

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2022 Issue: 12 Volume: 116

Published: 07.12.2022 <http://T-Science.org>

Issue

Article



Ildar Urakovich Khatamov

Karshi Engineering-Economic institute

Russian Language teacher

Department of Uzbek Language and Literature, Karshi, Uzbekistan

TRANSLATING AUTHENTIC CONTEXTS VIA GOOGLE PLATFORM

Abstract: In teaching and learning foreign languages at present time, is prosperous. In particular, due to vast changes in technology, there are increasing number of platforms which offer translation opportunities in different languages for learners in the world. However, translating through electronic platforms are not always effective because those platforms are constructed according to technology languages such as (Java Script, CSS, PHP and HTML). Additionally, electronic platforms are fast to translate and help learners find synonyms of words they research and need in web sites. That's why, researchers and non-linguists often use electronic platforms such as google-translator.

Key words: foreign language, electronic platform, translation, Russian language.

Language: English

Citation: Khatamov, I. U. (2022). Translating Authentic Contexts via Google Platform. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 12 (116), 36-39.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-12-116-8> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2022.12.116.8>

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

In learning Russian language, engineering students are always busy with translation technical and semi-technical words in Russian language even if this takes a lot of time and energy from them. Khasan Abdinazarov (2021) stated that learning FL for oil and gas engineering, specialist terminology acquisition is essential as it involves learners improving their profession in worldwide cooperation. Besides that, the students with petroleum engineering profile often accomplish tasks by using electronic platforms such google-translator in order to find L1 translation very fast especially, by using apps in the mobile phones. Meanwhile, they sometimes feel difficulty of finding relevant translation in Uzbek language via MT (Machine translation) such as google-translate platform. That platform is not yet fully enriched with oil and gas terminology in Uzbek language as they translate some profession-oriented words and combinations. Furthermore, google-translator platforms are helpful to find synonymous of the words we need. We carried out a research on the issues of how well that platform work in translating sentences from Russian into Uzbek language, especially, regarding to terminology in the field of oil and gas.

Forty students were very active in responding to the questions which were organized by linguists.

Views of linguists about Translation Platforms

In modernized era, while reading technical contexts, the engineering students are too eager to apply to the active function of machine translation in order to accomplish tasks such as translating contexts from Russian Language into Uzbek due to be fast in short-time. According to the statement of Mundt and Groves [3] while GT is approaching the grammatical level of certain competence of learners in English, it lacks the human ability to satisfy the norms of a discourse community in features that go beyond the sentence level. Additionally, Josefsson [4] claimed that while he was conducting a research on the issues of google-translation, having interviewed with 46 Swedish students, the result was that a good deal of learners complained its inaccuracies in translation from English into Swedish. Bahri and Mahadi [5] also made an interview with 17 Malaysian students on the issues of GT and the collected data showed that machine translation (GT) as a useful tool in translation because it is inexpensive, and offer a wide range of languages. What's more, one of the advantages of GT,

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИЦ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

it has technical ability to translate a written and spoken message into target language; consequently, it is gaining more and more momentum because businessmen in trade need fast and high-quality in translation of documents in written and spoken contexts. Lee, Seowon (2004) stated that learners face difficulty in comprehending meanings of words. Moreover, one of the issues of Russian language learners in translation is to perceive semanticity of terminology and define the meaning of authentic context, which means representation of ideas, actions, objects that leads to definition of meaning and is central to all linguistic concerns.

Linguists (Laufer, B., & Hill, M. (2000); Roby, W. B. (1999); Halliday, M.A.K., 1989a) stated that infiltration of numerous translation tools and free translation websites, electronic dictionaries, online dictionaries or vocabulary glosses those are integrated into language learning software or web pages learners may define the meaning of text. As a consequence, technical language is endowed with many peculiarities regarding to grammar and linguistic structures; lexicon, terminology, style, and syntax.

Halliday, M.A.K., (1989a), Halliday, M.A.K., (1989b), Crespo, B., (2011), Zorita, C.H., Sandoval, A.M., (2016) revealed that in the process of translating texts with full of technical terminology learners often encounter widely use of nominalization. Nominalization is a type of word formation in which a verb or an adjective is used as a noun, nominalization together with pre-modification and compounding all tend to reduce the number of function words and make the text more 'dense' with lexical words.

Semi-technical vocabulary translating via google-translator

1) Мама не работала. Она говорила, что ее работа – это муж и сын. Каждое утро она вставала раньше всех, готовила завтрак. И каждое утро отец говорил маме: «До свидания, моя родная!» И Генка видел, как мама рада слышать эти слова. Они вместе с отцом выходили из дома, вместе шли по улице, как два мужчины. И Генке нравилось идти рядом с сильным, спокойным отцом.

2) А вечером он вместе с мамой ждал отца. Он очень хотел открыть дверь отцу, но видел, что мама хочет этого еще больше, поэтому всегда смотрел, как отец входит и говорит маме: «Здравствуй, моя родная!» И потом они вместе сидели и слушали рассказы отца о работе, о том, как много и долго нужно иногда работать. А Генка рассказывал о новом фильме, о школе. Это была счастливая, дружная семья.

3) Однажды летом я зашёл в сад. У меня была интересная книга. Я сел на скамейку и начал читать. Я читал до вечера. В саду уже никого не было. Я боялся, что сад закроется, встал и быстро пошёл к выходу. Вдруг я услышал, что кто-то

плачет. Я повернул налево и увидел небольшой белый дом. Около стены дома стоял мальчик и громко плакал. Ему было 7–8 лет.

Technical words translating via google-translator

1.Кривошип 14 при помощи шатуна 15 приводит в колебательное движение балансирующую раму. При опускании рамы оттяжной ролик натягивает канат и поднимает буровой снаряд над забоем. При подъеме рамы канат опускается, снаряд падает, и при ударе долота о породу последняя разрушается. По мере углубления скважины канат удлиняют, сматывая его с барабана. Цилиндричность скважины обеспечивается поворотом долота в результате раскручивания каната под нагрузкой (во время припадём бурового наряда) и скручивания его при снятии нагрузки (во время удара долота о породу).

2. В процессе разбуривания трещиноватых и вязких пород возможно заклинивание долота. Для освобождения долота в буровом снаряде применяют штангу-ножницы, изготовленные в виде двух удлиненных колец, соединенных друг с другом подобно звеньям цепи.

3. Процесс бурения будет тем эффективнее, чем меньшее сопротивление долоту бурового снаряда оказывает накапливающаяся на забое скважины выбуренная порода, перемешанная с пластовой жидкостью. При отсутствии или недостаточном притоке пластовой жидкости в скважину с устья периодически доливают воду.

Равномерное распределение частиц выбуренной породы в воде достигается периодическим расхаживанием (приподъемом и опусканием) бурового снаряда. По мере накопления на забое разрушенной породы (шлама) возникает необходимость в очистке скважины.

While we made a research analysis on the issues of translating technical and semi-technical words occurred in the above-mentioned contexts, we observed and found that engineering students could translate simple words which we use for everyday life. However, the students had difficulties in finding equivalents of terminology from Russian language into Uzbek.

Conclusion.

In translating technical terminology from Russian language into Uzbek, especially technical contexts is not easy and it may takes long and complex process. However, it showed that GT (google-translator platform) has a lot of lexical deficiency especially, in the area of oil and gas field which not yet enriched in Uzbek. Adult learners, professor-teachers, researchers, employees/officials often prefer

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

electronic dictionaries comparing to paper-based. What's more, we sometimes find technical terminology in both electronic and paper based dictionaries. While translating we may encounter with the issues concerning lexico-semantic, syntactic in GT in Uzbek. In reading comprehension learners are engaged in performing translation activities such as translating authentic contexts from Russian into Uzbek in order to understand the meaning of the context. Today, information technology is advanced

due to capability of human mind, and all learners are interested in using mobile phones with internet access and apps. Therefore, they prefer employing machine translation (GT) in reading activities because it is fast and offers a word with multiple meanings, enable learners to choose appropriate word for translation but learners sometimes find errors in translation such as morphologicalsyntactic errors, lexicosemantic errors, and even orthographic errors.

