

Article

Research on the International Translation, Introduction, and Communication Strategies of Haikou Historical and Cultural Symbols under the Background of the Free Trade Port

Cuiting Gao^{1,*}

¹ Hainan Vocational University of Science and Technology, Haikou, China

* Correspondence: Cuiting Gao, Hainan Vocational University of Science and Technology, Haikou, China

Abstract: This study investigates the international translation, introduction, and communication strategies employed for Haikou's historical and cultural symbols within the evolving context of the Hainan Free Trade Port. As a coastal capital with layered heritage—spanning Li and Miao indigenous traditions, maritime Silk Road legacies, colonial-era architecture, and revolutionary modern narratives—Haikou presents a complex semiotic landscape requiring nuanced cross-linguistic and cross-cultural mediation. The research adopts a tripartite analytical framework grounded in translational pragmatics, strategic communication theory, and symbolic geography. Field-based data collection included systematic documentation of multilingual signage, official promotional materials, museum interpretive texts, digital platforms, and guided tour narratives across twelve key heritage sites. Linguistic analysis focused on lexical selection, syntactic framing, cultural substitution patterns, and narrative hierarchy in English-language outputs. Findings reveal persistent asymmetries: over-reliance on literal translation obscures contextual meaning; selective symbol amplification privileges colonial and republican-era landmarks while marginalizing indigenous epistemologies and vernacular urban memory; and digital dissemination remains fragmented across institutional silos with inconsistent terminology and tonal registers. The study proposes a calibrated strategy of 'anchored adaptation'—a process that retains core cultural referents while dynamically adjusting explanatory depth, narrative sequencing, and multimodal emphasis according to target audience profiles and communicative contexts. This approach prioritizes semantic fidelity over lexical equivalence, foregrounds relational meaning over static representation, and embeds translation within broader institutional coordination mechanisms. The implications extend beyond Haikou to inform policy-integrated cultural communication frameworks for emerging free trade zones where heritage serves both identity consolidation and global positioning functions.

Keywords: cultural translation; heritage communication; Free Trade Port

Received: 05 December 2025

Revised: 18 January 2026

Accepted: 29 January 2026

Published: 04 February 2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction: Haikou's Heritage at the Confluence of Policy and Perception

1.1. Strategic Context: The Free Trade Port as a Catalyst for Cultural Re-Positioning

The Hainan Free Trade Port represents a paradigmatic policy shift that fundamentally recalibrates Haikou's geopolitical and cultural positioning. No longer confined to its traditional function as a provincial administrative hub, the city is now strategically reconfigured as a node of international cultural exchange and symbolic projection. This transformation imposes urgent demands on how Haikou's historical and cultural identity—layered across colonial, maritime, revolutionary, and vernacular registers—is selected, framed, translated, and communicated to global audiences [1]. The Free Trade Port framework does not merely facilitate economic openness; it activates a structural imperative for cultural re-positioning, wherein heritage ceases to be an inward-facing archive and becomes an active instrument of soft diplomacy, place branding, and cross-border narrative alignment [2]. Consequently, translation practices must transcend

linguistic equivalence to encompass semiotic adaptation, contextual mediation, and strategic resonance. Introduction mechanisms—ranging from digital platforms and museum curation to multilingual signage and academic collaboration—require systematic calibration against both policy objectives and audience reception patterns. Communication strategies must therefore be conceived not as ancillary outreach but as constitutive elements of Haikou's emergent international identity within this accelerated institutional landscape [1, 3].

1.2. Defining the Core Challenge: From Local Symbolism to Global Intelligibility

Haikou's historical and cultural symbols—Qilou architecture, Wugong Temple, Li bamboo weaving traditions, and Nanyang returnee narratives—embody layered local epistemologies that do not map transparently onto English-language discursive frameworks. These symbols function as semiotic nodes within endogenous sociocultural systems, where meaning accrues through embodied practice, intergenerational transmission, and spatial ritual rather than lexical denotation. Consequently, direct lexical translation frequently yields semantic attenuation or pragmatic misalignment: architectural terms lack functional equivalents in built-environment discourse; craft-specific lexicons elide technical and cosmological dimensions; diasporic histories resist compression into standardized narrative templates [1, 4]. The challenge is thus not merely linguistic but hermeneutic—requiring strategic mediation that preserves symbolic density while enabling cross-contextual intelligibility. This necessitates moving beyond equivalence-based models toward adaptive translational architectures capable of sustaining polyvalent signification across policy, curatorial, and digital communication domains. Under the Free Trade Port framework, such architectures must simultaneously satisfy regulatory coherence, audience accessibility, and semiotic fidelity—rendering the problem structural rather than procedural [5].

1.3. Scope and Orientation of the Study

This study deliberately narrows its analytical aperture to the translational, institutional, and discursive dimensions of Haikou's historical and cultural symbols as they circulate internationally within the evolving framework of the Hainan Free Trade Port [3, 6]. It does not address heritage conservation, site management, or material restoration practices. Instead, it interrogates how meaning is actively constructed through translation choices—lexical, syntactic, and pragmatic—across multiple language pairs; how state and quasi-state institutions mediate symbolic content via official publications, digital platforms, and diplomatic briefings; and how audience-specific framing strategies recalibrate narrative emphasis for distinct international constituencies, including policymakers, investors, scholars, and cultural tourists [7, 8]. The orientation is fundamentally semiotic and communicative: attention centers on processes of signification, channel selection, message adaptation, reception variability, and feedback loops in cross-border symbolic exchange [9]. Methodologically, the research prioritizes comparative discourse analysis, institutional ethnography, and multilingual corpus interrogation over archaeological survey or architectural documentation. Its contribution lies in mapping the operational logics that govern how Haikou's intangible symbolic capital is rendered legible, credible, and strategically functional beyond national borders.

2. Literature and Conceptual Foundations: Beyond Translation as Transfer

2.1. Translational Pragmatics in Cultural Contexts

Translational pragmatics reorients translation from a static transfer model to a dynamic, context-embedded practice [4]. Within cultural communication—particularly for historically layered urban symbols such as those of Haikou—the act of rendering meaning is inherently strategic: every decision to omit, amplify, or explicate reflects tacit assumptions about audience familiarity, institutional authority, and communicative intent [10]. This perspective foregrounds translation as situated action, where lexical equivalence yields to functional adequacy across divergent epistemic frameworks. In the

Free Trade Port context, such actions acquire heightened significance, as translation mediates between local heritage narratives and global policy discourses, demanding calibrated interventions that preserve semantic integrity while accommodating asymmetrical knowledge distributions [2, 11]. Pragmatic choices thus operate at multiple levels: syntactic restructuring to manage temporal or spatial deixis; paratextual framing to signal interpretive stance; and terminological negotiation to reconcile vernacular specificity with international intelligibility [7, 12]. Crucially, these operations are neither neutral nor universally applicable but emerge from iterative alignment among source-culture fidelity, target-audience reception, and macro-strategic objectives. Consequently, translation becomes a site of epistemological negotiation—one where linguistic form serves as both conduit and constraint in cross-cultural symbolic exchange.

2.2. Strategic Communication and Symbolic Geography

Strategic communication operates as a deliberate, multi-channel practice through which historically sedimented cultural symbols are recontextualized and spatially activated to construct authoritative narratives about place. Within symbolic geography, Haikou's historical landmarks, vernacular architecture, and intangible heritage practices function not as static artifacts but as mobile signifiers whose meanings are continuously negotiated across diplomatic, economic, and touristic registers [13]. In the Free Trade Port context, such symbols become instrumental in projecting developmental legitimacy, regional distinctiveness, and institutional trust—mediating between local memory and global expectations. This process entails coordinated semiotic labor: translation extends beyond linguistic equivalence to encompass visual framing, temporal sequencing, and platform-specific adaptation, all calibrated to resonate within competing geopolitical imaginaries [5]. Spatial embedding ensures that symbolic deployment is anchored in material sites—port zones, heritage districts, waterfront corridors—where physical infrastructure and narrative infrastructure converge [14, 15]. Consequently, communication strategy must account for layered reception: domestic stakeholders interpret symbols through continuity frameworks, while international audiences engage them via legibility thresholds shaped by prior exposure to Chinese urban branding. The efficacy of such strategies hinges on coherence across scalar levels—from municipal policy documents to social media micro-narratives—without flattening historical complexity into promotional cliché.

2.3. Heritage Narratives in Policy-Driven Urban Transformation

Heritage narratives in policy-driven urban transformation operate at a critical juncture where historical symbols are mobilized not merely as cultural artifacts but as strategic instruments within state-led development frameworks [12, 16]. In contexts such as the Hainan Free Trade Port, heritage is increasingly instrumentalized to reinforce territorial branding, attract foreign direct investment, and accelerate infrastructural modernization [5]. This instrumental logic often privileges legible, marketable motifs—monumental architecture, ritualized festivals, or stylized vernacular aesthetics—while marginalizing counter-narratives rooted in displacement, contested ownership, or intergenerational erasure. Such selective representation risks flattening layered temporalities into linear progress scripts, obscuring how residents negotiate continuity amid rapid spatial reconfiguration. Ethical translation of Haikou's historical-cultural symbols thus demands more than linguistic fidelity; it requires epistemic humility toward plural authorship, acknowledgment of silences embedded in official archives, and methodological openness to non-institutional memory practices. The challenge lies in sustaining narrative complexity without compromising communicative clarity—ensuring that heritage functions not as a static backdrop for policy spectacle, but as a dynamic, contested, and living register of urban belonging. This recalibration necessitates institutional scaffolding that values interpretive plurality alongside strategic coherence [14, 17].

3. Materials and Methods: Systematic Documentation and Analytical Triangulation

3.1. Site Selection and Representativeness Criteria

Site selection employed a stratified purposive sampling framework to identify twelve heritage sites across Haikou that collectively represent the city's layered historical and cultural identity. Temporal coverage spans the Tang dynasty through the contemporary era, ensuring chronological breadth. Ethnic representation encompasses Hainanese Han, Li, and Hui communities, with sites selected to reflect distinct linguistic, ritual, and architectural traditions. Institutional stewardship was evaluated across three tiers: state-administered museums, municipally managed memorial parks, and community-governed religious structures—each demonstrating divergent translation mandates and communicative constraints. Visibility within official tourism infrastructure served as a fourth criterion; all selected sites appear in at least two of the following: provincial bilingual travel portals, national intangible cultural heritage databases, or Free Trade Port promotional materials. Historic districts such as Qilou Old Street were included for their high-density symbolic clustering, while individual landmarks—including Buddhist temples, colonial-era churches, and revolutionary memorial parks—were chosen for their discrete semiotic weight and documented translation histories [18]. This configuration enables analytical triangulation across temporal, ethnic, administrative, and discursive dimensions, supporting systematic comparison of translation fidelity, lexical adaptation, and narrative framing across institutional contexts. The final sample balances density and diversity without compromising methodological coherence or empirical tractability [19].

3.2. Data Collection Protocols

Data collection adhered to a rigorously standardized protocol designed to ensure reproducibility, contextual fidelity, and multilingual integrity across six artifact categories: public signage, printed brochures, audio guide scripts, official website content, institutional social media posts, and verbatim transcripts from live guided tours. Each artifact was captured in its original language version, with parallel translations recorded only when officially provided by source institutions. Version control was implemented through timestamped digital archiving, with metadata fields capturing location coordinates, date of capture, institutional provenance, medium-specific format (e.g., PDF, MP3, HTML), and observable audience engagement cues where applicable. For dynamic content—including websites and social media—archival snapshots were taken at biweekly intervals over a twelve-month period to track iterative revisions and strategic recalibrations. Audio recordings underwent professional transcription with speaker attribution and paralinguistic notation (e.g., pauses, emphasis markers) preserved. All textual materials were subjected to optical character recognition validation where necessary, followed by manual verification against originals. Contextual metadata included environmental conditions (e.g., indoor/outdoor placement, proximity to landmarks), intended audience segmentation (e.g., domestic tourists, international visitors, academic delegations), and explicit communicative purpose (e.g., orientation, commemoration, commercial promotion). No artifacts were altered, redacted, or synthetically generated; inclusion required demonstrable public accessibility and institutional authorship. The final corpus comprised 1,247 discrete artifacts, each uniquely identified via a hierarchical alphanumeric code reflecting domain, subdomain, temporal sequence, and language variant [9, 19]. This systematic approach ensured analytical coherence while preserving the semantic and pragmatic heterogeneity essential for triangulated interpretation [8].

3.3. Analytical Framework and Coding Logic

The analytical framework employs a three-tier coding system designed to capture translation-specific transformations across lexical, narrative, and pragmatic dimensions [7]. Lexical anchoring codes examine how core cultural terms—such as qilou, Hainanese opera, and Wenchang chicken—are rendered in English, distinguishing between transliteration, calque, functional equivalence, and explanatory paraphrase. Narrative framing codes track structural shifts in temporal sequencing, agent attribution, and causal logic, identifying whether source-text agency is preserved, redistributed, or suppressed,

and whether historical causality is linearized, attenuated, or recontextualized for target audiences. Pragmatic modulation codes assess textual density through explanatory insertions, register adjustments (e.g., formal academic versus journalistic), and intertextual referencing patterns—including citations of UNESCO frameworks, tourism policy documents, or regional heritage charters. Each code operates at the sentence and paragraph level, with dual coding by trained annotators achieving intercoder agreement of $\kappa = 0.87$ on a stratified 15% sample. Coding logic follows iterative refinement: initial schema development was grounded in pilot analysis of ten representative texts, followed by two rounds of consensus calibration using discrepancy resolution protocols. All coded data are mapped to strategic categories—domestication, foreignization, amplification, omission, and reframing—to support comparative assessment of translation fidelity, communicative efficacy, and discursive alignment with Free Trade Port development objectives. This triangulated approach ensures systematic capture of both explicit semantic choices and implicit ideological positioning embedded in translation practice.

4. Results: Patterns of Representation and Discontinuity

4.1. Lexical and Syntactic Trends Across Media Channels

Analysis of lexical and syntactic patterns across media channels reveals systematic divergence in representational strategies for Haikou's historical and cultural symbols. Official documents exhibit a pronounced preference for nominalization, favoring abstract, de-verbified constructions that foreground institutional authority and temporal permanence—such as "the preservation of Qilou architectural heritage" rather than "authorities preserve Qilou buildings." In contrast, tour scripts systematically avoid culturally embedded verbs—particularly those denoting ritual, lineage, or localized labor practices—substituting generic action verbs like "visit," "see," or "explore" to ensure cross-linguistic accessibility. Terminological inconsistency emerges as a critical discontinuity: the term 'Qilou' appears variably as "arcade buildings," "veranda houses," or left untranslated as 'Qilou,' with no discernible channel-specific rationale governing selection. This variation correlates neither with audience expertise nor medium formality but reflects ad hoc editorial decisions lacking terminological governance frameworks. Syntactically, official texts deploy complex embedding and passive voice to depersonalize agency, whereas promotional materials prioritize subject--verb--object immediacy and active voice to enhance narrative engagement. Such asymmetries indicate fragmented strategic coherence: while nominalization reinforces bureaucratic legitimacy, lexical substitution and inconsistent terminology undermine semantic stability and intertextual alignment. These patterns collectively signal a representational ecology characterized less by deliberate multichannel adaptation and more by reactive, context-bound compromises—compromises that risk diluting the epistemic weight and cultural specificity of Haikou's symbolic repertoire within international discourse.

4.2. Narrative Hierarchy and Temporal Compression

Analysis reveals a pronounced narrative hierarchy in English-language representations of Haikou's historical and cultural symbols, characterized by systematic temporal compression. Pre-modern histories—including Ming-Qing maritime trade networks, Hainanese dialect literature, and pre-colonial ritual topographies—are consistently truncated or omitted, despite their physical inscription in urban heritage sites. In contrast, twentieth-century political milestones dominate discursive space, often foregrounded as singular inflection points that eclipse longer-term socio-spatial continuities. This asymmetry is not merely additive but constitutive: the selection and sequencing of events actively reconfigure causality, positioning modern state-led development as the teleological culmination rather than one episode within layered historical trajectories. Crucially, indigenous cosmological frameworks—such as Li and Miao spatial ontologies, ancestral geomantic logics, and seasonal ritual calendars—remain nearly absent from official English narratives, even where material traces persist on-site, such as stone alignments, sacrificial platforms, or vernacular architectural

orientations. Such omissions are not incidental but reflect institutionalized translation protocols that privilege legibility for international policy audiences over epistemic fidelity to local knowledge systems. The resulting representational architecture thus enacts a double erasure: first, of deep-time historical agency; second, of non-Western temporalities and relational worldviews. This pattern undermines the stated objectives of intercultural dialogue and equitable knowledge exchange under the Free Trade Port framework, revealing a structural misalignment between infrastructural ambition and semiotic practice.

4.3. Institutional Fragmentation in Digital and Physical Spaces

Institutional fragmentation manifests acutely across Haikou's digital and physical communication infrastructures, undermining coherence in the representation of historical and cultural symbols. Comparative analysis reveals persistent terminological inconsistencies: municipal tourism websites employ standardized Mandarin-to-English transliterations aligned with national romanization guidelines, whereas third-party travel platforms frequently adopt phonetic approximations or legacy spellings that obscure semantic continuity. Museum exhibition labels further diverge, introducing specialized academic terminology absent from public-facing digital interfaces, thereby erecting epistemic barriers for non-specialist audiences. Chronological framing exhibits comparable disjunction—official portals emphasize linear developmental narratives anchored in administrative milestones, while crowd-sourced platforms privilege anecdotal temporalities tied to visitor experiences or seasonal events. Thematic emphasis compounds this discontinuity: heritage institutions foreground maritime trade and colonial-era architecture as constitutive of Haikou's identity, whereas commercial platforms disproportionately highlight culinary traditions and contemporary street art, effectively recasting historical symbolism through experiential and consumptive logics. These misalignments are not incidental but structurally embedded, reflecting decentralized governance models, divergent performance metrics across agencies, and asymmetrical resource allocation between digitization initiatives and curatorial infrastructure. The absence of cross-platform lexical governance frameworks permits semantic drift to accumulate unchecked, eroding referential stability across touchpoints. Consequently, the Free Trade Port's strategic objective of projecting a unified cultural brand remains compromised by institutional silos that operate without shared ontologies, validation protocols, or feedback mechanisms capable of sustaining representational integrity across mediated spaces.

5. Discussion: Toward Anchored Adaptation as a Strategic Imperative

5.1. Interpreting the Gaps: Epistemic Prioritization and Communicative Risk Aversion

The observed patterns in the international translation and communication of Haikou's historical and cultural symbols are not symptomatic of operational inadequacy but rather reflect deliberate epistemic choices embedded within institutional frameworks. These choices prioritize diplomatic legibility—ensuring alignment with internationally recognized historical narratives—over granular cultural specificity, thereby facilitating smoother reception across multilateral platforms. Such prioritization manifests in the consistent substitution of locally grounded semantic units with broadly intelligible analogues, such as rendering vernacular maritime rituals through generalized "coastal heritage" tropes or reframing colonial-era architectural hybridity via universalized "fusion aesthetics." Concurrently, communicative risk aversion operates as a structural constraint: institutions systematically favor historically familiar templates—Qing dynasty urbanism, Lingnan architectural motifs, or pan-Southeast Asian trade networks—over less codified, contested, or politically nuanced layers of Haikou's layered identity [4]. This aversion is neither arbitrary nor passive; it functions as a calibrated strategy to minimize interpretive friction, reduce potential for misrepresentation, and sustain narrative coherence across heterogeneous stakeholder groups. Consequently, adaptation becomes anchored—not to source-text fidelity or local semiotic density—but to pre-established discursive

affordances that guarantee functional interoperability within the Free Trade Port's transnational governance and promotional ecologies. The resulting representational economy privileges stability, scalability, and diplomatic resonance over epistemic plurality or historiographic complexity.

5.2. The Limits of Standardization and the Case for Contextual Calibration

Standardization in translation and cultural communication, while administratively expedient, proves fundamentally inadequate for mediating Haikou's historical and cultural symbols within the Free Trade Port context [16]. Rigid glossaries and static style guides assume semantic stability across divergent reception environments—a premise contradicted by empirical engagement patterns. Signage deployed at port terminals demands lexical economy and immediate legibility, prioritizing topographic clarity over historiographic nuance. In contrast, interactive digital platforms afford layered exposition: users may toggle between archival photographs, oral histories, and linguistic etymologies, enabling recursive, self-paced interpretation. Audience segmentation further destabilizes uniformity: domestic tourists require minimal contextual scaffolding for symbols like Qilou architecture or Wugong Temple, whereas international business delegates or academic researchers necessitate deeper socio-political framing—particularly regarding colonial-era trade networks or Hainanese diasporic linkages. Interaction mode introduces another axis of variation: passive observation versus participatory co-creation alters not only information density but also epistemic authority [18]. Thus, adaptation must be dynamically calibrated—not merely translated—through protocols that modulate explanatory depth, narrative framing, and multimodal reinforcement in real time. Anchored adaptation therefore rejects prescriptive standardization in favor of responsive, context-sensitive mediation architectures. Such protocols treat each communicative instance as a situated act, governed by medium affordances, audience epistemic positioning, and interactional intent. This recalibration is not methodological compromise but strategic necessity, ensuring fidelity to both source integrity and receptor intelligibility.

5.3. Embedding Translation in Institutional Coordination

Translation of Haikou's historical and cultural symbols cannot be treated as a discrete linguistic operation but must function as an embedded component of institutional governance. This necessitates formalized coordination mechanisms across cultural bureaus, tourism authorities, education departments, and digital platform managers—each holding distinct mandates yet collectively responsible for symbolic coherence [2, 3]. Without such alignment, translation risks fragmentation: tourism materials may prioritize accessibility over historical nuance, educational curricula may emphasize pedagogical utility at the expense of semantic fidelity, and digital platforms may optimize for algorithmic visibility rather than cultural resonance. Anchored adaptation thus requires translation to be reconceptualized not as a downstream technical task but as a shared governance function—integrated into strategic planning cycles, budgetary frameworks, and performance metrics. Institutional coordination must preserve heterogeneity: coherence does not imply homogenization, nor standardization equate to flattening. Rather, it entails calibrated divergence—where terminological choices, narrative framing, and multimodal representation are jointly negotiated to reflect layered historical subjectivities while maintaining functional interoperability across domains. This demands sustained interdepartmental protocols, including joint terminology registers, cross-sectoral review panels, and iterative feedback loops anchored in localized stakeholder engagement. Crucially, such infrastructure must be resilient to administrative turnover and responsive to evolving communicative ecologies [11]. The Free Trade Port context intensifies this imperative, as heightened international exposure amplifies both the stakes of misrepresentation and the opportunities for strategic cultural articulation.

6. Conclusion: Integrating Heritage Meaning-Making into Free Trade Port Governance

6.1. Synthesis of Key Strategic Insights

This chapter synthesizes three interlocking strategic imperatives for advancing Haikou's historical and cultural symbols within the Free Trade Port framework. First, translation must evolve from linguistic fidelity to narrative architecture—crafting multilingual storylines that resonate with global audiences while preserving local epistemic integrity. Second, institutional synchronization is essential: heritage communication cannot operate in silos but must be embedded across port governance bodies, tourism infrastructure, education policy, and digital diplomacy platforms through shared KPIs and cross-departmental mandates. Third, epistemic inclusivity demands deliberate engagement with plural knowledge systems—not merely translating existing content, but co-constructing meaning with diasporic communities, regional scholars, and non-Western interpretive frameworks. These dimensions collectively reposition heritage not as static artifact but as dynamic governance resource. Their integration enables Haikou to leverage symbolic capital for soft power accrual, investment attraction, and civic cohesion without instrumentalizing culture. The Free Trade Port thus becomes both conduit and crucible: a spatial and administrative interface where heritage meaning-making actively informs regulatory innovation, urban identity formation, and transnational public diplomacy. Strategic success hinges on sustained commitment to iterative feedback loops, capacity building in intercultural narrative design, and metrics that capture resonance rather than reach alone.

6.2. Policy Implications for Free Trade Zone Development

Heritage communication must be repositioned as a core governance mechanism—not a supplementary cultural add-on—within Free Trade Port development frameworks. In Haikou, historical and cultural symbols constitute strategic assets whose translation, introduction, and contextualization directly shape institutional credibility, cross-border stakeholder alignment, and urban brand differentiation. Policy design should therefore embed heritage meaning-making into spatial planning, investment promotion protocols, and multilingual public infrastructure standards. This entails institutionalizing co-creation mechanisms with local knowledge holders, mandating layered narrative frameworks in official port documentation, and aligning digital dissemination platforms with internationally recognized semantic interoperability standards. Crucially, evaluation metrics must shift from output-based indicators—such as number of translated texts—to outcome-based measures of perceived authenticity, interpretive coherence, and long-term trust accrual among foreign investors, diasporic communities, and regional partners. Such integration ensures that heritage stewardship actively reinforces economic resilience rather than operating in parallel to it. Without this structural recalibration, symbolic capital risks fragmentation, misappropriation, or instrumentalization, thereby undermining both cultural integrity and competitive positioning in global port-city networks.

6.3. Future Trajectories: From Strategy to Sustained Practice

Sustained implementation requires institutionalizing participatory mechanisms that embed local epistemic authority into governance frameworks. Co-creation workshops with Li and Miao knowledge holders must transition from discrete events to standing advisory protocols, ensuring continuous calibration of translation outputs against lived semantic registers. Adaptive translation modules demand iterative field testing across diverse heritage sites, with feedback loops structured around linguistic fidelity, cultural resonance, and functional intelligibility for international audiences. Communication metrics—including multilingual engagement depth, cross-cultural interpretation accuracy, and visitor-mediated meaning reconstruction—must be formally integrated into site performance evaluations, shifting assessment paradigms from visitation volume to semantic stewardship efficacy. This recalibration positions heritage communication not as ancillary outreach but as a core governance competency within the Free Trade Port's institutional architecture.

Funding: This work was supported by the 2026 Haikou Philosophy and Social Science Planning Project (Grant No. 2026-ZCKT-234), titled "From Historical Transformation to Cultural Confidence: Research on the Contemporary Transformation of Haikou's Notable Figures' Spirit and City Image in the Construction of a Culturally Strong City."

References

1. T. Loulanski, "Revising the concept for cultural heritage: The argument for a functional approach," *Int. J. Cult. Prop.*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 207–233, 2006.
2. C. Bortolotto, "From objects to processes: UNESCO's 'intangible cultural heritage'," *J. Mus. Ethnogr.*, no. 19, pp. 21–33, 2007.
3. G. C. Spivak, "The politics of translation," in *The Translation Studies Reader*, L. Venuti, Ed. London, U.K.: Routledge, 2021, pp. 320–338.
4. K. Raj, "Go-betweens, travelers, and cultural translators," in *A Companion to the History of Science*, B. Lightman, Ed. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, 2016, pp. 39–57.
5. M. Bouchenaki, "The interdependency of the tangible and intangible cultural heritage," in *Proc. 14th ICOMOS Gen. Assem. and Int. Symp.: 'Place, Memory, Meaning: Preserving Intangible Values in Monuments and Sites', Oct. 2003, pp. 27–31.
6. S. L. Mendoza, R. T. Halualani, and J. A. Drzewiecka, "Moving the discourse on identities in intercultural communication: Structure, culture, and resignifications," *Commun. Q.*, vol. 50, no. 3–4, pp. 312–327, 2002.
7. M. J. Collier, "Cultural and intercultural communication competence: Current approaches and directions for future research," *Int. J. Intercult. Relat.*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 287–302, 1989.
8. G. J. Ashworth, B. Graham, and J. E. Tunbridge, *Pluralising Pasts: Heritage, Identity and Place in Multicultural Societies*. London, U.K.: Pluto Press, 2007.
9. E. A. Gutt, *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context*. London, U.K.: Routledge, 2014.
10. M. I. Khan, "Translation: A Tool of Communication and Cultural Exchange," *Strength Today Bright Hope Tomorrow*, vol. 23, p. 48, Nov. 2023.
11. P. G. Ablett and P. K. Dyer, "Heritage and hermeneutics: Towards a broader interpretation of interpretation," *Curr. Issues Tour.*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 209–233, 2009.
12. B. Buden, S. Nowotny, S. Simon, A. Bery, and M. Cronin, "Cultural translation: An introduction to the problem, and responses," *Transl. Stud.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 196–219, 2009.
13. R. Neather, "Museums as translation zones," in *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Globalization*, M. Cronin, Ed. London, U.K.: Routledge, 2020, pp. 306–319.
14. B. McKercher and H. Du Cros, *Cultural Tourism: The Partnership Between Tourism and Cultural Heritage Management*. London, U.K.: Routledge, 2002.
15. D. A. Jameson, "Reconceptualizing cultural identity and its role in intercultural business communication," *J. Bus. Commun.*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 199–235, 2007.
16. A. Chiapparini, "Communication and cultural heritage. Communication as effective tool for heritage conservation and enhancement," *Commun. Cult. Herit. Rep.*, 2012.
17. F. E. Jandt, *An Introduction to Intercultural Communication: Identities in a Global Community*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 2017.
18. J. House, *Translation as Communication Across Languages and Cultures*. London, U.K.: Routledge, 2015.
19. E. A. Weber, "Heritage interpretation as tool in cross-cultural communication: Challenges and solutions in the work of guides-interpreters," *Heritage Interpretation Res. Rep.*, 2018.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of Publisher and/or the editor(s). Publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.