



Rassegna italiana di Linguistica Applicata

ESTRATTO

ULZONI
DITTORE


Anno XLV

Gennaio-Aprile 2013 / 1
ISSN 0033-9725

“A PERFECT TUSCAN EXPERIENCE”: DESTINATION IMAGE AND CULTURAL EXPECTATIONS IN POSITIVE TRAVEL REVIEWS IN ENGLISH AND ITALIAN

Abstract

L'articolo discute somiglianze e differenze che emergono dall'analisi lessicale e collocazionale di un piccolo corpus comparabile di recensioni positive pubblicate da viaggiatori di madrelingua inglese e italiana su TripAdvisor, ad oggi il maggiore sito di viaggi fondato su contenuti generati dagli utenti. L'analisi delle recensioni di hotel situati in Toscana mostra come anche questa tipologia testuale di recente sviluppo contribuisca alla natura essenzialmente tautologica del discorso turistico, rafforzando l'immagine stereotipica della destinazione in modo non dissimile da ciò che avviene nel testo promozionale per il turismo propriamente detto attraverso il ricorso a temi e strategie retoriche tipiche.

Introduction

The role of tourists' cultural expectations is widely acknowledged in tourism studies. Linguistic research on stereotypes in tourism discourse has traditionally focused on genres with a more or less overt promotional intent, such as advertisements, brochures, websites and guidebooks (Cappelli 2006, 2008a, 2012, forthcoming; Castello 2002; Fodde, Van Den Abeele 2012; Fodde, Denti 2005; Francesconi 2007; Mattiello 2012; Nigro 2006; Vestito 2005). The latter are certainly iconic of the famous statement by adman Jerry Goodies included in an article published in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* 30 years ago: “Adver-

tising doesn't always mirror how people are acting, but how they're dreaming... In a sense, what we're doing is wrapping up your emotions and selling them back to you" (Nelson 1983).

Dann (1996:65-67) highlights the tautological nature of tourism discourse and of its circularity. On the one hand, destinations are presented as everybody imagines them, and, on the other, tourists demand to see things as they dream of them, and to photograph the same images they see on brochures and ads. Photos become "mere verifications of the tourist's image-filled mind" (Dann 1996:66) and narrations reproduce the discourse of brochures, guidebooks and ads, not only in their contents, but also in their ideology and style (Thurot, Thurot 1983). Advertisers and marketing strategists have known this for a long time, and have used tourists' feedback to produce more advertising material. Some scholars have pointed out that promotional genres¹ can be "essentially fraudulent in their tautological messages of guaranteeing that what is advertised is what will be seen and experienced" (Buck 1977:206).

It is probably because of the increasing awareness of this fact among consumers as well that online user-generated content has been growing in popularity over the past few years to an extent that it is now considered the most influential factor in the way in which consumers' travel decisions are made (Tancer 2008; Zehrer, Crotts, Magnini 2011). Travel reviews in particular have been found to be especially decisive in travel planning, as indicated by the recently published TripBarometer by TripAdvisor Global Report² (2013), with an average of 69% of global travellers relying on them alone in order to choose accommodation. This figure reaches 76% in the USA and in the UK and 87% in Italy. Overall, 93% of the participants in the survey said that other people's evaluations on travel review websites influenced their travel plans (p.6) and 41% of them reported they actively contributed online evaluations of their travel experience in the form of an accommodation review (51%), a website review or a blog or forum post (p.7).

¹ Buck (1977) focuses on brochures in particular, but the observations can be extended to all promotional tourism materials.

² TripBarometer by TripAdvisor (2013) is at present "the world's largest accommodation and traveller online survey" commissioned by TripAdvisor and carried out by the agency StrategyOne on a sample of 35,042 participants (both travellers and businesses) from 26 different countries. Data were collected in December 2012 and January 2013. Results were published in March 2013 and are publicly available online (<http://www.tripadvisortripbarometer.com/>).

Besides being of great interest to the tourist industry, these data provide interesting stimuli for linguistic research as well, as they portray the rapid growth in popularity and availability of post-trip genres of tourism discourse (Dann 1996; Cappelli 2006) such as reviews and trip reports. Texts which can be described as eWOM or electronic word-of-mouth (Hennig-Thurau, Gwinner, Walsh, Gremler 2004), or rather, "word-of-mouse" as they are commonly referred to, are rapidly becoming the most prolific genre in tourism discourse, with presumably interesting consequences for the discursive domain at large.

Since Dann's (1996:2) pivotal observation that "tourism is grounded in discourse", there has been a growing interest in the crucial role of language in the field. Interestingly, long before reviews became so popular, he also observed that "[...] tourists often can and do feed back into this discourse. [...] They build up their own systems of expectation, and, when these do not mesh with the promises held out by the language of tourism, one will clearly discern the voice of complaint. On the other hand, when tourists are satisfied with their experiences, they contribute to the language of tourism by becoming promoters themselves" (1996:3).

Travel reviews have certainly become the main locus for the expression of the tourist's voice and, in this sense, they represent the most remarkable exception as regards "the lack of sender identification" listed by Dann (1996:62) among the divergent properties unique to the language of tourism discourse. In the case of reviews, trip reports, blog entries, and forums, the reader is very much aware of the real or "online" identity of the writer (Sen, Lerman 2007; Vermeulen, Seeger 2009; Vásquez forthcoming a), who acts as a living testimonial to the quality of the accommodation or lack thereof, the truthfulness of the advertisement, etc. (Cappelli 2006).

The spread of these more "subjective", peer-oriented genres, along with the success of social media such as Facebook, Twitter, Foursquare, Pinterest, and Instagram to mention but a few, seem to be slowly changing the way in which more or less traditional genres such as guidebooks, brochures and official websites address their readers, by pushing them towards a progressive democratization of content creation as well as towards a decrease in the lack of sender identification. "Companion sites" for guidebooks as well as blogs on traditionally informative websites where identifiable users or authoritative writers can contribute original content are now quite common: a sign of the remarkable influence exerted by the growing popularity of user-generated content, which is giving a whole new meaning to the concept of online

reputation and personal branding. Miguéns, Baggio, and Costa (2008:27) describe this trend as a shift “from a business-to-consumer marketing to a peer-to-peer model for the sharing of information” which is pressing suppliers and buyers to “value more and more the opinions, reviews and referrals of fellow travelers. These information agents (Travel 2.0 users) represent a more reliable and trustworthy source than the suppliers themselves”.

In spite of recent interest in travel reviews (Fina 2011; Vásquez 2011, 2012, forthcoming a), the striking paucity of systematic linguistic studies of this post-trip genre through which tourists become active users (and creators) of tourism discourse demands a thorough investigation of its features. This article investigates a small corpus of positive accommodation reviews written by English and Italian travellers in their own native language and posted online on TripAdvisor³, presently the largest travel website populated with user-generated content. First, the results of a lexical and collocational analysis of the reviews are presented and trends and preferences in the way in which speakers of the two languages report on their experience are identified. Hypotheses are made as to the possible connections between linguistic and cultural aspects which may be responsible for some of the differences observed in the genre across the two languages. Finally, the data are discussed with respect to the problem of the tautological nature of tourism discourse, and more specifically of whether the imagery presented or evoked in accommodation reviews mirrors – and therefore contributes to – the rhetoric of canonical tourism promotion or whether, on the contrary, it provides a more independent and faithful portrayal of the tourist experience.

1. Previous linguistic research on travel reviews

Research on the language of tourism has mainly focused on the rhetorical or linguistic features of advertising and of other more or less overtly promotional genres such as brochures, destination or accommodation websites and guidebooks, or on the way in which cross-cultural differences are represented in these or other “pre-trip” materials (Capelli 2006, 2008a, 2012, forthcoming; Castello 2002; Fodde, Van Den Abeele 2012; Fodde, Denti 2005; Francesconi 2007; Mattiello 2012;

³ The article reports on the first results of a larger research project focusing on post-trip tourist texts, more specifically positive and negative accommodation reviews, trip reports and forum posts.

Nigro 2006; Vestito 2005). Since travel reviews are more similar to personal writing without an explicit promotional intent, they have traditionally been left out of the debate.

Some studies have appeared in journals and conference proceedings dedicated to professional communication in which reviews or online communities and their value were discussed in terms of their role in improving service quality (Pollach 2006; Ricci, Wietsma 2006; Briggs, Sutherland, Drummond 2007; Sen, Lerman 2007; Chung, Buhalis 2008; Miguéns, Baggio, Costa 2008; Yoo, Gretzel 2009). It is only very recently, though, that the first linguistic analyses of reviews, and more specifically travel reviews, have started to appear (Fina 2011; Vásquez 2011, 2012, forthcoming a, forthcoming b). Each of these works focuses on specific aspects of either positive or negative travel reviews, but a comprehensive study of the genre and its impact on tourism discourse as a whole has, to my knowledge, not yet been carried out⁴.

Fina's (2011) article presents the results of a corpus-driven analysis of linguistic patterns in two comparable corpora of positive accommodation reviews in English and Italian and discusses what they can tell us about culture. The study shows how it is possible to unveil not only some of the ways in which language is used in the specific genre at issue, but also those aspects of culture that are acquired informally and conveyed by language (Katan 2004). Fina (2011) relies on Manca's (2011) and Tognini-Bonelli's (2001) methodologies for corpus analysis: a combined quantitative and qualitative analysis for the identification of functional correspondences across languages. This approach, otherwise applied to translation (Manca 2004, 2008a, 2008b, 2012), allows the author to identify diverging linguistic preferences that she interprets through the theoretical framework of Intercultural Studies (Hall 1990; Hofstede 2001; Katan 2004; Francesconi 2007) observing that "[...] Italian travellers and English travellers tend to provide travel information in different ways. More specifically, [...] due to the use of all-encompassing words and abstractions, Italian reviews tend to be more generic in descriptions. In contrast, due to the use of more specific words and a more factual style, English reviews tend to be more de-

⁴ Vásquez (forthcoming b) is dedicated to the discourse of online reviews and is a corpus study of over 1,000 consumer reviews, examining "many of the discourse features that are characteristic of this rapidly growing, computer-mediated, and primarily text-based, genre" (<http://camillavasquez.com/current.html>). At present, this promises to be the most exhaustive work on online reviews at large, although it is my understanding that it will not be specific to travel reviews (personal communication).

tailed and itemised" (Fina 2011:72). This is seen as providing support to Hall's (1990) and Katan's (2004) hypothesis that English and Italian culture differ in terms of preferred communication styles. English would prefer Low Context communication (i.e. communication would rely on explicit information provided by the text) and Italian would prefer High Context communication (i.e. communication would rely heavily on the context). These preferences are associated with other trends observed in travel reviews, such as the tendency of High Context cultures to focus on feelings and "being", to prefer implicitness and to value relationships more than tasks (Fina 2011:61; Katan 2004).

Vásquez (2011), (2012) and (forthcoming a) all rely on the investigation of a corpus of a hundred negative accommodation reviews in English published on TripAdvisor. Vásquez (2011) does not focus primarily on the features of travel reviews: the study's main research goal is to determine whether complaints in computer mediated communication (CMC) display some of the defining characteristics of complaints found in the literature on the topic, and, if so, to what extent. Nevertheless, the article contributes interesting observations about travel reviews as a genre. Besides confirming that CMC complaints share with "more traditional" complaints the tendency to juxtapose negative evaluation and some sort of positive appraisal and to make explicit reference to expectations not being met, Vásquez points out that in travel reviews complaints tend to occur as a speech act set which includes advice and recommendations more often than threats and warnings, as is usually the case in other types of complaints. Moreover, the author observes that most complaints in reviews tend to be indirect, with a few cases that blur the direct/indirect dichotomy, as it could be expected in the case of a medium that makes content publicly available to users who are not directly involved in the events described.

Vásquez (2012) and Vásquez (forthcoming a) focus more specifically on features of negative travel reviews that emerged prominently in Vásquez's (2011) corpus study. The first article explores canonical and genre-specific narrative features in reviews. The pervasive use of narration in reviews has been acknowledged in previous studies (Cappelli 2006:294)⁵, but Vásquez's (2012) study is the first which presents a detailed picture of the way in which this technique is used by concentrating especially on the discursive function of story prefaces, deictic shifts,

⁵ The use of narratives has received much attention lately. See Gotti and Guinda (2013) for a collection of studies of narratives in academic and professional genres.

and represented speech and mental states in the corpus. They are shown to be useful in attracting the attention of the readers, by engaging them, appealing to them directly and drawing them into the narrative “in spite of the fact that, in this context, narrators and audience are unknown to one another, and are separated by both space and time” (2012:119). In this sense, they “make up” for the absence of the features of involvement that are typically associated with conversational narratives and indicate “that reviewers are aware of their audience as they write their stories” (2012:119).

Vásquez (forthcoming a) focuses on the construction of the reviewer’s identity. Building on the hypothesis that the latter plays an important role in terms of how reliable a review is considered, Vásquez identifies the main rhetorical strategies and linguistic resources “used by reviewers to construct identities as particular types of individuals in this online context” (forthcoming a:10). Even though only few people choose to reveal personal information in their user profiles, many of them (intentionally or unintentionally) provide quite a lot of information in their reviews so as to provide support to their arguments. The most common strategies observed in the data present the reviewer as an experienced and/or professional traveller, or as a person who has reasonable expectations and is not easily prone to complaining. Other strategies include the use of cultural references and humour and of intertextuality (e.g. reference to other people’s reviews).

3. Corpus and methodology

This study presents the first results of a research project on the post-trip genres of tourism discourse. More specifically, it reports on the analysis of the positive component of a micro-corpus of accommodation reviews focusing on hotels in Tuscany⁶ published between 2009 and 2013 on TripAdvisor (<http://www.tripadvisor.com>) by native speakers of English and Italian. The entirety of the data is organized in two sets of comparable corpora of 100 positive and 100 negative reviews for each language (Pos_En, Pos_It, Neg_En and Neg_It).

