

The Concept of Public Administration Efficiency and The Criteria for Its Evaluation

Isayeva Nishonaxon Saydullayevna

Senior Lecturer at The University of Journalism and Mass Communications of Uzbekistan

Received: 22 April 2026; **Accepted:** 18 May 2026; **Published:** 06 June 2026

Abstract: This article analyzes the political-institutional, legal, organizational, and socio-economic dimensions of the concept of public administration effectiveness. It highlights the significance of such criteria as political and institutional stability, legality, quality of governance, rational use of resources, openness, accountability, public participation, and citizens' trust in evaluating the effectiveness of public administration.

Keywords: Public administration, administrative effectiveness, political and institutional criteria, legality, quality of governance, socio-economic effectiveness, openness, accountability, public participation, citizens' trust, comprehensive evaluation.

Introduction: The development of modern society requires state bodies to organize their activities in accordance with new demands. The increasing complexity of social relations, growing public expectations regarding the quality of public services, the digitalization of administrative processes, and the strengthening of public oversight have created a need to evaluate public administration on the basis of clear and reliable criteria. Under such conditions, assessing the activities of administrative bodies solely through the volume of completed work or quantitative results does not fully reflect the actual changes taking place in society.

The issue of determining the effectiveness of public administration is closely connected with political stability, the rule of law, the capacity of state institutions, the quality of public services, and the protection of citizens' interests. At the same time, the existence of different academic approaches to the meaning of effectiveness and the indicators used to evaluate it requires a comprehensive study of this issue. In particular, identifying the relationship between administrative outcomes and the processes through which they are achieved, between official performance indicators and citizens' assessments, and between short-term achievements and long-term

social impact is of considerable theoretical and practical importance.

METHODOLOGY

The study employs a systematic approach, comparative analysis, institutional analysis, logical generalization, and scientific abstraction to examine the political-institutional, legal, organizational, and socio-economic dimensions of the concept of public administration effectiveness. These methods make it possible to conduct a comprehensive analysis of public administration effectiveness on the basis of such criteria as the achievement of established goals, compliance with the law, rational use of resources, quality of governance, openness, accountability, public participation, and citizens' trust. The interrelationship among objective and subjective indicators, short-term and long-term outcomes, as well as general and sector-specific indicators, is also examined systematically.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The views of M. Qirg'izboyev, A. Kh. Saidov, U. Tadjikhanov, H. T. Odilqoriyev, and E. Xojiyev on the state, the political system, state authority, and the legal status of public administration bodies serve as important theoretical sources for explaining the political and institutional essence of public

administration. In the works of these scholars, public administration is interpreted as an integrated system associated with the expression of common interests in society, the maintenance of legal order, the exercise of the powers of state bodies, and the organization of the implementation of administrative decisions.

Max Weber's views on rational-legal administration make it possible to explain the organization of state bodies' activities on the basis of lawful authority, professional public service, and clearly established procedures. Douglas North's institutional theory substantiates the influence of not only formal rules, but also informal norms, public service traditions, and political and legal values on administrative effectiveness. Herbert Simon's ideas concerning bounded rationality and decision-making demonstrate the need to assess administrative effectiveness not only through final outcomes, but also through the quality of decision preparation, the evaluation of alternative options, and the use of available information.

Dwight Waldo criticizes the evaluation of public administration effectiveness as a purely technical criterion detached from political and ethical values. His approach provides a basis for considering legality, justice, equality, the public interest, and responsibility towards citizens as essential components of effective governance. Francis Fukuyama associates state capacity with the ability to enforce laws, implement political decisions, and provide high-quality public services. Christopher Pollitt and Geert Bouckaert emphasize the need to distinguish among resources, processes, immediate outputs, and the broader social impact of administrative activity.

Mark Bovens's views on accountability demonstrate that state bodies should explain their activities and decisions to the public, respond to questions, and assume responsibility for identified shortcomings. Janet Denhardt and Robert Denhardt interpret citizens not merely as consumers of public services, but as members of a political community who actively participate in shaping the public interest. M. Sharifxo'jayev's views on civil society, the openness of state authority, and citizens' socio-political activity strengthen the theoretical foundations for evaluating public administration effectiveness through public participation, social trust, and the quality of dialogue between the state and society.

The analysis of the existing academic literature demonstrates that public administration effectiveness is a multidimensional concept. Its evaluation requires the integrated consideration of the degree of goal attainment, legality, institutional capacity, quality of

governance, social utility, rational use of resources, openness, accountability, public participation, and citizens' trust.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Public administration is an important component of the political system of society and serves to translate the goals and objectives established by state authority into practical action. Its content is not limited to the performance of administrative tasks by government bodies. Public administration encompasses interconnected processes such as identifying social needs, developing political decisions, organizing their implementation, coordinating the activities of various institutions, and evaluating the results achieved. Therefore, it is appropriate to understand public administration as a form of purposeful and regulatory influence exercised by the state over social life.

In this regard, Uzbek political scientist M. Qirg'izboyev states: "The political sphere of society differs from its economic, social, spiritual, and other spheres. It organizes the functioning of society at various levels, ranging from the state as a whole to its smallest structures, and consists of different levels concerned with the implementation of public administration. Had the political system of society not been created, society would have ceased to function amid a whirlpool of disorderly actions" [1, pp. 9–10].

The political essence of public administration is manifested primarily in its direct connection with state authority. On the basis of specific powers, state bodies adopt decisions that are binding on society, ensure their implementation, and regulate social relations. Uzbek legal scholars A. Kh. Saidov, U. Tadjikhanov, and H. T. Odilqoriyev characterize the state as an institution of political power established to govern society, express common interests, and ensure legal order. This approach makes it possible to understand the practical role of public administration in the exercise of political power [2, p. 8].

The German sociologist Max Weber associates the institutional development of public administration with the transition from traditional and charismatic forms of authority to a rational-legal form. Under rational-legal administration, the authority of an official is based not on personal status, origin, or informal influence, but on official duties and powers established by law. Such an order ensures the continuity of state bodies' activities, legal certainty, and their operation in accordance with predetermined rules [3, p. 212].

In analysing the legal foundations of state and societal governance, Uzbek legal scholar E. Xojiyev emphasizes that the activities of public administration bodies are manifested through their powers, functions, forms, and

methods. The institutional status of a state body is determined not merely by the fact of its establishment, but also by its possession of specific public-authority powers, its adoption of legal acts, its organization of their implementation, and its supervision over execution. This approach makes it possible to interpret public administration as an integrated system consisting of interconnected powers, obligations, and mechanisms of accountability [4, p. 257].

The institutional essence of public administration is not determined by the isolated functioning of individual state bodies. The effectiveness of the administrative system also depends on the distribution of powers and the level of cooperation among legislative, executive, and judicial institutions, central and local government bodies, the civil service, and citizens' self-governance structures. Although each institution performs specific functions within the limits of its authority, their activities must be directed towards the common goals of societal development. In the absence of institutional coherence, duplication of powers, ambiguity of responsibility, and delays in the implementation of decisions may occur.

The American economist and prominent representative of new institutionalism, Douglas North, defines institutions as a combination of formal rules, informal norms, and enforcement mechanisms that regulate relations among individuals. This view demonstrates that it is insufficient to evaluate public administration solely through laws, regulations, and organizational structures. The actual state of governance is also influenced by the professional culture of civil servants, established traditions of public service, interagency relations, and the political and legal values prevailing in society.

The proportionality between authority and responsibility in public administration is an important condition of political and institutional stability. Granting broad powers to a state body requires the existence of mechanisms for supervising its decisions and activities. The separation of authority from responsibility may lead to the predominance of departmental interests, a decline in the accountability of officials, and insufficient consideration of citizens' needs. Conversely, a system in which functions are clearly defined, decisions are legally grounded, and responsibility for performance outcomes is ensured contributes to the consistent operation of public administration.

At this point, it should be particularly noted that the American political scientist and public administration theorist Dwight Waldo criticized the understanding of public administration as an activity separated from

politics and consisting solely of technical and organizational methods. His views demonstrate that administrative goals, priorities in resource allocation, and performance evaluation criteria reflect particular political and social values. The problems that a state body identifies as priorities, the interests it protects, and the outcomes it seeks to achieve are connected with political choices.

Waldo's approach demonstrates that public administration cannot be a politically neutral activity. Values such as legality, justice, equality, the public interest, and responsibility to citizens are involved in the development and implementation of administrative decisions. Therefore, evaluating the quality of public administration solely in terms of organizational order or the speed of decision-making leads to a one-sided conclusion. In addition to implementing political objectives, administrative institutions perform the functions of maintaining trust between the state and society, protecting rights, and coordinating common interests.

By synthesizing the theoretical views discussed above, public administration may be interpreted as a multilevel process aimed at implementing the political and social goals established by state authority through legal powers, organizational institutions, and professional activity. This process encompasses the formulation of public policy, decision-making, the organization of implementation, the coordination of interinstitutional cooperation, and the assurance of accountability for performance outcomes. Thus, the political and institutional essence of public administration is expressed in its capacity to transform governmental powers into practical results in accordance with the needs of society and the public interest.

The capacity of public administration to transform political and social goals into practical results necessitates a theoretical clarification of its effectiveness. Effectiveness is a category widely used in evaluating the activities of state bodies. The outcomes of public administration are manifested not only in economic indicators, but also in the maintenance of legality and social stability, the protection of citizens' rights, the quality of public services, and public trust.

In academic literature, the concepts of "effectiveness," "goal attainment," "productivity," "economy," and "quality of governance" are sometimes used in closely related senses. However, there are certain differences between their meanings. Goal attainment indicates the extent to which established objectives have been achieved; productivity refers to the volume of work performed within a specific period and with particular

resources; and economy denotes the acquisition and use of necessary resources at an optimal cost. The quality of governance, in turn, indicates the conformity of decisions and services with legal requirements, established standards, and citizens' needs. Effectiveness is a broader concept that reflects the mutual coherence of these constituent dimensions.

The American economist and management theorist Herbert Simon places the decision-making process at the centre of administrative organization. In his view, organizational goals are realized through the decisions made and actions performed by employees. Therefore, administrative effectiveness is associated with the appropriateness of decisions, the extent to which available information is used, and the orientation of organizational activity towards a common goal. His concept of bounded rationality demonstrates that a decision-making actor cannot fully encompass all possible alternatives and their consequences [5, p. 18].

Simon's views on decision-making indicate that it is insufficient to measure the effectiveness of public administration solely by its final outcome. It is also important to consider the information on which a decision was based, the extent to which existing opportunities were taken into account, how alternative options were assessed, and how thoroughly implementation mechanisms were developed. A decision adopted on the basis of incomplete or unreliable information may, in some cases, produce a positive result by chance; however, it cannot be regarded as an example of sustainably effective administration. Effectiveness encompasses not only the substance of a decision, but also the quality of the processes through which it is prepared and implemented.

The views of Uzbek scholar E. Xojiyev on state and societal governance contribute to revealing the legal and organizational dimensions of effectiveness. A state body must conduct its activities within the limits of its established authority, on the basis of lawful forms and methods, organize the implementation of its decisions, and bear responsibility for their outcomes. Accordingly, the achievement of a goal by a state body should not be evaluated separately from its compliance with legal powers and procedures. A rapid result achieved in violation of legal requirements does not represent the full effectiveness of public administration [4, p. 257].

Goal attainment is one of the principal indicators of effectiveness in public administration. However, the fulfilment of every goal established by the state does not automatically signify positive effectiveness. The legality of the goal, its conformity with the public interest, its impact on citizens' rights, and the

appropriateness of the means used to achieve it must also be taken into account. The rapid and low-cost completion of a task that does not correspond to the needs of society may demonstrate organizational goal attainment, but it cannot be evaluated as politically and socially effective governance.

Dwight Waldo opposes the use of effectiveness as a universal criterion detached from political and ethical values. A public agency may operate rapidly, efficiently, and economically; however, if its decisions do not ensure justice, equality, legality, and responsibility towards citizens, the social value of such administration declines. Therefore, the question "For what purpose and in whose interests is effectiveness being ensured?" acquires significant methodological importance in evaluating public administration.

The economic dimension of public administration effectiveness is reflected in the rational use of financial, material, time, and human resources. Duplication of functions, excessive administrative stages, delays in the implementation of decisions, and the misuse of funds reduce administrative effectiveness. At the same time, it is also incorrect to equate effectiveness with minimizing expenditure as much as possible. Reducing essential services, qualified personnel, or oversight mechanisms solely for the purpose of saving funds may weaken the institutional capacity of a state body. Economic effectiveness does not mean the lowest possible expenditure, but rather an optimal use of resources that ensures the required quality and social outcome.

The social content of public administration effectiveness is manifested through the impact of administrative decisions on living conditions, social well-being, equal opportunities, and public needs. The fulfilment of planned targets by a state body or an increase in the number of services provided may not necessarily mean that citizens' problems have actually been resolved. Quantitative results must be evaluated together with service quality, accessibility, and the level of public satisfaction. Since administrative decisions may affect different social groups in different ways, the balance of interests must also be considered when determining effectiveness.

Uzbek political scientist M. Sharifxo'jayev associates the formation of civil society with the openness of state authority, the independence of social institutions, and citizens' active participation in socio-political processes. This approach suggests that the effectiveness of public administration should be evaluated not only through the internal performance of the state apparatus, but also through the quality of relations between the state and society. If citizens'

interests and proposals are not reflected in administrative decisions, even an organizationally orderly system may fail to produce sufficient social benefit.

The political dimension of public administration effectiveness is manifested in the capacity of state institutions to coordinate diverse interests, ensure political stability, and strengthen citizens' trust in the state. Even when public bodies fulfil their assigned tasks, the legitimacy of administrative institutions may weaken if decisions are adopted in a closed manner, their reasons are not explained, or officials are not held accountable. In this sense, political effectiveness also encompasses the public acceptance of state decisions, their conformity with citizens' interests, and the formation of stable trust between the state and the population.

The American political scientist Francis Fukuyama associates state administrative capacity with the ability to enforce laws, implement political decisions, and deliver public services. In his interpretation, a strong state does not mean unlimited authority, but rather a system of institutions capable of performing established functions professionally and consistently. Sustainable administrative effectiveness emerges when state capacity is combined with the rule of law and political accountability [6, p. 455].

Thus, the effectiveness of public administration cannot be expressed through a single economic, organizational, or quantitative indicator. It encompasses, in an interconnected manner, the achievement of established goals, compliance with legality, rational use of resources, coherence among institutions, social utility, and citizens' trust in the state. In our view, public administration effectiveness is a comprehensive political and institutional characteristic reflecting the capacity of state institutions to achieve political and social goals through the rational use of lawful powers and available capacity, to ensure the public interest, and to align administrative outcomes with citizens' needs.

The multidimensional content of public administration effectiveness implies that its evaluation cannot be limited to a single indicator. Although the fulfilment of assigned tasks by a state body is an important result, the legality, social utility, economic appropriateness, and conformity of such activity with citizens' interests must also be assessed. Therefore, effectiveness criteria should encompass not only the internal organizational activity of a state body, but also the political, legal, social, and economic outcomes produced by its decisions in public life. Such an approach makes it possible to evaluate administrative effectiveness on

the basis of political and institutional criteria, legal and managerial criteria, socio-economic criteria, openness and accountability criteria, and public participation criteria.

In developing the criteria for evaluating public administration effectiveness, the principal areas of state activity, institutional approaches, and the impact of administrative outcomes on social life were taken as the basis. From this perspective, the criteria were divided into five groups encompassing the stability and administrative capacity of state institutions, the legality and organizational quality of activity, the socio-economic results achieved, the openness and accountability of state bodies, and citizens' participation in governance processes.

The first group in evaluating public administration effectiveness consists of political and institutional criteria. These criteria reflect the stability of state institutions within the political system, their capacity to exercise their powers, the coordination of their activities, and the extent to which they are recognized by society. Even when the activities of state bodies are properly organized, overall administrative effectiveness declines if powers are distributed ambiguously, decisions are implemented inconsistently, or institutional responsibility is not ensured. Therefore, political and institutional evaluation is directed not at determining the mere existence and formal powers of a state body, but at identifying its actual administrative capacity.

The American political scientist Francis Fukuyama associates state capacity with the ability of public institutions to enforce laws, implement political decisions, maintain order, and provide public services. Based on his views, the degree to which adopted decisions are implemented, the professional capacity of state bodies, interagency coordination, and the ability of institutions to perform their functions consistently occupy an important place in evaluating political and institutional effectiveness. The breadth of state authority does not in itself ensure administrative effectiveness; the essential factor is whether that authority is exercised consistently, lawfully, and professionally [7, p. 472].

Political and institutional criteria include the clarity of the powers of state bodies, cooperation among different levels of administration, the consistent implementation of political decisions, the professionalism of the civil service system, and public trust in institutions. These indicators do not operate independently of one another. A body whose powers are clearly defined but which lacks qualified personnel cannot perform its functions effectively. Likewise, even

when professional capacity exists, the implementation of administrative decisions becomes difficult if interagency cooperation and accountability mechanisms are underdeveloped. Therefore, political and institutional effectiveness reflects the integrity and mutual coordination of state institutions' activities rather than their isolated results.

The second group comprises legal and managerial criteria, which serve to evaluate the legality, regulation, and organizational quality of state bodies' activities. Although achieving a goal is important in public administration, that goal must be attained through lawful means, clearly defined powers, and fair administrative procedures. A result achieved by circumventing legal requirements, exceeding authority, or restricting citizens' rights cannot be regarded as effective governance. From this perspective, the rule of law is not an external limitation on public administration, but a fundamental criterion ensuring its legitimacy and sustainability.

Legal and managerial criteria include the legal justification of decisions, the clear distribution of authority and responsibility, compliance with administrative procedures, implementation discipline, the quality of public services, and the timely adoption of administrative decisions. They also encompass the avoidance of unjustified duplication of functions, the reduction of excessive administrative stages, and the existence of oversight over the practical implementation of decisions. Only when the legal and organizational dimensions of public administration are harmonized can a balance be achieved between the legality of decisions and their practical effectiveness.

In their comparative analysis of public administration reforms, British scholar Christopher Pollitt and Belgian researcher Geert Bouckaert emphasize the need to distinguish among the resources expended, the processes implemented, the immediate outputs of activity, and their broader impact on society. This approach indicates that the number of tasks completed by a state body should not be equated with the ultimate effectiveness of governance. For example, an increase in the number of adopted documents or services provided may indicate a certain level of organizational activity; however, if they do not resolve citizens' problems, the social effectiveness of administration remains insufficient.

The third group consists of socio-economic criteria, which reflect the impact of public administration outcomes on social well-being and the use of resources. Social criteria serve to determine the extent to which administrative decisions satisfy public needs, take into account the interests of different social

groups, ensure access to public services, and influence citizens' satisfaction with the services provided. Economic criteria demonstrate how rationally financial, material, time, and human resources have been used. In this context, resource savings should not become an end in themselves, and reductions in expenditure should not negatively affect the quality of public services or the lawful interests of the population.

In evaluating socio-economic effectiveness, it is important to distinguish between the immediate and long-term consequences of administrative decisions. Certain decisions may reduce costs in the short term, but later contribute to the worsening of social problems or the emergence of additional public expenditure. At the same time, administrative reforms that initially require substantial funding may, in the long term, improve the quality of public services and reduce citizens' time and financial costs. Therefore, socio-economic criteria should take into account not only current indicators, but also the sustainability, social benefit, and prospective impact of administrative decisions.

The fourth group comprises openness and accountability criteria, which determine the extent to which the activities of state bodies are understandable and subject to public oversight. Openness is associated with citizens' access to information concerning the functions, decisions, performance results, and use of resources by state bodies. Accountability means that officials and public institutions explain their decisions, actions, and achieved outcomes and assume appropriate responsibility for them. Therefore, merely publishing information is insufficient; the information provided must be reliable, comprehensible, timely, and presented in a form that allows for an objective evaluation of the activities of a state body.

The Dutch political scientist Mark Bovens interprets accountability as a relationship in which a particular actor explains and justifies its activities before an authorized body or the public and accepts the resulting assessment and consequences. For accountability to exist, a state body must provide information about its activities, opportunities must be created to question its decisions, and practical measures must be taken in response to identified shortcomings.

Openness and accountability help prevent abuse, corruption risks, and unjustified administrative decisions in public administration. However, these criteria cannot be adequately assessed solely by the amount of information disclosed by a state body. The actual level of openness is determined by whether citizens can easily find the necessary information, understand it, and use it to evaluate the performance

of the state body. Accountability acquires practical meaning when identified shortcomings are acknowledged, responsible officials are required to answer for them, and measures are taken to improve institutional performance.

The fifth group comprises public participation criteria, which are aimed at evaluating the actual role of citizens in public administration processes. Public participation is not limited to citizens submitting appeals to state bodies or being informed about decisions that have already been adopted. It also encompasses participation in identifying problems, discussing draft regulatory and political decisions, submitting proposals, monitoring the implementation of decisions, and exercising public oversight over the activities of state bodies. In addition to the availability of participatory mechanisms, it is also necessary to assess the actual influence of citizens' opinions and proposals on the substance of decisions.

American public administration scholars Janet Denhardt and Robert Denhardt emphasize that, in democratic governance, citizens should not be viewed merely as users of public services, but as members of a political community who actively participate in shaping

the public interest. According to this approach, effective public administration involves not only studying citizens' demands, but also identifying and pursuing common interests in cooperation with them. Therefore, public participation criteria encompass the degree of citizens' involvement in governance, the availability of communication channels, the consideration of proposals, and the extent to which the results of public oversight are taken into account [8, p. 272].

Uzbek political scientist M. Sharifxo'jayev closely associates the development of civil society with the openness of state authority, the activity of social institutions, and citizens' participation in socio-political processes. This view demonstrates the need to focus on the study of public opinion, cooperation with civil society institutions, and the practical impact of public oversight when evaluating the effectiveness of public administration. When citizen participation is limited to formal events and one-way dissemination of information, effective dialogue between the state and society cannot be sufficiently established.



Although the criteria discussed above reflect distinct dimensions of public administration effectiveness, it is not appropriate to evaluate them in complete isolation from one another. Political and institutional capacity should be reinforced by legal order and professional administration; socio-economic outcomes should be achieved under conditions of openness and accountability; and public participation should strengthen the conformity of adopted decisions with citizens' needs. On this basis, it is appropriate to apply

political and institutional stability and capacity, legality and quality of administration, social utility and rational use of resources, openness and accountability, public participation, and citizens' trust in an integrated manner when evaluating the effectiveness of public administration.

CONCLUSION

It should be noted that a comprehensive evaluation of public administration effectiveness is not limited to recording separate outcomes of administrative activity.

Rather, it involves determining their interrelationship, sustainability, and impact on societal development in an integrated manner. The fulfilment by a state body of tasks established for a particular period cannot serve as a sufficient basis for a complete assessment of its activity. The legality of the results achieved, the appropriateness of the resources expended, their conformity with public needs, institutional sustainability, and the extent to which they are accepted by citizens must all be taken into account together. In this respect, comprehensive evaluation makes it possible to integrate the political and institutional, legal, organizational, social, and economic dimensions of public administration within a unified analytical framework.

In comprehensive evaluation, it is important to distinguish between the immediate outputs of state bodies' activities and the ultimate impact they produce in social life. The number of documents adopted, appeals reviewed, events held, or services provided may reflect the activity of an administrative body. However, these indicators do not in themselves demonstrate the extent to which existing problems have been resolved, service quality has improved, or citizens' trust in state bodies has increased. From this perspective, the quantitative indicators of the administrative process should be examined in conjunction with its qualitative outcomes and social impact.

The integration of objective and subjective indicators is also of particular importance in the comprehensive evaluation of public administration effectiveness. Objective indicators include measurable data such as the degree of implementation of decisions, the time required to provide public services, financial expenditure, the number of administrative procedures, and instances of legal violations. Subjective indicators are reflected in citizens' satisfaction with services, their trust in state institutions, and their assessments of the fairness of decisions and the openness of administrative bodies. Reliance solely on official statistical data does not reveal how governance is perceived by society, while public opinion alone may not fully reflect actual organizational outcomes. The combination of these indicators strengthens the objectivity of evaluation.

