

**PREVIOUS STUDIES ON TRANSLATION ISSUES IN TOURISM DISCOURSE
AND SPECIFIC FEATURES OF UZBEK AND ENGLISH TOURISM
TERMINOLOGY**

Shamsiddinova Sevinch Mekhrojiddinovna

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Faculty of English Philology and Translation Studies, 4th year, group 2204

Abstract: *This article reviews previous studies on translation problems in tourism discourse and examines the specific features of Uzbek and English tourism terminology. Tourism texts are widely used in intercultural communication and therefore require accurate and culturally appropriate translation. However, many tourism terms present difficulties due to cultural differences, lack of direct equivalents, and stylistic variation. The study focuses on the comparison of Uzbek and English tourism terminology and discusses common translation strategies such as descriptive translation and adaptation. The findings show that effective tourism translation depends not only on linguistic knowledge but also on cultural awareness and understanding of tourism discourse.*

Keywords: *tourism discourse, translation problems, Uzbek and English terminology, cultural adaptation, translation strategies.*

Аннотация: *В статье рассматриваются предыдущие исследования по проблемам перевода туристического дискурса и анализируются особенности туристической терминологии узбекского и английского языков. Туристические тексты играют важную роль в межкультурной коммуникации, поэтому их перевод должен быть точным и культурно адаптированным. Особое внимание уделяется сравнению узбекской и английской туристической терминологии и основным переводческим стратегиям. Результаты показывают, что качественный перевод туристических терминов требует не только языковой подготовки, но и культурной компетенции.*

Ключевые слова: *туристический дискурс, проблемы перевода, узбекская и английская терминология, культурная адаптация, переводческие стратегии.*

Introduction:

In the modern globalized world, tourism has become one of the most actively developing fields of international communication. Every year millions of people travel across countries and cultures, which increases the demand for accurate and culturally appropriate translation in tourism discourse. Tourism texts such as brochures, guidebooks, websites, hotel descriptions, and travel programs must not only transmit information but also create a

positive image of a destination and attract visitors. For this reason, translation in tourism is not a mechanical linguistic process but a complex interaction of language, culture, and communication.

One of the main difficulties in tourism translation arises from the specific nature of tourism terminology. Many tourism-related terms are deeply connected with national culture, traditions, history, and local realities. When translating such terms from Uzbek into English or vice versa, translators often face lexical gaps, cultural mismatches, and differences in conceptual meaning. Certain Uzbek tourism expressions have no direct equivalents in English, while some English tourism terms reflect cultural notions unfamiliar to Uzbek readers. This makes literal translation ineffective and sometimes misleading.

Previous studies in translation theory emphasize that tourism discourse belongs to a special type of pragmatic translation, where emotional appeal and persuasive function are as important as informational accuracy. Researchers point out that tourism language is characterized by expressive vocabulary, metaphorical expressions, and culture-specific items. Therefore, translators must possess not only linguistic competence but also cultural awareness and professional experience in tourism communication.

In the context of Uzbek and English tourism terminology, this issue becomes even more significant due to differences in social customs, hospitality concepts, and historical background. Uzbek tourism terminology is often influenced by national heritage, Islamic traditions, and local lifestyle, whereas English tourism terminology reflects Western travel culture and global tourism standards. These differences lead to frequent translation challenges, especially in terms related to accommodation, cuisine, rituals, and cultural events.

Another important aspect is the practical side of translation. In real-life tourism services, incorrect or inappropriate translation may result in misunderstanding, loss of tourist interest, or even damage to the country’s image. Thus, studying translation problems in tourism discourse is not only theoretically important but also socially and economically relevant. Improving the quality of tourism translation directly contributes to better intercultural communication and professional tourism development.

This article aims to analyze previous research on translation issues in tourism discourse and to identify the specific linguistic and cultural features of Uzbek and English tourism terminology. The study focuses on common translation problems, including lexical ambiguity, cultural adaptation, and contextual misuse of terms. By examining practical examples and using percentage-based analysis, the research highlights the most frequent difficulties faced by translators in tourism texts. The significance of this study lies in its attempt to combine theoretical approaches with real translation practice. The findings may be

useful for students of translation studies, tourism professionals, and future translators who work with Uzbek and English tourism materials. Moreover, the research contributes to the development of more flexible translation strategies that prioritize meaning, cultural relevance, and communicative effectiveness rather than strict word-for-word translation.

Methods:

This research is based on a qualitative and quantitative analysis of tourism discourse in Uzbek and English. The study examines translation problems related to tourism terminology by using examples taken from travel brochures, official tourism websites, guidebooks, and hotel descriptions. These sources were selected because they represent real-life tourism communication and contain a wide range of specialized terms.

To identify the main translation difficulties, a comparative method was applied. Uzbek tourism terms were compared with their English equivalents in order to reveal differences in meaning, structure, and cultural connotations. Special attention was given to culture-specific items, such as terms connected with national cuisine, traditions, accommodation, and local customs.

In addition, a small-scale survey and practical translation tasks were conducted among translation students and beginner translators. Participants were asked to translate selected tourism texts from Uzbek into English and from English into Uzbek. Their translations were analyzed to determine the most frequent types of errors and challenges.

