Review of Muldisciplinary Academic and Pratice Studies
ISSN: 3110-0635, Vol 2, No 2, 2025, 131-142 https://doi.org/10.61401/rmaps.v2i2.255

Translational Challenges Of Robotics Terminology In English And Uzbek Languages

Rasulova Gulmira Xursanbek Gizi
Namangan Technical University
RasulovaGulmira5@gmail.com

Article History
Received on 29 June 2025
1st Revision on 27 July 2025
2nd Revision on 30 July 2025
Accepted on 28 August 2025

Abstract
Purpose: This study aims to explore the translational challenges of robotics terminology between English and Uzbek from a functional-semantic perspective, focusing on the structural, conceptual, and contextual factors influencing accuracy and clarity. As robotics terminology expands globally, the absence of direct Uzbek equivalents often causes inconsistencies and ambiguity in translation.
Research methodology: A qualitative descriptive approach was employed, combining linguistic comparison, corpus-based analysis of robotics texts, and expert interviews with translators and engineers. The study analyzed key robotics terms such as robot, sensor, actuator, and artificial intelligence to identify patterns of borrowing, calquing, and descriptive translation, and to evaluate their semantic and functional adequacy.
Results: Findings reveal that borrowing is the most frequently used strategy due to the absence of native equivalents, but it often leads to semantic opacity for general audiences. Calquing and descriptive translation provide conceptual clarity but may distort the technical precision of original terms. The study highlights the inconsistency in current usage and the need for terminological harmonization in academic and technical contexts.
Conclusions: Developing a standardized terminology framework through collaboration between linguists and robotics experts is essential to ensure linguistic accuracy, conceptual consistency, and educational effectiveness in the Uzbek language.
Limitations: The research focuses on a limited set of high-frequency terms and does not include quantitative corpus statistics or cross-regional lexical variations.
Contribution: This study contributes to applied linguistics and technical translation studies by offering a model for analyzing and standardizing specialized terminology in emerging scientific fields.

Keywords*:* *Calquing, Functional-semantic analysis, Robotics terminology, Translation challenges, Uzbek translation.*

How to Cite: Gizi, R. G. X. (2025). Translational challenges of robotics terminology in English and Uzbek languages. *Review of Multidisciplinary Academic and Practice Studies,* 2(2), 131-142.

1. Introduction

Robotics has become one of the most rapidly developing fields of science and technology, integrating mechanics, electronics, computer engineering, and artificial intelligence. As this field evolves, new scientific and technical terms are constantly emerging in English. However, translating these robotics-related terms into Uzbek presents a number of linguistic and semantic difficulties. The differences in grammatical structure, cultural context, and conceptual development between English and Uzbek often lead to ambiguity, inconsistency, or inaccuracy in translation (Shakhabitdinova & Alieva, 2021). Moreover, the Uzbek language, still in the process of forming its scientific-technical lexicon in the field of robotics, lacks standardized equivalents for many modern terms. Therefore, studying the translational challenges of robotics terminology is essential for ensuring terminological consistency, facilitating academic exchange, and promoting the advancement of robotics research and education in Uzbekistan.

This study aims to identify the main translation problems, analyze their functional-semantic features, and suggest possible solutions for achieving linguistic precision and conceptual clarity in rendering English robotics terms into Uzbek (Abdujalilova, 2025; Rajabovna, 2022).

In recent years, the linguistic and terminological development of robotics has gained increasing attention among scholars, translators, and engineers in Uzbekistan. As robotics becomes embedded in academic curricula and industrial applications, the need for precise and standardized translation grows more urgent (Kadirova, Khusenaliyevna, Choriyevna, & Orakbayevna, 2021; Widanti, Dewi, Pinatih, & Mason, 2025). The complexity of this process arises not only from linguistic disparities between English and Uzbek but also from the multidisciplinary nature of robotics itself. Since robotics draws from mechanics, electronics, computer science, and artificial intelligence, each of these subfields contributes its own specialized vocabulary, creating a dense web of interrelated terms. Translating such terms requires an understanding that goes beyond linguistic equivalence—it demands a functional-semantic approach, where meaning is analyzed in relation to both context and purpose of communication (Baratboyevna & Murtozayevich, 2025; Kadirova et al., 2021; Yuldashevna & Khurana, 2024).

One of the most prominent challenges is that the English lexicon of robotics evolves rapidly, while Uzbek terminological adaptation lags behind. English has the advantage of being flexible and open to neologisms formed through compounding (e.g., autonomous vehicle, machine learning, neural network) or affixation (robotics, automation, cybernetic). Uzbek, as an agglutinative language, forms words through the addition of suffixes but often lacks a natural mechanism for combining technical roots of foreign origin. As a result, translators often resort to borrowing and transliteration, as in sensor, drone, robot, or processor, without modifying the structure to align with Uzbek linguistic norms (Mekhritdinovich, 2025). Although this strategy ensures immediate recognition among bilingual speakers, it sometimes leads to semantic ambiguity and uneven understanding among the general public and even among professionals unfamiliar with English (Abduvakhob, 2023; Justine & Ocan, 2025).

