pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 5, May -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

]THE IMPACT OF MACHINE TRANSLATION ON THE TRANSFER OF PRAGMATIC MEANING: AN EMPIRICAL ENGLISH–UZBEK PERSPECTIVE

O. M. Madjitova
Senior Lecturer, Kokand State University
Faculty of Foreign Philology
e-mail: aisha1208@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0009-0004-3077-8013

Y. Jo'raboyeva
Student, Faculty of Foreign Philology
Kokand State University
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20457381

Abstract. The rapid expansion of artificial intelligence technologies and neural machine translation systems has significantly transformed global intercultural communication and multilingual information exchange (Koehn, 2020; O'Brien, 2023). Contemporary machine translation tools such as Google Translate, DeepL, Microsoft Translator, and ChatGPT-based systems increasingly demonstrate high levels of grammatical fluency and semantic accuracy. Nevertheless, despite substantial technological progress, machine translation continues to encounter serious difficulties in transferring pragmatic meaning, particularly between linguistically and culturally distant languages such as English and Uzbek (House, 2015; Kecskes, 2014).

The present study investigates the effectiveness of AI-based machine translation in preserving pragmatic equivalence in English–Uzbek translation. The research employs a mixed-method corpus-based design combining qualitative pragmatic analysis and quantitative statistical evaluation. A corpus consisting of 160 English expressions containing pragmatic elements was analyzed. The dataset included idiomatic expressions, indirect speech acts, politeness strategies, conversational implicatures, sarcastic statements, humor, and culturally marked units. The selected materials were translated into Uzbek using Google Translate, DeepL, ChatGPT, and Microsoft Translator. Machine-generated translations were compared with expert human translations based on pragmatic equivalence, contextual appropriateness, communicative naturalness, and sociocultural adaptation (Baker, 2018).

The findings demonstrate that while AI systems successfully transfer denotative semantic meaning in informational texts, they frequently fail to preserve implicit communicative intention, politeness hierarchy, cultural nuance, figurative meaning, and discourse-sensitive pragmatics. Quantitative analysis revealed that idiomatic expressions and sarcastic statements produced the highest rates of pragmatic failure, while indirect speech acts demonstrated relatively higher translation accuracy. Among the analyzed platforms, ChatGPT-based translation showed comparatively stronger contextual adaptation, although substantial limitations remained in culturally embedded discourse.

The study argues that pragmatic competence remains one of the most challenging dimensions of machine translation because pragmatic meaning depends heavily on sociocultural cognition, contextual inferencing, and intercultural communicative norms (Levinson, 1983; Verschueren, 2012). The article contributes to translation studies, intercultural pragmatics, and computational linguistics by proposing an empirical framework for evaluating pragmatic equivalence in low-resource language pairs such as English and Uzbek.

pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 5, May -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

Keywords: machine translation; neural machine translation; pragmatic meaning; English–Uzbek translation; AI translation; intercultural pragmatics; speech acts; politeness strategies; computational linguistics; pragmatic equivalence

Introduction. The development of artificial intelligence and neural machine translation technologies has fundamentally transformed contemporary multilingual communication. During the last decade, machine translation systems have evolved from rule-based and statistical models into sophisticated neural architectures capable of generating highly fluent target-language texts (Hutchins & Somers, 1992; Vaswani et al., 2017). Platforms such as Google Translate, DeepL, Microsoft Translator, and ChatGPT-based translation systems are increasingly integrated into academic communication, international business, education, tourism, diplomacy, and digital media. As globalization intensifies intercultural interaction, machine translation has become an indispensable tool for overcoming linguistic barriers and facilitating rapid access to multilingual information.

Recent advances in transformer-based neural architectures have significantly improved translation fluency, lexical precision, and syntactic coherence (Vaswani et al., 2017). Large Language Models (LLMs) additionally demonstrate remarkable contextual prediction capabilities and increasingly imitate human-like language production (O'Brien, 2023). Consequently, many users perceive modern AI translation systems as reliable alternatives to human translators. Nevertheless, despite technological progress, the accurate transfer of pragmatic meaning remains one of the most problematic aspects of machine translation (House, 2015).

Pragmatic meaning refers not merely to literal semantic content but to implied communicative intention, contextual interpretation, sociocultural implication, interpersonal relationships, and discourse-sensitive meaning. According to Yule (1996), pragmatics investigates meaning as communicated by a speaker and interpreted by a listener within a specific communicative context. Similarly, Levinson (1983) emphasizes that pragmatic interpretation depends heavily on contextual inference and shared sociocultural knowledge.

In intercultural communication, pragmatic competence becomes particularly significant because linguistic expressions frequently carry implicit meanings shaped by cultural norms, politeness conventions, discourse traditions, and social hierarchy (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Consequently, translation involves not only lexical substitution but also the transfer of communicative intention and sociocultural appropriateness. Baker (2018) argues that pragmatic equivalence concerns the accurate interpretation of implied meaning within the target language community. Failure to preserve pragmatic meaning may therefore result in communicative distortion, intercultural misunderstanding, or sociolinguistic inadequacy (House, 2015).

The English–Uzbek language pair presents especially complex challenges for machine translation systems due to substantial linguistic and cultural differences between the two languages. English communication patterns frequently rely on indirectness, irony, idiomatic flexibility, and context-sensitive politeness strategies, whereas Uzbek communicative traditions emphasize hierarchical respect, honorific forms, collectivist discourse patterns, and culturally embedded interpersonal etiquette. As a result, AI systems frequently encounter difficulties when translating idioms, conversational implicatures, sarcasm, humor, indirect speech acts, and culturally marked expressions between English and Uzbek.

Furthermore, Uzbek remains significantly underrepresented within multilingual neural machine translation datasets. Most contemporary AI systems are trained predominantly on high-resource languages such as English, Chinese, Spanish, German, and French (Koehn, 2020). Low-resource languages such as Uzbek receive comparatively limited representation in neural training corpora, resulting in reduced contextual sensitivity and lower pragmatic precision in AI-generated translations. This issue is particularly visible in culturally dependent discourse where

pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 5, May -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

pragmatic interpretation requires deep sociocultural awareness rather than statistical lexical prediction (Kecskes, 2014).

Although numerous studies have investigated machine translation performance for major language pairs, relatively limited scholarly attention has been devoted to pragmatic transfer in English–Uzbek AI translation. Existing research primarily focuses on semantic equivalence, grammatical accuracy, or lexical correspondence, while the preservation of pragmatic meaning remains underexplored, particularly within low-resource language contexts. Therefore, the present study seeks to address this gap by conducting an empirical investigation of pragmatic transfer in English–Uzbek machine translation.

The study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of contemporary AI translation systems in preserving pragmatic equivalence between English and Uzbek. The research specifically investigates the translation of idiomatic expressions, politeness strategies, speech acts, conversational implicatures, sarcasm, humor, and culturally marked discourse. Additionally, the study compares the performance of several AI-based translation platforms and analyzes the sociocultural limitations that contribute to pragmatic failure.

The study addresses the following research questions:

To what extent do machine translation systems preserve pragmatic meaning in English–Uzbek translation?

Which pragmatic categories demonstrate the highest rates of translation failure?

How do AI translation systems differ in their handling of contextual and sociocultural meaning?

What linguistic and intercultural factors contribute to pragmatic inaccuracies in English–Uzbek machine translation?

The article contributes to translation studies, computational linguistics, and intercultural pragmatics by proposing an empirical evaluation framework for pragmatic equivalence in low-resource language pairs (Baker, 2018; House, 2015). The findings additionally provide practical implications for AI-assisted translation, translation pedagogy, and the future development of culturally adaptive neural translation systems.

Literature Review. Pragmatics and Translation Theory. Pragmatics occupies a central position in contemporary linguistic and translation studies because language meaning extends beyond literal lexical interpretation. Pragmatic meaning involves contextual inference, speaker intention, interpersonal relationships, and sociocultural conventions that shape communication within specific discourse communities. Yule (1996) defines pragmatics as the study of speaker meaning and contextual interpretation rather than isolated sentence semantics. Similarly, Levinson (1983) emphasizes that successful communication depends on the interaction between linguistic forms and contextual knowledge.

Within translation studies, the concept of pragmatic equivalence has become increasingly significant. Baker (2018) argues that translation should preserve not only semantic content but also implied communicative meaning and sociocultural intention. Consequently, translators must reproduce contextual implications, politeness hierarchy, emotional tone, and discourse function in the target language. Nida (1993) additionally emphasizes dynamic equivalence, according to which successful translation should evoke a communicative effect similar to that experienced by readers of the source text.

Pragmatic transfer becomes especially difficult in intercultural communication where languages reflect different sociocultural norms and communicative traditions. Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory demonstrates that communicative interaction is deeply influenced by face-saving strategies and social hierarchy. English frequently employs indirect requests, mitigated expressions, and pragmatic softeners, whereas Uzbek communication often relies on honorific forms, collectivist politeness conventions, and culturally embedded markers of respect. Therefore, direct lexical translation may fail to preserve interpersonal meaning.

pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 5, May -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

House (2015) introduces the concept of pragmatic failure, which occurs when translated utterances violate sociocultural expectations of the target language community. Pragmatic failure may lead to communicative awkwardness, misunderstanding, or unintended impoliteness. In AI-generated translation, such failures frequently emerge because machine systems prioritize grammatical and lexical correspondence while overlooking contextual and cultural dimensions of meaning.

Intercultural pragmatics has further expanded understanding of communication across culturally distant languages. Kecskes (2014) argues that pragmatic interpretation depends on both linguistic competence and sociocultural cognition. Successful translation therefore requires awareness of contextual inferencing, cultural assumptions, discourse conventions, and shared communicative expectations. Machine translation systems, however, generally operate through probabilistic prediction rather than genuine sociocultural understanding, which limits their ability to reproduce pragmatically sensitive meaning.

Recent scholarship additionally highlights the role of discourse-level interpretation in translation. Verschueren (2012) argues that pragmatics involves dynamic adaptation to communicative context. Translators must therefore recognize speaker intention, implied meaning, emotional tone, and interpersonal dynamics. These factors remain highly problematic for AI translation systems because contextual inferencing often requires world knowledge and cultural interpretation beyond lexical substitution.

Thus, existing theoretical research demonstrates that pragmatic equivalence constitutes one of the most complex dimensions of translation. While semantic meaning may be transferred through lexical correspondence, pragmatic meaning requires sociocultural adaptation and contextual interpretation that frequently exceed the capabilities of contemporary AI systems.

Neural Machine Translation and Artificial Intelligence. Machine translation has undergone substantial technological transformation during the past several decades. Early rule-based translation systems relied on manually constructed grammatical rules and bilingual dictionaries, which significantly limited linguistic flexibility and contextual adaptation (Hutchins & Somers, 1992). Statistical machine translation later introduced probabilistic language modeling; however, these systems continued to struggle with contextual coherence and discourse-sensitive meaning.

The emergence of Neural Machine Translation (NMT) radically changed the field of computational linguistics. Neural systems employ deep learning architectures capable of processing large multilingual datasets and predicting linguistic patterns through artificial neural networks. One of the most influential developments in this field was the transformer architecture proposed by Vaswani et al. (2017). Transformer models significantly improved translation fluency, syntactic coherence, and contextual processing by introducing attention mechanisms capable of analyzing relationships between words across entire sentences.

Contemporary AI-based translation platforms such as Google Translate, DeepL, Microsoft Translator, and ChatGPT increasingly rely on transformer-based architectures and large-scale multilingual corpora. Koehn (2020) argues that neural systems demonstrate considerably higher translation quality than earlier statistical models, particularly regarding fluency and lexical precision. Nevertheless, despite these advances, contextual and pragmatic interpretation remain problematic.

Recent studies emphasize that neural systems primarily operate through statistical pattern recognition rather than cognitive understanding. O'Brien (2023) notes that AI translation systems often generate grammatically sophisticated output while simultaneously failing to preserve discourse-sensitive pragmatic meaning. This issue becomes particularly visible in the translation of irony, humor, metaphor, and socioculturally embedded expressions.

Large Language Models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT represent a further development in AI language processing. Unlike traditional machine translation systems, LLMs demonstrate broader contextual reasoning capabilities and conversational adaptation. Nevertheless, recent studies

pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 5, May -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

indicate that even advanced AI systems continue to experience pragmatic degradation when translating culturally dependent discourse (Toral & Way, 2021).

Another major challenge concerns low-resource languages. Most neural machine translation systems are predominantly trained on high-resource multilingual datasets that heavily prioritize English, Chinese, Spanish, German, and French. Low-resource languages such as Uzbek receive comparatively limited representation in neural training corpora. According to recent computational linguistic research, insufficient training data reduces contextual precision, sociocultural sensitivity, and pragmatic adaptation in machine-generated translation.

Consequently, although neural machine translation has significantly improved semantic and grammatical translation quality, substantial limitations remain in discourse-level pragmatics and intercultural communication.

Theoretical Framework. The present study is grounded in several major theoretical approaches from pragmatics, translation studies, and intercultural communication.

Pragmatic Equivalence Theory. The concept of pragmatic equivalence proposed by Baker (2018) constitutes one of the central theoretical foundations of this study. Pragmatic equivalence concerns the transfer of implied meaning, communicative intention, and contextual interpretation between source and target languages. According to Baker, translation cannot be limited to lexical substitution because meaning frequently depends on inference, cultural assumptions, and speaker intention.

In the context of English–Uzbek translation, pragmatic equivalence becomes particularly important due to significant sociocultural differences between the two linguistic systems. Expressions that appear semantically equivalent may nevertheless produce different communicative effects within Uzbek discourse traditions.

Speech Act Theory. The study additionally draws upon Speech Act Theory developed by Austin (1962) and Searle (1969). According to this framework, utterances perform communicative actions such as requesting, apologizing, promising, warning, or criticizing. The interpretation of speech acts depends heavily on context and sociocultural convention.

Machine translation systems frequently experience difficulties in preserving indirect speech acts because communicative intention is often implicit rather than explicitly lexicalized. For example, English indirect requests such as “Could you possibly open the window?” may lose politeness nuance when translated literally into Uzbek.

Politeness Theory. Brown and Levinson’s (1987) politeness theory additionally informs the present research. The theory emphasizes the importance of face-saving strategies and interpersonal negotiation in communication. Different cultures employ distinct politeness conventions shaped by hierarchy, collectivism, and social distance.

Uzbek communicative culture strongly prioritizes respect, hierarchy, and formal politeness markers. Consequently, machine translation systems frequently fail to reproduce appropriate sociolinguistic adaptation in English–Uzbek translation.

Intercultural Pragmatics. The study also incorporates Kecskes’ (2014) theory of intercultural pragmatics, which examines communication between speakers representing different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Intercultural pragmatics highlights the role of shared knowledge, contextual inferencing, and sociocultural cognition in successful communication.

Because AI systems lack genuine cultural awareness, they frequently misinterpret figurative language, irony, and culturally dependent expressions. This theoretical framework therefore provides important insight into the limitations of neural machine translation in intercultural discourse.

Research Methodology. Research Design. The present study employed a mixed-method research design combining qualitative pragmatic analysis and quantitative statistical evaluation in order to investigate the effectiveness of AI-based machine translation systems in transferring pragmatic meaning from English into Uzbek. The integration of qualitative and quantitative

pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 5, May -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

approaches enabled a comprehensive examination of both linguistic accuracy and sociocultural appropriateness in machine-generated translations.

The qualitative component focused on identifying recurrent patterns of pragmatic degradation, contextual distortion, and intercultural semantic loss in machine translation outputs. The quantitative component measured the frequency of pragmatic failures across different categories of expressions and compared the performance of multiple AI translation platforms.

Such a mixed-method framework is particularly appropriate for pragmatics research because pragmatic meaning cannot be evaluated exclusively through numerical metrics; instead, contextual interpretation and sociocultural adaptation must also be considered (Kecskes, 2014; House, 2015).

Corpus Compilation. The research corpus consisted of 160 English expressions containing pragmatically sensitive linguistic units. The corpus was compiled from authentic communicative sources, including: conversational dialogues; literary texts; online discourse; academic communication; social media interactions; intercultural communication materials.

The expressions were categorized according to major pragmatic functions:

Pragmatic Category	Number of Examples
Idiomatic Expressions	40
Politeness Strategies	30
Indirect Speech Acts	25
Humor and Sarcasm	20
Cultural References	25
Conversational Implicatures	20
Total	160

The selected examples represented pragmatically complex utterances requiring contextual inferencing, sociocultural adaptation, and discourse-sensitive interpretation.

Translation Platforms. Four widely used AI-based machine translation systems were selected for comparative analysis: Google Translate, DeepL, Microsoft Translator, ChatGPT-based translation. These systems were selected because they represent contemporary neural machine translation technologies employing transformer-based architectures and multilingual training datasets (Vaswani et al., 2017; Koehn, 2020).

Each English expression from the corpus was translated into Uzbek using all four platforms. The machine-generated outputs were subsequently compared with human translations produced by bilingual linguistic experts specializing in translation studies and intercultural communication.

Evaluation Criteria. The translated materials were evaluated according to five major criteria:

Evaluation Criterion	Description
Semantic Accuracy	Preservation of denotative meaning
Pragmatic Equivalence	Preservation of implied communicative intention
Cultural Appropriateness	Adaptation to Uzbek sociocultural norms
Communicative Naturalness	Fluency and discourse coherence
Politeness Preservation	Accuracy of interpersonal hierarchy and etiquette

The evaluation process employed a three-level scoring system: Successful Transfer, Partial Transfer, Pragmatic Failure. Successful transfer referred to translations preserving both semantic and pragmatic meaning. Partial transfer indicated translations preserving basic semantic

pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 5, May -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

information while losing certain contextual or sociocultural nuances. Pragmatic failure referred to translations producing communicative distortion, contextual inadequacy, or sociocultural inappropriateness.

Data Analysis Procedures. The collected data were analyzed using descriptive statistical methods and comparative pragmatic analysis.

Quantitative analysis included: percentage distribution; comparative accuracy rates; frequency analysis; category-based performance comparison.

Qualitative analysis focused on: idiomatic mistranslation; sarcasm degradation; politeness distortion; contextual inconsistency; sociocultural inadequacy.

The combination of statistical and interpretive analysis allowed the study to identify both measurable trends and discourse-level pragmatic patterns in AI-generated translation.

Results. The findings demonstrate that contemporary AI translation systems generally perform effectively in transferring literal semantic meaning but continue to experience substantial limitations in preserving pragmatic and sociocultural dimensions of communication.

The quantitative analysis revealed considerable variation across different pragmatic categories.

Table 1. Overall Pragmatic Transfer Accuracy

Pragmatic Feature	**Successful Transfer**	**Partial Transfer**	**Pragmatic Failure**
Idiomatic Expressions	18%	34%	48%
Politeness Strategies	26%	41%	33%
Indirect Speech Acts	39%	37%	24%
Humor and Sarcasm	11%	28%	61%
Cultural References	17%	31%	52%
Conversational Implicatures	22%	43%	35%

The results indicate that humor, sarcasm, and culturally marked expressions produced the highest rates of pragmatic failure. Idiomatic expressions also demonstrated substantial levels of contextual distortion due to literal translation strategies. Indirect speech acts showed comparatively higher rates of successful transfer because some AI systems recognized conventional politeness structures and contextual mitigation patterns.

Idiomatic Expressions. Idiomatic expressions represented one of the most problematic areas for AI translation systems. In most cases, machine-generated translations prioritized lexical equivalence rather than figurative interpretation.

Example 1

Source Expression	**Machine Translation**	**Human Translation**	**Evaluation**
“Break the ice”	Muzni sindirmoq	Suhbatni boshlamoq	Pragmatic Failure

The literal translation “muzni sindirmoq” preserves lexical meaning but fails to communicate the idiomatic implication of reducing social tension or initiating interaction. This demonstrates the inability of AI systems to recognize figurative discourse structures.

Similarly, expressions such as: “spill the beans”; “hit the nail on the head”; “under the weather” were frequently translated word-for-word, resulting in semantic confusion and communicative unnaturalness.

Politeness Strategies. Politeness preservation demonstrated moderate translation accuracy; however, AI systems frequently failed to reproduce Uzbek hierarchical etiquette and honorific conventions.

Example 2

pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 5, May -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

Source Expression	Machine Translation	Human Translation	Evaluation
“Could you possibly help me?”	Yordam bera olasizmi?	Iltimos, yordam bera olarmidingiz?	Partial Transfer

Although grammatically correct, the machine-generated translation lacks sociolinguistic politeness markers expected in formal Uzbek communication. Human translators introduced additional mitigation and politeness softening to maintain interpersonal appropriateness. This finding supports Brown and Levinson’s (1987) theory that politeness strategies are culturally dependent and difficult to reproduce through purely statistical language prediction.

Humor and Sarcasm. Sarcasm and humor produced the highest rate of pragmatic failure across all categories.

Example 3

Source Expression	Machine Translation	Human Translation	Evaluation
“That’s just fantastic.” (sarcasm)	Bu juda ajoyib	Voy, yana muammo	Pragmatic Failure

The AI system interpreted the statement literally and failed to recognize the sarcastic communicative intention. Consequently, the emotional and interpersonal meaning of the utterance was entirely lost. This result demonstrates that sarcasm interpretation requires contextual inferencing and sociocultural cognition exceeding the capabilities of current AI systems.

Platform Comparison. The comparative analysis revealed differences among translation platforms.

Table 2. Comparative Pragmatic Accuracy by Platform

Platform	Successful Transfer	Partial Transfer	Pragmatic Failure
Google Translate	28%	39%	33%
DeepL	34%	37%	29%
Microsoft Translator	25%	42%	33%
ChatGPT-based Translation	46%	35%	19%

ChatGPT-based translation demonstrated comparatively stronger contextual adaptation and discourse sensitivity. Nevertheless, even the highest-performing system continued to exhibit significant pragmatic limitations in culturally dependent communication.

Discussion. The findings confirm that pragmatic equivalence remains one of the most challenging aspects of neural machine translation, particularly for low-resource language pairs such as English and Uzbek.

One major reason for pragmatic degradation lies in the fundamentally statistical nature of AI language processing. Neural machine translation systems primarily operate through probabilistic prediction derived from large multilingual datasets rather than genuine sociocultural understanding (Koehn, 2020). Consequently, machine systems often recognize lexical correspondence while failing to interpret implicit communicative intention.

The high rate of pragmatic failure in humor and sarcasm demonstrates that contextual inferencing remains heavily dependent on cultural cognition and discourse awareness. Sarcastic statements frequently communicate meanings opposite to their literal semantic structure. Human translators interpret such expressions through contextual knowledge, emotional tone, and interpersonal dynamics, whereas AI systems continue to prioritize surface-level lexical interpretation.

pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 5, May -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

Similarly, the mistranslation of idiomatic expressions reveals limitations in figurative language processing. Idioms function as culturally embedded communicative units whose meaning cannot be inferred directly from individual lexical components. The literal translation strategies frequently employed by AI systems therefore result in communicative dissonance and contextual inconsistency.

Another important factor concerns the underrepresentation of Uzbek within multilingual neural training corpora. Most AI systems are optimized for high-resource language pairs with extensive linguistic datasets. Uzbek, however, remains comparatively marginalized in computational linguistic resources. As a result, AI systems possess weaker contextual familiarity with Uzbek discourse conventions, politeness hierarchies, and sociocultural patterns.

The comparatively stronger performance of ChatGPT-based translation may be explained by broader contextual processing capabilities associated with Large Language Models. Unlike conventional translation systems, LLMs demonstrate more flexible discourse adaptation and conversational reasoning. Nevertheless, the findings indicate that even advanced AI architectures remain insufficient for fully accurate intercultural pragmatic transfer.

These findings support House's (2015) theory of pragmatic failure and Kecskes' (2014) intercultural pragmatics framework, both of which emphasize the importance of sociocultural interpretation in communication. Pragmatic meaning depends not only on linguistic structure but also on interpersonal relations, contextual assumptions, and cultural cognition.

Therefore, machine translation should currently be viewed as an assistive communicative technology rather than a complete replacement for human translators, particularly in pragmatically sensitive discourse contexts.

Conclusion. The present study conducted a comprehensive empirical investigation into the effectiveness of contemporary AI-based machine translation systems in transferring pragmatic meaning from English into Uzbek. The findings clearly demonstrate that, despite substantial advances in neural machine translation technologies, pragmatic equivalence remains one of the most problematic and insufficiently resolved dimensions of artificial intelligence–mediated translation (House, 2015; Koehn, 2020).

The analysis revealed that current AI translation systems are generally capable of preserving denotative semantic meaning and grammatical structure in informational discourse; however, they continue to experience considerable limitations in reproducing implicit communicative intention, discourse-sensitive interpretation, interpersonal nuance, and sociocultural adaptation. The results indicate that machine translation performs relatively effectively in semantically transparent expressions but demonstrates significantly lower accuracy when processing figurative, culturally embedded, and pragmatically complex discourse structures.

The quantitative findings demonstrated that sarcasm, humor, idiomatic expressions, and culturally marked units generated the highest rates of pragmatic failure. In particular, sarcasm exhibited a pragmatic failure rate exceeding 60%, indicating that contemporary AI systems remain largely incapable of accurately recognizing communicative inversion, emotional subtext, and context-dependent interpersonal meaning. Similarly, idiomatic expressions frequently underwent literal lexical translation, resulting in semantic distortion and communicative unnaturalness. These findings strongly support previous research emphasizing that pragmatic interpretation cannot be reduced to surface-level lexical correspondence because pragmatic meaning is fundamentally inferential, contextual, and culturally conditioned (Levinson, 1983; Kecskes, 2014).

The study additionally demonstrated that AI systems frequently fail to preserve Uzbek sociolinguistic conventions associated with politeness hierarchy, collectivist discourse norms, and culturally embedded etiquette. Although some platforms successfully reproduced basic formal structures, they often omitted important mitigation markers, honorific softening, and culturally expected politeness strategies necessary for natural Uzbek interpersonal

pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 5, May -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

communication. Such findings confirm Brown and Levinson's (1987) argument that politeness systems are deeply culture-specific and cannot be fully reproduced through statistical language modeling alone.

One of the central theoretical implications of this study concerns the distinction between statistical language prediction and genuine sociocultural cognition. Neural machine translation systems primarily operate through probabilistic pattern recognition derived from multilingual corpora rather than through contextual reasoning grounded in cultural awareness, emotional interpretation, or communicative intentionality (O'Brien, 2023). Consequently, AI systems frequently generate grammatically coherent yet pragmatically inadequate translations. This phenomenon becomes particularly visible in low-resource language pairs such as English–Uzbek, where limited training data further weakens contextual adaptation and discourse sensitivity.

The comparatively stronger performance of ChatGPT-based translation suggests that Large Language Models possess enhanced contextual processing capabilities relative to conventional neural machine translation systems. Nevertheless, even advanced transformer-based architectures remain insufficient for fully accurate intercultural pragmatic transfer. The findings therefore indicate that current AI systems should be regarded as assistive translation technologies rather than autonomous replacements for human translators, especially within culturally sensitive communicative contexts requiring inferential interpretation and sociocultural mediation.

From a theoretical perspective, the study contributes to several interdisciplinary fields, including translation studies, computational linguistics, intercultural pragmatics, and artificial intelligence research. More specifically, the article contributes to ongoing scholarly discussions regarding pragmatic equivalence, intercultural communication, and the limitations of neural machine translation in low-resource linguistic environments. The proposed mixed-method evaluation framework additionally offers a potentially valuable methodological model for future investigations involving other underrepresented language pairs.

The research also carries important practical implications. For translation pedagogy, the findings emphasize the continuing necessity of human pragmatic competence and intercultural awareness in professional translation training. For computational linguistics and AI development, the results highlight the urgent need for culturally adaptive translation architectures capable of deeper contextual inferencing and sociopragmatic reasoning. Furthermore, the study underscores the importance of expanding Uzbek-language neural corpora and developing linguistically diverse datasets capable of improving pragmatic sensitivity within multilingual AI systems.

Nevertheless, several limitations should also be acknowledged. The study focused specifically on English–Uzbek translation and therefore may not fully represent pragmatic transfer patterns across other low-resource language pairs. In addition, AI technologies continue to evolve rapidly, meaning that translation performance may improve substantially as neural architectures become increasingly sophisticated. Future research should therefore investigate multimodal translation systems, speech-based AI translation, emotion-sensitive language models, and culturally adaptive machine learning frameworks capable of integrating sociocultural cognition into computational translation processes.

In conclusion, the study demonstrates that pragmatic meaning remains one of the final and most complex frontiers of machine translation research. While artificial intelligence continues to transform multilingual communication and significantly improve translation accessibility, human pragmatic interpretation, contextual awareness, and intercultural competence remain indispensable for achieving genuinely effective communication across linguistically and culturally diverse communities. Consequently, the future of translation will likely depend not on the replacement of human translators by AI systems, but rather on the development of collaborative human–AI translation models that combine computational efficiency with human sociocultural intelligence (House, 2015; Kecskes, 2014; O'Brien, 2023).

References:

pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 5, May -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

1. Austin, J. L. (1962). How to Do Things with Words. Oxford University Press.
2. Baker, M. (2018). In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation (3rd ed.). Routledge.
3. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge University Press.
4. House, J. (2015). Translation Quality Assessment: Past and Present. Routledge.
5. Hutchins, W. J., & Somers, H. L. (1992). An Introduction to Machine Translation. Academic Press.
6. Kecskes, I. (2014). Intercultural Pragmatics. Oxford University Press.
7. Koehn, P. (2020). Neural Machine Translation. Cambridge University Press.
8. Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press.
9. Nida, E. (1993). Language, Culture, and Translating. Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
10. O'Brien, S. (2023). Machine translation and artificial intelligence: Current developments and future directions. Translation Spaces, 12(1), 15–34.
11. Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge University Press.
12. Toral, A., & Way, A. (2021). Is neural machine translation ready for literary translation? Language Resources and Evaluation, 55(1), 47–67.
13. Vaswani, A., et al. (2017). Attention is all you need. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 30, 5998–6008.
14. Verschueren, J. (2012). Ideology in Language Use: Pragmatic Guidelines for Empirical Research. Cambridge University Press.
15. Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford University Press.