
CONFERENCE ARTICLE**Advantages And Challenges Of A Multilingual Environment In Teaching Tourism Terminology****Akbarov Alisher**Doctoral student at Kokand State University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

Tourism education increasingly unfolds in multilingual classrooms where learners, instructors, and authentic materials draw on two or more languages. This article examines the pedagogical advantages and challenges of multilingual settings for teaching tourism terminology, with a focus on how translanguaging practices, cross-linguistic mapping, and corpus-informed materials shape terminological accuracy, collocational competence, and pragmatic appropriateness. The study reports on a mixed-methods intervention in a guide-interpreter program that integrated English, Russian, and Uzbek as resources for learning rather than as rigidly separated codes. Data sources included a pedagogical corpus of destination texts and museum scripts, performance-based tasks simulating live tour narration and sight translation, and qualitative reflections from learners and instructors. Results indicate that multilingual environments accelerate concept formation, strengthen retrieval through contrastive cues, and enhance sensitivity to audience design. At the same time, they introduce risks of negative transfer, unstable borrowing, and overreliance on promotional calques that dilute technical precision. Implications are offered for sequencing instruction, curating bilingual glossaries with usage notes, and aligning evaluation with real-world communicative demands in tourism.

KEYWORDS

Multilingual education; tourism terminology; translanguaging; ESP; corpus-informed pedagogy; guide-interpreters; collocation; cross-linguistic interference..

INTRODUCTION

The communicative ecology of tourism is inherently multilingual, involving global standards, local narratives, and visitor expectations encoded across languages. For learners who will act as guides and interpreters, terminology functions not only as a set of labels for domain concepts but also as a repertoire for positioning authenticity, responsibility, and safety. In multilingual classrooms, learners bring established lexical networks from their first language and varying degrees of proficiency in additional languages. A growing body of research suggests that these resources can be leveraged to accelerate learning when they are mobilized strategically rather than suppressed. Yet the same multilingual affordances can foster porous category boundaries, leading to hybridized expressions that undermine legal or technical clarity. The central problem addressed in this article is how to maximize the benefits of multilingual environments for tourism terminology while minimizing risks to precision and pragmatic fit.

The study aims to identify the pedagogical advantages and challenges of multilingual classrooms for teaching tourism terminology and to formulate design principles for instruction, materials, and assessment that improve accuracy, collocational control, and audience-appropriate usage among pre-service guide-interpreters.

The research took place over twelve weeks in a capstone module of a guide-interpreter program. Forty students with working proficiency in two of the three classroom languages participated; the language triad comprised English for international communication, Russian as a regional lingua franca, and Uzbek as the principal local language. A 300,000-word pedagogical corpus was compiled from destination marketing sites, UNESCO and ICOMOS documents, museum labels, and tour operator

itineraries in all three languages and was mined for key terms across the frames of heritage, hospitality, mobility, and sustainability. Instruction used concordance lines to reveal definitional contexts, collocational profiles, and cross-linguistic equivalences or asymmetries. Classroom tasks included bilingual micro-lectures, guided sight translation of museum panels, and role-play tours adjusted to audience type. Assessment consisted of timed term-recall quizzes, collocational cloze items, rubric-based ratings of live tasks, and reflective journals. Two trained raters evaluated the performances; interrater agreement reached acceptable levels. Qualitative data were coded for themes relating to benefits and difficulties perceived in multilingual practice.

The multilingual setting promoted rapid consolidation of conceptual knowledge. When learners examined parallel texts, they identified stable international constructs such as "intangible cultural heritage," "carrying capacity," and "community-based tourism," recognized their calqued equivalents, and mapped definitional components across languages. This alignment improved recall and reduced reliance on hypernymic paraphrases. Cross-linguistic contrast also sharpened collocational awareness. Exposure to concordance lines in multiple languages helped learners avoid promotional intensifiers detached from technical meaning and adopt verbs and modifiers that signaled safeguarding, transmission, and regulatory status appropriate to heritage discourse. Pragmatically, the multilingual environment made audience design salient. Students practiced varying levels of technicality and explication depending on whether they were addressing families, specialists, or mixed groups, and they learned to integrate endonyms for culture-bound items with concise glosses in an international language.

Challenges clustered around transfer and stability. Learners sometimes imported metaphors from one language into another without considering genre constraints, resulting in translations that sounded fluent but softened legal categories. Borrowed terms such as “boutique hotel” or “homestay” circulated with inconsistent scopes, leading to ambiguity in service descriptions. In sight translation, students hesitated over honorifics and hospitality formulas, oscillating between foreignization that confused visitors and domestication that erased local nuance. Finally, when terminology governance was not explicit, learner-generated glossaries accumulated near-synonyms that compromised standardization for safety-critical or regulatory units.

These findings support the view that multilingualism is not merely a background characteristic of learners but an instructional asset requiring careful orchestration. Translanguaging practices—purposeful movement across languages within a task—enabled learners to triangulate meanings, compare syntagmatic behavior, and test audience-appropriate renderings under time pressure. The effect was strongest when contrast was anchored in genre-specific exemplars rather than free-form discussion. Corpus-informed materials provided the evidential base for noticing recurrent frames and collocations, counterbalancing the gravitational pull of promotional style that often dominates tourism discourse. At the same time, the risks observed indicate that multilingual freedom must be coupled with terminological governance. Programs should distinguish domains that admit creative, culture-expressive variation from those requiring strict standardization. Regulatory labels, accessibility markers, and risk communication demand harmonized equivalents and back-translation checks to ensure semantic alignment. By contrast, culture-bound artifacts and rituals benefit from partial foreignization with brief, audience-sensitive explication.

Assessment in multilingual environments should capture not only lexical accuracy but also collocational control, register, and intercultural adequacy. Rubrics that articulate these dimensions produced reliable judgments and actionable feedback. Reflective journals revealed that learners internalized criteria more quickly when instructors made the rationale for translanguaging explicit, including when and why to retain endonyms, how to frame UNESCO designations within local stewardship narratives, and how to calibrate the density of technical vocabulary for different audiences. The persistence of unstable borrowings suggests the need for curated, living glossaries with usage notes, examples, and contraindications, maintained through a quality-assurance process that includes periodic corpus refresh and calibration sessions among instructors.

The broader implication is that multilingual education in tourism benefits from sequencing. Early stages should foreground stabilized international terminology and regulatory frames, building a spine of shared concepts across languages. Progressive modules can introduce experiential and identity-performative lexis where evaluative charge is pedagogically addressed rather than unconsciously absorbed. Throughout, translanguaging should be constrained by task purpose: exploratory in seminars, evidence-driven in corpus labs, and audience-focused in simulations. Such design turns multilingualism into a structured scaffold rather than a source of noise.

A multilingual environment offers distinct advantages for teaching tourism terminology by accelerating concept formation, strengthening collocational competence, and enhancing pragmatic adaptability to diverse audiences. The same conditions, however, heighten the risk of negative transfer, unstable borrowings, and genre drift that can erode technical clarity. The most effective instructional design integrates corpus-based noticing with principled translanguaging and task-based performance, underpinned by terminological governance that secures safety-critical designations while permitting

culturally expressive variation. Programs should institutionalize curated bilingual or trilingual glossaries with usage notes, adopt assessment rubrics that reward accuracy, collocation, register, and intercultural adequacy, and align sequencing so that stabilized frames precede more elastic experiential lexis. Future research should extend to additional language constellations, incorporate audio from live tours to analyze prosody in term delivery, and test long-term retention through spaced retrieval embedded in field practice.

References

1. Thurlow C., Jaworski A. *Tourism Discourse: Language and Global Mobility*. — Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010. — 272 p.
2. Dann G. M. S. *The Language of Tourism: A Sociolinguistic Perspective*. — Wallingford: CAB International, 1996. — 296 p.
3. Baker M. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. 3rd ed. — London; New York: Routledge, 2018. — 352 p.
4. García O., Wei L. *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. — London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014. — 175 p.
5. Cenoz J., Gorter D. *Minority Languages and Sustainable Translanguaging: Threat or Opportunity?* — Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2017. — 184 p.
6. Nation I. S. P. *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. 2nd ed. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. — 662 p.
7. Schmitt N. *Vocabulary in Language Teaching*. 2nd ed. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020. — 382 p.
8. Johns T. *From Printout to Handout: Grammar and Vocabulary Teaching in the Context of Data-Driven Learning* // *ELR Journal*. — 1991. — No. 4. — P. 27–45.