

# INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION VIA TRANSLATION OF TOURIST-RELATED PROMOTIONAL MATERIAL

Jurgita Motiejūnienė<sup>1</sup>, Kamilė Mončytė<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Kaunas University of Technology (KTU), Lithuania

**Abstract:** Translation of culture-specific references (CSRs) is challenging and results in cultural compromises and even untranslatability, especially when cultures are different. The aim of this study is to identify strategies for translating CSRs from Lithuanian into English in tourist-related promotional texts. CSRs were categorised according to their types and translation strategies. The distribution of CSRs was almost proportional in all categories: organisations, material culture, social culture, names, and ecology. The translation strategies included literal translation (dominant), globalisation, preservation, addition, descriptive equivalent, omission and orthographic adaptation. The study contributes to the understanding of intercultural communication in the context of Lithuanian culture.

**Keywords:** intercultural communication, culture-specific references, tourism, promotional texts, translation strategies.

**About the author:** Jurgita Motiejūnienė is a lecturer at the Faculty of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities, and a member of the Language and Technologies research group, at Kaunas University of Technology (KTU), Lithuania. She is currently studying for a PhD of philology, with the focus on media and culture accessibility, at Vilnius University (VU), Lithuania. Her research interests include translation, linguistics, culture. She is teaching at the bachelor's study programme Translation of Technical Texts and master's study programme Translation and Post-editing of Technical Texts. She is a freelance translator, interpreter, editor. She has delivered practical seminars and workshop sessions nationally and internationally.

**e-mail:** jurgita.motiejuniene@ktu.lt

**ORCID iD:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4104-1592>

**About the author:** Kamilė Mončytė is currently studying for a bachelor's degree in Translation of Technical Texts at Kaunas University of Technology (KTU), Lithuania. She is also a freelance translator, editor, interpreter, and administrator of the Research Department at KTU. Her research interests include technical translation, machine translation, language technology-related linguistic communication, and translation of culture-specific references. She has presented her research on culture at international conferences in Lithuania and Slovakia.

**e-mail:** kamile.moncyte@ktu.lt

**ORCID iD:** <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-6087-8897>

**Copyright © 2024 Jurgita Motiejūnienė, Kamilė Mončytė**

**Article history:** Received: 24 June 2024; Reviewed: 22 October 2024; Revised: 25 October 2024; Accepted: 28 October 2024; Published: 9 December 2024



This open access article is published and distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

**Citation (APA):** Motiejūnienė, J., & Mončytė, K. (2024). Intercultural communication via translation of tourist-related promotional material. *Studies in Linguistics, Culture, and FLT*, 12(3), 115-131. <https://doi.org/10.46687/LYEB7503>.

## Introduction

In today's world, the boundaries between cultures are gradually becoming more ambiguous due to the increasing interconnectedness of people worldwide through economic activities, art, migration, tourism. The distinctions between cultures have been gradually diminishing worldwide, and concepts or practices that were unfamiliar or even culturally inappropriate a few decades ago are becoming increasingly familiar. The growing interest in travel and exploration of the world has contributed to the blurring of cultural boundaries. Nevertheless, translators still find it challenging and troublesome when dealing with culture specific references (hereafter referred to as CSRs). The translation of CSRs has been regarded as challenging in various language combinations (Horbačauskienė et al., 2016; Debbas, & Haider, 2020; Neshkovska & Kitanovska-Kimovska, 2020; Slavova & Borysenko, 2021; Bielska, 2022; Stoyanova-Georgieva, 2024). Some scholars even write about the problem of cultural untranslatability which occurs not only because of the absence of corresponding concepts in different cultures but also because of incomparable content of different cultures (Almijrab, 2020; Li, 2021; Ma'shumah & Sajarwa, 2022). Some scholars have referred to this phenomenon as cultural gaps or lacunae (Slavova & Borysenko, 2021). Moreover, mediation between cultures is essentially an interpretive act, i.e., the translator as the mediator between two cultures needs not only to know both cultures but also to have the competence of interpretation in order to be able to render CSRs to the target audience so that they can be easily perceived (Liddicoat, 2016). Therefore, it is relevant to investigate the translation of CSRs and provide more insights on how elements unique to a particular culture can effectively be conveyed in foreign contexts not only by preserving cultural identity but also enhancing effective intercultural communication and mutual appreciation among diverse communities worldwide.

Tourism is one of the industries with the greatest growth potential and a significant impact on economic growth, reflecting the historical, socio-political, and cultural background of a nation. These days, countries are investing more and more finances into promotional resources for tourists. Promotional texts are significant in helping tourists to learn about different cultures (Pratama et al., 2021). Therefore, translation of such material plays a significant role, especially with regard to CSRs. Scholars even report that some countries rich in tourism resources but lacking translated promotional texts might experience lower numbers of tourists, e.g., Japan (Turzynski-Azimi, 2021), Spain (Narváez & Zambrana, 2014) or the Shandong province in China (Yang, 2020).

The translation of tourism texts from Lithuanian into English holds great importance as it creates the potential for expanding the tourism industry in Lithuania. With English being a widely spoken global language, translating tourism materials enhances accessibility and promotes cultural exchange,

allowing for a broader range of tourists to connect with Lithuania's cultural heritage. Through accurate translations, potential tourists can gain insights into the country's unique traditions, landmarks, local cuisine and customs. Moreover, translating tourism texts into English not only attracts international tourists but also facilitates effective intercultural communication among native speakers and visitors to Lithuania, e.g., international students, immigrants, or those travelling for business-related matters.

Kaunas (Lithuania), along with two other cities – Esch-sur-Alzette (Luxembourg), and Novi Sad (Serbia) – held the title of the European Capital of Culture for the year of 2022, which created the need to provide more tourism-related promotional texts in English, as the title of European Capital of Culture offers cities the opportunity to promote sustainable tourism and reconsider their cultural development. Every year, two or three cities are titled as European Capital of Culture by the European Commission (2022), based on a cultural agenda that requires a significant European aspect, which involves encouraging participation and active engagement from residents, communities, and stakeholders. This also contributes to the overall progress of the city and its neighbouring area in the long run. Aside from boosting tourism, this European Commission's cultural initiative raises the international profile of cities, as well as improves the image of cities in the eyes of their own citizens (Official Journal of the European Union, 2014). Incidentally, the authors point out that Lithuanian residents' online travel blogs or accounts on social media platforms (e.g., *Instagram*) promoting tourist attractions in other Lithuanian cities, such as Vilnius (the capital of Lithuania), Klaipėda, Anykščiai, etc., are also gaining in popularity, which could be a possible consequence of Kaunas being the European Capital of Culture in 2022.

Therefore, drawing on a range of examples from informational tourist guides and promotional texts, the study aims at exploring the translation strategies employed for transferring CSRs in tourism texts translated from Lithuanian into English. The focus is on whether translators effectively handle CSRs commonly found in tourist-related promotional texts and whether cultural losses can be minimised in intercultural communication. It is also important to consider the ways in which translators can successfully convey cultural nuances, while also maintaining the integrity of the original text. The analysed CSRs encompass a wide range of elements, including names of traditional events, architectural landmarks, national cuisine, customary clothing and attire, musical instruments and dances, geographical locations, historical allusions and others.

## **Literature review: Culture specific references and their translation strategies**

Although translators have many resources and tools to transfer meaning from one language to another, yet, dealing with CSRs is still often challenging and troublesome and cultural losses are inevitable. It has been recently determined in a systematic review of literature that researchers are more and more concerned with the translation of CSRs in tourism texts (Chen et al., 2023). Some researchers claim that CSRs require particular translation approaches (Narváez & Zambrana, 2014). When it comes to the classification of CSRs, scholars have provided several taxonomies, most of which are about assigning CSRs into certain domains. Newmark (1988) distinguishes five groups according to the area from which a CSR originates, namely ecology (flora, fauna, hills), material culture (food, clothes, houses and towns, transport), social culture (work and leisure), organisations, customs, activities, procedures, concepts (political and administrative, religious, artistic) and gestures and habits. Kożuszek (2022) has expanded and modified Newmark's taxonomy by proposing the following classification: places and locations (sights, tourist attractions; buildings and institutions: museums, castles, palaces, market squares, cloth halls, universities; statues, monuments, tombs; chapels and basilicas; geographical places: lakes, mountains, rivers, park names; people (famous figures (history, science, arts)); minorities and groups; material culture (cuisine: foods; transport: vehicles); and non-material culture (customs and traditions).

Various CSRs translation strategies for transferring CSRs from one culture to another have been presented by different researchers. In general, it can be observed that the strategies scale according to their degree of adaptation. When some cross-cultural similarity is observed, it can be relatively straightforward for translators to successfully match cultural stereotypes from one culture to another. However, such parallels in social stereotyping are rarely exact matches, which causes difficulties when trying to match social stereotypes that have no likely equivalents in the target culture (Hervey & Higgins, 1992). Exoticism is an extreme transfer option when CSRs are imported from the source text into the target text with minimal adaptation strategies, which on the one hand, may be attractive to readers and on the other hand, can feel quite alien. On the other end of the spectrum, we have cultural transplantation that is more like a transposition, an adaptation or a replacement of CSRs with cultural details drawn from the target culture. In translation practice, when transferring CSRs, translators tend to avoid “wholesale exoticism and wholesale cultural transplantation” and consider other in-between alternatives, such as cultural borrowing, calque, and communicative translation (Hervey & Higgins, 1992, p. 30). In the translation of CSRs from Lithuanian into English, there is a tendency to employ foreignization strategies in order to provide the readers

of the translation with as much cultural information as possible (Kalėdaitė & Asijavičiūtė, 2005; Leonavičienė & Inokaitytė, 2023).

Preservation according to Davies (2003) is used when a close equivalent cannot be found in the target language. One could argue that it is quite natural to borrow words from other languages; however, there is a different level of tolerance towards this strategy in different languages, e.g., official Lithuanian language policy is to avoid foreign words as borrowed equivalents are considered as barbarisms. Sometimes, when rendering CSRs, translators preserve the original CSR and supplement it with additional information in the target text (addition or specification). Some borrowed words are followed by meta-commentary in the footnotes, which is solely the translator's decision. It should also be noted that some foreign words that half a century ago were explained in the footnotes are nowadays presented in the translated literature without any meta-annotations as the audience is already familiar with them (Pažūsis, 2014). Omission is the opposite strategy to addition and can be used when it is extremely difficult to find an effective alternative for a CSR in the target culture or in order to avoid repetition.

Globalisation (Davies, 2003) or universalisation (Aixelá, 1996) means replacing CSRs with their more culture-neutral equivalents, which might open up texts to wider audiences. On the contrary, in cases of localisation (Davies, 2003) or naturalisation (Newmark 1981; Aixelá, 1996), a source culture reference is replaced by a different target culture reference, which makes the translated texts sound like they were originally written in the target language culture. Some translation strategies might be “made on the basis of a translator's or editor's judgement of their intended audience's tastes, aptitudes and capacities” (Davies, 2003, p. 87). And finally, creation (Davies, 2003) or autonomous re-creation (Aixelá, 1996) is the strategy of creating a CSR that was not present in the source text in order to add more of the flavour of the source culture or compensate for some losses introduced in other places of the source text. Descriptive equivalent is used if the concept does not exist in the target language (or if the target audience is not yet familiar with it). Translation sometimes requires balancing description with function; therefore, the use of this strategy involves describing the appearance, concept or practical use (function) of the CSR (Newmark, 1988, p. 83-84).

Aixelá (1996) divides translation strategies into two main groups: conservative strategies and substitutive strategies. Conservative strategies include repetition, orthographic adaptation, linguistic (non-cultural) translation, extra textual gloss and intra textual gloss. Repetition is achieved through the retention of the original reference, making the target text seem more foreign to the target reader due to the cultural distance. Orthographic adaptation is in the form of transcription or transliteration and preferred when the CSR is in a different

alphabet to that used by the target reader. Linguistic (non-cultural) translation is used when the chosen translation in the target culture is denotatively close to the source culture. Extra textual gloss includes explanations about the meaning of CSRs in the form of a footnote, endnote or other type of commentary, while intra textual gloss also includes explanations about CSRs, but they occur within the text in order to not disturb the reader's attention. Substitutive strategies involve synonymy, limited universalisation, absolute universalisation, naturalization, deletion and autonomous creation. Synonymy is replacing a CSR with a similar reference in the target culture. Limited universalisation occurs when a translator chooses another reference of a source language that is closer to target readers. Absolute universalisation means eliminating the CSR and using a neutral reference instead. Naturalisation (adaptation) is a modification of a CSR to better fit the target language by adjusting pronunciation and morphology to match the target language norms; intertextual corpus has to be considered. If the translator believes that a CSR is unacceptable due to lack of equivalence, cultural barrier, linguistic constraints, etc., the strategy of deletion is utilized. Lastly, autonomous creation takes place when the translator adds a non-existent cultural reference.

Of note, recent systematic research carried out by Chen et al. (2023) determined that domestication and foreignisation tendencies dominate in translation of CSRs in tourism texts although both strategies have a positive and negative side. Domestication usually helps to retain the brevity of the texts and reduce the unfamiliarity but loses some piquantness of the source culture; meanwhile, foreignisation reveals the nuances of the culture but disregards whether the reader understands them (Chen et al., 2023). The research carried out by Narváez and Zambrana (2014) notes that it is important to maintain a balance between domestication and foreignisation in order to hold readers' attention. Another study determined that foreignization was the most common strategy in the translation of CSRs in tourist-related promotional texts (Rezaei & Kuhi, 2014). As cultural losses in rendering CSRs are unavoidable, research on how to reduce such losses and improve intercultural communication is important.

Tourist-related promotional texts are often provided in multiple languages, among which English is undeniably most common, perhaps along with Spanish, French and German in Europe. The use of English as a lingua franca in tourist-related promotional texts can pose certain challenges related to linguistic diversity, cultural hegemony and accessibility. While it facilitates intercultural communication to a large extent, it also risks marginalising other languages and cultures. Therefore, it is imperative for the tourism industry to give higher priority in providing promotional texts in the tourists' native languages, alongside English, as this creates a sense of hospitality and respect and helps learn more about different cultures.

## **Methodology. Research design. Data collection**

This study investigates the translation strategies employed in transferring CSRs in tourism texts translated from Lithuanian into English. The comparative analysis study was performed by using a bilingual, parallel, unidirectional corpora using a qualitative descriptive interpretative research method. A corpus of 27 Lithuanian tourist brochures and their translated versions into English (in total, 600,000 words) was collected. In total, 158 CSRs were selected and categorised by both authors based on Newmark's taxonomy, consisting of 4 groups of CSRs, namely, ecology (i.e., names of geographical objects), material culture (i.e., names of food, clothes, buildings, transport, etc.), social culture (i.e., names related to work and leisure) and organisations (which includes names of organisations, political, administrative, religious, artistic concepts and customs). We have added a category of people as proper names may have historical and cultural significance and translators should be mindful of preserving the cultural context. Translation strategies were determined based on the taxonomies provided by Davies (2003) and Aixela (1996), namely preservation or repetition, omission or deletion, addition or specification, globalisation or universalisation, localization or naturalisation, literal translation, and descriptive equivalent. The study also draws attention to some translation inaccuracies when rendering culture specific references.

## **Results and discussion**

The analysis of CSRs found in tourist-related promotional texts revealed that the proportions in all five categories, namely organisations (24.1%), material culture (22.2%), social culture (22.2%), people (15.8%) and ecology (15.8%) were relatively close, which indicates that the representation of culture in tourist brochures is multifaceted, revealing its richness. This finding differs from Elsa et al.'s (2021) conclusion drawn from the analysis of CSRs in the Jambi province tourism Booklet where most CSRs belonged to the category of material culture as well as Mamoon et al.'s (2023) conclusions made in the study of CSRs in Thailand's promotional videos that material culture was also the dominant category.

The analysis of translation strategies applied in the translation of CSRs revealed that literal translation constituted 30.4%, globalisation added up to 24.7%, preservation comprised 22.2%, addition made up 8.2%, descriptive equivalent was used 7.6% of the time, omission amounted to 6.0% and orthographic adaptation accounted for 0.6%.

The most common translation strategies of CSRs in the analysed texts were literal translation, globalisation and preservation. Literal translation is not only one of the most commonly used strategies in general, but it is the dominant one in three categories of CSRs, namely, ecology, material culture and organisations.

Translators might give priority to the literal transfer of meaning when dealing with CSRs because they try to preserve the exact meaning of the original text and perhaps stay culturally neutral. However, literal translation may not capture cultural nuances and connotations, potentially leading to a loss of meaning. A strict focus on literal translation may lead to a less engaging translation for the target audience and, in some cases, even cause misunderstanding because certain cultural references need to be adapted or explained to ensure that the target audience understands them correctly. Quite common use of the globalisation strategy in the translation of CSRs might imply a more culturally adaptive approach to translation, where the translator considers broader cultural and contextual factors to make the translation more relevant or effective in the target culture. Preservation was also a commonly used strategy in the current research study, which reflects Amenador and Wang's (2022) conclusion drawn in a study of translation strategies used for rendering CSRs in the English-Chinese language. Regarding preservation, our results also correlate with those carried out by Horbačauskienė et al. (2016) in the research on rendering of CSRs used in a reality show from English to Lithuanian.

Addition, descriptive equivalent, omission and orthographic adaptation were less frequently used strategies in the current study, even though according to Ramière (2019), translators might choose a strategy like omission or neutralisation more often to make the translation immediately comprehensible by the target audience. Buts et al. (2022) claim that whether or not CSRs are omitted in indirect translation is a matter of linguistic and cultural imbalances as well as of shifting communicative functions of a text as it moves between different historically and geographically situated environments.

There were no cases where the localization strategy was used in the translation of CSRs, which might mean that translators chose retaining original cultural references rather than adapting them to the target culture. One reason for not localising could be the translator's wish to maintain the authenticity of the source material. Whereas in the translations from English to Lithuanian, the most popular approach to translating realia is to use a localisation strategy (Petruilionė, 2012).

The current study also provides an analysis of the distribution of translation strategies in each category of CSRs. The results, most distinctive examples and some comparisons to other studies are described below.

In the category of **social culture**, globalisation was the most popular translation strategy, constituting 65,6%. Addition made up 12.5%, literal translation



constituted 9.4%, descriptive equivalent equalled 6.3% and omission 3.1%. Globalisation was the most popular translation strategy. For example, the Lithuanian musical instrument *daudytė* was translated as *pipes*<sup>1</sup>. *Daudytė* is a straight wooden pipe wrapped in birch bark used from approximately the 18th century in north-eastern Lithuania until the beginning of the 20th century. So, the translation of *daudytė* as *pipes* is an example of globalisation because it is a more widely understood term. *Pipes* is a common English term for various wind instruments, including those with a similar structure or function to *daudytė*. By using *pipes*, the translation aims to make the concept more familiar for English-speaking audiences as it is a common term used for various wind instruments, including bagpipes, panpipes and others. However, such translation choices can also lead to the loss of cultural richness. While the word *pipes* may convey the general idea of *daudytė*, it does not capture the unique cultural and historical aspects of the instrument.

The finding of the current study that the dominant translation strategy in the category of social culture was globalisation is contrary to the conclusions made in Xia's (2020) study on CSRs in promotional films where the prevailing strategy in the category of social culture was omission. However, both translation strategies – globalisation and omission – reveal a certain level of adapting CSRs to the target cultures either by making the content more acceptable to the target audience or by omitting it. Globalisation usually considers cultural nuances, idiomatic expressions and other elements specific to the target audience's culture while omission involves selectively omitting certain content deemed unnecessary or irrelevant for the target audience.

The second most popular translation strategy in the category of social culture was addition when CSRs needed to be explained in more details because such concepts did not exist in the target culture and would not be easily understood by the target language readers. Therefore, translators added explanations, clarifications and descriptions to ensure that the target readers could grasp the intended meaning behind social and cultural concepts specific to the source culture. For example, *sodžius* was translated as *sodžius, an ancient type of village*, which helps non-Lithuanian speakers understand and imagine the concept while also keeping the original form of the Lithuanian word. Although an English village differs from Lithuanian *sodžius* in its layout as the main residential buildings in *sodžius* are constructed right next to the road while the cattle sheds, barns and other supplementary premises stand a bit further away from the main road, the concept of a *village* is widely recognised by an English-speaking audience. The translation strategy of addition was also employed for

---

1. The translation of the word *daudytė* as *pipes* is grammatically imprecise; however, this discrepancy is not addressed in the article as the focus of the study is on the translation strategies employed rather than on grammatical accuracy.

revealing concepts exceptionally used when referring to traditional Lithuanian music, for example, *sutartinės* was translated as *sutartinės, Lithuanian multipart songs* and *kanklės* was translated as *kanklės (plucked string musical instrument)*. Here, addition serves as a useful strategy because there are no direct equivalent terms in English for these concepts.

Literal translation was the third most used strategy in the category of social culture. For example, the museum of agriculture called *Arklio muziejus* was translated as *Horse Museum*. Another example in this category is a popular attraction both for locals and tourists in Lithuania – a virtual reality film *Angelių takais (Trail of Angels in English)* based on Lithuanian artist and painter Čiurlionis' works.

In the category of **people**, proper names were translated using two translation strategies. Maintaining the original spelling of the proper name (preservation) was used more often than its orthographic adaptation, 66.7% and 33.3% respectively. The preservation strategy aims to maintain the original form of the proper name as closely as possible, without making significant changes to its spelling or pronunciation. This approach is often used when the name has strong cultural or historical significance. For example, Čiurlionis' name is preserved in English with Lithuanian diacritics, as he was a world-famous artist: composer, painter, choirmaster, writer and he is considered one of the pioneers of abstract art in Europe in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Preservation of names in their original form also contributes to the widespread of cultures. On the contrary, orthographic adaptation involves altering the spelling of a proper name to make it more closely resemble the writing conventions of the target language. This is usually done to ensure that native speakers of the target language can recognise the name more easily, for example, *A. Žukauskas-Vienuoelis* (Lithuanian writer) rendered as *A. Zhukauskas-Venuolis* in the translation, or *Jurgis Mačiūnas* (American-Lithuanian artist) as *George Maciunas*. However, these examples are not ideal for non-native speakers to recognise the names. Translating *Jurgis Mačiūnas* as *George Maciunas* involves anglicising his name, which might make his name easier for English speakers to pronounce and remember, but it does not accurately reflect his original identity or cultural background. Preserving the original form of a person's name is important for respecting their identity, heritage and cultural context. Noteworthy, in the translations from English into Lithuanian, the majority of proper names are transcribed taking into regard the phonemic aspect and the application of Lithuanian grammar rules (Petruilionė, 2012).

In the category of **ecology**, literal translation was the dominant strategy, constituting 60.9%, followed by globalisation (17.4%), omission (13%), addition, and descriptive equivalent (4.3% each). As in the categories of material culture and social culture, literal translation was also the dominant one in the category

of ecology. Some distinctive examples include geographical names, such as *Olando kepurė* (*Dutchman's Cap* in English), *Žalieji ežerai* (*Green Lakes* in English), *Neries Regioninis Parkas* (*Neris Regional Park* in English). Literal translation was also found to be the main translation strategy for rendering of CSRs in the category of ecology in Leksananda and Manusu's (2023) study, while Xia (2020) determined that domestication and foreignization were dominant in the translation of CSRs in this category.

When discussing the use of the globalisation strategy in the category of ecology, CSRs were adapted to the target audience not by using an exact equivalent, but rather by utilising a broad generic concept. For example, *Dubravos rezervatinė apyrbė* was translated as *Dubrava Reserve Area*. In Lithuanian, *apyrbė* means an area that differs in some way from its surroundings, e.g., a forest between swamps or fields, or a single large ravine where there used to be a lake which turned into a swamp, sometimes with remnants of a lake, whereas the concept *area* is a very broad term that could define any kind of a territory, zone, region, district, locale, etc. Similarly, *Anykščių šilelis* was rendered as *Anykščiai pinewood*. The literal meaning of the word *šilelis* in the Lithuanian dictionary is a small forest of tall, straight conifers growing in sandy areas, i.e., not only pine trees. Another gripping example was *piliakalnis* (literal meaning – *castle hill*), translated as *mound*. Castle hills or hillforts are unique to Lithuanian culture as they are an important pagan heritage. Neighbouring countries around the 10th century built brick castles, while Lithuania lacked this material and, therefore, to ensure protection constructed wooden castles on top of hills altered specifically for this construction purpose. Mounds for an English speaker can mean a lot of different concepts, such as a heaped pile of earth, gravel, sand, rocks, etc., or any rounded mass rising above a surface. Therefore, the strategy of globalisation used in these cases does not help to grasp the precise meaning of the concepts.

In the category of **material culture**, literal translation constitutes 41.2%, followed by preservation (20.6%), globalisation (17.6%), descriptive equivalent (11.8%) and addition (8.8%). Examples of literal translation include *Nacionalinis Kauno dromos teatras* (translated as *National Kaunas Drama Theatre*), *Žaliakalnio funikulierius* (rendered as *Žaliakalnis funicular*), *Kauno sporto halė* (*Kaunas Sports Hall* in English), *Kauno menininkų namai* (translated as *Kaunas Artists' House*). Literal translation is often used when referring to names of institutions, infrastructure objects and establishments as it provides clarity to the reader by avoiding the ambiguity that may arise from attempting to adapt cultural references into the target language. Literal translation has been observed by other research to be commonly used for translation of units of measurement and names of currencies (Blažytė & Liubinienė, 2016).

The preservation translation strategy was used in the category of material culture to render names of dishes and beverages of Lithuanian cuisine, such as *šimtalapis*, *kibinai*, *gira*. Although tourists may not recognise these names, it is important to maintain the cultural authenticity especially with regard to national gastronomy as it is an important part of tradition for every country. In such cases, translators could also apply other translation strategies. For example, *šimtalapis* could be translated as *poppy seed pie*, *kibinai* as *pastries with filling* and *gira* as *sweet bread drink* by using descriptive equivalents, which would provide clarity to a target reader. However, the translator's choice to retain these names acknowledges the importance of local tradition and promotes the local culture to a broader audience.

The result of our study that the literal translation strategy was mainly applied to translate CSRs in the category of material culture does not comply with Xia's (2020) findings where compensation was the dominant translation strategy in the category of material culture and Leksananda and Manusu's (2023) conclusions that the transference strategy was mainly used to translate CSRs in the category of material culture.

In the category of **organisations**, literal translation was the most frequently used strategy, constituting 37.8%, followed by globalisation (18.9%), addition (13.5%), descriptive equivalent and omission (10.8% both), and preservation (8.1%). Literal translation in the category of organisations prevails as in the categories of material culture and ecology. Leksananda and Manusu (2023) in their study also determined that literal translation was employed in the translations of organisations.

The strategy of globalisation was the second most popular translation strategy in the category of organisations. For example, *koplytėlė* – miniature wooden religious monument – was translated by using the globalisation strategy in two different promotional texts, namely as a *shrine* and a *chapel* which are broader terms and normally refer to buildings. Even though the CSRs *koplytėlė* and *shrine* or *chapel* have different meanings in Lithuanian and English cultures, they share the religious aspect, which is probably why the translator chose them.

A distinctive example of the omission strategy used to translate CSRs was *Žolinė* (Švč. Mergelės Marijos ėmimo į dangų diena) – Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary. *Žolinė* is a specific Lithuanian word (one of its meanings is a *flower bouquet*) to describe a traditional Lithuanian holiday celebrated on the summer solstice. The translator chose to omit its Lithuanian name and only refer to it by direct translation. The use of the omission strategy in this case cannot be completely justified as it loses the “local spice”.

Applying the descriptive equivalent translation strategy, *stogastulpiai* among the analysed examples in the current study was translated as *pillar-type crosses*. In Lithuania, *stogastulpiai* are tall (up to 8 metres) decorative wooden pillars with little roofs and a cross or a sun symbol on top. The descriptive translation of *stogastulpiai* as *pillar-type crosses* might confuse the target reader because the implied meaning is too narrow, bringing up an image of a cross rather than what *stogastulpiai* really looks like. So descriptive equivalents do not always provide clarity for target readers.

The use of the translation strategies described in this study, such as literal translation, omission, globalisation, orthographic adaptation, addition and descriptive equivalent, were used to help the target reader comprehend the CSRs of a foreign and distant culture and bridge the linguistic and cultural gaps. Therefore, most of the translations of the CSRs followed the principle of domestication. In other research, domestication was also found to retain the brevity of the texts and reduce the unfamiliarity but lose some piquantness of the source culture (Chen et al., 2023). In the current study, foreignisation was achieved only through the preservation strategy. In other studies, foreignisation was also used to reveal the nuances of the culture but it disregarded whether the reader understood them (Chen et al., 2023). The research carried out by Narváez and Zambrana (2014) noted that it was important to maintain a balance between domestication and foreignisation in order to hold readers' attention.

## Conclusions

The results of the current study revealed that literal translation, globalisation and preservation were the most dominant strategies when translating CSRs from Lithuanian into English in tourist-related promotional texts. Translators were prone to use the strategies of literal translation and globalisation to bring the source culture closer to the target reader and the preservation strategy to retain the uniqueness of the local culture. There were no examples of localisation found.

A few limitations of this study should be acknowledged. First, the linguistic and cultural specificity of the Lithuanian–English language pair may limit the replicability of the research with other language pairs. Second, while cultural losses are unavoidable in translation, their impact remains undetermined, indicating a need for further research. Third, a larger sample size could provide more comprehensive insights into translation strategies. Finally, the study does not examine how target audiences perceive translated CSRs, which is an important factor in evaluating the effectiveness of translation strategies. Without evaluating how the target audience reacts to the translation, it is difficult to determine whether CSRs were successfully conveyed.

It is necessary to preserve the nuances and richness of individual languages and cultures, and find ways to transfer meaning from one culture to another without diluting the uniqueness of each culture. Therefore, translators should not only be skilled in recognising CSRs but also in applying translation strategies when transferring meaning across cultural boundaries. Their role is to preserve cultural identity and ensure that the nuances of the source culture are accurately conveyed while enabling effective intercultural communication. As some cultural losses in rendering CSRs are unavoidable, research on how to reduce such losses and improve intercultural communication is important.

## References

- Aixelá, J. F. (1996). Culture-specific items in translation. In R. Alvarez & C. A. Vidal (Eds.), *Translation, Power, Subversion*. (pp. 52–78). <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781800417915-005>.
- Bielska, A. (2022). (Un) translatability of culture-bound elements in AVT. *Językoznawstwo*, 15, 93–103. [https://doi.org/10.25312/2391-5137.15/2021\\_07ab](https://doi.org/10.25312/2391-5137.15/2021_07ab).
- Almijrab, R. (2020). Strategies used in translating English taboo expressions into Arabic. *African Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research*, 3(1), 22–30.
- Amenador, K. B., & Wang, Z. (2022). The translation of culture-specific items (CSIs) in Chinese-English food menu corpus: A study of strategies and factors. *SAGE Open*, 12(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221096649>.
- Blažytė, D., & Liubinienė, V. (2016). Culture-specific items (CSI) and their translation strategies in Martin Lindstrom's Brand sense. *Studies about languages*, 29, 42–57. <https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.sal.0.29.16661>.
- Buts, J., Hadley, J., & Aboomar, M. (2022). Keyness, context, and cultural specificity in indirect translation. *TransLogos Translation Studies Journal*, 5(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.29228/transLogos.40>.
- Chen, S., Mansor, N. S., Mooisan, C., & Abdullah, M. A. R. (2023). Examining Cultural Words Translation in Tourism Texts: A Systematic Review. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 14(2), 499–509. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1402.26>.
- Davies, E. E., (2003). A Goblin or a Dirty Nose? The Treatment of Culture-Specific References in Translations of the *Harry Potter Books*. *The Translator*, 9(1), 65–100. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2003.10799146>.
- Debbas, M., & Haider, A. S. (2020). Overcoming cultural constraints in translating English series: a case study of subtitling family guy into Arabic. *3L, Language, Linguistics, Literature*, 26(1). <https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2020-2601-01>.

- Elsa, A. H., Mukhlisa, D., & Mariana, T. (2021). Translation of cultural terms in the Jambi Province tourism booklet. *English Language, Linguistics, Literature, And Education Journal*, 3(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.30631/ellture.v3i1.39>.
- European Commission. (2022, January 3). Three new European capitals of culture for 2022. Culture and Creativity. Retrieved from <https://culture.ec.europa.eu/news/2022-european-capitals-culture#:~:text=As%20of%201%20January%202022,of%20Culture%20for%20one%20year>.
- Hervey, S., & Higgins, I. (1992) *Thinking Translation: A Course in Translation Method*, Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203417973>.
- Horbačauskienė, J., Kasperavičienė, R., & Petronienė, S. (2016). Issues of culture specific item translation in subtitling. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 231, 223–228. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.09.095>.
- Kalėdaitė, V., & Asijavičiūtė, V. (2005). Translation of Lithuanian Culture-Specific Items into English. *Kalbotyra*, 55 (3), 31–37. <https://www.journals.vu.lt/kalbotyra/article/view/23249>.
- Kożuszek, K. (2022) Travel, culture and translation: Polish cultural elements in the English translation of online travel guides. *New Vistas in Language Studies*, 37.
- Leksananda, F. A., & Manus, B. P. G. (2023). Translating Cultural Words in a Movie Subtitle: A Study on Translation Procedures. *Journal of English Language and Language Teaching*, 7(1), 33–46. <https://doi.org/10.36597/jell.v7i1.14340>.
- Leonavičienė, A., & Inokaitytė, G. (2023). Use of culture-specific items and their translation from Lithuanian into English and French in Ričardas Gavelis's Vilnius Poker. *Sustainable Multilingualism*, 22(1), 212–257. <https://doi.org/10.2478/sm-2023-0009>.
- Li, H. (2021). Untranslatability caused by cultural differences and approaches to it. *2nd International Conference on Language, Communication and Culture Studies* (353–361). <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211025.059>.
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2016). Intercultural mediation, intercultural communication and translation. *Perspectives*, 24(3), 354–364. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2014.980279>.
- Mamoon, W., Che Lah, S., & Abdou Moindjie, M. (2023). Translation of culture-specific items from Thai to English in tourism promotional videos. *International Journal of Language, Literacy and Translation*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.36777/ijollt2023.6.1.068>.
- Ma'shumah, N. K., & Sajarwa, S. (2022). Overcoming the problem of cultural untranslatability in Burnett's the secret garden from English into Indonesian.

- Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature*, 7(1), 34–50. <https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v7i1.16516>.
- Narváez, I. C., & Zambrana, J. M. V. (2014). How to translate culture-specific items: a case study of tourist promotion campaign by Turespaña. *The journal of specialised translation*, 21, 71-112. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/261011509\\_How\\_to\\_translate\\_culture-specific\\_items\\_a\\_case\\_study\\_of\\_tourist\\_promotion\\_campaign\\_by\\_Turespana](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/261011509_How_to_translate_culture-specific_items_a_case_study_of_tourist_promotion_campaign_by_Turespana).
- Neshkovska, S., & Kitanovska-Kimovska, S. (2020). Some key pitfalls in literary translation. *Studies in Linguistics, Culture, and FLT*, 8(1), 55–67. <https://doi.org/10.46687/SILC.2020.v08i01.005>
- Newmark P. (1981). *Approaches to translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100005222>.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation* (Vol. 66, pp. 1-312). New York: Prentice hall.
- Official Journal of the European Union (2014, April 16). *DECISION No 445/2014/EU OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL*. Establishing a Union action for the European Capitals of Culture for the years 2020 to 2033 and repealing Decision No 1622/2006/EC. Retrieved from [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv%3AOJ.L\\_2014.132.01.0001.01.ENG](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv%3AOJ.L_2014.132.01.0001.01.ENG)
- Pažūsis, L. (2014). Kalba ir vertimas. *Lodvila*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15388/VertStud.2014.7.10537>.
- Petrulionė, L. (2012). Translation of culture-specific items from English into Lithuanian: The case of Joanne Harris's novels. *Studies about languages*, 21, 43-49. <https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.sal.0.21.2305>.
- Pratama, A. A., Ramadhan, T. B. L., Elawati, F. N., & Nugroho, R. A. (2021). Translation quality analysis of cultural words in translated tourism promotional text of Central Java. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 6(1), 179-193. <https://dx.doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v6i1.515>.
- Ramière, N. (2019). Reaching a foreign audience: Cultural transfers in audiovisual translation. *Caleidoscópico: literatura e tradução*, 3(1), 7-20. <https://doi.org/10.26512/caleidoscopio.v3i1.25323>.
- Rezaei, M. & Kuhi, D. (2014). Strategies employed in translation of tourist guidebooks culture-specific items from Persian into English. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(4), 750-757. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.4.4.750-757>.
- Slavova, L., & Borysenko, N. (2021). Culture-specific information encoded in lacunae: The author's and translators' strategies of representation. *Studies about Languages*, 38, 17–28. <https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.sal.1.38.27396>.



- Stoyanova-Georgieva, I. (2024). Fantastic names and how to translate them. *Studies in Linguistics, Culture, and FLT*, 12(3), 99-114. <https://doi.org/10.46687/GBMV8502>.
- Turzynski-Azimi, A. (2021). Constructing the image of Japan as a tourist destination: translation procedures for culture-specific items. *Perspectives*, 29(3), 407–425. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2020.1758734>.
- Xia, M. (2020). A study on the translation of cultural-loaded words in the publicity film of Pingyao county from the perspective of the Skopos Theory. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 10(10), 1267–1272.
- Yang, T. (2020). The translation of cultural tourism resources in Shandong province under the Theory of Eco-Translation. *2020 International Conference on Social Sciences and Social Phenomena*, 619–623. <https://doi.org/10.38007/Proceedings.0001144>.