

Analysing the Thai to English Translations of Tourism Discursive Elements in the Tourism Authority of Thailand's English Webpages

PASAKARA CHUEASUAI

Department of English, School of Humanities, University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce, Thailand

Author email: pasakara_chu@utcc.ac.th

Article information	Abstract
<p>Article history: Received: 3 Jan 2022 Accepted: 8 Jul 2022 Available online: 21 Jul 2022</p> <p>Keywords: Thai to English translation Tourism promotional text Tourism authority of Thailand Translation of tourism discourse Translation studies</p>	<p><i>With its tourism industry becoming the main source of income of the country, Thailand has put an emphasis on promoting tourist destinations to foreign tourists via different channels including online resources. The Tourism Authority of Thailand (TAT), a state agency in charge of tourism promotion, provides useful information of attractions in Thai and other languages on their webpages. This paper attempts to analyse the tourism discursive elements as posited by Durán Muñoz (2012) and Dann (1996) in the English version of the TAT webpages on Bangkok and to analyse how these components are translated. The study found few uses of the tourism language characteristic in the translated version as the result of the moderate uses of these constituents and the exclusion of certain Thai texts in the translation. The investigation also found that these linguistic tools are both literally translated and adapted. While the original meaning is preserved by literal translation, adaptation tends to heighten the tourism discourse quality in the translated text yet alters the original meaning.</i></p>

INTRODUCTION

In the last two decades prior to the COVID-19 global pandemic in the year 2020, Thailand welcomed over ten million foreign tourists annually. The number steadily increased each year since 2000¹, and in the year 2019 almost forty million tourists visited the country, generating nearly two trillion Thai baht (approximately USD66.7 billion) income, which is 11% of GDP, to the 'Land of Smiles' in that year alone². Like many other popular tourist destinations, Thailand has an official tourist board Tourism Authority of Thailand (TAT) to take responsibilities for promoting the tourist industry of the country. One way to achieve the task is to provide potential tourists with necessary information about the country via different communication channels. Apart from conventional printed posters and brochures, online media such as websites at present have become a main, if not the only, resource for information search and gathering

¹ <https://intelligencecenter.tat.or.th/articles/20962> Last accessed on 30th September 2021.

² https://www.bot.or.th/Thai/MonetaryPolicy/EconomicConditions/AAA/250624_WhitepaperVISA.pdf Last accessed on 30th September 2021.

for tourists before they embark on their journeys. Undeniably, this is fundamentally due to ease of access and low, if not zero, expense (Pierini, 2007, p. 85). An appealing website is thus absolutely essential, and it can turn readers into tourists (Novozhilova et al., 2018, p. 2) as Dann's (1996, p. 2) often repeated quotation says that tourism language should "persuade, lure, woo and seduce millions of human beings, and in so doing, convert them from potential into actual clients". Tourism language, or tourism text, is referred to as "any text published by a public or private organisation of any kind intended to give information to any kind of visitor or to advertise a destination (city, hotel, restaurant, etc.) and encourage visitors to go there" (Kelly, 1998, p. 35). Thus, the term tourist promotional text (TPT) is used here to stress its promotional function. In terms of its components, TPTs usually consist of both attractive *verbal* and *non-verbal* elements, the latter of which include visual and sometimes audio resources, particularly those appearing on websites. To make TPTs known in the international sphere and to promote the local hidden gems to the world, in this part, translation unavoidably plays a vital role as a cross-cultural mediator (Durán Muñoz, 2011, p. 31; Veselica Majhut, 2021, p. 151) in rendering the information of TPTs from the source language to the target language.

Unfortunately, TPTs have been criticised for having low quality translation (Cappelli, 2008, p. 97; Durán Muñoz, 2012, p. 336; Sulaiman & Wilson, 2018a, p. 630). This seems to be a result of two misconceptions, i.e., TPTs are easy to translate (Durán Muñoz, 2011, p. 40; Pierini, 2007, p. 99) and TPTs belong to a general discourse (Durán Muñoz, 2011, p. 40; Pierini, 2007, p. 86) without necessity to pay much attention to. A common fallacy is that TPTs are easy to translate, resulting in the commission of non-professional translators to transfer meanings from the source text (ST) to the target text (TT) (Veselica Majhut, 2021, p. 155). The other misconception is that TPTs belong to a general discourse rather than a specialised one, which leads to the inappropriate use of language both in terms of syntactic and pragmatic choices in the translation (Durán Muñoz, *ibid.*). As a consequence, these two interrelated misunderstandings generate ineffective translated TPTs, which may drive away instead of drawing in online readers and turn them into actual tourists (Sulaiman, 2016, p. 54).

In the context of Translation Studies (TS), TPT has been the subject of scrutiny from different perspectives and language pairs applying various approaches. Assessing the quality of translation is a fundamental enquiry that translation scholars pay attention to such as Pierini (2007, pp. 85-103) who evaluated the quality of web translation between English and Italian TPTs and found semantic, pragmatic, and cultural non-equivalence in the translated TPTs. Similar findings of elementary linguistic mistakes and pragmatic mismatches with the target language (TL) register and genre are reported by Veselica Majhut (2021, pp. 151-167) who employed Pierini's (*ibid.*) web translation quality assessment in examining the quality of translation into English of Croatian Tourist Boards' TPTs on their websites. Once such pitfalls are recognised, potential solutions are proposed such as that of Durán Muñoz (2011, p. 46; 2012, p. 348) who sees that these issues can be solved by improving the quality of translated TPTs by means of a specific tourism translation course offered by academic institutions to produce professional tourism translators. Sulaiman (2016, p. 65), meanwhile, further points out that the TPT quality can be improved should a translation agent, i.e., translation commissioners, broaden their views towards translators' responsibilities as not only linguistic transferors but also cultural mediators. This can be achieved by showing respect and trust to the translators' works and status.

Apart from the linguistic perspectives, cultural differences are widely discussed and recognised as giving rise to problematic translated TPTs (Durán Muñoz, 2011, p. 40; Durán Muñoz, 2019, p. 353; Sulaiman & Wilson, 2018a, pp. 630-631). A different cultural value generates a different communication style in which it appears in a different textual convention in terms of content and style (Kelly, 1998, p. 36). As for the content, Kelly (ibid.) compared Spanish and English TPTs and found that the former emphasises history, architecture, and art history whereas the latter puts more emphasis on practical information such as opening times and telephone numbers. In terms of style, Spanish TPTs tend to be more formal and keep the relationship with the reader at bay by rarely addressing the reader directly whereas English texts show less formality and more direct communication with the reader using first and second personal pronouns. Different linguistic choices are also a result of a different cultural values as it can be seen in Sulaiman (2014, p. 504) and Sulaiman & Wilson (2018b, p. 1) who distinguish between an active, doing, and explicit Australian culture and a passive, gazing, and implicit Malay culture by means of an informal and imperative writing style in the former and a formal and polite writing one in the latter. Using a writing style contradictory to the audience's culture therefore leads to TPTs unsuccessfully attracting target tourists.

Findings of the studies above shatter the illusion long perceived that TPTs are easy to translate which results in low-quality translated TPTs. On the contrary, the studies show that linguistic and cultural non-equivalence between Source Text (ST) and Target Text (TT) makes this specific type of text as challenging to translate as the other types. These previous works also suggest the particular discursive elements that TPTs possess, making it belong to a specialised discourse (Cappelli, 2008, p. 102; Durán Muñoz, 2019, p. 353; Gandin, 2013, p. 326) rather than a general one as conventionally comprehended. By using the term 'discursive elements', this paper refers to them as verbal resources of TPTs at the lexical, syntactic, and textual levels, all of which construct the meaningful tourism discourse. Durán Muñoz (2012, pp. 336-338) identifies the most common lexical features in English tourism language that differentiate TPTs from other discourses as follows:

- a. the use of positive adjectives to give beauty and distinction to the text such as *spectacular, colourful*;
- b. the use of superlative form such as *the most beautiful, the largest*;
- c. the use of keywords to serve the tourist's expectations about holidaying such as *away, escape* including foreign and invented words to induce a sense of exotic feeling such as *wat* (Buddhist monastery or temple); and
- d. the use of cultural references which do not have any equivalence in the target language such as *stupa* (a Buddhist mound-like structure containing relics), *krengjai* (เกรงใจ)³.

At the syntactic level, Durán Muñoz (ibid.) enumerates the following common elements:

- a. nominalisation such as *when you arrive at the airport > upon your arrival at the airport*;

³ A Thai verb used to describe a characteristic of most Thai people that has the closest equivalence of 'be considerate' in English.

- b. imperative to engage the reader's attention of opportunities offered to them such as *try our famous street food*; and
- c. the use of the present tense to make the time of the holiday seems still and everlasting such as *Street foods in Chinatown attract both locals and tourists*.

By having the above lexical and syntactic features, TPTs will perform two major functions, at the pragmatic level: first, the referential or informative function; and second, the persuasive or vocative function since TPTs serve to inform and describe specific places while persuading the reader to travel to those places (Durán Muñoz, *ibid.*).

In addition, in his seminal work on tourism discourse, Dann (1996, pp. 185-188) observes one of the main linguistic features of English tourism discourse – the use of lexical devices typical of a conversational style, or ego-targeting, i.e., the use of first and second personal pronouns both in singular and plural forms as well as possessive adjectives and pronouns, both of which facilitate direct communication with the reader and encourage promotional function of TPTs.

While TS research on tourism discourse in the West has been extensively conducted, it is still lacking in the Thai context although the tourist industry is the country's main source of income. Only few previous studies have dealt with translation of TPT. Biltae et al. (2021), for example, looked into the strategies used in translating cultural terms in cultural tourism handbooks produced by TAT from Thai to English. The study found socio-political, ecological, material, and artistic and cultural terms translated mostly by literal translation. In addition, Sasongkoar (2019) compared the translation quality between human translation and machine translation of hotel websites from Thai to English and found that human translation produces better translation at lexical, sentence, and discourse levels.

With limited studies in the Thai to English context, this paper thus sees necessity to investigate the translation of Thai TPTs into English, especially in terms of the use of tourism language. This is because this specific linguistic tool plays a significant role in not only providing necessary information for the reader but also persuading them to visit the places at the same time. Concurrently, an examination into the accurate and appropriate translation is highly required since correct and effective TPTs thus can help build first impression and trust in the reader and in turn promote tourism of the country.

By examining different features and layers of TPTs, Durán Muñoz's (2012) tourism discourse elements and Dann's (1996) direct communicative approach together can be a helpful framework in analysing the availability of these tourism language constituents and how they are translated into English TPTs. This proposed framework should help answer two research questions of this paper:

1. What tourism discursive features are available in the English translation of the Thai TPTs?;
2. How are these features translated in the English version?

Answers to the questions will serve two objectives of this paper: to analyse the tourism

discursive elements of the translated TPTs following Durán Muñoz and Dann; and to examine the translation of these elements in the TT. Findings should contribute to translation pedagogy and practice with the specific focus on the translation of TPTs.

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

Data for this study were collected from the Thai and International English⁴ versions of the official website of the Tourism Authority of Thailand (TAT)⁵ who is the main state agency responsible for promoting the tourism industry of the country. Although other websites promoting Thailand's tourism are available on the Internet, the TAT website was chosen because it was created by a state office; therefore, the information should be adequate, reliable, accurate, and impartial – in the sense of not being commerce-oriented. The TAT website provides information about tourist destinations in different regions of Thailand each of which contains their main cities. To be able to manage a qualitative analysis of comparable texts in this paper, the study opted for Bangkok with the specific focus on the historical and cultural places of the palaces and temples.⁶ Bangkok was chosen because it is the capital city and main tourist destination of the kingdom both for local and foreign tourists. On the TAT website, Bangkok appears at the top of a list of top destinations. The city is also well-known for its old town where magnificent palaces and temples are located. Table 1 below presents the analysed data that were taken from the menus 'Highlights' that introduce attractions in and around Bangkok in brief (ST1/TT1); 'Top 5 Must-Visit Temples in Bangkok Once in A Lifetime!' under the 'Why Bangkok?' menu that provides interesting information of the Temple of Dawn, the Reclining Buddha Temple, the Golden Mount, the Golden Buddha Temple, and the Marble Temple (ST2/TT2); and 'Explore Bangkok' menu under which the Royal Grand Palace (ST3/TT3), the Giant Swing (ST4/TT4), the Temple of Dawn (ST5/TT5), and the Erawan Shrine (ST6/TT6) were examined.

Table 1
The analysed data

ST Webpages		TT Webpages	
ST1	https://www.tourismthailand.org/Destinations/Provinces/กรุงเทพมหานคร/219 (471 words)	TT1	https://www.tourismthailand.org/Destinations/Provinces/Bangkok/219 (156 words)
ST2	https://www.tourismthailand.org/Articles/5-วัด-5-เอกลักษณ์ทั่วกรุงเทพ-ที่ต้องมาเยือนให้ได้ซักครั้ง (1341 words)	TT2	https://www.tourismthailand.org/Articles/top-5-must-visit-temples-in-bangkok-once-in-a-lifetime (815 words)
ST3	https://www.tourismthailand.org/Attraction/พระบรมมหาราชวัง (793 words)	TT3	https://www.tourismthailand.org/Attraction/grand-palace (560 words)
ST4	https://www.tourismthailand.org/Attraction/เสาชิงช้า (367 words)	TT4	https://www.tourismthailand.org/Attraction/sao-chingcha (272 words)
ST5	https://www.tourismthailand.org/Attraction/พระปรางค์วัดอรุณราชวรารามราชวรมหาวิหาร (346 words)	TT5	https://www.tourismthailand.org/Attraction/phraprang-wat-arun-ratchawararam-ratchawora-mahawi (136 words)
ST6	https://www.tourismthailand.org/Attraction/ศาลท้าวมหาพรหม (504 words)	TT6	https://www.tourismthailand.org/Attraction/erawan-shrine (390 words)

⁴ The word 'international' is used here to distinguish the English version produced for English-speaking readers from any countries because there are also English versions for India, Malaysia, and Singapore markets in separate webpages.

⁵ <https://www.tourismthailand.org/home>

It should be noted at this stage that since the corpus size is small, the results can never be used to generalise the overall translation of the TAT English webpages. In addition, this paper analyses only the verbal elements of the website. Although visual resource undeniably plays an important role in the meaning-making process of a website as a whole, the analysis focuses on the verbal items as the resource for constructing tourism specialised discourse.

The data were analysed first following Dann's (1996) and Durán Muñoz's (2012) tourism discourse elements at lexical, syntactic, and textual levels mentioned earlier in order to examine how the translated TPTs contain these aspects. Then the study examined how these constituents were rendered in the international English version. To conform with the analytical framework, the paper looked at the lexical, syntactic, and textual dimensions of the TT.

As for the translation, several prominent scholars in Translation Studies have proposed various types of translation, most of which are the dichotomies between the Source Text (ST) oriented and the Target Text (TT) oriented. Nida (1993), for example, posits formal equivalence, which stresses ST form and meaning; and functional equivalence, which focuses on TT response of the message. Larson (1998) puts forward form-based translation, which follows the ST form; and meaning-based translation, which lays stress on carrying ST meaning in the TT natural form of language. Therefore, Nida's formal equivalence and Larson's form-based translation are ST oriented, whereas functional equivalence and meaning-based translation are TT oriented. Newmark (1995) also proposes source language (SL) emphasis versus target language (TL) emphasis, each of which is further divided and classified according to closeness to the ST (from word-for-word, literal, faithful, to semantic translation) or the TT (from adaptation, free, idiomatic, to communicative translation). However, to identify one particular type from another, especially those that are located in between the two polarities, can be challenging in practice. To minimise the problematic classification, the current study opts for the two diametric typologies, i.e., *literal translation* and *adaptation* based on the meaning. These two terms are similar to Newmark's classifications of literal translation and adaptation. However, Newmark's literal translation converts the ST grammatical constructions to their nearest TT equivalents, but the lexical words are translated singly out of context. His adaptation is referred to as the freest form of translation. The TT is a rewritten text. Vinay & Darbelnet (1995) also propose and define literal and adaptation as two of seven translation procedures. However, their definitions of literal translation are concerned more with the syntactic similarities between ST and TT, and adaptation involves replacing ST cultural references with those of the TT due to socio-cultural differences. The literal translation in this paper is referred to as a type of translation that directly preserves the original meaning, whereas adaptation is a type of translation in which the ST meaning is changed, removed, added, explained, etc., resulting in changes of the ST meaning in the TT.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE THAI TPTs AND ITS ENGLISH TRANSLATION

This section reports the results of the analysis of both versions by firstly presenting the tourism language elements identified in the ST and TT, and then explaining how these features are rendered.

Tourism discursive elements in the ST and TT

Before further exploring the ST and TT, it is worth noting here that the translated version is shorter than the original text (See Table 1) because only certain contents and paragraphs are translated. As a result, certain ST tourism language features disappear or change. The analysis of tourism language elements is divided into three levels: lexical, syntactic, and functional, each of which is exemplified and discussed below.

Lexical level

A. Table 2 shows the use of the positive adjectives found in both versions. The analysis found 20 evaluative adjectives in the ST and 16 in the TT. Certain original adjectives are removed (marked by ∅ together with its tentative translation in parenthesis) whereas some are added (with + in front of the word) in the TT. Although no specific criterion for number of positive adjective or ratio between positive adjective and text is specified, the identified positive adjectives seem out of proportion with the size of the English TPTs. In addition, most of these adjectives are basic ones such as *popular*, *important*, *beautiful*, *interesting*, etc., and most of those appear only once. The limited uses of these evaluative adjectives in the TT, it can be argued, are due to the limited uses in the ST itself. Although TT adds new ones, it also removes some original adjectives as well. As a result, it tends to decrease the characteristics and qualities of TPT that are supposed to create aesthetic appeal, positive feelings, and desirable images of these destinations to the reader.

Table 2
Positive adjectives in the ST and TT

ST Positive Adjectives		TT Positive Adjectives	
ST1	1. ยอดนิยม 2. ที่น่าสนใจ 3. ที่น่าสนใจ 4. ชื่อดัง 5. ที่สำคัญ 6. ที่น่าสนใจ 7. หลูหร่า 8. ชั้นนำ	TT1	1. popular 2. ∅ (interesting) 3. ∅ (interesting) 4. ∅ (famous) 5. ∅ (important) + beautiful 6. Interesting 7. ∅ (luxurious) 8. Leading
ST2	1. โดดเด่น 2. ที่เห็นเด่นเป็นสง่า 3. อันงดงาม 4. ยิ่งใหญ่ อลังการ 5. เห็นเด่นเป็นสง่า 6. งดงาม	TT2	+ unique + valuable + famous 1. Unique + interesting + famous 2. ∅ (imposing) 3. ∅ (beautiful) 4. ∅ (grand) 5. ∅ (imposing) + great 6. ∅ (beautiful)
ST3	1. สำคัญ 2. สำคัญ	TT3	+ magnificent 1. ∅ (significant) 2. Significant
ST4	1. อันโดดเด่น 2. ที่สำคัญ	TT4	1. outstanding 2. ∅ (important)
ST5	-	TT5	-
ST6	1. ที่เคารพนับถือ 2. มีชื่อเสียง	TT6	+ famous 1. ∅ (respected) 2. ∅ (famous)
TOTAL	20	TOTAL	16

B. The use of superlative form can be argued as being few as shown in Table 3. Only nine superlative forms appear in the ST and six in the TT, such as *one of the most beautiful and gigantic stupas* (TT2), *the world's largest golden Buddha statue* (TT2), and *the first largest shrine* (TT6). Also, this feature is not available in all TTs: 1 and 3 have zero use of the superlative. In addition, as marked with *, the ST4 (สำคัญ [important]) and ST6 (ขนาดใหญ่ [large]) are not in the superlative form. However, the TT4 and TT6 alter the original meanings by using 'the most important' and 'the largest' instead. Otherwise, the use of this lexical element will be even more limited. The use of the superlative form presents something of the highest quality. The

limited use of this lexical element may reduce some readers' enthusiasm to visit certain destinations as they may consider the places as ordinary. With the superlative form, it adds a special and unique characteristic to these specific places; hence, it can attract potential visitors.

Table 3
Superlative forms in ST and TT

ST	Superlative forms	TT	Superlative forms
ST1	-	TT1	-
ST2	1. พระมหาเจดีย์ที่ยิ่งใหญ่และสง่างามที่สุด 2. พระพุทธรูปยืนที่มีความสูงที่สุด 3. พระพุทธรูปทองคำบริสุทธิ์ที่มีขนาดใหญ่ที่สุดในโลก 4. หินอ่อนที่ดีที่สุด	TT2	1. one of the most beautiful and gigantic stupas 2. the tallest Buddha statue 3. the world's largest Buddha statue 4. ∅ (the best marble)
ST3	-	TT3	-
ST4	1. สถานที่ท่องเที่ยวทาง ประวัติศาสตร์ที่สำคัญ*	TT4	1. one of the most historically important tourist attraction ^{6*}
ST5	1. สิ่งก่อสร้างที่สูงที่สุด 2. พระปรางค์ที่สูงที่สุด 3. หนึ่งในสิบสถานที่ทางพุทธศาสนาที่มีชื่อเสียงที่สุด	TT5	1. ∅ (the tallest building) 2. ∅ (the tallest prang) 3. the best known of Thailand's landmarks
ST6	1. ศาลพระพรหมศาลแรกที่มีขนาดใหญ่*	TT6	1. the first largest shrine housing Phra Phrom*
TOTAL	9	TOTAL	6

C. The use of keywords to stimulate the reader's expectation about holidaying, and foreign and invented words to trigger a sense of exotica to the reader, is presented in Table 4. It should be noted here that while the holiday keywords can be applicable to the Thai TPTs, the foreign and invented words are not as it refers to the use of such words in the translation. In this case, the Thai words are the foreign words in the English TPTs. Since the analysed data belong to the cultural sightseeing tourism, the keywords thus revolve around history, culture, and religion and tend to differ from other types of tourism that contain the keywords such as *away*, *adventure*, *dream*, *imagination*, etc. (Durán Muñoz, 2012, p. 337). Some of the holiday keywords are *historical*, *palace* (TT1), *ancient* (TT2), and *ceremony* (TT3), some of which have parentheses with a number to present the frequency the word appearing in the text. For example, ST1 found the word “วัด” in 18 places versus 12 places in TT1. As for the foreign words, a few Thai words are found to be used instead of their English translation such as *wat* (Buddhist monastery or temple) (TT1, TT2), *klong* (canal), *ubosot* (ordination hall) (TT2). Some of the English definitions are given after some of the Thai words such as *klong* (canal) in TT2 and *wat* (Buddhist temple) in TT5. Nonetheless, some of these Thai terms appear without their definitions or meanings such as *ubosot*, as in *The Temple's ubosot was constructed of marble imported from Italy, so tourists from all over the world know this temple as the “Marble Temple”* (TT2). Should the definition “ordination hall” have been given, the reader would have understood more of this specific term. The total number of ST keywords are 75 whereas 31 are found in TT. Differences in number between the two versions can be explained in terms of the shortened translation where certain ST texts are omitted.

⁶ 'Attraction' is in the singular form in the TT.

Table 4
Holiday keywords plus foreign and invented words in ST and T

ST	Holiday keywords plus foreign and invented words	TT	Holiday keywords plus foreign and invented words
ST1	1. พระบรมมหาราชวัง 2. วัด (18) 3. โรงละคร 4. พิพิธภัณฑ์ (3) 5. โบราณ (6) 6. ทางประวัติศาสตร์ (2) 7. พระราชวัง	TT1	1. Ø (the Grand Palace) 2. wat (12) 3. Ø (theatre) 4. museum (1) 5. Ø (old) 6. historical (1) 7. palace
ST2	1. วัด (27) 2. โบราณ 3. คลอง 4. อุโบสถ	TT2	1. wat (9) 2. ancient (3) 3. klong 4. ubosot
ST3	1. พระบรมมหาราชวัง (12) 2. พระราชพิธี (2)	TT3	1. the Grand Palace (8) 2. ceremony (2)
ST4	1. พระราชพิธี	TT4	+ ancient 1. ceremony
ST5	-	TT5	-
ST6	-	TT6	-
TOTAL	75	TOTAL	31

D. The use of cultural references that do not exist in the audience culture is presented in Table 5. Similarly, this lexical element is not applicable to the ST because it is meant to be used with the translation. However, the Thai data are only given as the references. Although the data belong to the cultural tourism, the cultural references are hardly used here. Only six references are found: *stupa* (a Buddhist mound-like structure containing relics), *Benjarong* (a five-coloured porcelain), *kinnari* (a mythical creature of half female and half bird), *garuda* (a mythical bird in Hinduism), *pagoda* and *prang*.⁷

Table 5
Cultural references in ST and TT

ST	Cultural References	TT	Cultural References
ST1	-	TT1	-
ST2	1. เจดีย์ 2. เบญจรงค์ 3. กินรี 4. พญาครุฑ 5. เจดีย์	TT2	1. <i>stupa</i> 2. <i>Benjarong</i> 3. <i>kinnari</i> 4. <i>garuda</i> 5. <i>pagoda</i>
ST3	-	TT3	-
ST4	-	TT4	-
ST5	1. พระปรางค์	TT5	1. <i>prang</i>
ST6	-	TT6	-
TOTAL	6	TOTAL	6

Syntactic level

Syntactic level involves the uses of nominalisation, imperative, and direct address in TPTs. The paper analyses all four syntactic elements (nominalisation, imperative, direct address, and present simple tense) in the TT, but does not discuss the present simple tense since the English TPTs use this specific tense mostly, especially verb to be to inform the reader the factual information of the tourist destinations. So, no prominent feature is found.

A. Nominalisation is not found in the TT although it occasionally occurs in the ST. One reason is that certain parts of ST are not translated resulting in excluding certain parts of ST that

⁷ The term *pagoda* is usually used as a synonym of *stupa* although the shapes are different. *Pagoda* is defined as a religious building that has several levels with a decorated roof at each level (<http://global.longmandictionaries.com/ldoce6/dictionary#pagoda>). Also, the wrong definition of *prang* is given in the TT. The correct meaning should be a Cambodian style *stupa*.

contain nominalisation, and the other is turning the ST nominalisation into non-nominal form. This phenomenon will be further discussed in translation of the discursive elements.

B. Imperative form, urging the tourist to do as suggested, is found only in TT2, such as in the Golden Buddha Temple script: *Before leaving the temple, don't forget to visit the great Buddha image, "Phra Phuttha Tossapol Yarn", too.*; and about the dress code to visit temples: *DO NOT wear the following when entering a Temple or place of worship*. Few imperative forms can be explained in terms of the lack of its use in the ST. This may be because these TPTs belong to the sightseeing tourism genre that tourists merely see and observe things and places, so-called passive and static tourist activities, rather than participating in active and dynamic activities as in adventure and sports tourism (Sulaiman & Wilson, 2018b, p. 2); the instruction is thus scarce. It can also be explained that giving direct orders to people to do or not to do things in Thai culture is considered impolite, especially if the relationship between a speaker and a hearer is not close. In addition, in Thai culture, in terms of the hospitality, hosts usually welcome guests with politeness using polite language. Thus, the imperative may signify impoliteness in this context. This coincides to Sulaiman's (2014, pp. 506-507) finding that the imperative in the English TPTs sounds from impolite to rude towards Malay tourists as it contradicts their politeness conventions. These similar findings to Sulaiman's study can be explained in terms of Thailand and Malaysia being the neighbouring countries in Southeast Asia that share not only a border but also certain cultural beliefs and norms, especially those concerning politeness.

C. Direct address creates a conversation and singles out the reader as the specific and special audience, or ego-targeting (Dann, 1996, pp. 187-188), but can only be identified in TT2: *Furthermore, you can see a variety of sculptures around the Temple like Kinnari, giants, angels, and garudas*; and *Another must-attend activity you don't want to miss is taking a photo with the 2 temple guardians*, which appears in the text of the Temple of Dawn; and finally, *You can also enjoy seeing a variety of interesting ancient Thai cultural murals around the temple*, which is in the Temple of Reclining Buddha. Three instances of creating a conversation can be considered as few. Interestingly, direct conversational communication such as this is not found in the ST. It is added in the TT and will be further mentioned in translation of the discursive elements.

Textual level

At the Textual Level, the textual meaning derives from the uses of both lexical and syntactic elements in a text to perform the informative and persuasive functions of TPTs. From the analyses of the lexical and syntactic dimensions, the TT informs the reader about factual information by describing the main historical and cultural sites of the capital city. Meanwhile, the persuasive role, which is the other predominant function of TPTs identified by the uses of positive adjective, superlative form, holiday keywords, cultural references, imperative, and conversational communication, seems limited. These are mostly the consequences of the ST's restricted uses of these specific features plus the partial translation that results in a shortened TT. The translated version mostly explains things in general rather than talks to the reader by directly addressing him or her with *you*.

At this stage, examining the translated TPTs concerning the availability of tourism language shows that they contain the lexical, syntactic (except nominalisation), and textual characteristics to a certain extent. Although no exact quantity per text of these aspects is set in the analytical framework, it should not be an understatement to state that with the occasional use of tourism language the translated version is inclined to lack an effective tourism discursive characteristic. This can be well illustrated by, for example, the uses of positive adjective that does not occur in every TT; or the direct address that appears only in TT2.

In the next section, the paper discusses the translation of these elements in detail.

Translation of the discursive elements

This section aims to demonstrate findings that answer the second research question regarding the types of translation of the discursive elements in the English TPTs. Although the tourism language elements following Dann (1996) and Durán Muñoz (2012) can be found in three linguistic layers: lexical, syntactic, and textual, respectively, this paper argues that the elements employed in the first two levels interrelate and help to perform the informative and persuasive functions of the textual level, which is concerned more with the conventional writing style. Therefore, the translation of the tourism elements at the lexical and syntactic levels is of great significance that can help shape the desirable textual functions and bring about an effective TPT.

As mentioned in the DATA AND METHODOLOGY the paper divides the translation into two types: literal translation and adaptation. The literal translation refers to the type of translation whereby the original ST meaning is preserved in the TT although the ST syntactic structure may not be preserved. The adaptation is the type of rendering in which the ST meaning is adjusted, added, removed, explained, etc., in the TT with the target audience in mind. In other words, by classifying these two translational types, the paper focuses more on meaning rather than form. From the analysis, the literal translation of the tourism language is found to be few, yet the ST meaning remains intact; for example, “น่าสนใจ” is translated literally as “interesting”, or “ชั้นนำ” as “leading”. The literal translation can be found only at the lexical level, but not at the syntactic level. Meanwhile the adaptation which is used throughout the TT both preserves and removes the original meaning and is used at both lexical and syntactic levels of the TT. Therefore, the paper discusses only the features belonging to the adaptation.

Lexical level

At the Lexical level, the discussion includes translation of positive evaluative adjectives, superlative forms, keywords plus foreign and invented words, whereas cultural references are not translated in the TT.

A. Positive adjectives are found to be translated by both the literal translation (4) and adaptation (10). Some of these adjectives are exemplified below:

Table 6
Examples of translation of positive adjectives

ST2			TT2	Type of Translation
	Romanisation	Tentative Translation		
จุดเด่นของวัดคงจะหนีไม่พ้น การเดินขึ้นบันได 344 ขั้น	<i>chutden khongwat khong cha ni mai phon kan doen khuen bandai 344 khan</i>	Highlight of the temple must be walking up the 344-step staircase	One of the <i>famous</i> highlights of this Temple is its spiral staircase of 344 steps.	Adaptation (addition)
ST3			TT3	Type of Translation
	Romanisation	Tentative Translation		
-	-	-	Every visitor to Bangkok should see the <i>magnificent</i> buildings within the Grand Palace compound...	Adaptation (addition)

The examples from ST/TT2 about the Golden Mount Temple and ST/TT3 about the Royal Grand Palace showcase how the texts are rendered by adaptation. As for ST/TT2, *famous* is added to stress *highlights*. It should be noted here that the collocation *famous highlights* seems to be unnatural in the English language⁸; it shows non-nativeness (Pierini, 2007, p. 96), reflecting the translator's insufficient knowledge in the English writing conventions. Adaptation by addition in this case makes the TT sounds odd. Meanwhile, ST/TT3 has the whole sentence added. The positive adjective *magnificent* is used to modify the beauty and elegance of the Royal Grand Palace buildings. In the second instance, the positive adjective provides a positive image to the described destination.

B. Superlative forms are found to have three literal translations and three adaptations. As shown in Table 7 below, ST/TT2 talks about the stupa at the Golden Mount Temple. An addition of *one of* changes the ST meaning from *the largest and most elegant stupa* to *one of the most beautiful and gigantic stupas*. Thus, different, or wrong, information is given in the TT. A similar instance takes place with ST/TT6 that describes the Erawan Shrine. Addition alters the original meaning from *the first large-scale Brahma shrine* to *the first largest shrine housing Phra Phrom*⁹. In these two cases, adaptation by addition falsifies the information of the ST.

Table 7
Examples of translation of superlative forms

ST2			TT2	Type of Translation
	Romanisation	Tentative Translation		
พระมหาเจดีย์ที่ยิ่งใหญ่และสง่างามที่สุดแห่งกรุงรัตนโกสินทร์	<i>phra maha chedi thi yingyai lae sa-nga ngam thisut haeng krung rattanakosin</i>	the largest and most elegant stupa of Bangkok	one of <i>the most</i> beautiful and gigantic stupas in that era.	Adaptation (addition)
ST6			TT6	Type of Translation
	Romanisation	Tentative Translation		
ศาลพระพรหมศาลแรกที่มีขนาดใหญ่	<i>san phra phrom san raek thi mi khanat yai</i>	the first large-scale Brahma shrine	<i>the first largest</i> shrine housing Phra Phrom	adaptation (addition)

C. Holiday keywords plus foreign and invented words are mostly translated literally—15 words

⁸ <https://ozdic.com/collocation/highlight> Last accessed 30th September 2021.

⁹ *Phra Phrom* is the Brahma God in Thai language.

whereas four are adapted as shown in Table 8. ST/TT2, which mentions the Reclining Buddha Temple, talks about the Chinese stone ballasts decorating the temple grounds. *Ancient* is added in the TT to *Another highlight is a vast array of ancient Chinese sculptures*. The addition helps to stress the antiquity of these sculptures that were brought from mainland China over a century ago. In ST/TT3, which is about the Royal Grand Palace, *The Grand Palace is used for ceremonial purposes* is added to the TT. This specific modifier offers a sense of celebration specifically and occasionally occurring in the Palace that mostly involves the royal family, an institution existing only in certain countries. Therefore, the adaptation by addition here elaborates the TT in its sense of antiquity and celebration of the historical and cultural tourism.

Table 8
Examples of translation of holiday keywords plus foreign and invented words

ST2			TT2	Type of Translation
	Romanisation	Tentative Translation		
อีกหนึ่งไฮไลต์เด่นคือเหล่าตุ๊กตาคีน	<i>ik nueng hai lai den khue lao tukkata chin</i>	Another highlight is the Chinese stone dolls	Another highlight is a vast array of ancient Chinese sculptures	Adaptation (addition)
ST3			TT3	Type of Translation
	Romanisation	Tentative Translation		
-	-	-	The Grand Palace is used for ceremonial purposes.	Adaptation (addition)

Syntactic level

Similar to the lexical features, the tourism discursive aspects concerning the syntactic elements are found to be less in the TT. This paper discusses and exemplifies instances of the nominalisation, imperative, and direct address that show interesting ways of rendering these features in the TT.

A. Nominalisation, which is scarcely found in the ST, is not available in the TT since certain ST nominalisations are adjusted into modifier. Examples are shown in Table 9. ST/TT1 talks about the temples in Bangkok. The ST nominalisation¹⁰ is removed and adapted to *beautiful* architecture in the TT. Similarly, ST/TT6, which tells about the Erawan Shrine, also adapts the original nominalisation to a verb *construct*. Although nominalisation is a preference of tourism discourse, this specific syntactic feature tends to formalise the text as found in the academic writing (Prasithratsint, 2014, pp. 1-3). The Thai and translated TPTs, by considering the lexical and syntactic choices used, do not show high level of formality. It can be argued that the text belonging to the TPT requires less formality but is more reader friendly with informal, clear, and direct writing style. Therefore, although the TT lacks this specific feature characterising tourism discourse, the English TPTs tend to be clearer and more reader friendly.

¹⁰ Nominalisation is also found in Thai language by means of adding a lexical noun การ *kan* or ความ *khvam* (Prasithratsint, 2005, p. 1) with the former signifying an action and the latter a state (Kawtrakul et al., 2002, p. 1) in front of a verb, adjective, or adverb such as ท่องเที่ยว *thongthiao* (to travel) to การท่องเที่ยว *kan thongthiao* (travelling) or สวยงาม *suai-ngam* (beautiful) to ความสวยงาม *khvam suai-ngam* (beauty).

Table 9
Examples of translation of nominalisation

ST1	Romanisation	Tentative Translation	TT1	Type of Translation
	ความสวยงามทางสถาปัตยกรรม	<i>khwam suai-ngam thang sathapattayakam</i>		
ST6	Romanisation	Tentative Translation	TT6	Type of Translation
	หลังจากการก่อสร้างโรงแรมแล้วเสร็จ	<i>langchak kan kosang rongraem laeo set</i>		

B. Imperative is found in four repetitive sub-headings *Not-to-be-missed Highlights* and three clauses, two of which are literally translated and the other one is adapted. Table 10 shows the imperative found at the end of ST/TT2 informing the reader about the proper clothes for visiting temples. This imperative is *DO NOT wear*. The ST clauses omit the subjects, which are *you*¹¹, whereas tourists is used as the subject in the first TT clause. The modality “ต้อง” (must) is used in the Thai text to show strong imposition that something has to be done as instructed because temples are highly respected areas in Thai culture. In the second clause, the original TPT uses “ควร” (should) that contains a lower level of imposition in order to suggest choices of appropriate clothes that tourists can wear. However, the translated version contains a stronger prohibition on inappropriate clothes and adds more details about these clothes. The list of prohibited clothes in the TT can suggest that the TPT wants to inform the foreign tourists with different cultural backgrounds about showing respect to the religious places, which are also tourist destinations, by means of wearing the proper clothes. This helps the tourists prepare and at the same time learn about Thai culture in order not to cause offence.

Table 10
Examples of translation of imperative

ST2	Romanisation	Tentative Translation	TT2	Type of Translation
	เนื่องด้วยเป็นพุทธสถาน จึงต้องแต่งกายให้สุภาพเรียบร้อย โดยควรสวมกระโปรงหรือกางเกงที่ยาวเลยเข่าลงไป เสื้อ มีแขน ไม่รัดรูปจนเกินไปนัก	<i>nueangduai pen phut sathan chueng tong taengkai hai suphap riaproi doi kham suam kraprong rue kangkeng thi yao loei khao long pai suea mi khaen mai ratrup chon koenpai nak</i>		

¹¹ Subject of a sentence can be omitted in Thai language.

C. As to direct address, three are found and all of which are rendered by means of adaptation. ST/TT2 examples are taken from the Temple of Dawn script describing the temple decorations. The direct communication style is not available in the ST. In addition, the nominalisation “การประดับตกแต่ง” (decoration) is used. As briefly mentioned earlier, nominalisation tends to formalise the text. For example, the second personal pronoun *you* is added in the TT to communicate directly with the reader. However, this specific feature is available only in TT2, so the English TPTs in general are shy of the conversational characteristic the tourism language is supposed to possess. Thus, the text becomes less personalised and the reader seems more like an observer than an interlocutor. Indirect communicative writing style thus keeps the reader at bay. As a result, it may be unable to draw the reader’s attention and persuade him or her to visit the real sites.

Table 11
Examples of translation of direct address

ST2	Romanisation	Tentative Translation	TT2	Type of Translation
นอกจากนี้ยังมีการประดับตกแต่งด้วยกิณนร กิณรี ยักษ์ เทวดา และพญาคูรุฑ	<i>nokchak ni yang mi kan pradap toktaeng duai kinnon kinri yak thewada lae phaya khрут</i>	Besides, it is decorated with Kinnorn, (a mythical half man and half bird), Kinnari (a mythical half woman and half bird), demons, angels, and garudas.	Furthermore, <i>you</i> can see a variety of sculptures around the Temple like Kinnari, giants, angels, and garudas.	adaptation (addition and deletion)
ST2	Romanisation	Tentative Translation	TT2	Type of Translation
อีกหนึ่งไฮไลต์ที่ควรค่าแก่การไปแวะภาพก็คือ ชุมประตู่ทางเข้าสู่พระอุโบสถด้านตะวันออก ที่มีทวารบาลยืนพร้อมกระบองคู่ใจ อย่าง “ทศกัณฐ์” ราชแห่งยักษ์ เจ้าครองกรุงลงกา และอีกยักษ์หนึ่งที่อยู่ทางซ้าย ภายสีขาวยี่ชื่อว่า “สหัสเดชะ” เจ้าครองเมืองปางตาล มีฤทธิ์มากเช่นเดียวกับทศกัณฐ์	<i>ik nueng hai lai thi kluan kha kae kan pai chae phap kokhue sum pratu thang khaosu phra ubosot dan tawan-ok thi mi thawanban yuen phrom krabong khuchai</i>	Another highlight worth snapping a photo is the eastern entrance of the ordination hall where two standing guardians are holding their favourite club, p. “Tossakan” the king of demons and Long Ka City and the other demon on the left in white colour is called “Sahasadecha” the king of Pang Tan City who is as powerful as Tossakan	Another must-attend activity <i>you</i> don’t want to miss is taking a photo with the 2 temple guardians, p. Tossakan, King of Krung Long Ka, and Sahasadecha, King of Pang Tan City. Both of the demons are very powerful.	Adaptation (addition and deletion)

Textual level

Similar to the ST, the TT also performs the informative function of the TPT. However, the shortened TT means less information is provided to the reader. With the adaptation approach of translation by summarising the text, the TT may reduce the overload of information provided for the foreign audience who are not acquainted with the ST culturally and historically detailed information (Kelly, 1998, p. 35). It also accommodates the reader’s comprehension about these historical attractions. Omission of certain information and paragraphs of the ST that are deemed irrelevant or too specific also makes the text more reader friendly which in turn attracts the reader’s attention. This therefore helps the text perform a certain degree of the persuasive function. Still, the insufficiency of positive adjectives to create desirable feelings and images and direct writing style to communicate with the reader may decrease the reader’s attention and involvement.

Table 12
Example of translation at textual level

ST2			TT2	Type of Translation
	Romanisation	Tentative Translation		
อีกหนึ่งไฮไลต์ห้ามพลาดก็คือ ภาพจิตรกรรมฝาผนังภายในพระอุโบสถ ที่เป็นภาพเขียนภายในของคูหาผนังทั้ง 8 ที่ สมเด็จพระมหาสมณเจ้า กรมพระยาวชิรญาณวโรรส ทรงกำหนดให้เขียนเป็น “จอมเจดีย์” ที่สำคัญของสยามทั้งหมด 8 องค์ สะท้อนอุดมคติเรื่องพื้นที่ และเขตแดนสมัยใหม่	<i>ik nueng hai lai ham phlat kokhue phap chittrakam faphanang phainai phra ubosot thi pen phapkhian phainai chong khuha phanang thang 8 thi somdet kromphraya damrong ra chanu phap song kamnot hai khian pen thisamkhan khong sayam thangmot 8 ong sathon udomkhati rueang phuenthi lae khetdaen samaimai</i>	Another highlight that cannot be missed is the mural paintings inside of the ordination hall. The paintings are inside eight frames on the walls that His Royal Highness Prince Damrong Rajanubhab asked to paint the eight “important stupas” of Siam. (The paintings) reflect the modern ideology on space and border.	Other highlights tourists can’t afford to miss are the murals around the ubosot displaying the History of 8 important pagodas of Siam, as well as 11 Buddha images in various styles dating from several periods.	adaptation (addition and deletion)
นอกจากนี้ยังมีจิตรกรรมฝาผนังพระที่นั่งทรงผนวช ที่ได้รับการโปรดเกล้าฯ ให้เขียนขึ้นตั้งแต่สมัยรัชกาลที่ 5 ที่เป็นภาพเขียนแบบภาพเหมือนจริง มีระยะใกล้ไกล งดงามอย่างยิ่ง	<i>nokchakni yang mi chittrakam faphanang phra thinang song phanuut thi dairap kan protkela paiyannoi hai khian khuen tangtae samai ratchakan thi 5 thi pen phap khianbaep phap muean ching mi raya klai klai ngotngam yangying</i>	Besides, there are mural paintings at Song Panuad building that were commissioned by King Rama V. The paintings are realistic with exquisite perspective.	-	-
พระพุทธรูปที่พระระเบียงพระอุโบสถ เป็นอีกหนึ่งไฮไลต์ของวัด ด้วยความงามของ “พุทธศิลป์” เรียงรายพระอิริยาบถยืนและนั่งสลบกันถึง 11 ปาง บนฐานปูนปั้นลายไทยปิดทองสวยงาม	<i>phraphuttharup thi phra rabiang phra ubosot pen ik nueng hai lai khongwat duai khwam ngam khong phut sin riangrai phra iriyabot yuen lae nang salap kan thueng 11 pang bon than punpan lai thai pit thong suai-ngam</i>	Buddha statues at the corridor enclosing the ordination hall are another highlight of the temple. With the beauty of “Buddhist Iconography”, 11 different sitting and standing postures on the Thai style gilded stucco bases are along the corridor.	-	-

Table 12 compares the ST2 and TT2 information. It can be seen that the TT omits certain information in the ST paragraph, and the two lower paragraphs are not translated. However, the information in the last paragraph regarding the eleven postures of the Buddha statue is included in the TT. Unfortunately, with the comparison, it shows that the TT provides ambiguous and different information from the ST in terms of meaning and fact. As it is used as an example of the use of foreign word, *ubosot* is not provided with the definition (the ordination hall), so the reader is left to guess the meaning. Besides, the murals are inside of the *ubosot*, not around, as appeared in the TT. In addition, the ST describes 11 different postures of Buddha statues along the enclosed corridor around the ordination hall. The TT mistakenly refers to 11 Buddha statues. Incorrect translation at lexical and syntactic levels as well as wrong information are found in many places in the English TPTs. This confirms the downside of the translated TPTs discussed in the introduction. However, it is not an objective of the current paper to discuss this specific issue and its possible solutions, but rather a further step of the research project.

With rather limited uses of lexical and syntactic components of tourism language in the ST, the TT that is a partial translation of the ST consequently contains less of the tourism discursive characteristics. As a result, although the TT performs the informative function duly, the persuasive force tends to be insufficient.

Overall, following the analytical framework, the findings show the restricted uses of tourism discursive elements, especially the positive adjectives, superlative forms, and direct communicational style in the English translation of Thai TPTs. The main reasons of this insufficiency are the relatively lack of these linguistic features in the ST itself and the shortened translated version. This shortcoming due to inadequate quality of ST material conforms to the studies of Durán Muñoz (2011, p. 45); Durán Muñoz (2012, p. 347); Kelly (1998, p. 36); and Valdeón (2009, p. 43). In the case of the analysed Thai texts, it is likely that it is not meant to be written for translation, or what Cappelli (2008, p. 102) defines as the process of writing to be translated as *internationalization*, but for the local Thai audience. Then the translation into other languages can simply use it as the ST. As a result, when it comes to the translation where literal translation and adaptation approaches are identified, the way in which these constituents are modified by adaptation, which is found to be the main approach, results in both increasing the characteristics of the tourism text while decreasing its original meanings in the TT. By means of heightening the tourism language, the addition of evaluative adjectives and superlative forms are often used in the TT at the lexical level. On the contrary, deletion can be explained in terms of shortening the original text to reduce the information overload for tourists, especially the culture-specific terms that appear throughout the ST. However, albeit with the adaptation, few uses of tourism linguistic tools in general still restrict the overall TT to be the effective TPTs according to the proposed framework.

CONCLUSION

This paper seeks to answer two enquiries: first, what tourism discursive features are available in the English translation of the Thai TPTs; and second, how are these features translated in the English version. The analyses found the translation contains nearly all but a few uses of tourism linguistic elements that are the positive adjectives, superlative forms, holiday keywords plus foreign and invented words, and cultural references in the lexical level; imperative and direct address in the syntactic level; and informative and persuasive functions at the textual level. However, with little use of these constituents, the English TPTs exhibit low efficiency of tourism language. This is partially due to the fair use of tourism elements in the ST and the shortened translated version that certain ST information is excluded. The findings also show that literal translation and adaptation are identified in the TT. While the former directly transfers the original meaning, the latter modifies the TT in the way that helps to increase the tourism characteristic but at the same time alters the original meaning.

THE AUTHOR

Pasakara Chueasuai is currently a lecturer at the Department of English, University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce. He holds a PhD in Translation and Intercultural Studies from the University of Manchester, UK and his research interests include translation studies, systemic functional linguistics, and multimodality.

pasakara_chu@utcc.ac.th

REFERENCES

- Biltae, P., Suktharacharn, M., & Timyaem, N. (2021). Translation strategies used to translate cultural terms in cultural tourism handbooks. *Vacana*, 9(2), 44-65. <https://rs.mfu.ac.th/ojs/index.php/vacana/article/view/323/233>
- Capelli, G. (2008). The translation of tourism-related websites and localization: Problems and perspectives. In A. Baicchi (Ed.), *Voices on translation: Linguistic, multimedia, and cognitive perspectives* (pp. 97–115). Bulzoni Editore.
- Dann, G. (1996). *The language of tourism: A sociolinguistic perspective*. CAB international.
- Durán Muñoz, I. (2011). Tourist translations as a mediation tool: Misunderstandings and difficulties. *Cadernos De Tradução*, 1(27), 29-49. <https://doi.org/10.5007/2175-7968.2011v1n27p29>
- Durán Muñoz, I. (2012). Analysing common mistakes in translations of tourist texts (Spanish, English and German). *Onomázein*, 26(2), 335-349. <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=134525391012>
- Durán Muñoz, I. (2019). Adjectives and their keyness: A corpus-based analysis in English tourism. *Corpora*, 14(3), 351-378. https://www.academia.edu/37125812/Adjectives_and_their_Keyness_A_Corpus-based_Analysis_on_Tourism_Discourse_in_English
- Gandin, S. (2013). Translating the language of tourism. A corpus-based study on the translational tourism English corpus (T-TourEC). *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 95, 325-335. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.654>
- Kawtrakul, A., Suktarachan, M., Varasai, P., & Chanlekha, H. (2002). A state of the art of Thai language resources and Thai language behavior analysis and modeling. *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Asian Language Resources and International Standardization*, 12, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.3115/1118759.1118766>
- Kelly, D. (1998). The translation of texts from the tourist sector: Textual conventions, cultural distance and other constraints. *TRANS*, 2, 33-42. <https://doi.org/10.24310/TRANS.1998.v0i2.2354>
- Larson, M. L. (1998). *Meaning-based translation: A guide to cross-language equivalence*. University Press of America.
- Newmark, P. (1991). *About translation*. Multilingual Matters.
- Newmark, P. (1995). *A textbook of translation*. Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E. (1993). *Language, culture and translating*. Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Novozhilova, A., Korolkova, S., Shovgenina, Y., & Shovgenin, A. (2018). Pragmatics of translating tourism discourse texts. In S. Cindori et al. (Ed.), *The International Scientific and Practical Conference "Current Issues of Linguistics and Didactics: The Interdisciplinary Approach in Humanities and Social Sciences (CILDAH-2018)*. (pp. 627-632). EDP Sciences. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20185001121>
- Pierini, P. (2007). Quality in web translation: An investigation into UK and Italian tourism web sites. *The Journal of Specialized Translation*, 8, 85-103. https://www.jostrans.org/issue08/art_pierini.pdf
- Prasithratsint, A. (2005). Nominalization and verbalization of verbs in Thai. In P. Sidwell (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 15th Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society* (pp. 73-81). Pacific Linguistic.
- Prasithratsint, A. (2014). Nominalization as a marker of detachment and objectivity in Thai academic writing. *Manusya*, 17(3), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1163/26659077-01703001>

- Sasongkor, K. (2019). A comparative study of human translation and machine translation (Google Translate) in hotel websites from Thai to English [Master's thesis, Thammasat University]. <https://doi.org/10.14457/TU.the.2019.1199>
- Sulaiman, M. Z. (2014). Translating the style of tourism promotional discourse: A cross cultural journey into stylescapes. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 118(19), 503-510. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.02.069>
- Sulaiman, M. Z., & Wilson, R. (2018a). Translating tourism promotional materials: A cultural conceptual model. *Perspectives*, 26(5), 629-645. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2018.1437193>
- Sulaiman, M. Z., & Wilson, R. (2018b). Translating adventure tourism: From action to relaxation. *Journal of Language Studies*, 18(3), 1-16. <http://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2018-1803-01>
- Valdeón, R. A. (2009). Info-promotional material discourse and its translation: The case of the Asturian Tourist Board texts. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 10(1), 21-47. <https://doi.org/10.1556/Acr.10.2009.1.2>
- Veselica Majhut, S. (2021). Did you try our good smoked ham? Assessing the quality of translation as cross-cultural mediation on Croatian Tourist Board websites. *English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries*, 18(1), 151-167. <https://doi.org/10.4312/elope.18.1.151-167>
- Vinay, J. P., & Dabelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation*. Translated and Edited by Juan C. Sager and M. -J. Hamel. Benjamin Publishing.