

# Equivalence Problems In Translating Mobile Communication Terms Between English And Uzbek

Arzimurodova E'zoza Berdimurod qizi

Doctorate, Karshi state university, Uzbekistan

Received: 22 March 2026 Accepted: 30 April 2026 Published: 20 May 2026

## ABSTRACT

The rapid expansion of mobile communication technologies has resulted in the emergence of numerous specialized terms, most of which originate in English and later enter Uzbek through translation, borrowing, transliteration, and semantic adaptation. This study investigates equivalence problems in translating mobile communication terminology between English and Uzbek. The research focuses on semantic, functional, pragmatic, and contextual equivalence within technical translation. Using comparative linguistic analysis, the article examines common translation difficulties such as non-equivalent lexical units, polysemantic terminology, abbreviations, hybrid formations, and culturally adapted terms. The findings demonstrate that complete equivalence is not always achievable due to structural and conceptual differences between the two languages. The study also identifies the most effective translation strategies, including borrowing, calquing, descriptive translation, and functional adaptation. The article contributes to the standardization of Uzbek mobile communication terminology and offers practical recommendations for translators and lexicographers.

**Keywords:** Equivalence, mobile communication terminology, translation studies, English, Uzbek, technical translation, functional equivalence, terminology standardization.

## INTRODUCTION

The development of information and communication technologies has significantly influenced the lexical systems of world languages. In particular, mobile communication terminology has become one of the fastest-growing terminological layers in modern linguistics. Since English dominates global technological innovation, the majority of mobile communication terms originate in English and later spread into other languages, including Uzbek [1].

Translation of technical terminology requires not only lexical substitution but also semantic, functional, and pragmatic equivalence between the source and target languages. Translation scholars such as Eugene Nida, J. C. Catford, and Mona Baker emphasize that equivalence is central to successful translation [2,3,4]. In technical discourse, equivalence becomes particularly problematic

because technological concepts often emerge earlier in English-speaking environments than in Uzbek linguistic practice [5].

Mobile communication terminology includes lexical units such as smartphone, roaming, wireless network, airplane mode, mobile hotspot, SIM card, and push notification. Many of these terms either lack direct Uzbek equivalents or are translated inconsistently across media, dictionaries, and professional discourse. Consequently, translators face challenges related to semantic ambiguity, polysemy, lexical borrowing, and standardization.

This research aims to investigate equivalence problems in translating mobile communication terms from English into Uzbek and to identify effective translation strategies for achieving linguistic and communicative adequacy.

**Research objectives are:**

1. to analyze types of equivalence in mobile communication terminology.
2. to identify major translation problems between English and Uzbek.
3. to examine translation strategies used in rendering mobile communication terms.
4. to evaluate the effectiveness of borrowing, calquing, and adaptation methods.
5. to propose recommendations for terminology standardization.

**Research Questions:**

1. What types of equivalence problems occur in translating mobile communication terms?
2. Which translation strategies are most effective in English–Uzbek technical translation?
3. Why do some mobile communication terms remain non-equivalent in Uzbek?

**Methods**

This study employs a qualitative comparative linguistic approach combined with terminological analysis. The research material consists of approximately 150 mobile

communication terms collected from English ICT dictionaries, telecommunications websites, mobile application interfaces, and Uzbek technical publications.

The methodological framework is based on theories of equivalence proposed by Eugene Nida, J. C. Catford, and Werner Koller [6]. Functional, semantic, pragmatic, and contextual equivalence models were applied during analysis.

The following methods were used:

- comparative linguistic analysis;
- terminological classification;
- semantic analysis;
- contextual interpretation;
- descriptive translation analysis.

The study also analyzed examples from bilingual glossaries, ICT corpora, mobile phone interfaces, and scholarly literature related to technical translation and terminology standardization [7].

**RESULTS**

The analysis revealed four major categories of equivalence problems in translating mobile communication terminology between English and Uzbek.

**1. Lexical Non-equivalence**

Some English mobile communication terms have no direct Uzbek equivalents because the concepts themselves emerged in English-speaking technological environments.

English Term	Uzbek Translation	Problem Type
smartphone	smartfon	direct borrowing
roaming	rouming	transliteration
hotspot	mobil ulanish nuqtasi	descriptive translation
push notification	bildirishnoma	partial equivalence
cloud storage	bulutli xotira	semantic adaptation

The findings indicate that borrowing remains the dominant strategy in Uzbek mobile communication terminology [8].

**2. Functional Equivalence Problems**

Certain translated terms preserve lexical meaning but fail to perform the same communicative function in Uzbek technical discourse.

For example:

Airplane mode - samolyot rejimi

Although semantically accurate, ordinary Uzbek users may not immediately associate the term with disabling wireless communication functions. Therefore, translators sometimes prefer explanatory versions such as:

telefon signalini vaqtincha o'chirish rejimi

This demonstrates that functional equivalence may require adaptation rather than literal translation.

### **3. Polysemantic Terminology**

Many English ICT terms possess multiple meanings depending on context.

Term	Meaning 1	Meaning 2
network	tarmoq	aloqa tizimi
signal	signal	aloqa sifati
port	port	ulanish nuqtasi

Polysemy creates ambiguity in translation and requires contextual interpretation. Translators must consider technical environment, software interface, and communicative purpose before selecting equivalents.

### **4. Abbreviations and Acronyms**

Abbreviations constitute another major equivalence challenge.

English acronym	Uzbek usage
SIM	SIM-karta
SMS	SMS xabarnoma
GPS	GPS navigatsiya
Wi-Fi	Wi-Fi
LTE	LTE tarmog'i

Most abbreviations are retained unchanged due to international standardization. However, explanatory additions are frequently necessary in Uzbek usage.

## **DISCUSSION**

The study demonstrates that equivalence in mobile communication terminology cannot always be achieved through direct lexical substitution. Instead, equivalence depends on communicative functionality, semantic transparency, and user comprehension.

The findings support the theoretical views of Eugene Nida concerning dynamic equivalence, according to which the target-language audience should receive a similar communicative effect as the source-language audience [9].

Borrowing appears to be the most productive strategy in translating mobile communication terminology because many technological innovations lack established Uzbek

equivalents. However, excessive borrowing may negatively affect terminological purity and comprehensibility for ordinary users.

Calquing is effective when semantic transparency can be maintained. For example:

wireless network - simsiz tarmoq

cloud storage - bulutli xotira

Such translations preserve both semantic meaning and functional clarity.

Descriptive translation is used when direct equivalence is absent. Although longer, descriptive forms improve understanding among non-specialist users.

The research also indicates that standardization remains a major issue in Uzbek ICT terminology. Different translators and media platforms often use inconsistent equivalents for the same English term. This inconsistency complicates communication and dictionary compilation.

Furthermore, pragmatic equivalence plays an important role in user-oriented translation, especially in mobile applications and software localization. Translation should account for user expectations, interface limitations, and cultural adaptation [10].

## **Conclusion**

This study investigated equivalence problems in translating mobile communication terminology between English and Uzbek. The analysis showed that the main challenges include lexical non-equivalence, polysemy, functional mismatch, and inconsistency in terminology standardization.

The findings demonstrate that no single translation strategy can solve all equivalence problems. Effective translation requires a combination of borrowing, calquing, semantic adaptation, and descriptive translation depending on context and communicative purpose.

The study concludes that:

-borrowing remains the dominant strategy in Uzbek mobile communication terminology;

-functional equivalence is more important than literal

equivalence in technical translation;

-standardization of Uzbek ICT terminology is urgently needed;

-translators must consider semantic, pragmatic, and contextual factors simultaneously.

The research contributes to translation studies, terminology theory, and Uzbek technical lexicography. Future studies may focus on corpus-based analysis, AI-assisted translation of ICT terminology, and multilingual comparison involving other Turkic languages.

## **References**

1. Arzimurodova Ezoza Berdimurodovna. (2025). Semantic Types Of Mobile Communication Terms In English And Uzbek: Polysemantic, Synonymous And Antonymic Units. *American Journal of Philological Sciences*, 5(09), 109–114. <https://doi.org/10.37547/ajps/Volume05Issue09-29>.
2. Nida E. A. *Toward a Science of Translating*. — Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 1964. — 331 p.
3. Catford J. C. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. — London: Oxford University Press, 1965. — 103 p.
4. Baker M. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. — London: Routledge, 2018. — 416 p.
5. Abdullayeva S.N. Adequacy and Equivalence in Financial and Economic Translation: Strategies for Effective Communication between English and Uzbek // *Current Research Journal of Philological Sciences*. — 2024. — Vol. 5, No. 11. — P. 30–46. DOI: 10.37547/philological-crjps-05-11-08.
6. Koller W. *Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft*. — Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1992. — 343 p.
7. Jurayeva S. “Bridging Terminological Gaps: Challenges in Translating Linguistic Terms Between English and Uzbek.” // *Journal of English Language and Scientific Innovation*. — 2024. — Available at: *Innovative Publication Journal*
8. Arzimurodova E.B. “BORROWING, CALQUING AND ADAPTATION IN THE TRANSLATION OF

MOBILE COMMUNICATION TERMS INTO UZBEK ”. International Conference on Linguistics & Translation, vol. 2, no. 3, Mar. 2026, pp. 56-59, <https://uniconflict.com/index.php/ICLT/article/view/3794>.

9. Nuraliev Jasur Rozikulovich. (2025). THE PROBLEM OF EQUIVALENCE IN TRANSLATION: THEORETICAL APPROACHES AND PRACTICAL EXAMPLES. NAZARIY VA AMALIY FANLARDAGI USTUVOR ISLOHOTLAR VA ZAMONAVIY TA'LIMNING INNOVATION YO'NALISHLARI, 2(10), 259–261. Retrieved from <https://innovativepublication.uz/index.php/NUZY/article/view/4320>
10. Bekmurodova F. N., Djumabayeva J. Sh., Madiyurova V. Q. Pragmatic Equivalence in the Translation of Cultural References from Uzbek into English // Arab World English Journal for Translation & Literary Studies. — 2024. — Vol. 8(2). — P. 241–254. — DOI: 10.24093/awejtls/vol8no2.17.