

Nature-based tourism in Greek and English with reference to translation

Malamatidou, Sofia

License:

None: All rights reserved

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Malamatidou, S 2019, Nature-based tourism in Greek and English with reference to translation. in M Ji (ed.), *Translating and Communicating Environmental Cultures*. 1st edn, Routledge Studies in Empirical Translation and Multilingual Communication, Routledge, pp. 218-246. <<https://www.routledge.com/Translating-and-Communicating-Environmental-Cultures/Ji/p/book/9781138359819>>

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

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is an Accepted Manuscript of a book chapter published by Routledge/CRC Press in *Translating and Communicating Environmental Cultures* on 08/07/2019, available online: <https://www.routledge.com/Translating-and-Communicating-Environmental-Cultures-1st-Edition/Ji/p/book/9781138359819>

General rights

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

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

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

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

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

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

Nature-based tourism in Greek and English with reference to translation

Sofia Malamatidou
University of Birmingham

Introduction

Recent years have seen massive changes in environmental practices and attitudes, which have given rise to environmentalism and a major preoccupation with anything that is ‘green’ or ‘eco’. Tourism is no exception to this pattern. Mass tourism, which can be defined as large numbers of people travelling to the same place at the same time and is related to events “brought about by the commoditization of culture and the associated homogenization and standardization of tourist experiences” (Wang 1999, p.352) is typically held responsible for various types of environmental damage (Farsari 2012), such as air and water pollution, damage to flora and fauna, waste, and high energy consumption. To redress the balance between tourism and the environment a number of alternative nature-oriented forms of tourism have been created focusing on nature (such as ecotourism, rural tourism, and adventure tourism), collectively named nature-based tourism (henceforth NBT).

From the point of view of the travel and tourism industry, this focus on nature, which is defined as “undeveloped resources” that “influence tourism activities as attraction features, settings or pristine areas” (Farrell 2000, p.409), can be understood as activities which occur primarily in nature, and more generally as opportunities to visit natural areas, which have not been exploited by humans. Naturally, the focus will differ based on the specific type of NBT. For instance, ecotourism focuses more on sustainability and education around nature and ecology, whereas adventure tourism is more about activities that take place in nature, like hiking or kayaking. Overall, NBT, as most types of tourism, is a particularly complex phenomenon, and one that has attracted significant attention from academics and tourism practitioners alike.

While NBT has been examined from a number of different perspectives which shed some light into its complexity, the focus of existing research is rarely on language, with very few exceptions (Mühlhäusler & Peace 2001; Stamou & Paraskevopoulos 2004; Trčková 2016). Although it is acknowledged that different geographic locations will focus on different aspects of NBT, which has been shown to be the case for ecotourism (Weaver 2008), the way this is achieved linguistically has so far been neglected. There seems to be a generally accepted, often Anglocentric, view that a homogenous discourse of NBT exists, not taking into account that different destinations, as well as different cultures, are likely to promote different aspects of NBT manifested through different linguistic preferences. Therefore, there

is very little understanding of how the discourse of NBT is constructed, and importantly how it differs from the discourse of mass tourism. What is more, no study has ever addressed the issue from a cross-linguistic point of view (the focus is typically on English), or examined the important role that translation might play, given that the vast majority of tourism texts is translated in at least one language. This focus on language is crucial, as it is the means through which destinations reach out to and attract a specific audience by managing (and often inflating) expectations.

The present study aims to address this gap by focusing on the language used on websites promoting NBT (mostly ecotourism and agrotourism) and examining whether a homogenous discourse of NBT exists, which is distinct from mass tourism, or whether differences are observed based on the destination promoted and/or language used, as well as the role that translation plays in negotiating such differences. Two languages are examined, namely English and Greek, given the popularity of the UK and Greece as tourism destinations. Recognising the important role that nature plays in NBT, the focus is on linguistic items (nouns and adjectives) used to refer to nature. Nature is examined through a number of categories referring to natural resources (e.g. landscape, flora, fauna), allowing for comparisons not only regarding the overall frequency of references to nature but also regarding the distribution of individual categories, where further differences are likely to be observed. In terms of research questions, this study aims to investigate, firstly, the differences between mass and nature-based tourism texts in Greek and English (focusing on each language separately), secondly, the difference between languages in the discourse of mass tourism and that of NBT (focusing on each category of tourism separately), and, finally, how any differences observed are negotiated in translation.

Nature-based tourism: defining a nebulous concept

Since NBT is a broad and encompassing term, a general lack of agreement exists regarding its definition. Given the complexity of NBT, it is important to examine some of the definitions proposed, and explain how this concept will be understood in this study. It is worth mentioning that originally the term ‘ecotourism’ was synonymous to NBT (Wallace & Pierce 1996; Weaver 2005; Boo 1990; Lindberg 1991; Aylward & Freedman 1992), but as different types of NBT emerged, ecotourism became more restricted (see below), while NBT started being used as an umbrella term.

One of the early definitions is that provided by Valentine (1992, p.108), who defines NBT as “primarily concerned with the direct enjoyment of some relatively undisturbed phenomenon of nature”. The defining characteristic here is for tourism to take place in an environment that has not been manipulated by humans, which raises the question of whether a natural park, with its trails and ponds, might be considered as a setting where NBT can take place. Similar

definitions focusing on undisturbed or uncontaminated natural areas are provided by Boo (1990) and Ceballos-Lascurain (1987). A more recent definition is offered by Naidoo and Adamowicz (2005, p.160) who argue that NBT is “a non-consumptive activity that should rely on intact natural resources to generate resources”. The focus is again on undisturbed nature, but also on consumptiveness as a differentiating criterion between nature-based and mass tourism. Similarly, Fennell (2014, p.40) understands NBT as an overarching term encompassing all those forms of tourism “which use natural resources in a wild or undeveloped form”.

When trying to understand the reality of NBT it is useful to also examine the motivation for it, that is, why people engage with this type of tourism and visit destinations that promote themselves as nature-based. Note that I refer to promotion on purpose here, as the reality of a destination compared to how it promotes itself might be different. A large number of motivating factors has been suggested. These include the desire to get back in touch with nature as part of the environmental movement (Lee 1997; Dowling & Fennell 2003; Dekhili & Achabou 2015), as more and more people become aware of the threats posed to the environment, either through coverage in the media, or the importance given to these issues in political and international agendas. Saarinen (2005) interprets the shift from mass to nature-based tourism as a move away from Fordist to post-Fordist production, with young people especially looking for alternatives to mass tourism which can offer non-materialistic values (Teigland 2001). Another reason for engaging in NBT, and in particular adventure tourism, is the range of activities it offers, such as bird-watching, hiking and kayaking (Blamey 2001). Finally, Mehmetoglu (2007) identifies the desire to escape from everyday life as the strongest motivating factor for NBT. An escape to nature is therefore not necessarily guided by an eco-conscience, but simply by a desire to be in a natural setting away from the cityscape of everyday life. Similarly, in their study, Stamou and Paraskevopoulos (2003) identified the dominance of recreational over environmentalist motives of ecotourists. Therefore, in the context of escaping from the city, mass tourism can also offer opportunities for nature-based experiences, for example by going to the beach, which can be considered a nature-based activity (Fennell 2014; Weaver 2008).

