

**THEORETICAL AND ECONOMIC FEATURES OF THE FORMATION OF INCOME
OF SERVICE SECTOR WORKERS (USING UNIVERSITIES AS AN EXAMPLE)**

Shadieva Gulnora Mardievna

Samarkand Institute of Economics and Service

gulnora.shodiyeva@mail.ru

0000-0001-7078-8815

Master's student at the Samarkand Institute

of Economics and Service ,

group MI-224, Rustamova **Feruza Kamolovna**

Аннотация: В статье рассмотрены экономические и институциональные особенности формирования доходов работников сферы услуг, прежде всего в системе высшего образования. Показано, что в современных условиях конкурентной экономики доход преподавателей и административного персонала вузов зависит не только от тарифной ставки, но и от качества образовательных услуг, рейтинга университета, участия в проектах и грантах. Исследованы основные факторы, влияющие на уровень доходов: государственная политика, источники финансирования, организационно-правовой статус вуза, а также структура внебюджетных поступлений.

Ключевые слова: доход, сфера услуг, вуз, заработная плата, стимулирование труда, внебюджетные доходы.

Abstract: This article examines the economic and institutional characteristics of income generation for service sector workers, primarily in higher education. It is shown that in today's competitive economy, the income of university faculty and administrative staff depends not only on their salary but also on the quality of educational services, university rankings, and participation in projects and grants. The article examines the key factors influencing income levels, including government policy, funding sources, the university's legal status, and the structure of extra-budgetary revenues.

Keywords: income, service sector, university, wages, labor incentives, extra-budgetary revenues.

Introduction. The modern service sector is a key sector of the national economy, ensuring not only high employment but also the formation of human capital, a strategic resource for the country's sustainable development. In the context of the transition to an innovative growth model, the service sector is becoming the foundation for structural transformation, influencing quality of life, labor productivity, and social stability.

Higher education occupies a special place in this system—an industry where the work of employees is distinguished by its high intellectual richness, creativity, and significant social significance. Universities shape the professional and value foundations of human potential,

which determine the competitiveness of the national economy and its ability to adapt to global change.

The formation of higher education employee incomes reflects the complex interaction between the state, the market, and society. It relies on a balance between budgetary and extra-budgetary funding, as well as modern labor incentive models aimed at improving the quality of educational services and scientific results. Thus, an analysis of the specifics of university employee income formation is a relevant area of research, allowing us to identify potential for improving the efficiency and fairness of the remuneration system in the service sector.

Research methodology. The methodological basis of the study is determined by the interdisciplinary nature of the problem under study and combines elements of economic, institutional, and socio-labor analysis. The formation of university employee incomes is considered as part of a system of socio-economic relations in the service sector, where the interests of the state, educational organizations, and employees intersect.

Literature review. The formation of employee incomes in the service sector, including in higher education, is a key topic in modern economics. The theoretical foundations of this category date back to the classical concepts of income developed by Adam Smith, David Ricardo, and Karl Marx, who viewed income as the result of the distribution of created value among the main factors of production—labor, capital, and land. In the works of Karl Marx, income is interpreted as a form of remuneration for labor, reflecting the socio-economic relations between employee and employer.

In the 20th century, income theory was developed within the neoclassical school. According to A. Marshall and J. Hicks, a worker's income is determined by the marginal productivity of labor, that is, their contribution to the overall output of production. This approach was expanded and adapted in the service sector: scholars (P. Samuelson, J.M. Clark) emphasized the dependence of income on intangible factors—skills, educational level, social utility, and innovative activity.

Modern research emphasizes that in a knowledge economy, the income of knowledge workers is influenced by both market and institutional factors. For example, in the works of T. Schultz and G. Becker (human capital theory), income is considered a function of investment in education, skills, and professional development. This is particularly relevant for the higher education sector, as faculty income is directly linked to the quality of the human capital they create through their teaching.

In the post-Soviet space, the issue of university staff remuneration has been actively studied by E.A. Klimova, N.G. Mikhailova, L.V. Shirokova, and others, who highlight the specifics of budgetary funding, the dependence of revenues on government regulation, and the need to implement differentiated remuneration mechanisms. Researchers note that the existing faculty remuneration system at most universities remains inert, not fully reflecting the results of research and teaching activities.

In Uzbek academic literature, income generation in education has been examined by G.M. Shodieva, Z.S. Artikov, and Sh.Kh. Khalimov, who emphasize the relationship between the effectiveness of educational services, the quality of teaching, and funding sources. Particular attention is paid to the role of extra-budgetary resources, the development of paid educational services, and the implementation of contractual staff incentive systems. International organizations such as UNESCO, the OECD, and the World Bank, in their reports (Education at a

Glance, Global Education Monitoring Report), point to the need to link faculty salaries to their professional performance and academic productivity. According to OECD research, countries with high levels of human capital development (Finland, South Korea, Germany) have established flexible compensation systems, including a base salary and incentive bonuses based on publication activity, innovation, and international collaboration.

Modern authors (Kotler, 2020; R. Bell, 2021; Yu. Meshkov, 2022) consider the income of university staff as an element of educational institutions' competitiveness. They note that the financial well-being of faculty directly impacts the quality of educational services, academic freedom, and the attractiveness of the profession.

Thus, an analysis of scientific sources shows that the formation of university staff salaries should be considered a multi-level system, including state, institutional, and individual mechanisms. Despite a significant amount of research, the literature continues to require comprehensive approaches that take into account the specifics of national funding models, the integration of universities into the international educational space, and the impact of digitalization on faculty income structures.

University employee income is remuneration for labor, including wages, surcharges, allowances, bonuses, income from research and project activities, and financial benefits. Unlike in manufacturing industries, in education, the results of labor are intangible and manifest themselves in the improved knowledge, competencies, and qualifications of students.

The formation of university employee income is a multi-component process dependent on macroeconomic conditions, government policy, and the internal strategy of the educational institution itself. Unlike manufacturing enterprises, where the results of labor are expressed in tangible products, university employee income is influenced by socioeconomic, organizational, and institutional factors reflecting the specific nature of the service sector. One of the key factors is the state's remuneration policy in publicly funded organizations, which determines base salary rates, the amounts of bonuses, and the procedure for their indexation. In recent years, the state has taken steps to improve the competitiveness of faculty salaries, linking them to the quality of the educational process and research productivity. However, the level of budget funding remains limited, forcing universities to seek additional sources of income.

University rankings and financial independence are important, as an educational institution's prestige directly impacts the volume of extra-budgetary revenues and its attractiveness to applicants, partners, and investors. Universities with high rankings and developed infrastructure are able to create a sustainable revenue system, including paid educational services, grants, and international projects.

Actively attracting grants, international projects, and contract research is also a significant factor. This activity not only enhances the financial stability of the university but also contributes to the development of scientific potential, creating additional sources of compensation for faculty and researchers.

The development of fee-based educational programs and services, including advanced training, master's programs, distance learning courses, and corporate training, plays a significant role. These forms allow universities to expand their revenue base and implement modern incentive mechanisms for staff.

Finally, an important internal element is a motivation and incentive system, including differentiated bonuses, additional payments for scientific and innovative activity, participation in international rankings, and digital initiatives. An effective incentive system not only contributes to increased employee income but also enhances the competitiveness of educational services overall.

Thus, the income level of university employees is determined by a combination of external and internal factors—from government policy and market conditions to the effectiveness of internal management. A harmonious combination of these factors creates the preconditions for the sustainable development of higher education institutions as service providers.

Current trends in the formation of university employee salaries reflect the transformation of the entire higher education system, driven by market and institutional changes. With the digitalization of the economy, increased competition in the educational services market, and the implementation of international quality standards, approaches to determining and distributing faculty salaries are changing.

First and foremost, the connection between the quality of educational and research results and the level of remuneration is strengthening. Universities are implementing employee performance evaluation systems (KPIs) that take into account not only teaching load but also publication activity, project participation, grant application preparation, and international collaboration. This fosters greater personal accountability among employees for their work results and stimulates the development of professional competencies.

At the same time, the practice of extra-budgetary funding is developing, becoming a key source of income. The expansion of the range of fee-based educational programs, the implementation of research and consulting projects, and collaboration with businesses allow universities to increase their revenue base and more flexibly shape their remuneration systems.

There is also a trend toward an increasing role for innovation and project-based activities. As part of national education modernization programs, universities are actively involved in the development of startups, innovation clusters, and science and technology parks. This opens up new opportunities for generating additional revenue, including through grant mechanisms, international foundations, and private investment.