A comprehensive approach also requires public administration activity to be analysed in terms of the unity of short-term and long-term outcomes. Certain administrative decisions may initially produce rapid results, yet at a later stage they may generate additional expenditure, institutional imbalance, or social dissatisfaction. Another reform may initially require substantial financial and organizational

resources, but in the long term it may improve the quality of public services, the sustainability of administration, and convenience for citizens. Therefore, evaluating the activities of state bodies solely on the basis of results achieved during the current reporting period overlooks their prospective political and social consequences.

In the comprehensive evaluation of public administration effectiveness, the relationship between general and specific indicators must also be taken into account. General requirements such as legality, goal attainment, openness, accountability, rational use of resources, and service to citizens' interests apply to all state bodies. At the same time, each sector and administrative body has specific indicators arising from its functional responsibilities. For example, evaluating the activities of social protection, healthcare, education, or local administration systems on the basis of identical practical indicators would fail to take sufficient account of their distinctive functions. While preserving general criteria, comprehensive evaluation should also encompass indicators adapted to sector-specific characteristics.

The reliability of the evaluation process depends on the quality, verifiability, and comparability of the data used. Although reports provided by a state body itself constitute an important source of information, reliance solely on internal data may create a tendency to present results in an overly positive manner. Therefore, it is appropriate to compare official statistics, independent monitoring findings, expert assessments, public opinion, citizens' appeals, and the conclusions of oversight institutions. An integrated analysis of information obtained from different sources makes it possible to identify not only the achievements of the administrative system, but also hidden problems or issues insufficiently reflected in official reports.

It is appropriate to organize the comprehensive evaluation of public administration effectiveness on the basis of three interconnected levels. The first level encompasses the internal institutional capacity of a state body, including the clarity of powers, the availability of professional personnel, the adequacy of resources, and the state of organizational coordination. The second level reflects the legality of the administrative process, the quality of decisions, implementation discipline, openness, and accountability. The third level is aimed at evaluating the socio-economic benefits of the outcomes achieved, their conformity with citizens' needs, public trust, and the long-term impact of administrative decisions. Taken together, these levels reveal the relationship among the institutional capacity of a state body, its operational processes, and its final outcomes.

Thus, the comprehensive evaluation of public administration effectiveness is a continuous analytical process that serves to determine the current state of the administrative system, explain the causes of achieved outcomes, identify institutional shortcomings, and define future directions of development. The substance of comprehensive evaluation is manifested in the integrated assessment of the degree of goal attainment, legality, institutional capacity, social utility, rational use of resources, openness, accountability, and public participation in the activities of state bodies. This approach makes it possible to evaluate public administration effectiveness through the unity of political, legal, organizational, and social outcomes.

REFERENCES

1. Qirg'izboyev.M. Political Science: Textbook for Higher Education Students / M. Qirg'izboyev; University of Journalism and Mass Communications of Uzbekistan. – Tashkent: Sharq, 2024. – pp. 9–10.
2. Saidov.A.Kh., Tadjikhanov.U., Odilqoriyev.H.T. Fundamentals of State and Law / A.Kh.Saidov, U.Tadjikhanov, H.T.Odilqoriyev. – Tashkent: Sharq, 2002. – p. 8.
3. Weber.M. Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology / M. Weber. – Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978. – P. 212.
4. Xojiyev.E. Legal Foundations of State and Society Governance / E. Xojiyev. – Tashkent: Yangi Kitob, 2017. – 257 p.
5. Simon.H.A. Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organizations / H.A. Simon. – 4th ed. – New York: The Free Press, 1997. – P. 18.
6. Fukuyama.F. The Origins of Political Order: From Prehuman Times to the French Revolution / F. Fukuyama. – New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011. – P. 455.
7. Fukuyama.F. Political Order and Political Decay: From the Industrial Revolution to the Globalization of Democracy / F. Fukuyama. – New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2014. – 672 p.
8. Denhardt.J.V., Denhardt.R.B. The New Public Service: Serving, Not Steering / J.V. Denhardt, R.B. Denhardt. – 4th ed. – New York: Routledge, 2015. – 272 p.