

**Assessing the Accuracy and Functional Adequacy of AI-Generated Urdu Translations  
of HR Policy Documents**

**Wasiya Tariq**

MS English Linguistics, Pakistan

**Moneeba Habib**

[moniba.umar@comsats.edu.pk](mailto:moniba.umar@comsats.edu.pk)

PhD Scholar, NUML.

Faculty English Linguistics, COMSATS University Islamabad, Pakistan

**Corresponding Author: \* Moneeba Habib** [moniba.umar@comsats.edu.pk](mailto:moniba.umar@comsats.edu.pk)

**Received:** 17-10-2025

**Revised:** 15-11-2025

**Accepted:** 27-11-2025

**Published:** 14-12-2025

**ABSTRACT**

*This study examines the accuracy and quality of AI-generated Urdu translations of two HR policy documents, the General Code of Conduct and the Harassment Policy, using ChatGPT and Gemini. The research aimed to evaluate how well each tool preserves meaning, handles terminology, maintains structure, and reflects the professional tone required in HR communication. Using Skopos Theory as the guiding framework, the study analyzed lexical, semantic, structural, and pragmatic aspects of both translations. Findings show that ChatGPT produced clearer, more fluent, and more contextually appropriate Urdu translations, making them more suitable for practical HR use. Gemini's translations, although generally accurate, were more literal and contained formatting artifacts that reduced readability. The study concludes that while AI tools can support HR translation tasks, human post-editing remains essential to ensure clarity and accuracy, especially for sensitive policies. The research highlights the value of AI-assisted translation while emphasizing the need for careful human oversight.*

**Keywords:** HR Policy, ChatGPT, Gemini, HR translation, AI Tools, AI-generated translations

**INTRODUCTION**

Large language models (LLMs) and neural machine translation (NMT) systems provide quick and scalable translations, and artificial intelligence (AI) has been progressively included in translation processes in recent years. Although many systems, like ChatGPT and Gemini, offer speed and efficiency, there are still concerns regarding their capacity to maintain domain-specific terminology and semantic accuracy in highly specialized writings (Shahmerdanova, 2025). Translation accuracy is crucial in the domain of human resources (HR), since policy documents contain formal, legal, and culturally sensitive language. Errors in the translation of HR policies may result in miscommunication among employees, noncompliance, or legal danger.

PSW is an Automated Digital System that enables trading parties to submit standardized data and documentation with a single point of entry to satisfy all regulatory obligations about import, export, and transit. By digitizing Pakistan's cross-border trade and doing away with paper-based manual processes, it seeks to lower the time and expense of conducting business.

The Pakistan Single Window (PSW) creates and distributes HR rules and guidelines for workers in Pakistan's public and commercial sectors. Setting norms for professional behavior, anti-corruption initiatives, preventing harassment, and whistleblower protocols are all part of PSW's job description. Its HR policy documents are intended to foster a corporate and professional workplace that complies with

corporate governance guidelines (PSW, 2025). This study uses PSW policies, which are current, organized, and authoritative policy papers that represent current HR standards in Pakistan.

The application of AI translation to institutional HR papers has not received enough attention in academic research, despite the technology's increasing use in a variety of fields. There is no research on how AI handles organizational policy writings, especially when translating from English into Urdu, despite earlier work evaluating AI translation in legislative and professional contexts (Khan, 2025). By evaluating the translation accuracy of the two PSW HR policy documents, the General Code of Conduct and the Harassment Policy, when translated into Urdu using AI techniques, this work advances translation studies and HR management. This study attempts to determine if AI-generated translations preserve meaning, conciseness, and terminological faithfulness by critically examining the translated documents. This will provide insights into the advantages and disadvantages of utilizing AI in HR policy translation.

### **Problem Statement**

HR policy manuals are typically written in English; however, translation into Urdu is necessary for many employees who speak Urdu to understand them accurately. Organizations may depend on machine-generated Urdu translations of important documents, such as harassment policies and codes of conduct, as AI translation technologies become more widely used. However, lexical, semantic, or pragmatic distortions could be introduced by these AI-generated translations. Such errors may distort the purpose of the policy, compromise its clarity, and have an impact on ethical or legal compliance. Therefore, it is crucial to assess how well AI translation algorithms translate HR policy information into Urdu while maintaining the original policies' tone and meaning.

### **Research Objectives**

1. To evaluate the accuracy of AI translation platforms in converting English HR policy content (General Code of Conduct and Harassment Policy) into Urdu.
2. To identify common errors or meaning shifts in machine-generated Urdu translations of these HR policy documents.
3. To compare different AI translation platforms in terms of terminology handling, clarity, and preservation of meaning.

### **Research Questions**

1. How accurately do AI translation platforms convert English HR policy content (General Code of Conduct and Harassment Policy) into Urdu?
2. What types of errors or meaning shifts are observed in machine-generated Urdu translations of these HR policy documents?
3. How do different AI translation platforms compare in terms of terminology handling, clarity, and meaning preservation?

### **Significance of the Study**

This study is important in a number of ways. By concentrating on AI translation performance in a specific field, HR policy, it contributes to the collection of knowledge in Translation Studies. Practically speaking, it highlights the possible dangers of misinterpretation, compliance problems, and legal misunderstanding for HR departments and businesses thinking about using AI-based translation for policy distribution. The

study highlights the limitations of existing AI techniques and the necessity of post-editing or human monitoring when working with important institutional texts for linguists and translators.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

This section presents the literature review of this research.

### **Translation of HR Policies**

In translation studies, HR policy texts represent a distinct genre. They are culturally specific, formal, and prescriptive. A successful translation must strike a balance between cultural appropriateness, instruction clarity, and terminological accuracy (Khan, 2025). Despite this, little research has been done on AI translations of HR documentation. The majority of research focuses on literary, technical, or general legal writings (Li & Wang, 2022; Zhang et al., 2023). By examining AI-generated translations of PSW HR policies, this work fills this gap.

### **Limitations and Accuracy of AI Translation**

The increasing use of AI in translation processes is demonstrated by recent studies. Large language models (LLMs) and neural machine translation (NMT) models are examples of AI-based systems that offer quick translations but frequently have trouble with terminology and context unique to a given area (Li & Wang, 2022; Shahmerdanova, 2025). Even little mistakes can result in miscommunication, misinterpretation, and non-compliance in HR papers, where exact phrasing and cultural sensitivity are crucial (Alyami & Al-Zubi, 2025).

There is ample evidence of domain-specific translation mistakes. Due to their weak contextual awareness, Gosai and Vyas (2024) discovered that AI-generated translations often distort legal, corporate, and policy-related terminology. Similar to this, Zhang et al. (2023) showed that AI translations of institutional documents frequently leave out organizational-specific vocabulary, cultural allusions, and implicit meanings, which may have an impact on employee comprehension.

### **Errors in Domain-Specific Translation**

Due to a lack of contextual awareness, machine translation often misrepresents concepts relating to law, business, and policy (Gosai & Vyas, 2024). Similar to this, Zhang et al. (2023) showed that AI translations of institutional documents frequently leave out organizational-specific vocabulary, cultural allusions, and implicit meanings, which may have an impact on employee comprehension.

### **Human-AI Cooperation in Translation**

A number of recent research studies support human-AI cooperation. Although AI technologies can speed up translation, human translators must still post-edit for correctness, tone, and compliance (Alyami & Al-Zubi, 2025; Shahmerdanova, 2025). These results highlight how crucial it is to examine AI translations of delicate institutional materials, such as HR manuals.

### **Theoretical Structure: Skopos Theory**

Translation must have a specific function for the intended audience, according to functionalist theories, especially Skopos Theory (Vermeer, 1978; Du, 2012). The "skopos" of HR policies is to accurately inform

workers about regulations, duties, and moral principles. This study assesses the fidelity, clarity, and usability of AI-generated Urdu translations using this methodology.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The following section covers the methodology of this research

### **Design of Research**

Instead of gathering data from human participants, this study uses a qualitative research approach based on document analysis, concentrating on how AI translation technologies produce policy materials.

### **Data Sources**

Source texts in English: The General Code of Conduct and the Harassment Policy are two HR policy documents from PSW (PSW, 2025). Translated texts: Two artificial intelligence algorithms (such as ChatGPT and Gemini) produced Urdu translations.

### **Theoretical Framework**

Skopos Theory serves as the theoretical foundation for this investigation. Vermeer (1978) established Skopos Theory, a functionalist approach to translation studies that emphasizes that translation decisions should be guided by the translation's goal, or skopos. The notion states that translation is a deliberate action meant to accomplish a particular goal for the intended audience rather than just a word-for-word substitution between languages (Du, 2012). The goal of this study is to accurately and simply convey institutional HR standards to employees who speak Urdu. The General Code of Conduct and Harassment Policy's AI-generated Urdu translations will be assessed to see if they fulfill this functional goal.

