FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE - UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS PUTTING THEIR KNOWLEDGE TO THE TEST IN CREATING TERMINOLOGICAL RECORDS: A SURVEY INTERPRETATION

Alexandra-Maria Vrînceanu
Assist., Prof., PhD, "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iaşi

Abstract: The article focuses on interpreting the results of a survey administered to BA students, tasked to work on a series of term records that are meant to be part of a multilingual glossary on the sensory system, dedicated to Veterinary students. The BA students were assigned to work with postgraduate students in mini-teams, and were meant to compile materials, as well as do research, so that the MA students could create the term records. Thus, we were interested in ascertaining a series of aspects relevant to conducting this kind of terminological work, such as: difficulties encountered on a more general scale, challenges in adapting and finding adequate definitions, in adapting the online queries in order to find veterinary contexts and definitions, whether they used AI tools in their research work, to what extent, etc.

Keywords: survey, term record, research, AI tools, terminological project

Introduction

The "CONCEVOIR DES CONTENUS LINGUISTIQUES ET PÉDAGOGIQUES À L'AIDE DES OUTILS DE L'INTELLIGENCE ARTIFICIELLE (IA) DANS LE DOMAINE DE LA MÉDECINE VÉTÉRINAIRE (LANGVET-IA)" project, funded by L'Agence Universitaire de la Francophonie (Association of Francophone Universities), was part of the 2024 RESCI-ECO (Recherche scientifique francophone en Europe Centrale et Orientale) call for projects. Its primary goal was to promote the use of AI tools among the students of Veterinary Medicine, as well as their professors and instructors, whilst also elaborating and creating concrete, ready to use materials to serve as educational and linguistic resources in English, French and Romanian.

Seeing as it is an ambitious and comprehensive project, naturally the multidisciplinary facet is of paramount importance, as experts and professionals from multiple institutions and universities have come together to contribute. Among them, the team hailing from Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi (AICU), Romania, having been among those tasked with the terminological element, has undertaken the mission of elaborating a glossary of specialized veterinary terms, pertaining to the sensory system. This has meant enlisting the help of a team of students, both at BA and at MA level, since the Faculty of Letters and its English Department specifically train students enrolled in the Applied Modern Languages (undergraduate) and Translation and Terminology (graduate) programs in the field of Terminology and terminological project management.

As the tasks unfolded over the course of the months that elapsed, the AICU Faculty of Letters team decided to administer a survey to the students involved, to better and more accurately ascertain both their work, research methodology and experience, but also gauge their own expectations and results. This article aims to briefly present the methodology employed by the AICU team with respect to the elaboration of the terminological records, the undergraduate 'actors' involved, the survey creation and aims, as well as the interpretation of the results and the broader picture it paints.

Methodology

In terms of the categories of knowledge involved at this stage, there was great need of corpus linguists (an academic specializing in AI tools for automatic term extraction, linguists from the Romanian Institute), as well as domain experts (academics from the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, as well as Veterinary Medicine professionals). The corpus linguists are the ones who provide the methodological steps with respect to the tools and means used upon mining the existing corpus of specialized texts (BOUSQUET and ZIMINA, 2010, p. 226) on the animal sensory system, as well as the quantitative results, namely the terminological records. The role of the domain experts "was to choose and validate relevant terms in case of several variants" (BOUSQUET and ZIMINA, 2010, p. 227) present in the corpus. The suggestion to focus on the subdomain of the animal sensory system was provided by academics from the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, as they had previously found such a glossary to be lacking in terms of creating correspondences between Romanian, French and English in their ESP (English for Specific Purposes) classes.

The list of terms for the sub-field of 'The sensory system' was extracted using an AI tool and, having later been validated by experts, the parties in charge decided to submit the preliminary list for consideration by several veterinary medicine students, as the would-be beneficiaries. At this point, the list, which had been extracted automatically using an AI tool, looked as such:

"term": "Chemoreceptor",
"definition": "Chemoreceptors are sensory receptors that detect chemical stimuli, which are crucial for the senses of taste and smell. They respond to changes in chemical concentrations in the environment or body fluids.",
"related_terms": [
{"term": "Taste bud", "type_of_relation": "specific receptor"},
{"term": "Olfactory receptor", "type_of_relation": "specific receptor"}
],
"example_usage": "Chemoreceptors in taste buds enable recognition of different flavors."
},

Starting from the source text, in this case, Starkie's *Avian Physiology*, Fifth Edition, 2000, Chapter Three, "The Chemical Senses in Birds" (MASON and CLARK, 2000, p. 39-56), the AI extractor, based on the code and indications provided by the linguists Therefore, apart from the term itself, there was a gloss, namely a brief definition or explanation, as well as 'reference metadata', which primarily included the context, as well as an example in use, plus related terms, be they hyponyms (NCON), or hypernyms (BCON). The query would have been as follows (using keywords): *dog veterinary 2 key terms*, with the mention that a keyword specifically narrowing down the search to the animal kingdom (i.e. veterinary, dog, canine, avian, feline, etc.) was absolutely essential:

TERM 1: Canine Distemper": {
"term": "Canine Distemper",
"definition": "Canine distemper is a highly contagious viral disease that affects various members of the Canidae family, including dogs, foxes, and wolves. The disease is caused by the Canine distemper virus (CDV), which can lead to severe respiratory, gastrointestinal, and neurological symptoms. It commonly manifests through signs such as coughing, vomiting, diarrhea, and in severe cases, neurological issues like seizures and paralysis. Vaccination is the primary preventive measure, significantly reducing the incidence of this life-threatening disease in the canine population.",
"related_terms": [
{"term": "Canine Parvovirus", "type_of_relation": "similar viral disease"},

{"term": "Kennel Cough", "type_of_relation": "related respiratory illness"},
{"term": "Vaccination", "type_of_relation": "preventive measure"}
]
TERM 2: "Canine Parvovirus": {
"term": "Canine Parvovirus",
"definition": "Canine parvovirus (CPV) is a highly contagious viral disease primarily affecting puppies and unvaccinated adult dogs. The virus is transmitted through direct contact with infected feces or contaminated environments. Symptoms include severe gastrointestinal distress, manifested as vomiting and diarrhea, leading to rapid dehydration and potentially fatal conditions. Early diagnosis and intensive supportive care are critical for survival, alongside vaccination to prevent infection in healthy pet populations.",
"related_terms": [
{"term": "Canine Distemper", "type_of_relation": "similar viral disease"},
{"term": "Gastroenteritis", "type_of_relation": "associated symptom"},
{"term": "Vaccination", "type_of_relation": "preventive measure"}

After the corpus experts reviewed the initial lists extracted using the AI tool, it was clear that adjustments had to be made, primarily with respect to fine-tuning the definitions. Seeing as the BA students had already undergone two seminars concerning good and bad practices for terminological definitions, it was important that "we practiced what we had preached", in that, ideally, definitions were not longer than one sentence, they were intensional definitions, insofar as possible:

"Intensional definitions shall include the superordinate concept immediately above, followed by the delimiting characteristic(s). The superordinate concept situates the concept in its proper context in the concept system (i.e. 'mice' among 'pointing devices', 'trees' among 'plants'). In practice, intensional definitions are preferable to other types of definitions and should be used whenever possible as they most clearly reveal the characteristics of a concept within a concept system." (Terminology work – Principles and methods - ISO 704, 2009, p. 22)

While the glossary was meant for specialists in the field, albeit in-training, it was paramount that there was consistency among the three definitions (in EN, RO and FR), that they were succinct, clear and encompassed the necessary data, without any additional cumbersome information. It was thus agreed upon by the AICU team that such supplementary information, as per ISO 704 (p. 29), would, if deemed relevant and necessary by the student-researchers, be included in the following fields: *Notes* or *Context*. The former includes non-essential characteristics or optional parts related to the concept, while the latter allows users to infer the concept's meaning through implication. While it cannot substitute an intensional definition, it can provide supplementary information. Defining contexts are often gathered at the outset of a terminology project, prior to the formulation of comprehensive concept systems and coherent definitions.

As far as the veterinary medicine students, as a result of their feedback, the following transpired: there was need of more examples ("To make the list more complex it should contain more examples. In the case of joint receptors, it lacks the mechanism of action, the entry does not explain how joint receptors detect and relay information about joint angle, position, and movement. I feel like this would be a more fitting definition: Joint receptors are sensory receptors embedded within the joint capsule, ligaments, and surrounding tissues that detect changes in joint angle, position, movement, and load. They play a key role in proprioception, or the body's ability to sense its own position and movements, contributing to posture and coordinated motion."), with some even providing input in terms of definition-writing. Others required further details and practical uses: "It is well-organized, with short definitions, related terms, and useful examples. However, it could be improved by adding more details and

practical uses. For example, it would be helpful to include how sensory receptors are involved in health problems in animals or how their function changes between different species." The latter part of the input was conveyed to the domain experts, who provided valuable concept relations for the last stage of the project, after the elaboration of the term records per se. In some specific cases, a respondent suggested the need for an extensional definition: "Encapsulated nerve endings: The definition is fairly clear but could be expanded to explain the variety of encapsulated nerve endings and their specific functions in more detail.", which was included as a Comment for the student-researcher who documented that term, so that they were clearly instructed to include this information in the Notes field. Lastly, the pronunciation seemed to be an issue ("I also think that some terms with difficult pronunciations like "Cochlea" or "Homunculus" could have mentioned the correct pronunciation of the term."), which led to us including links to the dictionary entry of said term, so that the user could access the official pronunciation as well. Overall, the students were content with the definitions: "In my opinion, the terms presented in the material are very useful, the definitions are easy to understand and I believe that a single example is enough to understand the situations in which we can use these terms.", "I think that all the definitions are quite useful and contain quite a lot of information considering that the sentences are not very long. I wouldn't make any changes, it's perfect like that.", "I like the examples; the definitions are good and easy to understand."
The purpose and objectives of the project were then presented and discussed in a meeting, as well as the steps to follow. Firstly, the teams were created, each comprised of a third year BA student in the Applied Modern Languages program, as well as two students enrolled in the Translation and Terminology Master's program, each from a different year, namely bringing forth varying degrees of experience with respect to terminological work. A Microsoft Teams class was created for the purpose of communicating and uploading their work, as well as a WhatsApp group for more informal discussions.

Broadly speaking, the process unfolded as follows: the 3rd year BA students worked on documents titled "EXTR_term", which served as a primary draft, of sorts, where they included the fruits of their documentation work: multiple definitions and sources, multiple contexts, any questions or comments by way of Track changes. After the BA students had amassed the raw data, the first year MA graduates filled in the terminological record template per se, whereas the second year MA graduates acted as revisors and supervisors. During the first week of December 2024 the terms were allocated to each team, after which the work commenced, with each team allotted 5 terms, yielding approximately 60 term records in the end.

Therefore, methodologically speaking, from the point of view of Terminology users, this endeavor brought together direct users (the specialists and specialists-in-the making, the Veterinary Medicine students), indirect users (which includes the other actors involved, as well as the students carrying out the research), as well as terminologists (those experts to provide valuable input in the final stage of the project) (TALAVÁN , 2016, p. 12-13). Upon embarking on the research and data collection stage, the BA students were instructed to use a series of references made available by the instructors, which included: *Introduction to veterinary anatomy and physiology textbook*, by Melanie Capppello (Elsevier, 2015), *Hill's Atlas of veterinary clinical anatomy* (Hill's Pet Products, 2003), as well as *Introduction to animal and veterinary anatomy and physiology*, by Aspinall, Victoria; Cappello, Melanie; Phillips, Catherine (CAB International, 2020). Other, online, resources were provided, as well as indications concerning the quality criteria for using said terminological resources, which include: availability, publication date, the publisher, the author's credentials, a readily available bibliography that could provide several other resources, the inclusion of definitions and their quality: "should be clear, unambiguous, precise, and adapted to the users of the work" (TALAVÁN, 2016, p. 16-17). Thus, if the definitions and/or contexts for the terms could not

be found in a specialized resource, the student-researchers were encouraged to turn to general use dictionaries such as Encyclopedia Britannica, Merriam Webster, Longman, Oxford, Collins, or The Free Medical Dictionary.

Moreover, they were instructed to collect primary data, namely raw information amassed by them, rather than secondary data "[…] collected by other researchers and made available to the research community for analysis" (SALDANHA and O'BRIEN, 2014, p. 21). The definitions were meant to be as consistent as possible between the three languages, in terms of content, length and vocabulary. In addition, the vocabulary itself was to ensure the definitions were as succinct as possible and follow the best practices for a good definition: reference to a concept system, conciseness, "[…] but still containing all the essential distinguishing characteristics" (LUŠICKY and WISSIK, 2015, p. 40), affirmativeness, non-circularity, absence of tautology, as well as substitutability (p. 41).

The actual final draft of the term record was then created by the first year MA students, selecting and introducing the data deemed relevant (out of the raw data amassed by the BA students) as a result of their training thus far, then revised, in the same vein, by the second year MA students. Having uploaded their final version of the term records, the BA and MA students were then asked to fill in surveys meant to ascertain both their research process, as well as their overall experience and expectations.

The actors involved

The actors involved were, as mentioned, the BA and MA students, the involvement of whom was two-faceted. On the one hand, there was need of research, namely amassing raw data, then compiling the terminological records. On the other hand, as instructors, we know that, in our case, Applied Modern Languages BA students and Translation and Terminology MA students could greatly benefit from being involved in an actual terminological project, seeing as it implements the theoretical knowledge they have received and places them in a position of actual agents, part of the process, armed with the knowledge that they are contributing to an actual tool to be used in a real-life situation.

This project, through the tasks and end-goal, puts both the general competences, as well as the course-specific competences we are training them for in Terminology. Thus, generally speaking, they are honing their management of tasks, observing certain norms of ethics with regard to the research portion (the sources used). More specifically, they documented terms using both available sources, as well as their own research, they created the term records and fine-tuned their research in accordance with the domain, more precisely veterinary, not human medicine. Seeing as they had received methodological instructions and steps to follow, they also implemented, essentially the Terminology course and seminar content (the latter taught by the author), namely: Identifying and selecting information for the term records, creating them, documenting a term, assessing and selecting the most appropriate sources, choosing or even creating definitions, as well as performing terminological analysis, in that they also had to identify and include term relations such as broader terms (hypernyms), narrower terms (hyponyms), as well as any associative relations, if applicable.

Survey creation

The aim of the survey was to both extract valuable information with respect to the research conducted by the students, namely gauge how they had put their Terminological knowledge (after one semester) to actual use, as well as ascertain their perspective as members of a team. Two major criteria I took into consideration upon designing the survey were relevance and accuracy to the purpose at hand. The former entails that "[…] the information generated is appropriate for the purpose of the study. The objective of the question defines the information that is needed and models the words to be used" (IAROSSI, 2006, p. 27). Thus, I

aimed to be as concise and clear as possible, using key words that would immediately prompt the responders and bring their work to mind, as it "[…] serves no purpose to ask the respondent about something he or she does not understand clearly or that is too far in the past to remember correctly; doing so generates inaccurate information." (IAROSSI, 2006, p. 28).

The questions, designed to gauge the quantitative and qualitative aspects of their work, their time-management, their experience as team members, the specific difficulties encountered and how they managed them, their resorting to the use of AI tools, as well as their own assessment of the relevance of information they learned in class, were as follows: 1. How many terms EXACTLY did you do research for?; 2. Which one specifically proved the most difficult to research? Please provide as much detail as possible. 3. On average, how much time would you estimate you allocated for research FOR A SINGLE TERM?4. How difficult was it to adapt the research so as to find definitions, contexts, images FOR VETERINARY MEDICINE, rather than for HUMANS?; 5. How often did you rephrase/combine information from more than one source in order to create a suitable definition for the term? Can you provide a specific example if that is the case?; 6. Did you find the bibliographic resources uploaded by us on Teams useful? (i.e. DID YOU USE ANY OF THEM AT LEAST ONCE?); 7. Where did you primarily find definitions and contexts?; 8. When researching the ROMANIAN EQUIVALENT, DEFINITION AND CONTEXT:; 9. DID YOU, AT ANY POINT, USE AI? IF SO, SPECIFY WHICH PROGRAM/TOOL?; 10. WHAT DID YOU ASK THE AI TO DO?; 11. HOW SATISFIED WERE YOU WITH THE RESULTS OBTAINED AFTER USING THE AI TOOL?12. How would you rate your collaboration with the MA students in your team?; 13. Did at any point the AI created content contradict the instructions/protocol or the information provided during the lectures on Terminology?; 14. Please expand on question 13. In what way?.

The questions were of multiple types, aiming to elicit information from the respondents in a variety of ways, so as to provide a comprehensive a view of the process as possible. Thus, I included multiple choice, short and long answer questions, as well as yes/no questions.

Interpretation of the results and the broad picture

Upon interpreting the results, I will attempt to start with the more neutral, clear-cut questions, then focus on the difficulties encountered. The most concrete, clear-cut question, namely how many terms each BA student had researched, yielded an overall consistent five terms each, which was the goal. Four out of the twelve respondents researched three terms, whereas three six terms. Only two responders explained further the cause of their either going over the allotted five terms, or under, both rooted in subjectivity. With respect to the time allocated for a single term, two to three hours was the overall response, with three respondents out of the twelve going over (four to five hours), and three below two hours. The first of the yes/no questions pertained to the usefulness of the resources provided beforehand, with the majority of respondents (ten) replying affirmatively, which is also verifiable by looking at the sources of the definitions, contexts and/or illustrations they included in the documents.

As regards the use of any AI tools, a minority of only three out of the twelve respondents denied using any AI tools, with the rest either simply responding affirmatively, or singling out Chat GPT as the tool they turned to (six in total). One respondent so much as specified what prompt she had used: "sometimes for clarity regarding the meaning for some of the terms by usually just asking 'can you tell me what X means like you would explain it to a 5-year-old?'". It is unclear at this point why they resorted to this AI tool and not Gemini, Microsoft Copilot or another tool but, as stated, the goal of the survey was not to overwhelm the respondents with too varied questions, as this risked 'muddying' the waters and losing sight of the overall purpose. Students were also given an opportunity to assess the usefulness of the

instruction given during their Terminology course and seminar, with a majority of eight replying that at no point did "the AI created content contradict the instructions/protocol or the information provided during the lectures on Terminology". Upon expanding, five students agreed that AI is not reliable enough and 'can make mistakes as well', yet they used it nonetheless as a starting point. One student provided a caveat "It is a good starting point for research, but it is not 100% reliable and I was not willing to risk the integrity of the project just for the 'easy way out'. In short, there was no significant AI content to begin with, so it did not contradict anything." The three students that had responded negatively to the use of AI further explained, in varying phrasing, with one vehemently stating: "AI is not a reliable, trustworthy source, it can make mistakes, and the information has to be verified from other sources in order to be used". The question "What did you ask the AI to do?" prompted answers (it was multiple choice) centering on broader/narrower terms (four respondents), thus the students seemingly encountered difficulties placing the terms within a larger concept system ("find broader and/or narrower terms. I would also ask it to provide some hierarchies, again to better understand the concept and to figure out if the equivalent is the same."). One student used the AI "to help organize the information and for source ideas", and three others to "provide a context", as well as two respondents to "provide the RO/FR equivalent for a term". Only one student stated they had asked the tool to "provide the domain and subdomain of some terms". Overall, the question "HOW SATISFIED WERE YOU WITH THE RESULTS OBTAINED AFTER USING THE AI TOOL?" yielded mixed replies, with five respondents declaring themselves 'somewhat satisfied', four 'neither satisfied nor dissatisfied', and three 'somewhat dissatisfied'.

In what concerns, the more specific questions, entailing a greater degree of specificity and reference to the actual research conducted and difficulties encountered, each student was asked to state which term in particular proved the most difficult to research. While the terms themselves were of course different for each respondent, the overall difficulty was the lack of reliable information and sources referencing veterinary, instead of human medicine. The use of the keyword 'reliable' is important to note, as it showcases the fact that the students have gleaned the importance of assessing sources and ascertaining the reliability and trustworthiness of a certain source, namely the journal/website/book, the authors and the publisher. A 'deforming' tendency we had noticed, having been their course/seminar instructors, is that, more often than not, particularly in the case of undergraduate students, they resort to Wikipedia as a major source of information, even at the cost of overlooking more viable, reliable sources. So as to promote curiosity and encourage the 'journey', we, as per the Purdue guide for conducting research (*Evaluating Digital Sources* – Purdue OWL), urge them to use Wikipedia entries as "jumping-off points", by heading to the resources list at the end of each entry. Four respondents also specified that it was the Romanian equivalent and definition that proved most cumbersome, with two respondents explaining that the reason they had difficulty in finding information was due to the term also being used under a different designation (""Merkel cell" was the most difficult to research because it is frequently used under this name and under "Merkel's disk", so I did more research.").

Another highly relevant question for the purpose of their integrating the advice and tenets learned in Terminology class, the steps to follow methodologically-wise, as well as adapting information for the field at hand (veterinary medicine), was "How difficult was it to adapt the research so as to find definitions, contexts, images FOR VETERINARY MEDICINE, rather than for HUMANS?", to which all respondents agreed: "rather challenging", "difficult considering the scarcity of research papers and overall resources centered around veterinary medicine, especially in Romanian", "barely any sites specialised for veterinary medicine that I would call reliable; most results were based on human medicine", "quite difficult", "very difficult", "challenging" , "fairly difficult", with one respondent simply concluding "There is a lack of resources in the veterinary domain in both English and Romanian", which sums up

the reason why this project aims to at least fill a specific gap in the literature and teaching materials through this glossary and practice activities. The majority of the respondents also stated they had not rephrased/combined "information from more than one source in order to create a suitable definition for the term", with eight outright specifying: "I did not.", "I didn't rephrase/combine any sources to create a definition.", "I was not sure how much liberty I had with creating a definition from scratch, so I avoided doing it.", "I chose not to in order to maintain accuracy and correctness.". One respondent directly stated that she had left it to the MA students to handle the raw data she had amassed, as was protocol: "I compiled a list with a variety of definitions where I was able to and left it to the MA students to create the definitions when needed. I believe that not many of the terms I was assigned needed a new definition.". Two students did, in fact, either rephrase ("I did not combine information, but I did rephrase some definitions, however there were only a few adjustments."), or did both ("I tried to do that for all, but mostly for the following terms: "primary sensory cortex", "secondary sensory cortex", "sensory deprivation" and "sensory processing disorder (SPD)").

Regarding the sources used by the BA student-researchers for the definitions and contexts, the question was multiple choice. Half (six) of the respondents opted for all three options, namely general use dictionaries (Merriam, Collins, Oxford, Britannica, etc.), scientific articles (e.g. Science Direct, Elsevier, AVAM Journals, Veterinary World, Journal of Veterinary Science etc.) and veterinary practice websites (Petmd, etc.), three just for general language dictionaries, whereas the rest for a combination of the three.

For the question "When researching the ROMANIAN EQUIVALENT, DEFINITION AND CONTEXT", the respondents were prompted to choose between: it took more time and effort than the ENGLISH versions because there were fewer resources available, it took less time than the English, because there were more resources available, I almost never found information, I often left the fields for RO DEF, RO CONTEXT blank, I only found information for HUMAN medicine. The majority (nine) opted for "it took more time and effort than the ENGLISH versions because there were fewer resources available", two stated they had only found information on human medicine, and a single respondent stating, "I often left the fields for RO DEF, RO CONTEXT blank".

One of the questions, namely "How would you rate your collaboration with the MA students in your team?", was designed to gain some insight into the dialogue between the researchers and those tasked with compiling the terminological records, with seven out of the twelve respondents agreeing that the MA students on their respective team "were helpful and readily available, provided input whenever asked", whereas four confessed: "I did my portion of the research and uploaded the documents, I had minimal contact with the MA students". Only one student chose the option "were NOT very helpful and available for input".

Conclusions

Overall, the goal of this phase was to create a deliverable, namely a glossary of specialized terms for students and academics in the field of Veterinary medicine. Subsequently, the experts at the University of Life Sciences devised practical applications and exercises based on said terminological records.

Thus, the term records and the research conducted by the undergraduate students was two-fold: for one, it gave them the opportunity to implement theoretical knowledge they had acquired over the course of the year in the Terminology course and seminar; then, as a result of the documentation work and the data extracted from the surveys, it provided us, their instructors, with an insight into their process and allowed us to ascertain whether they had performed consistent work.

As far as the use of AI tools in terminological research is concerned, the students did acknowledge the limitations, yet the manner in which they put it to use is not to be disregarded.

As such, they resorted to it for several areas which were to be expected, such as: providing the broader or superordinate concept and the narrower or subordinate concept (BCON and NCON), as well as for the subfield/domain. Moreover, they also used the AI for help organizing and sorting the information, which was particularly useful, since the MA students then had an easier time using and rifling through it. The limitations and shortcomings of the AI as opposed to the 'legwork' done by a person conducting research, trained in the steps to follow, the criteria for assessing whether a source is reliable, were most visible, according to the student-users, as far as the quest for 'reliable' and 'accurate' equivalents in French and/or Romanian, as well as definitions and contexts, together with the sources, for the Veterinary field.

ACKNOWLEGMENTS

This article is based on a study of the LANGVET-IA project, "Concevoir des contenus linguistiques et pédagogiques à l'aide des outils de l'intelligence artificielle (IA) dans le domaine de la médecine vétérinaire" (Conceiving linguistic and pedagogical content with the help of artificial intelligence tools in the field of veterinary medicine), coordinated by the University of Life Sciences "Ion Ionescu de la Brad" Iași, with the financial support of the Agence Universitaire de la Francophonie within the call AUF-ECO 2024 - Soutien à la recherche scientifique francophone en Europe Centrale et Orientale - RESCI-ECO, and developing from July 1, 2024 to August 31, 2025.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. BOUSQUET, Cedric and Maria ZIMINA, "The PERTOMed project: Exploiting and validating terminological resources of comparable Russian-French-English corpora within pharmacovigilance." in Terminology in Everyday Life, edited by Marcel Thelen and Frieda Steurs. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2010.
2. *"Evaluating Digital Sources - Purdue OWL® - Purdue University," n.d. https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/conducting_research/evaluating_sources_of_information/evaluating_digital_sources.html. Date accessed June 20 2025.*
3. IAROSSI, Giuseppe. *The power of survey design: a user's guide for managing surveys, interpreting results, and influencing respondents*. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, 2006.
4. LUŠICKY, Vesna and Tanja WISSIK. *Procedural manual on Terminology – Translation Oriented Terminology Work,* prepared in cooperation with the Sector for Preparation of the National Version of Acquis Communautaire, Secretariat for European Affairs, 2015.
5. MASON, J. Russell and Larry CLARK, United States Department of Agriculture. Philadelphia: Academic Press, 2000.
6. Saldanha, Gabriela and Sharon O'Brien. *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies*. Routledge, 2014.
7. TALAVÁN, Noa. *A University Handbook on Terminology and Specialized Translation.* Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia. Madrid, 2016.
8. *Terminology work – Principles and methods*, Third edition, ISO 704. Geneva: ISO Copyright Office, 2009.