



№8(1)
2026

- 13.00.00 Pedagogika fanlari
- 13.00.01 Pedagogika nazariyasi. Pedagogik ta'limotlar tarixi
- 13.00.02 Ta'lim va tarbiya nazariyasi va metodikasi (sohalar bo'yicha)
- 13.00.03 Maxsus pedagogika
- 13.00.04 Jismoniy tarbiya va sport mashg'ulotlari nazariyasi va metodikasi
- 13.00.05 Kasb-hunar ta'limi nazariyasi va metodikasi
- 13.00.06 Elektron ta'lim nazariyasi va metodikasi (ta'lim sohaları va bosqichlari bo'yicha)
- 13.00.07 Ta'limda menejment
- 13.00.08 Maktabgacha ta'lim va tarbiya nazariyasi va metodikasi
- 13.00.09 Ijtimoiy pedagogika
- 07.00.00 Tarix fanlari
- 19.00.00 Psixologiya fanlari
- 01.00.00 Fizika-matematika fanlari
- 02.00.00 Kimyo fanlari
- 03.00.00 Biologiya fanlari
- 09.00.00 Falsafa fanlari
- 10.00.00 Filologiya fanlari
- 11.00.00 Geografiya fanlari

M AKTABGACHA VA AKTAB TA'LIMI

Pedagogika, psixologiya fanlariga ixtisoslashgan ilmiy jurnal

MAKTABGACHA VA MAKTAB TA'LIMI



*Elektron nashr. 154 sahifa,
3-avgust, 2026-yil.*

BOSH MUHARRIR:

Karimova E'zoza Gapirjanovna – O'zbekiston Respublikasi Maktabgacha va maktab ta'limi vaziri

BOSH MUHARRIR O'RINBOSARI:

Ibragimova Gulsanam Ne'matovna – Pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor

TAHRIRIYAT KENGASHI A'ZOLARI

Ibragimov X.I. – pedagogika fanlari doktori, akademik
Shoumarov G'.B. – psixologiya fanlari doktori, akademik
Qirg'izboyev A.K. – Tarix fanlari doktori, professor
Jamoldinova O.R. – pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor
Sharipov Sh.S. – pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor
Shermuhhammadov B.Sh. – pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor
Ma'murov B.B. – pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor
Madraximova F.R. – pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor
Kalonov M.B. – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor
Nabiyev D.X. – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor
Qo'ldoshev Q. M. – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor
Ikramxanova F.I. – filologiya fanlari doktori, professor
Ismagilova F.S. – psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor (Rossiya)
Stoyuxina N.Yu. – psixologiya fanlari nomzodi, dotsent (Rossiya)
Magauova A.S. – pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor (Qozog'iston)
Rejep O'zyurek – psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor (Turkiya)
Wookyu Cha – Koreya milliy ta'lim universiteti rektori (Koreya)
Polonnikov A.A. – psixologiya fanlari nomzodi, dotsent (Belarus)
Mizayeva F. O. – Pedagogika fanlari doktori, dotsent
Baybayeva M.X. – pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor
Muxsiyeva A.T. – pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor
Aliyev B. – falsafa fanlari doktori, professor
Abdullayeva N. Sh. – Pedagogika fanlari doktori (DSc), professor
Doniyorov S. M. – “Yangi O'zbekiston” va “Pravda Vostoka” gazetalari tahririyati DM bosh muharriri, O'zbekiston Respublikasida xizmat ko'rsatgan jurnalist, filologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent
G'afurov D. O. – falsafa fanlari doktori (Phd)
Shomurodov R.T. – iqtisodiyot fanlari nomzodi (PhD), dotsent
Mirzayeva F. O. – pedagogika fanlari doktori (DSc), dotsent
Jalilova S.X. – psixologiya fanlari nomzodi (PhD), dotsent
Bafayev M.M. – psixologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent
Usmonova D.I. – Samarqand iqtisodiyot va servis institute dotsenti
Saifnazarov I. – falsafa fanlari doktori, professor
Nematov Sh.E. – pedagogika fanlari nomzodi (PhD)
Tillashayxova X.A. – psixologiya fanlari nomzodi (PhD), dotsent
Yuldasheva F.I. – pedagogika fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent
Yuldasheva D.B. – filologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa (PhD) doktori, dotsent
Tangriyev A. T. – Toshkent davlat iqtisodiyot universiteti kafedra professori
Ashurov R. R. – psixologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent
Panjiyev M. A. – Qashqadaryo viloyati Maktabgacha va maktab ta'limi boshqarmasi boshlig'ining birinchi o'rinbosari
Xudayberganov N. A. – Xorazm Ma'mun akademiyasi Tabiiy fanlar bo'limining katta ilmiy xodimi, biologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD)
Vaxobov Anvar Abdusattor o'g'li – Pedagogika fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori, dotsent

Muassis: “Tadbirkor va ishbilarmon” MChJ

Hamkorlarimiz: O'zbekiston Respublikasi Maktabgacha va maktab ta'limi vazirligi, O'zbekiston milliy pedagogika universiteti

