

---

---

.....

# *Cultus*

THE JOURNAL OF INTERCULTURAL  
MEDIATION AND COMMUNICATION

---

TOURISM ACROSS CULTURES  
*Accessibility in Tourist Communication*  
2016, Issue 9, Volume 1

ICONESOFT EDIZIONI - GRUPPO RADIVO HOLDING  
BOLOGNA - ITALY

---

Registrazione al Tribunale di Terni  
n. 11 del 24.09.2007

Direttore Responsabile Agostino Quero  
Editore Iconesoft Edizioni – Radivo Holding  
Anno 2016

ISSN 2035-3111 (e) ISSN 2035-2948  
Policy: double-blind peer review

© *Iconesoft Edizioni – Radivo Holding srl*  
*via Ferrarese 3 – 40128 Bologna*

---

# CULTUS

*the Journal of Intercultural Mediation and Communication*

## TOURISM ACROSS CULTURES Accessibility in Tourist Communication

2016, Issue 9, Volume 1

GENERAL EDITOR

*Cinzia Spinzi*  
*University of Palermo*

GUEST EDITOR

*Elena Manca*  
*University of Salento*

ICONESOFT EDIZIONI – RADIVO HOLDING  
BOLOGNA

---

# CULTUS

*the Journal of Intercultural Mediation and Communication*

---

## Scientific Committee

*Michael Agar*

Ethknoworks LLC and University of Maryland, College Park, USA

*Milton Bennett*

Intercultural Development Research Institute, Portland (OR), USA

*Patrick Boylan*

SIETAR-Italy and past Professor at Roma Tre University, Rome

*Ida Castiglioni*

University of Milan (Bicocca), Intercultural Development Research  
Institute

*Andrew Chesterman*

University of Helsinki, Finland

*Delia Chiaro*

University of Bologna (SSLMIT), Forlì, Italy

*Madeline Strong Cincotta*

University of Wollongong NSW, Australia

*Floriana Di Gesù*

University of Palermo

---

*Nigel Ewington*

WorldWork Ltd, Cambridge, England

*Peter Franklin*

HTWG Konstanz University of Applied Sciences, dialogin-The Delta  
Intercultural Academy

*Maria Grazia Guido*

University of Salento, Italy

*Xiaoping Jiang*

University of Guangzhou, China

*Tony Liddcoast*

University of Warwick, England

*Elena Manca*

University of Salento, Italy

*Raffaella Merlini*

University of Macerata, Italy

*Robert O'Dowd*

Universidad de León, Spain

---

*Anthony Pym*

Intercultural Studies Group, Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Tarragona, Spain

*Federica Scarpa*

SSLMIT, University of Trieste, Italy

*Christopher Taylor*

University of Trieste, Italy

*David Trickey*

International Diversity Management, Bologna, Italy

*Margherita Ulrych*

Catholic University of Milan, Italy

---

## Table of Contents

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Foreword – <i>Elena Manca</i> and <i>Cinzia Spinzi</i>   | 1   |
| Official Tourist Websites and the Cultural Communication Grammar model: analysing language, visuals, and cultural features<br><i>Elena Manca</i>   | 2   |
| Perception or Perspective? Adjusting the representation of Italy and the UK for the tourist: the Made in Italy and This is Great Britain campaigns<br><i>Stefania M. Maci</i>  | 23  |
| Promoting Venice through digital travel guidebooks: a case study of texts written in English and in Italian<br><i>Daniela Cesiri</i>   | 49  |
| Popularization and accessibility in travel guidebooks for children in English<br><i>Gloria Capelli</i>   | 68  |
| ELF narratives of ancient and modern ‘odysseys’ across the Mediterranean Sea: An Experiential-Linguistic Approach to the marketing of Responsible Tourism<br><i>Maria Grazia Guido, Lucia Errico, Pietro Luigi Iaia, Cesare Amatulli</i> | 90  |
| Beauty is in the eye of MygranTour. A case study of migrant-driven intercultural routes across Europe<br><i>Laura Centonze</i>   | 117 |

---

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Translanguaging and its effects on accessibility in Travel Writing. A Case Study: H.V. Morton on Apulia<br><i>Thomas W. Christiansen</i> | 131 |
| “Dancing with the Spider”: popularization at work in intangible tourism-travel discourse<br><i>Sabrina Francesconi</i>                   | 153 |
| Notes on contributors  | 170 |
| Guidelines for contributors  | 174 |

## Foreword

It is our great pleasure to present the first volume of Cultus 9, an issue entirely dedicated to the language of tourism in a cross-cultural perspective. A high number of articles have been submitted for this issue by international academics and researchers. For this reason, eight articles are being published in volume 1, edited by Elena Manca and Cinzia Spinzi, the remaining ones will follow in volume 2, edited by David Katan and Cinzia Spinzi.

We would like to thank all the authors for contributing to this field of study, and to this issue, with their high-quality, innovative and interesting work and for their dedication and patience.

In addition, we would like to thank those members of the Scientific Committee who have contributed to the making of this volume and whose work has increased the quality of the articles even more.

We are sure that this issue will be very useful for future research in Tourism Discourse studies.

*Elena Manca and Cinzia Spinzi*

---

***Beauty is in the eye of MygranTour.***  
**A case study of migrant-driven intercultural routes  
 across Europe**

*Laura Centonze*

*Abstract*

*The present study attempts to investigate the relation between tourism perception as well as the process of appropriation/subjectivisation of the main tourist landmarks on the part of tourist guides in their routes across some of the most important European cities. Specifically, we report the preliminary results of a case study that was carried out on so-called “migrantourism”, a newly-emerging phenomenon whose objective is to assist the integration of migrant citizens into nine participant European cities (i.e. Turin, Milan, Genoa, Florence, Rome, Marseille, Paris, Valencia and Lisbon) by means of informal intercultural walks on which migrants act as tourist guides. In this role, they are committed to illustrating the city’s main tourist attractions from their own perspective and experience. By means of Wordsmith Tools 7 (Scott 2016), we shall provide an overview of the different perspectives adopted by migrants in the revisitation of their past experience as new arrivals/tourists. By analyzing the transcriptions of some videos available on the internet, we shall see the extent to which the different perspectives on the description of each of the cities involved in the project encode concepts linked to culture-bound elements and locations (e.g. customs and traditions, historical key facts), as well as experiences of integration, either successful or not, by migrants, which can be seen to be informed by their native lingua-cultural schemata (see Guido 2008, 2016). As Mitchell (2001 cit. in Knudsen and Greer 2008) states, “the meaning of landscape, like all meaning, is created, recreated, and contested in social processes”. As well as providing a brief tour d’horizon of the main features of the diverse lingua franca variations found in the scripts, this study contributes to the already existing literature in the field of intercultural communication and the negotiation of meaning and tourism accessibility to culture-bound elements on the part of migrants.*

## **1. Introduction**

*Migrantourism* is a phenomenon which is gradually spreading all over the world and most of all in the main European capital cities. It originated a

few years ago from a project called “MygranTour: a European network of migrant driven intercultural routes to understand cultural diversity” promoted by associations which, among others, included Oxfam, Viaggi Solidali and also enjoyed the support of the European Union<sup>1</sup>. The project boasts the collaboration of nine cities (Turin, Milan, Genoa, Florence, Rome, Marseille, Paris, Valencia and Lisbon) and is aimed at enhancing cooperation among stakeholders as well as the integration of migrants into the cities taking part into the project. As explained on the MygranTour website, the play on words is inevitable and successfully describes the main activities and ideas behind such an ambitious project:

**“From Mygrantour to Migrantour: My Gran Tour:** the way each of us has of travelling in our own city, the places and routes that reinforce our sense of belonging to the place in which we live, that make us feel at home.

**Migrant... Tour:** The routes of migrants, walks accompanied by new citizens, that take us in discovery of intercultural and cosmopolitan neighbourhoods, uncovering stories and secret corners that not even born-and-bred locals know as well.

From **Mygrantour** to **Migrantour**: a change in one letter and yet in this small difference lies a long, fascinating and absorbing journey that has led us from the very first moment we imagined the path to today: we have come a long way. A simple name has become a logo that you will find in this virtual space alongside the names of cities and migrants. It will help you recognise the routes created and the people working daily to offer you the **Migrantour urban intercultural walks**<sup>2</sup>”.

The analysis of tourism in general has been gaining momentum over recent decades due to the large-scale expansion of the tourist phenomenon throughout the world<sup>3</sup>. As a whole, in the literature

<sup>1</sup> The website of the project: <http://www.mygrantour.org/>.

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.mygrantour.org/en/the-project/#the-project> (last accessed 23/06/2016).

<sup>3</sup> With regards to this, Guido’s *ELF in Responsible Tourism: Power relationships in unequal migration encounters* (in Pitzl and Osimk-Teasdale 2016: pp. 49-56) analyses the role of power asymmetries in the misunderstandings occurring in responsible tourism practices between tourists and migrants: the former being welcomed in voluntary-

---

concerning the study of tourism discourse across cultures, two parallel trends can be identified: 1) the linguistic characterizations of tourism information through the comparison of audio guides, brochures as well as travel blogs (Cappelli 2013; Luzón 2016), 2) the implications and challenges of carrying out research that relies on translated materials and on their quality/reliability (cf. Hogg *et al.* 2014). Furthermore, also different approaches to the analysis of the language of tourism/tourists have been adopted over the last decades, which range from corpus-driven/based analyses (Kang 2011; Gandin 2013), semantic annotation (Capriello *et al.* 2013) to automated analysis by means of dedicated software (García-Pablos *et al.* 2016).

Within the framework of the perception and reception of the tourist product on the part of tourists as well as tourist guides, we witness a two-fold scenario: on the one hand, tourist guides (in Yasumara's (1994) words, the "hosts") whose first language is other than the one spoken in the visited country (e.g. migrants acting as tourist guides as part of promotional campaigns undertaken by municipalities and countries all over the world) and acting according to their own socio-cultural schemata (Carrell 1983) in the cultural promotion of the cities according to what they believe to be relevant to the tourists ("guests", Yasumara 1994); on the other, tourists coming from all over the world to visit places of interest. Such a dichotomy inevitably brings about a contrast of different cultures and diverse perceptions of the tourist experience on both sides, which are characterized by different linguistic and lexico-semantic choices. As a consequence of such a process, we get a vision of the whole tourist experience which is subjective – if not 'distorted' – and gives origin to stereotypes and commonplaces within social interaction as well as to different social system.

With special reference to the above-said, Wang (1999: p. 350) deals with the issue of authenticity in tourism experience, which he explains as

“[...] products of tourism such as works of art, festivals, rituals, cuisine, dress, housing, and so on [which] are usually described as ‘authentic’ or ‘inauthentic’ in terms of the

---

work camps and acting as mediators; the latter committed to promoting the tourist destination. It shows the extent to which the tourists'/mediators' willingness to achieve mutual understanding and cooperation with migrants leads to the imposition of their own socio-cultural schemata (pp. 50-51).

---

criterion of whether they are made or enacted by local people according to custom or tradition”.

He goes on to point to three different types of authenticity in tourism, i.e. 1) *object-related (objective) authenticity*, which he describes as the “authenticity of originals, [...] a museum-linked usage of the authenticity of the originals which are also the toured objects to be perceived by tourists” (*ibidem*, p. 351); 2) *activity-related (existential) authenticity* which refers to the feeling and state of being which is activated through the tourism experience, and 3) *constructive (symbolic) authenticity*, “the result of social construction, not an objectively measurable quality of what is being visited” (*ibidem*). In the light of this, tourism has begun to be perceived as a cultural phenomenon providing useful insights into the *Weltanschauung* of tourists who, from their own perspectives, “tend to see the world in similar ways according to a shared map or model of reality” (Katan, 2012: p. 84). In addition to this, the idea of a so-called “tourist gaze” (Urry and Larsen, 2011), which characterizes a reality that is filtered by means of a process of appropriation, simplification and standardization of the tourist experience, has also acquired even more importance.

Drawing on Wang’s (1999) third type of authenticity (i.e. constructive/symbolic authenticity of the tourist experience), by means of a corpus-driven approach to data, the present case study attempts to: 1) investigate the perception of and the accessibility to the tourist experience in Italy and in other European countries; 2) identify and compare the different attitudes towards the tourist experience on the part of non-local tourist guides; 3) provide some examples of appropriation/subjectivisation of the tourist experience by migrant tourist guides in their routes across some of the most important European cities; 4) last but not least, raise awareness of the emergence of new advances in the study of tourism accessibility not only on the part of tourists, but of tourist guides as well, and propose a new analysis which does not only concentrate on Urry and Larsen’s tourist gaze, but also on the tourist gaze of (migrant) tourist guides. For the purposes of the present case study, we shall take into account a small set of videos made available on YouTube, in which migrants act as tourist guides to newcomers/tourists by providing their own perspective in the description of their own experience as tourists in the hosting country.

## 2. Materials and methods

For the purposes of our analysis, we compiled a small corpus of transcriptions of the MygranTour videos available on the promotional website<sup>4</sup> of the project as well as on Youtube on a dedicated channel<sup>5</sup>, in which the migrant tourist guides describe cities to visitors. Details about the videos taken into consideration are given in Table 1. Each video is approximately six up to ten minutes long, depending on the excerpts available on the web.

|                             |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| <b>Video 1 (French)</b>     | “MyGranTour Marseille: Marseille vous invite!”                          |
| <b>Video 2 (French)</b>     | “MyGranTour Paris: le monde en ville”                                   |
| <b>Video 3 (Portuguese)</b> | “MyGranTour Lisboa”   |
| <b>Video 4 (Italian)</b>    | “MygranTour Genova: la città vecchia raccontata dai nuovi cittadini”    |
| <b>Video 5(Italian)</b>     | “MygranTour Milano: Porta Venezia dai Promessi Sposi al Corno d’Africa” |

Table 1. The MygranTour study sub-corpora.

In Table 2 the breakdown of the corpus is represented and sorted out by file size and number of types (different words) in the corpus. We transcribed each video by focusing on the discourse of the migrant tourist guides taking part in the MygranTour project; we isolated any comments and/or overlapping provided by the interlocutors outside the description of the cities and, after transcribing each video, we used Wordsmith Tools 7 (Scott 2016) in order to easily and automatically generate frequency lists and have a closer look at collocates throughout each of the study corpus sections. Since the aim of our case study was to have a look at word frequency lists, we applied a stop list whereby we isolated prepositions, adjectives as well as pronouns and any other item which was not relevant to our analysis.

|          | <b>Text file</b>     | <b>File size (words)</b> | <b>Number of types (different words) in corpus</b> |
|----------|----------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <b>1</b> | Migrantour Genova    | 2,795                    | 483  |
| <b>2</b> | Migrantour Milano    | 1,793                    | 314  |
| <b>3</b> | Migrantour Marseille | 1,459                    | 211  |

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.mygrantour.org/> (last accessed 07/04/2016).

<sup>5</sup> [https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCo93AM3STwFNf1hDHeXc\\_WQ](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCo93AM3STwFNf1hDHeXc_WQ) (last accessed 07/04/2016).

|   |                   |       |     |
|---|-------------------|-------|-----|
| 4 | Migrantour Paris  | 1,289 | 201 |
| 5 | Migrantour Lisboa | 1,235 | 198 |

Table 2. Breakdown of the MygranTour study sub-corpora

By using the *Wordlist* and *Concord* commands available in Wordsmith Tools 7 we concentrated on the most-frequently occurring words and their collocates across the different corpus sections and then compared the results for each of them. For the above, we considered the first fifteen most frequent nouns as listed in Wordsmith Tools 7, as in each of the sections this represents the threshold for any term related to the tourist experience and, as Vaughan and Clancy (2013: p. 5) points out, “a small corpus builder can address issues of representativeness by ensuring that the samples collected are typical of the speech domain represented by the corpus”.

### 3. Noun frequency lists and main collocates in the MygranTour study corpus

#### 3.1 The French section

As already explained in section two, by means of Wordsmith Tools 7 we extracted all the instances of words available in the different sections of the corpus. Here follows the list of the first fifteen words for the French corpus section (files 1 and 2).

| Word         | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|--------------|-----------|----------------|
| Ville        | 17        | 1.15           |
| Marseille    | 15        | 1.02           |
| Belsunce     | 6         | 0.41           |
| France       | 6         | 0.41           |
| Centre       | 5         | 0.34           |
| Port         | 5         | 0.34           |
| Quartier     | 5         | 0.34           |
| Canebière    | 4         | 0.27           |
| Marseillaise | 4         | 0.27           |
| Paris        | 4         | 0.27           |
| Place        | 4         | 0.27           |
| Empire       | 3         | 0.20           |
| Guerre       | 3         | 0.20           |
| Histoire     | 3         | 0.20           |
| Monarchie    | 3         | 0.20           |

Table 3. Word frequency lists and percentages in the French corpus section

As transpires from Table 3, the most frequently occurring words are *ville* (En.<sup>6</sup> *city*, 17 occurrences), *Marseille* (15 occurrences), and *Belsunce* and *France* (6 items each) immediately followed by *centre* and *port* (En. *centre* and *harbour*, 5 occurrences found); it is also interesting to note how figures for *Paris* (4 instances) are lower than those found for *Marseille* (15 instances), although the size of the corpus sections does not vary significantly (respectively 1,459 and 1,289 words); in addition to this, the main focus of the whole description carried out by the migrant tourist guides appears to be mainly focusing on the historical key facts and main characters in the history of both cities, as also highlighted in the main collocates of *ville* found within the French subcorpora:

|            | Keyword      |                                 |
|------------|--------------|---------------------------------|
| Le centre- | <b>ville</b> | de Marseille                    |
| La         | <b>ville</b> | du Second Empire                |
| La         | <b>ville</b> | pendant la Monarchie de Juillet |
| La         | <b>ville</b> | au temps de Charles X           |
| La         | <b>ville</b> | des jésuites astronomes         |
| Une        | <b>ville</b> | perdue de reputation            |
| La         | <b>ville</b> | “sans nom”                      |
| La         | <b>ville</b> | de Gaston Deferre               |

Table 4. Main collocates for *ville*

The other most frequent words in the current section also appear to display a more history-related collocational profile, which for reasons of space we are not able to provide in tables, but some of which can be summarized as follows. *Belsunce* is mainly associated with la *deuxième guerre mondiale* (En. World War II), during which the area witnessed migration flows from Africa and Egypt; France’s main collocates are represented by *république* (En. *republic*) and *présidence*, when introducing the different presidents of the French Republic and their projects for the valorisation of monuments in Paris; *centre* is mainly associated with *ville* and with the names of the two cities represented in this section, i.e. Paris and Marseille; *port* represents a very interesting word, as it is exclusively used to describe the city of Paris as ‘port de mer’, an initiative which traces back to The Middle Ages. *Quartier* is a word which is found 5 times in the corpus and whose collocates include, beside *historique* (En. *historical*), also *Panier*, which is one of the main historical parts of Marseille, where a Greek colony was erected in 600 BC. *Canebière* itself is one of the main historical streets in

<sup>6</sup> The English translation is provided in brackets throughout the paper.

Marseille. *Marseillaise* is the national anthem, and is found to be mainly associated with *armée* (En. *army*), *empereur* (En. *emperor*) and *hymne* (En. *anthem*); *Paris* collocates with *histoire* (En. *history*) and *capital* (En. *capital*); *place* (En. *square*) is used to introduce the most famous squares in Paris, *Place de la Bastille*, *Place de la Concorde*, *Place des Pyramides*, and *Place de la République*; *empire* (En. *empire*) is associated with ordinal numbers *second* (En. *second*) and *premier* (En. *first*), when talking about the two different empires, the former led by Napoléon Bonaparte and the latter by Napoleon III; *guerre* (En. *war*) also collocates with ordinal numbers *première/seconde* (guerre) *mondiale*, when talking about World War I and World War II; *histoire* (En. *history*) collocates with the two cities of Marseille and Paris, and once with *France* as well, whereas *monarchie* (En. *monarchy*) collocates with *juillet* (En. *July*) and with *révolution française* (En. *French Revolution*).

In the following section, along the same line, we shall discuss our findings for the Portuguese corpus section.

### 3.2. The Portuguese section

Word frequency lists in the Portuguese corpus section are collected and represented in Table 5, according to frequency and percentage:

| Word          | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|---------------|-----------|----------------|
| Bairro        | 6         | 1.58           |
| Diversidade   | 5         | 1.32           |
| Mouraria      | 4         | 1.06           |
| Cidade        | 2         | 0.53           |
| Imigrantes    | 2         | 0.53           |
| Lisboa        | 2         | 0.53           |
| Terra         | 2         | 0.53           |
| Arte          | 1         | 0.26           |
| Bangladesh    | 1         | 0.26           |
| Casa          | 1         | 0.26           |
| Chinatown     | 1         | 0.26           |
| Chineses      | 1         | 0.26           |
| Encontro      | 1         | 0.26           |
| Indianos      | 1         | 0.26           |
| multicultural | 1         | 0.26           |

Table 5. Word frequency lists and percentages in the Portuguese corpus section

The most frequent words within the Portuguese corpus section are *bairro* (En. *quarter, district*, 6 items found), *diversidade* (En. *diversity*, 5 items), *Mouraria* (4) and *cidade* (En. *city*), *imigrantes* (En. *migrants*), *Lisboa* (*Lisbon*) and *terra* (En. *land*) with only 2 instances. If we have a closer look at the frequency lists of the Portuguese corpus section and compare it with the French one, there seems to be a shift in the description from main historical key facts (as we shall see in the Italian corpus sections) to more intercultural aspects of the city of Lisbon (e.g. *diversidade, imigrantes, encontro, multicultural*). This is also backed up by the occurrence of words and proper nouns related to nationality (e.g. *Bangladesh, Chinatown, Chineses, Indianos*) as well as by the main collocates which were found in the Portuguese corpus sections:

|                    | Keyword            |                         |
|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| Ao Fado viveram no | <b>Bairro</b>      | , como Mariza           |
| Oje o              | <b>Bairro</b>      | mais cultural da cidade |
| um                 | <b>Bairro</b>      | que se tiem degradado   |
| Una grande         | <b>diversidade</b> | cultural                |
| La                 | <b>diversidade</b> | linguistica             |
| La                 | <b>diversidade</b> | de culturas             |
| La maior           | <b>diversidade</b> | cultural de Lisboa      |

Table 6. Main collocates for *bairro* and *diversidade*

The main collocates for the two most frequent words within the Portuguese corpus section are related to the (inter)cultural aspects of the city: *fado*, for instance, is a typical music genre in Portugal, and *bairro* is also associated with the adjective ‘cultural’ as well as with ‘degradado’, the latter pointing to the failure in safeguarding the cultural heritage of the city of Lisbon; as far as *diversidade* is concerned, here as well we find adjectives referring to the cultural and linguistic diversity in Lisbon, which is also emphasized by adjectives like *grande* and *maior*. *Mouraria* collocates with adjective *multiculturais* (En. *multicultural*) and *rotas urbanas* (En. *urban routes*), which refers to the project which introduces intercultural pathways across the city of Lisbon; *cidade* is associated with *maravilhosa* (En. *wonderful*) and *migrantes* (En. *migrants*); *imigrantes* collocates with *São Paulo*; *Lisboa* collocates with *capital* and *teatro* (En. *theatre*); *terra* (En. *land*) is found to be associated with *cultura* (En. *culture*) and *hábitos* (En. *customs*).

### 3.3. The Italian section

In this section, we shall have a closer look at frequency lists including the first fifteen most-occurring words within the Italian corpus sections of migrantourism, which are listed in Table 7 below:

| Word     | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|----------|-----------|----------------|
| Genova   | 8         | 1.00           |
| Città    | 7         | 0.88           |
| Cosa     | 5         | 0.63           |
| Negozio  | 5         | 0.63           |
| Mondo    | 4         | 0.50           |
| Parte    | 4         | 0.50           |
| Casa     | 3         | 0.38           |
| Culture  | 3         | 0.38           |
| Luogo    | 3         | 0.38           |
| Prodotti | 3         | 0.38           |
| Storie   | 3         | 0.38           |
| Vissuto  | 3         | 0.38           |
| Angolo   | 2         | 0.25           |
| Cuore    | 2         | 0.25           |
| Mercato  | 1         | 0.25           |

Table 7. Word frequency lists and percentages in the Italian corpus sections.

Beside the noun of the city of *Genova* (En. *Genoa*, 8 items) the main words occurring in the Italian corpus sections are *città* (En. *city*, 7 items found), the general noun *cosa* (En. *thing*, 5) and *negozio* (En. *shop*, 5), followed by *mondo* (En. *world*) and *parte* (En. *part*). If we have a look at the words following them in the list, we also notice the presence of terms such as *culture* (En. *cultures*, 3), *luogo* (En. *place*, 3), *prodotti* (En. *products*, 3), *cuore* (En. *heart*, 2): all of them being terms related to a more ‘personalized’ way of perceiving the city and its landmarks; one could say that the description provided by the migrantourist guides in Italy is more subjective than in the other two subcorpora considered for the purposes of our study; in addition to this, if we consider the collocates for the most occurring words within the relevant corpus (e.g. *Genova* and *città*), we find that the description of the cities also incorporates examples of the integration process experienced by the migrantourist guides (Table 8):

|                        | Keyword       |                             |
|------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|
| --                     | <b>Genova</b> | deve il suo fascino a       |
| --                     | <b>Genova</b> | , città di porto            |
| La interculturalità di | <b>Genova</b> | ---                         |
| La mia                 | <b>città</b>  | di adozione                 |
| La                     | <b>città</b>  | è scrigno nuovo da scoprire |
| ---                    | <b>città</b>  | di migranti                 |
| ---                    | <b>città</b>  | con palazzi eleganti        |

Table 8. Main collocates for *Genova* and *città*.

Further evidence for a personalisation of the tourist experience on the part of migrant tourist guides is also provided by the noun *cosa* (En. *thing*), which collocates mainly with adjectives expressing delight and wonder, e.g. *una cosa bella*, *una cosa interessante*, *una cosa nuova*, etc.; *negozio* (En. *shop*) collocates with *moda* (En. *fashion*) and *souvenirs* as well as with *tessuti* (En. *textiles*); *mondo* (En. *world*) is found to collocate with the verb *scoprire* (En. *discover*), the adjective *nuovo* (En. *new*) and *affari* (En. *business*); *parte* (En. *part*) is associated with *più bella* (En. *the most beautiful*), and *nuova* (En. *new*); *casa* (En. *home*) and *culture* (En. *cultures*) both collocate with *incontro* (En. *meeting*)

#### 4. Conclusions

The present study has attempted to provide some insights into a newly-emerging phenomenon, i.e. migrantourism; more specifically, by means of a corpus-driven approach to the analysis of data, it has demonstrated the extent to which tourist guides belonging to different realities and linguacultural backgrounds (cf. Cogo *et al.* 2011; Guido 2008) tend to elaborate their experience as tourists by giving more emphasis to different aspects of their experience as tourists: the description of the cities by French migrant tourist guides appears to be mainly related to historical key facts (Tables 3 and 4); the Portuguese description concentrates on the intercultural aspects of the city of Lisbon and on diversity (Tables 5 and 6), whereas the Italian corpus sections display more subjective descriptions which also rely on aspects of integration on the part of the migrant tourist guides.

In the light of such findings, the issue raised in the Introduction section, i.e. whether it is possible to take into consideration a ‘tourist guide gaze’ as opposed/as an additional feature to Urry and Larsen’s tourist

gaze, inevitably acquires importance in the study of the discourse of tourism and, more specifically, in the reception of tourist products (e.g. brochures, audio-guides, and so forth) on the part of tourists. Of course, given the small amount of data provided by the web in such a perspective (i.e. *migrantourism*), it is impossible to generalize findings and concentrate on other factors; notwithstanding this, it might be well worth considering the approach adopted in the present study from a much wider perspective, by implementing bigger corpora of spontaneous discourse by tourist guides and, where possible, create multilingual corpora from which it would be possible to infer and better understand the different attitudes of tourist guides. In addition to this, the analysis could also be combined with other approaches, e.g. the analysis of suprasegmentals, proxemics, gestures within the exchange of information between migrant tourist guides and tourists; last but not least, it would also be interesting to look at the occurrence of culturemes (Vermeer 1983), i.e. terms concerning institutions, gastronomy, geography which are untranslatable, as well as the use of hyperonyms, paraphrases in the description of tourist landmarks by migrant tourist guides.

## References

- Cappelli, G. 2013. "Travelling words: Linguaging in English tourism discourse". In A. Yarrington, S. Villani and J. Kelly (Eds.), *Travels and Translations*. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi, pp.353-374.
- Capriello A., Peyton R.M., Boyd D., Crott J. 2013. "Mining consumer sentiment from blog narratives: an application of three alternative methods". *Journal of Business Research*, 66(April), pp. 778-785.
- Carrell, P.L. 1983. "Some issues in the role of Schemata, or Background Knowledge, in Second Language Comprehension". *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 1, pp. 81-92.
- Cogo, A., Archibald, A., Jenkins, J. (Eds.) 2011. *Latest trends in ELF research*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Gandin, S. 2013. "Translating the language of tourism. A corpus-based study on the Translational Tourism English Corpus (T-TourEC)". *Procedia – Social Behavioral Sciences*, 95, pp. 325-335.
- García-Pablos A., Cuadros, M., Linaza M. T. 2016. "Automatic analysis of textual hotel reviews". *Information Technology & Tourism*, 16 (1), pp. 45-69.

- Guido, M. G. 2008. *English as a Lingua Franca in cross-cultural immigration domains*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Guido, M.G. 2016. "ELF in Responsible Tourism: Power relationships in unequal migration encounters". In M.L. Pitzl and R. Osimk-Teasdale (Eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca: Perspectives and Prospects. Contributions in Honour of Barbara Seidlhofer*. Boston/Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 49-56.
- Hogg, G., Miao M.H., O’Gorman, K. 2014. "Reading between the lines: multimodal translation in tourism consumption". *Tourism Management*, 42, pp. 157-164.
- Kang, N. 2011. "Corpus-based stylistic analysis of tourism English". *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(1), pp. 129-136.
- Katan, D. 2012. "Translating the tourist gaze: from heritage and ‘culture’ to actual encounter". *Pasos*, 10 (4), pp. 83-95.
- Knudsen, D. C., Greer, C. E. 2008. "Heritage Tourism, Heritage Landscapes and Wilderness Preservation: The Case of National Park Thy". *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 3 (1), pp. 18-35.
- Luzón, M. J. 2016. "Features of ELF interactions in travel blogs: travellers doing interactional work". *Ibérica: Revista de la Asociación Europea de Lenguas para Fines Específicos*, 31, pp. 127-148.
- Migrantour website: <http://www.migrantour.org/> (last accessed 07/11/16).
- Scott, M. 2016. *WordSmith Tools version 7*. Stroud: Lexical Analysis Software.
- Urry, J., Larsen, J. 2011 [2002]. *The Tourist Gaze* (3rd Ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Vaughan, E., Clancy B. 2013. "Small Corpora and Pragmatics". In Romero-Trillo J. (ed.), *Yearbook of Corpus Linguistics and Pragmatics 2013: New Domains and Methodologies* (1), Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2013, pp. 53-73.
- Vermeer, H. J. 1983. "Translation Theory and linguistics". In R. Roinila, R. Orfanos and S. Tirkkonen-Condit (Eds.), *Näkökohtia käänämisen tutkimuksesta*. Joensuu: University of Joensuu, pp. 1-10.
- Wang, N. 1999. "Rethinking authenticity in tourism experience". *Annals of Tourism Research* 26(2), Elsevier Science Ltd, pp. 349-370.
- Yasumara, K. 1994. *The sociological sphere of tourism as a social phenomenon*. Revised version of a draft for the Workshop on Tourism Studies of the Department of Tourism, Hokkai Gakuen University of

Kitami, <http://yasumura.info/files/02-01.pdf> (last  
accessed 02/18/16).