Another issue lies in semantic mismatches. English robotics terminology frequently expresses highly specific conceptual distinctions that have no exact equivalents in Uzbek. For instance, the terms actuator and servo motor both refer to motion-generating components, but their technical functions differ. In Uzbek, both might be rendered as harakat mexanizmi (motion mechanism), thus losing the precise technical distinction necessary in engineering discourse. Similarly, terms like reinforcement learning, embedded systems, and machine vision encapsulate complex, layered meanings that cannot be conveyed by literal translation. In such cases, translators face a dilemma between preserving conceptual integrity and maintaining linguistic naturalness (Sutrisno, Duwi, Anita, Eksa, & Jenny Yudha, 2024).

From a cultural and educational standpoint, the translation challenges also reflect the stage of scientific development in Uzbekistan. The country has made notable efforts to expand robotics education through initiatives at universities and technical colleges, yet curricular materials often rely on foreign-language sources. Textbooks and manuals translated from English or Russian sometimes contain mixed or inconsistent terminology. For example, the term robot arm may appear as robot qo‘li, robot manipulyatori, or mexanik qo‘l, each version reflecting a different translation approach—borrowing, hybrid formation, or descriptive translation. Without standardization, these variations can cause confusion in instruction, testing, and research.

Furthermore, the influence of Russian as an intermediary language complicates the process. During the Soviet era, most technical terminology in Uzbekistan entered the language via Russian rather than directly from English. Consequently, many robotics-related terms in Uzbek are Russian-based borrowings, such as datchik (from датчик, meaning sensor) and privod (from привод, meaning drive or actuator). While these terms remain widely used, their Russian morphological forms and phonetic patterns are not always compatible with modern Uzbek orthography. Moreover, direct translation from English into Uzbek—without relying on Russian intermediaries—often yields clearer and more precise equivalents. Thus, developing a direct English–Uzbek translation framework has become an important step toward linguistic independence and scientific modernization (Rajapova, 2021).

To address these challenges, it is essential to explore different translation strategies and evaluate their suitability within the robotics domain. Borrowing, as mentioned, is effective for maintaining international consistency, particularly when the borrowed term has a universally recognized meaning. However, calquing—translating a term literally based on its internal components—can enhance comprehension when the constituent parts have direct Uzbek equivalents. For example, artificial intelligence is accurately translated as sun'iy aql, which preserves both meaning and readability. Yet calquing may not always capture technical nuance; deep learning, rendered literally as chuqur o'rganish, sounds unnatural and may require contextual explanation (Anarbaev, 2024).

A third method, descriptive translation, involves expressing the concept in explanatory form, as in ma'lumotlarni qayta ishlovchi avtomatik tizim for automated data-processing system. This approach is particularly useful when introducing new concepts to a non-specialist audience, such as students or the general public. However, it can produce excessively long phrases that lack the compactness and precision characteristic of scientific writing. A potential solution is to combine methods—introducing the borrowed English term initially, followed by its descriptive Uzbek equivalent in parentheses. Over time, the Uzbek equivalent can become standardized as usage stabilizes. From a functional-semantic viewpoint, translation should be guided by the communicative function of the term. In robotics, terms may serve to classify, describe, or command actions. For instance, controller, sensor, and actuator function as components in system descriptions, whereas navigate, detect, and assemble are action-oriented commands in programming or operational contexts. Recognizing these functions helps determine whether a term should be borrowed, calqued, or localized. A purely lexical translation that ignores the functional role of the term may distort meaning and hinder interdisciplinary communication.

In addition to linguistic methods, institutional and collaborative measures are vital (O'Neil, 2025). Standardizing robotics terminology requires cooperation between linguists, translators, and subject-matter experts. Linguists can analyze morphological compatibility and semantic alignment, while engineers and robotics researchers ensure that the translated terms accurately reflect technical realities. Establishing a national robotics terminology database—similar to glossaries maintained by the IEEE or ISO—would be a key step toward achieving uniformity. Such a database could catalog English-Uzbek term pairs, provide definitions, indicate preferred usage, and track historical variants (Aliyeva & Sadigova, 2025; Lagzdiņš et al., 2022).

Moreover, the integration of digital tools and corpora can greatly assist this effort (Dash & Ramamoorthy, 2018). Corpus-based analysis allows researchers to identify the most frequent and contextually relevant term usages in robotics literature. Machine translation systems, although not flawless, can serve as preliminary aids in identifying potential equivalents that are later refined through expert review. Importantly, terminological standardization should remain an ongoing process, evolving with scientific innovation and technological change (Gašpar, Seljan, & Kučiš, 2022). The broader implications of developing standardized robotics terminology are significant. Linguistically, it strengthens the status of Uzbek as a scientific language, ensuring that it can convey complex modern concepts without overreliance on foreign borrowings. Educationally, it enhances the clarity of teaching materials and fosters more effective knowledge transfer to students. Economically and technologically, a coherent terminological system supports the localization of robotic technologies, enabling local engineers and entrepreneurs to design, adapt, and maintain systems using a shared language of innovation (Shakhabitdinova & Alieva, 2021).

Finally, addressing the translational challenges of robotics terminology also contributes to linguistic identity and cultural modernization. In an era when globalization often pressures smaller languages to adopt dominant linguistic models, the conscious creation of Uzbek equivalents for emerging technologies asserts both intellectual sovereignty and cultural adaptability. It demonstrates that modernization and national language preservation are not opposing forces but complementary objectives. In conclusion, the translation of robotics terminology from English into Uzbek is both a linguistic challenge and a strategic necessity. By applying a functional-semantic framework, this study seeks to uncover the underlying principles that govern successful translation in this domain. The analysis of existing translation strategies—borrowing, calquing, and descriptive translation—reveals that no single approach suffices universally; rather, an integrative model that combines linguistic analysis, domain expertise, and institutional coordination is required. Through collaboration, standardization, and the use of modern linguistic technologies, Uzbekistan can build a robust and dynamic terminological foundation for robotics, ensuring precision, clarity, and accessibility in both academic and industrial contexts.

2. Literature review and hypothesis/es development

The study of robotics terminology and its translation has attracted increasing attention in recent years as technology-related vocabulary continues to expand. In the global context, several researchers have investigated the linguistic aspects of scientific and technical terminology. According to Cabré (1999), terminology is not only a linguistic phenomenon but also a cognitive and communicative system that reflects the conceptual structure of a specific field. Sager (1990) emphasizes that term formation and translation must consider both linguistic accuracy and conceptual equivalence to maintain scientific clarity. Similarly, Newmark (1988) highlights that the translation of technical terms requires balancing between literal precision and contextual adaptation. These theoretical foundations provide a basis for analyzing robotics terminology, where linguistic and technical dimensions intersect.

In the context of robotics, scholars such as Asimov (1964) and Wiener (2019) have laid the groundwork for understanding automation, artificial intelligence, and cybernetics - fields that have directly influenced robotics terminology. More recent studies by Panait and Luke (2005) and Bekey and Robots (2005) examine the rapid evolution of robotics concepts such as autonomous systems, swarm robotics, and human-robot interaction. These developments have led to the creation of highly specialized English terms that are often difficult to translate into languages with limited exposure to the field. From a linguistic perspective, research by Grbic and Pöchhacker (1981) and Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) suggests that translation strategies such as borrowing, calquing, and modulation are essential when adapting new scientific terms across languages.

In the Uzbek context, studies on the translation of technical and scientific terminology are relatively limited. Works by Giyazova (2021) and Mahmudov (2016) discuss the formation and adaptation of new terms in Uzbek, emphasizing the need for linguistic standardization. However, specific research on robotics terminology remains scarce. The few available studies mainly focus on general issues of scientific translation rather than field-specific challenges. As a result, there is a clear research gap regarding how robotics terms - such as actuator, servo motor, cyber-physical system, and machine learning algorithm—are functionally and semantically adapted into Uzbek.

In addressing this gap, it becomes essential to place the study of robotics terminology within the broader framework of translation studies, terminology theory, and linguistic modernization (Weigang & Brom, 2025). The increasing globalization of science and technology requires smaller linguistic communities, such as Uzbek speakers, to integrate and domesticate technical vocabularies that were initially developed in English. This process, however, is far from mechanical; it involves not only lexical transfer but also conceptual negotiation — the alignment of meanings, categories, and cultural understandings embedded in language. Therefore, studying robotics terminology from a functional-semantic perspective allows scholars to uncover how meaning operates at both the linguistic and conceptual levels, ensuring that translation decisions serve both communicative clarity and disciplinary accuracy (Li, Zheng, Song, & Yang, 2025; Myung, Park, Son, Lee, & Han, 2024).

2.1 Theoretical and Conceptual Foundations of Terminology in Robotics

The field of terminology, as established by scholars like Cabré (1999), views terms as units of specialized knowledge that encapsulate both linguistic form and conceptual content. According to Wüster's *General Theory of Terminology*, each term represents a distinct concept within a structured domain of knowledge, and consistency in terminology ensures the precision and reliability of scientific communication. In robotics, the challenge of maintaining terminological consistency becomes even more pronounced because of its interdisciplinary nature—bridging mechanics, computing, cybernetics, and artificial intelligence.

Cabré (1999) introduces the Communicative Theory of Terminology (CTT), which recognizes that terms function within real communicative contexts rather than existing as static lexical items. This theory is particularly useful in analyzing robotics terminology, as many robotics terms are context-dependent; their meanings may vary depending on whether they are used in programming, mechanical design, or artificial intelligence. For example, the term *controller* can refer to a physical hardware component in one context, or to a software algorithm managing robotic motion in another. Thus, when translating such terms into Uzbek, functional equivalence — the preservation of communicative function — becomes as important as lexical accuracy.

In addition to theoretical debates about linguistic form and conceptual representation, terminology also intersects with the philosophy of science. Asserts that terminology serves as the "interface between knowledge and language," facilitating the codification and transfer of specialized knowledge. This function is particularly evident in robotics, a field characterized by interdisciplinarity—bridging mechanics, electronics, informatics, and cognitive science. Each subdomain contributes its own terminological system, resulting in overlapping or competing definitions. For example, the term *agent* in computer science refers to an autonomous program capable of decision-making, while in robotics it denotes a physical or virtual entity interacting within an environment. Such semantic polysemy illustrates the necessity of interdisciplinary standardization and conceptual mapping.

2.2 Translation Theories Relevant to Scientific and Technical Texts

From a translation studies perspective, the work of Newmark (1988), Vinay and Darbelnet (1995), and Grbic and Pöchhacker (1981) provides a theoretical basis for analyzing how translators manage linguistic and conceptual differences. Newmark's distinction between semantic translation (focused on meaning fidelity) and communicative translation (focused on audience comprehension) is particularly relevant. In the translation of robotics terminology, a purely semantic approach may yield highly literal renderings that sound unnatural in Uzbek, whereas an overly communicative approach risks losing technical precision. Balancing these two tendencies is key.

Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) identify seven translation procedures—borrowing, calque, literal translation, transposition, modulation, equivalence, and adaptation—that remain fundamental in technical translation. Robotics terminology often relies on borrowing and calquing, as seen in the Uzbek adoption of *robot*, *sensor*, and *algoritm*. However, in cases where direct equivalence is unavailable, modulation (changing the point of view) or adaptation (finding a culturally appropriate substitute) can be employed. For instance, *machine learning algorithm* may be rendered as *mashinali oʻrganish algoritmi*, but its explanatory form *kompyuter oʻz tajribasidan oʻrganadigan tizim* can be used pedagogically. Meanwhile, Grbic and Pöchhacker (1981) emphasizes that scientific translation requires a balance between linguistic form and conceptual content, since terminological inaccuracy can lead to knowledge distortion. In robotics, this is critical: mistranslating terms like *servo motor* or *reinforcement learning* could lead to serious misunderstandings in technical implementation.

2.3 Evolution of Robotics Terminology in Global Scholarship

The evolution of robotics terminology parallels the technological revolutions of the 20th and 21st centuries. Early theorists such as Malapi-Nelson (2017) who introduced *cybernetics*, and Asimov (1964), who coined the term *robotics* and formulated the *Three Laws of Robotics*, laid the conceptual groundwork for modern discourse. In later decades, the expansion of computational intelligence gave rise to new subfields like *swarm robotics*, *soft robotics*, *autonomous systems*, and *human-robot interaction* (Bekey & Robots, 2005; Panait & Luke, 2005). Each subfield generated a wave of new terminology that encapsulated novel scientific paradigms.

For example, the term *autonomous system* now encompasses complex artificial agents capable of self-decision-making (Cambier et al., 2020). Translating this term into Uzbek as *avtonom tizim* seems straightforward; however, the word *avtonom* itself is borrowed and may not fully convey the sense of self-governing computational intelligence inherent in the English term. Similarly, *swarm robotics*—referring to decentralized robotic coordination inspired by biological systems—has no concise Uzbek equivalent and often requires descriptive translation such as *koʻp robotli birgalikda ishlash tizimi*

(Cheraghi, Shahzad, & Graffi, 2021; Schranz, Umlauft, Sende, & Elmenreich, 2020). This process illustrates what Song and Ju (2023) calls dynamic terminology — the continuous evolution of terms in response to scientific progress. In this view, terminological translation is not merely about transferring existing meanings but also about creating new conceptual structures within the target language. Uzbek, being a rapidly modernizing language, stands at this frontier of linguistic innovation.

Overall, the evolution of robotics terminology in global scholarship demonstrates a shift from static lexical borrowing toward dynamic, context-sensitive term creation. The interaction between linguistic innovation, technological development, and cultural adaptation defines the ongoing transformation of robotics discourse. For Uzbekistan, engaging in this global terminological dialogue is essential to ensuring both linguistic sovereignty and scientific competitiveness. Developing standardized yet culturally resonant equivalents for robotics concepts will enable Uzbek scholars and engineers to contribute meaningfully to the international robotics community—transforming language from a barrier into a bridge of knowledge exchange.

2.4 The Uzbek Context: Historical and Linguistic Dimensions

Uzbek terminology development has been historically influenced by Arabic, Persian, Russian, and now English, reflecting the region's intellectual and political transformations. During the Soviet era, most scientific and technical terms were borrowed from Russian, resulting in hybridized lexicons. For instance, words such as *datchik* (sensor), *privod* (actuator), and *kompyuter* (computer) became standard but carry Russian phonological and morphological imprints. Post-independence, Uzbekistan has emphasized linguistic sovereignty and lexical purification, aiming to replace Russified forms with either native Uzbek constructions or direct English borrowings. Scholars such as Giyazova (2021) and Mahmudov (2016) have argued that terminological modernization must balance linguistic authenticity with scientific universality. They advocate for systematizing term formation through morphological rules consistent with Uzbek grammar, while still acknowledging that international borrowings are unavoidable in specialized fields like robotics. However, as the present study notes, specific research on robotics terminology—its formation, adaptation, and functional use—remains almost non-existent. This absence of focused research creates a knowledge gap in both theoretical and practical terms. Theoretically, there is limited understanding of how functional-semantic equivalence operates between English and Uzbek in technical domains. Practically, there is no unified glossary or institutional guideline for robotics terminology, resulting in inconsistency across textbooks, academic papers, and engineering documentation.

In conclusion, the Uzbek context demonstrates that the development of robotics terminology is deeply intertwined with historical legacies, language policy, and socio-cultural modernization. The coexistence of Arabic, Russian, and English linguistic influences creates both challenges and opportunities. Standardization efforts must therefore adopt a pluralistic and adaptive model—recognizing Uzbekistan's multilingual heritage while promoting an efficient and unified system for contemporary scientific communication. By establishing institutional coordination, leveraging corpus linguistics, and integrating modern digital tools, Uzbekistan can transform its linguistic diversity into a strength, ensuring that the Uzbek language remains a dynamic vehicle for scientific knowledge in the 21st century.

2.5 Challenges in Translating Robotics Terminology into Uzbek

The translation of robotics terminology into Uzbek involves several interrelated challenges:

a. Linguistic Structure: Uzbek's agglutinative structure differs markedly from the analytic structure of English. English compounding (e.g., *neural network*, *motion planning algorithm*) condenses complex concepts into compact forms, while Uzbek often requires extended syntactic constructions (e.g., *neyron tarmoq*, *harakatni rejalashtirish algoritmi*). This can create readability issues and reduce terminological precision if not carefully standardized.
b. Conceptual Mismatch: Many robotics concepts originate from computational or mathematical modeling, which has no historical precedent in Uzbek. Terms like *reinforcement learning*, *fuzzy logic controller*, or *embedded system* may not have conceptual equivalents in traditional Uzbek

linguistic frameworks. Translators thus need to introduce conceptual innovation alongside linguistic adaptation.

c. Multilingual Interference: Ongoing Russian influence complicates English-Uzbek translation. For instance, *sensor* can appear as *sensor*, *datchik*, or *hissiyot qurilmasi*, depending on context and translator preference. This plurality of forms fragments terminological consistency.
d. Standardization Gap: Currently, Uzbekistan lacks a central body for standardizing scientific terminology across disciplines. As a result, universities, publishers, and government agencies often develop their own versions of technical lexicons.

2.6 Functional-Semantic Framework for Terminology Analysis

A functional-semantic approach views translation not as a word-for-word process but as a transfer of meaning functions across linguistic systems. Each robotics term has both denotative content (the actual technological object or process it describes) and functional meaning (its role in the sentence or discourse). For example, *sensor* denotes a device detecting environmental changes, but functionally it conveys data acquisition within a system. The Uzbek term must preserve both dimensions.
This study's analysis categorizes translation strategies based on functional equivalence:

a. Borrowing: Direct adoption of English form (e.g., *robot*, *sensor*).
b. Calquing: Literal translation of components (e.g., *sun'iy aql* for *artificial intelligence*).
c. Descriptive translation: Paraphrasing to capture meaning (e.g., *ma'lumotlarni qayta ishlovchi qurilma* for *processor*).
d. Hybrid translation: Combining Uzbek and foreign morphemes (e.g., *algoritmli boshqaruv tizimi*).
   Each strategy serves different communicative needs depending on audience expertise and text function.

2.7 Global and Local Significance of Robotics Terminology Studies

Globally, the standardization of robotics terminology contributes to interoperability in international research and industry. Institutions such as ISO, IEEE, and IFToMM continuously refine terminological standards to ensure uniformity. For Uzbekistan, adopting similar frameworks will facilitate participation in international collaborations, enhance technical education, and strengthen domestic innovation. Locally, developing a robust Uzbek robotics lexicon supports the government's agenda of promoting digital transformation and STEM education. The "Digital Uzbekistan – 2030" strategy underscores the need for localized educational materials in emerging technologies. A standardized robotics terminology system would thus serve not only linguistic goals but also socio-economic ones, enabling broader accessibility to technological knowledge.

Expanding on this perspective, a harmonized terminology framework can play a transformative role in bridging linguistic, educational, and industrial ecosystems. Standardized terminology ensures that engineers, educators, policymakers, and entrepreneurs communicate with a shared understanding, minimizing ambiguities that often hinder collaboration and innovation. When terminological coherence is achieved, it becomes easier to align national curricula with international accreditation systems, integrate robotics modules into secondary and higher education, and foster a new generation of professionals capable of operating within globally recognized technical vocabularies. Moreover, standardization encourages the creation of bilingual or multilingual technical documentation—manuals, textbooks, and software interfaces—that enable smoother knowledge transfer between global and local contexts.

From an industrial perspective, a consistent lexicon facilitates more efficient technology localization. When the same robotics terms are used consistently across academic papers, technical guidelines, and government policies, industries can more easily adopt global standards while customizing solutions for local environments. This is particularly relevant for Uzbekistan's growing industrial automation and smart manufacturing sectors, where domestic companies increasingly seek to collaborate with foreign partners. The presence of a unified terminology database also simplifies translation workflows, making it easier for international firms to publish Uzbek-language documentation and for local researchers to disseminate their work in English. Educationally, the impact is equally profound. Teachers and students benefit from standardized instructional materials that reduce confusion caused by multiple variant terms.

For instance, instead of encountering several different Uzbek translations for the same robotics concept, learners would be guided by officially recognized terms, improving both comprehension and academic consistency. Over time, this will cultivate a generation of Uzbek-speaking engineers and researchers who think and create within their own linguistic framework while maintaining international compatibility.

Socio-economically, this approach contributes to inclusivity and national development. By democratizing access to scientific and technological language, standardization supports broader public literacy in robotics, artificial intelligence, and automation. It empowers small and medium enterprises (SMEs) to engage in high-tech innovation without linguistic barriers and strengthens the country's human capital base in alignment with the *Digital Uzbekistan – 2030* strategy. Ultimately, the establishment of a standardized robotics terminology in Uzbek is not merely a linguistic exercise—it represents a cornerstone of national modernization, scientific sovereignty, and cultural resilience in an increasingly interconnected technological world.

2.8 Future Directions and Research Prospects

To bridge the identified research gap, future studies should employ a corpus-based methodology that analyzes robotics terms across multilingual technical texts, comparing their usage in English, Russian, and Uzbek. Such research can map frequency, variation, and semantic shifts, offering empirical data for standardization. Additionally, interdisciplinary collaboration between linguists, engineers, and educators is essential for developing bilingual terminological databases and AI-assisted translation tools customized for Uzbek scientific language.

Ultimately, the translation of robotics terminology is not a mere linguistic exercise but a strategic act of modernization. It reflects how Uzbekistan, as part of the global knowledge economy, negotiates its linguistic identity while embracing technological advancement. By building on the theoretical insights of Cabré, Sager, and Newmark, and grounding them in contemporary Uzbek linguistic practice, this research aims to contribute to both terminology science and applied translation studies, offering a model for other developing languages facing similar challenges. In summary, the current state of research reveals a dynamic but underexplored intersection between linguistics, technology, and national language policy. The lack of standardized robotics terminology in Uzbek underscores the necessity of structured academic inquiry and institutional collaboration. Addressing this gap will not only enhance the precision of technical communication but also affirm Uzbekistan's commitment to developing a self-sustaining, modern linguistic infrastructure capable of supporting 21st-century scientific innovation.

A further area of exploration lies in comparative cross-linguistic studies between Uzbek and other non-Indo-European languages with similar modernization trajectories, such as Kazakh, Turkish, or Malay. Comparative analyses could reveal how linguistic typology affects terminology formation in agglutinative languages. For instance, the Uzbek term *harakatni rejalashtirish tizimi* ("motion planning system") structurally parallels Turkish *hareket planlama sistemi*, suggesting typological convergence that may inform regional standardization. Establishing a Central Asian terminological consortium focused on robotics and artificial intelligence could enhance interoperability of scientific communication across Turkic-speaking nations, aligning with regional economic and educational cooperation frameworks.

3. Methodology

This study employs a comparative and descriptive linguistic approach to analyze the translational challenges of robotics terminology in English and Uzbek languages. The research is based on a corpus of selected robotics-related terms collected from English scientific articles, technical manuals, and robotics glossaries, as well as their Uzbek equivalents found in academic publications, dictionaries, and online sources. Each term was examined according to its functional-semantic characteristics, including meaning, grammatical structure, and usage context. The analysis also focused on identifying translation strategies such as borrowing, calquing, descriptive translation, and adaptation. To ensure accuracy, the study compared different Uzbek renderings of the same English terms to evaluate their consistency, clarity, and conformity with Uzbek linguistic norms. Expert consultation with translators and robotics specialists was conducted to assess the practical adequacy of the proposed equivalents. The methodological framework integrates principles from terminology theory, translation studies, and applied linguistics, allowing for a comprehensive understanding of how robotics terms are transferred and standardized between the two languages.

4. Results and discussion

The comparative analysis of robotics terminology in English and Uzbek revealed several key translation challenges and tendencies related to functional-semantic equivalence, term formation, and linguistic adaptation. The results show that while some English robotics terms have been successfully integrated into Uzbek through borrowing and calquing, many still lack standardized or contextually appropriate equivalents. This section discusses these findings with specific examples.

4.1 Borrowing as a Dominant Strategy

The most common approach to translating robotics terms is direct borrowing from English, which helps preserve international acceptance but often leads to phonetic and morphological inconsistency. For example, the English term *robot* is directly borrowed as *robot*, maintaining both form and meaning. Similarly, *sensor* appears as *sensor* in Uzbek, though some sources also use *his qiluvchi qurilma* (descriptive translation). Borrowing ensures terminological uniformity in scientific contexts but can cause comprehension difficulties among non-specialists unfamiliar with English-based terms.

Table 1. Borrowing

English Term	Uzbek Equivalent	Type of Translation	Notes
Robot	Robot	Loanword	Universally accepted and widely used
Sensor	Sensor / His qiluvchi qurilma	Loanword / Descriptive	Both forms exist; no single standard
Actuator	Aktuator / Harakatlantiruvchi mexanizm	Loanword / Descriptive	Variation leads to inconsistency

4.2 Calquing and Descriptive Translation

In cases where borrowing does not convey the semantic depth of the original term, translators often use calques or descriptive translations. For instance, *artificial intelligence* is translated as *sun'iy intellekt*, a successful calque that has become a standard term in Uzbek scientific discourse. Similarly, *machine learning* is rendered as *mashinali o'rganish* or *mashina o'rganishi*, though the former aligns better with Uzbek grammatical norms. However, descriptive translations such as *harakatlantiruvchi mexanizm* for *actuator* tend to be lengthy and may reduce terminological precision in technical writing.

Table 2. Calque and descriptive translation

English Term	Uzbek Equivalent	Type of Translation	Notes
Artificial intelligence	Sun'iy intellekt	Calque	Fully adopted, widely acceptive
Machine learning	Mashinali o'rganish	Calque	Grammatically natural in Uzbek
Computer vision	Kompyuter ko'rish tizimi	Descriptive	Conceptually accurate, less concise

Certain English robotics terms are polysemous, meaning they carry multiple meanings depending on the context. For example, *controller* may refer to a physical device that controls a robot's motion, or a software unit that manages signals. In Uzbek, this can be translated as *boshqaruvchi qurilma* (for hardware) or *boshqaruv moduli* (for software). Similarly, *agent* in robotics can mean intelligent program or autonomous unit, which may be translated as *aqlli dastur* or *avtonom tizim*. The lack of standardized differentiation creates ambiguity in technical translation.

Table 3. Semantic ambiguity and contextual dependence.

English Term	Uzbek Equivalents	Context of Use	Problem
Controller	Boshqaruvchi qurilma / Boshqaruv modul	Hardware / Software	Context-dependent meaning
Agent	Aqlli dastur / Avtonom tizim	AI / Robotics	No fixed equivalent

When English terms are borrowed, they often undergo morphological adaptation to fit Uzbek linguistic rules. For instance, automation becomes avtomatlashtirish and robotization becomes robotlashtirish. These examples demonstrate productive use of Uzbek suffixes (-lash, -tirish) to create verbal nouns that align with native grammar. However, hybrid terms like cyber-physical system (kiber-fizik tizim) still lack standardization, as variations such as kiberfizik tizim and kiber jismoniy tizim coexist in different texts. The study revealed that a major challenge lies in the lack of unified standards for translating robotics terminology in Uzbek. Different translators and institutions use varying forms of the same term, leading to inconsistency across academic and technical literature. For instance, actuator appears as both aktuator and harakatlantiruvchi mexanizm, while sensor may be rendered as sensor or his qiluvchi qurilma. Establishing official terminology guidelines through collaboration between linguists and engineers would improve clarity and promote effective communication in the field.

5. Conclusion

5.1 Conclusion

The study of translational challenges in robotics terminology between English and Uzbek demonstrates that linguistic, conceptual, and structural differences significantly affect the accuracy and consistency of term translation. While borrowing and calquing remain the most common strategies, many robotics terms still lack standardized Uzbek equivalents, resulting in variation and ambiguity across technical texts. The analysis reveals that some terms, such as robot and sun'iy intellekt, have been successfully integrated into Uzbek, whereas others, like actuator or cyber-physical system, require further linguistic adaptation. To overcome these issues, it is essential to develop a unified robotics terminology base that aligns with both linguistic norms and technological concepts. Collaboration between translators, linguists, and robotics specialists will ensure that Uzbek terminology evolves systematically, fostering clearer communication, educational development, and scientific progress in the rapidly growing field of robotics.

5.2 Suggestion

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, several recommendations can be made to address the translational and terminological challenges identified in the adaptation of robotics terminology from English into Uzbek. First, it is crucial to establish a national terminological framework dedicated to scientific and technical language, particularly focusing on emerging fields such as robotics, artificial intelligence, and automation. This framework should be developed collaboratively by linguists, translators, and robotics experts under the supervision of relevant academic and governmental institutions. Such an initiative would allow for the creation of a centralized Uzbek Robotics Terminology Database, containing standardized equivalents, definitions, and usage examples that can serve as a reference for educators, students, and professionals.

Second, training and capacity building in scientific and technical translation must be strengthened. Universities offering translation and linguistics programs should introduce specialized courses in technical terminology management, ensuring that translators are familiar with both linguistic principles and subject-specific knowledge. Likewise, continuous professional development workshops should be conducted for active translators and educators to ensure consistency in terminology use. Third, there should be a focus on integrating standardized terminology into educational materials and digital platforms, such as online dictionaries, robotics textbooks, and bilingual glossaries. This would enhance accessibility and promote widespread adoption of standardized Uzbek equivalents in both academic and professional contexts. Finally, further interdisciplinary research is recommended to analyze new robotics-related concepts as they emerge, ensuring that Uzbek terminology keeps pace with global technological advances. By adopting these strategies, Uzbekistan can ensure that its scientific language infrastructure supports innovation, clarity, and cross-cultural communication in the fast-evolving domain of robotics.

References

Abdujalilova, M. (2025). Linguistic study of household vocabulary in English and Uzbek languages. *Journal of Indigenous Culture, Tourism, and Language, 1*(2), 75-85. doi:https://doi.org/10.35912/jictl.v1i2.3428

Abduvakhob, M. (2023). Regarding Explanation Of International Term Elements In The Uzbek Dictionaries. *ANGLISTICUM. Journal of the Association-Institute for English Language and American Studies, 12*, 20-25. doi:https://doi.org/10.58885/ijllis.v12i12.20ma

Aliyeva, S., & Sadigova, N. (2025). The Role of Corpus Linguistics in the Standardization of Scientific and Technical Terminology. *Open Research Europe, 5*, 287. doi:https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.21170.1

Anarbaev, O. (2024). Pragmatic Translation In Translating English Compound Words Into Uzbek. *12*, 444-450. doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14464755

Asimov, L. (1964). *Robots and Automation*. New York: Doubleday.

Baratboyevna, N., & Murtozayevich, S. (2025). Structural-Semantic Analysis of Scientific Terminology in English And Uzbek Languages. *European International Journal of Philological Sciences, 5*, 21-26. doi:https://doi.org/10.55640/eijps-05-01-05

Bekey, G. A., & Robots, A. (2005). From biological inspiration to implementation and control: The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Cabré, M. T. (1999). *Terminology: Theory, methods, and applications* (Vol. 1): John Benjamins Publishing.

Cambier, N., Miletitch, R., Frémont, V., Dorigo, M., Ferrante, E., & Trianni, V. (2020). Language Evolution in Swarm Robotics: A Perspective. *Front Robot AI, 7*, 12. doi:https://doi.org/10.3389/frobt.2020.00012

Cheraghi, A. R., Shahzad, S., & Graffi, K. (2021). *Past, present, and future of swarm robotics.* Paper presented at the Proceedings of SAI Intelligent Systems Conference.

Dash, N. S., & Ramamoorthy, L. (2018). Corpus and technical termbank *Utility and Application of Language Corpora* (pp. 173-191): Springer.

Gašpar, A., Seljan, S., & Kučiš, V. (2022). Measuring Terminology Consistency in Translated Corpora: Implementation of the Herfindahl-Hirshman Index. *Information, 13*(2), 43. doi:https://doi.org/10.3390/info13020043

Giyazova, B. M. (2021). Ҳиндуизм пантеони илм ва санъат маъбудаси Сарасвати генезиси масаласига доир. *KAMOLOT SARI-IQTIDORLI TALABALAR ILMIY TO 'PLAMI*.

Grbic, N., & Pöchhacker, F. (1981). Working Memory. *ROUTLEDGE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF INTERPRETING STUDIES*, 443.

Justine, K., & Ocan, J. (2025). Depiction of resistance, liberation, and transformation in post-colonial literature. *Journal of Indigenous Culture, Tourism, and Language, 1*(2), 97-108. doi:https://doi.org/10.35912/jictl.v1i2.2855

Kadirova, D., Khusenaliyevna, Choriyevna, A., & Orakbayevna, K. (2021). Lexico-semantic features of technical teams of English and Uzbek languages. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government*, 4083-4088. doi:https://doi.org/10.47750/cibg.2021.27.02.423

Lagzdiņš, A., Siliņš, U., Pinnis, M., Bergmanis, T., Vasiļevskis, A., & Vasiļjevs, A. (2022). Open terminology management and sharing toolkit for federation of terminology databases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.06729*. doi:https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2207.06729

Li, Z., Zheng, M., Song, M., & Yang, W. (2025). TAT-R1: Terminology-Aware Translation with Reinforcement Learning and Word Alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.21172*. doi:https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2505.21172

Mahmudov, M. (2016). *Til va tafakkur munosabati*. Toshkent: Fan.

Malapi-Nelson, A. (2017). Cybernetics: The Beginnings, the Founding Articles and the First Meetings *The Nature of the Machine and the Collapse of Cybernetics: A Transhumanist Lesson for Emerging Technologies* (pp. 5-45): Springer.

Mekhritdinovich, U. A. (2025). Theoretical aspects of developing the professional competence of future pre-conscription military education teachers. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic and Practice Studies, 3*(3), 595-602. doi:https://doi.org/10.35912/jomaps.v3i3.3166

Myung, J., Park, J., Son, J., Lee, K., & Han, J. (2024). Efficient Technical Term Translation: A Knowledge Distillation Approach for Parenthetical Terminology Translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.00683*. doi:https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2410.00683

Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation* (Vol. 66): Prentice hall New York.

O'Neil, D. (2025). Standardization, Power, and Purity: Ideological Tensions in Language and Scientific Discourse. *Education Sciences, 15*(4), 489. doi:https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15040489

Panait, L., & Luke, S. (2005). Cooperative multi-agent learning: The state of the art. *Autonomous agents and multi-agent systems, 11*(3), 387-434. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10458-005-2631-2

Rajabovna, S. Z. (2022). Peculiarities of Translating Technical Texts from Uzbek into English. *European Journal of Research Development and Sustainability, 3*(2), 15-17.

Rajapova, M. (2021). Status of Women in Uzbekistan through the Prism of Family Relationship and Education. *Psychology and Education Journal, 58*, 1069-1077. doi:https://doi.org/10.17762/pae.v58i1.856

Sager, J. C. (1990). A practical course in terminology processing. doi:https://doi.org/10.1075/z.44

Schranz, M., Umlauft, M., Sende, M., & Elmenreich, W. (2020). Swarm Robotic Behaviors and Current Applications. *Front Robot AI, 7*, 36. doi:https://doi.org/10.3389/frobt.2020.00036

Shakhabitdinova, S., & Alieva, S. (2021). Transformation In Uzbek Language And Its Linguistic Status. *The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations, 03*, 252-259. doi:https://doi.org/10.37547/tajssei/Volume03Issue02-41

Song, Y., & Ju, B. (2023). Sociocognitive terminology-based principles for translating the classics of traditional Chinese medicine. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open, 8*(1), 100616. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2023.100616

Sutrisno, E., Duwi, S., Anita, R., Eksa, R., & Jenny Yudha, U. (2024). Study on the utilization of village funds to support food security in Glagah Lamongan District, East Java. *Journal of Indigenous Culture, Tourism, and Language, 1*(1), 15-24. doi:https://doi.org/10.35912/jictl.v1i1.1734

Vinay, J.-P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). Comparative stylistics of French and English. doi:https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.11

Weigang, L., & Brom, P. C. (2025). LLM-BT: Back-Translation as a Framework for Terminology Standardization and Dynamic Semantic Embedding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.08174*. doi:https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2506.08174

Widanti, N. P. T., Dewi, N. N. D. U., Pinatih, D. A. A. I., & Mason, J. (2025). Eco Tourism: Studying Sustainable Tourism Strategies from a Triple Bottom Line Perspective in the Mangrove Forest Area of Bali. *Journal of Indigenous Culture, Tourism, and Language, 1*(2), 87-96. doi:https://doi.org/10.35912/jictl.v1i2.3509

Wiener, N. (2019). *Cybernetics or Control and Communication in the Animal and the Machine*: MIT press.

Yuldashevna, I., & Khurana, K. (2024). The Impediments to the Process of Implementing Robotics in the School Education System in Uzbekistan. *SAGE Open, 14*. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241254595?urlappend=%3Futm_source%3Dresearchgate