

## LINGUOCULTURAL AND DISCURSIVE FEATURES OF RURAL TOURISM TERMINOLOGY

**Ostonov Utkir Yangiboyevich**

Acting associate professor of the department  
“Teaching to languages” Samarkand  
Institute of economics and service  
e-mail. [ostonovutkir@mail.ru](mailto:ostonovutkir@mail.ru)

**Abstract:** This article examines the linguocultural characteristics of the terminological system of rural tourism. The study focuses on the functional roles of rural tourism terminology in informational, communicative, and expressive discourse. Special attention is given to the semantic structure, pragmatic features, and discursive potential of rural tourism terms derived from geography, ethnography, ecology, history, and agronomy.

**Keywords:** rural tourism, terminology, linguocultural analysis, tourism discourse, national identity, cultural heritage, ethnolinguistics, metaphor, intercultural communication

**Аннотация:** В статье рассматриваются лингвокультурные особенности терминологической системы сельского туризма. Основное внимание уделяется функциональным аспектам терминологии сельского туризма, выполняющей информационные, коммуникативные и экспрессивные функции в туристическом дискурсе. Анализируется семантическая структура, прагматические особенности и дискурсивный потенциал терминов, заимствованных из географии, этнографии, экологии, истории и агрономии.

**Ключевые слова:** сельский туризм, терминология, лингвокультурный анализ, туристический дискурс, национальная идентичность, культурное наследие, этнолингвистика, метафора, межкультурная коммуникация

Analysis of the linguocultural features of the terminological system of rural tourism places particular emphasis on its functional orientations. This system performs various forms of communication implemented in the tourism process—informational, communicative, and expressive functions. Within the informational function, rural tourism terms serve to provide tourists with accurate information about natural and cultural objects of rural areas. For example, terms such as “historical site,” “cultural monument,” and “handmade product” introduce tourists to the distinctive features of rural regions.

In the communicative function, lexical units related to rural tourism facilitate interaction between tourism stakeholders—local residents and tourists—and ensure social and cultural exchange in the process of providing tourism services. The terms used in this process function as tools of intercultural dialogue, shaping unity among representatives of different cultures through language. For instance, words such as “guesthouse,” “hospitality,” and “local cuisine” represent the linguistic centers of this communication.

Within the expressive function, rural tourism terminology serves to convey the emotional, aesthetic, and cultural images of rural life. This is explained by the enrichment of terms with metaphorical and symbolic meanings. Expressions such as “the heart of the village,” “the hand

of nature,” and “the breathing of trees” evoke a unique rural atmosphere in tourists and enhance their aesthetic perception through language.

Another important aspect of linguistic analysis is the semantic structure of rural tourism terminology. This system is often formed from the lexicon of specialized fields such as geography, ethnography, history, ecology, and agronomy. The combined use of these terms reflects the multifaceted and complex nature of rural tourism. For example, terms such as “eco-route,” “local handicraft product,” and “traditional village festival” illuminate various aspects of the tourism process.

Rural tourism terminology also functions as a cultural bridge. It is an important tool for promoting rural culture at national and international levels and for encouraging cultural exchange through tourism. The language and culture of rural areas acquire new meanings and forms in the global cultural space through rural tourism terminology.

In studying the linguocultural features of the rural tourism terminological system, its impact on discourse deserves special attention. In the communication process within the field of rural tourism, terminology functions not only as a means of information transfer but also as an instrument for creating and shaping discourse. This discourse ensures the global promotion of rural culture through tourism and the preservation of national and regional identities through language. Within the discourse context, the meanings and functions of terms expand, and their role in reflecting the socio-cultural aspects of tourism changes.

From a linguocultural perspective, the structural features of rural tourism terminology are also significant. Within this terminology, unique morphological and syntactic constructions and multi-word phraseological units are frequently encountered. For example, terms such as “local handicraft items,” “rural tourism route,” and “traditional village food festival” simultaneously express the cultural, economic, and ecological dimensions of tourism activities. These combinations expand the semantic layer of language and enrich the field of meanings.

The extensive use of linguistic devices such as metaphor and metonymy further enriches the linguocultural features of rural tourism terminology. For instance, “the heart of the village” as a metaphor denotes the main or cultural center of a village, while the metonymy “orchard” symbolically represents rural natural beauty and productive potential. These linguistic devices play a crucial role in creating the aesthetic and cultural images of rural tourism.

Examples:

1. “Tourists are invited to experience the heart of the village—from bread baking with locals to attending folk music evenings.”

2. “Visitors can walk through the orchard and pick fresh apricots during the harvest season.”

Furthermore, discursive strategies within rural tourism terminology reveal linguistic methods aimed at preserving and developing national identification and cultural heritage. For example, incorporating terms derived from local dialects and vernaculars into the terminological system highlights linguistic diversity and cultural richness, thereby strengthening national consciousness among tourism stakeholders.

From the perspective of linguistic pragmatics, words and expressions used in rural tourism perform various types of speech acts, including description, invitation, encouragement, and recommendation. For instance, phrases such as “we invite you to visit the village,” “explore local traditions,” and “join the eco-tourism route” attract tourists and encourage their active participation in tourism activities.

The linguocultural features of rural tourism terminology are closely connected with innovative processes within the language. The development of modern tourism leads to the creation of new words and terms and the assignment of new semantic layers to existing ones, demonstrating that language is a dynamic and evolving system.

The terminological system of rural tourism is a complex linguocultural structure that reflects the close relationship between language and culture and performs communicative, semantic, and pragmatic functions. It plays an important role in preserving and promoting the national and regional identity of rural areas through language. This system reveals not only the theoretical foundations of rural tourism but also its cultural and social significance in practical activities, creating conditions for the emergence of new linguistic forms and expressions.

One of the linguocultural aspects of rural tourism terminology is its function as a means of national identification. Through rural tourism terms, the customs, values, and cultural traditions of the Uzbek people are preserved in linguistic form and transmitted to future generations. For example, words such as “dasturxon,” “hospitality,” and “mahalla” are not merely lexical units but cultural-conceptual elements that reflect the socio-cultural life and value system of the Uzbek people. These terms serve as tools for promoting and preserving local culture in rural tourism activities.

Another important linguocultural feature of rural tourism terminology is its contextual and pragmatic flexibility. Terms and expressions are used in various contexts of communication between tourism stakeholders—tourists and local residents. For instance, terms such as “agro-eco route,” “local handicrafts,” and “sustainable use of natural resources” are used not only in academic or official texts but also in tourism promotional materials, signposts, excursion programs, and conversations with tourists. Depending on the context, these terms expand their meanings and adapt to new communicative functions.

Linguistically, rural tourism terminology often appears in the form of multi-word units (phraseological expressions) that precisely express different aspects of tourism. For example, phrases such as “services based on local traditions,” “natural beauty of the village,” and “eco-friendly products” reflect the ecological, cultural, and economic orientations of rural tourism. These phraseological units convey not only lexical meaning but also specific cultural and social significance.

Ethnolinguistic elements also play an important role in rural tourism terminology. Terms used in this field often reflect national and ethnic specificity, folk traditions, and customs. For example, words such as “kurash,” “beshbarmak,” “sumalak,” and “wedding ceremony” represent key attributes of rural culture and familiarize tourists with this heritage. This highlights the role of rural tourism in preserving and promoting cultural heritage from a linguocultural perspective.

In addition, multilingualism and intercultural communication are prominent in rural tourism terminology. In a multiethnic and multilingual country such as Uzbekistan, terms from Uzbek, Russian, Karakalpak, Tajik, and other languages are used together in rural tourism activities. In this linguistic contact zone, the terminological system develops as an integration of units from different languages, contributing to the development of intercultural communication.

Overall, the terminological system of rural tourism, with its linguocultural features, not only enriches the cultural content of language but also reflects the cultural-spiritual and socio-economic potential of rural tourism. This system strengthens the close relationship between

language and culture, preserving national identity, promoting cultural heritage, and reinforcing the country's position within the global tourism process.

#### **REFERENCES**

1. Gulmuratova, M. (2025). *Lexical-Semantic Features of Tourism Terms in English and Uzbek Languages*. Analysis of lexical-semantic features of tourism terms. Retrieved from [scientific-jl.com](http://scientific-jl.com)
2. Sobirova, Z. R. (2025). *Study of the Terms of Tourism in English on Lexical-Semantic Aspects*. Investigation of tourism terminology from a lexical-semantic perspective. Retrieved from [iejrd.com](http://iejrd.com)
3. Yakubova, N., (2024). *Linguocognitive Analysis of Tourism Terms in English, Uzbek and Russian Languages*. Linguocognitive analysis of tourism terms in three languages. Retrieved from [academicpublishers.org](http://academicpublishers.org)
4. Abdullayeva, U. N. (2025). *Polysemy in Tourism-Related Terminology in English and Uzbek Languages*. Analysis of polysemy in tourism-related lexical units. Retrieved from [academicpublishers.org](http://academicpublishers.org)
5. Kuchkarova, G. A. (2025). *Tourism Terms in Uzbek and English: Lexical and Cultural Aspects*. Examination of lexical and cultural features of tourism terminology. Retrieved from [theusajournals.com](http://theusajournals.com)