



Translating information technology expressions from English to Arabic: Strategies for bridging linguistic gaps

Muneera Muftah

Najran University

Najran, Saudi Arabia

munmef5@gmail.com 

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5898-5426> 

Abstract: Despite the prevalence of English in the field of information technology, Arabic translators face considerable challenges due to the lack of standardized Arabic equivalents for many information technology expressions, outdated dictionary entries, and delayed arabization efforts. This study examines the challenges and strategies involved in translating technical terms from English to Arabic within the computer science and internet technologies, specifically within the Arabic-speaking regions. By analyzing “Limited Access” texts—non-specialized materials such as web proposals, price quotes, and agreements—it investigates how semantic gaps between the two languages shape the translation process. The findings reveal that translators navigate these issues by employing strategies such as amplification, explication, and transliteration. Specifically, while transliteration ensures familiarity with widely recognized terms, amplification and explication serve to enhance clarity and usability for non-specialist audiences. Consequently, this study contributes to bridging linguistic gaps in second language contexts by demonstrating how translators balance linguistic accuracy with contextual relevance, tailoring translations to meet the needs of the target audience while preserving the functional intent of the source text. Moreover, it adds to the field of technical translation by identifying key linguistic and cultural factors that influence the translation of information technology content. Importantly, it underscores the need for institutional efforts to replace transliterations with standardized Arabic terms and further offers valuable insights into effective translation practices within the information technology sector.

Keywords: Arabic localization; information technology terminology; limited access texts; technical translation; translation strategies.

I. Introduction

Technical sciences have witnessed unprecedented global advancements in recent years, resulting in an exponential increase in the number of technical terms used worldwide. These terms



primarily originate from specialized fields such as electronics, industrial machinery, medical science, chemistry, and physics (Baker & Saldanha, 2019). Among these developments, the widespread integration of computers, the internet, and digital services has become one of the most dominant innovations, significantly shaping the information technology (IT) sector, particularly in English-speaking contexts (Lam'an & Setiawan, 2020). Consequently, English has experienced a substantial influx of neologisms that have evolved into specialized IT terms (Uzakova, 2025). Establishing systematic approaches to translating these terms is critical for managing linguistic expansion and aligning translation practices with fast-evolving technological trends (Vorobiova, 2024). Although the precise number of new IT terms is difficult to estimate, studies show that scientific and technical neologisms are introduced into Arabic annually (Al-Asal & Smadi, 2012; Al-Smadi, 2022; Muftah, 2023b).

Given the urgent need to transcend language barriers in the pursuit of international collaboration and knowledge exchange, translation plays a vital role in facilitating communication across borders (Al-Tarawneh, 2025). English, as the predominant language in science and technology, often accompanies imported technologies, becoming the default medium for technical communication. In this context, O'Hagan (1996) notes that non-English speakers have historically learned English as a *lingua franca* to overcome communication barriers. He also critiques the tendency of English-speaking producers to neglect the principle that products should be sold in the customer's language—a neglect that further underscores the importance of effective translation.

Despite these demands, technical translators working from English to Arabic—especially in the IT sector—struggle to keep pace with the proliferation of new terminology. Franco Aixelá (2004) traces the historical roots of technical translation to the 1950s, when English gained dominance in scientific discourse. Initially, the field prioritized mechanical terminology mapping, but it has since evolved into a recognized academic and professional discipline. Similarly, Newmark (2003) underscores translation's role in supporting service-sector growth, noting its expanding global relevance—particularly in technical domains.

Numerous scholars have acknowledged the linguistic challenges involved in translating English IT terminology into Arabic (Hassan, 2017; Abdelaal, 2020; Muftah, 2024). However, as Mohammad, Alawi and Fakhouri (2010) argue, Arabic has a robust linguistic system capable of incorporating scientific and technical concepts through derivation, borrowing, coinage, and arabization. Jamoussi et al. (2024) reinforce this potential, showing how translation quality in institutional settings is shaped by organizational structures, translator training, and technological infrastructure. In parallel, Gomaa (2024) explores English-Arabic media translation and highlights persistent issues related to idiomatic expressions and cultural gaps, reinforcing the value of context-sensitive strategies.

Initially, translators rely on specialized dictionaries, yet many now question their reliability and relevance for IT terminology. Often, such resources fail to provide accurate or widely accepted equivalents. When reliable terms are unavailable, translators frequently resort to personal strategies, such as transliteration, explication, or consulting informal glossaries posted on personal blogs (Husni & Newman, 2015; Baker, 2018; Al-Khalafat & Haider, 2022). This lack of standardized resources makes translation decisions highly individual and variable. As Cherneha et al. (2024) note, comprehensive standardization efforts are urgently needed to ensure consistency and precision.



In addition to resource constraints, many translators lack adequate exposure to modern computer literacy, particularly those who did not encounter IT topics during their education. This gap is compounded by the absence of specialized Arabic training materials or dictionaries, forcing translators to rely on personal intuition or trial-and-error methods. Importantly, this limitation does not reflect a weakness in Arabic as a language, but rather the lack of institutional and pedagogical investment in Arabic-language IT development. To navigate these obstacles, translators may adopt a range of strategies—including literal translation, semantic or communicative translation, adaptation, and transliteration (Scarpa, 2020; Guerrero, 2021). However, these are often employed independently, without institutional frameworks or standardized norms. As such, translation practices remain inconsistent, particularly in non-institutional contexts.

Accordingly, this study seeks to address a critical gap in the literature by examining how widely used IT expressions—particularly those found in limited access texts—are translated from English to Arabic. Although previous studies have documented general challenges in technical translation, few have empirically investigated how translators address semantic and linguistic inconsistencies in second language and non-institutional settings. This research contributes to filling that gap by exploring the strategies translators adopt to ensure both functional clarity and audience accessibility in the absence of standardization.

This study investigates the translation of widely used expressions with limited accessibility. It focuses on analyzing these expressions by considering their level of technicality and how this stimulates translators' strategy choices. The study aims to find if the function of the ST significantly impacts the final translation. Additionally, it highlights how maintaining the comprehensibility of the translated expressions and potential reconciliation strategies are important elements in text analysis.

Furthermore, the study emphasizes that the exposure of a non-expert audience to technological expressions, whether translated into Arabic or originally written in Arabic with English influence, guides translators through a challenging translation process filled with obstacles and a lack of tools. The technological expressions in question serve purposes such as business advertisements or complete service quotes and target a broad audience. The main focus is on translating these specialized expressions for non-experts, ensuring the translations are tailored to the text's function and are understandable for the intended recipients. Thus, the study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. How do translators compensate for semantic gaps when translating widely used limited access IT expressions from English to Arabic?
2. What strategies do professional translators use to convey widely used limited access IT expressions, and how do these strategies align with user expectations?
3. How do cultural and technological factors influence the translation choices of expressions that are widely recognized in Arabic?
4. What are the primary challenges translators encounter in the IT field?



2. Theoretical foundation

2.1 Translating IT limited access expressions

Technical expressions, especially those related to IT services, are notoriously complex when assigned as translation tasks (O'Hagan & Ashworth, 2002; Scarpa, 2020; O'Hagan, 2019). However, the degree of complexity varies depending on the stage of communication between the service provider and the customer (Jiménez-Crespo, 2024). Hatim and Mason (1990, 1996) observed that while a text might have a dominant purpose, other underlying purposes might also exist, which can complicate translation if the text's function changes without necessary modifications. The selected expressions are drafted by specialists but intended for a nonspecialized audience. This contrast makes translation difficult, as highly technical content must be adapted for readers with little or no technical knowledge. This study focuses on examining widely used expressions across different stages of commercial interaction, such as service offers for online trade companies, detailed web service proposals, price quotations, website legal agreements, and programming code documentation. The decision to investigate these expressions stems from their prevalence and the critical role they play in communication between service providers and clients. To ensure the relevance of the findings, translations were assigned to experienced professionals, who were informed of the unique needs of the target audience (Byrne, 2006).

Newmark (1988) categorizes technological jargon into three groups: widely used terms, document-specific terms, and abbreviations, a classification that helps distinguish between general IT vocabulary and highly specialized terminology. Building on this framework, each category is shown to pose distinct challenges and to necessitate tailored translation strategies in order to maintain both accuracy and comprehensibility. Accordingly, this study focuses on widely used expressions to uncover effective practices for addressing translation difficulties, particularly for non-specialized audiences. In doing so, it also aims to offer practical solutions for bridging linguistic gaps when translating into Arabic as the target language (see Nord, 2005, 2022).

2.2 Limited access expressions

A technological text classified as limited access is one that is not publicly available but rather provided upon request (Byrne, 2006), typically to a company director interested in acquiring web-solution services after viewing an advertisement. As the name implies, limited access expressions refer to terms that are specific to particular areas of human activity. These expressions are transmitted through secured channels like personal emails or fax due to their containing specialized programming details and exclusive price quotes.

These expressions are exchanged during advanced stages of commercial negotiations. Initially, customers prioritize brief overviews of service features and competitive pricing. However, as the deal progresses, they seek detailed information on programming languages, website functionality, security measures, and backup consultation availability. These expressions frequently include highly specialized technological terms, showcasing the precise and formal language employed by expert programmers. The use of present and perfect tenses, simple grammatical structures,



technical jargon, and passive voice, especially in legal sections, is common. Given their role in finalizing commercial agreements, these expressions must elucidate technical advantages and financial details, even if this means delving into complex disbursement items within price quotes and web-solution descriptions.

2.3 Challenges in translating limited access expressions

Limited access expressions present two challenges. They are highly specialized and technical, often filled with complex terminology. Professional programmers even question whether such expressions can be effectively translated. O'Hagan and Ashworth (2002) and O'Hagan (2013, 2019) claim that IT expressions are rarely designed for translation, leading to significant adaptation challenges. This is evident in cases where source texts assume a shared technical background that may not exist in the target audience. To make the translated text suitable for a nonspecialized target audience, translators must make adjustments, as suggested by Byrne (2006), who argues that English ST writers should focus on ensuring linguistic compatibility for different English-speaking audiences.

The lack of foresight regarding translation adds to the difficulty of translating limited access expressions. However, considering the predominantly informative nature of these expressions and the necessity of conveying a communicative message within the limitations imposed by such expressions allows for some flexibility for modification throughout the translation process.

2.4 Multifaceted functions of limited access expressions

It is evident that limited access expressions, by their nature, serve multiple functions rather than being strictly mono-functional, with one primary function often overshadowing others (Hatim & Mason, 1990). Newmark (1981), Nord (2005, 2022), and Byrne (2006) all emphasize the informative function of technical expressions. This aligns with the findings in this study, which show that IT expressions prioritize clarity over stylistic variation. The three analyzed texts are intended to provide clients with essential insights into the technological procedures involved in delivering web-based solutions. The website agreement, for example, functions as an authoritative document that not only specifies terms and conditions but also elaborates on critical aspects such as quality assurance, testing protocols, browser compatibility, and validation procedures. This dual purpose of setting regulations and educating the client underscores its predominantly informative nature.

Similarly, the technical report serves as a prime example of the informative function, offering a comprehensive proposal detailing the processes and solutions tailored to meet client needs. On the other hand, the third text, comprising detailed price quotations, incorporates an operative or vocative function by encouraging the client to act—selecting a specific service package. Recognizing that clients may opt to source hosting, design, and programming services from different providers, the price breakdown highlights the costs of individual components. This approach seeks to attract potential clients while eliminating any financial uncertainty that might arise from only presenting an overall total, ensuring transparency and appeal.

Reiss (1989) underscores the significant relationship between text type and the appropriate stylistic approach in translation, particularly in accordance with translation Skopos. She argues that



when both the ST and TT aim to convey information, the translator must select a style that effectively communicates the content to the target audience. Newmark (1988) delineates four styles commonly found in informative texts: 1) a formal, non-emotive, technical style for academic papers; 2) a neutral or informal style with defined technical terms for textbooks; 3) an informal, warm style for popular science or art books; and 4) a familiar, racy, non-technical style for popular journalism.

The style of limited access, informative expressions in initial unsolicited service offers typically aligns closely with the first style, the formal, non-emotive, technical style, owing to the prevalence of specialized technological terms. Considering functional shift, the translation of such expressions should ideally adopt a neutral “informal” style with clearly defined technical terms, or possibly shift towards the warm, informal style for popular science. Alternatively, the translated text could adopt a more informal, non-technical style, though this is rare in technical translation.

Opting for a neutral or informal style facilitates comprehension for non-specialized audiences by explaining technical terms they may not be familiar with, thus providing essential background information to grasp the technological concepts. Similarly, the warm, informal style retains a scientific tone while its simplicity allows for a wide range of vocabulary to define and illustrate concepts, meeting the informative function’s requirements. However, employing the non-technical style encourages creativity in presentation, incorporating images, colors, and special effects to maintain informativeness while also appealing to readers. In essence, translators are encouraged to adjust the style of the original text downward in Newmark’s hierarchy, prioritizing the universal informative function for both texts and employing related translation strategies, albeit while navigating potential conflicts between functionality and loyalty, as elaborated in the following section (Abdelaal, 2020).

2.5 Skopos theory principles: coherence and fidelity

Byrne (2006) notes that Skopos theory, which emerged in the 1970s, was among the first to emphasize the communicative aspects of translation. Byrne describes Skopos theory as a broadly applicable framework, as it does not prioritize specific translation strategies. Instead, it empowers the translator to act according to the requirements of the Skopos without adhering to any fixed principles (Vermeer 1989; Reiss & Vermeer, 2013). Regarding text usability, Byrne argues that technical translations should not only provide accurate information but also present it in a way that is usable for the reader. The sample documents in the study were intended for readers with limited IT knowledge. Therefore, the translator must act as a text creator, making decisions based on the reader’s background and expectations (Byrne, 2006; Wang, 2018). The ST’s function is to convey technological details to an informed audience (Zhang, 2014). Consequently, the Skopos theory was applied to address the translation challenges (Muftah, 2023a; Nord, 2022; Vermeer & Chesterman, 2021). Vermeer (1989) asserts that translation is guided by the function of the final product, which is defined by the needs of the receiver. According to Munday (2009), the Skopos theory emphasizes two main principles in creating the TT: fidelity and coherence. Munday argues that fidelity and coherence remain essential components of Skopos theory that must be considered during the translation process.



2.5.1 Coherence

Skopos theory provides a broad framework that includes various translation strategies. Vermeer and Chesterman (2021) contended that translations are crafted for specific audiences with defined objectives within a particular context. In a similar vein, Yuan and Ma (2020) assert that the primary element in the translation process is its purpose, underscoring the significance of Skopos theory. However, Reiss and Vermeer (2013) highlight coherence and fidelity as the two key principles, emphasizing that the target reader is central to the translation process. They assert that coherence involves a harmonious relationship between the ST and TT and between the TT and its audience.

Reiss and Vermeer (2013) identify two types of coherence: intertextual and intratextual. Intertextual coherence, also known as the “fidelity” principle, refers to the relationship between the ST and the TT. Intratextual coherence, as defined by Schäffner (2001), focuses on the compatibility of the translation with the target audience’s situation and context of use, considering factors like background knowledge and situational circumstances.

Munday (2009) establishes a hierarchy of rules in Skopos theory, agreeing with Vermeer (1989) that intratextual coherence takes precedence over intertextual coherence, but both are secondary to the Skopos of the translation action. For limited access expressions, the Skopos centers on the target audience’s limited technological knowledge. This guides the translator in choosing terms that align with the audience’s background knowledge, ensuring intratextual coherence. Unlike intertextual coherence, where the translator balances between free and faithful choices, the focus here is on the target audience’s understanding.

Reiss and Vermeer (2013) also note that achieving “objective correctness” or intertextual coherence must be balanced with intratextual coherence. For limited access expressions, heavily intertextually coherent translations might be too complex for the target audience, effectively requiring another translation. On the other hand, a translation with a focus on intratextual coherence, tailored to a non-specialized audience, ensures better comprehensibility. In this study, both source and target texts are informative, but the translator must adjust the information based on the target audience’s background knowledge, providing more clarification where necessary and omitting overly specialized details. The challenge lies in meeting the target audience’s expectations and producing a text that is both adequate and appropriate for the new context.

2.5.2 Fidelity

Typically, a translator is expected to convey all aspects of the ST and remain ethically committed to it (Nord, 2022). Being “faithful” implies finding equivalent terms and references in the target language (Munday et al., 2022; Vermeer & Chesterman, 2021). However, finding equivalents between unrelated languages like English and Arabic, especially in fields like IT, is challenging. Despite efforts by organizations like the Arab League’s ALECSO (2015) to standardize IT terminology, Arabic still lacks widely accepted equivalents for many English IT terms. Even when such equivalents are proposed, they often remain incomprehensible to non-specialized audiences. For instance, the term



'firewall' has multiple Arabic renditions—such as 'جدار ناري' (literal translation) and 'حاجز أمني' (security barrier)—yet none has achieved widespread adoption.

To address non-equivalence, Neubert (1984, p. 68) suggests aiming for “text-bound equivalence”, which involves using strategies that adapt the translation to fit the TT’s context. This might mean under-translating in certain areas to better suit the circumstances of the TT. In the translation samples provided, the translator had to cater to a non-specialized audience, considering their limited technological knowledge. The instructions emphasized effectively communicating key information, such as the advantages and disadvantages of the service, time limitations, and costs. According to Nord (2005), when balancing “functionality” and “loyalty”, a translator may focus on certain aspects while ignoring others, as long as the omissions are noted. Nord advises adopting instrumental strategies where the translation serves as an independent communicative tool, fulfilling its purpose without the receiver being aware of the original communication.

This instrumental view of translation allows some flexibility for the translator, particularly with IT-related documents. Nord (2005, 2022) also allows for greater adaptation when the ST is deeply rooted in its original culture or highly specialized. This freedom stems from the need to prioritize a different kind of loyalty—the loyalty to the client (Jabir, 2006).

3. Methodology

3.1 Corpus selection

The corpus consisted of limited access IT expressions commonly found in real-world documents such as service offers, price quotations, website agreements, and technical proposals exchanged between IT service providers and clients. These texts are considered “limited access” because they are not publicly available but are shared privately upon request, typically during business negotiations. Their language is technical yet aimed at non-specialist audiences, making them ideal for analyzing how translators balance accuracy and comprehensibility. A total of 44 key expressions were selected from authentic IT documents, including terms such as “backup”, “authentication”, “drag and drop”, “hyperlink”, and “cookies”. These expressions were chosen for their frequency of use and relevance in both English and Arabic-speaking IT contexts.

3.2 Participants

The study analyzes widely used IT expressions by examining translations produced by professional translators with at least five years of experience in the field. These participants were selected for their demonstrated expertise in IT translation and their familiarity with both English and Arabic technical terminology. Notably, the translators were independent freelancers rather than members of institutional translation teams. As they were not bound by organizational style guides or standardized protocols, their translation choices reflect individual, non-standardized practices. Each translator received the same source expressions and was asked to render them into Arabic as they would in a real work context, without consulting each other or using predefined glossaries.



This context helps explain the variation and occasional inconsistency observed across some of the translated renditions.

3.3 Data collection and analysis

The translated versions of the selected IT expressions were collected and tabulated for comparative analysis. Translators were not provided with prescriptive guidelines, which allowed their strategy choices—such as literal translation, amplification, transliteration, adaptation, or simplification—to emerge organically. This approach ensured the authenticity of the translation practices and enabled an exploration of real-world, non-institutional solutions to semantic and terminological challenges. The analysis was grounded in established translation theories, including Nord's (2005, 2022) functionalist approach, Reiss and Vermeer's (2013) Skopos theory, and Newmark's (1988) categorization of terminology. These theoretical frameworks provided a comprehensive lens for assessing how translators negotiated between terminological accuracy and functional clarity, particularly when targeting non-specialist audiences.

Each translated expression was evaluated based on three primary criteria: (1) semantic equivalence—the degree to which the Arabic rendering preserved the original meaning; (2) audience appropriateness—how understandable and suitable the translation was for non-specialist users; and (3) translation strategy—the specific method employed in the rendering. For instance, Translator I often applied amplification, as in the translation of “backup” to “نسخ احتياطي للبيانات على الإنترنت”, to clarify technical functionality, whereas Translator II generally favored literal or formal renderings. The analytical process also incorporated the concepts of intertextual and intratextual coherence (Schäffner, 2001; Munday, 2009), examining both the consistency between source and target texts and the alignment of the target text with its intended audience. Moreover, the findings were contextualized within broader discussions of specialized terminology translation, drawing on insights from scholars who highlight the recurring challenges of standardization, domain specificity, and accessibility. These issues are particularly prominent in language pairs such as English and Arabic, where linguistic and conceptual mismatches complicate the translation of rapidly evolving IT terminology.

4. Results

4.1 Compensating for the semantic gap

Building on the comparative analysis outlined in the methodology, this section presents the findings regarding how translators addressed semantic gaps when rendering IT expressions from English to Arabic. The Arabic translations were examined to identify semantic deficiencies and assess how translators selected or adapted terminology to compensate for gaps. In particular, the results focus on how these decisions affected the target audience's comprehension of the texts.

The analysis is structured around the three evaluation criteria established in Section 3.3: semantic equivalence, audience appropriateness, and translation strategy. Translator efforts to address the semantic gap and the lack of widely accepted Arabic equivalents were analyzed based



on how effectively their choices aligned with the functional needs of non-specialist users. Informed by the theoretical models introduced earlier—such as intratextual coherence (Schäffner, 2001), Munday’s (2009) translation rule hierarchy, Newmark’s (1988) style hierarchy, and Skopos theory (Reiss & Vermeer, 2013)—the analysis highlights how translators employed specific strategies and identifies the potential risks and compensatory methods used by professional translators.

4.2 Widely used expressions

These technical expressions, integral to daily discussions in computer science and internet-related activities, find their frequent usage rooted in their indispensable role in website programming and development. Arab programmers and IT specialists have readily adopted the English versions of these terms, seamlessly integrating their pronunciation into everyday Arabic technical conversations. This assimilation has led to widespread recognition and understanding, even among those less familiar with the subject matter. The trend is further compounded by the delays and inadequacies in institutional efforts to devise Arabic equivalents for emerging technical terminology (Altarabin, 2020). A thorough examination of the data reveals a common practice among translators: simplifying Arabic technological expressions to facilitate comprehension. Table I illustrates instances of this simplification.

Table I: Translations of widely used expressions

No. of Items	Original expression(s)	Translation I	Translation II
1.	accessibility	إمكانية الوصول	الإتاحة
2.	attachment	مرفق	مرفق / ملحق
3.	authentication	المصادقة	التحقق من الهوية/التثبت من الهوية
4.	Backup	نسخ احتياطي للبيانات على الإنترنت	نسخه مساندة
5.	cloud Services	الخدمات السحابية	خدمات سحابية
6.	Configuration	تكوين وتشكيل	إعدادات
7.	Cookies	كوكيز - ملفات تعريف الارتباط	ملفات تعريف الارتباط
8.	cyberspace	الفضاء الإلكتروني	الفضاء السيبراني
9.	database	قاعدة بيانات	قاعدة بيانات
10.	dialog box	مربع حوار	نافذة الحوار
11.	digital asset	الأصول الرقمية	الأصول الرقمية
12.	directory	فهرس / دليل	دليل ارشادي
13.	Download and upload	تنزيل وتحميل	رفع الى الموقع وتحميل من الموقع
14.	Drag and drop	السحب والإسقاط	تقنية السحب والإفلات
15.	e-mail archiving	أرشفة البريد الإلكتروني	أرشفة البريد الإلكتروني
16.	emoticon	الرموز التعبيرية	الإيموجي / الصور الرمزية / التعبيرات
17.	extension	امتداد الملفات	امتداد
18.	flash memory	ذاكرة سريعة/ومبضية	ذاكرة فلاش
19.	generative AI	الذكاء الاصطناعي التوليدي	الذكاء الاصطناعي التوليدي
20.	handshaking	المُصافحة	تأكيد الإتصال
21.	Hardware	العتاد الصلب	العتاد التقني / هاردوير

22.	helper application	التطبيق المساعد	التطبيق المساعد
23.	home page	الصفحة الرئيسية	الصفحة الرئيسية
24.	hyperlink	رابطة تشعُّبِيَّة	ارتباط تشعُّبِي
25.	hypertext	نص تشعُّبِي	نص تشعُّبِي
26.	Internet Explorer	إنترنت إكسبلورر	متصفح الإنترنت
27.	IP address	عنوان آي.بي	عنوان بروتوكول الإنترنت
28.	knowledge base	قاعدة المعلومات	أساس المعرفة/ المعارف
29.	log in, log on	وُلُوج ، دخول	تسجيل الدخول
30.	mailing list	قائمة بريدية	القوائم البريدية/ لائحة البريد
31.	multimedia	وسائط متعددة	وسائط متعددة
32.	Navigation	الملاحة والتنقل	التَّصَفُّح
33.	peer-to-peer	نظير إلى نظير	نظير إلى نظير
34.	Permissions	صلاحيات	الأذونات
35.	plug and play	الربط و التشغيل	التوصيل والتشغيل
36.	pop-up blocker	أداة حظر العناصر المنبثقة	مانع الإطارات المنبثقة/ النوافذ المنبثقة
37.	Server	المزود، الخادم	المزود أو السيرفر
38.	scroll bar	شريط التمرير	شريط التمرير
39.	Source Code	الشفيرة الأصلية/ المصدريّة	النص البرمجي المصدري
40.	spam	رسائل غير مرغوب فيها	الرسائل المزعجة أو الرسائل العشوائية
41.	Track (n)/(v)	إِقْتَفَى أثر	تَعَقَّب/ تتبع
42.	Uninstall	إزالة	إلغاء تثبيت التطبيقات
43.	virtual reality	الواقع الافتراضي	الواقع الافتراضي
44.	wireless (networking)	شبكة إنترنت لاسلكية	شبكة لاسلكية

Source: Author (2026)

“Accessibility”, “attachment”, and “permissions” are widely used expressions among both business professionals and technicians. They are consistently translated as الإتاحه/إمكانية الوصول, ملحق/مرفق, الأذونات/صلاحيات, respectively. No matter the technological context, these expressions are always rendered with these functional equivalents due to their common usage. Similarly, translators unanimously agree on rendering “database” and “peer-to-peer” as قاعدة بيانات and نظير إلى نظير in all translation tasks, as these expressions are also widely recognized in Arabic.

Another example from this group of terms is “Track”, which Translator I renders as إقْتَفَى أثر, while Translator II opts for تَعَقَّب/تتبع. Translator II’s choice reflects the formal and serious tone typical of technological documents. In contrast, Translator I employs a more formal style, aiming to engage the target audience with warmer, more promotional language, particularly since it is not a highly specialized term. This approach makes the text more appealing and ensures comprehensibility. Additional examples of this set of terms include “handshaking” and “navigation”, which translator I renders as المصافحة and الملاحة والتنقل, respectively, while translator II opts for التَّصَفُّح and تأكيد الإتصال. Translator II’s choices reflect the formal and serious tone typical of technological documents. In contrast, translator I employs a less formal style, aiming to connect with the target audience through more engaging and warmer language, particularly since these are commonly used expressions rather than specialized jargon. This approach enhances the text’s appeal and ensures it remains comprehensible.



The term “backup” refers to creating a copy of computer data stored elsewhere to restore the original data after a loss event. Translator II rendered it as *نسخه مساندة*, which is a literal translation. However, Translator I recognized that in the context of web hosting, this term pertains to the process of copying and archiving website data for recovery in case of data loss. Therefore, *نسخ احتياطي للبيانات على الإنترنت* is more appropriate and helps the audience understand its function. Similarly, the term “extension” was translated by Translator I as *امتداد الملفات* to clarify that extensions indicate which application created or can open a file and determine the file’s icon. Translator I used amplification in both terms as a translation strategy, adding elements to the source text to enhance comprehension.

Translator II also employed the amplification strategy in translating certain expressions. While Translator I rendered expressions like “authentication” and “uninstall” literally as *المصادقه* and *إزالة*, Translator II used *التحقق من الهوية/التثبت من الهوية* for “authentication” to clarify that it involves proving the genuineness of a fact or document, particularly in computer science where it is associated with verifying a user’s identity. For “uninstall”, Translator II used *إلغاء تثبيت التطبيقات* to specify that it refers to removing software from a computer system, including all files copied to the hard disk during installation, often using a specially designed program. This approach illustrates that fidelity in translation is relatively attained when choosing among possible alternatives.

The widely used expressions “cookies”, “cyberspace”, “emoticon”, “flash memory”, “hardware”, “Internet Explorer”, “IP address”, and “server” are often rendered into Arabic through transliteration, i.e., borrowing. This is because these expressions have quickly entered the Arabic market. These expressions have been translated into Arabic as *ملفات تعريف الارتباط , الفضاء الإلكتروني, الرموز* , *التعبيرية, ذاكرة وميضية , العتاد الصلب , متصفح الانترنت, عنوان بروتوكول الإنترنت, المزود/ الخادم*. However, these translations have not gained wide circulation among Arabic speakers because the effort to localize these expressions came too late. Thus, even though translators might be familiar with these Arabic equivalents, they tend not to use them. This is because there needs to be a strong association between the audience’s background and expectations and the translator’s choices. Both translators have redundantly provided the borrowed terms alongside the English terms. For example, Translator I used the transliteration strategy for *إنترنت إكسبلورر* and *كوكيز*, *عنوان آي.بي*, while Translator II did the same for *السيرفر* and *الفضاء السيبراني, الإيموجي, ذاكرة فلاش, هاردوير*.

Expressions like “download and upload”, “drag and drop”, and “plug and play” are frequently used in everyday conversations among people of various educational backgrounds. There is significant uncertainty in their prevailing Arabic equivalents. Translator I translates these expressions as *التشغيل والربط* and *تحميل* and *تنزيل*, and *الربط والتشغيل*. However, both *تنزيل* and *تحميل*, as well as *الربط* and *التشغيل*, are somewhat similar in meaning. For instance, *تحميل* in computer science does not clearly indicate the direction of file transfer, whereas “upload” specifies transferring files from the user’s device to another, and “download” indicates the opposite. Translator II addresses this by using *الموقع رفع الى* for “upload” and *تحميل من الموقع* for “download”, offering a clear, simple, and accurate translation. Likewise, Translator II translates “drop” in “drag and drop” as *إفلات*, which is a common term when moving an object to a different location, and “plug and play” as *التوصيل والتشغيل*, indicating a system feature that allows a device to be used as soon as it is connected. The translations provided by Translator II are more precise and accurate.

A knowledge base simplifies the process for users to find the information they need efficiently. Consequently, “knowledge base” is frequently heard in Arabic conversations. Translator II translated this expression as *أساس المعرفة/المعارف*, which is a literal translation that might be somewhat acceptable. However, translating “base” as *أساس* overlooks the technical context and conveys only the linguistic meaning, which is not advisable for technical translation in certain cases (Awawdeh, 1990). In contrast, Translator I successfully rendered the term as *قاعدة المعلومات*, following the translation used by Arabic versions of websites and companies for “base”. This approach makes the expression more recognizable to the target audience and accurately conveys the concept of a centralized information system where companies and websites store important documentation for their expressions. Thus, this translation is more user-friendly.

Other translations, including those for expressions like “helper application”, “home page”, “hyperlink”, “hypertext”, “generative AI”, “mailing list”, “multimedia”, “scroll bar”, “virtual reality”, and “wireless (networking)”, accurately capture both the contextual meaning and the expectations of the target audience (see Table 1). Therefore, the translator’s approach to conveying the intended meaning of these words is considered effective, as it aligns well with the contextual setting.

As demonstrated by the examples of common technical expressions, understanding the technological context is crucial for translators to highlight technological characteristics appropriately in flexible language where suitable. However, these expressions often require less modification compared to other categories of technological jargon. It is also noteworthy that the selected common expressions appear more frequently in the initial stages of the communication between the service provider and the customer, and much less so at more advanced stages.

5. Discussion

The translation of technical terms in the fields of computer science and internet technologies from English to Arabic poses several challenges, given the complexities of semantic gaps, cultural nuances, and the rapid evolution of technological language. In this study, the translation strategies employed by professionals, the impact of cultural and technological factors, and the challenges encountered by translators are explored in detail. A central theme emerging from the data is the need for translators to adapt their strategies based on the context of the term, the nature of the target audience, and the constraints imposed by the fast-evolving IT field. This section synthesizes the findings and offers answers to the key research questions raised by the study.

RQ1. How do translators compensate for semantic gaps when translating widely used limited access IT expressions from English to Arabic?

Translators face significant challenges when translating widely used limited access IT expressions due to semantic gaps between the source and target languages. They often employ various strategies to bridge these gaps. For example, in translating terms like “backup” and “authentication”, translators add extra context to enhance understanding. Translator I’s choice of “نسخ احتياطي للبيانات على الإنترنت” (online data backup) instead of simply “نسخة مساندة” (backup copy) demonstrates an amplification strategy, offering more information about the concept. Similarly,



“authentication” is translated as “التحقق من الهوية”, providing clarity on the process of verifying identity, which is crucial in technology (Altarabin, 2020). These strategies ensure the target audience comprehends the technical meaning, even if no direct equivalent exists in Arabic. This aligns with the principles of Skopos theory, particularly the need for coherence and fidelity in technical translation (Vermeer, 1989). The translator’s goal is not just to remain faithful to the original term but to ensure that the TT conveys the same functionality and usability as the ST, catering to the target audience’s needs (Reiss & Vermeer, 2013). This is crucial in a domain like IT, where new terms are constantly emerging and the target audience may not have a high level of technical expertise. In this regard, the findings support Mohammad’s (2010) claim that Arabic can accommodate new technical terms through creative linguistic mechanisms, such as derivation and arabization.

RQ2. What strategies do professional translators use to convey widely used limited access IT expressions, and how do these strategies align with user expectations?

The data reveals several strategies used by professional translators to convey widely used limited access IT expressions: simplification, literal translation, and transliteration. Common terms like “cloud services” (الخدمات السحابية) and “database” (قاعدة بيانات) are translated directly, which are widely recognized within the Arabic-speaking tech community. However, for more complex terms like “knowledge base”, some translators opt for terms like “أساس المعرفة”, which might not be as contextually suitable (Awawdeh, 1990). These strategies align with user expectations by balancing technical accuracy and user comprehension. Newmark’s (1988) style hierarchy suggests that clarity and audience comprehension should take precedence over literal translation, reflecting the need to make technical information accessible while retaining accuracy. Muftah (2023a) emphasizes that effective translation strategies must consider user background knowledge and cultural context, especially when addressing functional expressions in digital or service-oriented communication. This study reflects that approach, as translators adjusted the level of formality and technicality based on the assumed expertise of the intended users. Munday (2009) stresses that Skopos theory calls for aligning translations with the audience’s expectations, particularly regarding functionality and clarity. Translators are often required to strike a balance between technical accuracy and audience accessibility. This practice, as Byrne (2006) notes, reflects the Skopos theory’s focus on the translation’s end purpose.

RQ3. How do cultural and technological factors influence the translation choices of expressions that are widely recognized in Arabic?

Cultural and technological factors significantly influence translation choices, especially for expressions that are widely recognized in Arabic. For example, terms like “cookies” (كوكيز) and “cyberspace” (الفضاء الإلكتروني) have been transliterated into Arabic, as they are widely adopted in the Arabic lexicon. This is due to the delay in developing standardized Arabic equivalents and the global dominance of these concepts in technology (Altarabin, 2020). The rapid pace of technological advancements and the lack of Arabic alternatives drive the adoption of transliterations, making them



more familiar to the audience than possible Arabic counterparts. These factors illustrate how the cultural and technological context shapes translation decisions in the IT field. Skopos theory helps explain this tendency, as it allows for flexibility in translation strategies when the primary concern is ensuring the target audience's understanding (Reiss & Vermeer, 2013). The delay in the development of standardized Arabic equivalents underscores the critical role of institutional efforts in shaping translation practices—a point emphasized by Vermeer and Chesterman (2021). This institutional gap is further echoed in the findings of Jamoussi et al. (2024), who point to institutional inefficiencies and inconsistent workflows as contributing to terminological inconsistency and translator reliance on informal strategies. Furthermore, the rapid pace of technological advancements and the lack of Arabic alternatives drive the adoption of transliterations, making them more familiar to the audience than possible Arabic counterparts. These borrowed terms have become more familiar to Arabic-speaking users than their potential native counterparts, reflecting a broader cultural and technological influence on translation practices. In this context, Skopos theory provides a useful explanatory framework, as it allows for flexibility in translation strategies when the primary concern is ensuring the target audience's understanding (Reiss & Vermeer, 2013). This adaptability becomes particularly vital in the IT domain, where comprehension often takes precedence over literal equivalence.

RQ4. What are the primary challenges translators encounter in the IT field?

Translators in the IT field encounter several challenges that stem from both linguistic and technical complexities. These include:

- Lack of equivalent terminology: Many IT terms, especially those related to emerging technologies, lack established Arabic equivalents, forcing translators to create new terms or use transliteration (Munday, 2009; Vorobiova, 2024).
- Cultural and contextual adaptation: Translators must ensure that translated terms fit the cultural and contextual expectations of the Arabic-speaking audience (Altarabin, 2020; Gomaa, 2024).
- Precision and clarity: IT terms often have specific meanings, and errors in translation can lead to significant misunderstandings. Translators must ensure that the terminology is both accurate and contextually appropriate (Awawdeh, 1990).
- Balancing formal and informal tones: Some IT expressions require a balance between formal technical language and informal equivalents that are more accessible to a wider audience (Newmark, 1988).

This is compounded by the rapid pace of technological advancements, which outstrip the ability to develop corresponding terms in Arabic. Cultural adaptation is also crucial, as translators must ensure that the technical content aligns with the cultural context of the target audience. Skopos theory emphasizes that the translation must not only be accurate but also contextually appropriate, particularly when addressing a non-specialized audience (Reiss & Vermeer, 2013). Furthermore, Franco Aixelá (2004) highlights that the evolution of technical translation as a scholarly discipline



stems from the need to address precisely these challenges, reflecting the growing complexity of bridging language gaps in specialized domains.

6. Conclusion

This study emphasizes the complex interplay between translation strategies and user comprehension in the field of technical translation. Translators must balance accuracy with the clarity expected by the target audience, often compensating for semantic gaps through strategies such as amplification, literal translation, or borrowing. While some terms have been successfully localized into Arabic, others remain untranslated or are adopted in their original English forms due to the delay in institutional efforts to create standardized equivalents. This highlights the importance of understanding both the linguistic and cultural context in ensuring effective communication of technical content. The findings also underscore the significance of translator expertise in navigating these challenges, particularly when dealing with emerging technological terminology. In line with previous studies, such as those by Newmark (1988) and Munday (2009), the research shows that a well-considered translation strategy is essential for ensuring that technical terms resonate with the target audience while preserving their intended meaning. Future research could explore how the Arabic-speaking audience's evolving familiarity with technological terms affects their reception of various translation strategies.

Nevertheless, despite offering valuable insights into the translation of widely used technical terms in the domain of computer science and internet-related expressions, this study is not without limitations. One key constraint is the narrow scope of the data, which primarily focuses on commonly used limited access expressions. This emphasis on everyday IT terminology may not capture the full complexity involved in translating more specialized or domain-specific terms that often require different strategies. A broader investigation including more specialized jargon would therefore provide a more comprehensive understanding of the challenges faced by translators (Newmark, 1988; Munday, 2009). Additionally, the study did not account for document-specific expressions or abbreviated terms, which frequently pose unique translation difficulties. These expressions are highly contextual and may be interpreted differently across specialized technical domains. Abbreviations, in particular, can lack direct equivalents in the target language, underscoring the need for future research to address how such forms are managed (Altarabin, 2020).

Furthermore, the absence of feedback from the target audience is another limitation, as user responses could offer crucial insight into the effectiveness of the translation strategies employed. In real-world contexts, translation success is often evaluated based on its reception and clarity to the intended audience. Thus, incorporating user feedback in future studies could help assess not only linguistic accuracy but also practical usability and relevance (Awawdeh, 1990; Munday, 2009). Lastly, the study's reliance on only two professional translators may limit the generalizability of the findings. Translation practices may vary significantly across professionals with different backgrounds or working within different cultural and institutional contexts. Including a larger and more diverse sample of translators would allow for a more nuanced understanding of individual choices and help establish patterns and best practices that are applicable more broadly across the technical translation field.



Acknowledgements

The author would like to express sincere gratitude to the professional translators for their valuable time, expertise, and insightful input.

References

- Abdelaal, N. (2020). Translation theory. In *Translation between English and Arabic: A textbook for translation students and educators* (pp. 9–67). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-34332-3_2
- Al-Asal, M. S., & Smadi, O. M. (2012). Arabicization and Arabic expanding techniques used in science lectures in two Arab universities. *Asian Perspectives in the Arts and Humanities*, 2(1), 15–38.
- Al-Khalafat, L., & Haider, A. S. (2022). A corpus-assisted translation study of strategies used in rendering culture-bound expressions in the speeches of King Abdullah II. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 12(1), 130–142. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1201.16>
- Al-Smadi, H. M. (2022). Challenges in translating scientific texts: Problems and reasons. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 13(3), 550–560. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1303.11>
- Altarabin, M. (2020). *The Routledge course on media, legal and technical translation: English–Arabic–English*. 1st ed. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003052555>
- Al-Tarawneh, A. (2025). Translation: Unleashing Innovation, Learning, and Cross-Cultural Knowledge Exchange. In A. M. A. Musleh Al-Sartawi, M. Al-Okaily, A. A. Al-Qudah & F. Shihadeh (Eds.), *From Machine Learning to Artificial Intelligence: Studies in Systems, Decision and Control*, vol 572 (pp. 883–894). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-76011-2_63
- Awawdeh, A. Y. (1990). *Major problems of scientific-technical translation from English into Arabic*. [Unpublished Master's Thesis]. Yarmouk University.
- Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: A coursebook on translation*. 3rd ed. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315619187>
- Baker, M., & Saldanha, G. (Eds.). (2019). *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*. 3rd ed. Routledge.
- Byrne, J. (Ed.). (2006). *Technical translation: Usability Strategies for Translating Technical Documentation*. Springer Netherlands. <https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-4653-7>
- Cherneh, D., Turyshcheva, O., & Dzykovych, O. (2024). IT terminology: Translation challenges and prospects. *Advanced Linguistics*, 14, 165–170. <https://doi.org/10.20535/2024.14.314085>
- Franco Aixelá, J. (2004). The study of technical and scientific translation: An examination of its historical development. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 1, 29–49.
- Gomaa, Y. A. (2024). Deciphering linguistic and cultural hurdles in English–Arabic media translation: Insights from the BBC online news articles. *Cadernos de Tradução*, 44(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.5007/2175-7968.2024.e94510>
- Guerrero, M. J. H. (2021). News translation strategies. In E. Bielsa (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of translation and media* (pp. 232–249). Routledge.
- Hassan, S. S. (2017). Translating technical terms into Arabic: Microsoft terminology collection (English–Arabic) as an example. *Translation & Interpreting: The International Journal of Translation and Interpreting Research*, 9(2), 67–86. <https://doi.org/10.12807/ti.109202.2017.a05>



- Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the translator*. Longman.
- Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1996). *The translator as communicator*. 1st ed. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203992722>
- Husni, R., & Newman, D. L. (2015). *Arabic–English–Arabic translation: Issues and strategies*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203883297>
- Jabir, J. K. (2006). Skopos theory: Basic principles and deficiencies. *Journal of the College of Arts, University of Basrah*, 41, 37–46.
- Jamoussi, R., Al Zahran, A., El Karnichi, F., & Al Saidi, A. S. (2024). Institutional translation in Oman: An investigation of social, technical, and organisational factors. *Cadernos de Tradução*, 44(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.5007/2175-7968.2024.e96440>
- Jiménez-Crespo, M. A. (2024). *Localization in translation*. Taylor & Francis.
- Lam'an, E. H., & Setiawan, A. (2020, May). The Massive Development of Web-Based Office Applications. In *1st Borobudur International Symposium on Humanities, Economics and Social Sciences (BIS-HESS 2019)* (pp. 1217–1221). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200529.255>
- Mohammad, A. K., Alawi, N., & Fakhouri, M. (2010). Translating contracts between English and Arabic: Towards a more pragmatic outcome. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literature*, 2(1), 1–28.
- Munday, J. (2009). *The Routledge companion to translation studies*. 1st ed. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203879450>
- Munday, J., Pinto, S. R., & Blakesley, J. (2022). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications* 5th ed. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429352461>
- Muftah, M. (2023a). Translating routine phrases from Arabic into English: Between functional translation and cultural specificity. *Comparative Literature: East & West*, 7(2), 151–165. <https://doi.org/10.1080/25723618.2023.2238964>
- Muftah, M. (2023b). The effects of web-based language learning on university students' translation proficiency. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 15(5), 1420–1439. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-05-2022-0173>
- Muftah, M. (2024). Machine vs human translation: A new reality or a threat to professional Arabic–English translators. *PSU Research Review*, 8(2), 484–497. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PRR-02-2022-0024>
- Neubert, A. (1984). Text-bound translation training. In W. Wilss & G. Thome (Eds.), *Translation theory and its implementation in the teaching of translating and interpreting* (pp. 61–70). Narr Verlag.
- Newmark, P. (1981). Approaches to translation (Language Teaching Methodology Series). *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 7(1), 114–115. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100005222>
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. Vol. 66. Prentice Hall.
- Newmark, P. (2003). Chapter 3: No Global Communication Without Translation. In G. Anderman & M. Rogers (Eds.), *Translation Today: Trends and Perspectives* (pp. 55–67). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853596179-005>
- Nord, C. (2005). *Text analysis in translation: Theory, methodology, and didactic application of a model for translation-oriented text analysis*. Rodopi.



- Nord, C. (2022). Action/skopos theory. In R. Muñoz Martín (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of translation and methodology* (pp. 11–25). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315158945>
- O'Hagan, M. (1996). *The coming industry of teletranslation: overcoming communication barriers through telecommunication*. Multilingual Matters.
- O'Hagan, M. (2013). The impact of new technologies on translation studies: A technological turn? In C. Millán & F. Bartrina (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of translation studies* (pp. 503–518). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203102893>
- O'Hagan, M. (Ed.). (2019). *The Routledge handbook of translation and technology*. Routledge.
- O'Hagan, M., & Ashworth, D. (2002). *Translation-mediated communication in a digital world: Facing the challenges of globalization and localization*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853595820>
- Reiss, K. (1989). Text types, translation types and translation assessment. (A. Chesterman, Trans.). In A. Chesterman (Ed.), *Readings in translation theory* (pp. 105–115). Finn Lectura. (Original work published 1977).
- Reiss, K., & Vermeer, H. J. (2013). *Towards a general theory of translational action: Skopos theory explained*. (C. Nord, Trans.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315759715>
- Scarpa, F. (2020). Translating specialised texts. In L. Zhu (Ed.), *Research and professional practice in specialised translation* (pp. 45–67). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-51967-2_3
- Schäffner, C. (2001). Skopos theory. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (pp. 235–238). Routledge.
- Uzakova, A. (2025). Neologisms in modern english: the impact of social media and digital culture. *Innovations in Modern Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 1(1), 287–289. <https://doi.org/10.47689/ZTTCTOI-vol1-iss1-pp287-289>
- Vermeer, H. J. (1989). Skopos and commission in translational action. In A. Chesterman (Ed.), *Readings in translation theory* (pp. 173–187). Finn Lectura.
- Vermeer, H. J., & Chesterman, A. (2021). Skopos and commission in translational action. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (pp. 219–230). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429280641>
- Vorobiova, L. (2024). Terminological aspects of translation in the IT sphere. *Bulletin of Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University*, 2(361), 86–91. [https://doi.org/10.12958/2227-2844-2024-2\(361\)-86-91](https://doi.org/10.12958/2227-2844-2024-2(361)-86-91)
- Wang, Q. (2018). Hierarchical processing of localization of legal texts in legal succession. *Journal of China University of Political Science and Law*, 2, 75–89.
- Yuan, S., & Ma, X. Y. (2020). Science and technology news English–Chinese translation from the perspective of Skopos theory—A case study of China Daily bilingual website. *Open Access Library Journal*, 7(7), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1106766>
- Zhang, G. (2014). Translation of automobile brand name from the perspective of Skopostheorie. *US-China Foreign Language*, 12(2), 157–170.

Editorial notes

Authorship contribution

Conceptualization: M. Muftah

Data collection: M. Muftah

Data analysis: M. Muftah

Results and discussion: M. Muftah

Writing – review and editing: M. Muftah

Research dataset

Not applicable.

Funding

Not applicable.

Image copyright

Not applicable.

Approval by ethics committee

Ethics statement: This study involved two adult participants and posed minimal risk. The author's personal information and CV are already recorded in the institution's system, and, at the time of this publication, the author holds a valid certificate of completion of the Scientific Research Ethics course issued by King Abdulaziz City for Science and Technology. **Consent to participate:** Both participants provided written informed consent prior to data collection. They were informed about the aims of the study, the use of data, and their right to withdraw at any time without penalty. Data were collected and analysed anonymously to ensure confidentiality. The participants also consented to the publication of the results.

Conflicts of interest

Not applicable.

Data availability statement

The data from this research, which are not included in this work, may be made available by the author upon request.

License

The authors grant *Cadernos de Tradução* exclusive rights for first publication, while simultaneously licensing the work under the Creative Commons Attribution ([CC BY](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)) 4.0 International License. This license enables third parties to remix, adapt, and create from the published work, while giving proper credit to the authors and acknowledging the initial publication in this journal. Authors are permitted to enter into additional agreements separately for the non-exclusive distribution of the published version of the work in this journal. This may include publishing it in an institutional repository, on a personal website, on academic social networks, publishing a translation, or republishing the work as a book chapter, all with due recognition of authorship and first publication in this journal.

Publisher

Cadernos de Tradução is a publication of the Graduate Program in Translation Studies at the Federal University of Santa Catarina. The journal *Cadernos de Tradução* is hosted by the [Portal de Periódicos UFSC](https://portal.periodicos.ufsc.br/). The ideas expressed in this paper are the responsibility of its authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the editors or the university.

Section editors

Andréia Guerini – Willian Moura

Style editors

Alice S. Rezende – Ingrid Bignardi – João G. P. Silveira – Kamila Oliveira

Article history

Received: 04-07-2025

Approved: 18-11-2025

Revised: 11-03-2026

Published: 03-2026