References:

1. Abdinazarov, Kh. Sh. (2021). Lexical deficiency of oil and gas terminology observing in translation from english into uzbek language via gt (google-translate). ilm-sharchashmalari. Scientific journal. Namangan State University. 2021. *ILM Sharchashmalari*. Retrieved from <https://e-library.namdu.uz>
2. Bassnett, S. (2013). *Translation Studies*. Routledge, London.
3. (2016). *Google AI Blog. A neural network for machine translation, at production scale*. Retrieved from <https://ai.googleblog.com/2016/09/a-neural-networkfor-machine.html>
4. Groves, M., & Mundt, K. (2015). Friend or foe? Google translate in language for academic purposes. *English for Specific Purposes*, 37(1), 112-121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2014.09.001>
5. Josefsson, E. (2011). *Contemporary approaches to translation in the classroom: A study of students' attitudes and strategies*. Retrieved from <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urnjurn:nbn:se:du-5929>
6. Bahri, H., & Mahadi, T. S. T. (2016). Google translate as a supplementary tool for learning Malay: A case study at Universiti Sains Malaysia. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 7(3), 162-167.
7. Lee, S. (2004). Teaching Lexis to EFL Students: A Review of Current Perspectives and Methods. *Annual Review of Education, Communication and Language Sciences*, Vol 1.
8. Paramaswari, J., Maryam, H., & Ilangko, S. (2014). An Analysis of Google. Translate Use in Decoding Contextual Semanticity among EFL Learners. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 1-13.
9. Laufer, B., & Hill, M. (2000). What Lexical Information Do L2 Learners Select in a CALL Dictionary and How Does it Affect Word Retention? *Language Learning & Technology*, 3: 58-76.
10. Roby, W. B. (1999). What's in a gloss? *Language Learning & Technology*, 2(2): 94-101.
11. Halliday, M.A.K. (1989a). "Some Grammatical Problems in Scientific English". Review of Applied. Linguistics. Supplement Series.
12. Halliday, M.A.K. (1989b). *Spoken and Written Language (Language Education)*, Reviews.
13. Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *Spoken and Written Modes of Meaning*. Media Texts: Authors and Readers.(2006). researchgate.net.Perez Ruiz, L..
14. (n.d.). Unraveling noun strings: toward an approach to the description of complex noun phrases in technical. writing. *Revista de Filología Inglesa* 27, 163-1. Ediciones Universidad de Valladolid.
15. Crespo, B. (2011). Rosewater, wheel of fortune: compounding and lexicalisation in seventeenth-century scientific texts. *Nordic J. Engl. Study*.
16. Zorita, C.H., & Sandoval, A.M. (2016). *Sentence Length and NP Complexity of General and Medical. Written Academic and media Texts*. An Analysis Using a Trained SyntacticParser researchgate.net.
17. Robinson, D. (2012). *Becoming a Translator - an Introduction to the Theory and Practic of Translation*. Routledge, LondonHatim, B., & Mason, I. *Discourse and the Translator*. Routledge, London.
18. Bozorgian, M., & Azadmanesh, N. (2015). A survey on the subject-verb agreement in Google machine. translation. *International Journal of Research Studies in Educational Technology*, 4(1), 51-62. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.5861/ijrset.2015.945>
19. Keshavarz, M. H. (1999). *Contrastive analysis and error analysis*. Tehran: Rahnama Publication.

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India) = 6.317	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582	ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939	PIF (India) = 1.940
	GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.771	IBI (India) = 4.260
	JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

20. Karami, O. (2014, January). *The brief view on Google Translate machine*. Paper presented at the meeting of the 2014 Seminar in Artificial Intelligence on Natural Language, German.
21. Aiken, M., & Balan, Sh. (2011). An analysis of Google Translate accuracy. *Translation Journal*, 16(2). Retrieved June 26, 2015, from <http://translationjournal.net/journal/56google.htm>
22. Callison-Burch, Ch., Osborne, M., & Koehn, Ph. (2006). *Re-evaluating the role of bleu in machine translation*. In Proceedings the 11th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (pp. 249-256). Trento, Italy.
23. Naunton, J., & Alison, P.(2011). *Oil and Gas 2*. Oxford English for Careers. Oxford University Press.