

MODEL OF TOURISM TERMINOLOGY IMPLEMENTATION IN LANGUAGE FOR TOURISM PURPOSES UNIVERSITY COURSES

Tina Orel Frank

Faculty of Tourism Studies, Turistica, University of Primorska, Slovenia
Corresponding Author Email: tina.orel@fts.upr.si

Article Info	Abstract
Article History Received: February 2022 Revised: March 2022 Published: April 2022	<i>Terminology is one of the key language elements in developing communicative competence in any language for specific purposes course. Like any other field of knowledge, tourism has certain peculiarities in its terminology. The aim of this paper is to develop a model for the effective implementation of LTP (language for tourism purposes) in a university tourism-related language course. To achieve this goal, the typology of tourism terminology was investigated through a literature review and a study of the characteristics of tourism terminology and its teaching from the perspective of teachers and students at the University of Primorska. The results are presented in a model for the implementation of LTP terminology, which proposes methods and activities for teaching tourism terminology, which tends to be multidisciplinary, internationalised and (de)terminologized. The findings are not limited to tourism-related foreign language courses, but can be applied to any LSP university course.</i>
Keywords Language for Tourism Purposes; Tourism Terminology; Teaching Terminology;	
How to cite: Frank, T. O. (2022). Model of Tourism Terminology Implementation in Language for Tourism Purposes University Courses, <i>JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching</i> , 10(2), pp. 148-160. DOI: https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v%vi%i.4778	

INTRODUCTION

The most important feature of a language for specific purposes is its field-specific terminology, which refers to the conceptual information of the field named by specific terms. In defining terminology, we refer to Vintar (2008, 37-39), who says that the only possible criterion for determining a term is its function and its specialized use - formal universal criteria for distinguishing terms from non-terms cannot exist - and Gabrovšek (2005, 16-17), who defines terms in the broadest sense as lexemes that refer to specific concepts within a given field and form a subsystem of knowledge. In the past, a term was recognized as a kind of static entity, while the more recent approaches determine its dynamic character and consider it as a "verbalized special concept that appears and improves in the process of cognition" (Leichik, 2012, 235).

"To know the terminology of a field is to acquire knowledge of it" (Cabre, 2008, 358). As a professional, it is necessary to be terminologically competent, which is understood as the basis for the formation of professional foreign language communication competence of future professionals and is one of the main tasks of foreign language teaching in a non-linguistic university (Bakirova, 2020). Unfortunately, Vepreva (2011) notes that the methodology of teaching the oriented foreign language vocabulary is not sufficiently developed. In particular, the author (ibid.) highlights the insufficient methodology of developing lexical abilities and skills when teaching the special foreign language vocabulary. On this basis, we can agree with Bakirova (2021), who recently stated that "the search for new methodological solutions that will ensure in practice high-quality mastery by students of the foreign language terminology of their professional industry, does not lose its relevance" (Bakirova, 2021).

"A ESP course is expected to cover the terminology of their discipline." (Meristo & Lopez Arias 2020, 251). The thorough acquisition of a conceptual framework by students depends on

the systematic acquisition of the terminological lexicon of the tourism industry (Yakubova, 2008, 264). Nowadays, foreign words, especially English, are widely used, especially in "secondary" languages such as Slovenian (as the office language at the Faculty of Tourism Studies - Turistica in Slovenia, where the survey in this paper was conducted). English is often referred to as the language of international travel, business and communication. Nevertheless, interlingual borrowing is a frequent and common process in any living general or specialised language. This is particularly evident in areas with a particularly international character, such as tourism, which is also noted by Sokolova (2020). Therefore, as Ciobanu (2015) notes, there are also many English terms in tourism lexicons worldwide, and Slovenian is no exception. There are expressions in Slovenian that are used in English either out of necessity, but mainly out of luxury, so that an English equivalent replaces an existing or pre-existing Slovenian word in order to sound modern, rather than using an existing Slovenian equivalent (e.g. English term booking instead of Slovenian term rezervacija). Anglicisms are chosen wisely to attract the attention of readers, viewers, or listeners in the fields of marketing and journalism, while the greatest influence is clearly observed in the fields of politics, technology, science, sports, tourism, and culture (Sokolova, 2020). Since recently many linguists have noted that the extent of English influence on "secondary" languages has become overwhelming and possibly a dangerous trend, it is important to incorporate the new tourism terminology into LTP classes, paying particular attention to making students, as future professionals, especially aware of this problem by providing them with methods to overcome this problem in future term formation.

Tourism language has been observed by several authors (Dann 1996, 2012; Jaworski & Pritchard, 2005; Jaworski & Thurlow, 2010; Mikolič, 2015). In recent times tourism terminology gained more focus, especially due to its fast development mirroring tourism extensive growth and progress. Authors focus on tourism terminology development in the digital age (Hasanova, 2018; Mihaylova-Palanska, 2020), its register variation (Pulcini, 2012), the extensive use of anglicisms in modern tourism language (Gimenez Folques, 2015), its semantic and structural relations (Kuchkarova, 2021), pragmatics (Nazarova, 2021), antonym prefixation in English tourism terminology (Yurko & Styfanyshyn 2020; Antolijivna & Mykolayivna, 2020). Certain authors focus and assess the development of certain term clusters inside a specific type of concept of tourism, eg in religious tourism (Jackowski (2000); Küpeli, Koc & Hassan, 2016; Khan 2016). Translation issues and procedures are also a focus of authors dealing with tourism terminology (e.g. Mammadova, 2021). Nevertheless, the field of language of tourism and its terminology is well researched and also a vast number of published work focuses on English language skills teaching for a successful tourism careers (e.g. Zahedpisheh, 2017; Erazo et.al., 2019), there are up to date and to our knowledge no research of the implementation of tourism terminology in university courses. Hence this paper is trying to fill the void by establishing The Model of Tourism Terminology Implementation in Language for Tourism Purposes University Courses.

T TYPOLOGY OF TOURIM TERMINOLOGY

The field language of tourism covers several contexts, from its use within the tourism industry, to the scientific, multidisciplinary nature of tourism, to its use in the broader social context. Dann (2012) defines it as three-layered (tourism industry, academia, and public). These three layers are in a constant relationship, which is probably also one of the most active within all disciplines and sciences. The creation of concepts and their naming takes place at the level of all three layers, and the special interest of tourism lies precisely in the fact that it is difficult to draw a clear line between the scientific, the professional or the general part of its own field. Consequently, the understanding of tourism terminology can be very broad. A wide range of subject areas and a high number of multidisciplinary terms show that tourism is a distinctly

interdisciplinary activity that is closely connected with other fields (Mikolič, 2015, 16). In its global development, with the emergence of internationalisms, tourism can also be characterized as an interlingual field, where new terms to describe tourism concepts are rapidly formed through interlingual transition. This is also helped by the high topicality of the field, which in its short history has become a comprehensive global activity with the emergence of the concept of leisure, easier access to travel, and the opening of new markets (such as China). In line with these processes, tourism is a rather autochthonous field, and the recent vocabulary consequently remains inconsistent. As a result of the aforementioned tourism characteristics, its terminology is rather inconsistent, full of synonyms, Anglicisms, neologisms, internationalisms and transterms, and the processes of (de/trans)terminologization seem to be very active (Mikolič & Beguš 2011, 315).

From the justification of the existence of the regional discourse on tourism also comes the need to define the terminology of tourism. Preparing an effective ESP course depends on identifying students' needs (Anthony 2018), but we might add that a thorough study of the characteristics of field terminology (as one of the key elements in a ESP course) is also required. ESP teachers might often face a major challenge here, as they often lack content field knowledge (Li & Flowerdew 2020; Woodrow 2017). Therefore, Anthony (2018) emphasises the need for collaboration between subject matter experts and ESP teachers. The terminology typology in tourism is very specific given the wide field of the language community, which includes both the scientific and professional language of tourism and its more general part through tourists and local communities. In general, the terms in tourism (as a culture-dependent field) can be classified as pseudoperscriptive terms, which means that they are often ambiguous, unstable, non-economic and strongly text-independent (Žagar Karer, 2011, 35).

Taking into account the peculiarities of tourism and the communicative context of its terminology in the sense of socioterminology, which proposes the consideration of terms in context, the typology of tourism terms was formed from the perspective of the origin of a particular tourist term (see Table 1).

Table 1
Typology of tourism expressions by area of origin

1. Terms of professional and scientific language of tourism	Terms created in the professional and scientific language of tourism (eg <i>catering</i>): a) general tourism terms (eg <i>tourist gaze</i>) and b) terms from the tourism thematic fields, eg <i>tourism industry</i> , <i>tourism sociology</i> .
2. Transterms	Terms originally used by other disciplines that passed into the field of tourism with transterminologisation (eg <i>sharing economy</i> , <i>sustainable</i>).
3. Pseudo-terms	Words that originated in general vocabulary and pass into the field language of tourism (e.g. <i>foodist</i> , <i>gramping</i>).

