E-ISSN: 2997-9439
American Journal of Education and Evaluation Studies
https://semantjournals.org/index.php/ AJEES

| Research Article

Check for updates

Intercultural Pragmatics in Tourism Terminology

Mukaddam Kurbanova
KSU

Abstract: This paper explores the intersection of intercultural pragmatics and tourism terminology, highlighting how culture-specific communicative norms affect language use in tourism contexts. As tourism functions as a global connector, the terminology used in this field must bridge diverse pragmatic expectations. The study delves into speech acts, politeness strategies, implicatures, and the role of context in interpreting tourism discourse across different cultural backgrounds. By comparing English, Uzbek, and Turkish tourism terminology, the paper identifies common pragmatic pitfalls and suggests strategies for more effective intercultural communication.

Keywords: Intercultural pragmatics, tourism terminology, speech acts, politeness, cross-cultural communication.

This is an open-access article under the CC-BY 4.0 license

Introduction

Tourism is not only an economic activity but also a rich field of intercultural interaction. Tourists and service providers often belong to different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. As such, the success of tourism communication depends heavily on pragmatic competence—how language is used appropriately in a given context. This paper focuses on *intercultural pragmatics*, a subfield of pragmatics that studies language use in intercultural contexts, with a particular emphasis on the terminology of tourism.

Understanding tourism terminology from a pragmatic perspective helps improve cross-cultural interaction and reduces misunderstandings that arise from differing expectations of politeness, formality, or indirectness.

Intercultural pragmatics, developed by Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper (1989), analyzes how speech acts function across different languages and cultures. Unlike general pragmatics, it emphasizes the intercultural dimension of communication—how people interpret meaning based on their own cultural frames.

In the context of tourism, concepts such as *hospitality*, *customer service*, and *comfort* carry culturally specific expectations. For example, the phrase “feel at home” may have different pragmatic interpretations in Uzbek, Turkish, or English-speaking contexts.

Pragmatic Elements in Tourism Terminology

Tourism communication is not just about conveying information, but about creating trust, satisfaction, and positive expectations. In this context, pragmatic competence—the ability to use language appropriately according to cultural norms—plays a vital role. Key pragmatic elements found in tourism terminology include speech acts, politeness strategies, implicature, and contextual interpretation.

Speech Acts in Tourism Contexts

Tourism-related interactions rely heavily on the successful performance of speech acts—actions performed via utterances (Searle, 1969). Common acts include requesting information, offering help, making reservations, complaining, apologizing, and thanking.

Function	English	Turkish	Uzbek
Request	"Could you please…"	"Rica etsem…"	"Iltimos, ..."
Apology	"We apologize for the inconvenience."	"Rahatsızlık için özür dileriz."	"Noqulaylik uchun uzr so'raymiz."
Offering help	"May I help you?"	"Yardımcı olabilir miyim?"	"Yordam bera olaymi?"

These vary in formality, directness, and emotional tone, reflecting the values of the culture behind the language.

Politeness Strategies

Politeness is crucial in tourism to maintain customer satisfaction. Based on Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory, cultures vary between:

Negative Politeness: Indirect, respectful, often found in English-speaking cultures.

Positive Politeness: Warm, friendly, emphasizing closeness (common in Turkish and Uzbek cultures).

Example:

English: "Would you mind filling out this form?"

Turkish: "Bu formu doldurabilir misiniz acaba, zahmet olmazsa?"

Uzbek: "Iltimos, bu formani to'ldirib bera olasizmi?"

These variations affect how tourism staff should address international clients. Misuse can result in perceived rudeness or lack of professionalism.

Implicatures in Tourism

Implicature refers to the meaning inferred rather than explicitly stated. In multilingual tourism contexts, such nuances may be lost.

Example:

"The museum is closed on Mondays."

In English, this is informative.

In Turkish or Uzbek culture, a tourist may still ask, "But can I go in and just take photos?"

Understanding such unstated meanings is key to avoiding misinterpretations.

Contextual Relevance

Contextual factors—social status, power distance, familiarity—shape how tourism professionals should speak. A guide speaking to a foreign tourist may use more simplified or formal speech depending on cultural expectations.

Cultural Comparison of Key Tourism Terms

Tourism terminology carries different cultural weight across languages. Some terms may appear equivalent, but their pragmatic implications differ due to historical, social, or cultural influences.

Term	English	Turkish	Uzbek	Pragmatic Function
Guest	Customer (neutral)	Misafir (respected, honored)	Mehmon (highly honored)	In TR/UZ, implies deeper hospitality obligations
Reservation	Booking	Rezervasyon	Band qilish	“Binding” tone in UZ culture
Tour	A guided trip	Tur	Sayohat / ekskursiya	“Sayohat” can also mean solo travel
Welcome	General greeting	Hoş geldiniz	Xush kelibsiz	In TR/UZ, conveys cultural warmth
Guide	Informative role	Rehber	Yo‘l ko‘rsatuvchi	Often seen as a trusted figure in UZ

Example Analysis:

The term "guest" is pragmatically rich in Uzbek. “Mehmon” implies not just service, but moral obligation to care, feed, and protect. In English, “guest” is mostly transactional in tourism.

These distinctions influence how hotels, guides, and travel services are described—and perceived.

Pragmatic Failures and Misunderstandings

In cross-cultural tourism communication, pragmatic failures arise when culturally specific expectations are not met or are misinterpreted.

Examples of Pragmatic Failure

A hotel staff member uses overly direct English:

“Give me your passport.”

→ Perceived as rude by Uzbek or Turkish tourists who expect more polite forms.

A Turkish guide translates literally:

“Buyurun” → “Here you are.”

→ May sound unnatural or abrupt in English unless contextualized.

Consequences

Loss of face: Tourist feels disrespected.

Service dissatisfaction: Communication style affects perceived quality.

Negative reviews: Misunderstandings spread through online platforms.

Intercultural Examples

An Uzbek guest may say “Biz mehmonmiz, yordam bering” (“We are your guests, help us”) expecting special treatment, which could confuse a Western hotel that views guests more as clients than honorary family.

Pragmatic failures often stem not from poor language skills, but from different communicative values.

Pedagogical Implications and Recommendations

Intercultural pragmatic awareness should be integrated into the training of tourism professionals, translators, and educators.

Teaching Strategies

Contrastive Roleplays: Practicing the same tourism scenario across different languages/cultures.

Authentic Materials: Use brochures, dialogues, and complaint letters from different regions.

Awareness-Raising: Reflective activities about cultural perceptions of politeness and service.

Practical Integration

Hotel front-desk scripts can include options for addressing clients from different backgrounds.

Tourism English curricula should teach indirectness, hedging, and tone modulation.

Policy Recommendations

International tourism organizations should create intercultural communication guides.

Language textbooks should go beyond grammar and vocabulary, emphasizing cultural pragmatics.

Conclusion

In the increasingly globalized tourism industry, effective communication is not merely a matter of language proficiency but of **intercultural pragmatic competence**. This paper has demonstrated how tourism terminology is deeply intertwined with cultural expectations, politeness norms, and context-sensitive interpretation. Speech acts such as requesting, offering, and apologizing carry different pragmatic weight across English, Turkish, and Uzbek, influencing how messages are constructed and perceived.

The analysis shows that **tourism terminology is not universally neutral**. Words such as *guest*, *reservation*, and *guide* have layered meanings shaped by historical, social, and cultural experiences. Misunderstandings occur when interlocutors apply their native pragmatic rules to intercultural settings without awareness of the other party's communicative norms.

Pragmatic failures—though often subtle—can lead to discomfort, dissatisfaction, and even reputational loss in the tourism sector. Therefore, developing **intercultural pragmatic awareness** is essential for professionals who work in tourism, hospitality, and related fields. Language instruction for these sectors must go beyond grammar and vocabulary to include **the sociocultural dimensions of meaning**.

As tourism continues to serve as a bridge between cultures, understanding and respecting pragmatic differences becomes both a professional necessity and a step toward mutual cultural appreciation. With the right pedagogical tools, tourism discourse can be reshaped to foster **effective, respectful, and culturally appropriate interactions**, enhancing both customer satisfaction and global understanding.

References

1. Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Ablex Publishing.
2. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Leech, G. (2014). *The pragmatics of politeness*. Oxford University Press.

4. Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage pragmatics: Requests, complaints, and apologies*. Mouton de Gruyter.
5. Ishmukhamedova, G. (2021). *Pragmatic aspects of tourism language in Central Asia*. Journal of Intercultural Communication, 54(2), 112–126.