⁶ Reviews focus solely on hotels in Tuscany. The choice to focus on a specific destination was guided by the hypothesis that it would be easier to identify stereotypes and cultural-specific expectations. Since Tuscany is a destination that is popular both among English and Italian travellers, and is associated with a well-established imagery, it seemed an ideal candidate.

In order to ensure as much as is possible that the texts included in the corpora were produced by native speakers of English and Italian, only reviews published by users who specified their nationality on their public profile were included. Dubious cases (e.g. cases with spelling mistakes or non-standard grammar) were evaluated by native speakers of the variety of English supposedly spoken by the reviewer. Preference was given to reviews by users who have contributed more than one single comment (including forum posts), so as to have more material to evaluate in order to establish whether English and Italian were or were not the writer's native language. Only reviews that were unanimously judged as written by native speakers of English or Italian were included in the corpus⁷. Table 1 shows the composition of the corpus of hotel reviews in terms of running words (tokens) and lemmas (types).

	Positive		Negative	
Reviews in English	17988 tokens	2470 types	24238 tokens	2597 types
Reviews in Italian	12379 tokens	1933 types	14438 tokens	2499 types

Table 1

On an average, both positive and negative reviews in English tend to be longer than reviews in Italian, with a difference in the number of both tokens and types used. Negative reviews tend to be significantly longer, even though the number of types in Italian reviews is only slightly lower.

The decision to compile a small corpus of only 400 reviews was determined by the choice of investigating not only collocational patterns, but also other semantic, pragmatic and discursive features for which automatic coding was not possible. The corpus had therefore to

⁷ Even so, a word-of-caution is necessary. Given the nature of the media investigated, there is no way to know with absolute certainty that the reviews were in fact written by native speakers: it is impossible to exclude that some of reviews were published by speakers of English or Italian with near-native proficiency in these languages, or by reviewers who have access to native speakers who can correct their texts. In principle, this should not impact the results of the research significantly given the hopefully limited number of such possible cases.

be coded in several rounds. First, it was automatically POS-tagged and prepared to be queried through the SketchEngine interface so that lexical and collocational aspects could be looked into. Then, it was marked manually for specific pragmatic and discursive features such as speech acts, rhetorical strategies, and humour.

For the purpose of this study, reviews in English and Italian were first compared at the lexico-collocational level in order to identify which aspects of the travel experience were commented on and in what terms. In order to do this, wordlists were created. It was possible to extract a list of keywords for Pos_En but not for their Italian counterparts, since no reference corpus to which Pos_It could be compared was available. For this reason, the analysis focused first on the list of English keywords, so as to identify the most frequent items evaluated, which were then classified in semantic fields. For the Italian corpora, a list of functionally equivalent keywords was obtained from the raw wordlists on the basis of frequency of occurrence. The collocational profile of each of these items was analysed. The corpora were then scanned manually to retrieve more distant collocates which contributed to the evaluation of the item at issue but which had not been recognized as such by the SketchEngine concordancing system. This was in fact often the case for the Italian corpora, where evaluation can be scattered over several sentences and referents are often left implicit.

The corpus was then manually screened multiple times for recurring phraseology, metaphors and idioms and rhetorical strategies to emphasize or convey indirectly positive evaluations.

4. Lexical and collocational analysis of positive reviews

As could be expected, English and Italian reviews focus on the same macro-areas, namely “accommodation” and “service”. Other topics such as “food” and “location” are functional to the evaluation the main domains. Food-related comments will not be discussed, because they all focus on the quality of breakfast food at the accommodation reviewed and, despite the well-known differences in eating habits between English and Italian people, they do not seem to contribute much in terms of culturally-dictated preferences⁸.

⁸ Both English and Italian reviewers evaluate the same aspects, that is, the freshness of the products offered and the variety of the buffet.

4.1. Accommodation

In line with Fina's (2011) findings, the number of occurrences of terms denoting types of accommodation in English are generally greater than that of terms denoting types of accommodation in Italian. In particular, the same disproportion in the use of the word *hotel* in the two languages can be observed (Pos_En 149 vs. Pos_It 40). Fina explains this difference with the tendency of the English language towards repetition, the frequent use of *hotel* as a modifier (e.g. *hotel room*), and also with the fact that in English reviews the items and features characterising accommodation tend to be the "rheme" of the sentence (i.e. new information), in the Italian reviews these tend instead to be the "theme" of the sentence (i.e. given information)" (2011:67). However, if we compare the number of occurrences of all the lexical items that denote types of accommodation in the two corpora and which could be substituted in that context with *hotel*, the gap appears significantly smaller.

	Pos_En	Pos_It
Lemmas denoting types of accommodation	<i>hotel</i> (147), <i>hotel name</i> (106), <i>place</i> (47), <i>villa</i> (14), <i>property</i> (8), <i>bed and breakfast</i> (3), <i>relais</i> (3), <i>cottage</i> (2), <i>retreat</i> (1), <i>site</i> (1)	<i>hotel</i> (40), <i>hotel name</i> (46), <i>posto</i> (29), <i>struttura</i> (28), <i>relais</i> (23), <i>luogo</i> (15), <i>villa</i> (10), <i>b&b</i> (9), <i>albergo</i> (8), <i>ambiente</i> (6), <i>alloggio</i> (4), <i>location</i> (4), <i>contesto</i> (3), <i>sistemazione</i> (3), <i>complesso</i> (2), <i>interno</i> (2)
Total	333	233

Table 2

Table 2 does not include anaphoric references to the accommodation. In order to assess the relevance of such cases, the corpus was revised manually and several instances such as (1) and (2) below were found to occur quite frequently in the corpora.

- (1) È da consigliare sicuramente (Pos_It:7)
- (2) It was also quite a good value (Pos_En:8)

Other terms were also found to be occasionally used metaphorically to comment on accommodation. Examples are *base*, *stay*, *break*, *getaway*, *choice* in English and *soggiorno* and *scelta* in Italian. The automated and manual study of the data show however that English reviewers tend to comment on types of accommodation almost twice as

much as Italian reviewers.

The expressions used to evaluate accommodation were grouped in 12 semantic fields ("age", "appearance", "authenticity", "cleanness", "comfort", "generic quality", "location", "noise", "reputation", "service", "type" and "value") for which some examples as lemmas are provided in Table 3.

	Pos_En	Pos_It
Age	<i>old, modern, new but with an old soul</i>	<i>nuova, di recente ristrutturazione</i>
Appearance	<i>beautiful, charming, cosy, elegant, elegantly understated, lovely, magnificent, nice, palatial, smart, with nice decor, wonderful</i>	<i>bello, curato (nei minimi dettagli, nei particolari), di stile, elegante, fantastico, incantevole, la bellezza di questo posto, magnifico, meraviglioso, splendido, un gran bel posto</i>
Authenticity	<i>a typical Italian home, a pure Italian experience, exactly what one would hope to see in Tuscany, it feels like you are staying in the real Tuscany, perfect Tuscan experience, the gem of Tuscany, the perfect Tuscan place, Tuscan haven, very high Tuscan standard, wonderful Tuscan experience</i>	<i>caratteristico, toscano</i>
Cleanness	<i>clean, immaculate, pristine, spotless</i>	<i>pulizia, pulitissimo</i>
Comfort	<i>beautifully appointed, comfortable, comfortably furnished, luxurious, warm and inviting, well fitted, well furnished</i>	<i>accogliente, confortevole, molto ben fatto, rilassante</i>
Generic quality	<i>amazing, best, beyond compare, brilliant, excellent, fantastic, first class, good, great, incredible, perfect, sensational, the place to stay, top, top notch/class, very special, world class</i>	<i>buona qualità di x, di alto/altissimo livello, il miglior x in assoluto, da sogno, particolare, perfetto, piacevole, ti lascia davvero senza parole</i>
Location	<i>a picture postcard view of Siena, a very good base, a x minute drive, about x minutes drive, convenient, conveniently located, great/perfect</i>	<i>collocato in una cornice veramente fantastica, dalla vista mozzafiato, gode di una bellissima vista, immerso nella natura ma</i>

	<i>base for..., idyllic location, in a perfect location, just a short walk from/to, off the beaten path, away from the throngs of tourists, outstanding base, remote, secluded getaway in the heart of Tuscany, the location of this x can't be beaten, tucked away in Tuscany, under the Tuscan sun, well positioned</i>	<i>vicinissimo a..., immerso nelle crete senesi, in pieno centro, strategico</i>
Noise	<i>quiet, peaceful</i>	<i>dove si vive un clima esclusivo di relax, la tranquillità del posto, nella completa tranquillità della struttura, un angolo di pace</i>
Reputation	<i>a well deserved n1 ranking, highly rated, n. 1 on TA</i>	<i>inserito tra le 100 strutture al mondo</i>
Service	<i>professional, this is hospitality at its best, well run</i>	<i>la cordialità, l'accoglienza, il servizio</i>
Type	<i>boutique, family run, little, x star</i>	<i>un magnifico complesso</i>
Value	<i>good value for money quite a good value the real deal there is real value in</i>	

Table 3

English and Italian reviewers dedicate to “accommodation parts” more or less the same attention in terms of occurrences.

	Pos_En	Pos_It
Lemmas denoting parts of accommodation	<i>room (106), restaurant (26), bathroom (12), garden (12), parking (11), (swimming) pool (11), grounds (8), patio (4), balcony (3), ensuite (2), terrace (2)</i>	<i>camera (68), bagno (27), cucina (19), stanza (19), piscina (17), giardino (12), parcheggio (11), ristorante (9), ambienti (4)</i>

Table 4

Accommodation parts are evaluated in terms of “age”, “appearance”, “cleanness”, “comfort”, “equipment”, “location”, “noise”, “size” and “value”.

	Pos_En	Pos_It
Age	(bathrooms only) <i>modern, up-to-date</i>	(bathroom only) <i>rinnovato, nuovo</i>
Appearance	<i>lovely, impeccable, amazing, beautifully decorated, impeccably designed, gorgeous, pretty</i>	<i>bello, fantastico, curata in ogni particolare, molto carina, luminosa, da sballo, incantevole, da pubblicare su riviste di architettura, unico, spettacolare, suggestivo</i>
Cleanness	<i>clean, spotless, refreshed, meticulously maintained</i>	<i>pulito, la pulizia, ben pulito, ben tenuto, lindo</i>
Comfort	<i>Comfortable</i>	<i>confortevole, calda, di comfort inusuale</i>
Equipment	<i>beautifully appointed, with + amenity/facility</i>	<i>dagli arredi di ottimo livello, riccamente arredata, lussuoso, ben attrezzato,</i>
Location	<i>(rooms and outdoor facilities only) with nice views (of the countryside), with the lights of Siena twinkling in the distance, overlooking the vineyards</i>	<i>in centro, con una vista indimenticabile, con un panorama meraviglioso, panoramico, con uno sguardo sulle colline senesi, immerso nel verde</i>
Noise		<i>silenzioso</i>
Size	<i>large, nice size, spacious</i>	<i>ampio, spazioso, grande, di dimensioni inusuali</i>
Value	<i>(parking only) free</i>	<i>(parking only) gratuito</i>

Table 5

Contrary to Fina's (2011) conclusions that English reviews tend to be more detailed and itemised, very few cases of accommodation or accommodation parts followed by a list of equipment or facilities were found in Pos_En (16 reviews), and in these few cases, amenities are usually made the object of dedicated evaluation as in (3). In both Pos_En and Pos_It, the tendency seems to be to divide relevant information into separate sentences as in (3) and (4) and to comment on equipment and facilities in general terms as in (6).

- (3) Our room was clean, spacious and cozy. There was a shower and bidet but no tub, which we didn't really miss. The unheated infinity pool was gorgeous, and there was a lovely, compact spa area with hot tub and workout equipment. The grounds were immaculate and lovingly maintained. (Pos_En:31)

- (4) Il Bed and Breakfast è situato in posizione tranquilla e strategica [...]. Le camere sono spaziose, silenziose e molto pulite, gli ambienti confortevoli e curati. D'estate si può fare colazione nel giardinetto interno. (Pos_It:3)
- (5) Hotel spotlessly clean. Spacious rooms and lovely bathroom. Hotel staff extremely friendly and helpful. Breakfast was good and plenty of choice. Good location for station. (Pos_En:5)
- (6) Rooms and bathrooms are very large, well furnished, well equipped. (Pos_En:1)

In fact, Italian reviews seem to provide more information in terms of what is available at the accommodation than English reviews do (60 reviews). The comparison between modifiers in Tables 3 and 5 shows however that, while English almost exclusively resorts to adjectives (e.g. *clean, beautiful, professional, peaceful*), Italian often uses equivalent abstract nouns such as *pulizia, bellezza, cortesia, and tranquillità*, (cf. Manca 2007; Fina 2011). This need for abstraction (Manca 2007) and the fact that the style is usually quite narrative as in (7), might contribute to the overall impression that Italian reviews are less precise and factual⁹.

- (7) Il cancello si apre su un grazioso cortiletto in ghiaia dove poter comodamente parcheggiare l'auto, [...]. Scaricati i bagagli ti accompagnano all'entrata del relais, ma prima non si può non apprezzare la splendida e rilassante vista di Siena dal verde e curato giardino su cui risalta l'azzurro trasparente della piscina. [...] tutto è curato, ordinato e molto familiare, con un soggiorno ed un'ampia ed accogliente cucina a disposizione dei clienti per ogni necessità (dal frigorifero, al lavandino, al microonde, a bibite e dolci per allietare eventuali momenti di relax. (Pos_It:31)

Most of the semantic domains are represented in both corpora, with some interesting exceptions. Pos_It does not include any overt evaluation of accommodation in terms of "value" and Pos_En does not include any mention of "noise" in accommodation parts. The latter could be ex-

⁹ The passage in (7) also exemplifies the widespread and marked use of adjectives in pre-nominal position in Italian reviews, in line with the highly evaluative character of the genre. Italian distinguishes (although not rigidly) between a qualitative use and an evaluative use of adjectives. Adjective normally follow the noun they modify when they are used to describe a quality (e.g. "un uomo povero" – "a poor man"). They may precede it when they are used to express a judgment (e.g. "un pover uomo – a wretched man").

plained by the English reviewers' tendency to make a synecdochic use of terms denoting accommodation types: their judgments on the hotel usually extends to its parts as well. The fact that Italian reviewers do not mention prices directly or indirectly might depend on the fact that reviewers prevalently comment on aspects that exceed their expectations, and being travellers in their own country, the value-per-money ratio might simply seem unexceptional.