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF:

Karimova E'zoza Gapirzhanovna – Minister of Perschool and School Education of the Republic of Uzbekistan

DEPUTY EDITOR-IN-CHIEF:

Ibragimova Gulsanam Ne'matovna – Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor

EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBERS:

Ibragimov X.I. – Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Academician

Shoumarov G'. B. – Doctor of Psychological Sciences, Academician

Qirg'izboyev A. K. – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor

Jamoldinova O.R. – Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor

Sharipov Sh.S. – Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor

Shermuhhammadov B.Sh. – Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor

Ma'murov B.B. – Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor

Madraximova F.R. – Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor

Kalonov M.B. – Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor

Nabiyev D.X. – Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor

Koldoshev K. M. – Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor

Ikramxanova F.I. – Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor

Ismagilova F.S. – Doctor of Psychological Sciences, Professor (Russia)

Stoyuxina N.Yu. – Candidate of Psychological Sciences (PhD), Associate Professor (Russia)

Magauova A.S. – Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor (Kazakhstan)

Rejep O'zyurek – Doctor of Psychological Sciences, Professor (Turkey)

Wookyu Cha – President of the National University of Education, Korea (South Korea)

Polonnikov A.A. – Candidate of Psychological Sciences (PhD), Associate Professor (Belarus)

Mizayeva F. O. – Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor

Baybayeva M.X. – Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor

Muxsiyeva A.T. – Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor

Aliyev B. – Doctor of philosophy, professor

Abdullayeva N. Sh. – Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences (DSc), Professor

Doniyorov S. M. – Editor-in-Chief of the DM Editorial Office of the newspapers “Yangi O'zbekiston” and “Pravda Vostoka”, Honored Journalist of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philology, Associate Professor

Gafurov D. O. – Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

Shomurodov R.T. – Candidate of Economic Sciences (PhD), Associate Professor

Mirzayeva F. O. – Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences (DSc), Associate Professor

Jalilova S.X. – Candidate of Psychological Sciences (PhD), Associate Professor

Bafayev M.M. – Doctor of Philosophy in Psychological Sciences (PhD), Associate Professor

Usmonova D.I. – Associate Professor, Samarkand Institute of Economics and Service

Saifnazarov I. – Doctor of philosophy, professor

Nematov Sh.E. – Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences (PhD)

Tillashayxova X.A. – Candidate of Psychological Sciences (PhD), Associate Professor

Yuldasheva F.I. – Doctor of Philosophy in Pedagogical Sciences (PhD), Associate Professor

Yuldasheva D.B. – Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philological Sciences, Associate Professor

Tangriyev A.T. – is a professor of Tashkent State University of Economics

Ashurov R. R. – Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Psychology, Associate Professor

Panjiyev M. A. – First Deputy Head of the Department of Preschool and School Education of the Kashkadarya Region

Khudaiberganov N. A. – Senior Researcher of the Department of Natural Sciences of the Khorezm Mamun

Academy, Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Biological Sciences

Vakhobov Anvar Abdusattor oğlu – Doctor of Philosophy in Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor

“Maktabgacha va maktab ta'limi” jurnali O'zbekiston Respublikasi Oliy attestatsiya komissiyasining quyidagi qarorlariga asosan pedagogika va psixologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD) hamda fan doktori (DSc) ilmiy darajasiga talabgorlarning dissertatsiyalaridagi asosiy ilmiy natijalarni chop etish uchun milliy ilmiy nashrlar ro'yxatiga kiritilgan:

Pedagogika fanlari bo'yicha: OAK Kengashi tavsiyasi (26.08.2024-y., №11-05-4381/01) asosida:

- Ekspert kengashi (29.10.2024-y., №10)
- Rayosat qarori (31.10.2024-y., №363/5)

Psixologiya fanlari bo'yicha: Toshkent davlat pedagogika universiteti murojaatiga asosan OAK tavsiyasi (24.04.2025-y., №11-05-2566/01):

- Ekspert kengashi (25.05.2025-y., №10)
- Rayosat qarori (08.05.2025-y., №370/5)

“Maktabgacha va maktab ta'limi”
jurnali

26.09.2023-yildan

O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti
Administratsiyasi huzuridagi Axborot
va ommaviy kommunikatsiyalar
agentligi tomonidan **№C-5669363**
reyestr raqami tartibi bo'yicha
ro'yxatdan o'tkazilgan.

Litsenziya raqami: **№136361**

MUNDARIJA

Sun'iy intellekt muhitida o'sib kelayotgan Alfa avlodining shaxsiy va psixik rivojlanishi	10
<i>Jo'rayeva Dilfuza Abdug'aniyevna</i>	
Teng yonli uchburchak xossalari va kesmaning o'rta perpendikulyari xossalariidan foydalangan holda masalalar yechish	13
<i>Namozov Diyorbek Baxtiyor o'g'li</i>	
Xiva xonligining siyosiy boshqaruv modeli: Buxoro va Qo'qon xonliklari bilan qiyosiy tahlili.....	17
<i>Mutallibjonov Boburmirzo</i>	
Boshlang'ich sinfda informatika fanini o'qitish metodikasi	26
<i>Nosirova Feruza Baxadir qizi</i>	
Funksional savodxonlik asosida bo'lajak boshlang'ich ta'lim o'qituvchilarini professional rivojlantirishning strukturaviy-faoliyatli modeli.....	30
<i>Gafurova Mahfuza Abbosovna</i>	
Mutafakkirlar asarlarida bolalar faolligini shakllantirishda o'yinlardan foydalanishning yoritilishi	35
<i>Ravshanova Uldona Narziboyevna</i>	
Ijtimoiy-madaniy qadriyatlar variatsiyasi sharoitida talabalarda kitobxonlik madaniyatini rivojlantirish mazmuni	39
<i>Vorisova Barnoxon Olimjon qizi</i>	
Huquqiy ta'lim va huquqiy tarbiya integratsiyasi orqali yoshlar orasida huquqbuzarliklarning oldini olish	43
<i>Habibjonov Izzatbek Dilshodjon o'g'li</i>	
Bo'lajak o'qituvchilarning tanqidiy va refleksiv tafakkurini rivojlantirishda antfragil yondashuvning o'rni.....	51
<i>G'ulomjonova Ziyodaxon A'zamjon qizi</i>	
Badiy adabiyotning yoshlar tarbiyasidagi didaktik imkoniyatlari	57
<i>Irisboyeva Xotiraxon Utbasarovna</i>	
Talabalarining o'quv amaliyoti jarayonida kasbiy mobilligini rivojlantirishda dual ta'limga asoslangan metodikani takomillashtirish	61
<i>G'ofurov To'liqinjon</i>	
Didactic Opportunities of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Technology in English Language Teaching	67
<i>Ismailova Aziza Dilshodovna</i>	
Фольклорные источники в историко-географическом изучении памятников Устюрта.....	72
<i>Канаатов Есимкан</i>	
Xorijiy davlatlar tajribasida o'zgarishlarni boshqarish ko'nikmalarini rivojlantirish amaliyoti.....	76
<i>Abdullayev Amirulla Xazratovich</i>	
Algoritmik faollikni rivojlantirishning zamonaviy metodik yondashuvi	81
<i>Pardayeva Kamola Sultonovna</i>	
Sun'iy intellekt va startap ekotizimi asosida talabalarining tadbirkorlik ko'nikmalarini rivojlantirish	86
<i>Imomaliyev Quvvat Choriyevich</i>	
Maktab ta'limida o'qitish sifatini baholashning ko'p tarmoqli raqamli-diaagnostik tizimini joriy etish va boshqarish	91
<i>Nurmetov Tursunbek Kenjayevich</i>	
Event ta'lim texnologiyasi vositasida talabalarining o'qish samaradorligini oshirish	96
<i>Latipova Ma'rifat Salohiddin qizi, Bo'tayeva Saodat Xudoyor qizi</i>	
Texnologik ta'lim yo'nalishi talabalarining malakaviy va pedagogik amaliyotlari uzviyligini ta'minlashning metodik modeli	99
<i>Mardonov Maqsudbek Maxmudovich</i>	
Nogironligi bo'lgan bolalarni tarbiyalayotgan oilalarga ijtimoiy-psixologik yordam ko'rsatishning nazariy-metodologik asoslari	103
<i>Umarova Umidaxon Ibaydullayevna</i>	



Chizmachilik darslarida animatsiyali modellarni qo'llashning pedagogik asoslari	108
<i>Xo'janiyozov Shokir Rustamovich</i>	
Fanlararo aloqadorlik asosida tibbiyot oliy ta'lim muassasalarida ingliz tilini o'qitish metodikasi va uning eksperimental samaradorligi	114
<i>Isroilova E'zoza Akmal qizi</i>	
Umumiy o'rta ta'lim tashkilotlarida ingliz tilini o'qitishda veb-kvestlar va raqamli keyslarni samarali qo'llash usullari	119
<i>Shermatova Ra'no O'ktam qizi, Baxodirova Gulnoz Kamalovna</i>	
Xalq og'zaki ijodi asosida bo'lajak boshlang'ich sinf o'qituvchilarining kreativ faoliyatini takomillashtirish texnologiyalari	124
<i>Abduraximova Muxabbat Allayevna</i>	
Bo'lajak fizika o'qituvchilarini nanotexnologiya sohasidagi bilimlarni taqdim etishga va o'qitishga tayyorlash metodikasi	129
<i>Sottarov Abduvali Umirqulovich</i>	
Raqamli ta'lim muhitida talabalarning raqamli tafakkurini rivojlantirishning pedagogik mexanizmlarini takomillashtirish	133
<i>Nuraliyeva Feruza Abdusalim qizi</i>	
Emotsional intellekt va raqamli kommunikatsiya: yoshlar psixologiyasida zamonaviy tendensiyalar	137
<i>Qahharov Nuriddin Sherbek o'g'li</i>	
Kichik maktab yoshidagi o'quvchilarda "o'quv burnout" (o'qishga nisbatan charchash va sovish) holatining oldini olishda motivatsion pedagogik texnologiyalar	142
<i>Babajanova Gulmira Muratbayevna</i>	
Linguopragmatic Errors in Artificial Intelligence-Generated Translations	147
<i>Aytmuxamedova Durdona Jasur qizi</i>	



LINGUOPRAGMATIC ERRORS IN ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE- GENERATED TRANSLATIONS

Aytmuxamedova Durdona Jasur qizi

Applicant for the PhD Programme
Tashkent, Uzbekistan

ORCID: 0009-0006-9558-6164

Abstract: This article examines linguopragmatic errors occurring in translations generated by artificial intelligence from the perspective of contemporary Translation Studies. The study aims to define the nature of linguopragmatic errors, identify the factors contributing to their occurrence, and evaluate their impact on translation quality. Although artificial intelligence systems have achieved remarkable progress in lexical and grammatical translation, they still experience considerable difficulties in conveying pragmatic meaning, communicative intention, contextual information, and culture-specific elements. The article classifies the principal types of linguopragmatic errors and discusses possible approaches to reducing their occurrence in AI-assisted translation. The findings contribute to improving translation quality assessment and advancing linguopragmatic approaches within modern Translation Studies.

Key words: Artificial intelligence, machine translation, Translation Studies, linguopragmatics, linguopragmatic errors, pragmatics, equivalence, adequacy, communicative intention, translation quality.

Annotatsiya: Mazkur maqolada sun'iy intellekt asosida yaratilgan tarjimalarda uchraydigan lingvopragmatik xatolar tarjimashunoslik nuqtayi nazaridan tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqotda lingvopragmatik xatolarning mohiyati, ularning yuzaga kelish sabablari hamda tarjima sifatiga ta'siri zamonaviy tarjimashunoslik nazariyalari asosida yoritiladi. Sun'iy intellekt tizimlari leksik va grammatik jihatdan yuqori natijalarni namoyon etayotgan bo'lsa-da, pragmatik ma'no, kommunikativ niyat, nutq vaziyati hamda madaniy xususiyatlarni uzatishda muayyan kamchiliklarga ega ekanligi aniqlanadi. Maqolada lingvopragmatik xatolarning asosiy turlari tasniflanadi hamda ularni kamaytirishning ilmiy yondashuvlari taklif etiladi. Tadqiqot natijalari sun'iy intellekt yordamida bajarilgan tarjimalarni baholash mezonlarini takomillashtirish va tarjima sifatini oshirishga xizmat qiladi.

Kalit so'zlar: Sun'iy intellekt, tarjimashunoslik, mashina tarjimasi, lingvopragmatika, lingvopragmatik xato, pragmatika, ekvivalentlik, adekvatlik, kommunikativ niyat, tarjima sifati.

Аннотация: В данной статье рассматриваются лингвопрагматические ошибки, возникающие в переводах, созданных с использованием искусственного интеллекта. Исследование посвящено определению сущности лингвопрагматических ошибок, анализу причин их возникновения и оценке их влияния на качество перевода. Несмотря на высокий уровень лексической и грамматической точности современных систем искусственного интеллекта, они по-прежнему испытывают трудности при передаче прагматического значения, коммуникативного намерения автора, особенностей речевой ситуации и культурно обусловленных элементов текста. В статье предлагается классификация основных типов лингвопрагматических ошибок и рассматриваются возможные пути их минимизации. Полученные результаты могут быть использованы при совершенствовании систем машинного перевода и развитии современной теории перевода.

Ключевые слова: искусственный интеллект, машинный перевод, переводоведение, лингвопрагматика, прагматика, эквивалентность, адекватность, коммуникативное намерение, качество перевода.

INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence (AI) has become one of the most significant technological achievements of the twenty-first century, profoundly influencing numerous aspects of human activity, including language services and translation. The integration of AI into translation technologies has revolutionized multilingual communication by enabling users to translate texts rapidly and efficiently across different languages. Neural machine translation (NMT), supported by deep learning algorithms and extensive multilingual corpora, has substantially improved translation fluency and grammatical accuracy compared with earlier rule-based and statistical machine transla-

tion systems. Consequently, AI-generated translations are now widely applied in education, scientific communication, healthcare, tourism, business, law, diplomacy, information technologies, and many other professional domains.

Despite these remarkable technological advances, translation cannot be regarded merely as a mechanical process of replacing linguistic units from one language with corresponding units in another. Translation is primarily a communicative act that requires the successful transfer of semantic meaning, pragmatic intention, cultural values, discourse conventions, and contextual information. A translator is expected not only to reproduce the lexical and grammatical content of the source text but also to preserve its communicative function and intended effect on the target audience. Therefore, high-quality translation depends on achieving not only semantic equivalence but also pragmatic equivalence.

One of the major challenges facing artificial intelligence-generated translations is the preservation of pragmatics. AI systems frequently process texts by recognizing statistical language patterns rather than understanding communicative situations, speaker intentions, or sociocultural contexts. Consequently, translations generated by artificial intelligence may appear grammatically accurate while failing to convey the pragmatic meaning intended in the original message. Such deficiencies often result in linguopragmatic errors that reduce translation adequacy and negatively influence communication between the author and the target audience.

Linguopragmatic errors occur when the translated text fails to preserve the communicative purpose, contextual appropriateness, interpersonal meaning, or cultural implications expressed in the source text. These errors may involve inaccurate interpretation of speech acts, inappropriate politeness strategies, misunderstanding of implicatures, incorrect translation of deixis, distortion of discourse coherence, or inadequate rendering of culture-specific expressions. Unlike lexical or grammatical mistakes, linguopragmatic errors directly affect communication because they alter how the translated message is understood by its recipients. Even a linguistically correct translation may become pragmatically inappropriate if it ignores the communicative context in which the original text was produced.

The growing dependence on AI-assisted translation has intensified scholarly interest in evaluating translation quality beyond grammatical correctness. Contemporary translation studies increasingly emphasize that successful translation should be assessed according to communicative effectiveness rather than linguistic accuracy alone. Scholars such as Eugene Nida, Peter Newmark, Mona Baker, Jeremy Munday, Anthony Pym, Dorothy Kenny, and Sharon O'Brien have highlighted the importance of pragmatic equivalence, contextual adaptation, and discourse analysis in translation evaluation. Their theoretical contributions demonstrate that translation quality largely depends on preserving the communicative intentions embedded in the source text.

Although numerous studies have investigated lexical, grammatical, and semantic aspects of machine translation, linguopragmatic errors in AI-generated translations remain comparatively underexplored. Existing research predominantly concentrates on translation accuracy, terminology management, and syntactic performance, whereas relatively limited attention has been devoted to pragmatic failures that influence communication. This research seeks to address this gap by examining linguopragmatic errors from the perspective of contemporary translation studies and pragmatics.

The relevance of this study is determined by the increasing use of artificial intelligence in professional translation activities and the growing demand for reliable methods of evaluating AI-generated translations. Understanding the nature of linguopragmatic errors may contribute to improving translation quality assessment, developing more effective post-editing strategies, and enhancing cooperation between artificial intelligence systems and human translators.

The object of the research is artificial intelligence-generated translations.

The subject of the research is linguopragmatic errors occurring in AI-generated translations.

The aim of this study is to investigate the nature, classification, causes, and communicative consequences of linguopragmatic errors in translations generated by artificial intelligence.

To achieve this aim, the following objectives have been established:

- to define the concept of linguopragmatic errors within contemporary translation studies;
- to identify the principal types of linguopragmatic errors occurring in AI-generated translations;
- to analyze linguistic and pragmatic factors contributing to these errors;
- to examine the impact of linguopragmatic errors on translation quality and communicative effectiveness;
- to discuss possible approaches for minimizing linguopragmatic errors through linguistically informed evaluation and post-editing.



LITERATURE REVIEW

The issue of pragmatics in translation has attracted considerable attention in contemporary Translation Studies. Researchers increasingly emphasize that successful translation requires not only lexical and grammatical correspondence but also the preservation of communicative intentions, contextual meanings, and pragmatic effects. The rapid development of artificial intelligence and machine translation technologies has further intensified scholarly interest in evaluating translation quality from a linguopragmatic perspective.

One of the earliest and most influential contributions to pragmatic translation theory was made by Eugene Nida (1964), who introduced the concept of dynamic equivalence. According to Nida, an effective translation should produce a response in the target audience that is substantially similar to that experienced by the readers of the source text. This principle emphasizes the importance of communicative effect rather than formal linguistic correspondence. In the context of artificial intelligence-generated translations, dynamic equivalence becomes particularly significant because AI systems frequently reproduce lexical meanings while failing to convey the intended pragmatic effect.

Another important contribution was made by Peter Newmark (1988), who distinguished between semantic translation and communicative translation. Semantic translation focuses on preserving the original meaning and structure of the source text, whereas communicative translation aims to achieve an equivalent effect on the target audience. Newmark argues that translators should prioritize communicative effectiveness whenever literal translation impedes understanding. This approach is highly relevant to AI-generated translations, which often demonstrate grammatical accuracy but fail to adapt messages to specific communicative situations.

The relationship between translation and pragmatics was further developed by Mona Baker (1992), who emphasized the importance of equivalence at different levels of language, including pragmatic equivalence. According to Baker, translators should consider implicatures, coherence, and contextual factors in order to preserve the communicative value of the original message. She argues that successful translation depends on the ability to interpret implied meanings rather than merely translating explicit linguistic structures. The inability of artificial intelligence to adequately process implicatures and contextual assumptions frequently leads to linguopragmatic errors.

