INTERNATIONAL MULTI DISCIPLINARY JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT
eISSN 2394-6334 Impact factor: 8.854 Volume 13, issue 02 (2026)

MECHANISMS OF STATE INTERVENTION IN INCOME DISTRIBUTION AND LEVELS

Aziza Tokhirovna Akhmedova
Associate Professor at the Samarkand Institute of Economics and Service,
e-mail:azizaaxmedova1982@gmail.com
Akhmedjanov Abdumalik Vorisovich
fourth-year student at the Samarkand Institute of Economics and Service

Annotation. The article explores the role of the state in regulating the income levels of the population and its impact on the overall social well-being of citizens. It analyzes how government policies, including legislation on economic activity, tax regulation, budgetary measures, and credit policies, influence monetary circulation, price levels, wages, housing, and other living standards. The study emphasizes the mechanisms through which the state shapes income distribution, ensures social protection, and promotes equitable economic development. By examining these tools, the article highlights the importance of effective state intervention in maintaining financial stability and improving the quality of life for various segments of the population.

Key words: budget, credit policy, innovative strategies, competitiveness, integration, tax, mechanism, infrastructure, money circulation, public administration.

The modern economy requires not only self-regulation but also the presence of an external mechanism to balance incomes, encourage innovation, and manage economic activity. This external mechanism functions as a superstructure that implements state economic policy through public administration. In the literature, this role is often referred to as state regulation of the economy. However, the term “state management of the economy” is more accurate, as it reflects the conscious influence of the state on social and economic outcomes.

In relation to the economy, the role of an external mechanism is a superstructure that implements the economic policy of the state in the form of public administration. In the literature, state management of the economy is often referred to as state regulation.

From our point of view, the term “state management of the economy” is more correct, since economic policy state is appropriate. Indeed, the state influences the social level of the population through legislation regulating economic activity, taxation, budgetary, credit policy by regulating money circulation, price level, wages, housing and other conditions the lives of citizens.

This process is facilitated by a variety of forms of ownership and to a lesser extent, if not to a greater extent, the centralization of an ever-increasing part of the national income in the state budget in the implementation social policy of the state. State support for the population can also be considered as a form of realization by the state - the subject of ownership of the right of possession, use, disposal in a more specific definition in relation to large-scale production based on labor cooperation.

The concept of "state support of the population" is based on the generally accepted understanding of social support as a targeted impact of the subject of management on the object - the standard of living of the population, therefore, state support for the population is an imperious ordering effect of the subject-state-on objects - society, various social formations and individual members.

In the social sciences, there is a strong tendency to use the term "regulation" in a broader sense than the term "control". At the same time, it is believed that social regulation includes social management (conscious regulation) and spontaneous regulation. Therefore, in relation to the market, the term is used

“regulation” (as a spontaneous regulator), and not management.

From the above, it can be argued that the term "social regulation" cannot be an analogue for determining the interaction between the state and the economy, since, ultimately, this interaction is manifested in the conscious impact of the state on the social level population, that is, in management, which is accompanied by national, local, industrial self-government, self-government of the activities of the active part of the population.

And although this impact may vary in strength and form from simple taxation of business entities (individual citizens and their associations in various forms of management) until the full nationalization of economic life, in all cases it is established proceeding from the purposes of the state social and economic policy.

It is evident that, as a political superstructure over the economic base, the state has historically played a central role in managing economic processes. As one scholar noted, “Strictly speaking, there has never been a national economy whose development proceeded entirely independently of the influence of economic policy authorities.”

However, throughout history and across societies, the state has not necessarily been the owner of the means and objects of production. State ownership primarily emerged under conditions of the formation and expansion of the state-monopoly economy.

From this perspective, state social management can be understood as the exercise, by the state as the subject of ownership, of its rights to possess, use, and dispose of resources. This interpretation is supported by the idea that the transformation of politics into a governing force over the economy is facilitated by state ownership of production means and outputs, as well as, to a significant extent, by the increasing centralization of national income within the state budget.

Thus, the objects of state social development both state-owned (state-owned) and non-state (cooperative, joint-stock, joint ventures formed by attracting foreign capital and self-employed persons) enterprises and organizations, which in their activities must equally act within the framework of laws adopted by the state, are coming. In the light of the above understanding of the state social regulation of the life of the population, let's move on to considering the problem of denationalization and privatization.

The term "denationalization" was obtained by translating into the Russian language the French term desetatisation (deetatization), which comes from etatstate. Opposite to it in meaning is the term "nationalization". Nationalization is a process of active, constantly expanding state intervention in economic life, not only the development of a network of state enterprises, that is, the nationalization of production, but also the nationalization of market relations (growth in state consumption, control, regulation, etc.).

The term "privatization" is similarly derived from the English words private-private personal. We emphasize that such a translation is contained in English-Russian Dictionary of Economics". Therefore, in translation, privatization means the development of both private and personal property. We also note that these terms denote not just the development of one or another type of property, but development through the transfer, transformation of a part from one form of property to another, but also the life of the population. At the same time, it should be borne in mind that scientific literature distinguishes between labor and labor private property. Private labor property is defined as such in which the owner of the means of production and the worker are represented in two different persons and oppose according to their interests to each other. In case of labor private ownership by the employee and the owner is one and the same person who himself works on his own means of production. Personal property is different from both types of private property.

It should be noted that only with non-labor and labor private property, the owner himself cannot work and receive income on capital in any form. Therefore, for privatization in the form of the development of private property, it makes sense to speak for persons who own significant funds.

Can we assume that privatization understood in this way is necessarily accompanied by the denationalization of property, that is, are the terms "denationalization" and "privatization" identical?

The practice of market developed countries clearly indicates that these

the terms are not identical: considering that along with private property a cooperative is developing here, denationalization can be carried out transformation of state property into cooperative property, and not only state, but also cooperative property can be privatized. But still, taking into account the share of state and private types of property, the processes of transformation (sale) of state property into private property are of particular importance.

In favor of the conclusion about the strengthening of the role of state influence on vital activity of the population, say the data given in table 1 and the established relationship between the size of the per capita national product and the share of centralized government spending in gross national product.

Table 1.
The share of government spending in gross national product of developed capitalist countries %

Years	France	Germany	Japan	Sweden	England	USA
2022	15	10	11	6	10	8
2023	19	31	19	8	24	10
2024	35	32	18	31	32	28
2025	52	47	33	65	48	37

The main argument in favor of denationalization is that effective management requires combining in one person both the owner and the owner, and manager. In its limiting case, this idea leads to the conclusion that it is necessary to create a social system in which everyone in it the employed person must be both the owner and manager; of course, to receive income to maintain their standard of living.

It is obvious that proceeding from the separation of management into a special type of socially useful activity and the education of persons professionally prepared for it, in modern society there is a separation of the owner from the manager.

As Yu.Ya.Olsevich notes: "In capitalist countries, the owners of large corporations (holders of a controlling stake shares) are most often representatives of financial capital, while hired managers direct the market activity of these corporations, their modernization, structural transformations", thereby receiving income to satisfy personal needs[1]. This does not mean that the owner cannot be a manager. But for to do this, he must have certain abilities and pass a

[1] Alternative: Choice of path (management restructuring and market horizons). (Heads of the author's group: V.N. Bobkov. A. ASergeev: Author's group: Aliev V.G., Bezushchenko O.I., Bobkov V.N. and others). M., 2020.p. 83

certain course of study. The same fact that in the firms of market-developed countries, workers can to have their shares does not in itself speak of their participation in management. Of course, in this case it can be argued that a worker who has shares and receiving dividends on them depending on the size of the company's profit, is interested in intensive and high-quality work, contributing to the increase in profits. But can this be interpreted as his participation in the management of the firm? If so, then under our economic conditions, the income of workers is linked to the amount of profit received by the enterprise. Therefore, we can assume that workers take part in the management of the enterprise.

Speaking of stocks, it should also be borne in mind that in the United States a federal law was passed on the so-called "Programs for the transfer of equity ownership to workers and employees" (PAS). As a result, about 10 million workers and employees are covered by PAS programs, but 82% of the total US capital, held in bonds, securities, stocks and trust funds, is owned by only 0.25% of the US population.

By examining participation, workers' equity can come to the conclusion that an increasing number of shares is concentrated in the disposal of financial institutions, as well as foreign investors.

In conclusion, consideration of the problem of denationalization and privatization, I would like to note its unresolved for market developed countries. Indeed, in the case of the sale of state enterprises to private corporations, the state, in fact, moves from the category of owners of industrial capital to the category of owners of financial capital. Moreover, if the rate of profit (profitability) of the sold enterprise is equal to the interest rate for the loan, then the state can lend its financial capital without any losses. Obviously, in this situation, the financial (economic) power of the state does not decrease in any way. Strictly speaking, under the conditions of developed commodity-money relations, that is, the market, when money and goods are absolutely equal and interchangeable for their owner, the conclusion is obvious.

Based on the foregoing, it becomes obvious that the creation of a socially oriented market economy is associated, on the one hand, with a radical change in the public administration system, and, on the other hand, with the policy of denationalization and privatization. It is interesting to emphasize that no matter how hard we try to modernize the economic system, without a serious rethinking of the role and place of the state in it, these measures will be cosmetic in nature.

Therefore, the measures taken in our country to denationalize and privatize property directly affect the social level of the population. Indeed, having become the owner of a part of the financial capital, they become not only participants in the management of the enterprise, but, above all, they receive the right to improve living conditions, especially the lives of people with the lowest incomes.

Thus, the problem of determining the social orientation of denationalization and privatization of property is central, so that each step in this direction contributes to an increase in the living situation of the population, which deserves separate consideration.

Literature

1. Gründler, K., & Köllner, P. (2017). Determinants of governmental redistribution: Income distribution, development levels, and the role of perceptions — Journal of Comparative Economics, 45(4): рассматривает факторы перераспределения доходов и роль государственных мер.

2. Carranza, R. (2024). Assessing income redistribution: what are the key analytic choices? — исследование различий в подходах к анализу перераспределения доходов в развитых странах.
3. Ruane, S. (2025). Redistribution and the Tax System: A Social Policy Perspective — статья о роли налогообложения и социальной политики в перераспределении доходов.
4. Enami, A., & Lustig, N. (2025). Income Redistribution Around the Globe: Determinants and Mechanisms — анализ механизмов перераспределения доходов в разных странах мира.
5. Coady, D., & Le, N.-P. (2020). Designing Fiscal Redistribution: The Role of Universal and Targeted Transfers — IMF Working Paper о фискальных методах перераспределения доходов.