Items belonging to the "age" category also offer an interesting hint on the differences in English and Italian travellers' cultural expectations. While the quality of being new and modern is appreciated by both groups when it comes to facilities such as the bathrooms, when talking about the accommodation in general, English reviewers seem to prefer accompanying any mention of renovations or modern comforts with the fact that the building has a long history as in (8). Most travellers, after all, come to Italy for its millennial history, and staying at a modern, recently-built accommodation might be seen as less charming and "authentic" than staying at an older, hence more traditional and typical accommodation.

- (8) Can't say enough about this wonderful, "new but with an old-world soul" villa (Pos_En:69).

Authenticity is indeed a relevant topic in English reviews, while it is only mentioned in three reviews in Pos_It (*caratteristico, tipicamente toscano*) and always to comment on "structural features" as in (9), where it serves a similar function as the "age" terms in English.

- (9) [...] ristrutturato da poco e devo dire davvero accogliente rimanendo in stile tipicamente toscano (Pos_It:11).

4.2. *Authenticity and location*

The categories of "authenticity" and "location" play a major role in reviews, especially in English. It is mostly through the references to these two thematic areas that the culturally-predicted expectations of the reviewers emerge in the texts. Being typically Italian or Tuscan is often presented as one of the major qualities of the accommodation as in (10):

- (10) [...] it feels like you're staying in the real Tuscany (Pos_En: 94)

What is most interesting is that, in the corpus, terms like *Italian*, *Tuscan/Tuscany*, or *Toscana* appear to encode more than some basic geographic information: they are used to summarize a whole set of assumptions about these destinations supposedly shared by travelers of the same cultural background. It is, therefore, not surprising, that this

“authentic feel or aspect” is often explicitly associated with the reviewer’s expectations as in (11):

- (11) [we] were looking for a typical Italian home to live in...and that is exactly what we found! (Pos_En: 14)
- (12) La Toscana come la immagino (Pos_It:93)

In this respect, on the one hand, the language of reviews draws on the ideology, the imagery and even the stereotypes made popular by other, more “traditional” tourist genres such as guidebooks, ads, brochures and even “official” websites (Cappelli 2006, 2008a; Francesconi 2007) and, on the other hand, it contributes to the fixation and propagation of such ideology, imagery and stereotypes (Dann 1996). When reviewers write that a hotel was “an authentic Italian villa” (Pos_En: 93) or the “perfect Tuscan place” (Pos_En:85), they address directly all those people who share their very same idea of what Italy and Tuscany (or more specific destinations¹⁰) are – and, most importantly, what they are supposed to be – in terms of landscape, local lifestyle and type of vacation. For this reason, these terms are often used in review titles:

- (13) Wonderful Tuscan experience (Pos_En: 34)
- (14) True Tuscany (Pos_En: 55)
- (15) Perfect Tuscan experience (Pos_En: 63)
- (16) The gem of Tuscany (Pos_En:67)
- (17) The perfect Tuscan Place – it was one of the Best!! (Pos_En:85)
- (18) Tuscan hospitality (Pos_En:87)
- (19) [hotel name]... a little slice of Tuscan Heaven (Pos_En: 90)
- (20) Italian Splendor... Tuscany at its Best (Pos_En:93)
- (21) Ricordo di un meraviglioso affresco in Siena (Pos_It:7)
- (22) Raffinate coccole fiorentine (Pos_It:29)
- (23) La Toscana come nei film (Pos_It:50)
- (24) La magia della Toscana (Pos_It:95)

Interestingly, besides summarizing the content of the review, titles are used as excerpts or quotes on the pages dedicated to each individual

¹⁰ In the Italian corpus reference to specific cities or towns in this type of context is more common than the reference to the region in general. This is probably because Italians are familiar with the individual areas in Tuscany and their expectations might be more specific than that of a foreign tourist, who might have no idea how diverse Tuscany and Italy in general are.

accommodation on the commercial part of the website¹¹. In this way, they end up acting as purely promotional texts, and contribute to “persuade, lure, woo, and seduce millions of human beings” (Dann 1996:2), just like official advertisements. Besides perpetuating the stereotypical image of the destination, they also provide support to the “plausibility” of the readers’ expectations by reason of the fact that the comments and descriptions come from somebody they can identify with (Vásquez forthcoming a) and who actually managed to have that “perfect Tuscan experience” they read of and are longing for, rather than from some anonymous marketing agency. The occurrences of the terms *experience* (33) / *esperienza* (7) are indeed quite interesting, since they too are used in a very evocative way to “condense” the complex mix of aspects that one expects to be part of a vacation at the destination.

Actual descriptions of the location are usually provided to provide support to the claim of authenticity and contribute to reinforce the stereotypical view of the destination. Mention of location-related aspects are pervasive in both corpora, both in the review titles and text. Besides the obvious references to the place where the hotel is situated, occurrences can be classified in four thematic groups, which are often combined: a) comments relative to how convenient the location is, as in (25)-(30); b) comments as to how central or peripheral the location is, as in (31)-(36); c) comments as to how beautiful the location is, as in (37-39); d) description of the view and of the elements of the landscape.

- (25) The perfect base to explore Tuscany (Pos_En: 28)
- (26) It is really very close about a 10 minute drive (Pos_En: 34)
- (27) Very conveniently located in the heart of Tuscany - making visiting all of the famous towns a breeze. (Pos_En:53)
- (28) The hotel is in a perfect location, right next to the Palazzo Davanzati (Pos_En:77)
- (29) L'Hotel è in una posizione perfetta... (Pos_It:53)
- (30) l'hotel è strategico soprattutto per chi raggiunge Firenze in auto (Pos_It:29)
- (31) It is within walking distance of the sights, but still off the beaten path away from the throngs of tourists. (Pos_En:37)

¹¹ Accommodation managers can pay to advertise on TripAdvisor, in which case the titles of the most recent reviews published on the website are automatically shown on the ad page.

- (32) While the hotel is remote, Siena is only 30 minutes away and famous Tuscan wine towns like Montalcino and Montepulciano are a short drive away (Pos_En:73)
- (33) [...] tucked away in Tuscany (Pos_En:58)
- (34) [...] in pieno centro e da lì puoi raggiungere velocemente qualsiasi punto della città.... (Pos_It:53)
- (35) [...] immerso nella natura ma vicinissimo a Siena [...] (Pos_It:14)
- (36) [...] immerso nella tranquilla campagna senese [...] (Pos_It:16)
- (37) It is an idyllic location (Pos_En: 35)
- (38) Situato in una cornice splendida [...] (Pos_It:48)
- (39) [...] è collocato in una cornice veramente fantastica. (Pos_It:11)

English reviewers comment more on objective aspects of the location of the hotel, (e.g. information on distances to major sights or services), while Italian reviewers seem to provide more generic descriptions and to focus on the beauty of the place. Views are often mentioned by both English and Italian reviewers:

- (40) [...] with a picture post card view of Siena [...] (Pos_En:35)
- (41) [...] with the lights of Siena twinkling in the distance [...] (Pos_En:67)
- (42) [...] overlooking the vineyards [...] (Pos_En:98)
- (43) Dalla vista mozzafiato di Siena [...] (Pos_It:13)
- (44) [...] con uno sguardo sulle colline senesi [...] (Pos_It:39)

Italian reviewers are generous in their praise, but they do not linger on the details of the landscape. English reviewers, on the contrary, describe the setting with vivid details which make location descriptions one of the most interesting features of their reviews. They portray “picture perfect” Tuscany: exactly what the tourists expected to see, as if their gaze was truly guided and shaped by the promotional material they have been exposed to (Dann 1996; Urry 2002; Cappelli 2012). In Pos_En, there are many descriptive passages that are very evocative of “stereotypical” Tuscany, such as (45) and (46).

- (45) [the room] had great views of the rolling hills and valleys. You could open the windows and hear people speaking Italian, see clothes hanging on the line and just take in the view. (Pos_En:54)
- (46) Tuscan sunsets are beautiful. Rolling hills covered in vines and olive groves as far as the eye can see, individual buildings, villages and towns perched on mountain tops. Cypress trees point like fingers toward blue skies. At this time storms prevail, spectacular displays of lightening and claps of thunder rumble around the valleys and the rain falls straight and true. (Pos_En:56)

It is therefore not surprising that comments on the location of the accommodation become one of the most powerful arguments in support of the evaluation.

4.3. *Service*

Comments on the service received feature prominently in both the English and Italian corpus: 80% of the reviews in Pos_En and 90% of the reviews in Pos_It deal with this aspect. Just like in the case of the evaluation of location, its relevance is evidenced by the high frequency with which titles are dedicated to service, especially in Italian.

Warm and friendly staff (Pos_En:2)

Great hospitality (Pos_En:14)

Che bello essere coccolati (Pos_It:26)

La cura dei dettagli e dell'ospitalità (Pos_It:42)

Cuore e professionalità (Pos_It:75)

Comments focus on the staff in general or on specific people working or running the establishment, who are evaluated in terms of how professional, knowledgeable, accommodating or welcoming they are. English and Italian reviewers seem to differ as to the importance attributed to these qualities: the former tend to praise all of them, but especially knowledgeability and professionalism in running the establishment, the latter focus more on the interaction with the staff.

The hotel is [...] very well run (Pos_En:10)

The staff were charming, helpful and very obliging. (Pos_En:10)

[hosts' names] are wonderful hosts [...]. The advice they gave us was invaluable particularly the drives [host's name] suggested (Pos_En: 21)

Very good and professional hotel (Pos_En:17)

Il servizio è servizio (Pos_It:65)

Un magico connubio di cortesia e professionalità (Pos_It:68)

I proprietari [...] ti fanno godere a pieno la vacanza, sempre pronti a consigliarti nel modo giusto in ogni occasione. (Pos_It:6)

I proprietari sono gentilissimi e molto attenti (Pos_It:9)

The relational aspect of the hotel stay is highly relevant in the most positive reviews in both languages. It is often presented as the highlight of the vacation and a determining factor in the overall positive evaluation of the accommodation.

The highlight however is undoubtedly the hospitality shown by [hosts' names] (Pos_En:14)

Ciò che però rende davvero speciale il [hotel name] è la squisita ospitalità dei gentilissimi gestori [hosts' names] e la loro capacità non comune di accogliere le persone e di farle sentire a proprio agio, unendo discrezione e simpatia. (Pos_It:3)

Italian reviews often include information about how kind and friendly the staff were, but details or examples are provided quite rarely.

[...] i proprietari sono gentilissimi e molto attenti. (Pos_It:9)

Accoglienza ottima e familiare, i proprietari sempre disponibili e gentili ma allo stesso tempo anche discrete (Pos_It:10)

On the contrary, many of the English reviews are quite thorough in detailing the reasons why the staff were judged as friendly or helpful. The use of relatively long descriptions of the interaction with the hosts in the form of narratives is quite interesting. In line with Vásquez's (2012) finds on narratives in negative reviews, they have the function of providing support to the writer's evaluation of the hosts and of the accommodation as a whole. (64) below exemplifies one of the many narrative passages found in the corpus.

[...] but if you simply evaluate a B&B on these, you are missing the real value of this B&B... which comes in the form of [hosts'names]... there isn't anything they won't do to ensure that you have a wonderful and fantastic stay in Tuscany.... we know... we took full advantage of them! [host's name] is an 'expert' when it comes to mapping out the most picturesque drives to take, what to see and do, and where to stop for lunch (or dinner) in almost any small town you want to name... and wine tasting, well, he can easily arrange that for you as well.... and [host's name] found a kindred soul in my wife... unfortunately (for me) [host's name] told my wife where to find the most interesting shops in Siena and other places.... and both [hosts' name] seem to know the 'right' people so restaurant reservations were never a problem. An example, during our week in Tuscany we were thinking about visiting Florence for a day... but we'd been there before so we decided we'd try a cooking school... but which one? We knew of a couple and asked [host's name]... he looked into them for us and they were both about a 45 minute drive away, would run about 3 hours with a group of anywhere between 6-12 people... on the other hand, he knew a chef who had a cooking school about 5-10 minutes away - would we be interested in that? Yes... so he checked, and we were in luck,

he was available so we reserved... on the day, [host's name] drove us over... we arrived just after 11... and we discovered it would be just us and the chef... and we chopped, mixed, pureed, sliced, boiled, simmered, grilled etc etc (oh, and ate!) until just after 4 when [host's name] picked us up... we had an absolutely fantastic time... this wouldn't have happened without [host's name]... (Pos_En:24)

The choice to dedicate so much space to the interactions with the staff might be interpreted with the fact that it represents the only contact with the “locals” (i.e. the local culture) most tourists ever have a chance to have. This becomes an important part of the tourist experience, because it provides it with an additional “layer of authenticity” and it gives the reviewer the chance to feel less of a “tourist” in the host country and more of a “traveler”¹². It also introduces an element of “affect” and familiarity that is generally absent in an already disorienting and estranging experience such as that of travel (Dann 1996; Cronin 2000). Cohen (2004:183) defines this attitude of some travellers in terms of recreation of their “environmental bubble” at the destination so as to reduce the “dangers” of finding oneself in a foreign environment. Fina (2011:76) observes a similar trend in her data and analogously concludes that it could be an indicator of “Uncertainty Avoidance, which Hofstede defines as ‘the extent to which the members of a culture feel threatened by ambiguous or unknown situations’ (2001:167)”. If this is the case, it is not surprising that English reviewers linger on this aspect more than Italian reviewers do, given that there is in principle no special cross-cultural interest in the tourist-hotel staff relationship for the latter.

One of the linguistic indicators of this need to recreate a “safe bubble” found in Fina’s (2011) discussion and confirmed by the data retrieved from Pos_En is the frequent occurrence of expressions referring to the ability of hosts to make you feel at home or with friends. Interestingly, even though less frequently, similar occurrences are found in the Italian corpus as well, which means that travel is always a “challenging” experience forcing people out of their comfort zone, even if it does not involve a remarkable “change of scene” from a cultural point of view.

a home away from home (Pos_En:11)

feel like home (Pos_En:12)

[...] we felt we had come ‘home’ (Pos_En:25)

¹² For a discussion of the tourist vs. traveller debate in tourist discourse see Cappelli (2008).

You will leave this place feeling as though you are leaving best friends (Pos_En:30)
Sembra di stare a casa... (Pos_It:1)
Come a casa (Pos_It:4)
I Proprietari riservano un'accoglienza calda ed "avvolgente" e cercano in tutti i modi di farti sentire un amico più che un ospite. (Pos_It:11)

The difference in the number of occurrences of these indicators is in fact smaller if we include the occurrences in which reference to feeling like a member of the family is made. As could be expected, they are considerably more frequent in Italian (*famiglia* 4, *familiare* 12) than in English (*family* 5):

They treated us like family and provided us with the warmest of welcomes. (Pos_En:59)
[...] ti fanno sentire in famiglia (Pos_It:60)
Come sentirsi parte della famiglia (Pos_It:83)
[...] un'atmosfera davvero familiare e cordiale [...] (Pos_It: 88)

In Pos_En, comments such as those exemplified in (65)-(75) usually precede or follow some sort of explanation. This generally involves hosts sharing their table with the guests or entertaining them with stories about their family history or property over a glass of wine, in other words, what is on occasion defined as "Italian hospitality at its best" (Pos_En:32). The image of the local hosts that emerges from these reviews is usually the quite stereotypical image of Italians as epicurean people, prone to welcoming strangers into their home and to making them long-lasting friends. For this reason, the fact that a specific accommodation can provide this type of "authentic" (or believed such) experience is presented as another aspect that supports the positive evaluation of the place reviewed.

5. Conclusion

Despite the fact that accommodation reviews are user-generated texts, their tone does not appear to part significantly from that of "official" tourist promotion. Positive reviews¹³ are echoic of the language of

¹³ Negative reviews might offer a different picture, because they might not be as influenced by the rhetoric of the official promotional materials, which only present the

the advertisements and brochures that attract the reviewers to the destination, both in the imagery and rhetorical strategies. Linguistic euphoria characterizes positive reviews as much as ads (Cappelli 2006). The lexical choices of the reviewers mirror the topics chosen by canonical tourism discourse (Dann 1996). They present Tuscany as a magical place out of time, endowed with rejuvenating powers (cf. Dann's (1996) magic and tense techniques; Cappelli 2006). Thus, the region is described as a magical and charming place ("un luogo magico e incantevole" Pos_It:99; "we had a magic time here" Pos_En:64), where you can have a dream vacation ("un soggiorno da sogno" Pos_It:78; "that fantasy Tuscan experience" Pos_En:63). It is a place "from another age" and which "will put you in touch with earlier times and human experiences" (Pos_En:60).

The stay at the accommodation reviewed becomes iconic of the whole travel experience, and more importantly, of the desired cross-cultural experience at large. In the reviews, the traveler's expectations emerge in the descriptions of the landscapes and of the encounters with the local people, who are often referred to by their first name ("I proprietari, Elisabetta and Mario, che mi permettono di chiamare confidenzialmente per nome", Pos_It:6), as a sign of a familiarity presumably attained through the sharing of "memorable" events. "Authentic" becomes synonymous with "stereotypical". All in all, the image of the destination that emerges from both the English and Italian reviews is picture-perfect Tuscany. The hotel managers and staff placed in this frame inherit its "typicality" and the region is presented as populated by welcoming hosts, ready to assist, offer advice and share good wine and stories. As could be expected these aspects are more prominently featured in the English corpus, because the cultural gap for Italian tourists is minimal, the only "surprising" aspects possibly being the features of the landscape or cityscape.

All of these descriptions bear a striking resemblance to the images printed on postcards and magazines, to the scenes described in guidebooks, novels and films¹⁴ set in the region, and to the characters populating those pictures, novels, and films. In other words, they mirror the expectations of the traveler, who "narrates what everyone else knows" (Dann 1996:65). In so doing, travellers' words contribute to spread the

destination in positive terms.

¹⁴ It is therefore not surprising that the expression "under the Tuscan sun", from the title of the very popular novel by Frances Mayes (1996) was found as the title of three reviews in Pos_En.

image of the destination as is stereotypically presented in their own culture. By leaving a positive testimonial of their experience, they confirm that those shared expectations can be indeed be satisfied and that the official voice of promotion can be trusted, which is something they might not have taken for granted¹⁵. They reinforce that “small set of markers which provides a mental grid for tourists to filter their own perceptions” (Dann 1996:66), and contribute to the tautological nature of tourism discourse.

References

- Boorstin D., 1987, *The Image. A Guide to Pseudo-Events in America*, Atheneum, New York.
- Briggs S., Sutherland J., Drummond S., 2007, “Are hotels serving quality? An Exploratory study of service quality in the Scottish hotel sector”, *Tourism Management*, 28, pp. 1006-1019.
- Buck R., 1977, “The ubiquitous tourist brochure. Explorations in its intended and unintended use”, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 4, pp. 195-207.
- Cappelli G., 2006, *Sun, Sea, Sex and the Unspoilt Countryside. How the English language makes tourists out of readers*, Pari Publishing, Pari.
- Cappelli G., 2008a, “The translation of tourism-related websites and localization: problems and perspectives”, in A. Baicchi (ed.), *Voices on Translation, RILA Rassegna Italiana di Linguistica Applicata*, Bulzoni Editore, Roma, pp. 97-115.
- Cappelli G., 2008b, “Expats’ Talk: Humour and irony in an expatriate’s travel blog”, in D. Chiaro, N. Norrick (eds), Special Issue *Exploring humo(u)r, language and culture*, *Textus*, 11, pp. 9-26.
- Cappelli G., 2012, “Travelling in Space: Spatial Representation in English and Italian Tourism Discourse”, in L. Fodde, G. Van Den Abeele (eds), *Tourism and Tourists in Language and Linguistics*, *Textus*, 25, pp. 19-35.
- Cappelli G., forthcoming, “Travelling words: Language in English tourism discourse”, in S. Villani, A. Yarrington (eds), *Travels and Translations*, Rodopi, Amsterdam/New York.
- Castello E., 2002, *Tourist-information Texts: A Corpus Based Study of Four Related Genres*, Unipress, Padova.

¹⁵ In fact, it is quite common for reviewers to underline the fact that their expectations were exceeded (“above and beyond” Pos_En:32; “dove la realtà supera l’immaginazione” Pos_It:18), as if they had become accustomed to being deceived by advertising.

- Chung J.Y., Buhalis D., 2008, "Web 2.0: a study of online travel community", in P. O'Connor, W. Höpken, U. Gretzel (eds), *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism: Proceedings of the International Conference in Innsbruck, Austria*, Springer, Vienna, pp. 267-278.
- Cohen E., 2004, *Contemporary Tourism: Diversity and Change*, Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- Cronin M., 2000, *Across the Lines: Travel, Language, Translation*, Cork University Press, Cork.
- Dann G., 1996, *The Language of Tourism. A Sociolinguistic Perspective*, CAB International, Wallingford.
- Fina M.E., 2011, "What A TripAdvisor Corpus Can Tell Us About Culture", *Cultus*, 4, pp. 59-80.
- Fodde L., Denti O., 2005, "Cross-cultural representations in tourist discourse: The image of Sardinia in English tourist guides", in M. Bondi, N. Maxwell (eds), *Cross-cultural encounters – linguistic perspective*, Officina Edizioni, Roma, pp. 116-129.
- Fodde L., G. Van Den Abeele, (eds), 2012, *Tourism and Tourists in Language and Linguistics*, *Textus*, 25, 1-12.
- Francesconi S., 2007, *English for Tourism Promotion. Italy in British Tourism Texts*, Hoepli, Milano.
- Gotti M., Guinda C.S. (eds), 2013, *Narratives in Academic and Professional Genres*, Peter Lang, Bern.
- Hall E.T., 1990, *The Silent Language*, Doubleday, New York.
- Hennig-Thurau T., Gwinner K., Walsh G., Gremler D., 2004, "Electronic word-of-mouth via consumer opinion platforms: What motivates consumers to articulate themselves on the Internet?", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 18, pp. 38-52.
- Hofstede G., 2001, *Culture's Consequences. Comparing Values, Behaviours, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.
- Katan D., 2004, *Translating Cultures: An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators*, St. Jerome Press, Manchester.
- Manca E., 2004, *Translation by Collocation. The Language of Tourism in English and Italian*, TWC, Birmingham.
- Manca E., 2008a, "From phraseology to culture: qualifying adjectives in the language of tourism", in U. Roemer, R. Schulze (eds), *Patterns, meaningful units and specialized discourses*, *IJCL Special Issue*, 13.3, pp. 368-385.
- Manca E., 2008b, "'Immerse yourself in the traditions of the simply way of life': analysing English translations of Italian agriturismo websites", *RITT Journal Rivista Internazionale di Tecnica della Traduzione*, 10, pp. 33-45.

- Manca E., 2011, "Corpus Linguistics and Cultural Studies: a combined approach in the translation process", in M. Bondi, S. Cacchiani and G. Palumbo (eds.), *CLAVIER'09 – Corpus Linguistics and Language Variation*, Special Issue of RILA *Rassegna Italiana di Linguistica Applicata*, 2011/1-2, pp. 263-285.
- Manca E., 2012, "Translating the language of tourism across cultures: from functionally complete units of meaning to cultural equivalence", in L. Fodde, G. Van Den Abeele (eds), *Tourism and Tourists in Language and Linguistics*, *Textus*, 25, pp. 51-68.
- Mattiello E., 2012, "Metaphor in Discourse: Imagined Worlds in English Tourist Texts on the Web", in L. Fodde, G. Van Den Abeele (eds), *Tourism and Tourists in Language and Linguistics*, *Textus*, 25, pp.69-84.
- Mayes F., 1996, *Under the Tuscan Sun*, Broadway Books, New York.
- Miguéns J., Baggio R., Costa, C., 2008, "Social media and Tourism Destination: TripAdvisor Case Study, in *Proceedings of the IASK Advances in Tourism Research 2008 (ATR2008)*, Aveiro, Portugal, pp. 194-199.
- Nelson J., 1983, "As the brain tunes out, the TV admen tune in", *The Toronto Globe and Mail*, April 16.
- Nigro M.G., 2006, *Il linguaggio specialistico del turismo. Aspetti storici, teorici e traduttivi*, Aracne Editrice, Roma.
- Pollach I., 2006, "Electronic word of mouth: A genre analysis of product reviews on consumer opinion web sites", in *Proceedings of the 39th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences. IEEE Computer Society*, pp. 50-60.
- Ricci F., Wietsma, R., 2006, "Product reviews in travel decision-making", in M. Hitz, M. Sigala, J. Murphy (eds), *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism*, 2006, Springer, Vienna, pp. 296-307.
- Sen S., Lerman D., 2007, "Why are you telling me this? An examination into negative consumer reviews on the web", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 21, pp. 76-94.
- Tancer B., 2008, *Click: What millions of people are doing online and why it matters*, Hyperion, New York.
- Thurot J., Thurot G., 1983, "The ideology of class and tourism. Confronting the discourse of advertising", *Annals of Tourism Research*, 10, pp. 173-189.
- Tognini-Bonelli E., 2001, *Corpus Linguistics at Work*, Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Urry J., 2002, *The Tourist Gaze. Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*, 2nd Edition, Sage, London.
- Vásquez C., 2011, "Complaints online: The case of TripAdvisor", *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, pp. 1707-1717.
- Vásquez C., 2012, "Narrativity and involvement in online consumer reviews. The case of TripAdvisor", *Narrative Inquiry*, 22(1), pp. 105-121.

- Vásquez C., forthcoming a, "Usually not one to complain but...": Constructing identities in online reviews", in C. Tagg, P. Seargeant (eds), *The language of social media: Community and identity on the internet*, Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Vásquez C., forthcoming b, *The discourse of online consumer reviews*, Bloomsbury Press, London.
- Vermeulen I., Seeger D., 2009, "Tried and tested: The impact of online hotel reviews and consumer considerations", *Tourism Management*, 30, pp. 123-127.
- Vestito C., 2005, "The Tourist Representation of the Italian South", *Textus* XVIII, pp. 369-380.
- Yoo K.-H., Gretzel U., 2009, "Comparison of deceptive and truthful travel reviews", in V. Hopken, U. Gretzel, R. Law (eds), *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism*, Springer-Verlag, Vienna, pp. 37-47.
- Zehrer A., Crotts J.C., Magnini V.P., 2011, "The perceived usefulness of blog postings: An extension of the expectancy-disconfirmation paradigm", *Tourism Management*, 32 (1), pp. 106-113.

Web references

- Sketch Engine*, Interface for Corpus Analysis <http://www.sketchengine.co.uk>, last accessed 11 March 2013
- TripBarometer by TripAdvisor 2013* <http://www.tripadvisortripbarometer.com/>, last accessed 11 March 2013.