Breaking Barriers with Multilingual AI in Translation Classrooms⋆

Usupova Elnura[1,*,†]

[1] *AlaToo International University, Tunguch,Bishkek-720048, Kyrgyzstan*

Abstract

In an interconnected world, language barriers persist as a challenge for students in translation classes. An experience gained in teaching at the Alatoo Intl' Univ. reveals the persistent challenges students face in overcoming linguistic limitations, which multilingual AI tools are now poised to address. The rise of multilingual artificial intelligence (AI) tools offers transformative opportunities to enhance language learning while introducing new complexities. This paper investigates how AI-driven translation technologies can help students overcome traditional linguistic limitations, providing personalized feedback, exposure to authentic cultural materials, and fostering critical engagement with machine translation. However, these tools also raise concerns about accuracy, bias, over-reliance, and the potential loss of deep linguistic understanding. Through case studies and analyses, this research explores how educators and students can navigate the dualities of innovation and tradition. By thoughtfully integrating AI into translation curricula, educators can equip learners to transcend language barriers, develop intercultural competence, and prepare for globalized workplaces. This study underscores the need for a balanced approach, blending technological advancements with human expertise to shape the future of language education effectively.

Keywords

AI-Driven Education, Intercultural Competence, Language Learning, Multilingual AI Tools

1. Introduction

In an era defined by unprecedented global connectivity, the ability to communicate across linguistic and cultural boundaries has become a cornerstone of personal, professional, and societal progress. Yet, despite advances in technology and globalization, language barriers persist as formidable obstacles to effective communication. For students in translation classrooms, these barriers are not merely academic challenges but represent the broader complexities of navigating a multilingual world. The traditional pedagogical approaches to translation education have long relied on human expertise, emphasizing linguistic precision, cultural nuance, and critical thinking [1]. However, the rapid emergence of artificial intelligence (AI) tools—particularly multilingual AI systems—has begun to reshape the landscape of language learning and translation education. These technologies provide personalized feedback, expose students to authentic cultural materials, and foster critical engagement with machine translation. Yet, they also introduce new ethical, pedagogical, and epistemological dilemmas that educators and learners must navigate.

The rise of AI-driven translation tools, such as Google Translate, DeepL, and ChatGPT, has revolutionized how individuals approach language tasks. These systems leverage neural machine translation (NMT) models trained on vast corpora of multilingual data, enabling them to produce translations with remarkable speed and accuracy [2]. While their utility is undeniable, their

integration into educational settings raises fundamental questions about the role of technology in shaping linguistic competence. On one hand, these tools offer unparalleled opportunities for students to engage with languages beyond their immediate reach. For instance, students can use AI to translate complex texts, explore idiomatic expressions, or practice conversational skills in real-time. On the other hand, the reliance on machine-generated outputs risks undermining the development of deep linguistic understanding and critical thinking skills that are essential for high-quality translation work [3].

Moreover, the advent of AI in translation education highlights a tension between tradition and innovation. Traditional translation pedagogy emphasizes the importance of mastering grammar, syntax, and cultural context through rigorous practice and mentorship. This approach cultivates a nuanced appreciation for language as both a communicative tool and a cultural artifact [4]. In contrast, AI tools prioritize efficiency and accessibility, often prioritizing fluency over fidelity to the source text. This divergence underscores a critical question: Can AI serve as a complement to traditional methods, or does it risk displacing the very skills it seeks to enhance? The answer lies in how educators choose to integrate these tools into their curricula, balancing the benefits of technological innovation with the enduring value of human expertise.

Another pressing concern is the issue of bias and accuracy in AI-driven translation systems. While these tools have made significant strides in recent years, they remain far from infallible. Research has shown that machine translation systems often struggle with low-resource languages, idiomatic expressions, and culturally specific references [5]. Furthermore, biases embedded in training data can lead to skewed or inappropriate translations, perpetuating stereotypes or reinforcing inequalities [6]. For example, gender biases in translation outputs have been well-documented, where neutral terms are often rendered in ways that reflect traditional gender roles [7]. Such limitations underscore the need for students to critically evaluate AI-generated content rather than accept it at face value. By fostering a culture of skepticism and inquiry, educators can empower students to use AI responsibly while developing the skills needed to identify and address its shortcomings.

The integration of AI into translation classrooms also has profound implications for intercultural competence—a key objective of language education. Language learning is not merely about acquiring vocabulary and grammar; it involves understanding the cultural contexts in which languages are used [8]. Multilingual AI tools provide students with access to a wealth of authentic materials, including news articles, literature, and multimedia content from diverse cultures. This exposure can broaden students' horizons and deepen their appreciation for global diversity. However, the mediated nature of AI-generated translations may inadvertently obscure cultural nuances, leading to superficial or incomplete understandings of foreign texts [9]. To mitigate this risk, educators must design activities that encourage students to interrogate the cultural dimensions of translated materials, using AI as a starting point rather than an endpoint.

Another dimension of this transformation is the potential for AI to foster personalized learning experiences. One of the greatest challenges in traditional translation classrooms is catering to the diverse needs and abilities of students. AI tools can address this challenge by providing tailored feedback, adaptive exercises, and real-time support [10]. For example, students struggling with specific grammatical structures can use AI to receive instant corrections and explanations, accelerating their learning process. Similarly, advanced learners can leverage AI to tackle more complex texts or explore specialized domains, such as legal or medical translation. While these applications hold immense promise, they also raise concerns about equity and access. Not all students have equal access to the technological infrastructure required to utilize AI tools effectively, potentially exacerbating existing disparities in educational outcomes [11].

The integration of AI into translation education necessitates a reevaluation of assessment practices. Traditional methods of evaluating translation proficiency often emphasize accuracy, coherence, and cultural appropriateness. However, the availability of AI tools complicates these criteria, as students may rely on machines to produce polished translations without fully engaging with the underlying processes [12]. To address this challenge, educators must develop new frameworks for assessing student performance, focusing on higher-order skills such as critical analysis, problem-solving, and creativity. For instance, assignments could require students to compare and critique multiple translations, analyze the strengths and weaknesses of AI-generated outputs, or propose improvements based on their own linguistic expertise [13]. By shifting the emphasis from rote reproduction to thoughtful engagement, educators can ensure that AI serves as a catalyst for deeper learning rather than a crutch.

Lastly, the integration of multilingual AI tools into translation classrooms represents both a challenge and an opportunity. These technologies have the potential to break down language barriers, enhance learning experiences, and prepare students for the demands of a globalized workforce. However, their adoption also raises important questions about accuracy, bias, over-reliance, and the preservation of linguistic and cultural depth. As educators navigate this complex terrain, they must strike a delicate balance between embracing innovation and upholding the core values of translation education. By thoughtfully integrating AI into their curricula, fostering critical engagement with machine-generated content, and emphasizing the development of intercultural competence, educators can equip students to transcend linguistic boundaries while remaining grounded in the richness of human language and culture. The future of translation education lies not in choosing between tradition and technology but in finding ways to harmonize the two, creating a dynamic and inclusive learning environment that prepares students for the challenges and opportunities of the 21st century. This study explores how educators and students at Alatoo International University navigate the dualities of innovation and tradition in translation education. Using a novel methodology that combines qualitative interviews, quantitative surveys, and mathematical modeling, the authors of this paper aim to provide actionable insights into the effective integration of AI tools in English-Kyrgyz translation classrooms.

2. Literature Review

Translation education has undergone significant transformations, evolving from traditional approaches emphasizing linguistic precision and cultural understanding to the incorporation of advanced digital tools and artificial intelligence (AI). These changes reflect broader trends in language education, where AI plays a growing role in facilitating personalized learning, enhancing accessibility, and expanding exposure to authentic cultural materials [14].

2.1   The Role of AI in Language Learning
Recent studies underscore AI's transformative potential in language education. AI tools offer adaptive exercises and personalized feedback, making learning more efficient and engaging [15]. However, concerns remain regarding their accuracy, especially with low-resource languages and idiomatic expressions [16]. Additionally, biases embedded in training data can result in skewed or inappropriate translations that reinforce stereotypes [17].

2.2   Challenges in Translation Education
Traditional translation pedagogy emphasizes grammatical and syntactic mastery, along with cultural literacy developed through rigorous practice [18]. AI tools, on the other hand, often prioritize fluency and speed over fidelity to the source text [19]. This divergence creates a

* Corresponding author.
† These authors contributed equally.
✉ elnura.usupova@alatoo.edu.kg (U.Elnura)

pedagogical challenge: educators must balance innovation with the foundational principles of translation education.

2.3   Gaps in Existing Research

While studies explore the benefits and limitations of AI, few offer comprehensive frameworks for integrating these technologies into educational settings. There is also limited empirical data on the perspectives of students and educators regarding AI in translation classrooms. This study seeks to address these gaps by analyzing data collected at Alatoo International University.

i.   Historical Trends in Translation Teaching

Before the digital age, translation education was grounded in traditional practices that focused on grammar, vocabulary, and cultural nuance through repetition and close reading [20]. Printed dictionaries and glossaries were central to this approach [21], although it was often inaccessible to students lacking cultural exposure or resources [22]. The introduction of computer-assisted translation (CAT) tools, such as translation memory systems, marked a turning point in the mid-20th century [23]. Despite their utility, these tools were initially seen as too technical for seamless curricular integration [24].

ii.   The Rise of Neural Machine Translation (NMT)

Recent advances in neural machine translation (NMT) have reshaped translation education. Unlike earlier rule-based models, NMT systems use deep learning to generate contextually appropriate translations [25]. Tools such as Google Translate, DeepL, and ChatGPT are now commonly used, enhancing access to multilingual materials and real-time language practice [26]. Nonetheless, these systems continue to face difficulties with idiomatic language and culturally nuanced content [27], and they may reproduce social biases found in their training data [28]. Educators are thus encouraged to treat NMT as a supplementary tool and guide students in critically analyzing AI-generated translations [29].

iii.   Multilingual AI Tools and Personalized Learning

A promising trend in translation education is the use of AI-driven tools that provide personalized feedback. These systems adapt to individual student needs, offering targeted support for grammar and vocabulary acquisition [30]. Unlike traditional methods, which struggle to address diverse learner profiles, AI tools cater to different proficiency levels and learning styles. Moreover, students benefit from access to authentic, culturally rich materials—news articles, literature, and multimedia—which enhance intercultural understanding [31].

iv.   Challenges of Bias and Over-Reliance on AI

Despite their advantages, AI tools raise concerns regarding embedded biases. Studies have documented instances of gender-biased or culturally insensitive outputs, reflecting the prejudices of their training data [32]. Furthermore, excessive dependence on AI may hinder students' development of critical thinking, cultural sensitivity, and language problem-solving skills. To address these issues, educators must foster analytical engagement with AI-generated texts and ensure assessments evaluate authentic student effort. Questions about academic integrity also emerge, particularly in AI-integrated classrooms where machine assistance may obscure actual proficiency.

v.   Blending Tradition with Innovation

Balancing innovation with tradition is crucial. While AI tools can increase efficiency by automating repetitive tasks, they cannot replace human judgment and creativity in translation [33]. A hybrid approach—combining traditional activities like peer reviews and close readings with AI-assisted

learning—promotes critical thinking and collaborative skills. This balance ensures that students are well-prepared for the complexities of real-world translation work.

vi.   Future Directions in Translation Education

Several emerging trends will shape the future of translation education. There is growing interest in designing AI systems specifically for educational use, featuring enhanced feedback, bias detection, and error correction [34]. Intercultural competence is also becoming a core focus, as global communication increasingly demands nuanced cross-cultural understanding [35]. AI tools, by providing exposure to diverse cultural content, support this development. Finally, ongoing research is needed to address the ethical dimensions of AI integration, including privacy, transparency, and equity [36].

In conclusion, translation education has evolved significantly, from traditional grammar-focused approaches to the integration of AI tools that offer greater accessibility, personalization, and exposure to global perspectives. While these innovations bring numerous benefits, they also introduce new challenges, including bias, over-reliance, and academic integrity concerns. A balanced, hybrid approach that embraces both technological tools and human expertise is essential for preparing students for the demands of a globalized, multilingual world.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Data Collection

Data was collected from Alatoo International University through qualitative interviews (20 educators, 30 students), quantitative surveys (150 students, 30 educators), and an error detection framework analyzing 500 AI-generated translations. Tools included Google Translate (fluency-focused NMT), DeepL (idiomatic accuracy), and ChatGPT (contextual reasoning). Translations of Kyrgyz-to-English student assignments were evaluated by bilingual experts for accuracy and bias, with tools equally weighted. Google Translate excels in fluency but struggles with cultural nuance, DeepL handles idioms well but lacks Kyrgyz support, and ChatGPT offers creativity but inconsistent precision. Automated processing (Google Translate/DeepL APIs) and manual prompts (ChatGPT) were used. Results highlighted a 78% accuracy rate, 12% bias factor, and common errors in idioms/cultural references. Surveys revealed 70% student AI usage weekly, with educators noting accessibility benefits but concerns about over-reliance. This mixed-methods approach identified opportunities for AI integration while underscoring the need for critical evaluation and bias mitigation in translation education.

3.2. Quantitative Tool

To assess the performance of AI translation tools, the study introduces a quantitative equation:

$$E = C/T \times (1 - B)$$

Where:

- E = Overall effectiveness of AI translation
- C = Number of correct translations
- T = Total translations evaluated
- B = Bias factor (ranging from 0 to 1)

Step 1: Data Analysis

A dataset of 500 AI-generated translations from platforms such as Google Translate and DeepL was evaluated by human experts to assess both accuracy and bias.

✉ **elnura.usupova@alatoo.edu.kg (U.Elnura)**

Step 2: Accuracy Calculation (C/T)
390 translations were deemed correct, and 110 had issues such as grammatical mistakes, mistranslations of idioms, or cultural inaccuracies.
Accuracy = C/T = 390/500 = 0.78 (78%)

Step 3: Bias Factor (B)
60 translations displayed bias (e.g., gender stereotypes, cultural insensitivity).
Bias Factor = B = 60/500 = 0.12 (12%)

Step 4: Effectiveness Calculation (E)
E = 0.78 × (1 − 0.12) = 0.6864, or 68.64% effectiveness

This result illustrates that although AI translations are relatively accurate, embedded biases significantly affect their effectiveness. AI outputs must therefore be critically assessed, especially in educational or professional settings.

Error Pattern Analysis
The study further classified errors among the 110 incorrect translations:
1. Idiomatic Expressions: 40 cases – AI struggled with non-literal meanings.
2. Culturally Specific References: 30 cases – Misinterpretations or oversimplifications.
3. Grammatical Errors: 40 cases – Errors in syntax or agreement.
This classification helps educators target specific problem areas in AI outputs when designing curriculum interventions.

Example of Bias Mitigation
A hypothetical improvement in training data reduces the bias factor from 0.12 to 0.05.
Recalculated Effectiveness:
E = 0.78 × (1 − 0.05) = 0.78 × 0.95 = 0.741 (74.1%)
This demonstrates that even a modest reduction in bias can notably improve AI performance.

3.3. Sensitivity Analysis

A sensitivity analysis was conducted to evaluate how variations in **accuracy** and **bias** affect the **effectiveness** of AI translation tools, using the formula **E = C/T × (1 − B)**. The base case showed an accuracy of 78% and a bias factor of 12%, resulting in an overall effectiveness of **68.64%**. Three alternative scenarios were modeled to assess improvements in accuracy, bias, or both:

Table1: Sensitivity Analysis of Accuracy and Bias Effects on AI Tool Effectiveness

SCENARIO	ACCURACY (C/T)	BIAS FACTOR (B)	EFFECTIVENESS (E)
Base Case	0.78	0.12	0.6864
Improved Accuracy (85%)	0.85	0.12	0.748
Reduced Bias (5%)	0.78	0.05	0.741

Both Improvements	0.85	0.05	0.8075

This analysis demonstrates that:

1. **Accuracy improvements** yield noticeable gains in effectiveness.
2. **Bias reduction** has a similarly strong impact.
3. A **balanced strategy** addressing both factors yields the best outcome.

The improvements were modeled without retraining AI models. Improved accuracy simulates better data coverage (e.g., Kyrgyz-specific content), while reduced bias represents post-editing workflows where educators flag problematic translations.

Strategies for Improvement:

- **Bias Mitigation**: Use domain-specific fine-tuning (e.g., Kyrgyz literature) and bias-detection tools like IBM Fairness 360.
- **Accuracy Enhancement**: Combine multiple AI outputs (e.g., DeepL for idioms, Google Translate for technical terms) and engage students in post-editing exercises.

Overall, the analysis underscores that improving both accuracy and fairness is essential to maximizing the educational value of AI translation tools.

4. Results

4.1 Qualitative Findings (Student/Educator Perceptions)

Interviews revealed that while students and educators recognize the value of AI tools in language learning, significant concerns persist. Approximately 70% of students use AI tools (e.g., Google Translate, DeepL, ChatGPT) for quick translations but note recurring cultural inaccuracies. Educators reported that 60% of students exhibit over-reliance on AI for homework, warning against "copy-paste learning," though some praised tools like DeepL for aiding sentence structure understanding.

4.2 Quantitative Findings (Student/Educator Perspectives and Error Detection)

Survey results and error detection analysis highlighted key trends:

- 70% of students use AI tools weekly, indicating widespread adoption.
- 60% of educators believe AI improves accessibility but worry about its impact on deep linguistic understanding.
- A moderate positive correlation ($r = 0.45$) was found between AI usage and academic performance.
- AI translation effectiveness averaged 78% , but 12% of outputs exhibited bias (e.g., gender stereotypes, cultural insensitivity).
- Common errors included mistranslations of idiomatic expressions (40 cases) and culturally specific references (30 cases).

Table 2: Integrated Survey and Error Detection Findings on AI Tool Usage in Translation Classrooms

Metric	Value/Description
AI Tool Usage Frequency (Student Surveys)	
Daily	20%

Weekly	70%
Monthly	8%
Rarely/Never	2%
Educator Perceptions	
AI Improves Accessibility	60%
Concerns About Linguistic Depth	60%
Quantitative Analysis (Student Performance & AI Effectiveness)	
Correlation Between AI Use and Performance	r = 0.45 (moderate positive correlation)
Total Translations Evaluated (T)	500
Correct Translations (C)	390 (78%)
Bias Factor (B)	0.12 (12% of translations exhibited bias)
Overall Effectiveness (E)	0.78
Common Error Patterns	
Idiomatic Expressions	Frequent (40 cases)
Culturally Specific References	Frequent (30 cases)
Grammatical Errors	Moderate (40 cases)

Key Insights from the Table 2
1. High Student Adoption :
   - 70% of students use AI tools weekly, reflecting their reliance on these technologies for translation tasks.
2. Moderate Correlation with Performance :
   - The moderate correlation (r = 0.45) suggests AI tools positively influence academic outcomes but are not standalone solutions.
3. Effectiveness vs. Bias :
   - While AI tools are 78% effective , the 12% bias factor underscores the need for critical evaluation and refinement.
4. Error Patterns :
   - Idioms (40 cases) and cultural references (30 cases) were the most frequent errors, highlighting AI's limitations in handling linguistic and cultural nuance.

4.3 Error Detection Analysis

Using the equation $E = TC \times (1-B)$, the analysis of 500 AI-generated translations revealed:
- Average effectiveness : 0.78 (78%).
- Bias factor : 0.12 (12% of translations exhibited bias).

- Low-resource language challenges : Errors were more prevalent in Kyrgyz-to-English translations due to limited training data for Kyrgyz.

This analysis confirms that AI tools, while generally reliable, require human oversight to address biases and improve accuracy for low-resource languages.

5. Discussion

5.1. Opportunities
AI tools offer significant opportunities for enhancing language learning, including personalized feedback and adaptive exercises.

5.2. Challenges
Key challenges include accuracy issues, particularly for low-resource languages, and embedded biases in training data.

5.3. Implications for Educators
Educators should use AI tools to support, not replace, traditional methods. Effective strategies include using AI for vocabulary building, stylistic editing, and creative writing support. AI works best as a scaffolding tool for dense texts, while class time should focus on cultural insight and error analysis.

Table 3: Pedagogical Strategies for AI Use

Stage	Tool Suggestion	Activity Example
Pre-Translation	Google Translate for vocabulary	Compare AI vs. dictionary definitions
Post-Editing	DeepL for stylistic refinement	Collaborative editing in groups
Creative Tasks	ChatGPT for paraphrasing	Use AI outputs as essay starting points

5.4. Results and Interpretation
The results revealed several key findings:

High Usage but Mixed Perceptions:
70% of students reported using AI tools at least once a week, indicating widespread adoption. While 60% of educators acknowledged that AI tools improve accessibility, they expressed concerns about their impact on deep linguistic understanding and cultural nuance.

Moderate Correlation with Academic Performance:
A moderate correlation (r=0.45) was found between AI tool usage and improved academic performance, suggesting that AI can enhance learning outcomes but is not a standalone solution.

Error Detection Analysis:
The mathematical model calculated an average effectiveness score (E) of 0.78, reflecting a generally reliable but imperfect performance.
A bias factor (B) of 0.12 highlighted the presence of skewed or inappropriate translations, emphasizing the need for critical evaluation by users.
Common errors included mistranslations of idiomatic expressions and culturally specific references, underscoring the limitations of AI in handling complex linguistic and cultural contexts.

5.5. Interpretation

The findings demonstrate that AI tools have transformative potential in translation education, particularly in enhancing accessibility and personalization. However, their limitations—such as errors, biases, and the risk of undermining critical thinking—highlight the need for a balanced approach. Educators must design activities that encourage students to critically engage with AI outputs, develop new assessment frameworks, and ensure equitable access to these technologies. By blending AI tools with traditional teaching methods, educators can harness their strengths while addressing their weaknesses, ultimately preparing students for the complexities of a globalized world. Future research should focus on refining AI models, exploring long-term impacts, and addressing ethical concerns to maximize their educational value. Further enhancing with ML learning techniques such as ablation can also improve on the outcomes of the model[37].

6. Conclusion

The research methodology adopted a mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative interviews, quantitative surveys, and mathematical modeling to provide a comprehensive understanding of the integration of AI tools in English-Kyrgyz translation classrooms at Alatoo International University. Semi-structured interviews with 20 educators and 30 students offered rich insights into their experiences and perceptions of AI tools, while a survey distributed to 150 students and 30 educators provided quantitative data on usage patterns, perceived benefits, and challenges. Additionally, a novel mathematical model was developed to evaluate the effectiveness of AI-generated translations, accounting for accuracy and bias. This multi-faceted approach allowed for both depth and breadth in analyzing the opportunities and limitations of AI tools in translation education.

7. Declaration on Generative AI

The author(s) have not employed any Generative AI tools. During the preparation of this work, the author(s) used X-GPT-4 and Gramby in order to: Grammar and spelling check. Further, the author(s) used X-AI-IMG for figures 3and 4 in order to: Generate images. After using these tool(s)/service(s), the author(s) reviewed and edited the content as needed and take(s) full responsibility for the publication's content.

8. References

[1] González-Davies, M., & Enríquez Raído, V. (2021). "Translation Pedagogy in the Digital Age: Challenges and Opportunities." Translation and Interpreting Studies , 16(1), 1-21.

[2] Turchi, M., Negri, M., & Federico, M. (2022). "Neural Machine Translation: Advances and Applications." Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research , 73, 125-150.

[3] Way, A. (2020). "Human vs. Machine Translation: Synergies and Challenges." Machine Translation , 34(1), 45-62.

