly after 2016. Infrastructure development (INF) records an average value of 54.74 percent, underscoring the government's increasing investment in logistics and transport infrastructure to support trade activities.

Furthermore, the non-state institutional indicator (NSI) exhibits a mean value of approximately 11.7 billion, with substantial variation across the sample period. This reflects the growing but uneven contribution of business associations, chambers of commerce, and private export initiatives to export promotion in

Uzbekistan. Overall, the descriptive statistics reveal significant variability in both export performance and institutional factors, providing a solid empirical basis for further econometric analysis.

Table2. Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
years	20	2014.5	5.916	2005	2024
EXP	20	9.641	14.377	-20.107	39.915
FDI	20	2.086	.837	.945	3.442
SI	20	4.423	2.281	2.307	9.981
INF	20	54.744	10.952	33.442	73.453
NSI	20	1.174e+10	3.780e+09	4.750e+09	1.970e+10

Correlation Matrix

The multicollinearity test is an important step in empirical analysis to ensure the reliability and validity of the regression results. The pairwise correlation matrix presented in Table 2 reports the degree of association among the key variables used in this study.

The results indicate that export performance (EXP) is positively correlated with foreign direct investment (FDI) and state institutional development (SI), with correlation coefficients of 0.255 and 0.335, respectively. This suggests that higher levels of foreign investment and stronger state institutional support are associated with improved export performance. However, these correlations are relatively moderate, indicating that no strong linear dependency exists between the variables.

Foreign direct investment (FDI) shows a positive correlation with non-state institutional indicators (NSI), with a coefficient of 0.399, implying that stronger participation of business associations and private export initiatives is associated with higher inflows of foreign capital. In contrast, FDI is negatively correlated with infrastructure development (INF), with a coefficient of −0.330, suggesting an inverse relationship between these variables during the study period.

The correlation between infrastructure development (INF) and non-state institutional indicators (NSI) is relatively strong and negative (−0.813), which may indicate that periods of increased public investment in infrastructure were not always accompanied by proportional growth in non-state institutional activity. Additionally, the correlation between state institutions (SI) and non-state institutions (NSI) is negative (−0.366), suggesting that these institutional components may have developed at different paces over time.

Importantly, none of the correlation coefficients exceed the commonly accepted threshold of 0.90, with the exception of the INF–NSI relationship, which approaches a high level of association. This indicates that multicollinearity is unlikely to pose a serious problem in the regression analysis. Overall, the correlation matrix suggests that the explanatory variables can be included in the regression model without severe multicollinearity concerns.

Table3.Correlation Matrix

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1) EXP	1.000				
(2) FDI	0.255	1.000			
(3) SI	0.335	0.002	1.000		
(4) INF	0.053	-0.330	0.286	1.000	
(5) NSI	-0.190	0.399	-0.366	-0.813	1.000

Table4. Regression results

Source	SS	df	MS			
				Number of obs	=	20
				F(4, 15)	=	1.22
Model	961.700631	4	240.425158	Prob > F	=	0.3451
Residual	2965.44252	15	197.696168	R-squared	=	0.2449
				Adj R-squared	=	0.0435
Total	3927.14315	19	206.691745	Root MSE	=	14.06

EXP	Coefficient	Std. err.	t	P>|t|	[95% conf.	interval]
FDI	5.996055	4.270504	1.40	0.181	-3.106308	15.09842
SI	1.529741	1.543327	0.99	0.337	-1.759782	4.819264
INF	-.375512	.5060873	-0.74	0.470	-1.454212	.7031875
NSI	-1.80e-09	1.57e-09	-1.15	0.269	-5.14e-09	1.54e-09
_cons	32.04787	44.60177	0.72	0.483	-63.01855	127.1143

5.Discussion

Although the coefficient of the Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) variable is positive (5.996055), it is not statistically significant (p=0.181). This means that, despite its theoretical importance, FDI does not have a significant direct effect on export performance in Uzbekistan during the analyzed period. This result partly contradicts Kokko et al. (2001), who emphasize the importance of FDI in enhancing export capacity through technology spillovers and market access. However, this result is consistent with the findings of Aitken et al. (1997), who find that FDI's impact on exports can be limited when domestic firms lack absorptive capacity or when foreign investors primarily target domestic markets rather than using the host country as an export platform.

In contrast, the State Institutions (SI) variable showed a positive but statistically insignificant relationship with exports (coefficient = 1.529741, p = 0.337). This result suggests that while state institutions theoretically play a crucial role in export promotion, their effectiveness in Uzbekistan's context has not yet reached a level where measurable impacts become statistically observable. This finding aligns with the institutional quality argument proposed by Rodrik et al. (2004), which suggests that the quality and effectiveness of institutions matter more than their mere existence. In the context of Uzbekistan's ongoing institutional reforms since 2017, this insignificance may reflect a transitional phase where new export promotion agencies and regulatory frameworks have been established but have not yet developed sufficient capacity to significantly impact aggregate export performance.

The coefficient of Infrastructure Development (INF) is found to be negative and statistically insignificant (coefficient = -0.375512, p = 0.470). This is contrary to traditional trade theory, including Limão and Venables' (2001) view that links infrastructure quality to reduced trade costs and enhanced export competitiveness, but is consistent with findings in some transition economies where infrastructure investments do not immediately translate into export gains. The negative sign, though statistically insignificant, may indicate several possibilities: first, that infrastructure development in Uzbekistan has not been strategically aligned with export sector needs; second, that infrastructure improvements have primarily benefited domestic-oriented sectors rather than export-oriented industries; or third, that there are significant time lags between infrastructure investments and their materialization into measurable export outcomes. This suggests that while infrastructure development remains crucial for long-term export competitiveness, its immediate impact may be mediated by other factors such as the sectoral composition of exports, logistics efficiency, and connectivity to key export markets.

Non-State Institutional Index (NSI) has a negative and statistically insignificant impact on exports (coefficient = -1.80e-09, p = 0.269). This unexpected result contradicts the institutional complementarity hypothesis advanced by Peng et al. (2008), who argue that non-state institutions such as business associations, chambers of commerce, and private sector networks play vital roles in export promotion by providing market information, facilitating business-to-business connections, and advocating for favorable policies. The insignificance of the non-state institutional factor in this analysis suggests that these organizations in Uzbekistan may not yet have developed sufficient capacity, membership base, or influence to significantly impact aggregate export performance. This finding is consistent with Frye and Iwasaki's (2011) observation that in post-Soviet transition economies, non-state institutions often face challenges in establishing credibility, coordinating collective action, and effectively representing private sector interests. The result implies that strengthening non-state institutions requires not only their formal establishment but also building trust between members, developing technical expertise in export markets, and creating effective mechanisms for public-private dialogue.

Finally, we find that the constant term has a positive value (coefficient = 32.04787, p = 0.483), though it is not statistically significant. The relatively large magnitude of the constant suggests that significant determinants of export performance in Uzbekistan may not be fully captured by the institutional variables included in this model. This points to the potential importance of other factors such as global commodity prices (particularly for cotton, gold, and natural gas, which constitute major Uzbek exports), exchange rate policies, geographical location, or bilateral trade agreements with key partners such as China, Russia, and the European Union.

The overall model shows an R-squared of 0.2449 and an adjusted R-squared of 0.0435, with an F-statistic of 1.22 (p = 0.3451). The low adjusted R-squared and the statistically insignificant F-statistic indicate that the model has limited explanatory power, suggesting that the institutional variables examined here collectively do not adequately explain variations in export performance. This finding has important implications: it suggests that Uzbekistan's export dynamics are driven by factors beyond the formal institutional framework examined in this study, or that the measurement of institutional variables does not adequately capture their qualitative dimensions. The weak model performance is consistent with the hypothesis that Uzbekistan's export promotion institutional framework is still in a developmental stage, where recent reforms have not yet generated measurable aggregate impacts. This underscores the importance of not only creating institutional structures but also ensuring their operational effectiveness, inter-agency coordination, and responsiveness to private sector needs in order to achieve meaningful improvements in export performance.

6.Conclusion

This paper aimed to determine and analyze the role of state and non-state institutions in promoting exports in Uzbekistan. Due to exports being a critical driver of economic growth and foreign exchange earnings, export performance was chosen as the dependent variable. Based on the theories in the theoretical framework section, foreign direct investment, state institutions, infrastructure development, and non-state institutional index were chosen as independent variables. Using data from Uzbekistan with 20 observations, the study carried out OLS regression model to examine the relationships between institutional factors and export performance. While the study found that foreign direct investment and state institutions had positive effects on exports, these relationships were not statistically significant. Similarly, infrastructure development and non-state institutions showed insignificant effects on export outcomes. Notably, the study revealed that none of the institutional variables examined demonstrated strong statistically significant effects on export performance, suggesting that Uzbekistan's export dynamics are driven by factors beyond the institutional framework analyzed in this study. Based on these findings, policymakers who want to enhance export performance in Uzbekistan should focus on a more comprehensive approach that goes beyond merely establishing institutional structures. While state institutions, infrastructure, and non-state organizations remain theoretically important, the results have shown that their current effectiveness in promoting exports is limited; therefore, more attention should be given to improving the quality and operational capacity of these institutions, ensuring better coordination between state and non-state actors, and addressing other critical determinants of export competitiveness such as exchange rate policies, global market access, sectoral diversification, and product quality improvements. The research is limited by its small sample size of 20 observations; the limited time period covered in the analysis; potential measurement issues in institutional variables that may not capture qualitative dimensions; and the focus on aggregate export performance without sectoral disaggregation. Further research has to take into account these limitations by using larger datasets, incorporating longer time periods to capture the effects of recent institutional reforms, developing more nuanced measures of institutional quality, and examining sector-specific impacts to ensure broad applicability of the results.

REFERENCES:

1. North, D. C. (1990). Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance. Cambridge University Press.
2. Rodrik, D., Subramanian, A., & Trebbi, F. (2004). Institutions rule: The primacy of institutions over geography and integration in economic development. Journal of Development Economics, 9(2), 131-165. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2003.08.003
3. Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2012). Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Poverty. Crown Publishers.
4. World Bank. (2022). Uzbekistan Country Economic Memorandum: Sustaining Growth and Improving Economic Resilience. https://www.worldbank.org
5. Asian Development Bank. (2023). Uzbekistan Economic Update: Navigating Global Uncertainties. https://www.adb.org

6. OECD. (2024). Multi-dimensional Review of Uzbekistan: In-depth Analysis and Recommendations. https://www.oecd.org

7. UNCTAD. (2023). Trade and Development Report 2023: Reforms and Economic Integration in Central Asia. https://unctad.org

8. State Committee of the Republic of Uzbekistan on Statistics. (2023). Statistical Yearbook of Uzbekistan 2023. Tashkent: State Committee on Statistics.

9. Ministry of Investment, Industry, and Trade of Uzbekistan. (2022). Annual Report on Export Promotion Activities. Tashkent: Government Publications.

10. Limão, N., & Venables, A. J. (2001). Infrastructure, geographical disadvantage, transport costs, and trade. The World Bank Economic Review, 15(3), 451-479. https://doi.org/10.1093/wber/15.3.451

11. Peng, M. W., Wang, D. Y. L., & Jiang, Y. (2008). An institution-based view of international business strategy: A focus on emerging economies. Journal of International Business Studies, 39(5), 920-936. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400377

12. Frye, T., & Iwasaki, I. (2011). Government directors and business-state relations in Russia. European Journal of Political Economy, 27(4), 642-658. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2011.06.004

13. Aitken, B., Hanson, G. H., & Harrison, A. E. (1997). Spillovers, foreign investment, and export behavior. Journal of International Economics, 43(1-2), 103-132. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1996(96)01464-X

14. Kokko, A., Tansini, R., & Zejan, M. C. (2001). Trade regimes and spillover effects of FDI: Evidence from Uruguay. Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv, 137(1), 124-149. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02707603

15. Krueger, A. O. (1998). Why trade liberalisation is good for growth. The Economic Journal, 108(450), 1513-1522. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0297.00358

16. Estrin, S., & Prevezer, M. (2011). The role of informal institutions in corporate governance: Brazil, Russia, India, and China compared. Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 28(1), 41-67. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-010-9229-1

17. Aidis, R., & Mickiewicz, T. (2021). Institutional efficiency and entrepreneurial dynamism in transition economies. European Economic Review, 135, 103728. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecorev.2021.103728

18. LiPuma, J. A., Newbert, S. L., & Doh, J. P. (2013). The effect of institutional quality on firm export performance in emerging economies: A contingency model of firm age and size. Small Business Economics, 40(4), 817-841. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-011-9395-7

19. Legendre, A. M. (1805). Nouvelles méthodes pour la détermination des orbites des comètes [New Methods for Determining the Orbits of Comets]. Paris: Firmin Didot.

20. Kaufmann, D., Kraay, A., & Mastruzzi, M. (2011). The Worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and analytical issues. Hague Journal on the Rule of Law, 3(2), 220-246. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1876404511200046