The generally broad definitions of NBT, as well as the fact that the motivation for it is often no more than a desire to be away from the city, raises the important question of what exactly qualifies as NBT. This is further complicated by the fact that visitors might behave in an environmentalist way in non-NBT locations and vice versa. The examination of relevant literature is rather inconclusive, with Blamey (2001) arguing that decisions will necessarily be subjective. Therefore, I approach NBT in its widest possible sense and question classifications that exclude elements of NBT from mass tourism. Visiting a destination to enjoy nature and be surrounded by it is an adequate reason to classify an activity or experience as nature-based. For example, it is very common for package holidays – the most typical example of mass tourism – to involve a guided tour to a natural resource, such as a

rainforest, and even focus on its ecological value. Alternatively, a visit to a park, even if the only aim is to admire nature and get away from the city, can be considered an example of a nature-based activity, but it is also possible for someone to visit a park for bird-watching, an instance of adventure tourism. The example of the park is a good one because it also questions the idea of undisturbed nature often appearing in definitions of NBT since it is the result of, at least to some extent, human intervention to nature. Therefore, the difference between mass and nature-based tourism does not lie in the presence or absence of nature-based experiences, but in the way and the degree to which these are promoted, not least linguistically.

NBT sub-types: Ecotourism and agrotourism

In this study, I will analyse NBT websites which are self-labelled as promoting either ecotourism or agrotourism, and it is therefore important to also examine these two sub-types of NBT in more detail. Out of all available sub-types of NBT, ecotourism has probably exhibited the largest growth, with words like ‘eco’ and ‘green’, as synonymous to sustainable, becoming buzzwords in the travel and tourism industry. Despite its significance, ecotourism is notoriously difficult to define, and there are as many definitions of the phenomenon as there are studies. Apart from a natural setting, most studies focus either on sustainable development (e.g. Arnegger et al. 2010; Björk 2000; Fennell 2014), or educational potential (e.g. Blamey 2001; Buckley 1994) as defining features of ecotourism. Some studies combine all three elements in their definition, such as the one provided by Weaver, who defines ecotourism as “a form of nature-based tourism that strives to be ecologically, and economically sustainable while providing opportunities for appreciating and learning about the natural environment or specific elements thereof” (2001, p.105).

And it appears that other forms of NBT suffer from the same ontological problem, with over 15 definitions proposed for agrotourism and related forms of tourism (e.g. agritourism and farm-based tourism). A comprehensive definition is that proposed by Ollenburg (2006, p.52), who describes agrotourism as “activities and services offered to commercial clients in a working farm environment for participation, observation or education”. Increasingly, however, this type of tourism is used to describe activities which simply take place on farms (Roberts & Hall 2001), such as wine- or cheese-making.

While ecotourism might be expected to belong to NBT, the same might not be said about agrotourism, which seems to take place in areas that can be considered as disturbed by humans (see also Hughes & Chirgwin 1997; Whelan 1991). However, some overlap between agrotourism and ecotourism is recognised in the literature (Robinson 2012) and an examination of various agrotourism websites suggests that agrotourism shares many of the defining features of ecotourism, such as nature, education, and sustainability. For example,

Eumelia, an organic agrotourism farm and guesthouse, states on its website, which is part of the data examined for this study, that they approach nature “with respect, looking at problems from a holistic point of view, keeping in mind that nature is not a single tree but a complex organism” and that they wish to “provide an educational aspect to our products bringing our projects and the people that come into contact with them closer” (Philosophy page). Both these statements echo strongly the aims of ecotourism. Importantly, agriculture, in this case, is identified as a physical rather than a financial activity (Philip et al. 2010). Finally, the farm is often the setting where activities take place, or rather the starting point for exploring the rest of the natural landscape surrounding it. Although agrotourism and other types of NBT, like ecotourism, might not focus on the same activities, what they have in common is the preoccupation with nature and natural resources. And it is for this reason that for the purposes of this study I will use the term NBT to also refer to agrotourism.

A homogenous category?

NBT is not an artificially distinct phenomenon (Preece et al. 1995), but rather a type of human activity woven into the fabric of tourism. This adds to the complexity of NBT. To further support this idea, many scholars distinguish different levels of engagement with nature. For example, Blamey (2001, p.7) makes the distinction between popular and classical ecotourism, which can be extended to NBT more generally. According to him, classical ecotourism involves “the small-scale, personalised and hence alternative nature of many (...) experiences”. Popular ecotourism, on the other hand, can be large-scale and thus share some distinguishing features with mass tourism. Weaver (2005) also makes a similar distinction between hard (active, deep) and soft ecotourism (passive, shallow). He argues that softer-path ecotourists are likely to restrict their activities to a small percentage of area in parks, whereas hard-path ecotourists are more likely to explore deeper. Similarly, Acott et al. (1998) distinguish between deep and shallow ecotourism. They distinguish between an extreme form of shallow ecotourism and mass tourism in the way the experience is promoted, that is in terms of references to nature and nature-based activities. This is also further supported by Kontogeorgopoulos (2004) who argues that ecotourism and mass tourism are linked in a symbolic level, with ecotourism often functioning as part of the mass tourism industry, which has helped the former survive financially. Finally, according to Weaver (2001), it is possible to talk about mass ecotourism, and he recognises that ecotourism can be seen as a variant of mass tourism. The same can be true about NBT, which can spill over into other forms of travel, like mass tourism.

What this discussion aims to show is that tourism categories are often arbitrary and fuzzy, with NBT being a particularly nebulous concept, and much more heterogeneous than what might originally appear (Arnegger et al. 2010). Importantly, we should not treat nature-based tourists as a homogenous ideology-oriented single unit. Differences are likely to be observed both within and across cultural groups. In other words, the concept of NBT should not be

considered universal, and we should be open to the possibility that it will be interpreted and manifested differently across languages. This is why it is important to examine how NBT is manifested linguistically across languages and through translation, and how it differs from mass tourism, especially given the fact that NBT is becoming increasingly important, and it is claimed to be the fastest growing sub-sector of the tourism industry (Buckley & Sommer 2000; Gray et al. 2003; Coria & Calfucura 2012; Dowling & Fennell 2003; Fennell 2014; Hawkins & Lamoureux 2001). Therefore, in this study, I will focus on the preoccupation with nature and natural resources as a defining characteristic of NBT, and examine how it is manifested linguistically, focusing on one its main features, that is natural resources.

Natural Resources

Definitions of NBT provided earlier revolve around the notion of natural resources as one of the defining characteristics of this type of tourism. One of the earliest and most well-known accounts of resources is that provided by Zimmerman (1951). His understanding of resources can be summarised by the phrase “resources are not; they become” (Zimmerman 1951, p.15). They are subjective, relative and static, and only acquire importance based on human needs. Human activity is, therefore, what turns various elements into resources (e.g. oil). The idea that the classification of natural resources might depend on human interpretation is also present in studies of NBT. For example, Cassells and Valentine (1990) identify different ways in which tourism can engage with nature: experiences that depend on nature, those that are enhanced by nature, and finally those for which a natural setting is incidental. Valentine (1992) offers the example of swimming, arguing that if a visitor’s main interest is to go for a swim, the natural setting is not important, and therefore incidental. However, whether or not the natural setting is incidental depends on a number of factors, and it requires knowledge of the visitor’s motivation. For instance, in Valentine’s example, if a visit to the swimming pool does not constitute an attractive alternative, then the natural setting cannot be considered entirely incidental. Such models are difficult to implement when large amounts of data are examined. What is needed is a classification which relies less on subjectivity, and which can help guide the linguistic analysis of tourism texts.

Such a classification is offered by Chubb and Chubb (1981), who distinguish between developed and undeveloped resources in relation to the tourism sector. Developed resources are those that facilitate the use of an area, such as motorways, and buildings. Conversely, undeveloped resources are those available in their raw form and can be found in both urban and rural settings. This classification serves as a better analytical framework for examining natural resources, also because it acknowledges the focus on wild or undeveloped nature, which is also frequently found in definitions of NBT. Chubb and Chubb (1981) identify seven types of undeveloped categories which are relevant to the tourism sector:

- geographic location,
- climate and weather,

- topography and landforms,
- surface materials,
- water,
- vegetation, and
- fauna.

While this is a very good starting point for the categorisation of nature-related references in tourism texts, this classification also presents certain interpretive limitations. A case in point is the category of water. According to Chubb and Chubb (1981), a lake belongs to the water category, but it could also belong to that of topography and landforms. Equally, the categories of geographic location, and topography and landforms present a significant amount of overlap and thus can be combined. Therefore, I propose a slightly different categorisation, which is presented in detail in Table 1.

Landscape	The visible structure of the surface of the earth (e.g. mountain, lake, sea)
Climate and weather	Phenomena and processes related to the atmosphere (e.g. rain, sun, wind)
Natural material	Materials derived from nature (e.g. rock, sand, wool)
Flora	Plant life (e.g. trees, flowers, bushes)
Fauna	Animals, both wild and domesticated (e.g. horse, beaver, eagle)
Human-made	Human interaction with and dependence from nature, the use of nature to directly support human activities (e.g. farm, garden, agriculture)
Generic	Anything else related to nature and the environment (e.g. nature, environment, earth)

Table 1: Categorisation of natural resources

It is important to include two additional categories that do not exist in the original model: human-made and generic. The human-made category aims to capture a relatively recent trend in NBT, which is often neglected in the literature, that is agrotourism. A generic category is also needed for all those items that cannot be easily assigned to any of the other categories, with *nature* being the most typical example.

Corpora and Methods

The present study uses methods from the discipline of corpus linguistics, which relies on the analysis of large electronic collections of texts (i.e. corpora) to find and reveal patterns in language. Specifically, it relies on corpus triangulation (Malamatidou 2018), a corpus approach for the examination of translation-related phenomena, which shares some similarities with a mixed-methods approach where different types of data and/or different

methodologies are combined. Corpus triangulation is defined as “the combination, in an integrated manner, of multiple (two or more) corpus values and/or attributes from one or more corpus variables and/or the use of (two or more) corpus analysis techniques in one study of a single phenomenon” (Malamatidou 2018, p.34). Based on this definition, there are two types of corpus triangulation: data and methods. On the one hand, corpus data triangulation refers to the combination of multiple corpora, based on one or more corpus aspects of corpus design (e.g. type of texts, languages, etc.). This is informed by the Values-Variables-Attributes (VVA) typology of corpora (Malamatidou 2018). On the other hand, corpus method triangulation is defined as the combination of two or more corpus analysis techniques and can be further divided into within-method, where different quantitative methods are combined, and between-method, where quantitative and qualitative methods are combined. It is also possible to use both data and method triangulation, resulting in multiple triangulation. In this study, I will use both corpus data and between-method triangulation. By using this triangulation approach, a clearer picture of the phenomenon can be obtained, which might not have been possible otherwise, especially for complex phenomena that need to be studied from a variety of angles, as is the case in this study.

In what follows, I will present the corpus design and methodology, and explain how triangulation is achieved in each case. Before I do this, it is important to remind the reader of the research questions this study aims to address, which will guide the triangulation process. The present study aims to investigate, firstly, the differences between mass and nature-based tourism texts in Greek and English (focusing on each language separately), secondly, the difference between languages in the discourse of mass tourism and that of NBT (focusing on each category of tourism separately), and, finally, how any differences observed are negotiated in translation.

Corpus design

Based on the research questions, the corpus examined in this study needs to consist of the following elements: a) websites promoting mass tourism and NBT, b) websites in Greek and English, and c) websites including translated and non-translated texts (from Greek into English). Based on these elements, a corpus of some 400,000 words is created for the purposes of this study, consisting of five components (Table 2).

Component	Website	No of words
English non-translated mass tourism texts	Visit England	39,185
	Visit Wales	58,886
	Visit Scotland	39,221
	Subtotal	137,294
Greek non-translated mass tourism texts	Visit Greece	39,712
	Discover Greece	59,863

	Incredible Crete	48,594
	Subtotal	148,196
English non-translated NBT texts	Wild Days Holidays	7,550
	Bamff Estate	4,864
	Wheatland Farm	8,633
	Gorge View Cottage	4,174
	Subtotal	25,221
Greek non-translated NBT texts	Agroville: The Ecotourism Experience	5,499
	Enagron Ecotourism Village	5,982
	Eumelia Organic Agrotourism Farm & Guesthouse	5,740
	Agroktima Traditional Guesthouse	2,956
	Subtotal	20,177
English translated NBT texts	Agroville: The Ecotourism Experience	5,313
	Enagron Ecotourism Village	5,837
	Eumelia Organic Agrotourism Farm & Guesthouse	5,434
	Agroktima Traditional Guesthouse	3,083
	Subtotal	19,667
Total		387,370

Table 2: Breakdown of the corpus of mass and nature-based tourism texts

Corpus data were collected in the period from June 2017 to August 2018. For the mass tourism texts, data are collected from official tourism websites, as they are considered to be the most representative of this type of discourse. For the NBT texts, data are collected from websites promoting specific businesses, as sufficient data could not be collected from websites promoting NBT more generally (similar to the mass tourism ones) in either Greek or English. Where possible, an attempt was made to include entire websites. Based on the corpus components identified above, corpus data triangulation is achieved by combining texts in different subcorpus configurations (Table 3). This specific corpus design allows for detailed comparisons across a number of corpus components.

Subcorpus	Components	No of words
A. a comparable, monolingual (Greek), synchronic (2017-2018) corpus of non-translated texts (from the categories of mass tourism and NBT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • non-translated Greek mass tourism texts • non-translated Greek NBT texts 	168,346
B. a comparable, monolingual (English), synchronic (2017-2018) corpus of non-translated texts (from the categories of mass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • non-translated English mass tourism texts 	162,515

tourism and NBT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • non-translated English NBT texts 	
C. a comparable, bilingual (Greek-English), synchronic (2017-2018) corpus of non-translated texts (from the category of mass tourism)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • non-translated English mass tourism texts • non-translated Greek mass tourism texts 	330,861
D. a comparable, bilingual (Greek-English), synchronic (2017-2018) corpus of non-translated texts (from the category of NBT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • non-translated English NBT texts • non-translated Greek NBT texts 	45,398
E. a comparable, monolingual (English), synchronic (2017-2018) corpus of translated and non-translated texts (from the category of NBT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • non-translated English NBT texts • translated English NBT texts 	44,888
F. a parallel, bilingual (Greek-English), synchronic (2017-2018) corpus (from the category of NBT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • non-translated Greek NBT texts • translated English NBT texts 	39,844

Table 3: Corpus compilation

There is naturally some overlap across subcorpora, which might share the same corpus components. This might appear as repetitive in terms of analysis. However, this assumed overlap offers a comprehensive picture of the phenomenon studied, that is, whether a homogenous discourse of NBT exists, which is distinct from mass tourism, or whether differences are observed based on the destination promoted and/or language used, as well as the role that translation plays in negotiating such differences.

Corpus triangulation is achieved in two main ways (for ease of reference, Table 4 summarises the VVA typology of corpora).

Corpus Variables

Corpus Values	<i>Type</i>	<i>Languages</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Texts</i>
	Parallel	Monolingual	Synchronic	Translated
	Comparable	Bilingual	Diachronic	Non-translated
	Reference	Multilingual		

Corpus Attributes	-	Specific languages	Specific time spans	Specific genres
----------------------	---	-----------------------	------------------------	--------------------

Table 4: VVA (Variables, Values, and Attributes) typology of corpora (Malamatidou 2018, p.46)

Firstly, by combining attributes from the texts variable, i.e. different genres: mass and nature-based tourism. Secondly, values from the corpus type variable are combined: comparable and parallel. Specifically, two types of comparable corpora (one of non-translated texts in different languages, and one of translated and non-translated texts in the same language) and one type of parallel corpus are combined. There is also a combination of languages values, i.e. monolingual and bilingual comparable corpora, and attributes, i.e. Greek and English non-translated texts. Similarly, there is also a combination from the text variable (translated and non-translated texts). Yet, these combinations are tied to corpus type and, as a result, are secondary in achieving triangulation.