Similarly, Jeremy Munday (2022) highlights the interdisciplinary nature of translation studies and argues that translation should be viewed as a communicative and sociocultural process. He emphasizes that meaning is constructed within specific contexts and that translators need to understand the interaction between language, culture, and discourse. Munday's approach is particularly valuable for the analysis of AI-generated translations because many translation errors emerge from the inability of artificial intelligence systems to recognize contextual and cultural nuances.

The importance of translator decision-making and contextual adaptation has also been emphasized by Anthony Pym (2014). Pym argues that translation involves risk management and problem-solving strategies that require human interpretation and cultural awareness. Since artificial intelligence systems largely depend on statistical prediction and pattern recognition, they frequently lack the pragmatic competence necessary to make contextually appropriate decisions.

Studies on machine translation and post-editing have significantly expanded in recent years. Dorothy Kenny (2022) and Sharon O'Brien (2012) argue that although neural machine translation has considerably improved translation fluency, human intervention remains essential in identifying and correcting pragmatic inaccuracies. Their studies demonstrate that machine translation systems often fail to recognize discourse conventions, speech acts, politeness strategies, and culture-bound meanings, thereby generating translations that are linguistically acceptable but pragmatically inappropriate.

From the perspective of pragmatics, the theoretical foundations of speech acts proposed by John Austin (1962) and further developed by John Searle (1969) provide valuable tools for analyzing translation quality. Speech act theory demonstrates that utterances perform communicative functions such as requesting, apologizing, promising, or warning. Artificial intelligence systems frequently encounter difficulties in preserving these communicative functions because they primarily process linguistic forms rather than communicative intentions. Consequently, translations may distort the pragmatic force of the original message.

Another important theoretical perspective is Grice's Cooperative Principle (1975) and the theory of conversational implicature. Grice argues that communication depends on shared assumptions and implicit meanings that extend beyond literal expressions. Since artificial intelligence systems often interpret language literally, they may fail to convey implied meanings and generate translations that are pragmatically inadequate.

Within Russian translation studies, significant contributions have been made by V. N. Komissarov (1990), who emphasized the communicative nature of translation and the necessity of preserving the functional equivalence of the source text. L. S. Barkhudarov (1975) and Ya. I. Retsker (1974) also stressed the importance of contextual interpretation and translation transformations in achieving adequate translation. Their theories

suggest that successful translation requires flexible adaptation to linguistic and communicative conditions rather than mechanical word-for-word correspondence.

In Uzbek translation studies, the works of Ibrohim G'afurov and G'. Rahimov have played a significant role in developing theoretical approaches to equivalence, adequacy, and communicative translation. These scholars emphasize that translation should preserve both the informational and pragmatic functions of the original text. Their theoretical insights provide an important framework for evaluating the quality of translations generated by artificial intelligence in the Uzbek linguistic context.

Despite the growing body of literature on machine translation, most existing studies primarily focus on lexical, grammatical, and semantic aspects of translation quality. Comparatively little attention has been devoted to the systematic investigation of linguopragmatic errors in artificial intelligence-generated translations. Consequently, there remains a significant research gap concerning the classification, causes, and communicative consequences of such errors.

The present study seeks to contribute to this field by examining linguopragmatic errors through the integration of contemporary translation theory, pragmatics, and machine translation research. It argues that the evaluation of AI-generated translations should extend beyond grammatical accuracy and incorporate linguopragmatic criteria that reflect the communicative effectiveness of translated texts.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present study employs a qualitative and descriptive research design to investigate linguopragmatic errors in artificial intelligence-generated translations. The research is based on the assumption that translation quality cannot be evaluated solely through lexical and grammatical accuracy but should also be assessed according to the extent to which the translated text preserves pragmatic meaning, communicative intention, and contextual appropriateness.

The empirical material for the study consists of English source texts and their translations generated by contemporary artificial intelligence-based translation systems. The selected materials include different text types, such as informative, academic, publicistic, and conversational texts, because various genres contain diverse pragmatic features and communicative functions. The corpus was selected according to the principles of thematic diversity, contextual richness, and the presence of culture-specific and pragmatically marked linguistic units.

The study applies several complementary research methods.

Descriptive analysis is employed to identify and explain the linguistic and pragmatic characteristics of translation errors. This method allows the researcher to classify the major categories of linguopragmatic errors and determine their communicative significance.

Comparative analysis is used to compare source texts and their corresponding translations in order to identify discrepancies in pragmatic meaning and communicative function. The comparison focuses on speech acts, contextual meaning, politeness strategies, discourse markers, and culture-bound expressions.

Linguopragmatic analysis serves as the principal method of the research. This approach examines how communicative intentions, contextual information, and pragmatic effects are transferred from the source language into the target language. Particular attention is paid to the preservation of speech acts, implicatures, deixis, and interpersonal meaning.

Contextual analysis is applied to determine the role of situational and cultural context in the interpretation of translated texts. Since many linguopragmatic errors arise from the inability of artificial intelligence systems to interpret contextual information adequately, this method provides an important framework for evaluating translation quality.

The theoretical and methodological foundations of the study are based on the works of scholars in translation studies and pragmatics, including Eugene Nida's theory of dynamic equivalence, Peter Newmark's communicative translation approach, Mona Baker's concept of pragmatic equivalence, and Grice's theory of conversational implicature. Speech Act Theory, developed by Austin and Searle, also provides an important analytical framework for identifying communicative failures in AI-generated translations.

For the purposes of this research, linguopragmatic errors are classified into several categories:

- errors related to communicative intention;
- errors in the translation of speech acts;
- errors involving implicatures and implied meanings;



- errors associated with politeness strategies;
- errors concerning culture-specific elements;
- errors affecting discourse coherence and contextual appropriateness.

The collected data are analyzed qualitatively through detailed examination of representative examples. The interpretation of the findings focuses on identifying the causes of linguopragmatic failures and evaluating their influence on communicative effectiveness and translation adequacy.

The methodological framework adopted in this study makes it possible to investigate artificial intelligence-generated translations from an interdisciplinary perspective that integrates translation studies, pragmatics, discourse analysis, and intercultural communication. Such an approach provides a comprehensive understanding of the nature of linguopragmatic errors and contributes to the development of more effective strategies for evaluating and improving AI-assisted translation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis demonstrates that artificial intelligence-generated translations frequently contain linguopragmatic errors despite their high degree of lexical and grammatical accuracy. The findings indicate that such errors primarily emerge from the inability of AI systems to adequately interpret contextual information, communicative intentions, and socio-cultural factors that influence meaning construction.

One of the most common categories of linguopragmatic errors is the misinterpretation of communicative intention. In many cases, artificial intelligence systems successfully translate the literal meaning of an utterance but fail to convey its intended communicative purpose. Interrogative structures, for example, may function as requests, suggestions, or expressions of politeness rather than genuine questions. AI-generated translations often reproduce the grammatical form of the sentence while neglecting its pragmatic function.

Another significant category involves speech act errors. Speech acts represent communicative actions performed through language, including requests, apologies, promises, invitations, and warnings. The findings reveal that artificial intelligence frequently fails to preserve the illocutionary force of utterances. A request may be translated as a command, or a polite suggestion may appear as a direct instruction. Such transformations substantially alter interpersonal relations and may negatively influence communication between participants.

The study also identifies numerous implicature-related errors. Human communication often relies on implicit meanings that extend beyond the literal interpretation of words. Artificial intelligence systems generally process linguistic forms explicitly and therefore encounter difficulties in recognizing implied information. Consequently, translations may become semantically accurate but pragmatically incomplete because important contextual assumptions remain unexpressed in the target text.

A further category of errors concerns politeness strategies and interpersonal meaning. Different languages and cultures employ distinct linguistic mechanisms for expressing respect, social distance, and politeness. Artificial intelligence systems frequently fail to adapt such expressions appropriately, resulting in translations that sound excessively direct, overly formal, or socially inappropriate. These deficiencies are particularly noticeable in professional correspondence, public communication, and institutional discourse.

The findings additionally reveal the presence of culture-specific errors. Many linguistic units are deeply embedded in cultural traditions and social practices. Artificial intelligence often translates such elements literally without considering their cultural significance. Consequently, target readers may fail to understand the intended meaning or may interpret the message incorrectly. The inability to process cultural references demonstrates one of the principal limitations of current AI translation technologies.

Another important category consists of deictic and contextual errors. Deictic expressions, including references to time, place, and participants, depend heavily on the communicative situation. Artificial intelligence systems occasionally fail to identify the appropriate contextual frame, resulting in ambiguity or distortion of meaning. Such errors indicate that contextual understanding remains a major challenge for machine-generated translation.

The analysis further demonstrates that discourse coherence errors frequently occur in longer texts. Although individual sentences may appear grammatically correct, the translated text sometimes lacks logical cohesion and pragmatic consistency. Connective devices, reference chains, and thematic progression are not always preserved adequately, thereby reducing textual coherence and communicative effectiveness.

The identified errors indicate that linguistic correctness does not necessarily guarantee successful communication. Artificial intelligence systems have achieved remarkable progress in lexical selection and syntactic processing; however, their ability to reproduce pragmatic meaning remains limited. The findings support the argument that translation quality should be assessed not only through linguistic equivalence but also through the preservation of communicative intentions and pragmatic functions.



From a theoretical perspective, the results confirm the relevance of Nida's concept of dynamic equivalence and Baker's theory of pragmatic equivalence. Effective translation requires the preservation of communicative effect rather than simple linguistic correspondence. The findings also support contemporary studies emphasizing the importance of contextual adaptation and human intervention in AI-assisted translation.

The present research suggests that linguopragmatic competence represents one of the principal challenges for artificial intelligence in translation. Although technological developments continue to improve machine translation systems, human post-editing remains indispensable in identifying and correcting pragmatic inaccuracies. Consequently, cooperation between artificial intelligence and human translators should be regarded as the most effective approach to achieving high-quality translation.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The rapid development of artificial intelligence has significantly transformed contemporary translation practices and increased the accessibility of multilingual communication. Modern AI-based translation systems demonstrate remarkable achievements in lexical selection, grammatical accuracy, and processing speed. Nevertheless, the findings of the present study indicate that the quality of translation cannot be evaluated solely on the basis of linguistic correctness, as successful translation also requires the preservation of pragmatic meaning, communicative intention, and contextual appropriateness.

