

Danylo Parkhomets

Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design (Kyiv)

Scientific supervisor – Assoc. Prof., Doctor of Philology Yana Boiko

METHODS OF TRANSLATING ENGLISH ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS INTO UKRAINIAN

(case study of NATO military discourse)

Abbreviations and acronyms are important elements of modern language, especially in specialized fields such as military discourse (Melnik, 2018). They are formed by shortening words or phrases, which reduces the amount of information that needs to be conveyed. The proper use of abbreviations can significantly enhance communication efficiency, especially in contexts requiring rapid information processing.

Abbreviations can be classified into several types: **initials** (e.g., NATO – North Atlantic Treaty Organization), **acronyms** (e.g., SACEUR – Supreme Allied Commander Europe), and **reductions** (e.g., Dr. for Doctor).

Each type has its own peculiarities that affect their use in different contexts. Understanding these types is critical for accurate translation and adaptation of terms into a new language. Initials typically consist of the first letters of words and are used to create short names. Reductions reflect part of a word or its component, while acronyms, unlike the other types, are pronounced as a single word.

These types of abbreviations have their own rules of usage that depend on the context. For example, official documents often employ acronyms, while informal communication may favor initials or reductions. Understanding these nuances is essential for accurate translation and adaptation of terminology.

Abbreviations in military discourse serve several important functions. First, they facilitate quick communication by reducing the time needed to convey information. Second, abbreviations lower the risk of misunderstanding by forming a specific linguistic code that is understood only by professionals. Third, they enhance professionalism by creating a common terminology (Петренко, 2021).

For instance, terms like STANAG (Standardization Agreement) have become widely accepted in international military practice and help avoid misunderstandings.

The use of terminology in military contexts is critical for maintaining effective communication between different countries, especially during joint operations.

The context in which acronyms are used can significantly influence their perception. For example, the acronym NATO may be familiar to military circles, but new users or civilian audiences may require clarification. This highlights the importance of adapting translations to the target audience (Кравець, 2018).

Understanding the specific context in which an acronym is used can help translators choose the most appropriate equivalent in the target language. This can ensure that the translation is not only accurate but also culturally relevant.

Examining specific examples of abbreviations, such as AOR (Area of Responsibility) and ISR (Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance), illustrates how these terms are used in NATO documents. They not only shorten information but also highlight the specifics of military terminology. These terms have become universally accepted in international military practice, aiding military professionals in quickly navigating documentation (Crystal, 2019).

These examples demonstrate how abbreviations become part of an accepted terminology, which is vital for ensuring clarity and unambiguity in an international context (Савченко, 2019). They also contribute to the formation of a common linguistic environment, critical for the success of joint operations.

The translation of English abbreviations into Ukrainian can be accomplished in various ways (Munday, 2016; Bassnett, 1980): adaptation, calquing, and transcription. **Adaptation** involves creating a new term that closely reflects the meaning, while **calquing** maintains the structure of the original but translates its meaning. **Transcription**, on the other hand, involves phonetic representation of the term.

The choice of translation method depends on the context in which the term is used and its recognition within the professional community. This helps avoid misunderstandings in international military operations where the accuracy of a term can impact mission outcomes.

Evaluating the quality of translated abbreviations can include several criteria: accuracy (how well the meaning is conveyed), clarity (how easily the audience can understand the term), and conformity (whether the term aligns with accepted

terminology). It is essential for the translation to meet the specific characteristics of military discourse and be comprehensible to the target audience.

Engaging experts in translation and military terminology is necessary to achieve high quality. This will help ensure the accuracy and clarity of terms used in NATO documents and other military texts.

Determining the criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of translation is an important step in adapting military terminology (Reiss, Vermeer, 1984). Effectiveness can be assessed based on indicators such as accuracy, speed of comprehension, and contextual relevance. High-quality translation ensures clarity in joint military operations, which is crucial for mission success. It is also important to consider cultural and social factors that may influence the perception of terms. This will enable the adaptation of terms to the needs of the target audience and ensure their proper usage.

The translation of military terminology, particularly abbreviations and acronyms, must be carried out by specialists with experience in the field. This ensures a high level of accuracy and conformity in terminology, which is essential for effective communication in an international context.

Experts should be familiar with the terms used in NATO documents as well as the translation methods that ensure clarity and accuracy. This will help avoid potential misunderstandings and errors in documents that could impact military operation outcomes.

REFERENCES

1. Грищенко Т. (2020). *Переклад англійської літератури українською: проблеми та перспективи*. Львів: Видавництво "Астролябія".
2. Кравець О. (2018). *Переклад як вид мовленнєвої діяльності: теорія та практика*. Київ: Видавництво Ліра-К.
3. Петренко І. (2021). *Цитати в перекладі: культурний контекст та адаптація*. Київ: Наукова думка.
4. Савченко Л. (2019). *Мовні бар'єри в перекладі: від англійської до української та навпаки*. Харків: Фоліо.
5. Algeo, John. (1973). *Onomastics and Linguistics: An Introduction*. American Name Society.
6. Cannon, Garland. (1987). *Historical Change and English Word-Formation: Recent Vocabulary*. Peter Lang.

7. Crystal, David. (2019). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press.
8. Coates, Richard. (2006). *Proper Names*. Blackwell Publishing.
9. Melnyk, O. V. (2018). *Linguistic Features of Military Discourse* (PhD Thesis). Kyiv National Linguistic University.
10. Munday, Jeremy. (2016). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. Routledge.
11. Bassnett, Susan. (1980). *Translation Studies*. Routledge.
12. Reiss, Katharina, and Hans Vermeer. (1984). *Towards a General Theory of Translational Action: Skopos Theory Explained*. Routledge.
13. Baker, Mona. (1992). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. Routledge.

Anastasia Pidhayna

Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design (Kyiv)

Scientific supervisor – Assoc. Prof., Maryna Vyshnevsk

DIGITAL PLATFORMS FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF EFFECTIVENESS

The integration of digital technology has transformed foreign language teaching, particularly accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic. This study compares the effectiveness of Zoom, Microsoft Teams, and Google Classroom in higher education, assessing their role in remote and hybrid learning. The research aligns with the theme of innovative methods in foreign language training. (Balyk & Shmyher, 2016)

Digital learning environments differ fundamentally from traditional classrooms, requiring platforms that support multimedia, interactivity, and collaboration. Effective digital instruction must ensure comprehensible input, meaningful interaction, and active student output. Evaluation criteria include accessibility, interactivity, collaboration, assessment tools, and language-specific resource integration. (Bloschynskyi, 2017)

Using a mixed-methods approach, the study analyzed survey data from 126 instructors and interviews with 20 specialists over two academic semesters (2023-2024). Platforms were assessed based on five key criteria: (1) accessibility, (2) instructional