Each research question is answered with the examination of two subcorpora, totalling three stages of analysis. Specifically, subcorpora A and B are examined to establish the differences between mass and nature-based tourism first in Greek and then in English (Research Question 1), with each subcorpus focusing on a different language. Subcorpora C and D are examined to establish any differences between languages in relation to mass tourism and NBT discourse between languages (Research Question 2). This is different from the first stage of analysis where the focus is on text types rather than languages. Finally, subcorpora E and F are examined to inspect the role of translated texts and their relationship to respective texts in the target language, as well as to their source texts (Research Question 3). Only if differences are observed in the first and second stage of analysis, the last two subcorpora are examined, which is evidence of the sequential approach to corpus data triangulation. It is worth stressing here that this approach, where the answer to one research question points to the next, is evidence that triangulation occurs in an integrated manner.

Corpus analysis

Corpus analysis mostly involves the identification of all linguistic items that refer to natural resources in the subcorpora examined. The focus is on nouns and adjectives, and not on adverbs or potentially verbs, as, based on pilot studies, nouns and adjectives have been found to express concepts related to natural resources more clearly and with a higher frequency. For the analysis of data, Sketch Engine, a corpus-processing toolkit (Kilgarriff et al. 2014), was used. The identification of nouns and adjectives was facilitated by the fact that the subcorpora have been part-of-speech (POS) tagged, using the modified English TreeTagger for English data, and the INTERA POS tagset for Greek data, which are the default POS taggers offered

by Sketch Engine for each language. For each linguistic category, a frequency list was generated. The lists were manually examined to remove any instances of nouns or adjectives not referring to natural resources. For instance, this process included the examination of concordance lines for polysemous words, like *branch* or *bank*.

Corpus method triangulation is achieved by combining two types of descriptive statistics, namely raw and normalised frequencies, and three types of inferential statistics, namely statistical significance, Bayes Factor (BIC), and effect size. These constitute the combination of different quantitative methods in the analysis of subcorpora, therefore achieving within-method triangulation. Specifically, descriptive statistics are recorded in detailed tables for each corpus component to allow for comparisons across subcorpora. Normalised frequencies are reported, as these allow for comparisons across corpus components, and are calculated based on the ratio of occurrence per 1,000 words, which is typical in corpus-based studies. Statistical significance is calculated by employing Rayson's (n.d.) statistical significance (log-likelihood) calculator, which also calculates Bayes Factor. Effect size is measured using percentage difference (%DIFF), which indicates the proportion of difference between normalised frequencies. The different types of statistics employed allow for more valid conclusions to be reached, making sure that where differences are observed they are meaningful and important.

To measure statistical significance and Bayes Factor, a null (H_0) and an alternate hypothesis (H_1) are also required. The H_0 is that any differences observed are due to chance, while the H_1 is that the differences found can be attributed to a factor other than chance – for example, different linguistic conventions employed in different languages or text types. Therefore, statistical significance is used to calculate whether or not any observed differences in the frequencies across corpus components and subcorpora are due to chance, that is, whether or not the H_0 can be refuted, while Bayes Factor is used to calculate the probability that this might be the case. For example, an observed difference might be found to be statistically significant, i.e. not likely to be due to chance, but this likelihood might be high or low, which is what Bayes Factor measures. Pragmatically, a statistically significant difference is one where the probability (p) is larger than 0.05, while very strong evidence against the H_0 is obtained when Bayes Factor is larger than 10.

Results

Mass vs nature-based tourism: a cross-linguistic analysis

The first research question, that is whether and to what extent there are any differences between mass tourism and nature-based tourism across languages, is addressed by examining comparable monolingual subcorpora of non-translated texts from the categories of mass and

nature-based tourism in both Greek and English. The answer to this question will reveal whether the two languages exploit references to nature in a similar manner to distinguish between the two types of tourism. In other words, whether there are any meaningful differences between the two types of texts in terms of how frequently they refer, and by extension, promote nature. Tables 5 and 6 summarise the results for Greek and English respectively (normalised frequencies are reported per thousand words). For the inferential statistics, where important differences are observed, cells are highlighted.

Category	Mass tourism		NBT		Log-likelihood	BIC	%DIFF
	Raw freq.	Normalised freq.	Raw freq.	Normalised freq.			
Landscape	4,435	29.93	422	20.91	p>.05	42.65	35.48
Climate & Weather	231	1.56	40	1.98	p<.05	-10.17	23.73
Natural Material	666	4.49	84	4.16	p<.05	-11.59	7.63
Flora	1,066	7.19	268	13.28	p>.05	58.87	59.50
Fauna	513	3.46	165	8.18	p>.05	66.56	81.10
Human-made	170	1.15	105	5.20	p>.05	111.16	35.48
Generic	861	5.81	355	17.59	p>.05	245.42	100.68
Total	7,942	53.60	1,439	71.32	p>.05	80.94	28.37

Table 5: Mass vs nature-based tourism in Greek

Category	Mass tourism		NBT		Log-likelihood	BIC	%DIFF
	Raw freq.	Normalised freq.	Raw freq.	Normalised freq.			
Landscape	2,968	21.62	103	4.08	p>.05	471	136.50
Climate & Weather	148	1.08	18	0.71	p<.05	-8.96	41.34
Natural Material	498	3.63	97	3.85	p<.05	-11.72	5.88
Flora	466	3.39	143	5.67	p>.05	14.18	50.33
Fauna	1,219	8.88	355	14.08	p>.05	41.46	45.30
Human-made	655	4.77	171	6.78	p>.05	3.61	34.81
Generic	563	4.10	187	7.41	p>.05	32.29	57.52

Total	6,517	47.47	1,074	42.58	p>.05	0.84	10.86
--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	-----------------	-------------	--------------

Table 6: Mass vs nature-based tourism in English

Starting with Greek, overall 7,942 (53.60 per 1,000 words) nouns and adjectives referring to nature have been identified in mass tourism texts and 1,439 (71.32 per 1,000 words) in NBT texts. Inferential statistics indicate that this difference is statistically significant ($p>.05$) and that there is very strong evidence against the H_0 (BIC=80.94). In terms of percentage difference, the proportion is moderate, that is, 28.37%. The fact that NBT texts rely more on nature for the promotion of a destination is to be expected since existing literature on NBT frequently stresses the key role that nature plays in defining this type of tourism. At first sight, and as far as the total frequency of references to nature is concerned, there is a clear distinction between Greek mass and nature-based tourism texts, with nature holding a more prominent place in the latter.

Examining the different categories of natural resources in more detail, it is evident that a number of categories have contributed to this pattern, with the exception of the categories of climate and weather, and natural material. For the latter two categories, we cannot refute the hypothesis that any differences observed are due to chance based on inferential statistics. The categories of human-made and generic natural resources stand out, as the percentage difference between mass and nature-based tourism texts is over 100. A special mention is also required for the category of landscape. Here the reverse pattern is observed, with NBT texts employing 30% fewer nouns and adjectives referring to nature compared to mass tourism texts.

Focusing on English tourism texts, overall there are 6,517 (47.47 per 1,000 words) nouns and adjectives referring to nature in mass tourism texts, and 1,074 (42.58 per 1,000 words) in NBT texts. Unlike Greek texts, English NBT texts refer, and by extension promote, nature less frequently than mass tourism texts. This difference, although not very high (10.86%), is found to be statistically significant, although the evidence against the H_0 is not strong at all (BIC=0.84). Based on the quantitative evidence, it can be concluded that English mass and nature-based tourism texts refer to nature with approximately the same frequency, and therefore a clear distinction between the two types of texts cannot be easily made.

In terms of individual categories, a very interesting pattern seems to emerge regarding English texts. Leaving the categories of climate and weather, and natural material aside, which, similar to Greek tourism texts, do not demonstrate any statistically significant differences, the reason why English NBT texts refer less frequently to nature compared to

mass tourism ones can be solely attributed to the landscape category. The percentage difference, in this case, is 136.50, which is one of the highest proportions identified throughout the entire corpus examination. This corresponds to mass tourism texts referring to nature 429% more frequently than NBT texts. To further illustrate this with an example: the second most frequent noun in this category is *island*, but while this noun appears with a frequency of 1.21 per 1,000 words in mass tourism texts, its frequency is only 0.20 per 1,000 words in NBT texts, which corresponds to a percentage difference of 142.86.

The reason why both Greek and English mass tourism texts refer more frequently to landscape compared to NBT texts is unclear, but it might have to do with the fact that NBT websites are mostly focused around a single destination and its surrounding area, while mass tourism websites tend to promote larger areas, in some cases the entire country. Therefore, it is more likely for mass tourism websites to mention a wider range of landscape elements, such as beaches, islands, and mountains. This is evidence of the fact that the destination might often dictate promotion.

The first stage of analysis reveals that while there are differences between mass and nature-based texts in Greek, with the latter referring to nature more frequently, a similar pattern is not observed in English, where the two text categories seem to behave similarly. The category of landscape exhibits some interesting patterns, which suggests that this particular category will need to be studied more closely, not least when it comes to translation. Based on these results, it might be concluded that Greek tourism professionals understand the difference between mass and nature-based tourism better than their English-speaking colleagues. While it is not possible to exclude this possibility, this is a rather naïve reading of the results. A more valid explanation might be that nature plays a more central role in the promotion of Greece as a tourism destination, and, therefore, this role is exploited more explicitly in tourism texts. To confirm this assumption, it is necessary to conduct a cross-linguistic study of mass and nature-based tourism texts, which is the next stage of analysis.

Mass tourism and NBT: Greek vs English

During this stage of analysis, the same corpus components are examined as those in the previous stage, but combined differently to form new subcorpora. Specifically, the aim is to examine whether and to what extent there are differences between languages in the discourse of mass tourism and that of NBT, and therefore each subcorpus focuses on a text type (mass tourism vs NBT) rather than on a language, as was the case in the previous stage of analysis. Specifically, two comparable bilingual (Greek-English) subcorpora of non-translated texts are examined, one focusing on mass tourism, and the other on NBT.

Results will help understand in more depth how the discourse of mass and nature-based tourism differs across languages and will complement the results obtained from the previous stage of analysis. This is also a necessary stage before examining translation, as it will highlight any differences between the two languages. Table 7 summarises the results for the mass tourism category, while Table 8 those from the NBT category.

Category	Greek		English		Log-likelihood	BIC	%DIFF
	Raw freq.	Normalised freq.	Raw freq.	Normalised freq.			
Landscape	4,435	29.93	2,968	21.62	p>.05	179.00	32.24
Climate & Weather	231	1.56	148	1.08	p>.05	-0.01	36.36
Natural Material	666	4.49	498	3.63	p>.05	0.65	21.18
Flora	1,066	7.19	466	3.39	p>.05	185.32	71.83
Fauna	513	3.46	1,219	8.88	p>.05	340.10	87.84
Human-made	170	1.15	655	4.77	p>.05	329.96	122.30
Generic	861	5.81	563	4.10	p>.05	29.62	34.51
Total	7,942	53.60	6,517	47.47	p>.05	40.48	12.13

Table 7: Greek and English mass tourism texts

Category	Greek		English		Log-likelihood	BIC	%DIFF
	Raw freq.	Normalised freq.	Raw freq.	Normalised freq.			
Landscape	422	20.91	103	4.08	p>.05	274.95	134.96
Climate & Weather	40	1.98	18	0.71	p>.05	3.46	94.42
Natural Material	84	4.16	97	3.85	p<.05	-10.44	7.74
Flora	268	13.28	143	5.67	p>.05	60.90	80.2
Fauna	165	8.18	355	14.08	p>.05	24.40	53.01
Human-made	105	5.20	171	6.78	p>.05	-6.09	26.38
Generic	355	17.59	187	7.41	p>.05	86.44	81.44
Total	1,439	71.32	1,074	42.58	p>.05	155.14	50.47

Table 8: Greek and English NBT texts

For the category of mass tourism, important differences are observed between the two languages. Overall, Greek texts refer to nature more frequently than English texts, (53.60 and 47.47 per 1,000 words respectively). Results from the log-likelihood test reveal that this difference is statistically significant ($p > .05$), while Bayes Factor confirms that there is very strong evidence against the H_0 ($BIC=40.48$). However, the overall difference is fairly small, i.e. 12.13%. Results from the examination of the comparable subcorpus confirm the assumption that Greek texts have the tendency to refer to and promote nature more frequently, as Greece is popular for its beaches and islands.

Some interesting and varied results are obtained when examining the individual categories of natural resources. Specifically, as also observed in the previous stage of analysis, the categories of climate and weather, and natural material do not reveal any meaningful differences between English and Greek. For these two categories, although results from the log-likelihood test indicate that the differences are statistically significant ($p > .05$), there is not sufficient evidence against the H_0 based on Bayes Factor ($BIC < 10$). Given their overall low frequency of occurrence, these categories do not have a strong influence on the total proportions. From the remaining five categories, three (i.e. landscape, flora, and generic) are more frequent in Greek than English, and two (fauna and human-made) follow the reverse pattern. In some cases, the difference is quite high, namely for the categories of flora, fauna, and human-made. In both languages, the category of landscape is the most frequent, which is further evidence as to its significance. The promotion of nature in the two languages relies on highlighting different aspects of nature, and while the focus is mostly on landscape, Greek texts also employ nouns and adjectives referring to flora, as well as those belonging to the generic category, while English texts show a preference for the categories of fauna and human-made.

A varied pattern is also observed when examining NBT texts. Overall, once again Greek texts refer to nature more frequently than English (71.32 and 42.58 per 1,000 respectively), but in this case the difference between the two languages is significantly higher, that is 50.47%. Considering also the findings from the previous stage of analysis, it is clear that Greek texts rely more heavily compared to English texts on the central role that nature plays in NBT discourse. This might be related to the fact that Greece is associated with natural beauty, as mentioned above, and therefore tourism professionals are more sensitive towards this topic.

As with mass tourism texts, the examination of individual categories reveals a certain variety. Once again, the categories of climate and weather, and natural materials do not demonstrate sufficient differences between the two languages. Given that these two categories have so far across all stages of analysis not demonstrated any differences, it is safe to assume that these

are not identified as strongly associated with nature by professionals responsible for the production of tourism texts, or, at least, not as elements that are relevant to NBT. A non-statistically significant difference was also observed for the category of human-made natural resources. This can be explained by the fact that aspects of agrotourism, such as farms, play an important role in the conceptualisation of NBT in both languages. For instance, *farm* (and its Greek equivalents αγρόκτημα and φάρμα), the most frequent noun in the human-made category, is used with approximately the same frequency in English and Greek NBT texts (1.70 and 1.88 per thousand words respectively). Of the remaining four categories, similar patterns are observed as with mass tourism texts, namely the categories of landscape, flora, and generic are more frequent in Greek than English NBT texts, while the reverse pattern is observed for the category of fauna, which is also the most frequent category in English. In Greek texts, the category of natural resources with the most occurrences is landscape. It is also interesting to note the very high difference (134.69%) in the landscape category between Greek and English NBT texts. Once again, the category of landscape seems to play a key role in the pattern observed.

What these findings reveal is that the language used in NBT texts depends primarily on the destination promoted, rather than the text-type, with very few similarities observed between the two languages for the same category of tourism texts. However, we should not exclude the possibility that some differences, especially those related to the preference for different categories of natural resources also depend on language and culture, in line with the argument proposed by Urry and Larsen (2011) that the tourist gaze, that is how we interpret the world around us and which elements of it we seem to prioritise, is informed by our age, social, and cultural group. Therefore, it is not just a case of Greece being promoted differently to the UK, with more references to nature. Greek and English texts also have different linguistic and cultural preferences, focusing on different aspects of nature. Given these important differences between Greek and English, it is interesting to examine how they are negotiated in translation.

NBT in translation

The final question that this study aims to answer is whether and to what extent English translated NBT texts differ from mass tourism texts, and what is the role of the Greek source texts, ultimately exploring the position of translated NBT texts. For this reason, a comparable, monolingual (English) subcorpus of translated and non-translated NBT texts is examined, as well as a parallel, bilingual (Greek-English) subcorpus of NBT texts. Table 9 presents results from the comparable subcorpus, and Table 10 the results from the parallel subcorpus.

Category	Translated		Non-Translated		Log-likelihood	BIC	%DIFF
	Raw freq.	Normalised freq.	Raw freq.	Normalised freq.			

Landscape	301	15.30	103	4.08	p>.05	146.12	115.79
Climate & Weather	21	1.07	18	0.71	p<.05	-9.13	40.45
Natural Material	86	4.37	97	3.85	p<.05	-9.96	12.65
Flora	259	13.17	143	5.67	p>.05	58.30	79.62
Fauna	84	4.27	355	14.08	p>.05	108.63	106.92
Human-made	105	5.34	171	6.78	p<.05	-6.93	23.76
Generic	264	13.42	187	7.41	p>.05	28.61	57.71
Total	1,120	56.95	1,074	42.58	p>.05	35.54	28.88

Table 9: Translated and non-translated English NBT texts

Category	Source Texts		Target Texts		Log-likelihood	BIC	%DIFF
	Raw freq.	Normalised freq.	Raw freq.	Normalised freq.			
Landscape	422	20.91	301	15.30	17.37	6.77	30.99
Climate & Weather	40	1.98	21	1.07	5.54	-5.05	59.67
Natural Material	84	4.16	86	4.37	0.10	-10.49	4.92
Flora	268	13.28	259	13.17	0.01	-10.58	0.83
Fauna	165	8.18	84	4.27	24.80	14.21	62.81
Human-made	105	5.20	105	5.34	0.03	-10.56	2.66
Generic	355	17.59	264	13.42	11.20	0.61	26.89
Total	1,439	71.32	1,120	56.95	32.12	21.53	22.41

Table 10: Source (Greek) and target (English) NBT texts

Starting from the comparable subcorpus, some differences can be observed between English translated and non-translated NBT texts. Overall, translated texts make higher use on nouns and adjectives related to nature than non-translated ones (56.95 and 42.58 per 1,000 words respectively). This difference, although not very big (28.88%) is found to be statistically significant (p>.05), and there is very strong evidence against the H_0 (BIC=35.54). Translated

NBT texts in English, it would appear, do not meet the communicate conventions of the target language, referring to nature significantly more frequently than non-translated ones. However, results from the previous stages of analysis also revealed that the frequency with which tourism texts refer to nature is most likely destination-specific, with texts promoting Greece relying more on it. It will be possible to confirm this hypothesis, once the parallel subcorpus is examined.

Regarding individual categories, no significant difference is observed for the categories of climate and weather, natural materials, and human-made. This finding confirms the observation made in the previous stage of analysis that, climate and weather, and natural materials are not strongly associated with nature by professionals responsible for the production of these texts, and this is probably why no difference is observed when comparing a number of corpus components. Conversely, references to the human-made category have been found to be equally frequent in Greek and English non-translated NBT texts, which might also explain the similarities between English translated and non-translated texts. Differences are observed for the categories of landscape, flora, fauna and generic natural resources. For all these categories, the difference between English translated and non-translated texts is statistically significant ($p > .05$), and there is very strong evidence against the H_0 ($BIC > 10$). However, some categories exhibit a larger difference than others, with the largest difference observed for the landscape (146.12%) and fauna (108.63%) categories. Once again, these two categories seem to stand out. Specifically, although the former is more frequent in translated than non-translated texts the reverse pattern is observed for the latter, with non-translated texts relying on this category more frequently than translated ones. Considering also the results obtained from the previous stages of analysis, landscape seems to play a key role in texts promoting Greece, while fauna in texts promoting the UK. This can also be associated with the attention that different cultures pay to natural elements and the idea of the tourist gaze (Urry & Larsen 2011).

The analysis of the parallel subcorpus reveals that, overall, Greek source texts refer to nature more frequently than English target texts (71.32 and 56.95 per 1,000 words respectively). This difference, which is however not very big (22.41%) is statistically significant ($p > .05$) and there is very strong evidence against the H_0 ($BIC = 21.53$). Target texts are situated between Greek source texts and respective NBT texts in English. This indicates that perhaps an attempt is made to negotiate the differences in NBT discourse between Greek and English, especially those aspects which have been found to be language-specific.

The examination of the individual categories reveals that the category of fauna is primarily responsible for any differences in the overall proportion of references to natural resources between source and target texts, as it is the only category where the difference is both statistically significant ($p > .05$) and there is very strong evidence against the H_0 ($BIC = 14.21$).

Linguistic items belonging to the category of fauna have been found to be preferred by English NBT texts, and one might expect that more frequent references to animals might be found in the English target texts following this pattern. However, the opposite pattern is observed. For the remaining six categories, even if there is a statistically significant difference, the evidence against the H_0 is not very strong, and therefore, there is not sufficient evidence to refute the possibility that any difference observed has occurred by chance. However, it is worth noting that the category of landscape could also be responsible to some extent for translated texts standing between Greek source texts and respective English target texts, although there is not sufficiently strong evidence against the H_0 ($BIC < 10$), which means that we cannot refute with certainty the hypothesis that this difference might be due to chance.

Therefore, at first sight, it might appear as if translated texts make an attempt to negotiate differences, but this attempt does not appear to be informed by existing patterns in the target language, but rather by a translation approach which seems to contradict such patterns. Overall, target texts are very close to their source texts, with the exception of the fauna category, and potentially to some extent that of landscape, although results are inconclusive in the case of the latter. It is possible that translators recognise that tourism promotion is mainly destination-specific, not realising that linguistic and cultural preferences might also be in play. This raises the question of whether translators realise how exactly the promotional function of tourism texts is achieved, and importantly whether they recognise the promotional potential of nature and how it might be achieved across languages, especially in the case of NBT.

Discussion

The aim of this study has been to examine, focusing on references to natural resources, whether a homogenous discourse of NBT exists, which is distinct from mass tourism, or whether differences are observed based on the destination promoted and/or language used, as well as the role that translation plays in negotiating such differences. It has been found that nature, as a concept which can have promotional value in tourism discourse, is deployed differently in English and Greek tourism texts. Greek relies much more on references to nature to distinguish and promote NBT as different from mass tourism, a pattern that has not been observed in English, where the linguistic items referring to natural resources are used with a similar frequency between mass and nature-based tourism. This can be associated with the fact that, compared to English, Greek tourism texts, irrespective of which category they belong to, refer to nature much more frequently, suggesting that nature is perceived as having a stronger promotional value for Greece. This might be explained by the general perception of Greece as a country with ample natural beauty and as a destination for beach and island holidays (compared to, for instance, a city break). This does not mean that English texts ignore the importance that nature plays in NBT, but rather that they might have other ways of

highlighting its central role, for instance, by expressing active engagement with it, for which, however, a different type of analysis is required. Therefore, although according to literature on NBT, we might expect nature to be referred to more frequently in texts promoting NBT irrespective of the language in which they are written and the destination they promote, this study reveals that this dependency on nature is primarily destination-specific, but also to some extent language-specific, as evidenced by the distribution of the categories of natural resources.

Translated texts seem, at least at first sight, to negotiate such differences to some extent by striking a reasonable balance between their Greek source texts and respective NBT texts in English. In a way, translators seem to recognise that the destination, i.e. Greece, needs to be promoted more heavily through nature, but also that English genre conventions suggest that this reliance on nature should be mitigated to some extent. The negotiation of differences in translation is, however, not observed for all categories of natural resources, rather it seems to be driven solely by the category of fauna and landscape, although inferential statistics are inconclusive in the case of the latter. The category of fauna, although found to be preferred in English than Greek texts in both mass and nature-based non-translated tourism texts, is used less frequently in translated texts even compared to the Greek source texts. In this case, there is no clear evidence of a justified translation approach, which might explain the very low frequency of linguistic items associated with fauna in English target texts. For the category of landscape, linguistic items belonging to this category have been found to be more frequently used in mass tourism texts compared to NBT ones, and more frequently in Greek than in English tourism texts. Translated NBT texts stand in between relying on these linguistic items more frequently than respective English texts and less frequently than Greek source texts. A similar pattern has not been observed for any of the other categories.

Therefore, while translators might recognise that the focus on nature relies on the destination being promoted, they seem to have missed the fact that some linguistic differences are also present regarding the distribution of individual categories. It is possible, although quantitative data are inconclusive, that translators identify landscape as the most representative category of nature, and therefore it is the only category where a justifiable translation approach is observed to an extent. This would mean that translators do not fully recognise that nature can be expressed through many other categories of natural resources, which play a significant role, particularly in NBT. Also, given the prominence of the landscape category in mass tourism texts, it seems that translators of NBT texts prioritise elements more representative of mass tourism, therefore approaching NBT texts in more or less the same way as they might approach mass tourism ones.

These findings have significant implications for both the tourism and travel industry, and translation studies. Comparing different categories of tourism texts across languages reveals

that aspects that might intuitively be considered universal, to the extent that they might define an entire category of tourism, can be realised differently according to the destination they are promoting and the language in which they are produced. This is the case even for tourism performed in Europe, which is generally considered as a homogenous category (Weaver 2008). The point raised about the language in which a text is produced is associated with the audience which it addresses and how this audience perceives the outside world (or at least how tourism professionals assume it perceives it). Research conducted by Urry and Larsen (2011) suggests that people belonging to different cultures and social groups see and interpret new places differently, which means that the perception of a destination is subjective (Mayo & Jarvis 1981). Consequently, the results of this study challenge the universality of NBT as a category and its distinguishing features and call for more research into what constitutes NBT and how it differs from mass tourism, taking into account cross-linguistic differences and arguments about the subjectivity of destination interpretation.

Translation studies also needs to reflect on its own practices. Results suggest that translators might not fully recognise the significant role nature might plays for a specific audience in a specific language. We need translation to engage more with reflective practice and create stronger links with some of the specialised fields in which it plays a central role, such as tourism. This will help raise awareness among translation professionals regarding the key characteristics of each text type and how they can be approached. At the same time, the present study highlights the fundamental role that translation plays in tourism promotion, and how easily a different interpretation and presentation of a destination through translation might be achieved. Translation, therefore, needs to claim its role in promotional language, and raise its profile in that regard, not least for the benefit of the tourism industry. This is the responsibility of translation studies, but equally of other disciplines, like tourism and travel, that need to start paying careful attention to how translation practice affects their products and services. Only then we will be able to have a fruitful interdisciplinary dialogue, which will result in better cross-cultural communication.

The final point that needs to be raised about the implications of this study is related to similarities observed between English mass and nature-based tourism texts regarding references to nature. As already stated, it should not be assumed that English texts ignore or do not recognise the important role that nature plays in NBT. It is highly possible that English texts highlight this role through other means, for instance through verbs expressing direct involvement with nature. However, it is also possible that what has been seen as a clear-cut distinction a couple of decades ago, that is mass vs nature-based tourism, is no longer so obvious, with references to nature infiltrating more and more frequently mass tourism texts in recent years, at least in the Anglophone world. In that sense, NBT might not be considered as a relatively distinct category of tourism anymore (which to an extent echoes Weaver's (2001) argument regarding mass ecotourism), with mass tourism and a soft/passive/shallow NBT significantly converging. This raises the question of how 'alternative' NBT is today. It is

necessary that tourism categories identified 20 or more years ago are frequently reviewed to access their relevance for today's tourism and travel industry. At the same time, more research is needed into how exactly nature is conceptualised and presented in different categories of tourism. However, we should not exclude the possibility that certain linguistic choices might be insufficient for promoting the desired aspects and principles of NBT, and therefore offer evidence towards 'greenwashing' (Donohoe & Needham 2006; Weaver 2005; Honey 2008). But, it is only by understanding better how these choices operate across languages that we can reach more valid conclusions about the extent to which their use is appropriate or not.

It should be noted, of course, that this study also has certain limitations. The corpus examined, although specialised, is still rather small, and any generalisations should be made with caution. A larger corpus, with a larger NBT component, needs to be studied, consisting of more languages, which will help reveal how heterogeneous NBT is as a category, and to what extent certain preferences are destination- or language-specific. Additionally, the validity of the results relies exclusively on the accuracy of the POS taggers, which even for the English POS tagger is expected to be around 90% (Horsmann et al. 2015). This is not ideal, but equally, it is impossible to conduct a similar analysis manually. To avoid similar issues of reliability, future studies might consider examining in more depth the most frequent (e.g. 10 or 20) items under each category, which can be captured with the use of a frequency list, and without the need for POS tagging. Additionally, a more in-depth analysis will reveal whether engagement with nature can be expressed not only by the frequency with which a text refers to it but also by other means, such as, for example, the verbs used to accompany nouns associated with natural resources.

Conclusion

The idea of alternative tourism is not something new, but our understanding of how different alternative tourism really is compared to mass tourism is very limited, while there is also a commonly accepted view that different types of tourism show universal characteristics. This has resulted in a significant amount of effort dedicated to defining concepts like NBT, but not realising that the difficulty associated with defining these might be related to the fact that different cultures might interpret and perform these types of tourism differently. This study has addressed this gap by offering for the first time insight from a cross-linguistic comparison of mass and nature-based tourism texts. As a result, it has questioned the way in which NBT has been perceived until now and also highlighted the important role that translation plays in its conceptualisation. It is necessary that more studies of this type, which focus on linguistic aspects, are conducted on tourism texts, which will allow us to reveal not only how different cultures look at the world, but also help the tourism and travel industry understand better how language might have an impact on destination promotion.

References

- Acott, T., Trobe, H. & Howard, S., 1998. An Evaluation of Deep Ecotourism and Shallow Ecotourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 6(3), pp.238–253.
- Eumelia Organic Agrotourism Farm & Guesthouse. Available at: <http://www.eumelia.com/en/our-farm/philosophy> [last accessed November 2018].
- Arnegger, J., Woltering, M. & Job, H., 2010. Toward A Product-Based Typology for Nature-Based Tourism : A Conceptual Framework. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(7), pp.915–928.
- Aylward, B. & Freedman, S., 1992. Ecotourism. In B. Groombridge, ed. *Global Biodiversity*. London: Chapman & Hall, pp. 413–415.
- Björk, P., 2000. Ecotourism from Conceptual Perspective. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 2, pp.189–202.
- Blamey, R.K., 2001. Principles of Ecotourism. In D. Weaver, ed. *The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism*. Wallingford: CABI Publishing, pp. 5–22.
- Boo, E., 1990. *Ecotourism: The Potentials and Pitfalls* WWF, ed., Washington.
- Buckley, R., 1994. A Framework for Ecotourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(3), pp.661–665.
- Buckley, R. & Sommer, M., 2000. *Tourism and Protected Areas: Partnerships in principle and Practice*, Gold Coast, Queensland.
- Cassells, D. & Valentine, P., 1990. Recreation Management Issues in tropical Rainforest. In *Institute of Tropical Rainforest Studies Workshop 1*. James Cook University, Townsville.
- Ceballos-Lascurain, H., 1987. The Future of “Ecotourism.” *Mexico Journal*, pp.13–14.
- Chubb, M. & Chubb, H., 1981. *One-Third of Our Time?: An Introduction to Recreation Behaviour*, New York: John Wiley.
- Coria, J. & Calfucura, E., 2012. Ecotourism and the Development of Indigenous Communities: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly. *Ecological Economics*, 73, pp.47–55.
- Dekhili, S. & Achabou, M.A., 2015. The Perception of Ecotourism: Semantic Profusion and Tourists ’ Expectations. *RIHME*, 19(5), pp.3–20.
- Donohoe, H. & Needham, R., 2006. Ecotourism: The Evolving Contemporary Definition. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 5(3), pp.192–210.
- Dowling, R. & Fennell, D., 2003. The Context of Ecotourism Policy and Planning. In D. Fennell & R. Dowling, eds. *Ecotourism Policy and Planning*. Oxford: CABI Publishing, pp. 1–20.
- Farrell, T., 2000. Nature. In J. Jafari, ed. *Encyclopedia of Tourism*. London & New York: Routledge, pp. 409–4010.
- Farsari, I., 2012. Sustainable Tourism Policy in North Mediterranean Destinations. *Journal of*

- Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 21(7), pp.710–738.
- Fennell, D., 2014. *Ecotourism* 4th Editio., London & New York: Routledge.
- Gray, P. et al., 2003. The Socioeconomic Significance of Nature-based Recreation in Canada. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 86, pp.129–147.
- Hawkins, D. & Lamoureux, K., 2001. Global Growth and Magnitude of Ecotourism. In D. Weaver, ed. *The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism*. Wallingford: CABI Publishing, pp. 63–72.
- Honey, M., 2008. *Ecotourism and Sustainable Development: Who Owns Paradise?* 2nd editio., Washington: Island Press.
- Horsmann, T., Erbs, N. & Zesch, T., 2015. Fast or Accurate? A Comparative Evaluation of PoS Tagging Models. In *Proceedings of the International Conference of the German Society for Computational Linguistics and Language Technology*. University of Duisburg-Essen, pp. 22–30.
- Hughes, K. & Chirgwin, S., 1997. Ecotourism: The Participant's Perceptions. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 8(2), pp.2–7.
- Kilgarrieff, A. et al., 2014. The Sketch Engine: Ten Years On. *Lexicography*, 1, pp.7–36.
- Kontogeorgopoulos, N., 2004. Conventional Tourism and Ecotourism in Phuket, Thailand: Conflicting Paradigms or Symbiotic Partners? *Journal of Ecotourism*, 3(2), pp.87–108.
- Lee, C.-K., 1997. Valuation of Nature-Based Tourism Resources Using Dichotomous Choice Contingent Valuation Method. *Tourism Management*, 18(8), pp.587–591.
- Lindberg, K., 1991. *Policies for Maximising nature Tourism's Ecological and Economic Benefits*, Washington: World Resources Institute.
- Malamatidou, S., 2018. *Corpus Triangulation: Combining Data and Methods in Corpus-Based Translation Studies*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Mayo, E.J. & Jarvis, L.P., 1981. *The Psychology of Leisure Travel: Effective Marketing and Selling Travel Services*, Boston: CBI.
- Mehmetoglu, M., 2007. Nature-Based Tourism : A Contrast to Everyday Life. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 6(2), pp.111–126.
- Mühlhäusler, P. & Peace, A., 2001. Discourses of Ecotourism : The Case of Fraser Island , Queensland. *Language & Communication*, 21, pp.359–380.
- Naidoo, R. & Adamowicz, W., 2005. Economic Benefits of Biodiversity Esceed Costs of Conservation at an African Rainforest Reserve. *proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 102(46), pp.16712–16716.
- Ollenburg, C., 2006. *Farm Tourism in Australia: A Family Business and Rural Studies Perspective*. Christian-Albrechts University of Keil and Griffiths University.
- Philip, S., Hunter, C. & Blackstock, K., 2010. A Typology for Defining Agritourism. *Tourism Management*, 31, pp.754–758.

- Preece, N., Van Oosterzee, P. & James, D., 1995. *Thwo Way Track - Biodiversity Conservation and Ecotourism: An Investigation of Linkages*, Canberra.
- Rayson, Paul. n.d. *Log-Likelihood Calculator*. Available at: <http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/llwizard.html> [last accessed February 2018].
- Roberts, L. & Hall, D., 2001. *Rural tourism and Recreation: Principles to Practice*, Cambridge: CABI Publishing.
- Robinson, P., 2012. Agritourism. In P. Robinson, ed. *Tourism: The Key Concepts*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Saarinen, J., 2005. Tourism in the Northern Wilderness: Wilderness Discourses and the Development of Nature-Based Tourism in Northern Finland. In C. M. Hall & S. Bpyd, eds. *Nature-Based Tourism in Peripheral Areas: Development or Disaster?*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications, pp. 36–49.
- Stamou, A. & Paraskevopoulos, S., 2004. Images of Nature by Tourism and Environmentalist Discourses in Visitors Books: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Ecotourism. *Discourse & Society*, 15(1), pp.105–129.
- Stamou, A.G. & Paraskevopoulos, S., 2003. Ecotourism Experiences in Visitors ' Books of a Greek Reserve : A Critical Discourse Analysis Perspective. *Sociologica Ruralis*, 43(1), pp.34–55.
- Teigland, J., 2001. The Effects on Travel and Tourism Demand from Three Mega-Trends: Democratization, Market Ideology and Post-Materialism as Cultural Wave. In W. Gartner & D. Lime, eds. *Trends in Outdoor Recreation, Leisure and Tourism*. Wallingford: CABI Publishing, pp. 37–46.
- Trčková, D., 2016. Representations of nature in Ecotourism Advertisements. *Discourse and Interaction*, 9(1), pp.79–94.
- Urry, J. & Larsen, J., 2011. *The Tourist Gaze 3.0*, London: SAGE Publications.
- Valentine, P., 1992. Review: Nature-based Tourism. In B. Weiler & C. Hall, eds. *Special Interest Tourism*. London: Belhaven Press, pp. 105–127.
- Wallace, G. & Pierce, S., 1996. An Evaluation of Ecotourism in Amazonas, Brazil. *Annals of Tourism Reserach*, 23(4), pp.843–873.
- Wang, N., 1999. Rethinking Authenticity in Tourism Experience. *Annals of Tourism Reserach*, 26(2), pp.349–370.
- Weaver, D., 2005. Comprehensive and Minimalist Dimensions of Ecotourism. *Annals of Tourism Reserach*, 32(2), pp.439–455.
- Weaver, D., 2008. *Ecotourism* 2nd editio., Milton: John Wiley.
- Weaver, D., 2001. Ecotourism as Mass Tourism : Contradiction or Reality ? *Cornell: Hotel and Restuarant Administration Quarterly*, April, pp.104–112.
- Whelan, T., 1991. Ecotourism and Its Role in Sustainable Development. In T. Whelan, ed. *Nature Tourism: Management for the Environment*. Washington: Island Press, pp. 3–22.

Zimmerman, E., 1951. *World Resources and Industries*, New York: Harper.