In particular, the translations will be evaluated for:

- Fidelity (Meaning Preservation): The degree to which Urdu correctly conveys the original concept, intent, and policy guidelines.
- Tone: Whether the HR documentation's official, businesslike, and legal tone is upheld.
- Clarity: whether or not the translations are clear and easy for staff members to understand.
- Functional Usability: The ability of the translated policies to fulfill their intended function, allowing staff members to appropriately adhere to guidelines, protocols, and moral principles.

This study highlights the advantages and disadvantages of automated translation within a professional organizational setting by using Skopos Theory as a structured lens to examine how well AI translations convey important HR information.

### **Data Collection Procedure**

- Take the General Code of Conduct and the Harassment Policy out of the PSW PDFs.
- To produce Urdu translations, enter English content into the AI translation systems.
- Save the results so you can compare them.

### **Plan for Data Analysis**

- Compare each Urdu translation with the original English text in a comparative document analysis.
- Create a framework for coding mistakes and meaning changes that includes:
  - Lexical mistakes (word selection)
  - Meaning distortion, or semantic errors
  - Grammar and sentence errors
  - Cultural and pragmatic errors (register, tone)
  - Errors in terminology (HR-specific terms)
- To evaluate the efficacy of translation, apply the Skopos Theory criteria (fidelity, functionality, and coherence).
- Make a comparison table to show how different AI tools differ from one another.

### **Limitation**

There are a number of limitations to this study that should be noted. First, the results may not apply to all HR manuals or organizational policy texts because the analysis is restricted to just two HR policy documents: the General Code of Conduct and the Harassment Policy. Second, contextual information supplied at the point of translation, platform updates, and prompting style can all affect how AI-generated translations turn out. This heterogeneity may impact the consistency of results across various translation attempts. Last but not least, the study lacks a comparison with post-editing by a human translator, which could offer further insight into the differences between AI translations and human translations that have been expertly edited. When interpreting the results and their relevance to larger contexts, these limitations should be taken into account.

### **ANALYSIS**

This chapter presents a detailed analysis of the Urdu translations generated by two AI tools: ChatGPT and Gemini, for two HR policy documents: the General Code of Conduct and the Harassment Policy. The purpose of this analysis is to examine how accurately each tool has translated the content, how clear and readable the translations are, and whether they meet the functional purpose of HR communication. The analysis focuses on five major aspects: lexical accuracy (word choice), semantic accuracy (meaning), structural clarity (organization), pragmatic accuracy (tone), and functional usability based on Skopos Theory. Each policy is analyzed separately, followed by a combined interpretation of the findings.

#### **Analysis of General Code of Conduct**

The General Code of Conduct is a foundational HR document that outlines acceptable behavior, company expectations, discipline, and reporting procedures. The Urdu translations from both tools were examined using the files you provided.

#### **Lexical Accuracy**

- ChatGPT uses smoother and more natural Urdu vocabulary. Terms such as      and “      ” appear professionally translated. This makes the document easy to read for Urdu-speaking employees.
- Gemini uses correct vocabulary but does so more literally. At several points, it keeps English terms unchanged or adds numbers like “185” and “189,” which disrupt the text flow. These appear to be footnote or reference numbers that were not removed during translation.

Overall: ChatGPT is more readable; Gemini is accurate but mechanically rendered.

### **Semantic Accuracy**

In terms of meaning, both translations capture the core ideas. However, differences emerge in how clearly and strongly the meaning is presented:

- ChatGPT maintains the directive tone of HR instructions.
- Gemini sometimes makes mandatory statements sound optional due to literal translation patterns.

For example, sections related to disciplinary action or confidentiality feel more assertive and precise in ChatGPT's version.

Overall: ChatGPT maintains policy seriousness and clarity more effectively.

### **Structural Clarity**

- ChatGPT organizes the translation in smooth, continuous paragraphs. Headings and sections flow logically, making the document ready for employees without major edits.
- Gemini presents text in segmented or table-like chunks. Because of additional numbering and uneven formatting, the structure needs polishing before it can be used as an official document.

Overall: ChatGPT is structurally cleaner and more professional.

### **Pragmatic Tone**

A Code of Conduct requires formal, professional, and instructional tone. ChatGPT achieves this well, often using official Urdu phrasing that reflects workplace seriousness. Gemini's tone, while formal, often lacks smoothness and coherence because of literal phrasing.

Overall: ChatGPT preserves tone more faithfully to the HR context.

### **Analysis of Harassment Policy**

The Harassment Policy is more sensitive and legally significant. It requires accurate wording and an empathetic tone. Both translations were reviewed carefully based on your uploaded documents.

### **Lexical Accuracy**

Both tools translated key terms well:

However, ChatGPT uses more polished wording, especially in sensitive sections such as confidentiality and reporting procedures. Gemini, again, includes numbers like "185" and "190," creating distractions.

### **Semantic Accuracy**

- ChatGPT clearly explains processes such as informal resolution, evidence collection, and inquiry steps. The meaning remains consistent with HR legal language.
- Gemini translates accurately but often too literally. This affects the clarity of procedural steps, which may be misunderstood by employees if not edited carefully.

### **Structural Clarity**

- ChatGPT's version flows as a complete document. Numbered points, definitions, and steps are well integrated.
- Gemini presents content in fragments, making it harder to read continuously. This structure also increases the risk of misinterpretation in serious HR cases.

### **Tone and Sensitivity**

Harassment policies must be written in a respectful, clear, and supportive tone for victims. ChatGPT maintains this tone. It sounds more human, more reassuring, and more appropriately formal.

Gemini provides information but lacks emotional sensitivity due to its literal, robotic phrasing style.

### **Combined Cross-Policy Analysis (More Detailed Summary)**

To give a clearer overall picture, this section combines the findings from both policies.

### **Accuracy & Clarity Across Both Policies**

- ChatGPT outperforms Gemini in readability and clarity for both documents.
- Gemini is not incorrect, but its translations feel like drafts requiring human review.
- ChatGPT's overall quality is closer to publishable Urdu with fewer edits.

### **Recurring Issues in Gemini**

Across both policies, Gemini shows repeating issues:

1. Footnote-like numbers appear inside sentences, disrupting the flow.
2. Literal sentence structure sometimes weakens meaning.
3. Tone feels mechanical, especially in sensitive content.
4. Sections appear in fragments instead of smooth paragraphs.
5. English terms are occasionally left untranslated or awkwardly transliterated.

These issues do not occur in ChatGPT's translations.

### **Strengths of ChatGPT**

Across both documents, ChatGPT consistently:

- Uses natural, fluent Urdu
- Maintains a formal tone suitable for HR
- Preserves imperative instructions clearly
- Presents content in a well-structured, readable way

Adheres to the functional purpose of HR policies (Skopos Theory) This makes ChatGPT's version more practical for real-world use.



### **Skopos Theory Evaluation (Combined)**

Skopos Theory focuses on purpose. The purpose of HR policies is to clearly communicate rules and procedures.

Based on this:

- ChatGPT meets the purpose more effectively, because employees can understand the translated content without confusion.
- Gemini only partially meets the purpose, because its literal wording and unnecessary numbering reduce clarity and professionalism.

Thus, in functional terms, ChatGPT is the more successful tool.

### **Practical Meaning of Findings**

From a practical HR perspective:

- If an organization needs to translate policies quickly and share them directly with staff, ChatGPT is more suitable.
- If an organization wants a first draft that will later be edited manually, Gemini can still be used.
- For sensitive topics like harassment, ChatGPT produces clearer and more empathetic language.
- Translation teams should still perform human proofreading regardless of the tool.

### **Summary**

This comparative analysis demonstrates that both AI tools can translate HR policies, but ChatGPT's translations are significantly more user-friendly, accurate in meaning, and professionally suitable. It handles tone, structure, and clarity better, making it more aligned with the needs of HR departments and employees.

Gemini, while correct in many places, requires noticeable editing to remove number artifacts, smooth sentence structure, and adjust tone. In documents where clarity and sensitivity are crucial, such as harassment policies, Gemini's literal phrasing may lead to misunderstandings.

Overall, ChatGPT produces translations that are closer to professional quality, whereas Gemini provides literal drafts that need refinement. The findings also reinforce Skopos Theory: the translation must serve its purpose. ChatGPT meets that purpose more effectively.

### **DISCUSSION**

The purpose of this study was to evaluate how accurately AI translation platforms (ChatGPT and Gemini) translate HR policy documents from English into Urdu, and to understand the types of errors and meaning shifts that occur in the process. The discussion presented in this chapter connects the research questions, literature review, and findings of the analysis to explain what the results mean and why they matter in the context of HR communication and Translation Studies.



