INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIETY, CULTURE & LANGUAGE

Reviewing the Knowledge of Culture and Language: Multilingual Literature Research in a Scenario Framework

Teodora Kiryakova-Dineva[1*]
[1]*South-West University "Neofit Rilski", Bulgaria*

Abstract This research reflects on how multilingual literature reviews (MLLRs) may be employed in view of methodological and conceptual frameworks in the study of culture and linguistic diversity. Common literature reviews often tend to rely exclusively on English-language sources and thus limit the depth of their analysis. In response, this investigation proposes a multilingual approach that incorporates evidence-based sources from diverse languages and addresses a critical gap in academic knowledge production. The theoretical framework positions MLLRs as a new type of academic literature review alongside existing review typologies. The study develops a methodology for multilingual reviews and presents three case scenarios for the field of sustainability, cultural food heritage, and wellness tourism to demonstrate the potential applicability of MLLRs. The findings emphasize the value of MLLRs in cultural nuancing and identity hidden in language. By suggesting the MLLRs approach, the paper aims to contribute to a more inclusive and globally representative type of academic inquiry.

Keywords: *Multilingual literature reviews (MLLR), Cultural diversity, Linguistic analysis, Inclusive scholarship, Cross-linguistic methodology*

1. Introduction

Culture is a distinctly human phenomenon that is deeply interwoven with language. As the primary vehicle through which traditions, practices, and knowledge are expressed, language shapes how culture is produced, consumed, and understood. Whether in everyday life, historical documentation, science, popular mass practices, or research, the call for equity and inclusion is visible not only through the social lens but also can be followed far more into the battle for the endangered languages. The striving to advance supportive awareness is relevant to the concept that languages are treated, displayed, analyzed, and transmitted equally. However, scholarly literature reviews are mainly dominated by English-language sources, often overlooking rich insights from biliteracy in writing systems (Bialystok et al., 2009) or perspectives on translanguaging (MacSwan, 2017) exclusively relevant to regional linguistic interactions.

[*]**Corresponding Author:**
Teodora Kiryakova-Dineva
teodora.kiriakova@swu.bg

Received: March 2025
Revised: May 2025
Accepted: May 2025
Published: June 2025

© 2025 Kiryakova-Dineva. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).

https://doi.org/10.22034/ijscl.2025.2057836.4007

Thus, a monolingual approach alone can be interpreted as a form of cultural favoritism, constraining outgroup communication (Efferson et al., 2008; Ji & Bates, 2020). When adopted, it inevitably limits the scope of scientific inquiry, particularly in domains where cultural and linguistic contexts are inseparable. For instance, multilingualism is a foundational principle in the European Union (EU), applied in its main institutions (Rekosh, 2014), whose policies continually promote linguistic diversity. Given the EU's commitment to multilingualism, social discourses often involve the establishment and intended adaptation in the sphere of multilingual education (Gorter & Cenoz, 2011; Lapresta Rey et al., 2024). In the same way, in many countries with diverse cultural and ethnic populations, multilingualism plays a critical role in official discourse (Stritar & Stabej, 2013). Examples from Switzerland, Canada, South Africa, and many others illustrate that the co-existence of multiple languages, in fact, contributes to tolerance and identity maintenance. Beyond institutional policies, multilingual knowledge production extends to various fields of applied knowledge, including regional studies. For instance, the Benelux region (with Dutch, French, and Luxembourgish), the DACHL region (with the varieties of German in Austria, Switzerland, and Liechtenstein), and the Baltic region (i.e., Finnish, Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian) each attest distinct scientific traditions. These are best understood in their original linguistic environments. In such cases, translation alone is not sufficient, as certain cultural interpretations can only be fully appreciated within their native languages. Without attention to these dimensions and their underlying linguistic discourses, basic critical features may remain incomplete.

Multilingualism presents both opportunities and challenges in acquiring cultural and linguistic knowledge, which are essential for the proper understanding of cultural expressions. This becomes particularly evident when traditions are reflected in literature, whether in classical or contemporary works. In Nobel Prize-winning contributions, for example, translations into other languages take on "the nature of a mission" (Liu, 2001, p. 3). The same applies to the translation of recognized bestsellers and films, where meaning often goes beyond words. In such cases, a multilingual approach becomes necessary, as linguistic transfer fails to convey the plethora of cultural meanings.

The complexities of multilingualism are further highlighted in intercultural communication, where the primary objective is fostering mutual understanding among people with diverse cultural and religious identities. A compelling example of how greetings can function as markers of culture is found in the Arabic phrase "Salam Alaykum", meaning "Peace be upon you." Popular among foreigners, this greeting manages to express a sense of mutual respect, peace, and spiritual connection. It is a usual form of address in many Muslim-majority societies and has also transcended linguistic boundaries, especially where a form of religious syncretism is observed (Lubanska, 2015). In the Balkans, particularly in Bulgaria and other countries with Muslim minority populations, people greet one another with салам алейкум / salam alaykum, even if they do not speak Arabic or Turkish. This greeting thus functions as a marker of ethnic identity. However, when translated simply as "hello" in English, the phrase's socio-cultural richness is lost. This example illustrates the potential of multilingual reviewing in the context of interreligious dialogue. Such cases are needed since they allow researchers to uncover and grasp the full cultural significance of expressions that cannot be adequately conveyed through literal translation or a monolingual lens. A similar dynamic is evident in the field of idiomatic expressions and themed semantics, where the cultural background embedded in language necessitates a multilingual approach. Such sensitivity contributes to reducing the risk of misinterpretation (Khussainova et al., 2024). More broadly, multilingualism is not merely a theoretical concept, it has practical justifications. This raises the question: *How can academic literature review processes become more inclusive and culturally attuned*?

This article argues that multilingualism, as an academic approach, can enrich the study of culture and language while also challenging conventional notions of scholarship. It can expand the ways in which human knowledge can be assessed, interpreted, and validated. By incorporating sources from multiple linguistic traditions, multilingual literature reviews (MLLRs) offer a more inclusive academic orientation and redefine how cultural and language heritage is perceived in scholarly discourse. By opening the perspective of a theoretical framework, suggesting an MLLR methodology, and offering illustrative case scenarios for its validation, this study aims to initiate a broader discussion about the necessity of MLLRs as a valuable type of academic literature review.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1. The Multilingual Approach in Academic Literature Reviewing

Multilingualism, broadly defined, refers to the ability to use and comprehend multiple languages within various contexts of communication and social interaction. As an approach, multilingual research challenges the dominance of lingua franca by emphasizing the roles of English in education and in diverse regions, such as ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) (Kirkpatrick, 2010). It addresses local linguistic identities by offering task-based learning (Giguashvili, 2017). As a powerful tool for increasing language visibility, multilingualism serves important social goals such as promoting solidarity, inclusion, and empowerment (Stavans & Hoffmann, 2015), with significant implications for education and pedagogy (Liaw & Accurso, 2021) and digitalization (Fenner & Miladinovich, 2024). The role of multilingualism becomes especially evident when explored through the lens of linguistic landscape and the cultivation of multilingual awareness, as done from a historical perspective by Finkbeiner and White (2015) or in a plurilingual and pluricultural direction (Bednarska et al., 2023). In view of this research, the multilingual approach can be included in the design of studies and thus can extend beyond communication to encompass perspectives of knowledge construction and interpretation across different linguistic traditions.

However, multilingualism as an approach is still not commonly accepted as a typical method of research design. This survey has identified several examples where the multilingual approach has already been applied as a strategy, as a method, and as a framework. As a strategy, multilingualism serves to foster multicultural church communities (Coetzee-Van Rooy, 2014); as a method, it is acknowledged for negotiating to diverse societies (Jansson, 2021), and as a framework, it is understood as a means for evaluating products by users from diverse linguistic backgrounds (Nousias, 2023). In this regard, Hale and Eleta (2016, 2017) have also shown that reviews of products in different languages often reflect distinct cultural backgrounds and experiences, which at the same time suggests that translations rarely manage to convey meanings appropriately. In other words, monolingual research models can fail to capture the culture of users, resulting in both a lack of multilingual sensitivity and what Nousias (2023) defines as a semantic mismatch.

In contrast, a multilingual research method could better attest to similar divergences by including insights from multiple languages. Thus, multilingual research not only challenges the dominance of the lingua franca model but also underlines the value of language identities, knowledge, and the visibility of diverse languages in both publicity and academic contexts. These advantages have particular relevance when given support by the concept of multilingualism in contemporary scientific inquiry. This article adopts this perspective and proposes a framework for MLLRs as an emerging and essential methodology in the study of culture and language.

2.2. Positioning the Multilingual Literature Reviews (MLLRs)

Academic literature reviews are an established part of each scientific contribution, aiming to provide a critique and evaluation of existing knowledge upon synthesizing it within a given field. They commonly justify and open the selected research area. A well-grounded review ensures that diverse perspectives are incorporated, allowing for comprehensive analysis and adding novelty to the mainstream. Paul and Criado (2020) compare the way of composing a literature review not only to scientific writing, but also to making art, and in a later study, they exemplified the role of classic systematic literature reviews. Research directions in knowledge systematization, such as *meta-analytical reviews*, predispose different methodologies for presenting and organizing the body of research. Among these literature review types, *framework-based* reviews and *theme-based* reviews have a strong relevance to cultural and linguistic studies. *Framework-based* reviews are based on what, why, and how to contribute. Lim et al. (2022) also offer structured methods for categorizing research based on conceptual criteria, which makes them suitable for assessing multilingual literature sources. *Theme-based* reviews, as presented by Ward et al. (2009), emphasize the role of thematic organization in analyzing cultural phenomena, which can be useful when dealing with cross-linguistic comparisons and regional peculiarities.

MLLRs have not yet been formally recognized as a distinct type of literature review. As the proposed framework suggests, MLLRs represent a novel discourse type, enabling the inclusion of culturally and linguistically diverse scientific sources. Unlike traditional reviews that primarily rely on English-dominant academic publishing, MLLRs integrate scholarship from multiple linguistic contexts. The MLLRs approach recognizes, first, that concepts such as cultural heritage, identity, and language are derived from their original linguistic environments and, second, that certain cultural expressions cannot be fully understood outside their native language frameworks.

3. Methodology

In order to obtain a profiled MLLR that brings together various perspectives, an inclusive approach to language must be secured. This study suggests that a common structure of an MLLR methodology is needed to ensure that cultural and linguistic characteristics can be developed. The first stage of the envisaged MLLR approach involves developing a comprehensive search strategy aiming at identifying relevant academic sources in multiple languages (emphasizing non-English languages). This includes international database accessing, institutional repository accessing, and regional journals that publish in languages other than English. Inclusion and exclusion criteria should be established to ensure a balanced selection of the literature while maintaining academic rigor. Studies should be selected on the basis of their relevance to the research topic, the quality of their methodology, and their contribution to the multilingual discussion. The MLLR will focus on identifying the most impactful non-English studies before integrating them into the review.

Once the sources have been identified, the next step is to determine the best method for translation and interpretation of the research topic. The literature review must go beyond word-for-word translation and involve a comparative linguistic analysis. In this way, MLLRs can capture cultural and contextual meanings that may not be effectively assessed through other review techniques. Collaboration with scholars fluent in the respective native languages can also be beneficial, and contextual translation strategies can help preserve cultural and linguistic specificity.

