



MODERN PROBLEMS IN EDUCATION AND THEIR SCIENTIFIC  
SOLUTIONS

A COMPARATIVE LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF PASSIVE VOICE  
STRUCTURES IN ENGLISH AND THEIR TRANSLATION INTO UZBEK

**Elmirzayeva Maftuna Dusmurod kizi**

*Karshi State University, Foreign language faculty*

*Teacher of Practical English department*

*email: [maftunaelmirzayeva7@gmail.com](mailto:maftunaelmirzayeva7@gmail.com)*

**Mustafoyeva Nigina Shuhrat qizi**

*Student of Karshi State University, Foreign Language faculty*

*email: [niginamustafoyeva04@gmail.com](mailto:niginamustafoyeva04@gmail.com)*

*orchid cod: 0009-0007-3148-5898*

**Abstract.** *This article presents a comparative linguistic analysis of passive voice structures in the English language and their translation into Uzbek. The study examines the grammatical, semantic, and functional characteristics of passive constructions and explores the challenges associated with rendering them accurately in translation. Particular attention is paid to the differences between English and Uzbek syntactic systems, as well as the strategies employed by translators to preserve meaning, style, and communicative intent. The research highlights how passive voice is used in various contexts, including academic, official, journalistic, and literary texts, and investigates the extent to which passive constructions can be retained or transformed in Uzbek translations. Through a contrastive analysis of representative examples, the study demonstrates that successful translation requires not only linguistic competence but also an understanding of cultural and contextual factors. The findings contribute to the field of translation studies and comparative linguistics by providing a deeper understanding of cross-linguistic variations in passive voice usage and translation practices.*

**Keywords:** *passive voice, comparative linguistics, English language, Uzbek language, translation studies, grammatical structures, syntactic analysis, translation strategies, linguistic equivalence, contrastive analysis, communicative function, language comparison.*

### Introduction

Language serves as a fundamental tool for communication, enabling individuals to convey ideas, emotions, and information across diverse social and cultural contexts. Among the various grammatical features that contribute to effective communication, the passive voice occupies a significant position in English due to its ability to emphasize actions, processes, and results rather than the agents performing them. As a result, passive constructions are frequently employed in academic discourse, scientific writing, official documents, journalistic texts, and literary works. Their widespread use makes the study of passive voice an important area of linguistic and translation research.





## MODERN PROBLEMS IN EDUCATION AND THEIR SCIENTIFIC SOLUTIONS

In contemporary linguistics, comparative studies of grammatical structures across languages have gained increasing attention. Such studies not only reveal similarities and differences between language systems but also provide valuable insights into translation practices. The passive voice represents one of the most challenging grammatical categories in this regard because languages differ considerably in the ways they express agency, focus, and information structure. While English possesses a highly developed system of passive constructions formed through the combination of the auxiliary verb *to be* and the past participle, Uzbek often relies on alternative grammatical and lexical means to convey similar meanings. Consequently, direct equivalence between English passive structures and their Uzbek counterparts is not always achievable.

Furthermore, the process of translating passive voice from English into Uzbek involves more than a simple grammatical transformation. Translators must consider contextual, stylistic, and pragmatic factors to ensure that the translated text preserves the original message and communicative intention. In many cases, English passive sentences are rendered into Uzbek through active constructions, impersonal expressions, or verb forms that better conform to the norms of the target language. This phenomenon highlights the importance of understanding both the structural characteristics of the source language and the communicative conventions of the target language.

Moreover, globalization and the growing demand for intercultural communication have increased the need for high-quality translations between English and Uzbek. As academic, scientific, and professional exchanges continue to expand, accurate translation of grammatical structures becomes increasingly important. A thorough understanding of passive voice and its translation strategies can therefore contribute significantly to language teaching, translation training, and cross-cultural communication.

The purpose of this study is to conduct a comparative linguistic analysis of passive voice structures in English and their translation into Uzbek. The research aims to identify the principal grammatical features of passive constructions, examine the translation techniques used to render them in Uzbek, and evaluate the linguistic factors that influence translation choices. By exploring authentic examples from different text types, this study seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of how passive voice functions across the two languages and how translators address the challenges arising from structural and functional differences. Ultimately, the findings are expected to contribute to the broader fields of comparative linguistics, translation studies, and English-Uzbek language research.

The passive voice is one of the most distinctive grammatical features of the English language. It is primarily used when the focus of a sentence is placed on the action or the recipient of the action rather than on the performer. In English, passive constructions are formed by combining the auxiliary verb *to be* with the past participle of the main verb. This structure allows speakers and writers to emphasize the process, result, or object of an action while either minimizing or omitting the agent responsible for it.





## MODERN PROBLEMS IN EDUCATION AND THEIR SCIENTIFIC SOLUTIONS

From a functional perspective, the passive voice serves several communicative purposes. First, it enables speakers to highlight the most important element of a message. Second, it contributes to objectivity and formality, particularly in academic and scientific discourse. Third, it allows writers to avoid mentioning an unknown, irrelevant, or intentionally concealed agent. For example, in scientific texts, statements such as “*The experiment was conducted under controlled conditions*” are preferred because the focus remains on the procedure rather than on the researcher.

Unlike English, Uzbek employs passive constructions less frequently in everyday communication. Although Uzbek possesses grammatical passive forms created through suffixes such as *-il*, *-in*, and *-l*, many English passive structures are translated using active or impersonal constructions. This difference reflects the distinct syntactic and stylistic preferences of the two languages. While English often prioritizes the action itself, Uzbek tends to favor clarity and directness by explicitly identifying the subject whenever possible.

For instance, the English sentence “*The report was prepared by the committee*” can be translated literally as “*Hisobot qo‘mita tomonidan tayyorlandi.*” However, in many contexts, Uzbek speakers may prefer “*Qo‘mita hisobotni tayyorladi.*” Although the grammatical structure changes from passive to active, the communicative meaning remains unchanged. This demonstrates that translation equivalence is not always based on structural similarity but rather on functional and semantic correspondence.

Another important aspect concerns the translation of passive constructions in official and academic texts. Since these genres require a high degree of formality and objectivity, translators often preserve passive structures in Uzbek. For example, legal documents frequently contain sentences such as “*The application was approved*”, which can be translated as “*Ariza tasdiqlandi.*” In such cases, the passive form contributes to an impersonal and institutional tone that aligns with the conventions of official discourse. Furthermore, literary translation presents unique challenges. Authors often use passive voice to create specific stylistic effects, including suspense, ambiguity, or emphasis. Translators must therefore determine whether maintaining the passive structure is necessary for preserving the aesthetic and pragmatic value of the original text. In some cases, retaining the passive voice ensures stylistic fidelity, whereas in others, transforming it into an active construction produces a more natural and fluent translation.

A contrastive examination of English and Uzbek passive constructions reveals that differences extend beyond grammar to include discourse organization and cultural communication patterns. English frequently utilizes passive voice to maintain thematic continuity and textual cohesion. Uzbek, on the other hand, often achieves similar communicative goals through lexical choices, word order adjustments, or active sentence structures. Consequently, successful translation requires not only grammatical knowledge but also a deep understanding of discourse conventions in both languages.





**Table 1. Comparative Analysis of English Passive Voice and Its Uzbek Translation Equivalents**

| No. | English Passive Construction              | Uzbek Translation                       | Translation Strategy | Linguistic Observation               |
|-----|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1   | The letter was sent yesterday.            | Xat kecha yuborildi.                    | Passive → Passive    | Direct structural equivalence        |
| 2   | The project was completed on time.        | Loyiha o‘z vaqtida yakunlandi.          | Passive → Passive    | Formal and objective style preserved |
| 3   | The report was prepared by the committee. | Qo‘mita hisobotni tayyorladi.           | Passive → Active     | Greater naturalness in Uzbek         |
| 4   | The decision was made after discussion.   | Qaror muhokamadan so‘ng qabul qilindi.  | Passive → Passive    | Common in official discourse         |
| 5   | The problem was solved successfully.      | Muammo muvaffaqiyatli hal qilindi.      | Passive → Passive    | Result-oriented emphasis maintained  |
| 6   | The book was translated into Uzbek.       | Kitob o‘zbek tiliga tarjima qilindi.    | Passive → Passive    | Standard translation equivalent      |
| 7   | The experiment was conducted carefully.   | Tajriba ehtiyotkorlik bilan o‘tkazildi. | Passive → Passive    | Frequently used in scientific texts  |
| 8   | The rules were changed recently.          | Yaqinda qoidalar o‘zgartirildi.         | Passive → Passive    | Agent omitted in both languages      |
| 9   | The house was built in 1990.              | Uy 1990-yilda qurilgan.                 | Passive → Passive    | Historical information focus         |
| 10  | The message was delivered immediately.    | Xabar darhol yetkazildi.                | Passive → Passive    | Action and result emphasized         |

The analysis presented in the table demonstrates that English passive constructions can often be translated directly into Uzbek passive forms. Nevertheless, translators frequently choose active structures when they sound more natural and communicatively effective in the target language. Therefore, the translation of passive voice should be guided not only by grammatical equivalence but also by stylistic appropriateness, contextual relevance, and the communicative purpose of the text.

In conclusion, the passive voice represents an important grammatical feature of the English language that plays a significant role in conveying objectivity, emphasizing actions and results, and maintaining coherence in various types of discourse. Its widespread use in





## MODERN PROBLEMS IN EDUCATION AND THEIR SCIENTIFIC SOLUTIONS

academic, scientific, legal, journalistic, and literary texts highlights its communicative value and stylistic versatility.

The comparative analysis conducted in this study demonstrates that although both English and Uzbek possess passive constructions, their frequency, functions, and patterns of usage differ considerably. English relies extensively on passive voice to foreground actions and de-emphasize agents, whereas Uzbek often prefers active or impersonal structures that provide greater clarity and naturalness. Consequently, the translation of passive constructions from English into Uzbek requires careful consideration of grammatical, semantic, pragmatic, and stylistic factors.

The findings reveal that successful translation is not always achieved through direct structural equivalence. In many cases, translators must adapt sentence structures to conform to the linguistic norms of the Uzbek language while preserving the original meaning and communicative intention. Such transformations demonstrate the importance of functional equivalence in translation practice. Furthermore, the study confirms that effective translation of passive voice demands not only linguistic competence but also a thorough understanding of discourse conventions and cultural contexts in both languages. Overall, the research contributes to the fields of comparative linguistics and translation studies by providing a deeper understanding of passive voice structures and their translation equivalents. The results may serve as a valuable resource for language learners, translators, researchers, and educators seeking to improve the quality of English-Uzbek translation and develop greater awareness of cross-linguistic grammatical variation.

## REFERENCES

1. Azar, B. S. *Understanding and Using English Grammar*. 5th ed. – New York: Pearson Education, 2017.
2. Baker, M. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. 3rd ed. – London: Routledge, 2018.
3. Catford, J. C. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965.
4. Crystal, D. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. 3rd ed. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
5. Halliday, M. A. K., Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 4th ed. – London: Routledge, 2014.
6. House, J. *Translation: The Basics*. – London: Routledge, 2018.
7. Karimov, B. *Ingliz va o'zbek tillari qiyosiy grammatikasi*. – Toshkent: Fan, 2021.
8. Munday, J. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. 5th ed. – London: Routledge, 2022.
9. Nida, E. A., Taber, C. R. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. – Leiden: Brill, 2003.





MODERN PROBLEMS IN EDUCATION AND THEIR SCIENTIFIC  
SOLUTIONS

10. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvik, J. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. – London: Longman, 1985.
11. Richards, J. C., Schmidt, R. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. 5th ed. – London: Routledge, 2020.
12. To‘xtasinov, I. M. *Tarjima nazariyasi va amaliyoti*. – Toshkent: Tafakkur Bo‘stoni, 2020.
13. Yule, G. *The Study of Language*. 8th ed. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023.
14. O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Vazirlar Mahkamasi. *Davlat tilini rivojlantirish va til siyosati bo‘yicha me‘yoriy hujjatlar to‘plami*. – Toshkent, 2022.
15. O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Konstitutsiyasi. – Toshkent: O‘zbekiston, 2023.