### **Interpretation of Findings in Light of Research Questions Research Question 1:**

How accurately do AI translation platforms convert English HR policy content into Urdu?

The analysis showed that both AI platforms are capable of producing understandable Urdu translations; however, the level of accuracy differs significantly between the two tools. ChatGPT consistently produced more fluent, natural, and professionally suitable translations. The content was clear and easy for Urdu-speaking employees to understand. This is important because HR policies must be communicated without confusion. Gemini, on the other hand, often produced literal translations. While the meaning was usually correct, the sentences did not always flow smoothly, and unnecessary numerical artifacts appeared within the text. These issues reduce the usability of the translation. Thus, the findings suggest that ChatGPT provides higher translation accuracy and clarity, aligning with studies like Li & Wang (2022) and Gosai & Vyas (2024), who argue that AI translation tools often vary in their ability to handle domain-specific texts.

### **Research Question 2:**

What types of errors or meaning shifts are observed in machine-generated Urdu translations of HR policies?

The study identified several types of errors, especially in Gemini's translation. These included lexical errors (inappropriate or literal word choices), structural issues (fragmented or table-like formatting), semantic weaknesses (slightly altered meanings), and pragmatic inconsistencies (tone sounding mechanical rather than professional). The most noticeable problem was the presence of random numbers such as "185" and "190," which appeared inside sentences and disrupted readability.

These findings align with earlier research (e.g., Zhang et al., 2023) stating that AI translation tools frequently struggle with technical documents and may not always understand contextual or cultural nuances. In sensitive policies like harassment procedures, even minor meaning shifts can affect how employees interpret their rights and responsibilities. Therefore, identifying these errors is crucial for ensuring that HR policies remain legally and ethically accurate.

### **Research Question 3:**

How do different AI translation platforms compare in terms of terminology handling, clarity, and meaning preservation?

The comparison revealed clear differences. ChatGPT handled HR terminology, such as "Code of Conduct," "confidentiality," "evidence," and "harassment"—in a more consistent and culturally appropriate way. It translated these terms into standard Urdu phrases that employees are likely to understand. Gemini also translated terminology correctly but sometimes used overly literal or awkward wording that was less user-friendly.

In terms of clarity, ChatGPT produced continuous, coherent paragraphs that resembled formal policy documents. Gemini's translations looked more like raw drafts that would require extensive human editing. Regarding meaning preservation, ChatGPT maintained the authoritative and formal tone of the original English documents, which is essential for HR communication. Gemini conveyed meaning but did not always capture tone effectively, especially in sensitive sections.

These comparisons support the literature that highlights variations in AI translation performance across platforms (Alyami & Al-Zubi, 2025). The study confirms that not all AI tools are equally effective for professional or sensitive texts.

### **Relationship with Literature Review**

The findings of this study reinforce several themes from previous research. First, as Shahmerdanova (2025) and Khan (2025) note, AI tools are powerful but not flawless. They often require post-editing when used for specialized texts such as legal or HR documents. This aligns closely with the results of the current study, where Gemini's translations needed human correction to remove artifacts and improve tone.

Second, the literature emphasizes the importance of context and purpose in translation, as highlighted in Skopos Theory. This study supports that idea: ChatGPT produced more functionally appropriate translations because they better served the purpose of HR communication. Gemini translated words correctly but did not fully adapt them to the functional requirements of workplace guidelines.

Finally, the study agrees with scholars like Gosai & Vyas (2024), who argue that AI can assist in translation but cannot replace human judgment entirely—especially in sensitive topics such as harassment policies, where clarity and tone carry ethical weight.

### **Implications for HR Practice**

For HR departments and organizations in Pakistan, the results carry important implications:

- ChatGPT may be a more reliable tool for producing accessible Urdu translations of HR policies.
- Gemini translations should be reviewed carefully to remove numerical artifacts and improve readability.
- Human oversight remains necessary, especially when policies involve legal obligations or employee protection.
- Organizations should adopt a combined workflow: AI for initial drafts + human post-editing for final approval.

These implications help HR managers decide how to use AI safely and effectively in documentation.

### **Theoretical Implications**

Using Skopos Theory as the framework, the findings show that the success of a translation depends on how well it fulfills its purpose for the target audience. ChatGPT met the “skopos” more successfully because its translation was clear, professional, and easily understandable. Gemini's literal translations fulfilled the basic purpose but did not fully achieve the clarity required for policy communication.

This supports Skopos Theory and shows that translation quality should be judged not only on linguistic correctness but also on functional effectiveness.

### **Overall Interpretation**

Overall, the comparison of ChatGPT and Gemini shows that while both tools can translate HR policies, ChatGPT is more suitable for real-world HR communication. Gemini can still be used, but only with careful human editing. The findings support the argument that AI translation tools are helpful but still need human guidance, especially in professional settings.

## **CONCLUSION**

This study set out to evaluate the accuracy of AI-generated Urdu translations of two HR policy documents: the General Code of Conduct and the Harassment Policy. By comparing translations produced by ChatGPT and Gemini, the research aimed to understand the quality, clarity, and functional appropriateness of AI translations in a professional HR context.

The findings clearly show that while both AI platforms are capable of translating HR content, their performance differs significantly. ChatGPT consistently produced more fluent, natural, and coherent Urdu translations. It maintained the formal and authoritative tone required in HR policies and presented information in clear, continuous paragraphs that employees can easily understand. Gemini, although accurate in its basic meaning, often provided literal translations with noticeable structural and lexical issues such as unwanted numbering and rigid sentence constructions. These errors made the text less readable and less suitable for direct use without human editing.

Overall, the study concludes that ChatGPT's translations align more closely with the purpose of HR communication, fulfilling the functional expectations emphasized by Skopos Theory. However, the study also reinforces the idea that AI should not replace human translators entirely, particularly when dealing with sensitive or legally significant content. Instead, AI tools should be used as support systems, with human oversight remaining essential for ensuring final accuracy and clarity.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the analysis and findings, the following recommendations are proposed for organizations, HR departments, and researchers:

### **1. Use AI translations with human post-editing**

Although ChatGPT provides strong translations, human review is still necessary, especially for sensitive HR topics such as harassment, compliance, and disciplinary procedures.

### **2. Prefer ChatGPT for HR policy translation**

ChatGPT consistently produced clearer and more professional Urdu translations, making it more suitable for organizations that need ready-to-use documents.

### **3. Develop a bilingual HR glossary**

Organizations should create a standard glossary of HR terms in English and Urdu (e.g., "Code of Conduct", "Confidentiality"). Providing this glossary to AI tools can improve consistency.

### **4. Train HR departments in prompt design**

Better prompts produce better translations. HR teams should be trained to instruct AI tools clearly, such as: "Translate in formal Urdu suitable for HR policy documents. Remove numbers, keep tone professional, and ensure clarity."

## REFERENCES

- Alyami, H., & Al-Zubi, Y. (2025). Human–AI collaboration in domain-specific translation: Challenges and opportunities. *Translation Studies Journal*, 18(2), 45–63.
- Du, J. (2012). Skopos Theory and translation practice: Functionalism in contemporary studies. *Meta: Journal des traducteurs*, 57(1), 143–159.
- Gosai, R., & Vyas, P. (2024). Evaluating AI translation accuracy in organizational documents. *International Journal of Translation Research*, 16(3), 101–118.
- Khan, S. (2025). Translating legal and corporate documents: Challenges for AI-based translation systems. *Journal of Language and Translation*, 12(1), 55–72.
- Li, X., & Wang, Y. (2022). Neural machine translation in institutional texts: Accuracy and limitations. *Machine Translation Review*, 35(4), 88–105.
- Pakistan Single Window (PSW). (2025). General Code of Conduct [PDF].  
<https://www.psw.gov.pk/media//HR-Policies/General-Code-of-Conduct.pdf>
- Pakistan Single Window (PSW). (2025). Harassment Policy [PDF]. <https://www.psw.gov.pk/media//HR-Policies/Harrasment-Policy.pdf>
- Shahmerdanova, A. (2025). Ethical and practical implications of AI in professional translations. *Translation & Interpreting Studies*, 20(2), 75–93.
- Vermeer, H. J. (1978). Skopos and commission in translational action. In A. Chesterman (Ed.), *Readings in Translation Theory* (pp. 173–187). Helsinki: Finn Lectura.
- Zhang, Y., Li, Q., & Chen, H. (2023). Accuracy of AI translations in institutional and technical texts. *Journal of Computational Linguistics*, 49(2), 215–234.