COMPARATIVE SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION TERMINOLOGY IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH

Gulmira Ergasheva Bakhrom kizi

doctoral student, Alisher Navo'i Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature.
E-mail: gulmiraergasheva127@gmail.com
ORCID ID: 0009-0002-7510-4915

ABSTRACT: *This article examines the comparative-semantic features of public administration terminology in Uzbek and English. The study analyzes the historical development, conceptual structure, and functional characteristics of administrative terms across both languages. Drawing on Weber, Simon, Easton, and Hood's theoretical frameworks, it identifies key semantic differences and equivalence challenges. The research shows that English governance terminology is more systematized, while Uzbek terms reflect historical layers and ongoing language reforms. Significant semantic gaps exist in translating concepts such as governance, policy, and accountability. The findings highlight the need for terminological standardization and deeper conceptual alignment. The study contributes to improving cross-linguistic understanding and supports the modernization of Uzbek administrative terminology.*

KEYWORDS: *public administration terminology; governance; semantic analysis; comparative linguistics; Uzbek terminology; English terminology; accountability; policy; cognitive linguistics; discourse analysis.*

INTRODUCTION

In the context of globalization, modernization of the public administration system, enhancement of transparency, openness, and efficiency in governance represent the core priorities of contemporary socio-political processes. These changes necessitate a systematic study of administrative terminology, including its formation, semantic development, and normative usage. Public administration terminology denotes the conceptual units that describe the structure of state authority, distribution of powers, mechanisms of decision-making, public participation, and practical administrative processes.

Modern linguistics requires that specialized vocabulary be examined not only from a lexical perspective but also through cognitive, discursive, semantic, and functional approaches. Accordingly, the study of administrative terminology lies at the intersection of several linguistic disciplines, including terminology theory, cognitive linguistics, comparative

Latin American Journal of Education

linguistics, discourse analysis, and corpus linguistics.

The purpose of this article is to analyze the formation, conceptual-semantic structure, and functional characteristics of public administration terminology in Uzbek and English on the basis of comparative linguistic methodology.

1. Historical and Linguistic Foundations of Public Administration Terminology in Uzbek

Administrative terminology in Uzbek has evolved since the earliest periods of Turkic statehood. The Orkhon-Enisei inscriptions contain numerous political and administrative titles such as elteber, tudun, yabghu, bek, and qagan, which reflect the hierarchical organization and governance practices of the Turkic states. These terms served as conceptual markers of political authority and institutional roles.

In Uzbek linguistics, B. Madvaliev characterizes terms as "precise, systematic and normative lexical units," emphasizing their role in ensuring terminological clarity (Madvaliev, 1996: 54–60). A. Mahmudov highlights that the internal derivational capabilities of Uzbek are sufficient to create modern terms, arguing that domestic word-formation models should prevail over calques or direct borrowings (Mahmudov, 2010: 102–115).

Traditional administrative terms such as aroz, devon, farmon, mirshab, hokim, and rais have long been part of Uzbek governance vocabulary. During the post-independence period, these terms expanded semantically, and numerous new concepts entered the lexicon, including strategy, concept, monitoring, regulation, authority, and participatory budgeting.

Furthermore, state language policies — particularly the Presidential Decrees PF-5850 (2019) and PF-6084 (2020) — emphasize the need to standardize public administration terminology and introduce unified terminology into administrative practices. This underscores the relevance of conducting scientific research aimed at systematizing and norming Uzbek administrative terminology.

2. Theoretical Foundations of Public Administration Terminology in English

English administrative terminology is deeply rooted in Western political philosophy, the evolution of state institutions, and the development of public administration theory. Max Weber's fundamental theory of bureaucracy remains one of the key bases for many administrative terms. Weber conceptualizes bureaucracy as "the technically most efficient apparatus of administration," highlighting its features such as hierarchy, official duties, regulatory documentation, and impersonality (Weber, 1947: 154–205; 337–339).

In the mid-20th century, Herbert Simon introduced a cognitive perspective into administrative studies, shaping the scientific meaning of terms such as decision-making and bounded rationality. Simon argues that decision-making is

influenced not only by formal rules but also by psychological and organizational factors (Simon, 1976: 259).

David Easton's "political system" model contributed concepts such as input, output, and feedback, which reflect the dynamic nature of political processes (Easton, 1965: 25–47).

By the late 20th century, Christopher Hood's New Public Management (NPM) paradigm introduced new terminology emphasizing efficiency, performance measurement, managerial accountability, and customer-oriented administration (Hood, 1991: 3–19).

Today, the OECD's (2015) international governance framework defines widely applied administrative categories including transparency, participation, rule of law, and accountability, which serve as global governance standards.

3. Comparative Semantic Features of Public Administration Terminology in Uzbek and English

3.1. Formation of the Semantic Field

Although public administration terminology in both languages describes governance structures, institutional functions, and administrative procedures, the scope of the semantic field differs significantly.

For instance:

governance in English refers to institutional coordination, regulatory mechanisms, accountability systems, transparency, and public engagement;

boshqaruv in Uzbek tends to emphasize managerial processes, administrative authority, and hierarchical relations.

Thus, the two terms are not fully equivalent semantically.

3.2. Pragmatic and Functional Differences

The English term accountability represents a multifaceted concept that includes public oversight, parliamentary control, transparent reporting, and institutional responsibility.

The Uzbek equivalent javobgarlik mainly denotes legal or disciplinary liability.

Consequently, accountability carries broader social and institutional meanings that "javobgarlik" does not fully capture.

3.3. Morphological Characteristics

English administrative terminology is typically formed through:

derivational suffixes (-ment, -tion, -ance, -ability, -ship, -ity);

compound structures (policy-making, performance audit);

multiword units (public sector, policy output).

Uzbek terminology relies on:

Persian-Tajik components (hokimiyat, vakolat, boshqaruv);

Arabic roots (nizom, tartib, farmon);

affixation (-chi, -lik, -goh, -noma).

3.4. Conceptual Structure

Bevir (2013) views governance as an interaction of political institutions, actors, regulatory mechanisms, and accountability systems (Bevir, 2013: 1–29).

Latin American Journal of Education

www.lajoe.org

Rhodes conceptualizes governance as a multi-centered network system (Rhodes, 2007: 47–82).

These conceptual layers are not yet fully represented in Uzbek administrative terminology.

4. Challenges and Equivalence Issues in Uzbek–English Administrative Terminology

4.1. Semantic Gaps

Several English terms lack precise Uzbek equivalents:

policy → often translated as "siyosat," but actually denotes a strategic document;

governance → rendered as "boshqaruv," yet institutional dimensions remain unexpressed;

public value → lacks a consistent Uzbek equivalent.

4.2. Cultural and Contextual Differences

The English term civil society encompasses institutional characteristics (NGOs, advocacy organizations), whereas the Uzbek fuqarolik jamiyati frequently conveys a broader socio-political meaning with fewer institutional nuances.

4.3. Normative Discrepancies

English distinguishes policy, strategy, regulation clearly;

Uzbek administrative texts often use yo'nalish, siyosat, strategiya interchangeably.

This indicates a need for semantic standardization.

CONCLUSION

Although public administration terminology in Uzbek and English shares a common conceptual domain, the two languages diverge in semantic scope, functional application, discursive roles, and morphological structure. English administrative terminology is grounded in well-established academic schools, while Uzbek terminology reflects historical, political, and sociocultural developments.

The comparative-semantic analysis presented in this article demonstrates that many English administrative terms have no full equivalents in Uzbek, which necessitates the creation of standardized definitions, unified terminological norms, and further linguistic research.

REFERENCES:

1. Weber, M. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. — New York: Oxford University Press, 1947. — P. 154–205; 337–339.

2. Simon, H. Administrative Behavior. — New York: Free Press, 1976. — P. 259.

3. Easton, D. A Systems Analysis of Political Life. — New York: Wiley, 1965. — P. 25–47.

4. Hood, C. "A Public Management for All Seasons?" // Public Administration. — 1991. — Vol. 69. — P. 3–19.

5. OECD. Principles of Good Governance. — Paris: OECD Publishing, 2015.

Latin American Journal of Education

6. Madvaliev, B. Til va jamiyat. — Tashkent: Fan, 1996. — P. 54–60.

7. Mahmudov, A. O'zbek tili taraqqiyoti masalalari. — Tashkent: Akademnashr, 2010. — P. 102–115.

8. Bevir, M. Governance: A Very Short Introduction. — Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. — P. 1–29.

9. Rhodes, R. A. W. Understanding Governance. — Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2007. — P. 47–82.