The research has demonstrated that artificial intelligence-generated translations frequently contain various types of linguopragmatic errors. The most common categories include errors related to communicative intention, speech acts, conversational implicatures, politeness strategies, culture-specific expressions, deictic references, and discourse coherence. Such errors arise primarily because artificial intelligence systems process language through statistical and algorithmic mechanisms rather than through genuine understanding of communicative situations and socio-cultural contexts.

The analysis confirms that linguopragmatic failures may substantially affect translation adequacy and communicative effectiveness. Even when translations are lexically and grammatically correct, they may fail to produce the intended effect on target readers if pragmatic meanings are distorted or omitted. Consequently, the preservation of pragmatic equivalence should be regarded as one of the principal criteria for evaluating translation quality in the age of artificial intelligence.

The findings also demonstrate that human participation remains essential in AI-assisted translation. Human translators possess contextual awareness, cultural competence, and pragmatic sensitivity that current artificial intelligence systems are unable to fully replicate. Therefore, post-editing and linguopragmatic evaluation should become integral components of professional translation practice involving artificial intelligence technologies.

The present study contributes to contemporary Translation Studies by emphasizing the necessity of integrating pragmatics into the assessment of AI-generated translations. It also provides a theoretical foundation for further investigations into the relationship between artificial intelligence, translation quality, and intercultural communication. Future research may focus on developing linguopragmatic models for evaluating machine translation and designing more effective strategies for reducing pragmatic errors in artificial intelligence-based translation systems.

References:

1. Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press.
2. Baker, M. (1992). In *Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. Routledge.
3. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics: Speech Acts* (Vol. 3, pp. 41–58). Academic Press.
4. Kenny, D. (2022). *Machine Translation for Everyone: Empowering Users in the Age of Artificial Intelligence*. Language Science Press.
5. Komissarov, V. N. (1990). *Theory of Translation (Linguistic Aspects)*. Vysshaya Shkola.
6. Munday, J. (2022). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications* (5th ed.). Routledge.
7. Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice Hall.
8. Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. E. J. Brill.
9. O'Brien, S. (2012). Translation as human-computer interaction. *Translation Spaces*, 1(1), 101–122.
10. Pym, A. (2014). *Exploring Translation Theories* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
11. Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press.

- 
- 13.00.00 Pedagogika fanlari
 - 13.00.01 Pedagogika nazariyasi. Pedagogik ta'limotlar tarixi
 - 13.00.02 Ta'lim va tarbiya nazariyasi va metodikasi (sohalar bo'yicha)
 - 13.00.03 Maxsus pedagogika
 - 13.00.04 Jismoniy tarbiya va sport mashg'ulotlari nazariyasi va metodikasi
 - 13.00.05 Kasb-hunar ta'limi nazariyasi va metodikasi
 - 13.00.06 Elektron ta'lim nazariyasi va metodikasi (ta'lim sohaları va bosqichlari bo'yicha)
 - 13.00.07 Ta'limda menejment
 - 13.00.08 Maktabgacha ta'lim va tarbiya nazariyasi va metodikasi
 - 13.00.09 Ijtimoiy pedagogika
 - 07.00.00 Tarix fanlari
 - 19.00.00 Psixologiya fanlari
 - 01.00.00 Fizika-matematika fanlari
 - 02.00.00 Kimyo fanlari
 - 03.00.00 Biologiya fanlari
 - 09.00.00 Falsafa fanlari
 - 10.00.00 Filologiya fanlari
 - 11.00.00 Geografiya fanlari



AKTABGACHA VA AKTAB TA'LIMI

Mas'ul muharrir: Ramzidin Ashurov

Ingliz tili muharriri: Murod Xoliyorov

Musahhih: Alibek Zokirov

Sahifalovchi va dizayner: Iskandar Islomov

2026. №8(1)

© Materiallar ko'chirib bosilganda "Maktabgacha va maktab ta'limi" jurnali manba sifatida ko'rsatilishi shart. Jurnalda bosilgan material va reklamalardagi dalillarning aniqligiga mualliflar ma'sul. Tahririyat fikri har vaqt ham mualliflar fikriga mos kelamasligi mumkin. Tahririyatga yuborilgan materiallar qaytarilmaydi.

"Maktabgacha va maktab ta'limi" jurnali 26.09.2023-yildan O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti Adminstratsiyasi huzuridagi Axborot va ommaviy kommunikatsiyalar agentligi tomonidan №C-5669363 reyestr raqami tartibi bo'yicha ro'yxatdan o'tkazilgan.
Litsenziya raqami: № 136361.

Manzilimiz: Toshkent shahar, Yunusobod tumani
19-mavze, 17-uy.