In formulating this overview, we have partially deviated from the typology proposed by Mikolič, since in our typology we do not group the terms of the general part of the field of tourism in the first two categories. Mikolič (2013, 258-259) considers only the first two categories when compiling a regional dictionary of tourism, since words from the general vocabulary pass in one way or another into the terminology of the professional language of tourism and the general technical term of tourism and do not need to be added.

There are constant intralingual transitions of terms between general and specific vocabulary, as well as transitions between different field languages. As far as the typology of tourism terminology is concerned (see Table 1), in the process of terminologization, terms move from category 3 to category 1 or to category 2. In the process of determinologization, the term moves from category 1/2 to category 3. This process is very common in tourism, as the determiners are mainly the areas of current social interest or otherwise (Žagar, 2005, 39). However, the process of transterminologization is influential in categories 1 and 2, when terms move from one profession or discipline to another.

In examining the current literature on teaching terminology in LSP classes, we have found that the biggest problem teachers face in implementing subject-specific terminology in their courses is the appropriate selection of materials (Cabre 2010; Franceschi 2015; Woodrow 2017; Anthony 2018; Kakoulli Constantinou & Papadima-Sophocleous 2020; Radosavlevikj 2020 Meristo & Lopez Arias 2020; Zelman & Mykytenko 2021). The term is an inseparable unit of text, language, and discourse and must always be presented as such in order to materialise subject knowledge and concepts in the classroom. "The use of professional texts helps students acquire specialised terminology and develop professional skills" (Zelman & Mykytenko 2021, 23). When selecting appropriate texts for LTP or other LSP students, teachers must, of course, take into account students' language level, prior knowledge, and specific needs. Therefore, the selection of materials is indeed the biggest challenge for ESP teachers (Anthony 2018). Moreover, special attention should be paid to the characteristics of the subject area and therefore an appropriate genre should be selected.

Many authors agree that authentic texts should be used at all language levels in order to provide future professionals with real communication situations (Radosavlevikj 2020). Meristo & Lopez Arias (2020, 251) also recognise this conflict between using authentic materials as opposed to constructed ones and cite Woodrow (2017), who argues for the use of authentic materials when selected in collaboration with stakeholders and students. Nonetheless, the task of selecting and preparing authentic texts is one of the most challenging for teachers, especially since there are few instructional materials (in the form of ready-made textbooks) available for ESP, especially in fields outside of engineering, law, and business (Franceschi 2015). One of the windows to expose learners to real language use in their specific disciplines is naturally opened by the use of technology, as it is the main source of authentic materials nowadays, according to Kakoulli Constantinou & Papadima-Sophocleous (2020, 17). Moreover, the authors (*ibid.*) emphasise the increasing need to integrate technology into ESP classrooms as "students need to be engaged in the learning process and build their image as global citizens" (*ibid.*).

RESEARCH METHOD

The present work aims to identify techniques for implementing tourism terminology for LTP teachers in universities and present them in The Model of Tourism Terminology Implementation in Language for Tourism Purposes University Courses. The model serves as a presentation of possible activities used by LTP teachers based on the distinctive features of tourism terminology expressed by teachers and students. The general methodological approach involves conducting a survey among LTP teachers and students of different foreign language courses (namely English, Italian and German). The LTP students participate in an online questionnaire, while the LTP teachers participate in in-depth interviews. The survey was designed to answer three key research questions.

RQ1: Which are their views on the key distinguishing characteristics of tourism terminology?

RQ2: Which issues they face when teaching/learning tourism terminology?

RQ3: What methods they find effective in teaching/learning tourism terminology?

The answer to the RQ1 helps identify the key areas that LTP teachers need to pay attention to when teaching, the answer to the RQ2 extracts the problems they face, and RQ3 was designed to identify possible solutions to the problems they face. To gain insight into the issues, the survey was conducted at the University of Primorska, The faculty for tourism studies - Turistica, the leading faculty of tourism studies in Slovenia. The languages taught at the faculty are English, Italian and German and are taught at levels from A2 (pre-intermediate) to C1 (advanced).

The responses were clustered according to the three research questions to identify the main characteristics of tourism terminology, the problems the participants face in teaching/learning tourism terminology, and the methods they both consider effective in the learning process. Accordingly, the model for implementing tourism terminology in university courses for tourism purposes was developed. In addition, the issues raised in RQ2 were analysed separately to identify a number of problematic areas in the teaching/learning of tourism terminology.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

Data were collected between July and September 2021. All LTP teachers (4) from The University of Primorska - The Faculty of Tourism Studies participated in the in-depth interviews. In addition, the survey includes 46 student participants (from all three undergraduate programmes offered at the Faculty) who responded to an online questionnaire.