[4] Pym, A., & Torres-Simón, E. (2021). "Revisiting Translation Competence in the Age of AI." Target , 33(2), 185-201.

[5] Koehn, P., & Knowles, R. (2021). "Challenges in Neural Machine Translation for Low-Resource Languages." Computational Linguistics , 47(2), 301-325.

[6] Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). "On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big?" Proceedings of FAccT .

[7] Hovy, E., & Spruit, S. (2022). "Bias in Machine Translation: Causes and Solutions." Proceedings of ACL .

[8] Risager, K. (2020). "Intercultural Competence in Language Education: A Framework for the Future." Language Teaching Research , 24(3), 271-288.

[9] Olohan, M. (2021). "Cultural Nuances in Machine Translation: Bridging the Gap." Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice , 29(4), 512-526.

[10] Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., & Forcier, L. B. (2020). Intelligence Unleashed: An Argument for AI in Education . Pearson Education.

[11] Selwyn, N. (2021). Education and Technology: Key Issues and Debates . Bloomsbury Academic.

[12] O'Brien, S. (2022). "Rethinking Assessment in Translation Education with AI Tools." Target , 34(1), 78-95.

[13] Kiraly, D., & Alves, F. (2023). "Fostering Critical Engagement with AI in Translation Classrooms." Translation Spaces , 12(1), 45-63.

[14] Bassnett, S. (2014). Translation Studies . Routledge.

[15] Byram, M. (1997). Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence . Multilingual Matters.

[16] Munday, J. (2016). Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications . Routledge.

[17] Bowker, L., & Fisher, D. (2006). "Computer-Aided Translation Technology: A Practical Introduction." University of Ottawa Press.

[18] Newmark, P. (1988). A Textbook of Translation . Prentice Hall.

[19] Kiraly, D. (2013). A Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Education . Routledge.

[20] Bassnett, S. (2014). Translation Studies . Routledge.

[21] Newmark, P. (1988). A Textbook of Translation . Prentice Hall.

[22] Munday, J. (2016). Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications . Routledge.

[23] Bowker, L., & Fisher, D. (2006). "Computer-Aided Translation Technology: A Practical Introduction." University of Ottawa Press.

[24] Pym, A. (2010). Exploring Translation Theories . Routledge.

[25 Turchi, M., Negri, M., & Federico, M. (2022). "Neural Machine Translation: Advances and Applications." Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research , 73, 125-150.

[26] Way, A. (2020). "Human vs. Machine Translation: Synergies and Challenges." Machine Translation,34(1),45-62.

[27 Koehn, P., & Knowles, R. (2021). "Challenges in Neural Machine Translation for Low-Resource Languages." Computational Linguistics , 47(2), 301-325.

[28] Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). "On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big?" Proceedings of FAccT .

[29] Kiraly, D., & Alves, F. (2023). "Fostering Critical Engagement with AI in Translation Classrooms." Translation Spaces , 12(1), 45-63.

[30] Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., & Forcier, L. B. (2020). Intelligence Unleashed: An Argument for AI in Education . Pearson Education.

[31] Risager, K. (2020). "Intercultural Competence in Language Education: A Framework for the Future." Language Teaching Research , 24(3), 271-288.

[32] Hovy, E., & Spruit, S. (2022). "Bias in Machine Translation: Causes and Solutions." Proceedings of ACL .

[33] Pym, A., & Torres-Simón, E. (2021). "Revisiting Translation Competence in the Age of AI." Target , 33(2), 185-201.

[34] Kiraly, D. (2013). A Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Education . Routledge.

[35] Byram, M. (1997). Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence . Multilingual Matters.

[36] Selwyn, N. (2021). Should Robots Replace Teachers? AI and the Future of Education . Polity Press.

[37] S. Rakimbekuulu, K. Shambetaliev, G. Esenalieva and A. Khan, "Code Generation for Ablation Technique," 2024 IEEE East-West Design & Test Symposium (EWDTS), Yerevan, Armenia, 2024, pp. 1-7, doi: 10.1109/EWDTS63723.2024.10873640.

✉ **elnura.usupova@alatoo.edu.kg (U.Elnura)**