



TERMINOLOGY ADAPTATION V.S STANDARDIZATION IN SCIENTIFIC TRANSLATION: THEORETICAL CONTRADICTIONS AND LINGUISTIC INSIGHTS

G'afurova Nazokat Bakhridin's

*daughter student of Tashkent State of
transport university*

Annotation: This article explores the theoretical contradictions between the adaptation and standardization of terminology in scientific translation. Through the lens of Skopos theory, equivalence models, and cultural adequacy, it examines the tension between the communicative needs of target audiences and the demand for technical precision. The study uses examples from scientific and technical domains to demonstrate how translators can balance fidelity and functionality.

Keywords: scientific translation, terminology, adaptation, standardization, functional approach, equivalence, cultural adequacy

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqolada ilmiy tarjimada terminlarni moslashtirish va standartlashtirish o'rtasidagi nazariy qarama-qarshiliklar o'rganiladi. Skopos nazariyasi, ekvivalentlik modeli va madaniy adekvatlik nuqtai nazaridan kelib chiqib, maqsadli auditoriya ehtiyojlari bilan texnik aniqlik talablari o'rtasidagi muvozanat tahlil qilinadi. Ilmiy va texnik sohalardan olingan misollar yordamida tarjimada sadoqat va funktsionallikni uyg'unlashtirish yo'llari ko'rsatib beriladi.

Kalit so'zlar: ilmiy tarjima, terminologiya, moslashtirish, standartlashtirish, funksional yondashuv, ekvivalentlik, madaniy adekvatlik

Аннотация: В статье рассматриваются теоретические противоречия между адаптацией и стандартизацией терминов в научном переводе. С опорой на теорию Скопос, модели эквивалентности и культурную адекватность анализируется противоречие между необходимостью точности



и потребностями целевой аудитории. На примерах из научно-технической сферы показывается, как переводчику удастся сбалансировать верность оригиналу и функциональность текста.

Ключевые слова: научный перевод, терминология, адаптация, стандартизация, функциональный подход, эквивалентность, культурная адекватность

In scientific translation, working with terminology is a central task that demands both linguistic accuracy and contextual sensitivity. The growing internationalization of scientific knowledge has led to increased reliance on standardized terminologies approved by organizations such as ISO, IEEE, and WHO. However, these terms are not always communicatively effective or culturally appropriate in target languages, especially in underrepresented or low-resource languages like Uzbek.

Therefore, translators often face a theoretical and practical contradiction between **terminological standardization**, which prioritizes precision, and **adaptation**, which seeks cultural and communicative clarity [1, p. 47]. This article investigates the nature of this contradiction, drawing on key translation theories and real-world examples to propose a balanced solution.

The Role of Standardization in Scientific Translation

Terminological standardization is crucial in fields requiring absolute clarity—such as medicine, law, and engineering—where the smallest ambiguity can have significant consequences. Standardized terminology ensures uniform understanding and global interoperability.

“Terminology standardization ensures conceptual clarity and interlingual consistency” [1, p. 47].

For example, the English term “**autonomous vehicle**” has a standardized equivalent in Uzbek: *avtonom transport vositasi*. However, some translations



render it as *o'z-o'zini boshqaruvchi avtomobil*, which, although easier to grasp, deviates from formal usage.

The challenge arises when standardized terms do not resonate with the cultural or educational context of the target audience, particularly in educational or mass communication settings.

The Case for Adaptation

Adaptation allows translators to reformulate terms in a way that suits the linguistic, cultural, and pragmatic norms of the target audience. This method finds support in the **Skopos theory**, which emphasizes that a translation should fulfill the intended purpose in the target culture [2, p. 180].

“The function of a translation is determined by the purpose it is intended to fulfill in the target culture” [3, p. 29].

Consider “**cloud computing**”, a widely used IT term. In Uzbek, it is often translated as *bulutli hisoblash*, a direct but somewhat opaque rendering. An adaptive translation like *bulut texnologiyalari asosidagi hisoblash* may improve comprehension while still conveying the concept accurately.

However, adaptation may risk oversimplifying complex technical terms, leading to partial or inaccurate understanding [4, p. 121].

Theoretical Contradictions in Practice

The contradiction between standardization and adaptation can be summarized as follows:



Criterion	Standardization	Adaptation
Strength	Clarity, accuracy, international use	Accessibility, reader engagement
Weakness	Jargon-heavy, culturally distant	Potential loss of precision
Suitable for	Technical manuals, legal/scientific docs	Educational content, public discourse

As Newmark notes: “Communicative translation attempts to produce on its readers an effect as close as possible to that obtained on the readers of the original” [5, p. 39].

This aligns with the idea that strategy selection should depend on the **purpose** of the translation and the **needs of the audience** rather than rigid theoretical preference.

The adaptation-standardization dichotomy is not a matter of “either-or” but rather a question of **strategic integration**. As the analysis in this paper shows, standardization secures consistency and credibility in global scientific discourse, while adaptation improves accessibility and reception in local contexts.

Therefore, the competent scientific translator must not only possess linguistic skills but also theoretical knowledge and contextual awareness. The final choice between adaptation and standardization should be informed by factors such as **text type, target readership, communicative function, and cultural background**.

“There is no single method of translating a term — only context-specific strategies that align with purpose” [4, p. 121].

References

1. Picht, H., & Draskau, J. (1985). *Terminology: An Introduction*. Surrey: University of Surrey Press.



2. Vermeer, H. J. (1989). *Skopos and Commission in Translational Action*. In Chesterman, A. (Ed.), *Readings in Translation Theory* (pp. 173–187). Helsinki: Oy Finn Lectura.
3. Nord, C. (1997). *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
4. House, J. (2015). *Translation Quality Assessment: Past and Present*. London: Routledge.
5. Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall.