

INTERCULTURAL PRAGMATICS IN TOURISM TERMINOLOGY

Mukaddam Kurbanova

PhD researcher at Kokand state university

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20179349>

Annotatsiya: Tourism terminology constitutes a specialized lexical system that operates at the intersection of language, culture, and communication. This study examines tourism terminology through the lens of Pragmatics and Intercultural Communication, focusing on how meaning is constructed and negotiated across linguistic and cultural boundaries. The study argues that effective use of tourism terminology requires not only lexical knowledge but also intercultural pragmatic competence.

Keywords: tourism terminology, intercultural pragmatics, semantic shift, translation, discourse analysis

The globalization of tourism has intensified the need for effective communication across diverse linguistic and cultural contexts. Tourism discourse relies on specialized terminology to convey complex meanings related to services, experiences, and cultural representations. However, these terms are not merely lexical units; they function as pragmatic tools shaped by context and cultural interpretation.

Within Applied Linguistics, terminology is increasingly viewed as a dynamic system embedded in communicative practice rather than a static inventory of words (Cabr , 2010). In tourism communication, meaning is co-constructed between speakers and audiences, often requiring adaptation across languages and cultures.

This study aims to explore how tourism terminology operates within intercultural communication, with particular emphasis on semantic variability and pragmatic negotiation.

Tourism terminology as a pragmatic resource

Tourism terminology operates as a multifunctional resource that combines informational, persuasive, and experiential meanings. Unlike general vocabulary, tourism terms are often strategically designed to influence perception and decision-making. For example, expressions such as *authentic experience* or *hidden gem* carry implicit evaluative meanings that shape expectations. These terms are pragmatically loaded and rely on shared cultural assumptions.

Thus, tourism terminology should be understood as part of discourse, where meaning is negotiated rather than fixed (Richards, 2018).

When tourism terminology is transferred from English into Uzbek, semantic shifts frequently occur due to differences in conceptual categorization and lexical organization. These shifts are not random but reflect underlying cognitive and cultural models. For instance, the English term *destination* encompasses not only a physical location but also symbolic and experiential dimensions, including identity, attractiveness, and emotional appeal. In Uzbek, its equivalents such as *manzil* or *sayohat joyi* primarily denote spatial reference, thereby reducing its conceptual complexity. This represents a case of semantic narrowing, where the target language captures only a subset of the original meaning. Conversely, certain Uzbek expressions may expand meaning to compensate for lexical gaps, illustrating semantic expansion. This bidirectional restructuring demonstrates that translation involves conceptual negotiation rather than direct equivalence (Faber, 2012).

Pragmatic adaptation plays a central role in the cross-linguistic transfer of tourism terminology. English tourism discourse is characterized by a high degree of promotional intensity, often employing positive semantic prosody and persuasive rhetoric. Terms such as *luxurious*, *breathtaking*, and *exclusive* function as discourse markers that position the reader within a desirable experiential frame. In contrast, Uzbek tourism discourse tends to prioritize informational clarity and cultural appropriateness over persuasive exaggeration. As a result, English terms are frequently recontextualized in Uzbek to align with local communicative norms. This may involve lexical simplification, tonal moderation, or restructuring of sentence patterns. For example, the English phrase “*an unforgettable luxury experience*” may be rendered into Uzbek in a less evaluative and more descriptive form. This shift reflects not a loss of meaning but a change in pragmatic orientation, where communicative effectiveness is adapted to audience expectations (House, 2015).

Tourism terminology is deeply embedded in cultural frameworks, which means that certain concepts cannot be transferred without reinterpretation. Cultural reinterpretation occurs when a term is mapped onto a different set of values or experiences in the target culture. For example, the concept of *cultural immersion* in English implies active participation and deep engagement with local life. In Uzbek contexts, this concept may be interpreted more passively, emphasizing observation rather than participation. Similarly, *heritage tourism* in English includes abstract notions of identity and collective memory, whereas in Uzbek it is often associated with tangible cultural artifacts such as monuments and historical sites.

These differences indicate that translation involves not only linguistic substitution but also cultural reconfiguration, where meaning is reconstructed within a new interpretive framework (Kramersch, 1998).

The analysis also reveals the use of different translation strategies, including:

Functional equivalence → preserving communicative purpose

Descriptive translation → explaining culturally specific concepts

Adaptation → modifying meaning to fit cultural expectations

These strategies demonstrate that equivalence in tourism terminology is relative and context-dependent, rather than absolute (Munday, 2016).

Challenges in intercultural tourism communication

One of the most significant challenges is the mismatch between communicative norms across cultures. English tourism discourse often relies on persuasive and emotionally engaging language, while Uzbek discourse tends to favor neutrality and informativeness.

This divergence can lead to misinterpretation, where promotional language is perceived as exaggerated or inauthentic. Consequently, the intended persuasive effect may be reduced or lost entirely (Spencer-Oatey, 2008).

During translation, certain semantic and pragmatic elements may be partially lost. This is particularly evident in terms that carry evaluative or experiential meanings.

For instance, words like *authentic* or *unique* may not have direct equivalents in Uzbek that convey the same pragmatic force. As a result, the translated text may retain informational content but lose persuasive impact, leading to pragmatic weakening (Pym, 2014).

Tourism discourse often simplifies complex cultural realities to make them accessible to international audiences. This process, known as cultural filtering, may result in generalized or stereotypical representations.

When such filtered concepts are translated into Uzbek, they may reinforce limited or distorted views of culture, reducing the richness and diversity of representation.

Conclusion. Tourism terminology functions as a dynamic system shaped by semantic, pragmatic, and cultural factors. This study has demonstrated that cross-linguistic transfer of tourism terminology involves complex processes of semantic restructuring, pragmatic adaptation, and cultural reinterpretation.

Effective communication in tourism contexts therefore requires more than lexical knowledge; it demands intercultural pragmatic competence. Future research should explore how digital technologies and AI-mediated communication further transform tourism terminology and discourse practices.

Adabiyotlar, References, Литературы:

1. Cabré, M. T. (2010). *Terminology: Theory, methods, and applications*. John Benjamins.
2. Faber, P. (2012). *A cognitive linguistics view of terminology and specialized language*. De Gruyter.
3. House, J. (2015). *Translation quality assessment: Past and present*. Routledge.
4. Anvarjonova, N. N. (2026, February). MISTAKES IN CURRICULUM DESIGN AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON TEACHING PRACTICES. In *International Online Multidisciplinary Conference* (pp. 713-716).
5. Anvarjonova, N. (2026). FLUENCY WITHOUT UNDERSTANDING: RE-EXAMINING COGNITIVE DEPTH, INTELLECTUAL PURPOSE, AND PEDAGOGICAL RESPONSIBILITY IN UNIVERSITY EFL INSTRUCTION. *SHOKH LIBRARY*, 1(1).
6. Anvarjonova, N. (2025). WHEN ASSISTANCE REPLACES THINKING: ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE, COGNITIVE ENGAGEMENT, AND ACADEMIC RESPONSIBILITY IN UNIVERSITY EFL CONTEXTS. *SHOKH LIBRARY*, 1(13).
7. Ummatovich, K. M., Mirsultonov, M. I., Hudoyberdiyevna, B. Z. G. Z., & Ahmedovna, K. M. (2025). Determinants Of Effective School Governance: Participation, Reflection, Trust And Leadership Competencies. *The Review of Diabetic Studies*, 201-208.
8. Ahmadaliyevna, H. G., Ahmedovna, K. M., Muhitdinovna, A. D., Tokhtasinovich, A. S., Yakubovna, U. N., & Ahadovna, Y. M. (2024). A LINGUISTIC JOURNEY: MORPHOLOGY AND POLYSEMY IN ENGLISH TOURISM TERMS. *Journal of International Crisis and Risk Communication Research*, 7(2), 242.
9. Axmedova, K. M. (2021). Sociolinguistic Features OF Everyday Discourse in English, Russian, Uzbek. *European Journal of Innovation in Nonformal Education*, 1(2), 259-261.
10. Mamatqulova, M. (2025). Linguocultural Codes in Uzbek Cinematic Discourse: A Study of National Identity through Media Language. *International Conference on Global Trends and Innovations in Multidisciplinary Research*, 1(5), 36-39. <https://tlepub.org/index.php/2/article/view/443>
11. Marhabo, M. (2023). Means of Modality in Linguistics as A Universal Linguistic Event. *International Journal on Integrated Education*, 5(4), 131-136.

12. Marhabo, M. (2022). DEVELOPMENT OF THE CATEGORY OF MODALITY IN PHILOLOGY AND THEIR COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS. *CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES*, 3(01), 40-45.
13. Mamatqulova Marhabo. (2023). HOW DOES A PERSON BECOME MULTILINGUAL?. *QO'QON UNIVERSITETI XABARNOMASI*, 9(9), 209–212. <https://doi.org/10.54613/ku.v9i9.874>
14. Mamatqulova Marhabo. (2023). NEEDS ANALYSIS AS A MAIN PHASE FOR DESIGNING ENGLISH FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSES (ESP) COURSE. *QO'QON UNIVERSITETI XABARNOMASI*, 9(9), 213–216. <https://doi.org/10.54613/ku.v9i9.876>
15. Haydarova, G., & Haydaraliyeva, R. (2024). FEATURES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF KUNTUGMISH DOSTON. *Академические исследования в современной науке*, 3(1), 3236.