In responses to RQ2 the participating teachers expressed problems they face when teaching LTP. The teachers stated that they mainly have problems with the selection of teaching materials, since there are no ready-made textbooks that fully correspond to the subject of tourism and the needs of tourism students. They also criticised the lack of collaboration with tourism industry professionals and the problems they have in dealing with the large amount of newer (highly anglicised and globalised) technical vocabulary in the tourism field. Their responses were divided into 4 sections representing the main problems faced by LTP teachers:

- (1) Finding appropriate texts to suit all language levels, students' special needs and the multidisciplinary nature of tourism;
- (2) the question of whether and how to introduce translation techniques;
- (3) dealing with internationalisms in tourism terminology and
- (4) handling neologisms within tourism terminology.

Students first mentioned general problems in learning terminology, only with the use of simpler terms, such as understanding the genre of the texts studied (e.g., "tourism texts differ from each other") or the difficulties in using terminology instead of general language expressions (e.g., "we tend to use simple descriptions, learning proper tourism terms is difficult"). The answers representing the main problems of LTP students were divided into 3 sections:

- (1) synonyms in tourism terminology (e.g. "*there are too many words with the same meaning*");
- (2) neologisms (e.g. "*there are many new words and sometimes even the teacher does not know what they mean and we cannot find them in dictionaries*");
- (3) anglicisms and internationalisms ("*we already understand most of the new terms because we use the same expressions in Slovenian*").

The main result of the survey is a model that represents the main distinctive features of tourism terminology and possible activities/methods that can be used in teaching/learning the terminology in the LTP university course. The whole collection of extracted distinctive features of tourism terminology (responses to RQ1 and RQ2) along with the proposed study outcome, suggested appropriate activity/method (responses to RQ3) and corresponding language level are presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2
The Model of tourism terminology implementation in LTP university courses

Key characteristic	Study outcome	Activity	Language level appropriateness
Multidisciplinary system of terminology	Students will be aware of the multidisciplinary nature of tourism. Students will be able to search for definitions of terms in other subject-related dictionaries or databases (e.g. Oxford's Dictionary of Sociology).	Students connect a given set of tourism transterms and define their areas of origin. They are then asked to find a definition in an appropriate dictionary.	B2-C1
Internationalisms	Students are made aware of the problem of overloading with English expressions. Students acquire knowledge of international issues in tourism.	Students observe internationalisms in different languages (advanced students) and their native language.	A2-C1
High instance of Anglicisms	Students learn how to use Internet sources to learn about Anglicisms. Students understand the problems of overuse of English in tourism. Students learn how to deal with anglicisms (possible translation techniques).	Students search online engines for reliable sources to obtain specific definitions. Students discuss why English is the language of tourism communication (they learn about socio-dynamic changes and the history of the English language).	A2-C1
High occurrence of neologisms	Students observe neologisms in context. Students learn where to find definitions. Students learn about the processes of word formation.	Students group neologisms into tourist themes. Students observe word formation processes. Students coin new expressions based on pattern neologisms.	A2-C1

		Students learn how to use search engines to obtain definitions.	
(De)Terminologization	Students learn about the multidisciplinary nature of tourism. Students learn about dictionaries for specific purposes. Students learn about the different levels of text specialization.	Students learn to use specialized dictionaries and terminology databases. Students observe the level of specialization of texts and also learn about the (in)formality of language.	B2-C1
High use of proper nouns	Students learn how to use proper nouns in English (A2). Students learn how to translate proper nouns L1 to L2 and vice versa.	Give students examples and practice using proper nouns (including articles) in English.	A2-C1
Synonymy	Assure students that terminology in tourism is often inconsistent and not standardized. Students draw conclusions about possible differences in the meaning/use of synonyms and variations.	Students compare various synonyms and variations of terms by stating possible differences. Students learn to pay attention to all aspects of a word - grammar, spelling, connotation, etc.	A2-C1

Discussion

The main purpose of this paper is to develop a model for the implementation of tourism terminology in university courses on language for tourism purposes (LTP). The model is intended to be used by LTP teachers in their effort to equip future tourism professionals with terminological competence, which is understood as one of the main tasks of foreign language teaching in a non-linguistic university, as Bakoriva (2020) states. It enables thorough acquisition of a conceptual framework in a systematic way, which is described by Yakubova (2008) as important for terminology implementation. In the survey conducted to prepare the model, responses were solicited from both LTP teachers and students to gain insight into both ends of the learning process. By answering questions RQ1 and RQ2, teachers and students jointly identified seven main features of tourism terminology (multidisciplinary terminology system, internationalisms, high occurrence of anglicisms, high occurrence of neologisms, (de)terminologization, high use of proper nouns, and synonymy) and suggested techniques in question RQ3 that can be used to successfully overcome these problems in the learning process. The research proves that the theoretical framework (which describes tourism terminology as multidisciplinary, includes an abundance of internationalisms, anglicisms and neologisms, filled with the processes of (de)terminologization, etc.) is indeed a representative set of problems that teachers and students face when teaching/learning tourism vocabulary. Moreover, the designed model acts as a proposed solution to the struggles in practise.

Teachers struggled primarily with finding appropriate texts for all language levels and needs, which, according to Anthony (2018), is indeed the biggest challenge for ESP teachers. In this context, we argue that authentic texts should be used at all language levels to provide future professionals with real communication situations (Radosavlevikj 2020). On the other hand, for students at lower language levels who struggle with authentic texts, it is advisable to divide the texts into shorter sections and give them exercises tailored to the information they need to convey. For example, give them a shorter text in which they have to pay attention to all expressions related to ecology. The international prefix *eco-* allows them to find different examples without having to master the text completely. Texts on tourism come from a variety of sources and on a variety of topics (culture, history, sociology, psychology, geography, management, finance, etc.), which can be an advantage, but also makes it difficult for students to find definitions, let alone translations, for certain terms. It is advisable to teach students how to use search engines and provide them with appropriate materials to familiarise themselves with the newly acquired terms. In order to avoid as many synonyms and variations of terms as possible (which is especially advisable for students with a low level of language proficiency), Cabre (2010, 362) advises "it is best to choose those that refer to national and international standards and documents produced by institutions responsible for standardising terminology," especially when it comes to scientific texts.

Regarding the second issue raised by the teachers, namely whether and how to introduce translation techniques, we argue that they are reserved, if at all, for advanced students. As a result, tourism terminology is full of neologisms and Anglicisms, making it difficult for students to find the right terms. When introducing translation procedures, start by teaching the translation of proper nouns, which goes hand in hand with predefined translation techniques useful for future tourism professionals. Creative activities that ask students to observe word formation techniques or even coin new expressions based on model words (e.g., using the word *backpacker* as a model word to elicit words like *nopacker*, *foodpacker*, etc.) are also reserved for advanced students or should rarely be introduced with a specific goal in mind (e.g., getting students to recognize the similarities between words like *glamping*, *gramping*, *camping*, etc.).

In addressing internationalisms in tourism terminology, which has been cited as a problem by both students and teachers, it is important to keep in mind that tourism is an extremely active international activity, which makes borrowing tourism terms from international languages a fruitful origin of terms. Hasanova (2018) expressed that international tourism terminology is one of the current research trends, adding that international tourism requires regulation, unification, and standardization of the terminology field at the international level. On the one hand, internationalisms make it easier for students to find their definition, so they are likely to have found a similar form in their own native language. On the other hand, the use of too many internationalisms discourages students from coining new expressions in their own native language as future tourism professionals, leading to an overload of international expressions for which there is an L1 alternative (e.g., the use of *all-inclusive*, for which there is a Slovenian equivalent *vse vključeno*). Be that as it may, this is a broader problem of the influence of English on secondary languages that cannot be solved in a single classroom, but nevertheless students should be aware of it in order to encounter it and perhaps influence it in their future careers.

Neologisms in tourism terminology proved problematic - both for students and teachers. When teaching specialized vocabulary both in the native language and in the foreign language, attention must be paid to the vividness of the terms in real texts (Bakirova, 2021). Due to the vividness of tourism terminology, there is a great tendency for students to come into contact with new expressions. The biggest problem when students are confronted with neologisms is that it is unlikely that any dictionary can fully meet the needs (Linčir Lumezi, 2019). Usually, there is no translation equivalent, but there is also no reliable definition. Kessler (2010, 262)

has also described neologisms as part of technology in the sense that "(...) technology-oriented neologisms are often too fleeting and numerous for even trained observers to document adequately." Therefore, special care must be taken when dealing with neologisms in LTP classes. Students must be equipped with methods to find definitions and possible translations of the newer terminology in ESP. In the studies conducted by Kakoulli Constantinou & Papadima-Sophocleous (2020) on the use of digital technology in ESP, they found that students already use dictionaries, Internet browsers, and word processors in their learning. Therefore, the task of ETP practitioners is to point students to valuable Internet tools and sources and teach them how to use them (e.g., the Lexicool web portal). Since neologisms make up a large part of tourism terminology, they could be covered in a special lesson devoted exclusively to classifying newer terms in thematic areas (e.g., sociology of tourism, sustainability) and monitoring developments in a particular subfield of tourism or tourism as a whole. This is appropriate for advanced students who can also observe newer word formation processes or perhaps attempt to coin new words themselves based on neologistic model words (e.g., honeymoon - babymoon, gendermoon). Students in lower grades can observe neologisms in texts, try to guess their meaning, and learn where to find definitions in online sources.

In a more general overview, we suggest the use of Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR). This technique allows networking and improves comprehension of the texts used in the course, while the concept of sharing is a motivating element in the development of professional English. Specifically, collaborative tasks reduce anxiety that hinders student participation and performance (Pireddu, 2021, 1). Following this approach, the Cooperative Learning Approach is proposed. It focuses on organizing different activities to transform the classroom into a social experience. Montaner-Villalba (2020) proposes the use of blogging, noting that there is significant empirical research on blogging in the ESP classroom in universities (Murray & Hourigan 2008; Pinkman 2005; Bran 2009; Awada & Ghaith 2014; Patel 2015) to refer to. When teaching terminology (from any field), any kind of memorization should be avoided. Teachers should use the communicative approach as the foundation of modern foreign language methodology. This approach allows students to learn through activities and practical application rather than simply memorizing terms. This increases the likelihood that the new terminology will be memorized for later use, in a non-rigid way that allows students to adapt it to any communicative need. In this sense, Zimnyaya (1991) suggests bridging the "gap between theoretical knowledge and the practical possibilities of its application" and enabling the "transition from the school of memory to the school of thought."

CONCLUSION

This paper fills the gap in the research on the implementation of tourism terminology in university courses by creating the model of tourism terminology implementation in university courses for tourism purposes. The conducted study identifies the key characteristics of tourism terminology in accordance with the literature review through an investigation in the form of an online questionnaire and in-depth interviews with teachers and students of LTP courses at the Faculty of Tourism Studies - Turistica in Slovenia. Key features that highlight the problems faced by students and teachers include: the multidisciplinary nature of tourism terminology, an abundance of internationalisms, anglicisms and neologisms, the occurrence of (de)terminologization processes, the heavy use of proper names and synonymy). The model addresses each key feature by proposing outcomes and activities appropriate for different language levels in LTP courses. In particular, it emphasises the need to use authentic tourism texts at all levels, to encourage student creativity, to introduce translation techniques in higher level language courses, and to provide students with opportunities to explore Internet sources to equip them with the skills and knowledge they need to master and handle new tourism

terminology in their future professional lives. The fact that, according to Kirovska-Simjanoska (2021, 19), all students who reach the university level have "more or less consistent technological experience" and enter "with advanced knowledge and understanding of technology" is a mitigating circumstance. However, Dashestani and Stojković (2015) caution that teachers need to refine the strategic use of technology in the classroom to increase motivation and engage students in the learning process.

Because this is the first attempt to create a model for implementing tourism terminology, the major limitation of this study is the number of tourism faculty who participated in the research. Future research requires a broader international investigation of the understanding and use of tourism terminology in university LTP courses, as this is the key aspect of training successful future tourism communicators, and also helps to create a more stable core of ever-evolving terminology education. Nevertheless, the results are not limited to the application of LTP, but also allow conclusions to be drawn about any LSP course. The need to understand the characteristics of a subject area and its terminology in the LSP course allows teachers to develop outcomes and activities that are appropriate for students to master each foreign language for specific purposes.

REFERENCES

- Anatoliyivna, Y. N. & Mykolayivna, S. I. (2020). Derivational Antonyms Patterns in English Tourism Terminology. *Scientific journal of the Lviv State University of Life Safety "Philological Periodical of Lviv"*, 7, 2020, 88-103.
- Anthony, L. (2018). *Introducing English for Specific Purposes*. Routledge.
- Awada, G. & Ghazi, G. (2014). Effect of Using the Blog Educational Tool on Writing Achievement and Motivation for Legal Writing. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 1(2), 317-388.
- Bakirova, H.B. (2020). Teaching Foreign Terminology at a Non-Language Universities. *International scientific and technical journal Innovation Technical and Technology*, 1(2), 46-50.
- Bakirova, H.B. (2021). Formation of Lexical Skills in Learning Foreign Language Terminology in a Non-Language University. *Emergent: Journal of Educational Discoveries and Lifelong Learning*, 2(5), 218-223.
- Bran, R. (2009). Do the Math: ESP + Web 2.0=ESP2.0!. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1: 2219-2523.
- Bucsa, S. & Gaceu, L. (2009). Travel and Tourism Terminology and document databases, essential Tools for Handling Specialied Knowledge and Professional Communication. *Journal of EcoAgriTourism*, 5(1), 35-42.
- Cabré, M. T. (2010). Terminology and Translation. In *Handbook of Translation Studies*, edited by Gambier Y. & in van Doorslaer L., Amsterdam/Philadelphia: J.Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ciobanu, M. (2015). English Terms Highly Used in Romanian and Spanish Tourism Terminology. *Romanian Economic and Business Review*, 10(1): 1-16.
- Dann, Graham, 1996: *The Language of Tourism. A Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Wallingford: CAB International.
- Dann, Graham, 2012: Remodelling a changing language of tourism: from monologue to dialogue and triologue. *PASOS* 10(4). 59–70.

- Dashtestani, R. & Stojković, N. (2015). The Use of Technology in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) Instruction: A Literature Review, *The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 3(3), Special issue: 435-456.
- Erazo, M. A. C., Ramírez, S. I. M., Encalada, M. A. R., Holguin, J. V., & Zou, J. H. (2019). English language skills required by the hospitality and tourism sector in El Oro, Ecuador. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 9(2), 156-167.
- Franceschi, V. (2015). Nursing Students and the ELF-Aware Syllabus: Exposure to Non-ENL Accents and Repairs Strategies in Coursebooks for Healthcare Professionals. *Iperstoria* 5, 51-61.
- Hasanova, L. H. (2018). Actual Issues in Tourism Terminology. *The Way of Science*, 5(51), 73-76.
- Gabrovšek, D. (2005). *Words Galore: Aspects of General and Slovenian-English Contrastive Lexicology*. Ljubljana: Faculty of Arts.
- Giménez Folqués, D. (2015). clientAnglicisms in Tourism Language Corpora 2.0. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 198(2015), 149-156.
- Jackowski, A. (2000). Religious Tourism – Problems with Terminology. *Peregrinus Cracoviensis*, 10(2000), 63-74.
- Jaworski, A. & Pritchard, A. (eds.). (2005). *Discourse, Communication and Tourism*. Clevedon, Buffalo in Toronto: Channel View Publications.
- Jaworski, A. & Thurlow, C. (2010). *Tourism Discourse: Language and Global Mobility*. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Khan, F. (2016). The “Halalification” of tourism. *Journal of Islamic Marketing*, 8(4), 558-577.
- Kessler, G. (2010). Virtual business: An Enron email corpus study, *Journal of Pragmatic* 42: 262-270.
- Kakoulli Constantinou E. & Papadima-Sophocleous S. (2020). The Use of Digital Technology in ESP: Current Practices and Suggestions for ESP Teacher Education. *The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 8(1), 17-29.
- Kirovska-Simjanoska, D. (2021). Designing an ESP Course for the 21st Century Students: The Clash of the Digital Immigrants and Natives. *The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 9(1), 17-30.
- Kuchkarova, N. E. (2021). Semantic and Structural relations in Terminology System of Tourism. *Academic Research in Educational Science*, 2(2), 215-220.
- Küpeli, T. S., Burcu, K. & Hassan, A. (2017). Understanding Religion-based Tourism Terminology in the Context of the Hotel Industry. *An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 29(2), 252-166.
- Li, Y. & Flowerdew, J. (2020). Teaching English for Reasearch Public Purposes (ERPP): A Review of language teachers' pedagogical initiatives. *English for Specific Purposes*, 59(4), 29-41.
- Linčir Lumezi, M. (2019). Challenges of Translating Tourism-Related Terminology: Acta Linguistica – some illustrative examples. *Acta Linguistica*, 31(1): 69-94.
- Leichik, V. M. (2009). *Terminology Studies. Scope, methods, structure*. Moscow: Librokom Book House.
- Mammadova, A. "CHALLENGES IN TRANSLATING TOURISM TERMINOLOGY INTO AZERBAIJANI." *Актуальні проблеми природничих і гуманітарних наук у дослідженнях* (2021): 831.

- Meristo, M. & Lopez Arias, F. J. (2020). Challenges in Teaching English for Specific Purposes in Estonian Universities. *The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 8(3): 249-263.
- Mihaylova-Palanska, M. (2020). Tourism Terminology In The Digital Age. *Economic Science, education and the real economy: Development and interactions in the digital age*, (1), 654-665.
- Mikolič, V. & Beguš, A. (2011) Meddisciplinarne pomenotvorne zmožnosti v procesih (de)terminologizacije turistične terminologije. In *Meddisciplinarnost v slovenistiki*, edited by Kranjc S., Obdobja 30. Ljubljana: Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete. 313–319.
- Mikolič, V. (2013). Področni govor in terminologija na primeru jezika turizma. In *Infrastruktura slovenščine in slovenistike*, Obdobja 32, edited by Žele, A., 255–261. Ljubljana: Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete.
- Mikolič, V. (2015). *Govor turizma*. Koper: Univerzitetna založba Annales.
- Mikolič, V. (2015a). Splošna leksika in večpodročni termini v govoru turizma, *Slavia Centralis*, 8(1). 188–202.
- Montaner-Villalba, S. (2020). Written Expression in English for Specific Purposes Through Blogging and Cooperative Learning. *The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 8(3), 171-186.
- Murray, L. & Hourigan, T. (2008). Blogs for Specific Purposes: Expressivist or socio-cognitivist approach? *ReCALL*, 20(1),82-97.
- Patel, T. (2015). Analyzing the Impact of Blogging on Writing and Grammar Editing Skills of Engineering Students. *International Journal of Humanities in Technical Education* 1 (2).
- Pinkman, K. (2005). Using Blogs in the Foreign Language Classroom: Encouraging Lerner Independence. *The JALT CALL Journal*, 1(1), 12-24.
- Pireddu, S. (2021). *E-learning and ESP Teaching for Tourism. MOOCs, Language learning and mobility, design, integration, reuse*. Apr 2021, online conference, Italy. <https://iris.unito.it/retrieve/handle/2318/1788651/760463/PIREDDU%20MOOC%20Conference%281%29.pdf>.
- Pulcini, V. (2012). Register Variation in Tourism Terminology. In *A Cultural Journal through the English lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Radosavlevikj, N. (2020). Teachers' and Students' Perceptions and Challenges in Communicative Language Teaching. *The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 8(3), 307-317.
- Sokolova, A. G. (2020). Anglicisms and loanwords: The contribution of English exemplified by contemporary Italian tourist terminology. *Training, Language and Culture*, 4(2), 21-30.
- Vepreva T. B. (2011). Teaching foreign vocabulary to students of nonlinguistic specialties. *Vestnik of Northern (Arctic) Federal University. Series: Humanities and social Sciences* 4, 126-130.
- Verhovnik, T. (2002). Slovensko izraze odnosov z javnostmi. *Teorija in praksa*, 39 (5), 755-765.
- Vintar, Š. (2008). *Terminologija: Terminološka veda in računalniško podprta terminografija*. Ljubljana: Faculty of Arts in Ljubljana.
- Zelman, L. & Mykytenko, O. (2021). Features of Teaching Humanities in Higher Institutions for Future Specialist in Hotel and Restaurant Business and Tourism. *Global Prosperity*, 1(2), 23-28.

- Zimnyaya, I. A. (1991). *Psychology of Foreign Language Teaching at School*. Moscow: Prosvechsheniye.
- Yakubova, N. I. (2019). Cognitive Approach to Judgment Systematicies of Terminology Sphere of Tourism. *Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University*, 1(5), 263-267.
- Yurko, N. A. & Styfanyshyn, I. M. (2020). Antonym Prefixation in English Tourism Terminology: Origin and Meaning Prefixes. *Philological Sciences*, Special issue LXXXI, 86-90.
- Woodrow, L. (2017). *Introducing Course Design in English for Specific Purposes*. Routledge.
- Zahedpisheh, N., Bakar, A., Zulqarnain, B., & Saffari, N. (2017). English for Tourism and Hospitality Purposes (ETP). *English Language Teaching*, 10(9), 86-94.
- Žagar, M. (2005). Determinologizacija (na primeru terminologije iz fizike). *Jezik in slovstvo*, 50(2), 35-48.
- Žagar Karer, M. (2011). *Terminologija med slovarjem in besedilom. Analiza elektrotehniške terminologije*. Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU.