

"A pretty village is a welcome sight"

Malamatidou, Sofia

DOI:

[10.1075/ts.18019.mal](https://doi.org/10.1075/ts.18019.mal)

License:

None: All rights reserved

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Malamatidou, S 2018, "A pretty village is a welcome sight": a contrastive study of the promotion of physical space in official tourism websites', *Translation Spaces*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 304-333.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/ts.18019.mal>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

First published in *Translation Spaces* on 28/11/2018

This article is under copyright and the publisher should be contacted for permission to re-use or reprint the material in any form.

<https://doi.org/10.1075/ts.18019.mal>

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

“A Pretty Village is a Welcome Sight”: A Contrastive Study of the Promotion of Physical Space in Official Tourism Websites

Sofia Malamatidou

0000-0002-9287-261X

University of Birmingham

s.malamatidou@bham.ac.uk

Abstract

This paper analyses adjectival descriptions used to frame and promote physical space in tourism texts in English and in Greek, and how any differences are negotiated in translation. A comparison is drawn across three categories of space (human-made, natural, and abstract) to investigate how each locality affects and is affected by linguistic choices.

Methodologically, a corpus triangulation approach is employed, combining corpora created from three types of tourism websites: original or non-translated Greek websites; their translations into English; and non-translated websites in English. Results reveal that, while important differences are observed between English and Greek non-translated texts, translations tend to stay very close to their source texts, with small differences observed across the three categories of space. This study contributes to both tourism and translation studies by offering insight into how space is framed across languages, which can inform, and ultimately, transform, translation practice.

Keywords

language of tourism, Greek, corpus triangulation, adjectives, translation

1. Introduction

Tourism is a global phenomenon (Francesconi 2014; Kevin 2001; Wahab and Cooper 2001); according to the World Trade Organisation, it constitutes the world's third largest export, responsible for 10% of the world's economic output. Within Europe, tourism is one of the major driving forces of southern economies, such as Spain, Italy and Greece, significantly contributing to their GDP. Despite the prevalence of tourism, there is little agreement as to what exactly it constitutes. The most comprehensive definition, which is also adopted in this study, is that provided by Panosso Netto (2009, 59) according to whom "[t]ourism is the phenomenon caused by the departure and the return of human beings from their place of habitual residence, for reasons that can be revealed or concealed". He adds that tourism relies on hospitality and communication with people and companies offering services that make displacement possible, while tourism products consist mainly of psychological experiences. Finally, tourism often has marked positive and negative economic, political, environmental and sociocultural effects (Panosso Netto 2009). For all these reasons, tourism is expected to differ from travel, which can also include, for example, travelling for work. However, a clear distinction between the two cannot be easily drawn, and the industry is often labelled *travel and tourism*. The situation is further complicated by the fact that in tourism communication (e.g. tourism websites) the difference between tourism and travel lies more in connotative, rather than denotative meaning. Specifically, according to Francesconi (2014), tourism is presented as a mass experience, which is viewed negatively, while travelling is individual and more desirable. In this article, I avoid using the "abused travel-tourism distinction" (Francesconi 2014, 3), and view tourism as a part of a broader activity that is travel.

One area that has attracted attention is the language of tourism, since, to support the sector, a number of tourism texts are produced annually. Apart from their strong informational value, tourism texts aim to turn readers into visitors and influence their choices through the use of specific linguistic and extra-linguistic resources (e.g. images), and, thus, also have a strong promotional function (Dann 1996; Valdeón 2009). This promotional function is realised through a carefully crafted ideology, which is reflected in the way a destination is framed. Ideology refers to the assumptions, beliefs, and values that are associated with tourism and in particular with physical space as tourism destination (e.g. nature is beautiful), which is the focus of this study. This can of course include various stereotypes and clichés, which are

prevalent in tourism texts (Dann 2001). Framing here is understood as the way in which information is organised, presented and interpreted, and is closely linked to the idea of tourist gaze (Urry and Larsen 2011), that is, ways of seeing and interpreting new places. Therefore, tourism texts carry significant ideological potential, shaping and classifying the world, and can have an impact on the way we think and act (Thurlow and Jaworski 2010). The importance of tourism discourse is highlighted by Dann (1996), who claims that it can be considered a type of language of social control, while Cappelli (2007, 9) argues that “every professional in the tourism industry needs to master the ‘language of tourism’”.

At the same time, textual practices related to tourism are, according to Thurlow and Jaworski (2010, 235) “socially pervasive and ubiquitous, and have a global reach and impact”. This is achieved mostly thanks to translation, as the vast majority of tourism texts need to be translated into at least one other language, often English, resulting in tourism texts representing a large proportion of all translated texts. The main challenge for translators is to create a text that presents a place in an informative, but also appealing way (Agorni 2012). Any translation strategy employed will have an impact on how the text is perceived by the readers, and consequently affect the promotion of tourist attractions, ultimately, affecting an entire industry. Not only does the text need to be grammatically correct, with notorious examples of tourism texts failing to do so, but also have the desired effect, that is, encourage the reader to visit the place described. And while grammaticality is easily addressed, as it relies on rules, effect, as understood here, is an elusive concept that requires a firm grasp of how promotion can be achieved through careful framing of a destination, as well as how this might differ across languages, since tourist gaze varies from society to society (Urry and Larsen 2011). However, research suggests that translators rely more on semantic equivalence when translating tourism texts, often ignoring their effect (Hickey 2004; Martínez 2000).

And yet, it would be unfair to blame translators for this state of affairs, when the amount of research into the translation of tourism texts is surprisingly small, especially given the size of the tourism industry and its textual production. What is more, no empirical cross-cultural research has been conducted focusing on the relationship between tourism texts and the tourist gaze. We lack a fundamental understanding of how different cultures and languages frame the world through tourism texts, and how this might have an effect on their

promotional potential. Without this understanding, translators will continue to struggle to produce effective translations of tourism texts.

This gap is not only a result of relatively limited research on the subject of tourism language but is also related to the focus of such research. Existing studies seem to either focus on the micro-level of the language of tourism (i.e. linguistic properties), or the macro-level, which involves the ideological potential and promotional function of tourism texts more generally. What is missing is a link between the micro-level and the macro-level, that is, one that shows how the ideological potential and promotional function of tourism texts is achieved through the use of specific linguistic features. Regarding translation, the few studies that focus on the promotional function of translated tourism texts, mostly through an examination of their pragmatic properties (Navarro Errasti et al. 2004; Valdeón 2009; Agorni 2012; Sulaiman 2014; Martínez 2000), rely on small-scale analyses of a handful of translations, typically discussing examples of different linguistic features found to be associated with the style of the translator or tourism discourse more generally. As a result, our understanding of the translation of tourism texts remains fragmented and limited. What is needed is a novel approach to the study of tourism texts, which recognises their diversity, examines all their interrelated aspects, and reveals their cross-linguistic idiosyncrasies and how these are negotiated in translation. Ultimately, this approach can offer significant insight into how different cultures look at the world, and how translators, as cultural mediators, negotiate such differences.

This study, which is part of a larger project examining the language of tourism from a multilingual and contrastive perspective, aims to form the first step towards this novel approach by focusing specifically on how physical space is presented in tourism texts. The study has two main aims. Firstly, to chart some of the features that contribute to the textual framing of physical space in Greek and English official tourism websites, potentially revealing how different cultures see and interpret space. This will form the basis for the second aim of this study, that is, the investigation of how any differences are negotiated in translated websites from Greek into English. I will be interested here in whether translation alters initial framing, for example by focusing on different topics, or by framing the same topics differently. In other words, the examination of the translated websites will show whether they offer an interpretation of physical space which is closer to the Greek source

texts or the expectations of readers, as extrapolated from knowledge of the English non-translated websites. Ultimately, this study aims to reveal the subtleties of how exactly promotion is achieved in tourism texts.

Analytically, the above aims will be achieved through the detailed examination of the use of adjectives pre-modifying nouns related to physical space (e.g. 'island', 'city', 'place'), which contribute significantly towards directing the readers' - and ultimately the tourists' - gaze, and interpreting the world for them. The analysis will focus on different types of adjectives and three categories of physical space: human-made (e.g. 'city', 'town'), natural (e.g. 'beach', 'island'), and abstract (e.g. 'place', 'area'). In this way, comparisons will be drawn between texts in different languages (Greek vs. English) and in different translation conditions (translated vs. non-translated English), across adjective and noun categories. The focus on specific linguistic items (micro-level) will serve as a vehicle for understanding how exactly ideology, through framing and promotion (macro-level), manifests itself in tourism texts.

2. Language of tourism

To understand the language of tourism, it is important to first examine what we mean by tourism text. Tourism texts come in different shapes and forms, from printed brochures, magazines and guides to, more recently, websites, which offer the significant advantage of reaching out to potential clients across the globe. According to Kelly (1997, 35) a tourism text is defined as "any text published by a public or private organisation of any kind intended a) to give information to any kind of visitor or b) to advertise a destination (city, hotel, restaurant, etc.) and encourage visitors to go there". Based on the above, it might appear as if there is a clear distinction between informative and promotional tourism texts, when, in reality, the majority of tourism texts fulfil both these functions, albeit in varying degrees. This is why tourism texts have been described as info-promotional (Valdeón 2009).

To serve these functions, tourism texts need to rely on specific linguistic conventions. Because most tourism texts are created by specialists for a non-specialist wider audience, they use the same linguistic conventions as general language, but to a greater and "pragmatically more specific" extent (Gotti 2006, 19). Such conventions might be the use of

imperatives, emphatic language and rhetorical questions to name a few. The frequent use of these and other features is what encouraged scholars like Dann (1996) and Cappelli (2007) to treat the language of tourism as specialised discourse. However, the language of tourism is particularly complex, and displays considerable variety at all linguistic levels, making it very difficult to define the concrete principles that make tourism a domain-specific discourse (Agorni 2012), or predict the linguistic features that will be used in a text (Gotti 2006). Even if we accept that some level of language specialisation is present, different levels of specialisation need to be associated with different types of texts (Cappelli 2008) and with different parts of the same text. Therefore, the language of tourism does not benefit from an approach that focuses on identifying the different linguistic features that make up the *entire* discourse of tourism, but rather from an approach that focuses on different elements of tourism texts and how these operate within the wider framework of their informational and promotional value.

2.1. Physical space

A central element of tourism texts is physical space (e.g. ‘island’, ‘city’, ‘area’), as their main aim is to promote the identity of specific geographical areas (Agorni 2012), which is achieved by semiologically differentiating a place; an often conscious and self-reflective process (Hughes 1998). Therefore, physical space is labelled and marketed as unique in an attempt to convey a special identity, which is textually represented through what can be characterised as the language of tourism (Francesconi 2014). Tourism becomes a catalyst of identity creation, as more and more places actively try to reconfigure their identity to become tourist destinations (Hughes 1992; Short et al. 1993). Essentially, tourism becomes a field of translating geographical locations into tourist destinations (Hughes 1998). We can, thus, observe a remarkable paradox: as touristic places become more and more similar, the language used to promote them aims at distinctiveness to attract visitors and bring economic benefit to the region. Tourism transforms the image of physical space, both literally and metaphorically. This is only one indication of the strong ideological potential of tourism texts, which is so frequently disregarded in studies examining the translation of such texts.

The reader plays an important role in this reconfiguration since the semiotic realisation of this framing and promotion is “nurtured in the tourist’s imagination” (Hughes 1998, 30). The reader is directed to perceive a postcard-like image of the physical space, which is achieved

by “beautifying and celebrating” it (Francesconi 2014, 58), essentially by transforming site into sight. Therefore, gaze is an important element of tourism texts (Urry and Larsen 2011), which, in turn, become our outlooks on the world, reflecting our own culturally and socially embedded perspectives and attitudes towards the places described. Tourism texts aim to create images of places, and each image will tell a different story. This framing process is extremely intricate and feeds into itself; it is directed by the sociocultural context (Urry and Larsen 2011), but, at the same time, it also informs socio-cultural preferences (Francesconi 2006). However, the questions of how exactly this process is mediated through translation, which is often the crucial link between the potential tourist and the destination, and how exactly words are translated into images, framing and promoting physical space, remain, thus far, unanswered.

2.2 The language of euphoria

As might be expected, emphatic language plays a central role in tourism texts, and, specifically, in the framing of physical space. Gotti (2006) observes that the language used in tourism texts is highly evaluative, often exaggerating the positive properties of the places described, aiming to create an idyllic view. Similarly, Dann (1996, 65) notes that tourism texts are characterised by “the language of euphoria”, which is associated with a tendency of the tourism text to “speak only in positive and glowing terms of the services and attractions it seeks to promote”, while Cappelli (2007, 63) argues that tourism texts aim to create a “spell effect” and an imagery of “magical atmosphere”.

A linguistic feature that is closely associated with emphatic language is the use of adjectives (Meyer 1994; Leech 1996; Goddard 2002; Valdeón 2009), which will form the focus of the present study. Adjectives can be divided into different categories. According to Halliday (2004), who refers to epithets (i.e. linguistic units that denote quality, which are often realised by adjectives), we can distinguish between experiential and attitudinal epithets. Experiential epithets express an objective property of the item described, as, for example, in:

The tiny cathedral city of St Davids is a short walk away.

while attitudinal epithets reflect the writer’s own opinion and are, thus, subjective, as, for example, in:

Afternoon tea in the beautiful city of Bath.

Halliday's classification has been used by Valdeón (2009), who argues that attitudinal epithets fulfil the promotional function of tourism texts. The claim that a certain category of adjectives can be more strongly associated with the promotional function of tourism texts is interesting and worthy of further investigation. However, the link between promotional function and attitudinal adjectives is misleading.

Halliday's (2004) distinction between objective and subjective descriptions is not straightforward, and hence is problematic, especially when used to distinguish between the informational and promotional function of tourism texts. This is because distinctions between experiential and attitudinal epithets are almost entirely dependent on context. A good example of this is 'silly', which can be an objective description of someone, or used affectionately and, thus, be subjective. In the context of tourism texts, distinctions between subjective and objective descriptions are difficult to make. Tourism texts aim to present descriptions as factual and objective, even though these might be the result of personal interpretation. The reason this happens so frequently in tourism texts is related to viewpoint: the, often anonymous, author of the text presents him/herself as an expert on a destination, describing it, while at the same time making judgements on it (Pierini 2009). Also, this viewpoint is what directs the tourist gaze, since places become *tourist places* only once they have been inscribed with certain characteristics that contribute towards their attractiveness as destinations. For example, adjectives related to size or extent might appear as objective, as in 'the city is a short walk'. However, what is to be considered as short is subjective, even though the sentence gives the impression of factual information that can be trusted. Therefore, a seemingly objective adjective such as 'short' might contribute towards the promotional or ideological function of tourism texts, especially when it is perceived as denoting a desired property. For this reason, I disagree with Valdeón (2009) who associates promotional function with attitudinal epithets.

Another categorisation of adjectives, which, however, has not been used in the analysis of tourism texts, is that provided by Biber et al. (1999). According to them, adjectives can be divided into two broad semantic groups: descriptors and classifiers. On the one hand, descriptors denote features such as colour, size, age, emotion (e.g. 'blue', 'old', 'beautiful') and their most important property is that they are gradable. On the other hand, classifiers

describe a noun in relation to other referents (e.g. ‘main’, ‘different’, ‘northern’) and they are non-gradable, that is, they cannot have degrees (e.g. *‘very main’). These two categories can be further divided into subgroups, as shown in Table 1.

Category	Meaning	Examples
Descriptors		
Colour	colour, brightness	white, green, red, dark, bright
Size/Quantity/Extent	size, weight, extent	big, deep, heavy, huge, long, thin
Time	chronology, age, frequency	daily, late, new, old, recent
Evaluative/Emotive	judgement, affect, emphasis	bad, beautiful, best, lovely, poor
Miscellaneous	any other descriptive	appropriate, cold, complex, free, open, strange, strong
Classifiers		
Relational/Classificational/Restrictive	delimiting the reference of a noun, particularly in relation to other referents	additional, average, different, direct, previous, original, standard
Affiliative	national or religious group	English, Christian, United
Topical/Other	subject area	chemical, commercial, legal, social, visual

Table 1: Semantic groups of adjectives (Biber et al. 1999).

Biber et al.’s (1999) model also relies on context but significantly less than Halliday’s (2004), and it allows for links between a certain category of adjective and the promotional function of tourism texts to be made more easily and based on better-defined criteria. The focus here is on gradability, as a distinguishing property of descriptive adjectives, which is crucial when it comes to tourism texts. Gradable adjectives are more likely to be used to create the perfect vista for readers, directing their gaze to those aspects of physical space that make it attractive. They are therefore more likely to reflect a certain ideology, or encode the language of euphoria. For example, describing a place as ‘amazing’ (an evaluative descriptor) or ‘famous’ (a miscellaneous descriptor) contributes significantly more towards creating “a positive

image of a destination as a holiday attraction worth visiting, beautifying and celebrating physical space” (Francesconi 2014, 58), compared to adjectives like ‘resting’ (a topical classifier) or ‘right’ (a relational classifier). By extension, descriptors are primarily responsible for the promotional function of tourism texts and carry stronger ideological potential than classifiers. This is not to say that classifiers cannot affect the language of euphoria or contribute towards the promotion of a place, but that their potential in that regard is limited compared to descriptors. Gradability is also what allows for superlatives, another typical feature of tourism texts, which aim to “locate the tourist experience far beyond the banality and mediocrity of everyday life” (Francesconi 2006, 66).

Consequently, in this study, Biber et al.’s (1999) classification will be employed, which also allows for more comprehensive comparisons to be made, given the number of different subcategories of adjectives identified. For ease of reference, in the rest of the paper the subcategories will be referred to as Colour, Size, Time, Evaluative and Miscellaneous (for descriptors), and Relational, Affiliative, and Topical (for classifiers).

2.3 Translation challenges

When it comes to translating the language of tourism, and specifically how adjectives are used to describe and promote physical space, translators often need to make significant adaptations to allow texts to fulfil their promotional function in the new linguistic and cultural environment. This is not a simple linguistic exercise; the amount of adaptation required suggests that the translation of tourism texts is somewhere between translation and rewriting (Kelly 1997).

Earlier, the importance of the tourist gaze was briefly discussed, and although tourism is not an exclusively visual activity (other senses are also involved), it is still dependent on the vista that is always present and forms the background of tourism as a kinaesthetic experience. People gaze at the world differently, and their gaze is framed by their social class, gender, nationality, age, and education (Urry and Larsen 2011). Therefore, as Mayo and Jarvis argue (1981), the perception of a destination is subjective. Translators need to (re)create images of physical space that are, ideally, in line with readers’ viewpoints and that direct their gaze towards the aspects of the physical space that they will perceive as attractive. Their task is not

to just translate words, but also attitudes and perspectives, to look, at the world through the eyes of someone else. This is what contributes to the successful promotion of a destination.

This is further exacerbated by the fact that we have to assume that a large proportion of tourist texts are often translated by non-native speakers of the target language, who will not share the same experiences and expectations as the target reader. This is because it is unlikely that there are enough native speakers of English, who can, for example, address the translation needs from Greek or other less-widely spoken languages into English. However, it would be unrealistic to argue that such translations need to be produced only by native speakers of the target language. If anything, the promotion of certain countries, with strong touristic activity (e.g. Thailand, Greece, Iceland), would become problematic. We need to gain a deeper understanding of how different cultures look at the world differently by examining the linguistic means they employ to direct gaze, which can, in turn, inform translators about how to negotiate such differences.

Regarding the language of euphoria, this might need to be adjusted in the target text to correspond with the target readers' pre-established notions about how physical space is to be gazed upon, and which are themselves derived, it is assumed here, from various discourses of tourism in the target language. And although one can argue that promoting an alternative gaze through tourism texts might be seen as a desired effect, this can come at a cost for the tourism industry, since "it becomes difficult, if not virtually impossible, to brand or rebrand a country, as if it were simply another consumer product" (Dann 2001, 10). Similarly, Smecca (2009, 109) argues that tourism texts are often manipulated by translators to "meet their target readers' expectations and appeal to culture-bound prejudices and stereotypes". Therefore, although translating an abundance of adjectives into semantically equivalent adjectives might be a straightforward strategy, even the frequency of adjectives can impact on the image of a place, with too many adjectives seen as too direct and aggressive as a marketing technique, presenting a false image of a place, and failing to build a relation with the reader (Valdeón 2009). It is clear that any translation strategy employed can have a considerable impact on the framing of the destination, which will, in turn, affect the promotional function of tourism texts.

Finally, it is important to note when translating tourism texts into English, as is often the case, that the target readership will belong to diverse cultures, which might use different

varieties of English or even have English as a second language. Thus, it is often difficult to identify the expectations and preferences of the readers, which are likely to be diverse, depending on their cultural and linguistic background. However, tourism texts written originally in English also face the same problem, albeit perhaps not to the same degree. For instance, a tourism text about London written in English is expected to be read by a diverse audience, including native and non-native speakers of English. Although a similar phenomenon might be observed in other languages, such as French or Spanish, it is particularly acute in the case of English. Therefore, when we have to compare non-translated English to translated English, the assumption is that both categories of texts address a similarly diverse audience.

3. *Data and methods*

3.1 *Corpus*

The methodology employed in this study comes from the discipline of corpus linguistics, which uses large electronic collections of text (corpora) to examine patterns in language. This methodology has been chosen as it allows for a systematic and in-depth analysis of substantial volumes of data. Corpora have been used in previous studies of the language of tourism, but they have tended to be small (e.g. the parallel corpus component of Manca's (2008) study is 100,000 words) and/or used predominantly for the examination of semantic patterns (e.g. Fijo León and Fuentes Luque 2013). They have not, however, been used systematically for the examination of the promotional function of tourism texts. This can be explained by the fact that promotion is tightly linked to implicit meaning, which is more difficult to capture using conventional linguistic tools.

For the purposes of this study, a corpus of some 475,000 words corpus taken from official tourism websites has been created. It consists of three components: non-translated texts in English, non-translated texts in Greek, and their translations into English. Texts were taken from a range of tourism websites to make sure that results do not simply reflect the individual style of a single website, author, or translator (Table 2). These websites were selected as they are created by the official tourist board of their respective country (e.g. *Visit Greece*) or work closely with it (i.e. *Discover Greece*), which, in turn, means that they focus on promoting a

place or country, rather than specific businesses. Additionally, these websites play a key role in building the tourism product and recognise the importance of promotion for the tourism industry. For instance, *Visit England* (About Us page) claims that its aim is to raise Britain’s profile worldwide, “increasing the volume and value of tourism exports and developing England and Britain’s visitor economy”, while *Discover Greece* (About Us page) argues that its aim is to “highlight the unexplored side of the country and enhance its competitiveness in the global tourism market”. Texts deal with a range of tourism topics, such as history, culture, and, attractions, and, where possible, an effort was made to include the entire website.

Component	Website	No of words
English non-translated texts	Visit England	50,985
	Visit Wales	70,686
	Visit Scotland	51,022
	Subtotal	172,693
Greek non-translated texts	Visit Greece (GR texts)	40,193
	Discover Greece (GR texts)	60,344
	Incredible Crete (GR texts)	49,075
	Subtotal	149.612
English translated texts	Visit Greece (EN texts)	39,892
	Discover Greece (EN texts)	63,182
	Incredible Crete (EN texts)	50,198
	Subtotal	153,272
Total		475,577

Table 2: Corpus of tourism websites

The corpus components are combined in different ways to allow for meaningful comparisons, following a corpus data triangulation approach (Malamatidou 2018). Specifically, three 300,000-word subcorpora are created: two comparable and one parallel (Table 3).

Comparable corpora can be of two types and both are used here: a corpus of translated and non-translated texts in the same language, and a corpus of non-translated texts in different languages (Olohan 2004). In other words, a corpus of translated and non-translated texts in English, and a corpus of non-translated English and Greek texts. A parallel corpus is understood here as a set of texts in one language and their translation in another (Olohan 2004), that is, a corpus of English source texts and their Greek translations. The nature of the study justifies the relatively small corpus size, as it requires manual processing (see section

3.2). That said, the parallel subcorpus is one of the largest compiled and studied to date for tourism texts.

Subcorpus	Components	Size
Comparable, bilingual (Greek-English) subcorpus of non-translated texts	Non-translated English texts Non-translated Greek texts	322,305
Comparable, monolingual (English) subcorpus of translated and non-translated texts	Non-translated English texts Translated English texts	325,965
Parallel, bilingual (Greek-English) subcorpus	Non-translated Greek texts Translated English texts	302,884

Table 3: Subcorpora and their components

Based on this corpus configuration, three types of comparisons are made. First, I examine the comparable bilingual subcorpus to investigate whether there are any notable differences between English and Greek in the way adjectives are used to frame and promote physical space. Secondly, if such differences are observed, the comparable monolingual subcorpus is examined to establish how they are negotiated in translation. Finally, to confirm whether or not translators tend to stay closer to the source text than to target-language norms, the parallel subcorpus is examined. Two corpus-processing toolkits were used to manage and interrogate the corpora in this study: Sketch Engine (Kilgariff et al. 2014) and Wordsmith Tools 7 (Scott 2017).

3.2 Data Extraction

Although the focus of this study is on the adjectives used to frame and promote physical space in official tourism websites, the procedural first step involved the identification of *nouns* denoting physical space. For this, wordlists were consulted for each of the corpus components, and the ten most frequent nouns denoting physical space were identified and divided into three categories: human-made, natural, and abstract (Table 4). The first category refers to physical space that is the result of human activity or intervention in the physical world or expresses concepts created by humans (e.g. ‘country’). Natural physical space denotes space that has been created through natural processes (e.g. ‘island’), while abstract physical space is expressed by any noun used to denote space, without an explicit reference as to what it consists of or how it has been created (e.g. ‘area’). When counting nouns,

variants were considered forms of a single lemma. This is especially important for Greek with its rich morphology.

The second stage of analysis involved the examination of the adjectives pre-modifying these nouns. The focus was on pre-modification, that is attribution, and not on post-modification, that is predication, because attributive adjectives are considered to be an essential part for the sense of the noun, while predicative adjectives are considered optional (Bolinger 1967). In other words, adjectives pre-modifying a noun have a stronger relationship with it and are necessary for its identification, while post-modifying nouns have a supplementary function. Therefore, this study focuses on the adjectives that are considered to be an integral part of the framing of physical space. Additionally, pre-modification was chosen since in both languages the unmarked syntax is for the adjective to appear before the noun.

The identification of adjectives in English was facilitated by the fact that the corpus has been part-of-speech (POS) tagged, using the modified English TreeTagger, the default POS tagger offered by SketchEngine for English. For each noun, a Word Sketch was also generated, which provided information on which modifiers were saliently used with which nouns. Results were confirmed through an examination of the concordance results for each modifier to remove any noise in the data and counts were lemmatised. For the Greek data, this process was not possible, as SketchEngine did not offer a POS tagger or the Word Sketch function for Greek at the time¹, and instead, Wordsmith Tools was used. Concordance lines were generated and manually filtered for each noun denoting physical space and all adjectives pre-modifying it were recorded. This involved a process of sorting concordances at various distances to the left of the noun (e.g. L1, L2, etc.). Results were then manually lemmatised to allow for accurate calculations.

Place-names used as pre-modifiers, such as ‘Cambridge city’, ‘Balos beach’, ‘Ionian islands’ were excluded from the analysis because their main function is to name rather than describe, and they are thus distinct from adjectives. Similarly, numerical pre-modifiers (e.g. ‘1,000’) have been excluded, but not adjectives related to quantity (e.g. ‘hundreds’). This is because it was found that numerals are used to count, rather than describe nouns, whereas quantifiers

¹ SketchEngine now offers these functions for Greek using the INTERA POS tagset.

had a more descriptive function. While interesting, no attention is paid here to the number of adjectives pre-modifying a noun (e.g. a single adjective or a cluster of three adjectives) as this would require a significant amount of manual refinement of concordance lines. It must be noted, however, that the vast majority of nouns are pre-modified by a single adjective.

The final stage of analysis consisted of assigning each adjective to Biber et al.'s (1999) (sub)categories. Adjectives were first divided into descriptors and classifiers, and then descriptors were divided into subcategories. Results (i.e. both raw and normalised frequencies) were recorded in detailed tables for each corpus component to allow for comparisons across subcorpora. Any observed differences were tested for statistical significance, employing Rayson's (n.d.) statistical significance (log-likelihood) calculator. Therefore, whenever a difference is reported in the findings, this refers to a statistically significant difference ($p < .05$).

Finally, apart from calculating all instances of adjectives pre-modifying physical space, the Type-Token Ratio (TTR) was also obtained to measure variation in the subcorpora regarding such adjectives, by dividing the total number of different adjectives (types) by the total number of adjectives (tokens). A high TTR indicates a high degree of variation in the subcorpus. Since results are lemmatised for both languages, it is possible to compare TTRs across languages and between translated and non-translated texts.

4. Results

4.1 Nouns and adjectives

Table 4 shows the total number of nouns denoting physical space in English non-translated, English translated, and the Greek non-translated texts. Normalised (per thousand words) frequencies are also given, to adjust for corpus components of different sizes. The table provides a preliminary indication that physical space might be framed differently in the two (non-translated) languages, with Greek texts directing their readers' gaze more frequently towards same. However, the fact that, with few exceptions, equivalent nouns have been identified demonstrates that the focus is on the same topics.

English NT			English T			Greek		
Noun	Raw frequency	Norm. frequency	Noun	Raw frequency	Norm. frequency	Noun	Raw frequency	Norm. frequency
Human-made								
Country	177	1.02	Country	152	.99	Χώρα (country)	241	1.61
City	279	1.61	City	295	1.92	Πόλη (city)	389	2.60
Town	217	1.26	Town	196	1.28	Χωριό (village)	224	1.50
Village	144	.83	Village	248	1.62			
Subtotal	817	4.72		891	5.81		854	5.71
Natural								
Island	174	1.00	Island	884	5.77	Νησί (island)	850	5.68
Beach	216	1.25	Beach	581	3.79	Παραλία (beach)	523	3.49
Woodland	102	.59	Mountain	247	1.61	Σπήλαιο (cave)	352	2.35
Coast	214	1.24	Cave	239	1.56	Φαράγγι (gorge)	195	1.30
Subtotal	706	4.08		1,951	12.73		1,920	12.82
Abstract								
Place	306	1.77	Place	214	1.40	Χώρος (space)	226	1.51
Area	151	.87	Area	274	1.79	Περιοχή (area)	360	2.41
						Τοπίο (landscape)	178	1.19
Subtotal	457	2.64		488	3.19		764	5.11
Total	1,980	11.44		3,330	21.73		3,538	23.64

Table 4: Nouns denoting physical space in the corpus components

In total, 1,980 (11.44 per 1,000 words) nouns denoting physical space were identified in the non-translated English component, 3,330 (21.73 per 1,000 words) in the translated English component, and 3,538 (23.64 per 1,000 words) in the Greek component. The difference between English and Greek non-translated texts was found to be statistically significant

($p < .05$), as was the difference between English non-translated texts and translated texts.

Despite the similar proportion in Greek source and English target texts, the log-likelihood test suggests that even this small difference is statistically significant ($p < .05$).

Table 5 shows the distribution of adjectives modifying such nouns in the three corpus components, again in raw and normalised frequencies (per thousand words).

English NT			English T			Greek		
Noun	Raw frequency	Norm. frequency	Noun	Raw frequency	Norm. frequency	Noun	Raw frequency	Norm. frequency
Human-made								
Country	13	.0075	Country	31	.202	Χώρα (country)	65	.434
City	91	.0527	City	131	.855	Πόλη (city)	136	.909
Town	181	1.048	Town	143	.933	Χωριό (village)	105	.702
Village	101	.585	Village	183	1.194			
Subtotal	386	2.235		422	3.184		306	2.045
Natural								
Island	39	.226	Island	186	1.214	Νησί (island)	187	1.250
Beach	92	.533	Beach	339	2.212	Παραλία (beach)	290	1.938
Woodland	45	.261	Mountain	46	.300	Σπήλαιο (cave)	94	.628
Coast	45	.261	Cave	66	.431	Φαράγγι (gorge)	56	.374
Subtotal	221	1.280		637	4.156		627	4.191
Abstract								
Place	185	1.071	Place	95	.620	Χώρος (space)	189	1.263
Area	102	.591	Area	141	.920	Περιοχή (area)	134	.896
						Τοπίο (landscape)	119	.795
Subtotal	287	1.662		236	1.540		442	2.954
Total	894	5.177	1,295		8.880	1,375		9.190

Table 5: Adjectives pre-modifying physical space in the corpus components

In total, 894 (5.177 per 1,000 words) adjectives were identified in the non-translated English component, 1,295 (8.880 per 1,000 words) in the translated English component, and 1,375 (9.190 per 1,000 words) in the Greek component. It is clear, even at this stage, that there are significant differences between English and Greek non-translated texts, while translated texts seem to stay close to patterns found in the source texts. These findings are confirmed by the log-likelihood test.

4.2 English vs. Greek

During this stage of analysis the comparable, bilingual (Greek-English) subcorpus of non-translated texts was examined. Results indicate that there are significant differences between the two languages across the three noun categories in the way physical space is framed and promoted in tourism websites. Table 6 shows the distribution of adjectives pre-modifying nouns denoting physical space in English and Greek regarding descriptors and classifiers. The common base for normalised frequencies in this and all following stages of analysis is 100, so that proportions can be expressed in the form of percentages to facilitate reporting. For the category of adjectives, the normalised frequency is the proportion of nouns denoting physical space pre-modified by an adjective. For the categories of descriptors and classifiers, the normalised frequency is the proportion of the respective category out of the total number of adjectives. The Type-Token Ratio (TTR) is also calculated for descriptors only recalling that descriptors are more strongly associated with the promotional function of tourism texts. Whenever the p value appears in bold it denotes a statistically significant difference.

	Greek		English		
	Raw frequency	Normalised frequency	Raw frequency	Normalised frequency	p value
Human-made					
Adjectives	306	35.83	386	47.25	<.05
Descriptors	225	73.53	179	46.37	<.05
Classifiers	81	26.47	207	53.63	<.05
TTR (descriptors)	0.24		0.48		
Natural					
Adjectives	627	32.66	221	31.30	>.05
Descriptors	484	77.19	113	51.13	<.05

Classifiers	143	22.81	108	48.87	<.05
TTR (descriptors)	0.25		0.53		
Abstract					
Adjectives	442	57.85	287	62.80	>.05
Descriptors	255	57.69	199	69.34	>.05
Classifiers	187	42.31	88	30.66	<.05
TTR (descriptors)	0.40		0.37		
Total					
Adjectives	1,375	38.86	894	45.15	<.05
Descriptors	964	70.11	491	54.92	<.05
Classifiers	411	29.89	403	45.08	<.05
TTR (descriptors)	0.20		0.36		

Table 6: Distribution of adjectives between Greek and English non-translated texts

Overall, Greek texts employ significantly more nouns depicting physical space (23.64 vs. 11.44 per 1,000 words), thus, focusing more on physical space, and directing the readers' gaze towards it. In the English texts, 45.15% (894) of nouns denoting physical space are pre-modified by adjectives, while the corresponding proportion for Greek is 38.86% (1,375). However, this includes both descriptors and classifiers.

If we examine descriptors separately and recalling that descriptors are more strongly associated with the promotional function of tourism texts, once again Greek texts show a clearer preference towards a campaign that is more tightly focused on the promotion of physical space compared to English. This is achieved through the greater use of descriptors: 70.11% (964) of all Greek adjectives pre-modifying nouns denoting physical space are descriptors compared with 54.92% (491) in English. Finally, differences are observed regarding the Size, Evaluative and Miscellaneous categories. Specifically, Greek texts employ a greater proportion of adjectives relating to size (e.g. *μεγάλο* – 'big', *βαθύ* – 'deep') and other miscellaneous descriptors (e.g. *άγριο* – 'angry', *αυθεντικό* – 'authentic') than comparable texts in English (el: 21.58% vs. en: 11.00% and el: 36.83% vs. en: 24.85% respectively), while English texts employ a significantly greater proportion of evaluative adjectives (e.g. 'idyllic', 'pretty') than Greek texts (el: 31.33% vs. en: 53.97%). These general observations are an indication that physical space in tourism texts is framed and promoted differently in the two languages, with Greek texts placing more emphasis on this aspect, while English texts show a marked tendency towards evaluation.

Examining different noun categories in more depth, space is approached differently in the two languages, with Greek texts paying more attention to natural physical space (12.82 vs. 4.08 per 1,000 words), which is also the most frequently used noun category in Greek texts. In English texts, the most frequently used nouns are those referring to human-made space, although when compared to Greek texts, the latter refer relatively more to human-made space (4.72 vs. 5.71 per 1,000 words). The fact that Greek texts focus more on natural physical space seems to be in line with well-established stereotypes about Greece, which is popular for its beaches and islands. Therefore, tourism websites reinforce stereotypes of the country that readers are likely to be familiar with, strengthening its identity. This is, of course, to be expected from tourism texts, since “[a]lternative representations, outside stereotypes, are very difficult to maintain, as their existence would cause frustration and disorientation in travellers (Travlou 2002, 127). Further, although human-made physical space is talked about more frequently in Greek texts, adjectival pre-modification is stronger in English texts with 47.25% (386) of nouns denoting physical space being pre-modified by adjectives compared with 35.83% (306) in Greek. However, promotion is stronger in Greek through the higher use of descriptors: 73.53% (225) of Greek adjectives pre-modifying nouns denoting physical space are descriptors compared with 46.37% (179) in English. As might be expected, descriptors are also more frequently used in Greek than in English when discussing natural physical space (el: 77.19% vs. en: 51.13%), while no significant difference is observed for the category of abstract nouns (el: 57.69% vs. en: 69.34%).

It is also interesting to note that English makes a significantly greater use of different descriptors compared to Greek texts. Specifically, the TTR regarding human-made space is 0.24 for Greek texts and 0.48 for English texts. The distribution is similar for natural physical space (el: 0.25 vs. en: 0.53). This pattern reveals an interesting difference in framing physical space, with Greek texts appearing to reinforce an image through repetition, while English texts appear to be more varied. As with the total number of descriptors, no significant difference is observed between English and Greek texts regarding the variation in descriptors used to describe abstract physical space (el: 0.40 vs. en: 0.37). This is a clear indication that adjectival pre-modification is not just a feature of tourism discourse more generally but tightly linked to what exactly is being described. Data examined here suggest that the more concrete physical space is, and the more strongly it is associated with the identity of a country, the more likely it is that differences between languages will be observed.

Finally, significant variation is observed regarding the distribution of the subcategories of descriptors, which can offer insight into how exactly physical space is framed in Greek and English, revealing how the world is viewed differently through the lens of language. Specifically, in the category of human-made physical space, Greek texts make greater use (el: 31.56% vs. en: 11.17%) of the Time category (e.g. *παλιά* – ‘old’, *σύγχρονη* – ‘modern’), while English texts make greater use (el: 23.56% vs. en: 46.37%) of the Evaluative category (e.g. ‘beautiful’, ‘picturesque’). For the category of natural physical space, the only difference is observed in the Time category, with English showing a stronger preference (el: 0.00% vs. en: 12.39%). This is the only noun category where no statistically significant difference is observed in the frequency of evaluative adjectives between the two languages. For the category of abstract physical space, Greek texts make greater use (el: 18.43% vs. en: 10.05%) of the Size (e.g. *μεγάλο* – ‘big’, *ευρύτερο* – ‘wider’) category, as well as greater use (el: 46.27% vs. en: 13.57%) of the Miscellaneous (e.g. *τουριστικό* – ‘touristic’, *φυσικό* – ‘natural’) category, while English texts show once again a stronger preference (el: 32.55% vs. en: 70.85%) for evaluative adjectives (e.g. ‘great’, ‘good’). When it comes to framing and promoting physical space, Greek and English official tourism texts thus direct the tourist gaze at different aspects. While English texts use fewer descriptors thus focusing less directly on creating a postcard-like image of physical space, they direct the readers’ gaze more actively towards aspects of space that can (or even should!) be praised and admired, making beauty its ultimate value.

4.3 *Translated vs. non-translated*

The next stage of analysis involves the examination of the comparable, monolingual subcorpus of English translated and non-translated texts. Their comparison suggests that translated texts direct readers’ gaze at different aspects of physical space than non-translated texts. Table 7 shows the distribution of adjectives – descriptors and classifiers – pre-modifying nouns denoting physical space in the two text categories.

	Translated English		Non-translated English		
	Raw frequency	Normalised frequency	Raw frequency	Normalised frequency	p value
Human-made					
Adjectives	422	47.36	386	47.25	>.05

Descriptors	270	63.98	179	46.37	<.05
Classifiers	152	36.02	207	53.63	<.05
TTR (descriptors)	0.27		0.48		
Natural					
Adjectives	637	32.65	221	31.30	>.05
Descriptors	494	77.55	113	51.13	<.05
Classifiers	143	22.45	108	48.87	<.05
TTR (descriptors)	0.29		0.53		
Abstract					
Adjectives	236	48.36	287	62.80	<.05
Descriptors	124	52.54	199	69.34	<.05
Classifiers	112	47.46	88	30.66	<.05
TTR (descriptors)	0.57		0.37		
Total					
Adjectives	1,295	38.89	894	45.15	<.05
Descriptors	888	68.57	491	54.92	<.05
Classifiers	407	31.43	403	45.08	<.05
TTR (descriptors)	0.25		0.36		

Figure 7: Distribution of adjectives between English translated and non-translated texts

As indicated in Table 4 above, translated texts employ significantly more nouns to refer to physical space than non-translated texts (tr: 21.73 vs. ntr: 11.44 per 1,000 words), even though this might not be seen as compatible with the readers' previous textual experiences. Overall, non-translated texts show a stronger preference for adjectival pre-modification compared with translated ones, with 45.15% (894) of nouns denoting physical space being pre-modified by adjectives in non-translated texts compared with 38.86% (1,295) in translated texts. But when descriptors are examined separately, we find that they are more characteristic of translated texts with 68.57% (888) of pre-nominal adjectives in English translated texts accounted for by descriptors compared with 54.92% (491) in non-translated texts. Finally, the only two subcategories where differences are not observed between non-translated and translated texts are Time (e.g. 'old', 'medieval') and Topical (e.g. 'underwater', 'woodland'). Interestingly, regarding evaluative adjectives (e.g. 'ideal', 'charming'), there is a significant difference between the two conditions of textual production with 53.97% (265) of descriptors pre-modifying nouns denoting physical space in non-translated texts belonging to this category compared with 30.86% (274) for translated texts.

Already from this broad overview, it is evident that there are significant quantitative differences between English translated and non-translated texts.

Regarding the total number of adjectives for each category of physical space, a significant difference is observed only for the category of abstract physical space, where more adjectives are employed in non-translated texts than in translated ones. Specifically, 62.80% (287) of nouns denoting abstract physical space found in non-translated texts are pre-modified by an adjective compared with 48.36% (236) for translated texts. However, this involves both descriptors and classifiers. When descriptors are examined separately, significant differences are observed across all three noun categories. In the case of human-made and natural physical space, descriptors are more frequently found in translated than non-translated texts. In translated texts, 63.98% (270) of nouns denoting human-made space and 77.55% (494) of nouns denoting natural physical space are pre-modified by a descriptor compared with 46.37% (179) and 51.13% (113) respectively in translated texts. Interestingly, the opposite pattern is found for the category of abstract physical space, with descriptors pre-modifying 69.34% (199) and 52.54% (124) of nouns denoting physical space found in translated texts and non-translated texts respectively.

Additionally, across all noun categories, there are significant differences in the TTR. However, while variation is higher in non-translated texts compared to translated ones for human-made and natural space, the reverse pattern is observed for abstract space. Specifically, the TTR for human-made space is 0.27 for translated texts and 0.48 for non-translated texts, with very similar ratios for the category of natural physical space (tr: 0.29 vs. ntr: 0.53). Finally, the TTR for the category of abstract physical space is 0.57 for translated texts and 0.37 for non-translated texts.

The different pattern that abstract physical space follows is quite surprising since no corresponding differences were observed between English and Greek texts. It seems that translators have tried to adapt the target text, but the reason behind this is unclear. These patterns are strong indication that intercultural differences regarding how physical space is approached linguistically are not easily identified by translators. Also, the more abstract physical space is, the less closely it seems to be associated with culturally embedded views about a destination, which might partly explain why translators feel that they can manipulate such nouns more easily.

A varied picture is also obtained when examining the categories of descriptors more closely. Evaluative adjectives (e.g. 'fine', 'brilliant') are more frequent in non-translated than translated texts for the category of human-made space (tr: 24.44% vs. ntr: 46.37%), with a similar pattern observed for abstract physical space (tr: 37.90% vs. ntr: 70.85%). No significant difference is found for the category of natural physical space between English translated and non-translated texts (tr: 32.59% vs. ntr: 36.28%), which can be associated with the similarity between evaluative adjectives observed between English and Greek texts during the previous stage of analysis. Further differences are observed in the Time category (e.g. 'young', 'modern') for human-made physical space, with translated texts employing time-related adjectives more than non-translated texts (tr: 31.11% vs. ntr: 11.17%). Also, translated texts show a stronger preference (tr: 5.26% vs. ntr: 0.88%) for colour-related adjectives (e.g. 'white', 'golden'), but a weaker preference (tr: 0.20% vs. ntr: 12.39%) for time-related adjectives (e.g. 'ancient') to describe natural physical space. Finally, translated texts employ miscellaneous descriptors (e.g. 'prominent', 'remote') more frequently than non-translated texts when describing abstract physical space (tr: 44.35% vs. ntr: 13.57%).

Overall, where similarities are observed between English translated and non-translated texts, these are mostly associated with similarities also observed between Greek and English texts, rather than an attempt at adaptation by translators. This is further supported by the fact that for most categories where differences are observed between Greek and English non-translated texts, typically differences are also observed between English translated and non-translated texts. This can have important implications for the reception of tourism texts, as different aspects of physical space are highlighted each time. And while perhaps some of the differences are to be expected, since, after all, different countries are presented (for example the greater use of 'white' in translated texts often used to describe 'white houses'), target texts seem to be a result of a translation approach that relies too much on semantic meaning, failing to recognise that there are different vantage points to view the world around us. If we are to assume that translators are more likely than not native speakers of Greek, this demonstrates how the interpretation of physical space is deeply embedded in our own culture.

4.4 Source vs. target texts

To investigate the hypothesis that translators prioritise semantic equivalence, it is important to also compare the translations to their source texts. Results from the parallel, bilingual corpus confirm that translators stay very close to the source texts, as shown in Table 8.

Greek Source Texts			English Target Texts		
	Raw frequency	Normalised frequency	Raw frequency	Normalised frequency	p value
Human-made					
Adjectives	306	35.83	422	47.36	<.05
Descriptors	225	73.53	270	63.98	>.05
Classifiers	81	26.47	152	36.02	<.05
TTR (descriptors)	0.25		0.27		
Natural					
Adjectives	627	32.66	637	32.65	>.05
Descriptors	484	77.19	494	77.55	>.05
Classifiers	143	22.81	143	22.45	>.05
TTR (descriptors)	0.25		0.29		
Abstract					
Adjectives	442	57.85	236	48.36	<.05
Descriptors	255	57.69	124	52.54	>.05
Classifiers	187	42.31	112	47.46	>.05
TTR (descriptors)	0.40		0.57		
Total					
Adjectives	1,375	38.86	1,295	38.89	>.05
Descriptors	964	70.11	888	68.57	>.05
Classifiers	411	29.89	407	31.43	>.05
TTR (descriptors)	0.20		0.25		

Figure 8: Distribution of adjectives between Greek source texts and English target texts

In total, 3,330 nouns were examined in the Greek source texts and 3,538 nouns in the English target texts (see Table 4). The proportion of adjectival pre-modification is identical in both sets of texts, that is, in both source and target texts 38.9% (ST: 1,375 vs. TT: 1,295) of nouns are pre-modified by an adjective. The proportion of descriptors is also very similar with 70.11% (964) of pre-nominal adjectives in Greek source texts accounted for by descriptors compared with 68.57% (888) in the English target texts. Similarly, no significant difference is

observed regarding the different subcategories of descriptors. For example, evaluative adjectives pre-modify 21.96% (302) of nouns denoting physical space in the source texts and 21.16% (274) in the target texts. Overall, translators seem reluctant to diverge from the framing of physical space available in the source texts and create new vistas, which would be more compatible with how the target readers are used to gazing at physical space through English texts. One could of course argue that readers expect to gaze at Greece differently to how they gaze at Britain. However, this would presuppose that tourist gaze does not depend on the tourist (i.e. their cultural, social, etc. profile), but rather on the destination. Existing research on the topic argues the opposite. And even if we accept that the destination might also have an impact on tourist gaze, we would expect target language preferences to also be considered at least to some extent (e.g. number of adjectives) resulting in a target text that is somewhere between the source and target language, which is not the case here.

Further similarities between Greek source and English target texts are found when examining the categories of adjectives in more detail. The proportion of descriptors is very similar between source and target texts across all noun categories, and no difference has been found in any of the subcategories of descriptors either. Since some differences have been observed between English and Greek non-translated texts, as well as between English translated and non-translated texts, it can be concluded that translators do not negotiate the differences in the way physical space is conceptualised in English and Greek. Therefore, they have created texts that linguistically belong to the target language, but from the point of view of framing belong to the source language.

Similarities are also observed when examining variation in the texts regarding descriptors. With the exception of abstract physical space, where the TTR is 0.40 for source texts and 0.57 for target texts, no significant differences are observed for the remaining two categories of abstract physical space. Once again, it is evident that the more abstract physical space is, the easier it is for translators to negotiate its representation and promotion.

5. *Controlled promotion*

The aim of this study was to examine how the use of adjectives pre-modifying nouns denoting physical space might have an impact on the way such physical space is framed in

Greek and English, as well as how any differences are negotiated in translated texts from Greek into English. This contributes to our understanding of how different cultures see and interpret physical space, as well as how translation can affect this interpretation, which has significant implications for the promotion of tourism destinations. Results reveal that, even though the same topics (as evidenced by the nouns studied) are being discussed, physical space is framed and promoted differently in the two languages, and that the translators in question (re)create a view of the world that is compatible with the source text but not with how target readers might classify their world.

These results demonstrate that the way humans perceive the physical world visually, that is, how we gaze at it, which is an important element of tourism discourse (Urry and Larsen 2011), differs significantly across cultures. We are consumers of culturally constructed imageries, whose aim is not to reflect the world, but rather to order, shape and organise it in our minds. This process feeds into and is fed by socio-cultural preferences, giving tourism texts not only a strong promotional function but also an ideological one. Every time a new place is presented therefore, we approach it with pre-established notions about physical space derived from previous discourses. This is not a new idea. What this study has revealed is that these considerations are not reflected in the translation process, with translators being strongly influenced by the patterns found in source texts. Two conclusions are possible depending on the profile of the translators. If we assume that the translators are native speakers of Greek, which I believe is the most likely scenario, this is evidence of how well-engraved in our own culture perceptions about physical space are. If, however, translators are native English speakers, this could be seen as evidence that our own well-engraved perceptions about physical space do not override different perceptions inscribed in source texts. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to verify the profile of the translators in this study. Regardless, translators are relying too heavily on semantic equivalence in both cases. This is in contrast with previous research (Smecca 2009) suggesting that tourism texts differ in their translated edition to address the expectations of a different audience.

One way of interpreting these results is to argue that translators have not been skilful enough to identify and employ the promotional techniques typically found in comparable English tourism websites, and have stayed very close to the source texts, mostly relying on semantic equivalence. This can have implications for the Greek tourism industry, with potentially

fewer readers being converted to visitors than would otherwise be the case. Therefore, a recommendation for translators would be to consider which techniques can help them achieve a better adaptation of tourism texts, based on a grounded understanding of the complex nature of tourism discourse, especially how ideology and promotion interact. In this respect, the present study can be read as a set of practical guidelines that can transform translation practice, by supporting translators in producing more effective translations.

To illustrate these practical implications, let us examine the phrase in the title of this paper. In English non-translated websites, we find examples such as:

After a morning's walking, a **pretty village** is a welcome sight.

with 'pretty', an evaluative descriptor, being the most common adjective used with 'village', a noun describing human-made physical space. The reader is invited to admire physical space and focus on its beauty as its most defining characteristic. In Greek, the most frequently used adjective with χωριό ('village') is ορεινό ('mountain'), a miscellaneous descriptor, as in:

Στη Θεσσαλία απολαύστε χειροποίητο τραχανά σε σούπα, ακόμη και για πρωινό στα ορεινά χωριά, όταν πιάσει το κρύο.

In Thessaly, you can enjoy hand-made trahana soup, even for breakfast, in the mountain villages, when it's cold outside.

The Greek reader is invited to focus on the setting of the village, which can be rich in connotations (traditional, with a view, remote, beautiful). This has been translated as 'mountain villages', evidence of the translator's overreliance on semantic meaning, at the expense of promotional function. Using an evaluative adjective, such as 'charming' would have been a more effective choice in bringing the English translation closer to the ideational world that English non-translated texts occupy.

Another, more critical, way of interpreting these results is not to take the somewhat stereotypical framing of physical space for granted or indeed as beneficial for this type of discourse. Instead, it is possible to question how responsible the use of promotional language is in this case. Evidence from the translated texts demonstrates that linguistic conventions found in the source texts seem to be followed almost blindly, with an overreliance on semantic equivalence. From the examination of the translation product, there is no clear

indication that the reader/consumer has been taken into account regarding the type of gaze that they are used at based on previous textual experiences. Even if we accept that translators stay deliberately close to the source texts, considering that this is what the English readers want to read about, this is further evidence that translators do not possess a grounded understanding of tourist gaze and its importance for destination promotion.

If there is evidence from translation that the use of promotional language is not carefully controlled, could this also be the case for non-translated production? It is not unlikely that a certain type of framing is employed as a cliché, based on the premise that this is what readers want (Dann 2001). However, this does not mean that any type of framing will do the trick. As Tomka (2013) rightly observes, clichés used to appeal to tourists are likely to drive locals away. Furthermore, overusing adjectives is likely to misrepresent destinations and raise unrealistic expectations in visitors. And while we cannot do much to avoid the use of certain stereotypical framings, as these are an important element of destination marketing, we can at least make more strategic use of these, taking into account the expectations of the reader/consumer. To achieve this *controlled framing*, we need more studies, like this one, which approach tourism from the vantage point of linguistics, translation, and intercultural communication. This will enable us to uncover how exactly what we call tourism discourse is shaping our identities and the way we view the world.

6. Conclusion

Although the present paper focused only on a specific language pair and one aspect of tourism websites (i.e. physical space), as well as only on adjectives that have an attributive rather than a predicate function, it is hoped that it will pave the way towards an in-depth understanding of the complex nature of tourism texts, in an attempt to support the tourism industry. Tourism texts can shape the way we view the world and are far from superficial and simplistic texts, whose only aim is to commodify destinations and attractions. The present study has shown how examining a specific linguistic feature (micro-level) can offer insight into how the framing and promotion of a destination is achieved in tourism discourse (macro-level). By understanding how individual elements of tourism texts operate within the larger framework of their ideological and promotional potential, we can reveal the role of human

beings in the context of their trips. This type of research can also have a strong positive impact on the tourism industry and the economies that rely on it. The next step in this admittedly long process is a more holistic examination of the language of tourism, focusing not only on physical space and adjectives but a wider range of elements, as well as a study investigating the impact that different translation strategies regarding promotional function have on target readers.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the University of Birmingham research grant for the project *Translating Tourism: A multilingual exploration of the language of promotion*. I would like to thank Vivian Nioti, my postgraduate assistant, who helped me collect the material for the corpus.

7. References

- Agorni, Mirella. 2012. "Tourism Communication: The Translator's Responsibility in the Translation of Cultural Difference." *PASOS: Revista de Turismo Y Patrimonio Cultural* 10 (4): 5–11.
- Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, and Susan Conrad. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Bollinger, Dwight. 1967. "Adjectives in English: Attribution and Predication." *Lingua* 18: 1–34.
- Cappelli, Gloria. 2007. *Sun, Sea, Sex and the Unspoilt Countryside*. 2nd edition. Paris: Paris Publishing.
- Cappelli, Gloria. 2008. "The Translation of Tourism-Related Websites and Localization: Problems and Perspectives." In *Voices on Translation*, edited by A. Baicchi, 97–115. Rome: Bulzoni Editore.
- Dann, Graham. 1996. *The Language of Tourism*. Oxon: CAB International.
- Dann, Graham. 2001. "The Self-Admitted Use of Cliché in the Language of Tourism." *Tourism, Culture & Communication* 3: 1–14.
- Fijo León, Maria Isabel, and Adrian Fuentes Luque. 2013. "A Corpus-Based Approach to the Compilation, Analysis, and Translation of Rural Tourism Terms." *Meta: Journal Des Traducteurs* 58(1): 212–26.
- Francesconi, Sabrina. 2006. "Touring Tourism Discourses: The Case of Scotland Underground." In *Translating Tourism: Linguistic/Cultural Representations*, edited by Orana Palusci and Sabrina Francesconi, 57–72. Trento: Trento University Press.
- Francesconi, Sabrina. 2014. *Reading Tourism Texts: A Multimodal Analysis*. Bristol, Tonawanda, and Ontario: Channel View Publications.
- Goddard, Angela. 2002. *The Language of Advertising: Written Texts*. 2nd edition. London and New York: Routledge.
- Gotti, Maurizio. 2006. "The Language of Tourism as Specialized Discourse." In *Translating*

- Tourism: Linguistic/Cultural Representations*, edited by Oriana Palusci and Sabrina Francesconi, 15-34. Trento: Trento University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 2004. *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hickey, Leo. 2004. "Perlocutionary Pursuits: Persuading Of/that/to." In *Pragmatics at Work: The Translation of Tourist Literature*, edited by Maria Pilar Navarro Errasti, Rosa Lorés Sanz, and Silvia Murillo Ornat, 57–79. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Hughes, George. 1992. "Tourism and the Geographical Imagination." *Leisure Studies* 11: 31-42.
- Hughes, George. 1998. "Tourism and the Semiological Realization of Space." In *Destinations: Cultural Landscapes of Tourism*, edited by Greg Ringer, 17–32. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kelly, Dorothy. 1997. "The Translation of Texts from the Tourist Sector: Textual Conventions, Cultural Distance and Other Constrains." *TRANS* 2: 33–42.
- Kevin, Meethan. 2001. *Tourism in a Global Society: Place, Culture, Consumption*. New York: Palgrave.
- Kilgarriff, Adam, Vít Baisa, Jan Bušta, Miloš Jakubíček, Vojtěch Kovář, Jan Michelfeit, Pavel Rychlý, and Vít Suchomel. "The Sketch Engine: Ten Years On." *Lexicography* 1: 7-36. Software available from: <http://www.sketchengine.eu>. Accessed 28 January 2018.
- Lee, Young-Sook. 2001. "Tourist Gaze: Universal Concept." *Tourism, Culture & Communication* 3: 93-99.
- Leech, Geoffrey. 1996. *English in Advertising: A Linguistic Study of Advertising in Great Britain*. London: Longman.
- Malamatidou, Sofia. 2018. *Corpus Triangulation: Combining Data and Methods in Corpus-Based Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Manca, Elena. 2008. "“Immerse yourself in the Traditions of the Simply Way of Life”": Analysing English Translation of Italian *Agriturismi* Websites." *RITT Journal Rivista*

Internazionale di Technica della Traduzione 10: 33-46.

- Martínez, Patricia. 2000. "Problems of Language Use in the Translation of Tourist Brochures: The Systemic Functional Grammar as a Serviceable Tool for Translation Decisions." In *Discourse and Community*, edited by Eija Ventola, 273–90. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Mayo, Edward J, and Lance P. Jarvis. 1981. *The Psychology of Leisure Travel: Effective Marketing and Selling Travel Services*. Boston: CBI.
- Meyer, Greg. 1994. *Words in Ads*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Navarro Errasti, Maria Pilar, Rosa Lorés Sanz, and Silvia Murillo Ornat (eds). 2004. *Pragmatics at Work: The Translation of Tourist Literature*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Olohan, Maeve. 2004. *Introducing Corpora in Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Panosso Netto, Alexander. 2009. "What is Tourism? Definitions, Theoretical Phases and Principles." In *Philosophical Issues in Tourism*, edited by John Tribe, 43-61. Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Pierini, Patrizia. 2009. "Adjectives in Tourism English on the Web: A Corpus-Based Study." *CÍRCULO de Lingüística Aplicada a La Comunicación (Clac)* 40: 93–116.
- Rayson, Paul. n.d. *Log-Likelihood Calculator*. Accessed 20 February 2018.
<http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/llwizard.html>.
- Scott, Michael. 2017. *WordSmith Tools Version 7*. Stroud: Lexical Analysis Software.
- Short, J. R., L. M. Benton, W. B. Luce, and J. Walton. 1993. "Reconstructing the Image of an Industrial City." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 83 (2): 207–24.
- Smecca, Paola Daniela. 2009. "Tourist Guidebooks and the Image of Sicily in Translation." *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 17(2): 109-119.
- Sulaiman, Mohamed Zain. 2014. "Translating the Style of Tourism Promotional Discourse: A Cross Cultural into Stylescapes." *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 118(19): 503–10.

- Thurlow, Crispin, and Adam Jaworski. 2010. *Tourism Discourse: Language and Global Mobility*. London: Palgrave.
- Tomka, Goran. 2013. "Who's This Space?: Clichés, Identities and Places." In *Marketing Places and Spaces: Shifting Tourism Flows*, 5th Advances in Tourism Marketing Conference Proceedings, Algarve, 2-4 October.
- Travlou, Penny. 2002. "Go Athens: A Journey to the Centre of the City." In *Tourism: Between Place and Performance*, edited by Simon Coleman and Mike Crang, 108-127. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Urry, John, and Jonas Larsen. 2011. *The Tourist Gaze 3.0*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Valdeón, Roberto A. 2009. "Info-Promotional Material Discourse and Its Translation: The Case of the Asturias Tourist Board Texts." *Across Languages and Cultures* 10 (1): 21–47.
- Wahab, Salah, and Chris Cooper. 2001. *Tourism at the Age of Globalisation*. London and New York: Routledge.