If direct translation options do not suffice, discourse analysis, particularly of written and spoken texts, can assist in identifying how meaning is constructed across languages. This type of documentation provides insights into how individuals' cultural and linguistic experiences shape their academic discourse. Applying an MLLR framework means connecting sources across languages and providing a better view of the topic. Another important aspect of this methodology is the verification of the credibility and quality of multilingual resources. This can be ensured through the use of peer-reviewed publications, journals with impact factors, and other high-quality sources. For works published in languages other than English, additional credibility checks – such as cross-referencing – can further enhance the readability of the review.

The final stage of the MLLR is the synthesis of the findings. Thematic, discourse, and chronological analysis can reveal both similarities and differences across linguistic traditions. By comparing the way concepts are understood in diverse languages, the MLLR process will guarantee the diversity inherent in multilingual scholarship. The synthesis stage aims to demonstrate that knowledge is not constructed in isolation but is embedded in cultural and linguistic contexts. Figure 1 illustrates the envisaged stages of conducting a MLLR.

By following the proposed methodological design, the MLLR offers a possible and trustworthy way to integrate multilingual sources in research, whereby honoring the professional worth of non-English scholarship is of paramount importance. The MLLRs can ultimately contribute to the realm of increased acknowledgment of linguistic diversity, using multiple languages, translating different sources of evidence, and linguistically analyzing argumentative texts through the concept of multilingualism.

Figure 1
Suggested Stages of the MLLR Framework



4. Case Scenarios for Validating the MLLR Methodology in Cultural and Linguistic Research

4.1. Linguistic Framing of Sustainability in European Union Policies

Sustainability is at the heart of modern policymaking today, being a part of important United Nations Development and UNESCO Programs, and in particular in the EU, where such thinking is pursued in the realm of multilingualism. The terms such as *green economy* and *blue economy* have been implemented in many documents such as the White paper "The Mediterranean Sea We Want", the "Future Blue Economies: Activating Sustainable Growth In Southeast Asia or the OECD Green Growth" paper, and many others, which emerged into widespread usage. However, the meanings of the terms connected to sustainability discourse appear to differ widely in different languages and cultures. An example of the concept of blue can be connected with the evaluation of anger, i.e., in the Kazakh language (Pansat & Khalilkova, 2023), which makes its connotation in this language disputable. In order to fully understand how such terms evolve, adapt, and shape the policy discussion in a variety of countries, a multilingual review approach is necessary. In English, we refer to the *green economy* as an economic model that is relevant to the notion of climate change (Nhamo, 2016; Philander, 2012), environmental sustainability (Verma & Kandpal, 2021), renewable energy (Byrne, 2017), and carbon neutrality (Bigerna et al., 2023). In French, the term actually implies a form of government intervention or state-driven environmental policies. É*conomie verte* can mean policies connected to poverty and equity (Khor, 2013), which differ from English. In German, the term *Grüne Wirtschaft* is arguably more about the policies of the Green party than the neutral term widely signified in English, again altering the meaning in an important way (Heyer, 2021). In Spanish, *economía verde* has also emerged from institutions in English however it may not always imply the organizational weight. In Bulgarian, *устойчиво развитие* (ustojchivo razvitie, BG.; sustainable development, ENG) is aligned with predominantly green policies; however, it often is used to refer to economic planning (Kiryakova-Dineva et al., 2021) rather than the more defined environmental sustainability in English.

In addition, the meaning of sustainability in tourism, when translated into German as *Nachhaltiger Tourismus*, is a clear example of how the term is interchangeable with "nachhaltig", which literally translates to long-term resource efficiency and is thus mainly directed to rural tourism (Siegrist, 2012),

but it does not share the same cultural connection that sustainability enjoys in English-language discussions. However, these differences demonstrate how sustainability ideas are perceived and applied across languages in environmental concerns and public discourse. A monolingual review based on English-language sources would hardly manage to capture both the semantic meaning and the implied instrumental implications across different linguistic regions. For example, research on EU legislation regarding sustainability must account for how translations of these key terms influence the framing of policies in different member states. Given that EU communication is officially multilingual, the way in which sustainability is discussed in official EU documents, legal frameworks, and public policy debates cannot be fully understood without examining sources in multiple languages.

4.1.1. Application of the MLLR Methodology

Applying the MLLR methodology to a case study of sustainable development can be presented by following the structured MLLR framework. The sustainable policy may differ across linguistic and cultural contexts, making a multilingual literature review essential to analyzing the relevant linguistic and cultural nuances. The suggested pyramid model (Figure 1) can be performed in the suggested stages given in Table 1.

Table 1
Implication of the Sustainability Scenario in the MLLR Framework

Stage number	MLLR framework stage	Implication
1.	**Identification of Sustainability Terms in Non-English Databases**	The MLLR begins by selecting sustainability-related terms in several languages, relevant to the elaborated study, including policy documents and media discussions. Terms including green economy, blue economy, and sustainable tourism were gathered from a variety of policy documents, academia, and media commentary. From here, the MLLR uses this multilingual corpus to analyze how these terms are defined and discussed in various regional contexts and languages.
2.	**Compilation of Multilingual Sources and Relevance Screening**	The selection of materials includes EU communications, government policy documents, regional development plans, and academic literature to represent institutional and local understandings of sustainability. The goal is to identify convergence and divergence in the sustainability conversation.
3.	**Linguistic Comparison and Cultural Framing**	The term *sustainability* in English, Spanish, German, and Bulgarian, varies in meaning and application. In Bulgarian, the use of sustainability may be replaced by the notion of a green economy, and interpreted in this way it can imply environmental issues. In the case of *sustainable tourism*, it can be understood as eco-friendly tourism as well. The influence of political, cultural, and institutional contexts in the interpretation of sustainability can be next evaluated. The semantic differences can be further compared to identify variations in meaning and intended contexts.
4.	**Contextual Analysis and Expert Collaboration**	The main achievement on this level is the understanding of the applied meanings of sustainability in relevant culture and policymaking. At this stage, scholars of language and ecological governance can contribute to the understanding of how the framing of sustainability policy is shaped by languages and narrowed in its relevant social and economic system.

5.	**Synthesis and Validation**	The findings of the sustainability works from diverse languages can be summarized into a comprehensive multilingual analysis, including their broader implications in view of language, culture, and local knowledge systems, which reflect the national policy contexts. The MLLRs thus can ensure that sustainability is neither static nor universally understood but is constructed around language, culture, and institutional constructs. The suggested MLLR approach illustrates how sustainability discourses work differently depending on the region and offers recommendations for harmonizing policy communication and local meanings.

4.1.2. Discussion of the Applicability of the Sustainability Scenario for MLLRs

This case study demonstrates the value of multilingualism in addressing global policy issues. MLLR methodology enables researchers to move beyond the limitations of conducting research from a monolingual perspective and ultimately provide richer accounts of how sustainability is framed and realized cross-linguistically and across cultures. The methodological process also illustrates its utility in identifying significant distinctions in the interpretation of policies. When studies are conducted from a single language perspective, researchers may not recognize the sociopolitical implications of language and the implications of linguistic frameworks, thus leaving aspects drastic or incomplete to the relationships and conclusions they form. The application of the MLLR methodology proves that sustainability is not simply something that is agreed upon to be 'universally' accepted, but rather, the meaning of sustainability emerges as a reality of language, governance, and national commitments.

In addition, the scenario application of MLLR provides a model for other interdisciplinary research, particularly for those trying to understand the adaptation of policy in multilingual communities. The approach will help confirm that research results are sound, inclusive, and representative of a diverse perspective that is important in international policy development. The case regarding sustainability discourse in the EU provides an understanding of the importance of applying a multilingual review framework to any policy analysis. The MLLR methodology is an important method for dealing with language equity concerns and enhancing the value proposition of cross-cultural inquiry. Future applications of this methodology can move from sustainability policy to other domains such as health communication, law, and economics to provide a broad understanding of global issues through multilingual and cross-cultural lenses.

4.2. Linguistic Framing of Spa and Wellbeing across Cultures

Cultural perceptions of health, relaxation, and self-care have a major impact on the global *Spa and Wellness* industry (Choi et al., 2016; Ranchich Demir, 2021). The terms used to describe spa experiences, wellness therapies, and holistic health approaches depend on language and cultural contexts. A comprehensive review of terminology in various languages is necessary to understand how terminology can influence consumers' expectations, dictate marketing, and require modification of wellness tourism and programs between areas. In English contexts, "spa" is largely associated with luxury, relaxation, and reliable benchmarking (Garrow, 2008), whereas, in a French context, thermes refers specifically to thermal baths that have recognized medicinal benefits, and *bien-être* refers more holistically to the wellness associated with health (Christelle, 2016). In German, however, the term *wellness* is predominantly used and is often appropriated by commercial branding so overwhelmingly that it sometimes loses its medical or therapeutic connotation. In Japanese, the notions *onsen* (hot springs) and *sento* (public baths) constitute long-standing traditions that can be associated with wellness (Morishita, 2016). The additional connotation is much wider since it implies collective bathing and cultural rituals.

These traditions are completely intertwined with cultural rituals and spirituality within wellness. The term spa in Bulgarian is a modern adoption, primarily used for marketing and in tourism in international contexts; however, many researchers and professionals in the field continue to prefer the term

balneological tourism [балнеоложки туризъм, BG] and tourism which refers to the long-standing history of mineral springs and medical hydrotherapy associated with the country (Bozhkova, 2022; Katsarova & Kostadinova, 2021).

4.2.1. Application of the MLLR Methodology

Utilizing the MLLR approach to the wellness and spa tourism case study can further expand the vision for exploring conceptualizations of wellness, relaxation, and therapy in various contexts and languages. We can allocate the stages of the MLLR to the proposed pyramid model. More specifically, the analysis progresses through the following five stages, outlined in Table 2.

Table 2
Implication of the Spa and Wellbeing Scenario in the MLLR Framework

Stage number	MLLR framework stage	Implication
1.	**Identification of Spa and Wellbeing Terms in Non-English Databases**	The MLLR process begins with the identification of key terminologies related to wellness, spa culture, and therapeutic tourism in a number of languages, i.e., English, French, German, Japanese, and Bulgarian. Specific focus is given to terms associated with spa, wellness, thermes, onsen, and balneological tourism, as they appear in local policy papers, tourism advertisements, peer-reviewed literature, and media representations. This establishes a multilingual lexicon for this field.
2.	**Compilation of Multilingual Sources and Relevance Screening**	A variety of source types, such as materials from tourism boards, wellness marketing campaigns, academic studies, and cultural analyses, can be gathered across the selected languages. Inclusion criteria prioritize linguistic diversity, regional authenticity, and recognition of cultural framing. For instance, the contemporary use of the term spa and the historical conceptualization of balneological tourism in Bulgaria are both investigated, acknowledging that these terms are simultaneously evolving and enduring. Key terms are queried in their original languages to capture discourses specific to regional and cultural connotations, i.e., *balneario* (Spanish), *hammam* (Turkish), *курорт с минеральными водами* (Russian) (kurort s mineral'nymi vodami; mineral water resort, ENG.) or *оздоровительный центр* (Russian) (ozdorovitel'nyj centr; health center, ENG.).
3.	**Linguistic Comparison and Cultural Framing**	All the terms and concepts collected can be analyzed for semantic nuance and cultural specificity. For example, while spa in English often implies some level of luxury and leisure, the French term *thermes* continues to connote therapeutic uses. The Japanese term *onsen* expresses dimensions of spiritual and cultural practice related to bathing in the community, and in the Bulgarian academic context, *balneological tourism* refers to state-supported health treatments' use of mineral water. These comparisons ultimately highlight inter- and intra-cultural pathways that encode wellness ideals through language and their historical foothold.
4.	**Contextual Analysis and Expert Collaboration**	To interpret these variations, contextual factors such as the influence of health care policy, national tourism strategies, and national cultural heritage can be considered. In addition, involving a range of scholars and

		professionals who have the knowledge of each relevant language and situation ensures that nuanced cultural meanings are not lost. For instance, a scholar may indicate that wellness in German represents a more contemporary and market-based construct. In the Scottish context, scholars may describe it as a misunderstanding to use the phrase spa in contemporary tourism despite its projected historical relevance and attests to medical engagement. A similar case is found in Bulgarian spa tourism, since it still coexists with the medically rooted term *balneology*.
5.	**Synthesis and Validation**	To bring together and develop meaning across these findings with multilingual/international contexts, a cohesive analytical framework to draw together the epistemological and cultural diversity of contextualizing wellness is developed. This phase exemplifies awareness of how aspects of health and self-care cannot be translated cleanly but are filtered through languages of tradition and institutional practices. It also illustrates the value of selecting appropriate terms from a suite of options- the text has a contextual impact on configuration - taking into consideration the likely translated equivalent of, the regional influences of how words are commonly used, and the sensibilities of people and places attribute to culture and tourism.

4.2.2. Discussion of the Applicability of Spa and Wellbeing Scenario for MLLRs

The application of the MLLR methodology to spa and wellness tourism research can enable the study and applied knowledge of culturally relevant marketing. As a result, this may improve the adaptability of global wellness services. This case study highlights the role of linguistic framing in building consumer trust and providing an authentic wellness experience in diverse cultural contexts. In addition, assessing the research outcomes for comparative studies on consumer acceptance and adaptations to the business service model will deepen the understanding of wellness.

4.3. Culinary Heritage and Protected Designation of Origin (PDO) in Multilingual Contexts

Culinary heritage is closely tied to language, regional identity, and legal definition, which is precisely why it is a paradigm for the need for multilingualism in food studies. The PDO (Protected Designation of Origin) and PGI (Protected Geographical Indication) systems are designed to authenticate and indicate the regional provenance of food products and encounter enforcement and comprehension challenges in relation to linguistic and cultural context. The classifications also differ substantially in the use and comprehension across languages, which could also misrepresent, misinterpret, and complicate the marketing of food heritage when translated for an international audience.

In French, Appellation d' Origine Protégée (AOP) (Protected Designation of Origin, PDO) labels convey a great amount of cultural prestige and are embedded into legal language and consumer understanding. Generally, consumers in France identify AOP labels as representing high quality and authenticity respectively. Similarly, the Italian Denominazione di Origine Protetta (DOP) (Protected Designation of Origin, ENG.) is also associated with cultural prestige, reinforced regional identity, and local farming traditions in Italy. In contrast, in English-speaking markets, most consumers do not have much understanding of PDO and PGI labels, nor do they differentiate between products that are legally protected and generic *traditional* or *authentic* food products. This gap in understanding between regulatory meaning and consumer interpretation is significant for global trade and marketing of food products.

Translating and interpreting PDO classifications is particularly challenging in Arabic-speaking contexts where there may not be equal legal structures. The result is that translations of PDO terms cannot reflect *cultural transfer*, which can result in inappropriate use or reference to European products in locales that do not have a full understanding of these terms as shaped by European culture and history. Any discussion of cultural food heritage that does not include a multilingual and intercultural reference would miss its complexities. By examining food through the MLLR approach, food heritage researchers are able to understand better how legal definitions, consumer perceptions, and cultural meanings interact through their own language context. This multilingual approach to understanding food heritage will help ensure that global conversations about food authenticity are accurate, representative, and inclusive of the many ways that culinary heritage is protected legally and valued culturally across the globe.

4.3.1. Application of the MLLR Methodology

Culinary heritage is closely associated with regional identity, frameworks of governance, and language, and thus is an excellent case for using the MLLR methodology. The European frameworks of PDO and PGI that establish authenticity and geographical specifications for food products are reliant on meaning derived from their linguistic and cultural contexts to be correctly understood and implemented. Each language has differing perceptions and applications of PDO and PGI, creating an opportunity for a multilingual analysis. The MLLR methodology used in this context operates as presented in Table 3.

Table 3
Implication of Culinary Heritage Scenario in the MLLR Framework

Stage number	MLLR framework stage	Implication
1.	**Identification of Culinary Heritage and Key PDO Terms in Non-English Databases**	The MLLR process begins with the identification of specific names and labeled food associated with protection in various languages, such as *Denominazione di Origine Protetta* (DOP) in Italian or *Защитени названия за произход/Защитени географски указания* in Bulgarian, and *PDO/PGI* in international and English contexts. The identified terms are sourced from EU legal databases, food regulation documents, marketing texts, and cultural documents. This initial step compiles relevant legal and cultural terms across languages, which is a critical and universal component of food heritage studies.
2.	**Compilation of Multilingual Sources and Relevance Screening**	The next step is to draw from a wide variety of sources (legal texts, food-based marketing, consumer studies, and media) written in relevant languages. The criteria for inclusion focus on regulation, cultural authenticity, and consumer understanding. For example, documents in French and Italian often reference PDO terms, summarizing their provenance in well-defined legal and cultural frameworks; however, English language summaries often treat terms more generically.
3.	**Linguistic Comparison and Cultural Framing**	At this point, the terms are revealed in view of their semantic nuance and cultural connotation. If related to French products, the respective associations may include national pride and regional terroir, while Italian *DOP* may be more tied to agricultural tradition and regional identity. In contrast, in English, *PDO/PGI* elicits a more ambiguous meaning. In Arabic, where no equivalent regulatory food mechanisms may not exist, the use of PDO labels may appear irrelevant. However, when importing food from outside the EU, it is a good idea to grant the specific food with the PDO/PGI label. Such

		comparative insights combine not only language and culture but consumer perception, quality associations, and regulatory values as well.
4.	**Contextual Analysis and Expert Collaboration**	To examine these variances in detail, besides linguistic and cultural peculiarities, additional economic and legal contexts in the given region may be needed. Engagements with cultural food heritage specialists local marketing traditions may indicate how specific terms function not only in view of their food labeling but also culturally significant denotations. At this level of contextual interpretation, it is critical to understand how multilingual framing potentially shapes market behavior and regulatory enforcement.
5.	**Synthesis and Validation**	The final synthesis of MLLR has to integrate findings from the multilingual analysis to provide a general understanding of how culinary heritage, legal protections, and market function operate across languages. This stage reveals the dangers of omitting meanings encoded in names. Cultural literacy is indispensable in this regard. Thus, the MLLR, in this case, improves the accuracy of policy communication while safeguarding and respecting cultural food heritage in a globalized world.

4.3.2. Discussion on the Applicability of the MLLR Methodology

This case study emphasizes how multilingual research contributes to discussions about global food policy. The MLLR methodology will help to unpack how legal food designations operate in different languages, thereby minimizing misrepresentation and facilitating the accurate projection of food products internationally. Without a multilingual lens, not only researchers but also business operators and policymakers may overlook the specific consumer perceptions (Atanasova & Yaneva, 2021) and the role of cultural food heritage, including the labelling of food in diverse cultural contexts. The scenario-based methodology of MLLR and the instance of PDO terminology and culinary heritage is a suitable example of the imperatives for multilingual analysis in the study of language and culture. Ultimately, the MLLR methodology provides a structured approach for food heritage protection in other language-based contexts, and for ensuring that regulations are communicated, enforced, and respected in matters of global trade and heritage preservation.

5. Concluding Remarks

The presented research aimed to discuss a conceptualization of an MLLR methodology as a novel framework for scholarship inquiry, mainly relevant to the humanities and social sciences. Its central goal was to explore the way that incorporating multilingual sources could influence the limitations of monolingual academic reviews, which are predominantly conducted based on English-language sources. As its sub-goals, the research involved a testing of the proposed MLLR through three scenarios from the following perspectives: the sustainability discourse, the global wellness and spa tourism practices, and food heritage, so that it can assess the relevance of the need of linguistic and cultural framing.

The findings support the assumption that the identified MLLRs can offer an alternative to conventional review methods since they enhance the cultural and linguistic dimensions of knowledge production in academic discussions. The freely chosen three case scenarios demonstrate how monolingual approaches risk overlooking meanings embedded in culture and language. Moreover, modern consumer behaviors, specific social practices, and policy interventions often become visible only in a multilingual approach. This aligns with earlier and contemporary critiques of linguistic imperialism in English teaching

(Canagarajah, 1999; Koceva et al., 2023) and the nation gap in psychological science (Cheek, 2017), revealing the need for greater linguistic inclusivity. It also affirms Bielsa's (2020) argument that cosmopolitanism must move beyond monolingual frameworks to account for the plurality of global experiences.

Possible justification of the MLLR stems from its staged methodology: beginning with source identification, passing through semantic analysis and contextual framing, and finally ending with expert consultation. These stages collectively contribute to the engagement with cultural specificity and linguistic authenticity. As illustrated in the case studies, such an attempt at culture and language is essential for addressing their social value, including in science. Scholars such as Pennycook (2010) have argued that language is not merely a vehicle of information, but a cultural meaning-making means as well. Likewise, Heugh and Stroud (2018) advocate for knowledge that reflects the diversities of multilingualism and linguistic citizenship. MLLRs respond to these calls by aligning scholarly inquiry with cultural and linguistic realities. As Aminian Jazi and Kahl (2023) argue in their work on ethnocultural diversity, inclusivity is critical for illuminating the diasporas and hybrid identities that characterize contemporary societies. The MLLR methodology actualizes this understanding, grounding it in the subject matter.

The implications of this study reach far. MLLRs can serve as a methodological tool for each investigator seeking to set culturally sensitive knowledge. This can raise attention to non-Anglophone voices and provide richer, more nuanced accounts in discussion. In fields where language, identity, and culture are strongly intertwined, for example, environment and sustainability, tourism, and heritage studies, the MLLR framework counts for reflexivity and broader academic participation beyond linguistic boundaries.

Future research could expand the application of MLLRs from an interdisciplinary perspective and include migration studies (Krasteva, 2017), media and communication, or public health, where cultural interpretation plays a crucial role. The aim of including networks with multilingual data could further streamline and standardize the suggested methodology. Researchers might also explore effectiveness studies between MLLRs and conventional reviews to empirically establish the added value of multilingual approaches in various research contexts. In the current era of globalization and linguistic homogenization, the urgency for multilingual research adds to their importance. The MLLR framework contributes to two paradigm shifts: first, the one that recognizes the multiplicity of knowledge systems of culture, and the second, that necessitates linguistic nuancing in scholarly reviews. By considering these perspectives, research can become more equitable, inclusive, and representative.

Disclosure Statement

The author claims no conflict of interest.

Funding

The author would like to express sincere gratitude to South-West University "Neofit Rilski", Blagoevgrad, Bulgaria, for fully funding the research and supporting the publication of this article.

References

Aminian Jazi, I., & Kahl, T. (Eds.). (2023). *Ethno-cultural diversity in the Balkans and the Caucasus*. Austrian Academy of Sciences. https://doi.org/10.1553/978OEAW88759

Atanasova, A., & Yaneva, D. (2021). Characteristics of business networks and their role for strategic company development. *Entrepreneurship, 9*(2), 58-67. https://doi.org/10.37708/ep.swu.v9i2.5

Bednarska, K., Wysocka, A., Kruk, D., Saprikina, O., Siudzinska, N., Speed, T., Szafraniec, K., Terekhova, S., Tsonev, R., & Uhlárikoví, J. (Eds.) (2023). *Contributions to the 24th annual scientific conference of the association of Slavists (Polyslav)*. Harrassowitz Verlag.

Bialystok, E., Luk, G., & Kwan, E. (2009). Bilingualism, biliteracy, and learning to read: Interactions among languages and writing systems. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 9*(1), 43-61. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532799xssr0901_4

Bielsa, E. (2020). Cosmopolitanism beyond the monolingual vision. *International Political Sociology, 14*(4), 418–430. https://doi.org/10.1093/ips/oly014

Bigerna, S., D'Errico, M. C., Micheli, S., & Polinori, P. (2023). Carbon neutrality and energy efficiency. In M. Shahbaz, K. Dong, D. Balsalobre-Lorente, & A. Gedikli (Eds.), *Recent developments in green finance, green growth and carbon neutrality* (pp. 321–360). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-443-15936-7.00009-8

Bozhkova, R. (2022). *Специализирани видове туризъм в трансграничния регион България – Гърция* [Specialized types of tourism in the cross-border region Bulgaria – Greece]. Southwestern University Neofit Rilski.

Byrne, J. (2017). The promise of a green energy economy. In J. Byrne & Y. Wang (Eds.), *Green energy economies* (pp. 1–17). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203790434-1

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Christelle, M. (2016). Bien-être, être-bien et bonheur: Essai de clarification conceptuelle [Well-being, well-being and happiness: An attempt at conceptual clarification]. In M. Torre-Schaub (Ed.), *Le bien-etre et le droit* [Well-being and the law] (pp. 17–32). Éditions de la Sorbonne. https://doi.org/10.4000/books.psorbonne.95177

Cheek, N. N. (2017). Scholarly merit in a global context: The nation gap in psychological science. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 12*(6), 1133–1137. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617708233

Choi, M., Poade, D., Sohn, M., & Choi, M. (2016). SPA goers' repeated visits for Health and wellness and the influential factors. *The Health Care Manager*, *35*(3), 241–250. https://doi.org/10.1097/hcm.0000000000000121

Coetzee-Van Rooy, S. (2014). A multilingual church leader for a multilingual world: A case study. *Die Skriflig/In Luce Verbi*, *48*(2), Article a1865. https://doi.org/10.4102/ids.v48i2.1865

Efferson, C., Lalive, R., & Fehr, E. (2008). The coevolution of cultural groups and ingroup favoritism. *Science*, *321*(5897), 1844–1849. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1155805

Fenner, J., & Miladinovich, A. (2024). Grüße – Pozdrav – Üdvözlet from Vojvodina [Greetings – Pozdrav – Greetings from Vojvodina]. Reflections of multilingualism and digitization practices in a postcard collection from the first half of the 20th century. *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie*, *60*(1), 6-27. https://doi.org/10.13173/ZFB.60.1.006

Finkbeiner, C., & White, J. (2015). Language awareness and multilingualism: A historical overview. In J. Cenoz, D. Gorter, & S. May (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 1–14). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02325-0_1-1

Garrow, J. (2008). Spa industry benchmarking. In M. Cohen & G. Bodeker (Eds.), *Understanding the global spa industry* (pp. 53–65). Butterworth-Heinemann. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-7506-8464-4.00004-7

Giguashvili, T. (2017). TBL (Task-Based Learning) approach and multilingual environment. *International Journal for Multilingual Education*, *V*(10), 1–7. https://multilingualeducation.openjournals.ge/index.php/ijml/article/view/6634

Gorter, D., & Cenoz, J. (2011). Multilingual education for European minority languages: The Basque country and Friesland. *International Review of Education*, *57*, 651-666. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-011-9248-2

Hale, S. A., & Eleta, I. (2016). User reviews and language: How language influences ratings. In J. Kaye & A. Druin (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 1208-1214). ACM. https://doi.org/10.1145/2851581.2892466

Hale, S. A., & Eleta, I. (2017). Foreign-language reviews: Help or hindrance? In G. Mark & S. Fussell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 4430-4442). ACM. https://doi.org/10.1145/3025453.3025575

Heugh, K., & Stroud, C. (2018). Diversities, affinities and diasporas: A southern lens and methodology for understanding multilingualisms. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *20*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2018.1507543

Heyer, A. (2021). Das grüne jahrzehnt [The green decade]. In S. A. D. Nachlass & W. Harichs (Eds.), *Das grüne jahrzehnt* (pp. 19–130). Tectum. https://doi.org/10.5771/9783828875951-19

Jansson, G. (2021). Negotiating belonging in multilingual work environments: Church professionals' engagement with migrants. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *14*(4), 723–749. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2021-0054

Ji, Y., & Bates, B. R. (2020). Measuring intercultural/international outgroup favoritism: Comparing two measures of cultural cringe. *Asian Journal of Communication*, *30*(2), 141–154. https://doi.org/10.1080/01292986.2020.1738511

Katsarova, S., & Kostadinova, T. (2021). Repositioning of Bulgaria on the European map as a tourist destination offering a competitive tourist product through health tourism (balneo-spa/medical spa, spa and wellness). *Varna Medical Forum*, *10*(2), 182-187. https://doi.org/10.14748/vmf.v10i2.7898

Khor, M. (2013). Les risques du concept d'économie verte au regard du développement durable, de la pauvreté et de l'équité [The risks of the green economy concept with regard to sustainable development, poverty and equity]. In B. Duterme (Ed.), *Économie verte: Marchandiser la planète pour la sauver?* [Green economy: Commodifying the planet to save it?] (pp. 23–84). Éditions Syllepse. https://doi.org/10.3917/syll.cetri.2013.01.0024

Khussainova, G., Tleuberdiyev, B., Shakenova, M., Islam, A., & Roziyeva, D. (2024). The cultural spectrum of colors: Exploring Kazakh, Korean and English color concepts. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, *12*(3), 80-94. https://doi.org/10.22034/ijscl.2024.2035309.3565

Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *English as a lingua franca in ASEAN: A multilingual model*. Hong Kong University Press.

Kiryakova-Dineva, T., Stoykova, B., & Yarkova, Y. (2021). The role of tourism for sustainable local development in the conditions of contemporary challenges. *EDULEARN Proceedings*, *1*, 8738–8743. https://doi.org/10.21125/edulearn.2021.1760

Krasteva, R. (2017). Local impact of refugee and migrants crisis on Greek tourism industry. *Economic Studies, 4*, 182-195

Koceva, A., Kostadinova, D., & Tabutova, T. (2023). British English versus American English preference by university students of EFL. *Teacher*, *26*, 6–10. https://doi.org/10.20544/teacher.26.01

Lapresta Rey, C., Janés i Carulla, J., Huguet, À., Senar Morera, F., Ubalde, J., Amadó, A., Fernández Costales, A., Jiménez-Salcedo, J., Martínez, M., Sandoval, A., & Van Hooft, A. (Eds.) (2024). *Multiling-EU minibook. Multilingualism and multilingual education in the European Union*. Universitat de Lleida. https://doi.org/10.21001/multilingualism.education.en

Liaw, M. J., & Accurso, K. (2021). Design and opportunity in critical multilingual/multimodal composing pedagogy. In D. Shin, T. Cimasko, & Y. Yi (Eds.), *Multimodal composing in K-16 ESL and EFL education* (pp. 89–108). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-0530-7_6

Lim, W. M., Kumar, S., & Ali, F. (2022). Advancing knowledge through literature reviews: 'what', 'why', and 'how to contribute.' *The Service Industries Journal*, *42*(7–8), 481–513. https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2022.2047941

Liu, L. (2001). Interview with Mabel Lee: Translating Nobel Prize winner Gao Xingjian's *soul mountain*. *Translation Review*, *62*(1), 3–9. https://doi.org/10.1080/07374836.2001.10523793

Lubanska, M. (2015). *Muslims and Christians in the Bulgarian Rhodopes. Studies on religious (anti) syncretism*. De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110440003

MacSwan, J., (2017). A multilingual perspective on translanguaging. *American Educational Research Journal*, *54* (1), 167–201. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216683935

Morishita, S. (2016). Managing Omotenashi in Onsen Ryokans. *Journal of Global Tourism Research*, *1*(2), 157–160. https://doi.org/10.37020/jgtr.1.2_157

Nhamo, G. (2016). Sustainability, climate change and green economy transition. In G. Nhamo & V. Mjimba (Eds.), *Sustainability, climate change and the green economy* (pp. 3–16). JSTOR. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvh8r100.13

Nousias, A. (2023). The ethics of machine translation. In H. Moniz & C. P. Escartín (Eds.), *Towards responsible machine translation*. *Machine translation: Technologies and applications* (Vol. 4, pp. 29-48). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-14689-3_3

Paul, J., & Criado, A. R. (2020). The art of writing literature review: What do we know and what do we need to know? *International Business Review*, *29*(4), Article 101717. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2020.101717

Paul, J., & Menzies, J. (2023). Developing classic systematic literature reviews to advance knowledge: Dos and don'ts. *European Management Journal*, *41*(6), 815–820. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2023.11.006

Pansat, Z., & Khalikova, N. (2023). Semantic features of color in emotional, expressive words: The concept of "blue" in the Kazakh language. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, *11*(2), 85-93. https://doi.org/10.22034/ijscl.2023.556420.2676

Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203846223

Philander, G. S. (Ed.) (2012). *Encyclopedia of global warming & climate change*. Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412963893

Ranchich Demir, M. (2021). Bet on health – conference review. *International Journal of Spa and Wellness*, *4*(1), 109–112. https://doi.org/10.1080/24721735.2021.1898809

Rekosh, K. K. (2014). Multilingualism as a principle of the EU court of justice. *MGIMO Review of International Relations*, *6*(39), 245–252. https://doi.org/10.24833/2071-8160-2014-6-39-244-252

Siegrist, D. (2012). Nachhaltiger ländlicher tourismus als entwicklungsperspektive in den Alpen [Sustainable rural tourism as a development perspective in the Alps]. In H. Rein & A. Schuler (Eds.), *Tourismus im ländlichen raum* [Tourism in rural areas] (pp. 333–342). Gabler Verlag. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-8349-3820-6_20

Stavans, A., & Hoffmann, C. (2015). *Multilingualism*. Cambridge University Press.

Stritar, M., & Stabej, M. (2013). EU and lesser-used languages. In A. Berthoud, F. Grin, & G. Lüdi (Eds.), *Exploring the dynamics of multilingualism* (pp. 179–204). John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/mdm.2.09str

Verma, S., & Kandpal, D. (2021). Green economy and sustainable development. In P. Singh, P. Verma, D. Perrotti, & K. K. Srivastava (Eds.), *Environmental sustainability and economy* (pp. 325–343). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-822188-4.00016-6

Ward, V., House, A., & Hamer, S. (2009). Developing a framework for transferring knowledge into action: A thematic analysis of the literature. *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy*, *14*(3), 156–164. https://doi.org/10.1258/jhsrp.2009.008120