An important area is the implementation of digital technologies—the development of online learning, electronic platforms, distance courses, and blended learning. These tools not only optimize the educational process but also create new revenue streams related to the provision of e-educational services and the sale of proprietary courses and digital materials.

Furthermore, the institutional autonomy of universities is increasing, manifested in the ability to independently determine the forms and amounts of incentive payments, establish differentiated rates, and develop internal regulations on employee bonuses and motivation.

Thus, the modern model for generating university employee income is increasingly focused on performance, innovation, and integration with global educational standards. It involves a transition from the egalitarian principle of distribution to a model of flexible, differentiated and fair remuneration based on the individual achievements and contribution of each employee to the development of the university.

Despite gradual reforms and the introduction of new approaches to remuneration in the higher education system, a number of structural and institutional problems remain that limit income growth and employee motivation. One of the most pressing issues remains the low base salary, which fails to reflect the true labor intensity of teaching and research. Faculty base salaries often lag behind the average wage in the economy, which reduces the prestige of the profession and leads to an outflow of qualified personnel to the commercial sector.

A serious problem is also the high income inequality between different categories of staff—faculty, administrative staff, and support staff. This inequality often fails to correlate with the university's contribution to educational and research outcomes, reducing motivation and violating the principles of pay equity.

Furthermore, the income of university employees is largely dependent on extra-budgetary funds, making the funding system vulnerable to fluctuations in demand for educational services. This limits revenue stability and increases financial instability, especially at regional educational institutions. To overcome these problems, a comprehensive set of measures is needed to improve motivation, fairness, and the effectiveness of the remuneration system. Specifically, it would be advisable to:

Expand the financial autonomy of universities in the area of salary fund formation, which will allow for more flexible setting of wage rates and incentive payments based on performance;

Implement flexible contract systems that provide for individual payment terms taking into account faculty performance indicators, participation in research projects, innovation, and international activity;

Make more active use of project financing and public-private partnership (PPP) mechanisms, which will create additional sources of income and ensure the sustainable development of university human resources.

Digitalization and the implementation of transparent payroll management systems are particularly important. They enable the objective assessment of each employee's contribution, reduce subjectivity, and increase trust in the resource allocation system.

Conclusion. An effective system for generating university employee salaries should strike a balance between guaranteed base pay and incentive mechanisms focused on the quality and performance of their work. In today's environment, this system is designed not only to ensure the social security of employees but also to serve as a tool for enhancing the competitiveness of educational institutions, strengthening human resources, and developing the national higher education system.

Creating a fair, flexible, and sustainable compensation model will transform the university environment into a space for professional growth, innovation, and academic motivation, consistent with the requirements of the knowledge economy and the strategic priorities for the development of the service sector.

References:

1. Смит а. Исследование о природе и причинах богатства народов. — м.: Соцэкгиз, 1962.
2. Рикардо д. Начала политической экономии и налогообложения. — м.: Госполитиздат, 1955.
3. Маркс к. Капитал. Т. 1–3. — м.: Политиздат, 1960.
4. Маршалл а. Принципы экономической науки. — м.: Прогресс, 1993.
5. Хикс дж. Стоимость и капитал. — м.: Прогресс, 1990.
6. Беккер г. Человеческое поведение: Экономический подход. — м.: Гу вшэ, 2003.
7. Шульц т. Инвестиции в человеческий капитал. — м.: Наука, 1971.
8. Норт д. Институты, институциональные изменения и функционирование экономики. — м.: Фонд экономической книги «начала», 1997.
9. Уильямсон о. Экономические институты капитализма. — спб.: Лениздат, 1996.
10. Герцберг ф. Мотивация к работе. — м.: Эксмо, 2007.
11. Самуэльсон п., нордхаус в. Экономика. — м.: Вильямс, 2010.
12. Oecd. Education at a glance 2023: Oecd indicators. — paris: Oecd publishing, 2023.
13. Unesco. Global education monitoring report 2022: Financing education for the future. — paris: Unesco, 2022.

14. Всемирный банк. World development report 2023: Learning for all. — Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 2023.
15. Климова Е.А. Финансирование и оплата труда работников высшей школы: Проблемы и перспективы // Экономика образования. — 2021. — №4. — с. 45–53.
16. Mardiyevna, S. G., & Abdusamatovich, J. J. (2022). Sanoat 4.0 konsepsiyasi va unga ta'sir etuvchi risklar. Current issues of bio economics and digitalization in the sustainable development of regions (Germany), 712-721.
17. Shadiyeva, G. M. O'g'li Isoqulov, Z. S. (2022). Ways to reduce poverty. Galaxy international interdisciplinary research journal, 10(12), 957-962.
18. Shodiyeva, G. M., & Paridaeva, O. M. Problems of family entrepreneurship developing and increasing employment and income of the population and reducing poverty. Gwalior management academy, 23, 210.
19. Пардаев, М. Қ., & Шодиева, Г. М. (2001). Оила хўжалиги иқтисодиёти ва тadbirkorлиги. Самарқанд, самки, 151.
20. Shadiyeva, G. M. (2022). Socio-economic concept of "Family economy". Conference, 1(1), 239-243.
21. Shadiyeva, G., & Saidmurodov, F. (2022). Development of national tourism and theoretical foundations of its competitiveness. Евразийский журнал академических исследований, 2(8), 115-124.
22. Шадиёва, Г. М., & Кувандиков, Ш. О. (2022). Роль семейного предпринимательства в развитии экономики страны. Current issues of bio economics and digitalization in the sustainable development of regions (Germany), 59-63.
23. Shadiyeva, G., & Kholmiraeva, G. (2022). Family business and its development. Евразийский журнал академических исследований, 2(8), 148-151.
24. Mardiyevna, S. G., & Boltaevna, S. F. (2021). The role of public-private partnerships in attracting investment projects in the transport sector. The journal of contemporary issues in business and government, 27(6), 138-145.
25. Mardiyevna, S. G., & Anvarovna, E. D. (2022). Mechanisms for improving the efficiency of family businesses in the digital economy. Galaxy international interdisciplinary research journal, 10(11), 206-211.
26. Shodiyeva, G., Tog'ayeva, D. A., & Sultonov, B. A. (2022). Kichik biznes va xususiy tadbirkorlikni iqtisodiyotda tutgan o'rni. Academic research in educational sciences, 3(5), 610-613.
27. Mardiyevna, S. G., & Oblokulovich, K. S. (2021). Methodology for determining the role of family business in the economy. European business and management, 7(6), 199.
28. Шадиёва, Г. М., & Садинова, Б. Б. (2022). Мамлакатимизда тadbirkorликни ривожлантириш йўллари.
29. Shadiyeva, G. M., & Urozaliev, E. (2022). The essence and stages of development of the digitalization of the economy. Galaxy international interdisciplinary research journal, 10(12), 963-971.
30. Шадиёва, Г. М. (2022). Оила хўжалиги фаровонлигини оширишда оилавий бизнеснинг роли. Архив научных исследований, 2(1).
31. Mardiyevna, S. G., & Zhamshedovich, K. Z. (2023). Synergetics and its role in solving problems of family business. British view, 8(1).
32. Shadiyeva, G. (2023). The role of family business in the development of the service industry.
33. Mardiyevna, S. G., & Ugli, Y. S. N. (2023). Development of entrepreneurship organizing enterprise activity through. Gospodarka i innovatsiya, 35, 564-571.

34. Шадиева, г. М. (2023). Оила хўжалигининг иқтисодий мустақамлигини таҳлил қилиш йўллари. *Journal of new century innovations*, 21(1), 91-94.
35. Шадиева, г., & шакирова, ф. (2021). Иқтисодиётни рақамлаштиришга трансформациялашувида интеллектуал мулкни расмийлаштиришнинг айрим масалалари. *Iqtisodiyot va ta'lim*, (5), 381-384.
36. Shadieva, g. M., & kuvandikov, s. O. (2021). "Mahallabay" Approach to assessing the role of family entrepreneurship in regional development. *Экономика: Анализы и прогнозы*, (3), 122-126.
37. Mardiyevna, s. G., & panjiyevich, k. S. (2023). Economic fundamentals of the development of services. *Gospodarka i innowacje.*, 35, 600-607.
38. Shadiyeva, g., & isoqulov, z. (2023). Narpay tumanida kambag'allikni qisqartirish va aholi bandligini ta'minlashda aholi xohish istaklari. *Евразийский журнал права, финансов и прикладных наук*, 3(3), 169-179.
39. Shadieva, g. M., & akbarovna, k. S. (2023). Theoretical views on concepts of entrepreneurship. *Journal of new century innovations*, 20(3), 42-45.
40. Мамаюнус, п., & мардиевна, к. Ш. Г. (2021). Маркетинг фаолиятида қўлланиладиган ахборотлар тизими ва уларнинг таснифи. *Development issues of innovative economy in the agricultural sector*, 278.
41. Шадиева, г. (2021). Оила тадбиркорлигини ривожлантиришда инновацияларнинг айрим назарий жиҳатлари. *Iqtisodiyot va ta'lim*, (1), 121-126.
42. Shadieva, g. M., & akbarovna, k. S. (2023). The concept of "Family economy", its development. *Journal of new century innovations*, 20(3), 32-41.
43. Mardiyevna, s. G., & farxodovna, m. R. (2023). Small service business trends. *Nexus: Journal of advances studies of engineering science*, 2(5), 123-130.
44. Mardiyevna, s. G., & ugli, a. U. A. (2023). Providing employment of the population in rural areas in the digital economy. *Research focus*, 2(1), 74-78.
45. Shadieva, g. M., & kulmuradova, r. (2022). The role of family business in improving the standard of living and ensuring the well-being of the population. *British view*, 7(4).
46. Shadiyeva, g. M., & urozaliev, e. (2022). History of railway transport development in our country and foreign experiences. *Евразийский журнал академических исследований*, 2(8), 221-226.
47. Shadieva, g., azamatovna, t. D., & abdukhililovich, s. B. (2022). The role of retail trade in increasing the standard of living of the population. *International journal of social science & interdisciplinary research issn: 2277-3630 impact factor: 8.036*, 11, 64-67.
48. Mardiyevna, s. G., & shukhatovna, m. S. (2021). Ways to increase investment potential in samarkand region. *Academicia globe*, 2(11), 44-50.
49. Shadieva, g., & shakirova, f. (2020). Milliy innovatsion tizimni rivojlantirishda investitsiya va innovatsiyalarning o'rni. *Science and innovative development*, 3(4), 9-16.
50. Shadiyeva, g. (2023). Opportunities to develop small business and family entrepreneurship in rural areas.
51. Shadieva, g. M., & akbarovna, k. S. (2023). Providing employment by improving the efficiency of family businesses. *Journal of new century innovations*, 20(3), 25-31.
52. Mardiyevna, s. G. (2022). Ways to develop entrepreneurship in our country. *Barqarorlik va yetakchi tadqiqotlar onlayn ilmiy jurnali*, 902-905.
53. Shadieva, g. M. (2020). Social and economic concept of "family economy", its development and conceptual ways to raise welfare. *International journal of management it and engineering*, 10(3), 68-74.

54. Shadiyeva, g. M., baratovna, s. N., & muminovich, a. S. (2022). Theoretical foundations of national tourism and competitiveness. *Specialusis ugdymas*, 2(43), 3166-3177.
55. Шадиева, г. (2022). Самарқанд вилоятининг каттакўрғон тумани ривожланишида оилавий тадбиркорлик роли “маҳаллабай” Ёндашуви орқали баҳолаш усуллари: https://doi.org/10.55439/eced/vol23_iss5/a62. *Iqtisodiyot va ta'lim*, 23(5), 370-375.
56. Шадиева, г. (2021). Инновацион иқтисодиёт шароитида тадбиркорликни ривожлантиришнинг айрим назарий жиҳатлари. *Iqtisodiyot va ta'lim*, (4), 210-215.
57. Shadiyeva, g. M., & isoqulov, z. S. (2022). Xalqaro tajriba asosida aholini kambag'allikdan chiqarilishi yo'llari.
58. Shadiyeva, g. M., urozaliev, e., & rasulov, j. (2023). Prospects for the development of the railway transportation digitalization system. *The journal of economics, finance and innovation*, 374-383.
59. Mardiyevna, s. G. (2023). Importance of sustainable development in the modern world. *The journal of economics, finance and innovation*, 59-67.
60. Mardiyevna, s. G., & abdusalilovich, s. S. (2023). The role of investments in the process of digitalization.
61. Mardiyevna, s. G. (2023). Importance of sustainable development in the modern world. *The journal of economics, finance and innovation*, 59-67.
62. Shadiyeva, g. M. (2022). The essence of the concept of poverty-theoretical views. *Confrencea*, 5(5), 133-137.
63. Shadiyeva, g. M., & akbarovna, g. K. (2023). The role of family business in increasing employment and welfare of the population.
64. Shadiyeva, g. (2023). The importance of small business and private entrepreneurship in improving population welfare. *Iqtisodiy taraqqiyot va tahlil*, 1(3), 33-37.
65. Mardiyevna, s. G., & navruz, q. (2023). Effective ways to improving business opportunities of the enterprise. *Journal of intellectual property and human rights*, 2(5), 185-192.
66. Shadiyeva, g. (2023). Mamlakatimizda investitsion muhitning jozibadorligini oshirish yo'llari. *Iqtisodiyot va ta'lim*, 24(1), 71-75.
67. Шадиева, г. (2023). Қишлоқ жойларида кичик бизнес ва оилавий тадбиркорликни ривожлантириш имкониятлари. *Economics and innovative technologies*, 11(1), 322-330.
68. Мардиевна, ш. Г., & бекмухамедов, и. Ж. (2023). Рақамли иқтисодиёт шароитида бизнес тузилмаларида фойда ва рентабелликнинг ошишига таъсир қилувчи омиллар. *Journal of marketing, business and management*, 2(1), 87-94.
69. Шадиева, г. М. (2023). Мамлакатимизда олий таълимни ривожлантиришнинг мақсадлари ва энг муҳим устувор йўналишлари. *Современное образование (узбекистан)*, (1 (122)), 10-16.
70. Mardiyevna, s. G., & ugli, a. U. A. (2023). Issues of entrepreneurship development in the conditions of digitalization of the economy in our uzbekistan. *Research focus*, 2(1), 70-73.
71. Shadiyeva, g. M., & o'g'li isoqulov, z. S. (2022). Ways to reduce poverty. *Galaxy international interdisciplinary research journal*, 10(12), 957-962.
72. Mardiyevna, s. G., & oblokulovich, k. S. (2022). The factors of development of family entrepreneurship. *ХI международный молодежный симпозиум по управлению, экономике и финансам*, 24, 564.
73. Shadiyeva, g. (2022). Issues of the development of family entrepreneurship. *Confrencea*, 1(1), 244-248.
74. Shadiyeva, g. (2022). The role of family entrepreneurship in increasing the standard of living of the population. *Confrencea*, 2(2), 254-257.

75. Shadieva, g. (2022). Problems of development of tourist clusters in the samarkand region. *Confrencea*, 2(2), 251-253.
76. Mardievna, s. G. (2022). The role of family business to improve the well-being of the family economy. *Confrencea*, 6(6), 222-224.
77. Shadiyeva, g. M. (2022). The role of the principle of trust in the process of carrying out entrepreneurial activities. *Confrencea*, 6(6), 222-224.
78. Shadiyeva, g., & rustamova, z. (2022). Ways to develop family entrepreneurship and increase efficiency in services. *Science and innovation*, 1(6), 609-616.
79. Shadiyeva, g. M. (2022). Ways to exclude the population from poverty based on international experience. *Confrencea*, 6(6), 133-135.
80. Shadieva, g. M., & boltaevna, s. F. A. (2022). Development of artificial intelligence technology in the transport sector. *Neuroquantology*, 20(12), 3214.
81. Shadiyeva, g., & rustamova, z. (2022). Xizmat ko 'rsatish sohasida oilaviy tadbirkorlikni rivojlantirish va samaradorligini oshirish yo 'llari. *Science and innovation*, 1(a6), 609-616.
82. Шадиева, г. М., & рустамова, з. (2022). Иқтисодийни модернизациялаш шароитида оила фаровонлигини оширишда оилавий тadbirkorликнинг роли. *Nazariy va amaliy tadqiqotlar xalqaro jurnali*, 2(1), 117-123.
83. Шадиева, г. (2021). Теоретические аспекты развития образования в контексте инновационной экономики. *Экономика и образование*, (4), 210-215.
84. Shadieva, g. M. (2021). Socio-economic content of the concept of "Family economy", its development and improvement. *Theoretical & applied science* учредители: Теоретическая и прикладная наука, (9), 559-565.
85. Шадиева, г. М. (2006). Социально-экономическое содержание семейного хозяйства республики узбекистан как субъект микроэкономики в условиях либерализации экономики. *Вопросы экономических наук*, (6), 249-251.