



The International Journal of Language Studies

ISSN: 3078-2244 (Online)

2026, Vol. 3, No. 4, pp. 1–14

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.60087/ijls.v3.n4.001>

Journal homepage: <https://ijlangstudies.org>



Translation Errors in Vietnamese-to-English Tourism Documents: Evidence from a Hanoi Travel Company

Ngo Thi Ha^{1*}; Dao Thi Thuy Linh²

^{1,2} Faculty of Foreign Languages, Hanoi University of Natural Resources and Environment, Hanoi, Vietnam

*Corresponding author: Ngo Thi Ha — e-mail: ntha.nn@hunre.edu.vn

Abstract

Tourism publications must serve two functions: provide useful information to passengers while also presenting a destination, a service, and a culture to readers from other countries. This study examines Vietnamese-to-English translation problems in real documents from a tourism company in Hanoi, Vietnam. It inquires about the types of flaws that emerge in the papers, what the staff believes is causing them, and what difficulties overseas clients describe. The design is a mixed-methods case study that draws on Nida's equivalence theory, Skopos Theory, and House's translation quality assessment. The data was gathered from 15 tourism documents, 15 staff interviews, and comments from 20 overseas clients. The documents had 85 mistakes, including lexical (44.7%), grammatical (25.9%), cultural (17.6%), and stylistic (11.8%). Staff cited minimal translation training, severe workloads and tight deadlines, a lack of a shared terminology resource, insufficient proofreading, and unequal inspection of machine or AI output. Customers highlighted issues with cultural content, information clarity, understanding of services, and the company's perceived professionalism. The sample is from a single organization, the participant groups are tiny, no inferential tests were performed, and the mistake coding was not validated by a second rater, hence the results explain this specific example and should not be interpreted as causal or industry-wide. They do argue that translation quality in tourism is dependent on linguistic, cultural, technological, and organizational safeguards that operate together.

Keywords: *tourism translation; Vietnamese-to-English translation; translation errors; translation quality assessment; cultural translation*

Article information: Received: 25/08/2026;

Accepted: 30/10/2026;

Published: 25/12/2026

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s). Published by the International Journal of Language Studies. This is an open-access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

1. Introduction

Translation in tourism entails more than just transferring information from one language to another. A translated itinerary or brochure also promotes a destination, advertises a service, and sets visitors' expectations before they arrive. Itineraries, brochures, websites, service descriptions, and business communications must therefore be both practical and credible, as well as appealing. Work on tourism discourse has long highlighted this combination of informational, descriptive, persuasive, and interpersonal roles (Dann, 1996; Pierini, 2007).

Accuracy at the sentence level is insufficient in this context. According to Pierini (2007), the quality of translated tourist writings is also determined by naturalness, genre fit, reader orientation, efficacy, and legibility. Later research has found that culturally distinctive terminology, legacy meanings, and collocations rarely survive word-for-word translation (Li et al., 2022; Majhut, 2021).

Vietnam adds its own challenges, as tourism materials frequently mention local customs, religious practices, food, and heritage sites. Nguyen et al. (2017) identified spelling, grammar, word choice, equivalence, pragmatics, and style issues in English tourism signs. Foreign visitors to a Hanoi museum struggled the most with references to religion, customs, textile crafts, and costumes (Pham & Tran, 2020), while Tran et al. (2024) found that cultural content was lost in English translations of Vietnamese culture-specific terminology in tourism materials.

Machine translation complicates things further. It speeds up composition and frequently produces usable initial copies, but machine-translated tourism documents still have issues with word choice, collocation, sentence structure, and English writing rules (Giampieri & Harper, 2022). What counts is not whether personnel use these technologies, but how thoroughly the output is vetted against context, terminology, cultural meaning, and purpose.

These difficulties are pertinent to a Hanoi-based tourism company (hereinafter “the Company”) that communicates with overseas consumers and partners using English-language materials. This study investigates reoccurring translation problems in the Company’s papers using document analysis, staff interviews, and customer feedback, and presents the findings as a mixed-methods case study of Vietnamese-to-English tourism translation in a working setting. The study’s objectives are to discover reoccurring error patterns, investigate the causes that staff associate with those patterns, and document the effects that consumers describe. There are three research questions that guide it.

RQ1: What forms of Vietnamese-to-English translation problems have been detected in the Company’s English-language tourism documents?

RQ²: What variables do staff believe contribute to the occurrence of these translation errors?

RQ3: What consequences of translation errors are mentioned by overseas customers?

The instance contributes to existing work in two ways. It investigates translation in the workplace rather than in the classroom or on tourism websites, and it compares textual evidence to staff stories and client feedback. The numerical figures are not intended to represent the Vietnamese tourism industry. They reveal patterns within a single organization that are interpreted using recognized techniques to translation quality and functionalist translation.

Literature Review

2. Literature Review

Nida’s (1964) account of translation is based on the concept of equivalence, and he distinguishes two orientations. Formal equivalence adheres as closely as feasible to the form and substance of the source communication, orienting the receptor toward the source language and culture. Instead, dynamic equivalence seeks “the closest natural equivalent” of the source message, and its test is the principle of equivalent effect: the target receptors should respond to the translated message in substantially the same way that the original receptors responded to the source (Nida, 1964; Nida & Taber, 1969). According to this viewpoint, a translation is evaluated based on how well it serves its readers rather than how closely it matches the source’s words.

Nida and Taber (1969) break this down into four basic requirements: the translation must make sense, capture the spirit and manner of the original, be natural and easy to express, and elicit a similar response. These prerequisites explain why meaning, naturalness, and reader response are viewed as linked: a text can copy every word of the source but yet reading as foreign or opaque, causing the receptor's response to differ from that of the original audience. Nida also emphasizes that meaning is not carried by words alone, but rather by the cultural context in which they are employed, therefore culture-bound notions must be adjusted, for example, by explanation or substitution, in order for the intended reader to understand them. Critics have noted that the comparable effect is difficult to quantify and that the model gives little weight to the translator's commission, a gap that the functionalist techniques described below fill.

Functionalist approaches, like Skopos Theory (Reiss & Vermeer, 1984; Vermeer, 1989/2004), focus emphasis away from the source text and toward the objective of the translation. The essential claim is that translation is a deliberate action whose goal, the skopos, defines the translation technique. The skopos is determined by the commission or translation brief, which describes the intended audience, the context of use, and the function the text is to serve. When the intentions differ, the same source text can be translated in various ways, and no single interpretation is correct in the abstract.

Skopos Theory is typically summarized as a minimal set of rules. The skopos rule states that the translation is dictated by its aim. The coherence rule (intratextual coherence) needs the target text to make sense to its receivers in their current position, but the fidelity rule (intertextual coherence) requires a relationship between the target text and the source text, the form of which is determined by the skopos. Fidelity is secondary to coherence, which is subordinate to skopos. Nord (1997) adds the notion of loyalty, which keeps translators accountable to both the commissioner and the receivers, limiting the latitude that the skopos rule would otherwise allow. She also distinguishes between documentary translation, which documents the source text for readers who are aware that they are reading a translation, and instrumental translation, which functions as a standalone message in the target culture without the receiver knowing the source. Texts intended to directly inform or persuade readers, such as brochures and itineraries, generally use the instrumental type. Nord (1997) divides translation problems into four categories: pragmatic problems, which arise from differences in the communicative situation; cultural problems, which arise from differences in conventions; linguistic problems, which arise from differences between language systems; and text-specific problems, which are associated with a single text.

House's (1997, 2015) Translation Quality Assessment approach assesses translations by comparing them to their sources in context. Drawing on Hallidayan systemic functional linguistics, the analyst creates a textual profile of the source text, then profiles the target text in the same way and compares the two; quality is determined by how well the source's function is preserved. A three-dimensional register analysis serves as the foundation for the profile. Field addresses the text's topic content and social action. Tenor includes the author's provenance (temporal, geographical, and social) and stance (intellectual, emotional, or affective), the social role relationship between author and reader, which can be symmetrical or asymmetrical, and the social attitude, which ranges from formal to informal. Mode encompasses both the medium,

which is easy when a text is written to be read or spoken to be heard, and participation, which is simple in monolog but difficult when the addressee is more directly involved. Genre connects the text to its language and cultural contexts. According to Halliday, the function of a text is divided into two parts: an ideational component, which is concerned with denotative content, and an interpersonal component, which is concerned with the author-reader connection. Errors are mismatches between two profiles. Covertly erroneous errors are mismatches along the situational dimensions of field, tenor, mode, and genre. Mismatches in the denotative meaning of source and target elements, such as deletions, additions, and substitutions, as well as violations of the target language system, are considered overtly erroneous. The comparison results are summarized in a declaration of quality.

House also distinguishes between overt and covert translation. In an overt translation, the target text is not directly addressed to the readers, who are aware that they are reading a translation, and the source text stays culturally relevant. A covert translation has the same status as an original in the target culture and is not bound by the source culture, allowing the source text's function to be transferred to the target. House refers to the distinction as a cline, not a precise binary. For covert translation, she suggests a cultural filter, a set of cross-cultural dimensions along which the source and target communities differ in socio-cultural expectation norms and stylistic conventions, which the translator uses to adjust the source to target-culture norms.

For analytical purposes, translation quality is measured using four interconnected dimensions. Lexical correctness refers to suitable terminology, word choice, semantic selection, and collocation. Grammatical accuracy refers to proper syntax, morphology, word order, and phrase structure. Stylistic appropriateness refers to the suitable register, tone, naturalness, and genre conventions. Cultural appropriateness refers to the appropriate mediation of culture-specific concepts and meanings. These categories are an operational framework designed for this study, not House's own taxonomy. They are connected to her model through interpretation: lexical and grammatical accuracy to incompatibilities in denotative meaning and the target language system, stylistic appropriateness to tenor, mode, and genre, and cultural adequacy to the cultural filter.

2.2. Previous studies

Tourism discourse informs readers while also creating an image of locations and experiences; Dann (1996) views it as a specialized discourse of promotion and representation. A translation of such a text must do more than simply convey the meaning of words. It must work for its audience inside a specific genre and context.

Pierini (2007) is the most appropriate empirical starting point. Her examination of UK and Italian tourism websites demonstrates that excellence includes language adequacy, genre-related efficacy, adaptability, target audience orientation, and legibility. The Company's paperwork comprise both practical and promotional content, so the point is clear: a line can be completely understandable but fail as tourism message.

Vietnamese studies provide local evidence. Nguyen et al. (2017) analyzed 203 tourism signs from eight locations in Northern Vietnam and discovered issues with spelling and grammar, word choice, equivalence of Vietnamese and English content, pragmatics, and style.

According to Pham and Tran (2020), most translations at the Vietnamese Women's Museum satisfied foreign tourists' expectations, while references to religion, customs, textile crafts, and costumes remained difficult to understand.

Tran et al. (2024) used Newmark's framework to assess 191 Vietnamese culture-specific phrases in tourism materials, describing both the translation procedures used and the loss of cultural characteristics. When taken together, these studies reveal that translation issues in Vietnamese tourism extend beyond grammar and vocabulary. They also leave open the question of how such difficulties occur in ordinary professional production, which is what this study investigates.

House's work on translation quality assessment situates review within a linguistic, situational, and sociocultural framework, calling for a systematic comparison of source and target texts (House, 1997, 2015). Pierini (2007) agrees that tourist texts should be evaluated based on their efficiency and naturalness, rather than their grammatical accuracy. When viewed this way, an error is significant because of what it does to correctness, clarity, naturalness, cultural suitability, or function, rather than because it deviates from the source. An uncomfortable style may preserve the practical meaning, whereas an erroneous description of a service can result in serious misunderstanding.

Cultural mediation is at the heart of tourist translation since tourism materials contain concepts founded in the originating culture. According to Li et al. (2022), Chinese-English geotourism translation requires corpus-based, interdisciplinary methodologies, as cultural and heritage meanings frequently fail to cross over through literal equivalence. Majhut (2021) views tourist translation as cross-cultural mediation and attributes its quality to how cultural heritage is conveyed.

The findings of Vietnamese investigations are consistent. Pham and Tran (2020), Tran et al. (2024), and Nguyen et al. (2017) all report issues with religious and cultural references, loss of cultural substance, or poor equivalence and pragmatics. This is why cultural adequacy is handled as a distinct dimension of study.

Machine translation and generative AI have transformed the way translators work. Giampieri and Harper (2022) compared machine-translated tourism texts to corpus-based translations and discovered common issues with word choice, collocation, and English writing conventions. This does not render machine translation undesirable for tourism, but it does demonstrate that human judgment is still required to assess phrasing in context.

2.3. Research gap

Existing research focuses on tourism discourse, internet translation, cultural mediation, machine translation, tourist signs, and museum labeling. Little of it investigates how Vietnamese-to-English translation is actually carried out within a tourism organization, or connects textual errors to staff-reported working conditions and consumer feedback. This case study fills that gap. Its contribution is descriptive and contextual, rather than statistical. The current case study examines this narrower gap. Its contribution is thus contextual rather than statistical: it demonstrates how linguistic, cultural, technological, and organizational elements can interact within a single professional tourist setting.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research design and setting

This is a mixed-methods case study. It provides quantitative descriptions of translation faults while subjectively analyzing staff interviews and customer feedback. Mixed techniques are appropriate since the data require context to explain how and why patterns may develop (Creswell, 2014). The case-study style reflects the goal of extensively examining translation practice in one firm rather than predicting how widespread these errors are throughout the industry (Yin, 2018).

Fieldwork took place at the Company's Hanoi location between November 2025 and February 2026. Only Vietnamese-to-English translations in written tourism documentation were examined. The data comes from 15 documents, 15 employees, and 20 overseas clients.

3.2. Participants and data sources

The corpus contains 15 real papers, including seven multi-day tour itineraries, four promotional brochures, and four official email threads with international customers. There was no stated sample technique, therefore the records are viewed as the material available for this instance, with no claim of representativeness made.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with fifteen employees from the sales and operations divisions. They included six Sales Executives, seven Tour Operators, and two Department Managers, all having between 1.5 and 8 years of experience. The questions addressed their translation experience, comfort with culturally distinctive terms, linguistic challenges, use of digital tools, verification habits, workload, terminology resources, proofreading, and suggestions for improvement.

Twenty international clients from Europe, Australia, and North America, who had previously used the Company's services, provided input on clarity, professional language, cultural understanding, and general satisfaction with the English-language materials. The study does not presume that they read the 15 documents examined. Their comments are viewed as perceptual data rather than a test of what caused a specific inaccuracy.

3.3. Data collection and analytical procedures

RQ1 was mostly assessed through document analysis. The researcher examined each Vietnamese source expression to its English representation and classified the observable faults into the four categories (lexical, grammatical, stylistic, and cultural) listed above. One constraint affects code. No second coder reviewed it, no coding manual was validated with multiple raters, and no reliability statistic, such as Cohen's kappa, was computed. The 85-error categorization is just one researcher's analytical coding and has not been validated as a measurement tool.

The fifteen interviews were evaluated thematically. Five factors reoccurred: low specialist training, workload and deadline pressure, inconsistent terminology resources, insufficient proofreading, and uneven verification of machine- or AI-assisted translations. They are based on what participants said, so they are provided as the staff's account of contributing factors rather than established reasons.

Customer feedback on information clarity, professional language, cultural understanding, and overall happiness was summarized using frequencies and percentages. With 20 responders and no inferential tests, these statistics only characterize the participants and cannot be applied to overseas tourists.

The four impact factors (difficulty with cultural content, confusion due by confusing language, misunderstanding of services, and decreased trust) overlap since a single client may report many. Their percentages are thus not combined together.

The three data sources were compared using triangulation. The documentation detail what went wrong, the interviews explain why staff believe it happened, and the customers provide an independent perspective on how the products were received. This improves interpretation across sources, but it does not render the study causal or statistically generalizable.

The company granted permission for its records and employees to be included for scholarly purposes. Staff participated willingly; their identities were kept private, and both the Company and the participants remain anonymous here.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Types of translation errors

An examination of the 15 tourism documents revealed 85 translation problems. Their distribution is shown in Table 1.

Table 1.

Distribution of identified translation errors

Error category	Frequency	Percentage
Lexical errors	38	44.7%
Grammatical errors	22	25.9%
Cultural errors	15	17.6%
Stylistic errors	10	11.8%
Total	85	100%

Lexical errors accounted for the most cases (38, 44.7%), followed by grammatical problems (22, 25.9%), cultural errors (15, 17.6%), and stylistic faults (10, 11.8%). Word choice and language certainly caused the most problems. Previous research has shown comparable lexical, collocational, and genre issues in tourism texts (Pierini, 2007; Giampieri & Harper, 2022), while Vietnamese studies have discovered lexical and linguistic issues in signs and culture-specific tourism translation (Nguyen et al., 2017; Tran et al., 2024).

Several instances demonstrate how a word might match in the dictionary but fail in use. Khách tự túc ăn trưa translates to “Guests self-sufficient lunch,” whereas “Lunch at your own expense” seems more natural. Miễn phí was translated as “Free money” instead of “Complimentary,” and nước suối as “Stream water” instead of “Bottled water.” Choosing

words for tourism necessitates subject knowledge rather than dictionary substitution. The grammatical errors included “Bus picking up guests from hotel” and “Guide tour enthusiastically.” A reader can decipher what these mean, but they sound casual and may harm the company’s professional reputation. The style faults, such as “You guys will like it” and “Must be on time,” convey the core idea, but the tone is inappropriate for official customer communication. Quality in tourism translation is determined by genre, communicative function, and good sentence structure (House 2015; Pierini 2007).

Cultural inaccuracies include “Village Hall” for đình làng, “Mother of the Forest” for Mẫu Thượng Ngàn, and “Holy Fish Stream” for Suối Cá Thần. The term “Village Hall” refers to an administrative building rather than the communal home (đình), which serves religious and community functions. In general, a literal or near-literal rendering may deprive readers of the necessary contextual information (Pham & Tran, 2020; Tran et al., 2024).

4.2. Staff-perceived contributing factors

Insufficient specialized translation training

All 15 interviewees had university degrees in Business Administration, Tourism Management, or English Studies, but none had taken a professional translation workshop. The average self-rated confidence in interpreting culturally distinctive phrases was 5.6 out of 10. This highlights a disparity between general English proficiency and the specialist skills required for tourism translation (Pierini, 2007; Pham & Tran, 2020). Competence was not assessed, and trained personnel were not compared to untrained staff, therefore this is what employees reported about themselves. It does not indicate that the 85 errors were caused by a lack of training.

Workload and deadline pressure

Every interviewee identified high workload as a key cause. They stated that responding rapidly to clients sometimes occurred before checking the text, therefore verification was limited. Quality is dependent on both manufacturing conditions and individual competence (House, 2015). However, these are self-reports, and the study cannot establish a statistical link between workload and error rate.

Lack of standardized terminology resources

According to the interviews, the company did not have a consistent tourism terminology database, therefore different staff members utilized different English phrasing for the same notion. A weak phrase can then spread across templates and reemerge, which accounts for the majority of lexical mistakes. The study did not count how many of the 38 lexical errors were caused by inconsistent terminology, therefore this is still a conceivable explanation rather than a quantifiable effect.

Weak proofreading procedures

Proofreading was largely informal. One manager reported evaluating approximately 20% of materials, focusing on prices and logistics rather than language. This leaves a gap in quality control. The study did not compare documents before and after proofreading, thus it is impossible to estimate how many errors would have been discovered with a formal second

inspection. The finding supports a practical proposal but does not provide an assessment of its impact.

Machine translation and generative AI use

All subjects used programs like Google Translate and ChatGPT, but how they verified the results differed. One indicated that ChatGPT's output may be accepted if it was read fluently, even if the technical terms had not been validated, which is consistent with Giampieri and Harper's (2022) findings on machine-translated tourism texts. The solution is not to ban these instruments. Human reviewers should remain in charge of terminology, context, cultural meaning, register, and final quality. It was unclear how many of the 85 inaccuracies were caused by machine translation or artificial intelligence.

4.3. Effects reported by international customers

RQ3 is about what the overseas customers reported. The evidence is descriptive and cannot demonstrate causation. Table 2 summarizes the responses.

Table 2.

Customer perceptions of English-language tourism materials (n = 20)

Criterion	Positive	Neutral	Negative
Clarity of information	45%	30%	25%
Professional language	40%	35%	25%
Cultural understanding	35%	30%	35%
Overall satisfaction	50%	30%	20%

Cultural understanding yielded the most evenly split results, with 35% of customers responding positively and 35% negatively. However, cultural errors accounted for just 17.6% of the errors in the texts, and the criterion garnered the largest percentage of negative answers of the four. Cultural issues may be less common than lexical issues, but they nevertheless have a greater impact on readers, which is consistent with previous findings that culture-specific allusions upset foreign readers (Pham & Tran, 2020). The correlation is provisional and does not demonstrate that the 15 cultural mistakes resulted in these reactions.

Professional language earned 40% positive, 35% neutral, and 25% negative feedback. That is broadly consistent with the lexical, grammatical, and stylistic issues discovered in the materials, though the sample size is modest and the data reflect perception only.

Overall, satisfaction was higher, with 50% positive, 30% neutral, and 20% negative. Finding flaws in papers does not imply that all consumers were dissatisfied. Translation issues appear to coexist with generally effective communication, although specific issues impair clarity or professionalism for some readers.

4.4. Reported impacts on customer experience

Table 3.

Reported translation-related impacts on customer experience (n = 20)

Reported issue	Customers reporting the issue, n (%)
Difficulty understanding cultural content	7 (35%)
Confusion due to unclear language	6 (30%)
Misunderstanding of services	5 (25%)
Reduced trust in service quality	4 (20%)

The most frequently reported issue was the difficulty in comprehending cultural content (35%), followed by confusion caused by unclear language (30%), misunderstanding of services (25%), and reduced trust in service quality (20%). The percentages are not summed because they overlap. The 30% who reported perplexity is slightly higher than the 25% who rated clarity negatively (Table 2). It is possible that some respondents who rated clarity as neutral were still confused at moments, but the data cannot verify this.

Four of the twenty consumers were affected by the 20% who reported a decrease in trust. This does not imply that translation errors were the primary or exclusive factor, as trust is contingent upon service delivery, price, communication, and expectations. The data suggest a correlation between perceived professionalism and translation quality; however, it is impossible to determine the magnitude of this relationship.

4.5. Integrated discussion

Utilizing the three theoretical perspectives implemented in this study, the results may be interpreted. Nida's (1964) emphasis on meaning and naturalness explains why literal transfer results in expressions that are formally associated with the source but are unnatural or misleading in English, such as "Guests self-sufficient lunch," "Free money," and "Stream water."

The reason why the same choice is of varying importance depending on the document is explained by Skopos Theory (Nord, 1997; Vermeer, 1989/2004). Practical details must be communicated clearly in an itinerary, while a promotional text must also evoke interest and a positive image.

In 1997 and 2015, House developed an approach that integrates contextual and linguistic evaluation. The severity of the 85 errors is not the same. The repercussions of a grammatical error in a brief routine email are distinct from those of an unclear service condition in a customer-facing itinerary. Consequently, each error must be evaluated in consideration of the genre, situation, reader, and purpose.

These results are consistent with previous research on the topic of naturalness in web translation (Pierini, 2007), geotourism translation (Li et al., 2022), machine-translated tourism texts (Giampieri & Harper, 2022), and Vietnamese tourism signs, museum labels, and culture-specific materials (Nguyen et al., 2017; Pham & Tran, 2020; Tran et al., 2024). The workplace perspective is contributed by this case, which demonstrates that translation issues are frequently

associated with a heavy burden, inadequate terminology management, inadequate proofreading, and inconsistent utilization of technology.

In their entirety, the documents demonstrate apparent linguistic and cultural issues, the staff describe circumstances that may have contributed to them, and customers report challenges with clarity, cultural comprehension, services, and professionalism. While the three sources indicate a common direction, they do not establish direct causal relationships.

5. Conclusion

This study examined Vietnamese-to-English translation issues in 15 tourism documents from a Hanoi-based company. Interviews with 15 staff members and feedback from 20 international consumers enabled the separation of observable faults from the factors recognized by the staff and the effects indicated by customers.

For RQ1, the document analysis discovered 85 mistakes, including lexical (44.7%), grammatical (25.9%), cultural (17.6%), and stylistic (11.8%). Word choice and terminology stood out, and the findings demonstrate that quality must be assessed using linguistic, stylistic, cultural, and functional criteria, not only grammar.

Staff cited little specialist training, workload and deadline pressure, inconsistent terminology resources, insufficient proofreading, and uneven verification of machine- or AI-assisted translations. These are the participants' personal accounts of contributing factors, not established causes.

RQ3 clients mentioned issues with cultural awareness, clarity, services, and perceived professionalism. This supports the idea that translation quality is important to clients, but it does not demonstrate that the 85 errors caused these perceptions.

In theoretical terms, the study proposes that equivalence, functionalism, and contextual quality assessment work well together to interpret tourism translation issues. In practice, firms could increase quality by creating a common terminology database, providing specialized training, systematic proofreading, and ensuring that people post-edit machine- or AI-assisted translations.

Several limits apply. The study includes one company and several small participant groups. The process of selecting papers is not sufficiently documented to claim representativeness. Neither a second coder nor a reliability statistic verified the error coding. The customer sample was tiny, no inferential tests were performed, and the data is from a single period. These constraints limit generalization, but the study nonetheless provides a good picture of translation quality issues inside a functioning tourism organization.

Future research might compare multiple tourism companies, utilize bigger and more systematically sampled corpora with independent coders and reported reliability, and track organizations over time to determine if terminology tools, proofreading, post-editing, and training reduce specific types of error.

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Author Contributions

Ngo Thi Ha: Conceptualization, Methodology, Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Writing - Original Draft.

Dao Thi Thuy Linh: Validation, Writing - Review & Editing, Supervision. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Ethics Statement

The study analyzed existing tourism documents with permission from the participating company. Confidentiality and privacy were maintained throughout the research process.

Informed Consent Statement

No participants were directly recruited for this study. Permission to use the documents was obtained from the participating company.

Data Availability Statement

The research data are not publicly available due to confidentiality and privacy restrictions.

Declaration of Generative AI and AI-Assisted Technologies

ChatGPT (OpenAI) and QuillBot were used to assist with minor language editing, grammatical corrections, and improving the clarity and readability of the manuscript. All revisions were reviewed and verified by the authors, who take full responsibility for the final content.

Declaration of Generative AI and AI-Assisted Technologies

The authors declare that no generative AI or AI-assisted technology was used in the preparation of this manuscript.

References

- Argeg, G. M. (2015). The problems of translating medical terms from English into Arabic. *Durham e-Theses (Durham University)*. <https://openalex.org/W572872332>
- Ishtiaq, M. (2019). Book Review Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches (4th ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n5p40>
- Dann, G. M. (2022). *The Language of Tourism: A Sociolinguistic Perspective*. CABI. <https://doi.org/10.1079/9780851989990.0000>
- Examples based on the 85 mistakes coded in the 15 documents. A dash (-) indicates that no Vietnamese source expression is duplicated in the sample. The various renderings are the writers' illustration suggestions; they have not been tested with readers, and the best option is determined by the

document and its intended audience.

- Giampieri, P., & Harper, M. (2023). Tourism Translation: from Corpus to Machine Translation (and back). *Umanistica Digitale*. <https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.2532-8816/15109>
- House, J. (1997). Translation quality assessment: A model revisited. <https://openalex.org/W625853345>
- Foley, J. (2015). Translation Quality Assessment: Past and Present. *The New English Teacher*, 9(1). <https://openalex.org/W1542235308>
- Li, Q., Wu, R., & Ng, Y. (2021). Developing Culturally Effective Strategies for Chinese to English Geotourism Translation by Corpus-Based Interdisciplinary Translation Analysis. *Geoheritage*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12371-021-00616-1>
- 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. *ELOPE: English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries*, 18(1), 151–167. <https://doi.org/10.4312/elope.18.1.151-167>
- Pham, A. T. (2012). Identifying and Improving the image of Vietnam Tourism as a Tourism destination among Finnish tourist. *Theseus (Ammattikorkeakoulujen)*. <https://openalex.org/W2275852911>
- Wonderly, W. L. (1966). LINGUISTICS: Toward a Science of Translating, with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating. Eugene A. Nida. *American Anthropologist*, 68(3), 808–810. <https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1966.68.3.02a00440>
- Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (1982). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004669147>
- Nord, C. (1997). Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained. <https://openalex.org/W1572036451>
- Trang, P. T., & Linh, T. P. (2020). ASSESSMENT ON VIETNAMESE-ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF OBJECT LABELS AT VIETNAMESE WOMEN’S MUSEUM THROUGH FOREIGN TOURISTS’ PERSPECTIVES. *VNU Journal of Foreign Studies*, 36(6). <https://doi.org/10.25073/2525-2445/vnufs.4635>
- Pierini, P. (2007). Quality in Web Translation: An Investigation into UK and Italian Tourism Web Sites. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*(8), 85–103. <https://doi.org/10.26034/cm.jostrans.2007.700>
- Reiß, K., & Vermeer, H. J. (1984). *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*. DE GRUYTER. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111351919>
- Tran, K.-N. N., Nguyen, V.-K., & Vo, L.-H. (2024). Strategies for translating Vietnamese culture-specific terms in tourism materials into English. *Vivid: Journal of Language and Literature*, 13(2), 159–170. <https://doi.org/10.25077/vj.13.2.159-170.2024>
- Vermeer, H. J. (2021). Skopos and commission in translational action. *Routledge eBooks*, 219–230. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429280641-26>
- Mizukoshi, K. (2023). Case Study Research and Applications. *Quarterly Journal of Marketing*, 43(2), 3–5. <https://doi.org/10.7222/marketing.2023.045>

Category	Source expression	Existing English rendering	Possible alternative rendering (authors' suggestion)
Lexical	khách tự túc ăn trưa	Guests self-sufficient lunch	Lunch at your own expense
Lexical	miễn phí	Free money	Complimentary / free of charge, depending on context
Lexical	nước suối	Stream water	Bottled water, if bottled water is intended
Grammatical	-	Bus picking guests at hotel	Bus picks up guests at the hotel
Grammatical	-	Guide tour enthusiastically	The guide conducts the tour enthusiastically
Stylistic	-	You guys will like it	You will enjoy it / You may enjoy it
Stylistic	-	Must be on time	Please arrive on time
Cultural	đình làng	Village Hall	Đình (communal house), with a brief note on its religious and community role
Cultural	Mẫu Thượng Ngàn	Mother of the Forest	Mẫu Thượng Ngàn (Mother Goddess of the Mountains and Forests), with a short note on her place in Mother Goddess worship
Cultural	Suối Cá Thần	Holy Fish Stream	Suối Cá Thần (Sacred Fish Stream), with a short note on its local significance