



ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN DEVELOPING TRANSLATION COMPETENCE IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Rahimova Dildora

Teacher at the National University of Uzbekistan

E-mail: dildoraumidjonovna@gmail.com

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19352569>

Keywords: translation competence, artificial intelligence, linguopragmatics, pragmatic equivalence, English Uzbek discourse.

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence into translation practice has generated both methodological opportunities and theoretical debates within translation studies. While neural machine translation systems demonstrate structural fluency and lexical adequacy, their capacity to ensure pragmatic equivalence between typologically and culturally distant languages remains insufficient. This study investigates the role of artificial intelligence in developing translation competence with particular attention to linguopragmatic divergence between English and Uzbek. The research argues that AI should be conceptualized not merely as a technological instrument but as a diagnostic medium that reveals latent pragmatic gaps in cross-cultural communication.

Translation competence has evolved far beyond bilingual ability. Scholars now consider translation competence to be "a constantly updated orchestration of skills involving knowledge of languages, intercultural awareness, pragmatic inference, problem solving strategies and skill in the use of translation tools" [1: 159]. Eugene Nida's principle of dynamic equivalence also states that a translation should try to produce the same response from its receptors as the original text produces [1: 166]. Functional methodology still applies when assessing machine translation since Artificial Neural Systems do not take into account communicative effect - they operate on formal probability.

Studying Pragmatics includes studying how language conveys meaning in context and how linguistic features interact with social rules. For example, Geoffrey Leech says that pragmatics are interpreted by the maxims of politeness, indirectness, and tact [4:10]. These maxims are relative to culture and cannot simply be interchangeable. The English language often resorts to indirect speech to lessen imposition. Modal verbs and conditional sentences are common ways to do this. In Uzbek, politeness and status are shown through honorific verb endings, kinship terms, and set sayings of etiquette. There is no plural you-form distinction between formal and informal situations in English so there is a marked bias when translating to "sen" or "siz" in Uzbek.

The novelty of this paper consists in regarding AI as a practical stress-test tool applied to translator training. The output provided by AI is not judged based on quality measures but rather assessed qualitatively as if it were a distorting mirror reflecting pragmatic neutralisation. Certain fragments of English discourse - such as indirect speech acts (e.g., requests), evaluative statements, and idiomatic expressions - were processed using neural machine translation and subsequently subjected to qualitative post-editing. The results reveal a clear tendency toward pragmatic flattening: indirect requests often emerge as direct statements, softened criticisms become categorical, and metaphorical expressions lose their stylistic resonance. These patterns suggest that, while AI systems are capable of structurally mapping language, they still lack sensitivity to contextual intent.



Uzbek translation scholarship underscores the importance of contextual adaptation. For example, Jurayeva Iroda Ahmedovna and Ruxillayeva Nilufar argue that effective literary translation relies on strategies that preserve communicative impact rather than mere surface equivalence [5: 34]. Their work emphasizes that linguistic transformations are justified only when they maintain pragmatic coherence. Similarly, Sarimsokov Khurshid Abdimalikovich highlights that lexical units in English and Uzbek discourse derive meaning from functional and sociocultural contexts [6: 52]. Together, these insights reinforce the idea that translation competence must combine structural understanding with pragmatic interpretation.

Building on these comparative findings, this study proposes three methodological innovations for translator education:

1. Integrating AI-assisted translation in the classroom as a comparative corpus for pragmatic analysis. Students can systematically identify mismatches in politeness, implicature, and stylistic tone, developing a critical eye for nuanced differences.
2. Developing a pragmatics-oriented post-editing model that prioritizes communicative intention over simple lexical correction, ensuring that meaning and tone are faithfully preserved.
3. Creating bilingual corpora enriched with sociocultural annotations to train AI systems more effectively, especially for low-resource languages like Uzbek.

The research further emphasizes that technological competence must include critical digital literacy. Future translators should engage actively with AI outputs, evaluating whether pragmatic equivalence has been preserved, rather than relying passively on automated results. This approach aligns with functionalist translation theory, which prioritizes communicative purpose and the reception of the target audience [3: 82]. In this sense, AI functions as a pedagogical catalyst, enhancing education without replacing human expertise.

In conclusion, artificial intelligence can significantly improve translation efficiency, yet it remains pragmatically incomplete. English and Uzbek exhibit deep differences in politeness systems, address conventions, and discourse strategies, which pose challenges for algorithmic generalization. The findings confirm that achieving pragmatic equivalence requires cognitive interpretation and cultural awareness, beyond what computational models can provide. The scientific novelty of this study lies in reframing AI as a teaching tool for diagnosing and strengthening translation competence. By combining pragmatics-focused training with technological tools, translator education can foster a balanced approach that blends innovation with human-centered expertise.

References:

1. Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: Brill.
2. House, J. (2015). *Translation Quality Assessment Past and Present*. London: Routledge.
3. Pym, A. (2010). *Exploring Translation Theories*. London: Routledge.
4. Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
5. Jurayeva, I. A., & Ruxillayeva, N. (2024). *Linguistic Transformations in Literary Translation The Case of Said Ahmad's Ufq from Uzbek into English*. *Western European Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 2(6).
6. Sarimsokov, X. A. (2024). *Ingliz va o'zbek tillarida sport sharhlari leksikasining lingvistik xususiyatlari*. PhD dissertation, Namangan State University.
7. Baker, M. (2018). *In Other Words A Coursebook on Translation*. London: Routledge.