The results were processed using percentage-based analysis. Translation problems were categorized into several groups: lexical gaps, cultural mismatches, stylistic errors, and contextual misuse of terminology. The frequency of each category was calculated to show which problems occur most often in tourism translation practice.

This methodological approach allows the research to combine theoretical observation with practical data. By integrating text analysis, comparison, and statistical evaluation, the study provides a clearer picture of the real difficulties faced in translating tourism terminology between Uzbek and English.

Results:

The analysis of translated tourism texts and student translation tasks revealed several major problem areas in translating tourism terminology between Uzbek and English. The results show that translation difficulties are not equally distributed but concentrate mainly on cultural and lexical aspects.

According to the percentage-based analysis, 38% of errors were related to cultural-specific terms. These included words connected with national food, traditions, and local lifestyle. For example, Uzbek terms such as “navro‘z sayli” or “milliy mehmondo‘stlik” were often translated literally, which led to loss of cultural meaning in English. Instead of

conveying the concept, translators produced grammatically correct but culturally weak equivalents.

27% of the problems were caused by lexical gaps, where no direct equivalent existed in the target language. Terms related to traditional accommodation, historical places, and local customs required descriptive translation. Many participants struggled to choose suitable explanations and tended to simplify the meaning, which reduced the informative value of tourism texts.

Another 20% of mistakes were connected with stylistic misuse. Tourism discourse requires attractive and persuasive language; however, many translations sounded too formal or neutral. For instance, promotional expressions in English tourism texts lost their emotional effect when translated into Uzbek without stylistic adaptation.

The remaining 15% of difficulties were linked to contextual misunderstanding. Some terms were translated correctly in isolation but became inaccurate when used within a specific tourism context, such as hotel services or travel programs.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that most translation problems occur when cultural meaning and communicative purpose are ignored. Translators who focused only on linguistic accuracy produced texts that were technically correct but ineffective for tourism communication.

Discussion:

The results of this study reveal that translating tourism terminology between Uzbek and English is a complex task that goes beyond simple word-for-word replacement. The majority of translation challenges arise from cultural specificity and the lack of direct lexical equivalents. Terms related to traditional food, national holidays, hospitality, and local customs often require descriptive translation or adaptation to convey the full meaning to the target audience. Literal translation of these terms frequently results in loss of cultural nuances, which can affect the effectiveness of tourism texts.

The percentage-based analysis highlights that cultural factors are the most frequent source of difficulty, accounting for approximately 38% of observed errors. Lexical gaps (27%) and stylistic issues (20%) further complicate the translation process, emphasizing that linguistic competence alone is insufficient. Translators must understand the cultural and social context of both the source and target languages. For example, translating Uzbek expressions like “navro‘z sayli” or “milliy mehmondo‘stlik” requires additional explanation to preserve their cultural significance in English texts. Similarly, English terms reflecting Western tourism concepts may need adaptation for Uzbek audiences.

These findings support the idea that tourism translation is not only a linguistic activity but also a cultural and professional practice. The effective translator must combine

knowledge of both languages with cultural awareness and an understanding of tourism discourse. Moreover, the study shows that stylistic adaptation is essential. Promotional materials, websites, and brochures aim to persuade and attract tourists; therefore, translations must maintain emotional appeal and communicative impact while remaining accurate.

The study also suggests that practical experience plays a crucial role in improving translation quality. Participants who practiced translating authentic tourism materials demonstrated better cultural sensitivity and were able to apply strategies such as borrowing, adaptation, and descriptive translation more effectively. This underscores the importance of including real-life texts and practical exercises in translation education.

In conclusion, the discussion confirms that tourism translation is a specialized field requiring a combination of linguistic proficiency, cultural competence, and professional knowledge. Addressing cultural differences, lexical gaps, and stylistic requirements ensures that tourism texts are both accurate and effective in intercultural communication.

Conclusion:

This study has shown that translating tourism terminology between Uzbek and English presents several challenges, mainly due to cultural differences, lexical gaps, and stylistic issues. Effective translation requires flexible strategies such as adaptation, descriptive translation, and cultural awareness. Combining linguistic competence with knowledge of tourism and local culture ensures that translated texts remain accurate and communicative. Overall, addressing these challenges improves intercultural communication and enhances the quality of tourism materials.

References:

1. Baker, M. (2018). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
2. Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice Hall.
3. Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). *The Translator as Communicator*. Routledge.
4. Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (2003). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Brill Academic.
5. Katan, D. (2014). *Translating Cultures: An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters, and Mediators* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
6. Qo‘ldoshov, O. O. (2023). *Yozma tarjima / Written Translation*. Samarkand: SamDCHTI.
7. Togaev, B. E. (2022). Translation issues of English hotel-tourism lexemes into Uzbek. *Ilmiy Tadqiqot va Innovatsiya Journal*, 14(2), 45–53.

8. Khudayberdiyeva, O. (2023). Lexical-semantic features of tourism terms in English and Uzbek languages. *So‘ngi Ilmiy Tadqiqotlar Nazariyasi*, 10(1), 12–21.

9. Shamsiddinova, S. M. (2026). Translation issues of tourism terminology in Uzbek and English (Unpublished thesis). Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages.