Francesca Bianchi[*]

# THE SOCIAL TRICKS OF ADVERTISING. DISCOURSE STRATEGIES OF ENGLISH-SPEAKING TOUR OPERATORS ON FACEBOOK

## 1. Introduction

According to a Wildfire survey (cited in Offutt and Schetzina 2012, 4-5), Facebook is the main form of social media for tourist marketing, and Facebook usage figures are growing. Despite this, research on the promotional use of Facebook in the tourist industry is still scarce, especially from a linguistic perspective. The current paper is intended to contribute to outlining the specificities of tourism promotion through Facebook. To this aim, this paper analyses the Facebook posts of three tour operators targeting a generalised audience and based in different English-speaking countries. The paper focuses on the following research questions:

1. How do travel management companies use their Facebook page? Do they use it to promote their services and specific destinations? If so, how is this promotion realised linguistically?;

2. What kind of relationship do they engage in with their prospective clients, and how is this realised linguistically?

The following paragraphs outline the backdrop of this study by illustrating the language of tourism and tourism promotion (Section 1.1.), briefly introducing Facebook as a communicative and promotional medium (Section 1.2), and reporting the existing literature on the use of Facebook as a marketing tool, with specific attention to the tourism industry (Section 1.3). Section 2 describes the materials and methods used in the current study. Section 3 reports the results of the analyses. Finally, Section 4 draws some conclusions and outlines perspectives for future research.

## 1.1 The language of tourism promotion

The language of tourism features specific characteristics which allow us to consider it as a type of specialised discourse (Dann 1996; Gotti 2006). In tourism discourse in general and tourism promotion in particular, the verbal message is inextricably interwoven with the accompanying images (Maci 2013). This forces researchers to take stock of both the verbal and visual channels (Maci 2007; 2016; Pierini 2008; Francesconi 2014; Manca 2016a; 2016b; Bianchi 2017).

Dann (1996) was the first author to list specific linguistic and rhetorical techniques; these techniques were then confirmed and further analysed by other researchers. The most commonly observed techniques of tourism promotion include: reference to an atemporal dimension, achieved by using specific verb tenses (Dann 1996); reference to a magical dimension, created by verbs such as *escape*, *forget*, *discover* in the imperative form (Dann 1996; Pierini 2008; Manca 2017); expressions of euphoria (Dann 1996; Gotti 2006; Pierini 2008), including highly positive adjectives (e.g. *extraordinary*) or indicators of large quantities (e.g. *many*; *plenty of*); expressions of social control, including modal verbs (e.g. *should*), negative interrogative sentences and rhetorical questions (Dann 1996; Pierini 2008); ego-targeting techniques (Dann 1996; Manca 2017), including personal pronouns and possessive adjectives (e.g. *you*; *your*), and expressions that directly address the reader (e.g. imperatives); metaphors and similes (Dann 1996; Mattiello 2012; Spinzi 2013; Manca 2017); and languaging, i.e. the use of foreign words (Dann 1996; Cappelli 2013; Cesiri 2016; 2017).

These techniques are equally attested in printed texts (Ernawati 2001) and in online forms of tourism communication (for the latter, see in particular Pierini 2008; Cappelli 2008; Maci 2010; Manca 2017).

The form of online tourism promotion that has most frequently attracted the attention of linguists so far is websites, be they those of official tourist boards (Pierini 2008; Maci 2012; Zuliani 2013; Manca 2016a; 2017)

---

[*] *Francesca Bianchi is researcher and lecturer at the University of Salento, Lecce, Italy. One of her primary research interests is corpus linguistics and how corpus linguistic methodologies can be applied to discourse and genre analysis. She has applied corpus methods to the analysis of academic papers, audiovisual material, and web material. She has published a volume titled* Culture, corpora and semantics*, a methodological investigation in the use of elicited data and Web data in the analysis of cultural specificities.*

or other types of tourist operators (Manca 2008; 2013; D'Andrea 2013; Cesiri 2017; Cesiri and Colaci in press). In particular, Pierini (2008) investigated the linguistic features of a range of national tourist websites across Europe. The features she observed included the following: the use of questions and imperatives to "create the impression of interpersonal communication and communicative immediacy" (Pierini 2007, 89); first person plural subjects (*we*) directly addressing the receivers (*you*; *your*); elliptic sentences and features typical of orality (e.g. contracted forms); superlatives (e.g. *the best*) and positively connoted adjectives (e.g. *effortlessly; perfect; comfortable*); reference to a magical dimension (represented by words such as *discover*, *enjoy*, *explore*, *experience*); and some attempt to engage readers in immediate action (e.g. verbs *search*, *choose*, *book*). Maci (2012) analysed some British websites promoting local tourist destinations and observed that the informative communicative function was more prominent than the argumentative function. Furthermore, by analysing key adjectives and their co-text, the author concluded that, in the websites under investigation, the destinations were presented by means of very concrete descriptions focussing on their physical and cultural features. The overall text however included frequent evaluative adjectives with positive connotations. Manca (2017) considered four English-speaking countries (Canada, the USA, Great Britain and Australia) alongside Italy and analysed the verbal techniques used on their official tourist websites. The first verbal technique that this author identified was the metaphorical use of the following conceptual domains: value and preciousness (e.g. *gem*, *pearl*, *jewel*); positive imaginary worlds (e.g. *paradise*, *oasis*); discovery and adventure (e.g. *escape*, *discover*); dream and magic (e.g. *wonderland*, *dream*); tasting (e.g. *a taste of England*); and immersion (e.g. *immersed*). These verbal techniques appeared in all the corpora, though with different frequencies in each of them, and according to the author the use of these metaphors "contributes to the persuasive aim of the tourist website" (Manca 2017, 97). As regards the English corpora, Manca's study also observed the following: a very limited use of languaging; no attempt to involve readers in forms of active sharing of experiences; and the presence of ego-targeting techniques, linguistically expressed by imperative verb forms, personal pronouns and possessive adjectives of first and second person (*we*, *our*, *you*, *your*), though in the British, Australian, and American corpora *we* and *our* were rare. Finally, the study identified different keywords for each country, namely: in the British corpus, words referring to the family, and words referring to attractions and heritage; in the Australian corpus, terms referring to the environment and to outdoor activities; in the US corpus, terms referring to the environment, historic attractions, and recent American traditions. More generally, Manca (2008; 2013; 2016a; 2016b; 2017) has demonstrated that different national cultures may show preference for different linguistic features and promotional techniques. Cultural specificities, however, will not be considered in the current paper.

## 1.2 Facebook as a communicative and promotional medium

Facebook belongs to a range of interactive media commonly known as 'social media.' Like many other forms of social media, Facebook offers its users electronic space to display multimedia content and tools for bidirectional interaction among users. Uploading multimedia files – photos, audio files, and video files – is easy and quick; despite this, according to Carr, Schrock and Dauterman (2012) written text still plays a fundamental role in Facebook communication, since contents are primarily provided in written form, mostly by means of public or private posts.

Unlike other forms of social media such as Twitter, where the length and form of the posts are constrained by specific conventions or limitations, Facebook posts have virtually no maximum character limit[1] and users are free to compose text to their liking. Posts can include text, images, emoticons and stickers. Furthermore, Facebook has recently copied Twitter in the use of hashtags (# followed by a word or phrase) to group posts about a given topic, making it easier to search for specific posts.[2]

From a marketing perspective, interactive media offer great promotional and marketing opportunities, but also require a shift from traditional marketing habits to new ones. In particular, consensus seems to exist on the

---

[1] Facebook's Help Community users suggest that a limit may exist, but the figures they mention are such (5000-550000 characters) that they do not represent a real issue: https://www.facebook.com/help/community/question/?id=1473679909539541. Last Visited October 10, 2017.
[2]http://www.socialmediatoday.com/social-business/should-you-use-hashtags-facebook-heres-what-research-says

fact that interactive media require interactive marketing (Gretzel and Yoo 2014; Minazzi 2015). With specific reference to social media,

> Social media marketing is essentially about building relationships (Barefoot & Szabo, 2010). In order to build those relationships, it needs to enable and shape conversations (Safko & Brake, 2009). Social media marketers are therefore conversation managers who develop methods to strategically influence conversations (Mangold & Faulds, 2009). (Gretzel and Yoo 2014, 494)

## 1.3 Facebook as a marketing tool in the tourist industry

The use of Facebook pages as a promotional medium in the tourist industry has attracted the interest of scholars in the marketing and tourism fields, but has been paid little attention in other research areas, such as linguistics. Furthermore, most published work has analysed the issue from a theoretical perspective, while empirical studies are still scarce. With regard to empirical studies focussing on the supplier side, researchers have so far investigated the use of social media by tourist boards and the like – sometimes called National Tourist Organisations (NTOs) or Destination Management Organisations (DMOs) – as well as hotel chains and airlines.

Zouganeli, Trihas and Antonaki (2011) analysed the structural features and contents of the official Facebook pages of 31 European National Tourist Organizations. As regards the content of the pages, the authors observed that 'likes' were especially triggered by posts with photos or videos, while comments were triggered by posts with "a question, a challenging statement, a common wish, an important cultural, athletic, political, natural, national etc. event" (Zouganeli, Trihas and Antonaki 2011, 115). Hays, Page and Buhalis (2013) focused on the national DMOs of seven top international destinations and explored their communication strategies on Facebook and Twitter. To this aim, they performed a content analysis of the posts and semi-structured interviews with DMOs' representatives. Data collection took place in 2013. Among other things, the researchers analysed the presence of hashtags and links to external pages and observed that 51% of the Facebook posts included links to websites (with as few as 23% in the UK posts). Furthermore, they classified the posts as either interactive or non-interactive, the latter group including posts "that directly asked a question or requested some form of response" (Hays, Page and Buhalis 2013, 223). With reference to Facebook, their DMOs showed different percentages of interactive posts (2% and n/a for Malaysia and Turkey, respectively; 15% and 20% for Germany and France, respectively; and 55%-60% in the UK, Spain, and Mexico), with an average value of only 27%. Finally, nearly 80% of the posts promoted the destination, either by means of factual information or by presenting opinions or reviews, with the majority of posts containing factual information. A few posts invited users to follow other social media channels of the DMO. Mariani, Di Felice and Mura (2016) investigated the ways in which Italian regional DMOs use Facebook to promote and market destinations. They collected data from Facebook pages (one month of posts and comments in 2013) and engaged social media marketers from those regions in semi-structured interviews. They analysed a very wide range of parameters. Here are reported only the results which are relevant to the current experiment. These authors observed that 81.2% of the posts published by the DMOs themselves included photos, 10.4% included links and 5.9% included videos. Photos and videos were the contents that elicited a greater number of comments from users, with photos being top of the list. Considering only the posts that generated more than 100 comments, they were almost all accompanied by a photo (97.2%) and frequently included opinion polls, quizzes or games. Posts were between 100 and 300 characters long, and the posts with a length of around 200 characters generated more engagements than the others. However, different regions displayed different strategies in their use of Facebook, with a significant number of regions using Facebook to replicate the messages posted on their official websites, and only a small number of regions using it in a more innovative and creative way. Finally, Huertas and Marine-Roig (2016) focused on the branding of specific destinations on Facebook and other forms of social media. They analysed the contents of the promotional pages of 24 tourist destinations in five different areas of Spain, and showed that the posts promoted monuments and other tourist attractions rather than emotional values. More specifically and with reference to Facebook: when the destination was a town, posts focused on landmarks of cultural or historical relevance; when the destination was a seaside resort, the focus was on events; for other destinations (e.g. mountain villages), posts offered institutional news, promoted local events and provided suggestions on how to spend one's free time.

A few studies have investigated promotional posts on Facebook by hotel chains. O'Connor (2011) considered 50 international hotel brands and observed that in 2010 their presence on Facebook was rather basic and characterised by low levels of social interaction, measured in terms of users' 'likes' and comments on the hotel's posts. Similar analyses by Minazzi and Lagrosen (2014) on international hotel chains and by Hsu (2012) on hotels in Taiwan highlighted that hotels promoted primarily internal facilities, services and events in a fashion that duplicated traditional marketing habits, with some interesting exceptions by some Taiwanese hotels that also advertised celebrations and festivals in the area.

Finally, Leung, Schuckert and Yeung (2013) analysed the Facebook pages of three low-cost airlines and observed that their posts performed the following six functions: promoting services (special fares, new routes and new apps); sharing links, photos and videos; announcing company, emergency or pre-promotion information; encouraging engagement by means of photo competitions, guessing games, lucky draws and the like; announcing the presence of celebrities at a specific destination; and showing user involvement by sharing users' photos. The frequency of these types of posts varied by functional category and by airline.

None of the studies above belongs to the area of linguistics. To the best of my knowledge the only linguistic studies analysing Facebook communication strategies in the area of tourism are Maci (2017) and Bianchi (2017).

Maci (2017) analysed three posts on Easy Jet's Facebook page, and three posts on South West Airlines' Facebook page. These posts were taken as case studies to illustrate the construction of meaning by tourist-industry operators and tourist consumers in social media. To this aim, the author analysed the intended meaning of the posts and the reactions they elicited in readers (called 'networkers' by the author). The posts included a photo competition, a bargain-prices offer, a 'summer starts now' post, and posts celebrating special events (Halloween; Star Wars Day; and Shark Week). The study showed that tourist-industry operators use Facebook to advertise services and also to promote their own image or identity. Networkers act as prosumers, i.e. active consumers, and not only do they reply to posts, but they also manipulate the original/intended meaning of the posts in a range of ways.

Bianchi (2017) analysed the English Facebook posts of luxury tour operators by means of manual analyses as well as corpus methods and concluded that luxury tour operators use their Facebook page as if it were a catalogue of destinations. In particular, the study observed the following features:

- General features: Facebook posts were accompanied by links to external pages in percentages ranging from 2% to 41% depending on the operator; the presence of emoticons was scarce (0 for two of the four operators considered; an average of 0.1 and 0.2 emoticons per post for the other two operators); luxury operators made ample use of hashtags, with an average of 1-1.26 hashtags for two of the operators studied, and as many as 26.5 for a third one.

- Types of posts: the majority of posts promoted destinations, with percentages ranging from 72% to 99%. Posts performing other functions appeared in very low percentages or only with a few operators. Among these, the ones worth mentioning in terms of presence were: tips (appearing with only two operators, with percentages from 8% to 12%); news (appearing with only two operators, with percentages from 1% to 9%); posts referring to the travel company itself (appearing with only three operators, with percentages from 1% to 8%); and the presence of testimonials (appearing with only two operators, with percentages from 2% to 6%).

- Images: clear preference for single photos rather than multiple pictures or videos. Very high percentage of conceptual images (72%-99%); posts promoting destinations were primarily accompanied by symbolic suggestive images (48%-81%); the other posts (considered as a single group) were accompanied by a wide range of types of images, with a majority of classificational processes.

- Addressing users (quantitative data): percentage of first and second person pronouns – calculated on the overall number of words – was similar in destination posts (2.27%) and in the other posts (2.68%). In all cases, second person pronouns were more frequent than first person pronouns (1.9% vs. 0.35% in destination posts; 2.43% vs. 0.25% in the other posts), but their relative rate was much higher in non-destination posts (9:1 vs. 5:1). Imperatives were more frequent in destination posts (2.34% vs. 1.42%). In terms of the distribution of pronouns, imperative forms, and interrogative forms across posts, these linguistic features were generally higher in non-destination posts (pronouns: 58.33% vs. 48.46%; imperative forms: 66.03% vs. 53.73%; interrogative forms: 36.97% vs. 10.96%).

- Addressing users in destination posts (qualitative data): imperative forms were used for a limited set of discourse functions. These are: to invite users to contact a travel agent or explore the link; to illustrate the advantages of booking through a travel agent; and to describe the destination and its features. Interrogative forms were used to invite users to consider the given destination and showed a very limited set of formulations: *What about [having fun at] [a trip to]*; *What can be better than*; *Can you imagine*; *Have you ever*. Personal pronouns and adjectives (with a predominance of *you* and *your*) often appeared in sentences describing the destination, frequently presenting it as the perfect or ideal place for a specific category of travellers, and in sentences inviting users to take a holiday. Finally, many posts were impersonal and described the place and its inhabitants and traditions; these posts sometimes included suggestions, a description of the image, a comment, or details on a specific offer.

- Contents of destination posts: instructions and suggestions on how to book; detailed information about the offer (e.g. price, discounts, advantages, deadlines); the name and type of the destination (generally a hotel); a description of the destination that typically portraits it as unique, authentic, special, elegant, or famous; travelling as an unforgettable experience; and set phrases that would help readers to identify special offers.

To stress the significance of the findings, Bianchi (2017) compared the posts of the luxury operators to the posts of non-luxury tour operators. The paper, however, focused on luxury tourism, and only the range of linguistic strategies adopted by luxury operators was richly detailed and exemplified. The current paper integrates Bianchi's (2017) findings by providing a detailed description of the linguistic and discourse strategies displayed by generalised and budget tour operators on Facebook.

## 2. Materials and methods

The current paper analyses the Facebook posts of three large international travel operators based in English-speaking countries, namely *Thomas Cook* (TC),[3] *House Of Travel* (HOT),[4] and *Last Minute Travel* (LMT).[5] TC is the oldest and most famous British leisure travel company, serving 19 million customers per year worldwide.[6] HOT is the biggest name in leisure travel in New Zealand. Finally, *Last Minute Travel* is a US-based operator. Originally created to help travellers to find cheap last-minute offers, it has gradually grown to offer a complete range of services, and not only for last-minute travel.

For each operator, six months of posts were manually collected from the official English Facebook page[7] accessible from the operator's English website, from the day the data collection began backwards. The posts thus span a period stretching from September 2016 to February 2017. The posts of each operator were considered as a sub-corpus within the larger corpus – here called FB Tourism corpus – comprising all the collected posts together, as summarised in Table 1. Column one specifies the name of the (sub)-corpus. Column two reports the number of posts collected for each operator and included in the corpus. Column three indicates the overall number of tokens in the (sub-)corpus. Finally, column four reports the number of tokens in the corpus excluding links, hashtags and emoticons, as these were removed in some of the analyses.

| (Sub-)Corpus | N. of posts | Overall n. of tokens | Tokens excluding links, hashtags and emoticons |
|---|---|---|---|
| TC | 163 | 5034 | 4968 |
| HOT | 70 | 1381 | 1373 |
| LMT | 93 | 1796 | 1711 |
| FB Tourism Corpus | 326 | 8211 | 8052 |

**Table 1.** The FB Tourism corpus – Composition

---

[3] https://www.thomascook.com

[4] http://www.houseoftravel.co.nz

[5] www.LastMinuteTravel.com

[6] https://www.thomascook.com/about-us/#intcmp=Footer_AboutUs

[7] https://www.facebook.com/thomascook/?fref=ts; https://www.facebook.com/houseoftravelNZ; https://www.facebook.com/LastMinuteTravel

Alongside the text of the posts, picture(s) accompanying each post were also collected, and track was kept of the match between post and picture(s). When the picture included a link to an external page – typically a page or article on the operator's website – the text on the external page was read and used to understand the contents of the Facebook post, but was not included in the corpus. The data collected thus include text and images.

For the sake of clarity, the levels of analysis will be divided here into five separate stages.

In phase one, the presence of multimodal and interactive features in the posts (i.e. links, hashtags, and emoticons) was observed. The results of this analysis are reported in Section 3.1.

In phase two, the posts were manually classified and grouped by content. Content categories were abductively decided after careful observation of the text, picture(s) and link(s) – if present – in each post. Section 3.2 presents the results of the analysis.

In phase three, the pictures of the posts were manually analysed within the framework of visual grammar (Kress and van Leeuwen 2006). The images were thus classified as narrative (45-78) or conceptual (79-113). Narrative images picture actions and events (action processes), reactions (reactional processes), and speech or mental processes while they are taking place; they may also realise conversion processes and symbolic communicative processes. Narrative images are characterised by the presence of vectors that link two or more participants (or areas) in the picture. Vectors are graphical elements indicating that an action is taking place and are physically realised by lines or other elements (e.g. participants' arms, legs, a road, a railway line, or the wake of a boat) that are slanted diagonally. Vectors may also have non-linear shapes – this is the case with symbolic narrative processes – or be accompanied by text, as is the case in conversion or speech processes. On the other hand, conceptual images picture participants not as actors of a contextual process, but as subjects of a general or universal value, to be observed and admired in their essence (59). In conceptual images, participants are not linked by vectors. Conceptual images may illustrate a class (classificational processes), a structure (analytical processes), or a meaning (symbolic attributive processes and symbolic suggestive processes). An image may include two or more embedded processes, either narrative or conceptual (107). In the current work, pictures including two or more different types of processes were classified according to the dominant process, established by observing the relative dimension and prominence of the elements in the picture. Section 3.3 analyses the pictures accompanying the posts and offers examples of the most frequent classes of images observed.

In phases four and five, a corpus approach was adopted to analyse the contents of the destination posts (excluding links, hashtags and emoticons). The Destinations sub-corpus was thus created, including a total of 3,912 words/tokens. Posts with other communicative functions had to be disregarded due to the small number of items composing each group. All corpus analyses were performed using Wmatrix (Rayson 2009), an online corpus analysis and concordancing tool developed at Lancaster University. Wmatrix presents a few specificities. First of all, it detects multi-word units, such as *New_York* and *take_a_look*, and treats them as individual words. Furthermore, it includes highly efficient POS tagging software for English texts called CLAWS (Garside and Smith 1997), and when major POS categories are considered it guarantees an error rate of only 1.5%.[8] Finally, Wmatrix integrates some reference corpora that researchers can use freely, including sub-sets of the BNC, and offers a range of parameters to fine-tune statistical comparisons.

More specifically, in phase four (Section 3.4.) the Destinations sub-corpus was compared to different reference corpora, and positive keywords were automatically extracted. In corpus linguistics, keywords are extracted by comparing two frequency word lists and considering measures of statistical significance. Keyword analysis allows researchers to assess the contents of a corpus in terms of themes (e.g. Scott and Tribble 2006; Gabrielatos and Marchi 2011), structure, and style (e.g. Fischer-Starcke 2010). In the application of this method, the reference corpus chosen is a highly relevant factor. In fact, although some suggest that any reference corpus may yield interesting results (Scott and Tribble 2006, 65), it has been observed that different reference corpora will provide different results (see for example Fischer-Starcke 2010). For the purposes of the current study, the following reference corpora were used: BNC Sampler Written Informal and BNC Sampler Spoken, sub-sets of the British National Corpus including examples of informal written texts and of spoken texts, respectively; a corpus of 377,254 tokens including the official promotional web pages of three English-

---

[8] http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/claws/

speaking countries (the UK, the USA, and New Zealand; Manca 2017), here called the Website corpus; and the LUX-DEST corpus, a corpus of 15,580 running words including three months of Facebook posts by luxury travel agents and advertising destinations (Bianchi 2017). Comparison with the BNC should highlight the features that are peculiar to the Facebook posts under investigation with respect to everyday language and suggest their positioning in the written-spoken/formal-informal continuum. Comparison to the Website corpus and the LUX-DEST corpus should highlight the specificities of the posts under investigation with respect to online tourism promotion. The keyword lists were ordered by log-likelihood (LL, a measure of statistical significance), and the top 100 positive keywords were considered, plus any other items in the list having the same %DIFF (an effect size measure) of the 100th item (Gabrielatos and Marchi 2011). Thus, comparison with the BNC Sampler Written Informal yielded 115 keywords for the analysis, comparison with the BNC Sampler Spoken yielded 133 keywords, while comparisons with the Website corpus and the LUX-DEST corpus yielded 100 items each. For each of the selected keywords, the co-text and context were considered, and the keywords were manually grouped into meaningful categories.

Finally, phase five focussed on the frequency and distribution of grammar features that typically express a direct dialogue between addresser and addressee (Section 3.5). The features considered were: first and second person pronouns and possessive adjectives (singular and plural); imperative forms; and questions. To establish the frequency of the first two features, POS tagging was performed. The POS data thus obtained were manually checked by concordance reading, in order to exclude tagging mistakes, if any. The frequency of interrogative forms was calculated using Word and searching for question marks. In fact, the standard tagset currently used in Wmatrix is CLAWS 7, a tagset that does not include punctuation tags. Finally, the distributions of these grammar features were manually established. Given the frequency of the various categories of posts (Section 3.2, Table 2), at this level of analysis destination posts were contrasted and compared to all the other posts taken together. The automatic quantitative analysis was followed by a qualitative, manual analysis of the concordance lines in the Destinations sub-corpus.

## 3. Results
### 3.1. Phase one: counting multimodal and interactive features in the posts
Posts may include multimodal and/or interactive features such as links (web addresses within the post itself), image links (i.e. by clicking on the image that accompanies the post, the user is sent to an external web page), emoticons, and hashtags. In the current corpus, image links represent 56% of all the images in TC and 23-26% in the other two operators, with an average number of links per post equal to 0.23-0.25 for TC and LMT, and to 0.65 for HOT. Typically, the links found in these pages lead users to YouTube videos or to the operator's website. Links within the post, on the other hand, are slightly more frequent for TC and LMT (with an average of 0.4-0.5 links per post, respectively), but not for HOT, where no links can be found. The picture depicted by these values is not substantially different from the one observed by Hays, Page and Buhalis (2013) in their analysis of Facebook usage by the national Destination Management Organisations of seven top international destinations. As regards the other features, hashtags are rarely used in the current data, with an average value per post of 0.07 in TC, 0.14 in HOT and 0.6 in LMT. Finally, emoticons are relatively frequently used, with an average value per post of 0.6 in TC and as many as 1.5 in LMT, though no emoticons can be found in HOT. Compared to luxury tour operators (Bianchi 2017), the operators in the current corpus show, on the whole, much greater use of emoticons and markedly less use of hashtags.

### 3.2 Phase two: classifying posts by content
Manual analysis of the posts led to the identification of 13 content categories. Taken together, these categories offer the entire range of communicative functions observed in the FB Tourism corpus. The following groups were identified:
- Posts advertising destinations (Destinations). These post are characterised by the presence of the name of a destination – be it a town, country or hotel – in the post itself or on an external page linked to in the post (e.g. *Three swimming pools Stunning sea views ✓ All inclusive offering Entertainment for all ages Hotel Sol Lanzarote is the perfect place to suit both adults and children. Doesn't it sound great? Take a closer look: http://po.st/E10CaP).*

- Posts offering ideas and tips of a general nature (Tips). These posts include aphorisms, suggestions, and other types of ideas generally referring to travelling (e.g. *It can be nerve-wracking thinking about that first big family holiday abroad with a baby or toddler. So we've put together some top tips to think about before you book. What's your top tip for traveling with little ones?*). Suggestions are often listed on an external page linked to in the post.

- Posts advertising the latest issue of the operator's catalogue or magazine (Catalogues) (e.g. *Perfect lazy Sundays start with hot brioche, hot coffee and HOT's latest Inspire magazine. Inside the Sunday Star Times this weekend*).

- Posts focusing on some person's travel experience, used as a sort of testimonial (Testimonials) (e.g. *Captivating story about one man's diverse life experiences on the road. You don't wanna miss this! http://blog.lastminutetravel.com/funny-life-works/*).

- Posts sending the tour operator's season's greetings to their readers (Season's greetings) (e.g. *Happy Valentine's Day! If you could go anywhere in the world to celebrate, where would it be?*).

- Posts celebrating special events and public holidays (Celebrations) (e.g. *We love capturing the world's beauty on camera! Where's your favourite place in the world to capture some stunning images? Here are a few of ours in honour of World Photography Day....*).

- Posts providing technical or scientific information connected to travelling (Information). These include, for example, statistics about travellers (e.g. *Useless facts about air travel to keep you entertained on your next flight. http://blog.lastminutetravel.com/fun-facts-flying-infograp…/*), information about air strikes or hurricanes (e.g. *Strike by Greek Air Traffic Control – Cancelled. Greek air traffic controllers have now cancelled their plans to strike over four days, 9, 10, 12 and 13 October. […]*), scientific information about the advantages of a holiday (e.g. *Need a new excuse for your holiday leave? Tell your boss that Vitamin D increases drive, focus and concentration*), or facts about a specific destination (e.g. *Did you know that it took over 22,000 people to build the Taj Mahal? And more than 1,000 elephants were employed to transport construction materials!*).

- Posts referring to the tour operator itself (Self-reference). These posts may advertise the advantages of being a club member (e.g. *They want playtime; we want family time. Holiday time = family time, and we have something for everyone. Instead of compromising why not have it all on a Thomas Cook holiday*), or celebrate anniversaries (e.g. *These illustrations may be 45 years old, but they still make us want to jet off for some winter sun! Take a look back at the history of Thomas Cook, as we celebrate 175 years! http://po.st/Where-We-Started*), prizes, and/or parties internal to the tour operator (e.g. *Sending big thanks to everyone who shared their Thanksgiving memories in our social media contest! Shoutout to our winner @nrggyal for capturing her mom and uncle seeing each other for the first time in 15 years. We hope your free hotel stay prize helps you to have another reunion, sooner than 15 years from now 😄 #ThankfulWithLMT*).

- Posts launching a survey to find out readers' opinions, tastes, or habits (Surveys) (e.g. *Ready for the challenge! ••• Tell us! What's your favorite winter sport? 🎿⛷🏂⛸ What inspires you to travel?*).

- Posts advertising special offers or discounts that are not linked to a specific destination (Offers) (e.g. *Congrats to the #cubs for winning the #WorldSeries for the first time in 108 years! In honor of this historic win, we have promo code CHICAGO108 for you. Get $30 off your hotel bookings! 🎉us*).

- Posts referencing other media channels of the tour operator (Cross-references) (e.g. *It's the most wonderful time of the year 🎄☕ ••• visit our website for a #winter surprise!*).

- Posts commenting on the accompanying picture (Comments). These comments are rather general (e.g. *There are some moments on holiday that you just have to stop to capture...*).

- Other posts including a range of contents that represent almost single instances (Other) (e.g. *Everybody breathe. You've officially made it through the first working week of 2017 *high five**).

Table 2 illustrates the percentual distribution of each group of post in each operator and in the whole corpus. Percentages have been calculated from the number of posts in each (sub-)corpus.[9]

| | TC | HOT | LMT | FB Tourism corpus |
|---|---|---|---|---|

---

[9] HOT included a few posts composed of a picture and a link, but no text. Hence, the figures in the HOT column do not sum up to 100.

| Destinations | 52.15 | 67.14 | 45.16 | 53.37 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tips | 1.23 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.61 |
| Catalogues | 0.00 | 1.43 | 0.00 | 0.31 |
| Testimonials | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.08 | 0.31 |
| Season's greetings | 0.00 | 1.43 | 0.00 | 0.31 |
| Celebrations | 3.07 | 4.29 | 2.15 | 3.07 |
| Information | 3.07 | 4.29 | 2.15 | 3.07 |
| Self-reference | 9.82 | 12.86 | 1.08 | 7.98 |
| Surveys | 12.88 | 4.29 | 10.75 | 10.43 |
| Offers | 3.68 | 0.00 | 13.98 | 5.83 |
| Cross-references | 0.00 | 0.00 | 8.60 | 2.45 |
| Comments | 7.36 | 0.00 | 11.83 | 7.06 |
| Other | 6.75 | 4.29 | 3.23 | 5.21 |

**Table 2.** Percentual distribution of posts in the corpus and across operators

The most frequent type of post – in the whole corpus as well as in each sub-corpus – is Destinations (53.37%), with local percentages ranging from 45.16% to 67.14%. However, Destinations cover only about half of the overall number of posts. The remaining half is composed of: Surveys (10.43%); Self-references (7.98%); Comments (7.06%); Offers (5.83%); Other (5.21%); Celebrations (3.07%); and Information (3.07%). All these categories appear in at least two operators. The remaining categories can be considered non-representative of the contents of Facebook pages, since they either appear only in one sub-corpus – Tips appears in TC only; Catalogues in HOT only; Testimonials and Cross-references exclusively in LMT – or show very small percentages, often close to zero.

These data therefore suggest that generalised and budget tour operators use their Facebook pages for a wider range of functions compared to other operators in the tourism industry, such as Destination Management Organisations (Hays, Page and Buhalis 2013), or luxury tour operators (Bianchi 2017). In comparison to the latter, the tour operators under investigation here also seem to use non-destination posts for a rather different set of aims (Bianchi 2017). However, the classes of post identified in the current experiment show an interesting degree of similarity to the categories of posts observed by Leung, Schuckert and Yeung (2013) in their analysis of the Facebook pages of three low-cost airlines.

### 3.3 Phase three: analysing the pictures in the posts

As shown in Table 3, the majority of posts (68.4%) are accompanied by single photos. This is the case in each of the three sub-corpora. The second most frequent form of visual accompaniment is a video (20.55%). Under the term 'video' I here subsume all forms of non-static images. Videos are used by all the operators considered, and are particularly frequent in TC (33.13%). Furthermore, in 7.67% of cases the post is accompanied by multiple photos (either presented as a sort of slide show or creating a single patchwork image). This technique, however, is attested in two operators only, i.e. TC and HOT. Finally, a small percentage of posts are text-only (3.37%).

| | TC | HOT | LMT | FB Tourism corpus |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Single photo (%) | 53.99 | 78.57 | 86.02 | 68.40 |
| Multiple photos (%) | 9.82 | 12.86 | 0.00 | 7.67 |
| Video (%) | 33.13 | 8.57 | 7.53 | 20.55 |
| No image (%) | 3.07 | 0.00 | 6.45 | 3.37 |

**Table 3.** Types of images accompanying posts

These percentages are similar to those observed by Mariani, Di Felice and Mura (2016) in their analysis of the Facebook pages of Italian regional Destination Management Organisations; an exception, however, is TC, as it shows a greater percentage of videos and a smaller percentage of images. At the same time, the current

corpus shows a greater percentage of videos and a lower percentage of images than the luxury corpus analysed in Bianchi (2017).

Let us now consider images with reference to the posts' content categories. Given the percentages observed in Table 2, Destinations will be considered on their own (Table 4; a total of 174 posts), and the other posts will be collected into a single group (Table 5; a total of 152 posts). Videos will be analysed in a separate paragraph. As regards Destinations (Table 4), the large majority of posts includes conceptual images. This is true in the entire corpus (79.71%) as well as in each sub-corpus (with values ranging from 65.12% in HOT to as much as 91.07% in TC). Within these conceptual images, the largest group presents symbolic suggestive processes (78.18% in the whole corpus; from 60.71% in HOT to as many as 88.24% in TC). The second most frequent type of conceptual image portrays classificational processes (10.91% in the whole corpus; from 5.88% in TC to 21.43% in HOT). Analytical processes and symbolic attributive processes, though present, are scarcely represented (only 5.45% and 2.73% respectively, if we consider the whole corpus).

| | TC | HOT | LMT | FB Tourism corpus |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Narrative (%) | 8.93 | 34.88 | 20.51 | 20.29 |
| Conceptual – All subtypes (%) | 91.07 | 65.12 | 79.49 | 79.71 |
|    Classificational | 5.88 | 21.43 | 9.68 | 10.91 |
|    Analytical | 0.00 | 10.71 | 9.68 | 5.45 |
|    Symbolic suggestive | 88.24 | 60.71 | 77.42 | 78.18 |
|    Symbolic attributive | 1.96 | 3.57 | 3.23 | 2.73 |

**Table 4.** Posts advertising destinations – Images

An example of symbolic suggestive process is provided in Figure 1, belonging to the TC sub-corpus.



**Fig. 1.** Example of a symbolic suggestive image accompanying a destination post

The scene in Figure 1 is dominated by a bright light illuminating a lake, a mountain range in the backdrop, and the sky – the three elements all playing with different shades of blue and gradually blending into each other. The man standing at the centre of the picture has his back to the viewer and is very small compared to the vastness of the panorama. Just like the viewer, he cannot but stand still and awe at the beautiful scene. The man is standing on a trunk. This latter is perfectly centred, runs vertically with respect to the base of the picture and is so bright that it can hardly be identified as such, which denies its hypothetically possible role as a vector. The image thus suggests uncontaminated natural beauty and positive feelings such as tranquillity.

Figure 2 is an example of classificational process from the TC sub-corpus.



**Fig. 2.** Example of a classificational image accompanying a destination post

The picture in Figure 2 has all the salient features of classificational images. The participants – two young girls, in this case – appear right at the centre of the picture and are displayed in exactly the same posture. They are both looking directly at the camera (and the observer) and smiling. The backdrop is the green water of a sandy beach. The image is perfectly symmetrical and totally de-contextualised; it could have been taken on any beach in the world. The two girls are representative of happy children from happy families on holiday.

Let us now consider the posts performing functions other than promoting a specific destination, considered as a single group (Table 5). As with Destinations, conceptual images are the most frequent class of pictures. However, percentages are much lower than in Table 4 and range from 50% in TC to 68.29% in LMT, with 58% being the value in the entire FB Tourism corpus. The most frequent conceptual images are of a symbolic nature (from 66.67% in HOT to 80.95% in TC, and a good 74.14% considering the entire corpus), with a tendency towards a predominance of the symbolic suggestive type, at least in the entire corpus (58.62%) and in the TC and LMT sub-corpora (76.19% and 53.57%, respectively). On the whole, however, the data in Table 5 show a more varied distribution of classes of images than the data in Table 4. In particular, this group of posts is characterised by a significantly high percentage of narrative images, going from 31.71% in LMT to as much as 50% in TC, and a good 42% in the entire FB Tourism corpus. Analysing the distribution of image classes across the different types of posts included in this group does not make much sense from a statistical perspective, as raw figures are very small. However, it is interesting to observe that narrative images are spread across several types of posts in all three sub-corpora, and no single type of post seems to be specifically rich or void of narrative images.

|  | TC | HOT | LMT | FB Tourism corpus |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Narrative (%) | 50.00 | 47.06 | 31.71 | 42.00 |
| Conceptual – All subtypes (%) | 50.00 | 52.94 | 68.29 | 58.00 |
|     Classificational | 9.52 | 11.11 | 21.43 | 15.52 |
|     Analytical | 9.52 | 22.22 | 7.14 | 10.34 |
|     Symbolic suggestive | 76.19 | 33.33 | 53.57 | 58.62 |
|     Symbolic attributive | 4.76 | 33.33 | 17.86 | 15.52 |
|     [Symbolic (suggestive + attributive)] | 80.95 | 66.67 | 71.43 | 74.14 |

**Table 5.** All posts except Destinations – Images

Picture 3 provides an example of a narrative image. It features two participants and two vectors. One vector is the girl's arm in the foreground, extending diagonally into the water; the other is represented by the paddle in the hands of the second girl, which enters the water to the girl's left. The girls are clearly smiling. The picture narrates the action of paddling a kayak and enjoying it. This picture accompanies a survey that reads *"We had wet bums for the rest of the day, but it was so worth it!" What do you remember about your first time on a boat?*



**Fig. 3.** Example of a narrative image from the corpus

Finally, as seen in Table 3, a prominent role is played by 'videos', a category subsuming a range of different forms of non-static visual elements. These are equally present in posts promoting destinations and in the other classes of posts considered as a group, with a slight preference for this type of image in non-destination posts, as shown in Table 6.

| | TC | HOT | LMT | FB Tourism corpus |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Destination posts (%) | 48.15 | 33.33 | 28.57 | 44.78 |
| Other posts (%) | 51.85 | 66.67 | 71.43 | 55.22 |

**Table 6.** Distribution of videos across posts

This array of non-static images is interesting for the characteristics that are common to all of them rather than for their technical differences. The non-static images observed in the FB Tourism corpus include:
A. 360-degree photos, in which the viewers can move their visual perspective by moving the mouse.
B. Very short videos showing a single action (e.g. splashing in the water from a platform) over and over again.
C. Videos showing tourists engaged in activities such as dancing on the beach, walking in a town centre, or doing aerobics in sea water.
D. Slide shows or video sequences of towns or other places, accompanied by text, typically the name of the town or country portrayed.
E. Slide shows or video sequences solely containing written text that scrolls in front of the viewer, right in the middle of the image.
Despite their differences, all these videos have a common feature: they consider the reader and prospective client as an active agent and, directly or indirectly, try to involve them in some kind of action. Types B and C show tourists performing actions, thus inviting the readers to identify themselves with the people in the images. Types A, D, and E invite the readers to perform an action (browse the photo, or read the text).

### 3.4 Phase four: keyword analysis of destination posts

The current corpus was compared to two sub-sets of the BNC and to two corpora focussing on tourism communication on the web. Four keyword lists including positive keywords only have been compiled (lists A, B, C, D; see Appendices). Keywords always provide information on the 'aboutness' of a corpus; but this is not the only insight they may offer. A comparison with the BNC (keyword lists A and B) may highlight peculiar features of the posts under analysis with respect to everyday language and suggest the positioning of the current texts in the written-spoken/formal-informal continuum. A comparison with the Website corpus (keyword list C) and the LUX-DEST corpus (keyword list D) may highlight specificities of the posts under investigation with respect to on-line tourism promotion. In these analyses, the functions of the keywords were established by reading their concordance lines.

### 3.4.1 Aboutness

As mentioned in Section 2, the Destinations sub-corpus was specifically created to include only posts promoting destinations. The four keyword lists all confirm that the posts revolve around tourism and tourism promotion. In fact, they all include a large set of items related to tourism and travelling:
- Names of famous holiday destinations (e.g. all lists: *Disney/Walt_Disney; New_York; Cape_Verde*; *Cyprus*; *Tenerife, Fuerteventura;* lists A and B: *Disneyland_Paris*; *San_Francisco*; *New_York_city/New_York_State*; *Hawaii*; *Gran_Canaria*; *Majorca*; *Lapland*; *L.A*; *Kaikoura*; *Cancun*; *Canary_Island*; *Bahamas*).
- Types of destinations (e.g. lists A and B: *city*; *beaches/beach*; *cruise*; *hotel*; *island*, *resort*; *h10_ocean; 5\**; *med* for 'Club-med'; list C: *hotel*; *h10_ocean*; *5\**; list D: *city*).
- General terms indicating holidays and holiday activities (e.g. lists A and B: *holiday*; *destinations*; *vacation*; *traveling*; *getaway*; *visit*; *relax*; *discover; swimming_pools; TrafalgarTravel*; *stay; festive;* lists C and D: *swimming-pools; pools; festive*).
- Natural beauty (e.g. list A: *view/views*; *sunsets*; *scenery*; *sun; outdoor;* list C: *sun*; list D: *sunsets*).
- Terms indicating offer, payment and/or booking (e.g. list A: *deposit*; *direct_debit; 25pp*; list B: 2*5pp*; list C: *deposit; direct_debit; 25pp; book; deals*; list D: *deals, deposit*).

As expected, the best term of comparison to establish aboutness is the BNC. However, it is interesting to observe that even the other two corpora would have allowed a researcher unaware of the contents of the corpus to establish its relation to tourism and tourism promotion.

### 3.4.2 Comparison with the *BNC*

A careful look at the two keyword lists obtained by comparison with the BNC shows that as many as 93 keywords are common to the two lists, which corresponds to 80% of list A and 70% of list B. Besides describing the aboutness of the texts (see Section 3.4.1), these common keywords illustrate features that have been extensively found in and considered typical of tourism promotion (see Section 1.1):
- Direct dialogue with the readers: *your*; *yourself*; *our*; *youre*; *youd*; as well as interrogative expressions *looking_for* and *whats*.
- Euphoria terms: *perfect*; *definitely*; *beautiful*; *stunning*; *best; top_5.*
- Reference to a magical dimension: *wonderland*.
- Reference to discovery and adventure: *adventure*; *discover*.
- Expressions of social control: *explore*; *discover*; *experience; find_out*; *visit*, *fall_in_love*, *treat* (*yourself to*); *Cant* (standing for 'can't').
- Ego-targeting techniques: *your*; *yourself*; *our*; *youre*; *youd*; *explore*; *discover*, *experience; find_out*; *visit*; *fall_in_love*; *favourite/favorite* (always embedded in sentences like *[which one's]/[what's] your favourite XXX?* or *Number X is our favourite whats yours?*).
- Metaphors: *wonderland* (magical dimension); *immerse* (immersion); *gems* (preciousness).
- Attempts to engage readers in immediate action: *take_a_look*; *check_out*; *tag*.
- Deictics: *heres* (standing for "here's").

Of the remaining common keywords, the following are of particular interest: *views/view*; *sunsets*; *scenery*. In her analysis of British websites promoting local tourist destinations, Maci (2012) observed that these were described by mentioning their physical and cultural features. In our data, on the other hand, it seems that

destinations are described by making reference to natural elements with an evocative power – e.g. *beautiful/picturesque/stunning scenery*; *beautiful/great view* and even more frequently *stunning/fabulous/undisturbed/sparkling/breathtaking views [of XXX];* and *sunsets*. Finally, a few keywords – *blogger*, *Anna* (the name of the blogger), *tag*, and *Instagram* – hint at the social nature of the web.

Let us now consider keywords that are unique to each list.

The unique keywords of list A (vs. BNC Written Informal) include primarily function words (54.5% of the unique items): *you*; *n't*; *what*; *why*; *'s*; *'ve*; *yours*; *want*; *get*; *here*; *do*; *'re*. They also include phrasal verbs: *go_on*; *miss_out* (9% of the unique items). These particular function words, as well as phrasal verbs in general, are frequent in informal communication (Biber et al. 1999). The remaining items include the following words: *time*; *stuck*; *stay*; and *take*. *Stay* and *take* are once more expressions of social control; in fact, they are used in imperative forms (*Stay at XXX*; *Take in the newest addition*; *Take a little break*; *Take a long stroll*), or negative interrogatives (*why not stay at XXX*). *Take* is also used as a request for immediate action: *Take our/this quiz*. Finally, though not providing clear indications of a difference between the current corpus and general language, *time* and *stuck* have very interesting collocational profiles which contribute to the description of the corpus under analysis. *Time* shows a few interesting profiles: it is used to spur the reader to act (*it's [the perfect] time [of year] to [find out]/[explore]*; *it's time you [took your family]/[got yourself to]*); and to define the holiday (*perfect for family time; want a good time; craving some 'me' time; enjoy some quality time*). *Stuck* is used with an unusually positive prosody: *a range of activities to get stuck into*; *With year-round sunshine and a song that's stuck in everyone 's head, it's not hard to see why Miami is a holiday favorite*; *you'll never be stuck for choice on where to make a splash*!.

The unique keywords in list B (vs. BNC spoken) include virtually no function words, the only exceptions being *to* and *with*. The remaining unique keywords belong to categories that we have already observed above:

- Euphoria terms: *filled* (*with*).
- Reference to a magical dimension: *magical*; *dream*; *enchanting*.
- Reference to discovery and adventure: *discover*; *venture*.
- Expressions of social control: *step*. Always followed by a number, this word indicates a series of suggestions (e.g: *Step 1: Find a friend; Step 2: Grab a boat; Step 3: […]*).
- Evocative descriptions: *luxury/luxurious*; *picturesque*; *iconic*; *stunning/spectacular/undisturbed* (*sea views*).

The presence in list A (vs. BNC Written Informal) of positive keywords that are typical of informal communication and the absence of the same or similar words in list B (vs. BNC Spoken) suggest that the posts under analysis, despite being written texts, are closer to spoken communication rather than written informal communication.

### 3.4.3 Comparison to the Website corpus and the LUX-DEST corpus

Keyword lists C and D have a remarkably high number of words in common (65%). Furthermore, the words that are unique to each list belong to semantic categories that are in common with the other list. In other terms, the two lists provide the same type of information.

The first thing that strikes the eye is a large presence of function words (pronouns, prepositions, auxiliary verbs, etc.), amounting to 24% in list C, and 33% in list D. Significantly, these function words include: first and second person pronouns (*we, us; you, yourself*); negations (*not, n't*); affirmative exclamations (*yes*); and *wh* words (*what, why; how; whats* for 'what's'; of these, 61.75-64.8% are interrogative pronouns). These express of a direct dialogue between writers and readers. Indicators of direct dialogue are also found among the content words in our lists: adjectives *yours* and *our*; and verbs in the imperative form (*take_a_look*; *find_out*; *tell*; *book*; *visit*; *take*).

As regards content words, nouns, verbs and adjectives in the two lists lead to the following considerations:
- These posts advertise primarily countries, islands, or towns (20 occurrences for a total of 61 tokens in list C; 11 occurrences for a total of 61 tokens in list D), rather than specific hotel structures (5 occurrences for a total of 19 tokens in list C; no occurrences in list D).
- Destinations are rarely described with reference to their facilities (keywords: *pool/pools; swimming-pools*; 13 token in list C and 9 tokens in list D) or attractions (list D keywords: *bridge; chocolate*; 6 tokens), but much more frequently in evocative terms (list C keywords: *definitely*; *perfect*, *love*; *favourite*; *festive*; *fun*; 70 tokens; list D keywords: *definitely, favourite; love; good; filled; festive; fun; sunsets; lights; perfect;* 79 tokens). In list

D, there are also prominent references to the ideal target market (keywords: *family; all; suit;* 30 tokens). Finally, in both lists the offer is presented as all-inclusive (keyword: *inclusive;* 3 tokens) or depicted as a real bargain (keyword: *deals*; 3 tokens).

- Offers are generally not detailed in terms of price, advantages or deadlines, except for rare references to deposits (keywords: *deposit* and *25pp*; 3 tokens in both lists) or methods of payment (keyword: *direct_debit* in list C; 2 tokens).

- Some of the keywords indicate references to the image or link accompanying the post (in both lists: *take a look; reasons; quiz; these*, for a total of 35 tokens*;* in list D only: *number*, 4 tokens).

- Perspective clients are constantly spurred to act or express opinions (in both lists: *take_a_look; would; go_on; looking_for; tag*; (why) *not*; *'d* (*you rather*); *give; want; treat* (*yourself*); *tell;* (*what are you*) *waiting* (for?), 96 tokens; in list C only: *find_out; book*; 15 tokens; list D only: *visit; go; venture; say; take*, 35 tokens).

- Two connected keywords highlight the social role of Facebook (keywords: *friend; tag*).

The features described above strongly differentiate non-luxury from luxury-tour operators (see also Bianchi 2017). However, they also suggest other considerations.

From a marketing perspective, second person pronouns and adjectives, plus imperative verbs, are ego-targeting techniques (Dann 1996), frequently observed in tourism promotion in general and on the web in particular (e.g. Pierini 2008; Manca 2017). Noticeably, the presence of second person pronouns and adjectives was observed and considered a key factor by Manca (2017), in her analysis of the promotional websites of national tourism boards based on a corpus that partially overlaps with the Website corpus used in this study for the creation of keyword list C. It is remarkable, then, that in list C second person pronouns and adjectives appear to be key. Furthermore, my corpus includes a fairly high percentage of first-person pronouns and adjectives (*we/us/our*); these are also found in website promotion, but in generally smaller proportions (Manca 2017). On the whole, these facts and the ample number of features expressing direct interaction with readers render the writer-reader relationship the most prominent feature distinguishing Facebook promotional posts from web promotion on websites. This feature will be further investigated in Section 3.5.

Another remarkable observation in this study is the similarity between lists C and D. This indirectly suggests that the way luxury tour operators make use of Facebook does not substantially diverge from the ways standard promotional websites are used.

### 3.5 Phase five: analysing dialogue between operators and readers/prospective clients

This section analyses the frequency and distribution of some linguistic features that may help us to identify the way operators address their prospective clients. These features are: first and second person pronouns and adjectives *we/us/our/you/your/yours*; imperative verbs; and interrogative forms. Given the frequency of the various types of posts (Section 3.2, Table 2), analyses were performed on destination posts on the one hand (174 posts), and all the other posts considered as a single group on the other (152 posts).

Table 7 summarises the frequency percentages of the features investigated, calculated from the overall number of words of each operator. Very few occurrences of *I/me* referred to the clients rather than the operator, and these were excluded from the calculations. Table 8 shows the percentage of posts characterised by the presence of the features under analysis.

| Frequency (%) | Destination posts | | | | Other posts | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | we/us/our | you/your/yours | all pron.s | V. imp. | we/us/our | you/your/yours | all pron.s | V. imp. |
| TC | 1.76 | 3.91 | 5.67 | 3.1 | 4.21 | 4.75 | 8.96 | 2.19 |
| HOT | 2.24 | 3.25 | 5.49 | 2.01 | 1.63 | 4.5 | 6.13 | 3.28 |
| LMT | 1.09 | 3.93 | 5.02 | 5.17 | 14.81 | 4.93 | 19.74 | 5.05 |
| FB Tourism corpus average | 1.7 | 3.7 | 5.39 | 3.43 | 6.88 | 4.73 | 11.61 | 3.51 |

**Table 7.** Frequency percentages of features related to operators/readers dialogue, calculated from the overall number of words of each operator

| Distribution across posts (%) | Destination posts | | | | Other posts | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pron.s | Imper. | Interr. | No features | Pron.s | Imper. | Interr. | No features |
| TC | 81.18 | 50.59 | 67.06 | 3.53 | 92.31 | 52.56 | 52.56 | 5.13 |
| HOT | 57.45 | 29.79 | 38.30 | 23.40 | 73.91 | 26.09 | 56.52 | 13.04 |
| LMT | 47.62 | 64.29 | 26.19 | 14.29 | 74.51 | 45.10 | 29.41 | 19.61 |
| FB Tourism corpus average | 62.00 | 48.22 | 43.46 | 13.74 | 80.24 | 41.25 | 45.74 | 12.59 |

**Table 8.** Percentual distribution of features related to operators/readers dialogue, calculated from the number of posts

Table 8 shows that the linguistic elements considered are a recurrent feature in the Facebook communication of these tour operators. In fact, in destination posts, pronouns appear in 62% of cases, imperative forms in over 48%, and interrogatives in over 43%. In non-destination posts, pronouns appear in over 80% of cases, imperative forms in over 41%, and interrogatives in over 45%.

Destination posts differ from non-destination ones primarily in terms of the use of pronouns: in the latter group, first and second person pronouns are much more frequent (+115%) and much more widely distributed across posts (+29.5%). This holds true for all the operators considered, although in different proportions. As table 7 shows, this is due to a generally more frequent use of second person pronouns (+27.8%), but above all of *we/us* (+304.7%). A look at individual sub-corpora, however, suggests that this should be considered with care, since there are marked differences in the use of first person pronouns in the three operators, especially in non-destination posts. Differences between the two groups of posts at the level of imperative forms and interrogative forms are less clear-cut.

Let us now see how these linguistic features are used in the promotion of destinations. All the examples are taken from the FB Tourism corpus; they are intended to be illustrative of the explanation and are not exhaustive of the formulations found in the corpus.

A manual analysis of concordance lines of imperative forms (POS tags VV0, VD0, VB0, VH0) in the destination posts showed that they are used for a wide range of communicative functions.

Imperatives are primarily employed to invite users to go beyond the post and acquire more information by looking at the pictures, clicking on the link, or reading further, as examples [1]-[3] illustrate:

[1] *Take a look [at]/[around]*

[2] F*ind out where you should [venture off]/[take your lover/family]*

[3] *Check out XXX*

They are also widely used to describe the travel experience in terms of an adventure ([4]) or the results of the travel experience ([5]-[10]):

[4] *[discover]/[explore] the world/[name_of_destination] through*

[5] *[prepare to] fall in love with [name_of_destination]*

[6] *get lost in [name_of_destination]*

[7] *[make yourself at home]/ [treat yourself] at [name_of_destination]*

[8] *have the best of XXX*

[9] *enjoy [luxury][some quality time]*

[10] *make your next holiday [luxurious] [magical]*

Furthermore, imperatives largely serve to spur users to go on holiday; this is achieved by using encouraging phrases such as [11]-[13], or by suggesting the need for a holiday ([14]-[15]):

[11] *[Go]/[go ahead]/[go on] + invitation to visit/enjoy XXX*

[12] *don't be shy*

[13] *have no fear*

[14] *[take a little break]/[treat yourself to a city break]*

[15] *[give yourself a treat]*

Finally, imperatives are largely employed to suggest activities that travellers can do on the given holiday ([16]-[21]):

[16] *Grab a boat*

[17] *[Venture upstate]/[Wander XXX]*

[18] *Take a stroll down XXX*

[19] *Cruise from XXX to YYY*

[20] H*ang loose*

[21] *Ride XXX*

Other important functions performed by imperatives in destination posts invite users to perform social media actions ([22]-[23]), take a quiz ([24]), or take part in a survey ([25]):

[22] *Tag [someone]/[a friend]*

[23] *Share your best XXX*

[24] *Take [this]/[our] quiz*

[25] *Tell us [which]/[where]*

Finally, a minority of imperatives illustrate the advantages of reserving the given holiday with the current operator ([26]-[28]), directly invite users to reserve now ([29]-[30]) or to reach the specific destination ([31]-[32]):

[26] *[Save]/[Get] [NN% off]/[more bang for your bucks]*

[27] *Skip the queue with XXX*

[28] *Make life easier with a deposit from as little as NN*

[29] *Book today*

[30] *Secure your holiday with a small deposit now*

[31] *Give XXX [a try]/[a visit]*

[32] *Visit XXX [today]*

A look at concordance lines of first person plural pronouns and adjectives (POS tags APPGE, PPIS1, PPIS2, PPIO1, PPIO2, PPY) may tell us how tour operators perceive themselves and their prospective customers.

In the current corpus, tour operators often present themselves as being on a par with their customers ([33]-[37]):

[33] *we have [found]/[heard] that XXX is*

[34] *we can't [decide]/[resist]*

[35] *we [love]/[think that] XXX is*

[36] *we [are so excited]/[can almost taste the long weekend]*

[37] *XXX surprised us*

However, they also present themselves as suggestion givers ([38]-[40]), owners of unique destinations and offers ([41]-[43]), and information providers ([44]):

[38] *our [favourite] [top] [destination][time]*

[39] *we think XXX*

[40] *our best tips*

[41] *we ['ve got]/[have in store for you]*

[42] *we're giving you the chance to*

[43] *our [name_of_destination]*

[44] *our [blog]/[brochures]/[Instagram story]*

Finally, they sometimes present themselves as interlocutors in a virtual conversation ([45]):

[45] *[tell]/[share with] us*

At the same time, tour operators perceive users/prospective clients primarily as customers with specific tastes, feelings, and desires:

[46] *would/n't you [rather]/[love/like to]/[choose]*

[47] *you would like to*

[48] *your [bucket list]/[with list]*

[49] *you wish you were*

[50] *your favourite/dream destinations*

This perspective is connected to other dialogic approaches, according to which clients are seen as suggestion receivers ([51]) whose needs are well known to the travel agent ([52]) and who will receive tailor-made offers ([53]):

[51] *you [should]/[can]/[don't want to miss]/[might want to]*

[52] *you [definitely can't miss]/[won't be disappointed/regret]/[deserve]*

[53] *is [right]/[the perfect place] for you*

Furthermore, customers are treated as great travellers ([54]) and holiday makers ([55]) who know the world well ([56]):

[54] *(how many of these places) have you [been to]/[taken a selfie]?*

[55] *your next [holiday]/[getaway]/[vacation]*

[56] *can you guess / did you know*

Some phrases are specifically there to make the client feel special ([57]-[58]), or to spur them to set off ([59]-[60]):

[57] *(we) [can make this happen]/[have in store]/[share] [for]/[with] you*

[58] *lucky for you*

[59] *Are you ready?*

[60] *What are you waiting for?*

Finally, the adjective *your* collocates primarily with categories of people ([61]), places ([62]), or concrete aspects of the travel experience ([63]):

[61] *your [family]/[partner]/[friends]/[little ones]*

[62] *your (favourite/dream) [destination]/[location]/[spot]*

[63] *your [booking]/[flight]/[hotel suit]*


## 4. Conclusions

The current paper has described six months of Facebook posts by three large international tour operators based in English-speaking countries. The posts were analysed in terms of the type of post and the multimodal features in the posts. Furthermore, the posts promoting destinations were qualitatively and quantitatively analysed through corpus linguistics methods.

Corpus analyses have shown that the posts under investigation, despite being written texts, are closer to spoken communication rather than written informal communication. Keyword analyses have also shown an ample presence of linguistic and rhetorical techniques that are described in the literature as typical of tourism promotion. These include: direct dialogue with the readers; euphoria terms; reference to a magical dimension; reference to discovery and adventure; expressions of social control; ego-targeting techniques; metaphors; attempts to engage readers in immediate action; and deictics. However, the current text type differs from other web-based types of tourism promotion because it shows an explicit presence of the tourism operator (first-person pronouns and adjectives) and a much greater degree of direct involvement of the reader (second-person pronouns and adjectives; imperative verbs and questions).

The tourism operators considered in the current study seem to have understood that social media marketing is based on building relationships and shaping conversation, and they prove to be expert conversation managers who have developed strategies to influence conversation (Gretzel and Yoo 2014). On their Facebook pages, these tour operators are suggestion givers, owners of unique destinations and offers, and information providers, but also interlocutors in a virtual conversation. Furthermore, they often present themselves as being on a par with their customers. They make the readers feel that the tour operator knows their personal needs and desires and that the services they will receive are tailored to their needs. The conversations are shaped to make the tastes, feelings and desires of prospective clients appear central. Some phrases are specifically there to make the client feel special. Furthermore, customers are treated as great travellers and holiday makers who know the world well.

The non-linguistic elements in the posts, analysed in Section 3.1, concur to create a friendly atmosphere (use of emoticons) and to engage users in a continuous dialogue (links with further information; quizzes; direct questions or requests; surveys). Not surprisingly, then, Surveys is the second most frequent type of post after Destinations. Even a relevant number of photos and videos are interactive and invite the readers to perform an action (browse the photo or read the text). Alternatively, videos show tourists performing actions, which not only invites readers to identify themselves with the people in the images, but also gives prospective clients the feeling of already being on holiday.

The linguistic and non-linguistic features found and described in the current study have also been observed in Facebook posts of other types of tourism-service suppliers (Section 1.3), but it is noticeable that they are markedly and substantially different from those observed in the Facebook pages of luxury tour operators

(Bianchi 2017). A comparison between the current results and previous empirical studies (Sections 1.1 and 1.3) suggests that promotional strategies and thus 'the language of tourism' varies, not only from culture to culture (as shown by Manca, see Section 1.1), but also depending on the text type (e.g. website vs. Facebook page), tourism service provider (e.g. hotel chains vs. tour operators) and target (e.g. luxury vs. non-luxury tour operator).

### 4.1. Limitations of current study and perspectives for future research

The corpus used in the current study was comprised of six months of Facebook posts by operators based in the UK, the USA and New Zealand. This corpus, though not very large, was enough to draw interesting conclusions on Facebook pages as a promotional genre in the tourism industry. The corpus, however, was not large enough to permit a detailed analysis of non-destination posts. Linguistic analyses of non-destination posts would add important information to a description of the Facebook page as a specific promotional medium. Furthermore, given the role that national culture has in shaping the language of tourist promotion, for a more precise view of the general picture, the Facebook pages of tourist operators based in different countries should be compared to each other. Indeed, in the current study, some quantitative differences were observed among the operators considered. For a meaningful cultural comparison, however, a much larger corpus would be needed, including more than one operator per country and possibly also more than three months of posts per operator.

### Acknowledgments

### Works cited

Bianchi, Francesca. "Strategie promozionali degli operatori turistici del lusso in Facebook." *Lingue e Linguaggi* 20, Special Issue (2017): 239-271.

Biber, Douglas, et al. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Longman, 1999.

Cappelli, Gloria. "The translation of tourism-related websites and localization: problems and perspectives." *RILA Rassegna Italiana di Linguistica Applicata* XL.3 (2008): 97-155.

---. "Travelling words: Languaging in English tourism discourse." *Travels and Translations*. Edited by Alison Yarrington, Stefano Villani and Julia Kelly. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2013. 353-374.

Carr, Caleb T., David B. Schrock, and Patricia Dauterman,. "Speech Acts Within Facebook Status Messages." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 31.2 (2012): 176-196.

Cesiri, Daniela. "Promoting Venice through digital travel guidebooks: a case study of texts written in English and in Italian." *Cultus* 9.1 (2016): 49-67.

---. "Representing Venice's local culture to international tourists: the use of the 'languaging' technique in websites in English." *Annali di Ca' Foscari. Serie occidentale* 51 (2017): 195-216.

---. and Colaci, Laura A. "The Construction of a Country's Image for the Expo 2015 Event: The Case of English and German Websites." *Discourse, Communication and the Enterprise* VIII (DICOEN VIII). Newcastle-Upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, in press.

D'Andrea, Giulia. "Linguistic notes on French music tourism. The case of La Fugue website." *Tourism and Tourist Promotion around the World. A Linguistic and Socio-Cultural Perspective*. Edited by Elena Manca and Francesca Bianchi. Lecce: Università del Salento, 2013. 95-108.

Dann, Graham. *The language of tourism. A sociolinguistic perspective*. Wallingford: CAB International, 1996.

Ernawati, Diyah Bekti. "The techniques of the language of tourism." *Jurnal Ilmiah Pariwisata* 42.2 (2001): 61-67.

Fischer-Starcke, Bettina. *Corpus Linguistics in Literary Analysis. Jane Austen and her contemporaries*. London and New York: Continuum, 2010.

Francesconi, Sabrina. *Reading Tourism Texts: a Multimodal Analysis*. Bristol: Channel View Publications,

2014.

Gabrielatos, Costas and Anna Marchi. "Keyness: Matching metrics to definitions. Corpus Linguistics in the South: Theoretical-methodological challenges in corpus approaches to discourse studies - and some ways of addressing them." University of Portsmouth, 5 November 2011. http://eprints.lancs.ac.uk/51449/. Accessed 5 March 17.

Garside, Roger and Nicholas Smith. "A hybrid grammatical tagger: CLAWS4." *Corpus Annotation: Linguistic Information from Computer Text Corpora*. Edited by Roger Garside, Geoffrey Leech and Anthony Mark McEnery. London: Longman, 1997. 102-121.

Gotti, Maurizio. "The language of tourism as specialized discourse." *Translating Tourism: Linguistic/Cultural Respresentations*. Edited by Oriana Palusci and Sabrina Francesconi. Trento: Università degli Studi di Trento, 2006. 15-34.

Gretzel, Ulrike and Kyung-Hyan Yoo. "Premises and promises of social media marketing in tourism." *The Routledge Handbook of Tourism Marketing*. Edited by Scott McCabe. London: Routledge, 2014. 491-504.

Hays, Stephanie, Stephen John Page and Dimitrios Buhalis. "Social media as destination marketing tool: its use by national tourism organisations." *Current Issues in Tourism* 16.3 (2013): 211-239.

Huertas, Assumpcio and Estela Marine-Roig. "Differential Destination Content Communication Strategies through Multiple Social Media." *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 2016. Proceedings of the International Conference in Bilbao, Spain, February 2-5, 2016*. Edited by Alessandro Inversini and Roland Schegg. Heidelberg: Springer, 2016. 239-252.

Kress, Gunther, and Theo van Leeuwen. *Reading Images. The Grammar of Visual Design, Second Edition*. London: Routledge, 2006.

Leung, Rosanna, Markus Schuckert and Emmy Yeung. "Attracting User Social Media Engagement: A Study of Three Budget Airlines Facebook Pages." *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 2013. Proceedings of the International Conference in Innsbruck, Austria, January 22-25, 2013*. Edited by Lorenzo Cantoni and Zheng Xiang. Heidelberg: Springer, 2013. 195-206.

Maci, Stefania. "Virtual touring: The Web-language of tourism." *Linguistica e filologia* 25 (2007): 41-65.

---. *The Language of Tourism*. Bergamo: CELSB, 2010.

---. "Click here, book now! Discursive strategies of tourism on the Web." *Textus* XXV.1 (2012): 137-156.

---. *Tourism Discourse: Professional, Promotional and Digital Voices*. Genova: ECIG, 2013.

---. "Perception of perspective? Adjusting the representation of Italy and the UK for the tourist: the Made in Italy and This is Great Britain campaigns." *Cultus* 9.1 (2016): 23-48.

---. "Meaning-making in Web 2.0 Tourism Discourse." *Ways of Seeing, Ways of Being: Representing the Voices of Tourism*. Edited by Maurizio Gotti, Stefania Maci e Michele Sala. Bern: Peter Lang, 2017.

Manca, Elena. "From phraseology to culture: qualifying adjectives in the language of tourism." *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 13.3 (2008): 368-385.

---. "Describing through the five senses. A contrastive socio-cultural and linguistic analysis of Italian and British tourist websites." *Tourism and tourist promotion around the world: a linguistic and socio-cultural perspective*. Edited by Elena Manca and Francesca Bianchi. Lecce: Università del Salento, 2013. 109-124.

---. "Official Tourist Websites and the Cultural Communication Grammar model: analysing language, visuals, and cultural features." *Cultus* 9.1 (2016a): 2-22.

---. *Persuasion in Tourism Discourse. Methodologies and Models*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016b.

---. "Verbal Techniques of the Language of Tourism Across Cultures: An Analysis of Five Official Tourist Websites." *Innovative Perspectives on Tourism Discourse*. Edited by Magdalena Bielenia-Grajewska and Enriqueta Cortes de los Rios. Hershey: IGI Global, 2017. 91-110.

Mariani, Marcello M., Marco Di Felice and Matteo Mura. "Facebook as a destination marketing tool: Evidence from Italian regional Destination Management Organizations." *Tourism Management* 54 (2016): 321-343.

Mattiello, Elisa. "Metaphor in Tourism Discourse: Imagined Worlds in English Tourist Texts on the Web." *Textus* XXV.1 (2012): 69-84.

Minazzi, Roberta. *Social Media Marketing in Tourism and Hospitality*. Cham: Springer, 2015.

---. and Stefan Lagrosen. "Investigating Social Media Marketing in the Hospitality Industry: Facebook and European Hotels." *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 2014. Proceedings of the International Conference in Dublin, Ireland, January 21-24, 2014*. Edited by Xiang Zheng and Tussyadiah lis. Heidelberg: Springer, 2014. 145-157.

O'Connor, Peter. "An analysis of the use of Facebook by International Hotel Chains" *International CHRIE Conference - Refereed Track*, 9, 2011.
http://scholarworks.umass.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1675&context=refereed. Accessed 18 March 2017.

Offutt, Bob, Cathy Schetzina. *PhoCusWright's Travel Innovation & Technology Trends*. 2012 & Beyond, Special Report for World Travel Market, PhoCusWright, 2012.
http://www.ahresp.com/files/articles/20130328_162313_PhoCusWright's%20-%20Special%20Report%20-%20Travel%20Innovation%20&%20Technology,%20Trends%202012%20&%20Beyond.pdf. Accessed 18 March 2017.

Pierini, Patrizia. "Quality in Web translation: An investigation into UK and Italian tourism Web sites." *The Journal of Specialised Translation* 8 (2007): 85-103.

---. "A warm welcome guaranteed – Aspetti dell'inglese nei siti degli enti nazionali per il turismo." *Studi Linguistici e Filologici Online* 6 (2008): 163-202.

Rayson, Paul. *Wmatrix: a web-based corpus-processing environment*. Lancaster: Computing Department, Lancaster University, 2009. http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/wmatrix/. Accessed 10 January 17.

Scott, Mike and Christopher Tribble. *Textual Patterns: Key Words and Corpus Analysis in Language Education*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2006.

Spinzi, Cinzia. "Treading lightly on the Earth. Metaphorical frames in the discourse of ecotourism." *Tourism and Tourist Promotion around the World. A Linguistic and Socio-Cultural Perspective*. Edited by Elena Manca and Francesca Bianchi. Lecce: Università del Salento, 2013. 81-94.

Zouganeli, Stathia, Nikolaos Trihas and Maria Antonaki. "Social media and tourism: the use of Facebook by the European national tourism organizations." *Tourism Today* 11 (2011): 122-140.

Zuliani, Alessandra. "A journey to Portugal. The official tourist promotion of Turismo de Portugal." *Tourism and Tourist Promotion around the World. A Linguistic and Socio-Cultural Perspective*. Edited by Elena Manca and Francesca Bianchi. Lecce: Università del Salento, 2013. 61-80.

**Appendices**

List A. Destinations sub-corpus vs. BNC Sampler Written Informal: Keywords

| Word | Destin. | % | BNC | % | | LL | %DIFF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| You | 89 | 2.28 | 1154 | 0.15 | + | 306.77 | 1370.16 |
| Your | 42 | 1.07 | 643 | 0.09 | + | 132.32 | 1145.14 |
| yourself | 18 | 0.46 | 25 | 0.00 | + | 131.00 | 13625.02 |
| take_a_look | 13 | 0.33 | 3 | 0.00 | + | 121.23 | 82504.28 |
| perfect | 17 | 0.43 | 52 | 0.01 | + | 102.18 | 6131.98 |
| explore | 12 | 0.31 | 16 | 0.00 | + | 88.06 | 14196.89 |
| definitely | 11 | 0.28 | 13 | 0.00 | + | 82.65 | 16029.83 |
| n't | 24 | 0.61 | 329 | 0.04 | + | 80.33 | 1290.58 |
| City | 19 | 0.49 | 160 | 0.02 | + | 80.25 | 2163.67 |
| beaches | 9 | 0.23 | 5 | 0.00 | + | 76.40 | 34212.55 |
| Fun | 11 | 0.28 | 27 | 0.00 | + | 70.18 | 7666.21 |
| holiday | 15 | 0.38 | 99 | 0.01 | + | 69.92 | 2788.26 |
| Love | 13 | 0.33 | 63 | 0.01 | + | 67.76 | 3833.54 |
| Disney | 9 | 0.23 | 12 | 0.00 | + | 66.04 | 14196.90 |
| blogger | 6 | 0.15 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 63.07 | 153374209853095936.00 |
| Anna | 6 | 0.15 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 63.07 | 153374209853095936.00 |

| What | 26 | 0.66 | 651 | 0.09 | + | 59.61 | 661.33 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| find_out | 9 | 0.23 | 20 | 0.00 | + | 58.89 | 8478.14 |
| Why | 15 | 0.38 | 162 | 0.02 | + | 56.63 | 1665.05 |
| looking_for | 10 | 0.26 | 43 | 0.01 | + | 54.22 | 4333.15 |
| cruise | 6 | 0.15 | 2 | 0.00 | + | 54.09 | 57087.57 |
| views | 11 | 0.28 | 63 | 0.01 | + | 54.07 | 3228.38 |
| beautiful | 12 | 0.31 | 90 | 0.01 | + | 53.18 | 2441.67 |
| stunning | 7 | 0.18 | 8 | 0.00 | + | 52.93 | 16579.71 |
| resort | 8 | 0.20 | 17 | 0.00 | + | 52.92 | 8870.60 |
| Fuerteventura | 5 | 0.13 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 52.56 | 127811861587427328.00 |
| favourite | 9 | 0.23 | 41 | 0.01 | + | 47.89 | 4084.46 |
| Visit | 12 | 0.31 | 117 | 0.02 | + | 47.51 | 1855.13 |
| beach | 8 | 0.20 | 27 | 0.00 | + | 46.74 | 5548.16 |
| 's | 63 | 1.61 | 4432 | 0.59 | + | 45.75 | 170.97 |
| Place | 14 | 0.36 | 202 | 0.03 | + | 45.58 | 1221.17 |
| Hotel | 10 | 0.26 | 75 | 0.01 | + | 44.32 | 2441.67 |
| Best | 15 | 0.38 | 262 | 0.04 | + | 43.76 | 991.37 |
| 've | 9 | 0.23 | 57 | 0.01 | + | 42.62 | 2909.87 |
| San_Francisco | 4 | 0.10 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 42.04 | 102249487551954944.00 |
| check_out | 5 | 0.13 | 3 | 0.00 | + | 42.00 | 31670.88 |
| swimming_pools | 5 | 0.13 | 4 | 0.00 | + | 40.23 | 23728.16 |
| Quiz | 4 | 0.10 | 1 | 0.00 | + | 37.05 | 76150.09 |
| go_on | 6 | 0.15 | 17 | 0.00 | + | 36.84 | 6627.95 |
| yours | 5 | 0.13 | 8 | 0.00 | + | 35.32 | 11814.08 |
| Hot | 7 | 0.18 | 39 | 0.01 | + | 34.75 | 3321.48 |
| New_York | 6 | 0.15 | 21 | 0.00 | + | 34.68 | 5346.44 |
| Want | 11 | 0.28 | 169 | 0.02 | + | 34.59 | 1140.76 |
| destinations | 7 | 0.18 | 43 | 0.01 | + | 33.53 | 3003.20 |
| Get | 12 | 0.31 | 228 | 0.03 | + | 33.23 | 903.29 |
| sunsets | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 31.53 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| halloween | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 31.53 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| favorite | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 31.53 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| Hawaii | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 31.53 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| Cape_Verde | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 31.53 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| Tag | 4 | 0.10 | 4 | 0.00 | + | 31.00 | 18962.52 |
| Here | 12 | 0.31 | 259 | 0.03 | + | 30.57 | 783.21 |
| family | 11 | 0.28 | 209 | 0.03 | + | 30.46 | 903.29 |
| Wine | 6 | 0.15 | 32 | 0.00 | + | 30.25 | 3474.22 |
| Our | 22 | 0.56 | 977 | 0.13 | + | 30.06 | 329.25 |
| Do | 18 | 0.46 | 673 | 0.09 | + | 29.40 | 409.84 |
| 're | 7 | 0.18 | 63 | 0.01 | + | 28.73 | 2018.06 |
| island | 6 | 0.15 | 39 | 0.01 | + | 28.13 | 2832.70 |
| whats | 3 | 0.08 | 1 | 0.00 | + | 27.05 | 57087.57 |
| getaway | 3 | 0.08 | 1 | 0.00 | + | 27.05 | 57087.57 |
| New_York_city | 3 | 0.08 | 1 | 0.00 | + | 27.05 | 57087.57 |
| Treat | 5 | 0.13 | 25 | 0.00 | + | 25.78 | 3712.51 |
| World | 14 | 0.36 | 470 | 0.06 | + | 25.28 | 467.82 |
| Cyprus | 3 | 0.08 | 2 | 0.00 | + | 24.82 | 28493.79 |
| outdoor | 4 | 0.10 | 11 | 0.00 | + | 24.76 | 6831.83 |
| festive | 4 | 0.10 | 11 | 0.00 | + | 24.76 | 6831.83 |

| adventure | 4 | 0.10 | 11 | 0.00 | + | 24.76 | 6831.83 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Relax | 4 | 0.10 | 12 | 0.00 | + | 24.18 | 6254.17 |
| Time | 15 | 0.38 | 571 | 0.08 | + | 24.07 | 400.77 |
| discover | 4 | 0.10 | 13 | 0.00 | + | 23.63 | 5765.39 |
| Walt_Disney | 3 | 0.08 | 3 | 0.00 | + | 23.25 | 18962.53 |
| Stay | 6 | 0.15 | 67 | 0.01 | + | 22.29 | 1607.09 |
| Stuck | 3 | 0.08 | 4 | 0.00 | + | 22.01 | 14196.89 |
| deposit | 3 | 0.08 | 4 | 0.00 | + | 22.01 | 14196.89 |
| Tenerife | 3 | 0.08 | 4 | 0.00 | + | 22.01 | 14196.89 |
| scenery | 4 | 0.10 | 17 | 0.00 | + | 21.77 | 4385.30 |
| Take | 10 | 0.26 | 274 | 0.04 | + | 21.41 | 595.71 |
| Sun | 5 | 0.13 | 42 | 0.01 | + | 21.14 | 2169.35 |
| View | 7 | 0.18 | 116 | 0.02 | + | 21.07 | 1050.32 |
| experience | 7 | 0.18 | 116 | 0.02 | + | 21.07 | 1050.32 |
| youre | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Youd | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| wonderland | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| vacation | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| upstate | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| traveling | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| top_5 | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| subway | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| miss_out | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Med | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| immerse | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| ice-cream | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| heres | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| h10_ocean | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| gran_Canaria | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| gems | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| fall_in_love | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| direct_debit | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| cocktails | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| adults-only | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| TrafalgarTravel | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Rocky_Mountaineer | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| New_York_State | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Majorca | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Lapland | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| L.A | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Kaikoura | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Instagram | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Disneyland_Paris | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Cant | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Cancun | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Canary_Island | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Bahamas | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| 5* | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| 25pp | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 21.02 | 51124743775977472.00 |

List B. Destinations sub-corpus vs. BNC Sampler Spoken: Keywords

| Word | Destin. | % | BNC | % | | LL | | %DIFF |
|------|---------|---|-----|---|---|----|--|-------|
| perfect | 17 | 0.43 | 25 | 0.00 | + | 131.54 | | 16981.90 |
| take_a_look | 13 | 0.33 | 3 | 0.00 | + | 128.37 | | 108755.28 |
| City | 19 | 0.49 | 54 | 0.01 | + | 126.87 | | 8738.68 |
| explore | 12 | 0.31 | 1 | 0.00 | + | 125.68 | | 301345.38 |
| beaches | 9 | 0.23 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 99.54 | | 230061349139382272.00 |
| Disney | 9 | 0.23 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 99.54 | | 230061349139382272.00 |
| yourself | 18 | 0.46 | 133 | 0.01 | + | 89.81 | | 3299.76 |
| holiday | 15 | 0.38 | 77 | 0.01 | + | 84.70 | | 4793.59 |
| Resort | 8 | 0.20 | 2 | 0.00 | + | 78.49 | | 100381.80 |
| Views | 11 | 0.28 | 26 | 0.00 | + | 76.84 | | 10527.88 |
| Visit | 12 | 0.31 | 48 | 0.00 | + | 73.06 | | 6180.11 |
| beautiful | 12 | 0.31 | 48 | 0.00 | + | 73.06 | | 6180.11 |
| Fun | 11 | 0.28 | 34 | 0.00 | + | 71.88 | | 8027.21 |
| destinations | 7 | 0.18 | 1 | 0.00 | + | 71.40 | | 175743.14 |
| Pool | 8 | 0.20 | 6 | 0.00 | + | 69.41 | | 33393.93 |
| Hotel | 10 | 0.26 | 28 | 0.00 | + | 67.03 | | 8871.59 |
| beach | 8 | 0.20 | 8 | 0.00 | + | 66.37 | | 25020.45 |
| blogger | 6 | 0.15 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 66.36 | | 153374209853095936.00 |
| stunning | 7 | 0.18 | 5 | 0.00 | + | 61.16 | | 35068.63 |
| Anna | 6 | 0.15 | 1 | 0.00 | + | 60.63 | | 150622.69 |
| Best | 15 | 0.38 | 200 | 0.02 | + | 58.69 | | 1784.03 |
| swimming_pools | 5 | 0.13 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 55.30 | | 127811861587427328.00 |
| Fuerteventura | 5 | 0.13 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 55.30 | | 127811861587427328.00 |
| World | 14 | 0.36 | 196 | 0.02 | + | 53.53 | | 1694.32 |
| cruise | 6 | 0.15 | 4 | 0.00 | + | 52.93 | | 37580.68 |
| favourite | 9 | 0.23 | 41 | 0.00 | + | 52.73 | | 5414.25 |
| definitely | 11 | 0.28 | 93 | 0.01 | + | 52.19 | | 2871.24 |
| Place | 14 | 0.36 | 233 | 0.02 | + | 49.14 | | 1409.38 |
| looking_for | 10 | 0.26 | 86 | 0.01 | + | 47.13 | | 2820.98 |
| island | 6 | 0.15 | 9 | 0.00 | + | 46.24 | | 16646.97 |
| With | 49 | 1.25 | 4031 | 0.41 | + | 43.22 | | 205.36 |
| check_out | 5 | 0.13 | 4 | 0.00 | + | 42.97 | | 31300.56 |
| New_York | 6 | 0.15 | 13 | 0.00 | + | 42.77 | | 11494.05 |
| family | 11 | 0.28 | 149 | 0.02 | + | 42.72 | | 1754.53 |
| Love | 13 | 0.33 | 249 | 0.03 | + | 42.33 | | 1211.51 |
| Your | 42 | 1.07 | 3250 | 0.33 | + | 40.53 | | 224.63 |
| Pools | 4 | 0.10 | 1 | 0.00 | + | 39.25 | | 100381.80 |
| Bay | 4 | 0.10 | 1 | 0.00 | + | 39.25 | | 100381.80 |
| adventure | 4 | 0.10 | 1 | 0.00 | + | 39.25 | | 100381.80 |
| San_Francisco | 4 | 0.10 | 1 | 0.00 | + | 39.25 | | 100381.80 |
| 3 | 4 | 0.10 | 1 | 0.00 | + | 39.25 | | 100381.80 |
| Step | 6 | 0.15 | 21 | 0.00 | + | 37.93 | | 7077.27 |
| find_out | 9 | 0.23 | 102 | 0.01 | + | 37.88 | | 2116.51 |
| To | 122 | 3.12 | 16611 | 1.69 | + | 37.51 | | 84.50 |
| outdoor | 4 | 0.10 | 2 | 0.00 | + | 36.62 | | 50140.90 |
| sunsets | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 33.18 | | 766687104926547968.00 |
| scenery | 4 | 0.10 | 4 | 0.00 | + | 33.18 | | 25020.45 |
| magical | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 33.18 | | 766687104926547968.00 |
| halloween | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 33.18 | | 766687104926547968.00 |

| getaway | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 33.18 | | 76687104926547968.00 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| festive | 4 | 0.10 | 4 | 0.00 | + | 33.18 | | 25020.45 |
| favorite | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 33.18 | | 76687104926547968.00 |
| destination | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 33.18 | | 76687104926547968.00 |
| New_York_city | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 33.18 | | 76687104926547968.00 |
| Hawaii | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 33.18 | | 76687104926547968.00 |
| Cuba | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 33.18 | | 76687104926547968.00 |
| Cape_Verde | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 33.18 | | 76687104926547968.00 |
| Sun | 5 | 0.13 | 15 | 0.00 | + | 32.93 | | 8273.48 |
| Paris | 4 | 0.10 | 5 | 0.00 | + | 31.92 | | 19996.36 |
| Our | 22 | 0.56 | 1271 | 0.13 | + | 30.56 | | 334.82 |
| Treat | 5 | 0.13 | 20 | 0.00 | + | 30.44 | | 6180.11 |
| travel | 6 | 0.15 | 44 | 0.00 | + | 30.02 | | 3325.52 |
| Quiz | 4 | 0.10 | 7 | 0.00 | + | 29.88 | | 14254.54 |
| discover | 4 | 0.10 | 7 | 0.00 | + | 29.88 | | 14254.54 |
| winter | 6 | 0.15 | 47 | 0.00 | + | 29.30 | | 3106.87 |
| Sea | 5 | 0.13 | 23 | 0.00 | + | 29.21 | | 5360.97 |
| whats | 3 | 0.08 | 1 | 0.00 | + | 28.69 | | 75261.34 |
| inclusive | 3 | 0.08 | 1 | 0.00 | + | 28.69 | | 75261.34 |
| Walt_Disney | 3 | 0.08 | 1 | 0.00 | + | 28.69 | | 75261.34 |
| Cyprus | 3 | 0.08 | 1 | 0.00 | + | 28.69 | | 75261.34 |
| 2 | 3 | 0.08 | 1 | 0.00 | + | 28.69 | | 75261.34 |
| Tag | 4 | 0.10 | 9 | 0.00 | + | 28.27 | | 11064.64 |
| luxury | 4 | 0.10 | 9 | 0.00 | + | 28.27 | | 11064.64 |
| Wine | 6 | 0.15 | 53 | 0.01 | + | 27.99 | | 2743.82 |
| View | 7 | 0.18 | 99 | 0.01 | + | 26.64 | | 1676.19 |
| experience | 7 | 0.18 | 99 | 0.01 | + | 26.64 | | 1676.19 |
| venture | 3 | 0.08 | 2 | 0.00 | + | 26.47 | | 37580.68 |
| Islands | 3 | 0.08 | 2 | 0.00 | + | 26.47 | | 37580.68 |
| 1 | 3 | 0.08 | 2 | 0.00 | + | 26.47 | | 37580.68 |
| Relax | 4 | 0.10 | 15 | 0.00 | + | 24.80 | | 6598.79 |
| Hot | 7 | 0.18 | 117 | 0.01 | + | 24.51 | | 1402.93 |
| dream | 4 | 0.10 | 16 | 0.00 | + | 24.35 | | 6180.11 |
| Filled | 4 | 0.10 | 17 | 0.00 | + | 23.93 | | 5810.69 |
| Tenerife | 3 | 0.08 | 4 | 0.00 | + | 23.65 | | 18740.34 |
| places | 6 | 0.15 | 83 | 0.01 | + | 23.07 | | 1715.94 |
| Hills | 3 | 0.08 | 5 | 0.00 | + | 22.64 | | 14972.27 |
| youre | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Youd | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| wonderland | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| upstate | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| unwind | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| traveling | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| top_5 | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| subway | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Spa | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Sf | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| picturesque | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| luxurious | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| landmarks | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |

| immerse | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| iconic | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| ice-cream | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| heres | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| hawaiian | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| h10_ocean | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| gran_Canaria | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| gems | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| fall_in_love | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| enchanting | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| direct_debit | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| cocktails | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| center | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| adults-only | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| TrafalgarTravel | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Rocky_Mountaineer | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| New_York_State | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Miami | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Majorca | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Lapland | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| L.A | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Kaikoura | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Instagram | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Florida | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Disneyland_Paris | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Croatia | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Cant | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Cancun | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Canary_Island | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Bahamas | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| 5* | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| 300 | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| 25pp | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| 11 | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 22.12 | | 51124743775977472.00 |
| perfect | 17 | 0.43 | 25 | 0.00 | + | 131.54 | | 16981.90 |

List C. Destinations sub-corpus vs. Websites corpus: Keywords

| Word | Destin. | % | Websites | % | | LL | %DIFF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| We | 30 | 0.77 | 141 | 0.04 | + | 118.83 | 1951.81 |
| take_a_look | 13 | 0.33 | 7 | 0.00 | + | 93.31 | 17809.37 |
| n't | 24 | 0.61 | 139 | 0.04 | + | 86.44 | 1565.07 |
| What | 26 | 0.66 | 196 | 0.05 | + | 81.81 | 1179.24 |
| Disney | 9 | 0.23 | 3 | 0.00 | + | 68.99 | 28830.52 |
| Would | 14 | 0.36 | 44 | 0.01 | + | 65.02 | 2968.39 |
| 's | 63 | 1.61 | 1783 | 0.47 | + | 64.36 | 240.74 |
| You | 89 | 2.28 | 3185 | 0.84 | + | 63.54 | 169.47 |
| definitely | 11 | 0.28 | 19 | 0.01 | + | 61.70 | 5483.08 |
| It | 43 | 1.10 | 971 | 0.26 | + | 57.89 | 327.06 |
| Our | 22 | 0.56 | 254 | 0.07 | + | 53.24 | 735.26 |
| Us | 11 | 0.28 | 31 | 0.01 | + | 53.08 | 3321.89 |

| Why | 15 | 0.38 | 95 | 0.03 | + | 51.71 | 1422.66 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| yourself | 18 | 0.46 | 169 | 0.04 | + | 49.86 | 927.12 |
| blogger | 6 | 0.15 | 1 | 0.00 | + | 49.23 | 57761.04 |
| Fuerteventura | 5 | 0.13 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 45.79 | 127811861587427328.00 |
| Anna | 6 | 0.15 | 4 | 0.00 | + | 41.57 | 14365.26 |
| 've | 9 | 0.23 | 30 | 0.01 | + | 40.91 | 2793.05 |
| Your | 42 | 1.07 | 1239 | 0.33 | + | 40.52 | 226.90 |
| Now | 13 | 0.33 | 118 | 0.03 | + | 36.76 | 962.42 |
| Quiz | 4 | 0.10 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 36.63 | 102249487551954944.00 |
| perfect | 17 | 0.43 | 234 | 0.06 | + | 36.16 | 600.60 |
| go_on | 6 | 0.15 | 8 | 0.00 | + | 35.99 | 7132.63 |
| looking_for | 10 | 0.26 | 65 | 0.02 | + | 34.02 | 1383.62 |
| swimming_pools | 5 | 0.13 | 4 | 0.00 | + | 33.51 | 11954.38 |
| Yours | 5 | 0.13 | 5 | 0.00 | + | 32.03 | 9543.51 |
| Love | 13 | 0.33 | 155 | 0.04 | + | 30.76 | 708.81 |
| favourite | 9 | 0.23 | 67 | 0.02 | + | 28.52 | 1195.40 |
| These | 14 | 0.36 | 206 | 0.05 | + | 28.25 | 555.38 |
| inclusive | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 27.48 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| deposit | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 27.48 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| Tenerife | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 27.48 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| Cyprus | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 27.48 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| Cape_Verde | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 27.48 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| Time | 15 | 0.38 | 251 | 0.07 | + | 27.15 | 476.31 |
| Tag | 4 | 0.10 | 3 | 0.00 | + | 27.13 | 12758.01 |
| holiday | 15 | 0.38 | 261 | 0.07 | + | 26.22 | 454.22 |
| Next | 8 | 0.20 | 61 | 0.02 | + | 25.02 | 1164.72 |
| Not | 14 | 0.36 | 241 | 0.06 | + | 24.71 | 460.20 |
| Pool | 8 | 0.20 | 63 | 0.02 | + | 24.57 | 1124.57 |
| Step | 6 | 0.15 | 29 | 0.01 | + | 23.48 | 1895.21 |
| Paris | 4 | 0.10 | 6 | 0.00 | + | 23.30 | 6329.00 |
| Cuba | 3 | 0.08 | 1 | 0.00 | + | 23.00 | 28830.52 |
| 'd | 4 | 0.10 | 7 | 0.00 | + | 22.36 | 5410.58 |
| Hotel | 10 | 0.26 | 132 | 0.03 | + | 21.96 | 630.57 |
| find_out | 9 | 0.23 | 105 | 0.03 | + | 21.62 | 726.59 |
| Give | 6 | 0.15 | 37 | 0.01 | + | 20.96 | 1463.81 |
| New_York | 6 | 0.15 | 37 | 0.01 | + | 20.96 | 1463.81 |
| Want | 11 | 0.28 | 176 | 0.05 | + | 20.70 | 502.72 |
| Does | 7 | 0.18 | 61 | 0.02 | + | 20.28 | 1006.63 |
| festive | 4 | 0.10 | 10 | 0.00 | + | 20.09 | 3757.40 |
| Think | 6 | 0.15 | 42 | 0.01 | + | 19.65 | 1277.64 |
| How | 10 | 0.26 | 154 | 0.04 | + | 19.44 | 526.20 |
| Spain | 3 | 0.08 | 3 | 0.00 | + | 19.22 | 9543.51 |
| treating | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 18.32 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| subway | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 18.32 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Sf | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 18.32 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Med | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 18.32 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| h10_ocean | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 18.32 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| gran_Canaria | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 18.32 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| direct_debit | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 18.32 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| adults-only | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 18.32 | 51124743775977472.00 |

| TrafalgarTravel | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 18.32 | 51124743775977472.00 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Trafalgar | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 18.32 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Rocky_Mountaineer | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 18.32 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Majorca | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 18.32 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Lapland | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 18.32 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| L.A | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 18.32 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Kaikoura | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 18.32 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Disneyland_Paris | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 18.32 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Croatia | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 18.32 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Cancun | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 18.32 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Canary_Island | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 18.32 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Bahamas | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 18.32 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| 5* | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 18.32 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| 25pp | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 18.32 | 51124743775977472.00 |
| Stuck | 3 | 0.08 | 4 | 0.00 | + | 18.00 | 7132.63 |
| Walt_Disney | 3 | 0.08 | 4 | 0.00 | + | 18.00 | 7132.63 |
| Yes | 4 | 0.10 | 14 | 0.00 | + | 17.85 | 2655.29 |
| Rather | 4 | 0.10 | 14 | 0.00 | + | 17.85 | 2655.29 |
| Treat | 5 | 0.13 | 31 | 0.01 | + | 17.42 | 1455.40 |
| Got | 5 | 0.13 | 31 | 0.01 | + | 17.42 | 1455.40 |
| Friend | 3 | 0.08 | 5 | 0.00 | + | 16.99 | 5686.10 |
| Tell | 5 | 0.13 | 33 | 0.01 | + | 16.88 | 1361.14 |
| Book | 6 | 0.15 | 56 | 0.01 | + | 16.68 | 933.23 |
| Fun | 11 | 0.28 | 228 | 0.06 | + | 16.23 | 365.26 |
| 're | 7 | 0.18 | 87 | 0.02 | + | 16.07 | 675.91 |
| waiting | 4 | 0.10 | 19 | 0.01 | + | 15.77 | 1930.21 |
| Wait | 3 | 0.08 | 7 | 0.00 | + | 15.40 | 4032.93 |
| Away | 6 | 0.15 | 64 | 0.02 | + | 15.32 | 804.08 |
| destinations | 7 | 0.18 | 94 | 0.02 | + | 15.18 | 618.13 |
| To | 122 | 3.12 | 8089 | 2.14 | + | 14.99 | 45.45 |
| Do | 18 | 0.46 | 591 | 0.16 | + | 14.81 | 193.71 |
| Sun | 5 | 0.13 | 43 | 0.01 | + | 14.60 | 1021.34 |
| summer_holiday | 2 | 0.05 | 1 | 0.00 | + | 14.52 | 19187.02 |
| Deals | 3 | 0.08 | 9 | 0.00 | + | 14.16 | 3114.50 |
| reasons | 4 | 0.10 | 25 | 0.01 | + | 13.88 | 1442.96 |
| Never | 6 | 0.15 | 74 | 0.02 | + | 13.86 | 681.91 |
| Whats | 3 | 0.08 | 10 | 0.00 | + | 13.64 | 2793.05 |
| Hot | 7 | 0.18 | 108 | 0.03 | + | 13.59 | 525.04 |

List D. Destinations sub-corpus vs. LUX-DEST corpus: Keywords

| Word | Destin. | % | Lux | % | | LL | %DIFF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 's | 63 | 1.61 | 49 | 0.31 | + | 70.79 | 412.05 |
| You | 89 | 2.28 | 111 | 0.71 | + | 60.76 | 219.33 |
| We | 30 | 0.77 | 12 | 0.08 | + | 51.48 | 895.65 |
| It | 43 | 1.10 | 34 | 0.22 | + | 47.65 | 403.68 |
| n't | 24 | 0.61 | 8 | 0.05 | + | 44.68 | 1094.79 |
| Disney | 9 | 0.23 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 28.91 | 230061349139382272.00 |
| What | 26 | 0.66 | 21 | 0.13 | + | 28.30 | 393.09 |
| take_a_look | 13 | 0.33 | 3 | 0.02 | + | 27.66 | 1625.80 |
| Some | 18 | 0.46 | 10 | 0.06 | + | 25.80 | 616.87 |

| Why | 15 | 0.38 | 6 | 0.04 | + | 25.74 | 895.65 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| definitely | 11 | 0.28 | 2 | 0.01 | + | 25.06 | 2090.44 |
| To | 122 | 3.12 | 281 | 1.80 | + | 23.54 | 72.91 |
| would | 14 | 0.36 | 6 | 0.04 | + | 23.22 | 829.28 |
| favourite | 9 | 0.23 | 1 | 0.01 | + | 22.85 | 3484.36 |
| 've | 9 | 0.23 | 1 | 0.01 | + | 22.85 | 3484.36 |
| Love | 13 | 0.33 | 5 | 0.03 | + | 22.72 | 935.48 |
| Us | 11 | 0.28 | 4 | 0.03 | + | 19.73 | 995.22 |
| looking_for | 10 | 0.26 | 3 | 0.02 | + | 19.42 | 1227.54 |
| go_on | 6 | 0.15 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 19.27 | 153374209853095936.00 |
| blogger | 6 | 0.15 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 19.27 | 153374209853095936.00 |
| Anna | 6 | 0.15 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 19.27 | 153374209853095936.00 |
| Do | 18 | 0.46 | 15 | 0.10 | + | 19.06 | 377.91 |
| Our | 22 | 0.56 | 23 | 0.15 | + | 18.61 | 280.95 |
| Not | 14 | 0.36 | 9 | 0.06 | + | 18.21 | 519.52 |
| Are | 30 | 0.77 | 41 | 0.26 | + | 18.01 | 191.41 |
| Does | 7 | 0.18 | 1 | 0.01 | + | 16.90 | 2687.83 |
| holiday | 15 | 0.38 | 12 | 0.08 | + | 16.46 | 397.83 |
| Tell | 5 | 0.13 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 16.06 | 127811861587427328.00 |
| Got | 5 | 0.13 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 16.06 | 127811861587427328.00 |
| Fuerteventura | 5 | 0.13 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 16.06 | 127811861587427328.00 |
| Place | 14 | 0.36 | 11 | 0.07 | + | 15.60 | 406.88 |
| yourself | 18 | 0.46 | 19 | 0.12 | + | 15.06 | 277.30 |
| Want | 11 | 0.28 | 7 | 0.04 | + | 14.41 | 525.84 |
| Is | 52 | 1.33 | 106 | 0.68 | + | 14.31 | 95.37 |
| Think | 6 | 0.15 | 1 | 0.01 | + | 13.98 | 2289.57 |
| Step | 6 | 0.15 | 1 | 0.01 | + | 13.98 | 2289.57 |
| Give | 6 | 0.15 | 1 | 0.01 | + | 13.98 | 2289.57 |
| Yes | 4 | 0.10 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 12.85 | 102249487551954944.00 |
| Tag | 4 | 0.10 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 12.85 | 102249487551954944.00 |
| reasons | 4 | 0.10 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 12.85 | 102249487551954944.00 |
| Quiz | 4 | 0.10 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 12.85 | 102249487551954944.00 |
| has_to | 4 | 0.10 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 12.85 | 102249487551954944.00 |
| Good | 4 | 0.10 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 12.85 | 102249487551954944.00 |
| Filled | 4 | 0.10 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 12.85 | 102249487551954944.00 |
| festive | 4 | 0.10 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 12.85 | 102249487551954944.00 |
| 'd | 4 | 0.10 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 12.85 | 102249487551954944.00 |
| How | 10 | 0.26 | 7 | 0.04 | + | 12.22 | 468.95 |
| Fun | 11 | 0.28 | 9 | 0.06 | + | 11.84 | 386.76 |
| family | 11 | 0.28 | 9 | 0.06 | + | 11.84 | 386.76 |
| These | 14 | 0.36 | 15 | 0.10 | + | 11.52 | 271.71 |
| Who | 9 | 0.23 | 6 | 0.04 | + | 11.41 | 497.39 |
| New_York | 6 | 0.15 | 2 | 0.01 | + | 11.17 | 1094.79 |
| swimming_pools | 5 | 0.13 | 1 | 0.01 | + | 11.10 | 1891.31 |
| 'll | 5 | 0.13 | 1 | 0.01 | + | 11.10 | 1891.31 |
| World | 14 | 0.36 | 16 | 0.10 | + | 10.68 | 248.48 |
| Visit | 12 | 0.31 | 12 | 0.08 | + | 10.65 | 298.26 |
| Go | 7 | 0.18 | 4 | 0.03 | + | 9.85 | 596.96 |
| 're | 7 | 0.18 | 4 | 0.03 | + | 9.85 | 596.96 |
| venture | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 9.64 | 766871104926547968.00 |

| sunsets | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 9.64 | 76687104926547968.00 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Suit | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 9.64 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| Stuck | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 9.64 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| Say | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 9.64 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| Lights | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 9.64 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| inclusive | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 9.64 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| halloween | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 9.64 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| Friend | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 9.64 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| Found | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 9.64 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| deposit | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 9.64 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| Deals | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 9.64 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| chocolate | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 9.64 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| bridge | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 9.64 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| Apple | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 9.64 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| Walt_Disney | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 9.64 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| Tenerife | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 9.64 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| Spain | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 9.64 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| New_York_city | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 9.64 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| Cyprus | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 9.64 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| Cape_Verde | 3 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | + | 9.64 | 76687104926547968.00 |
| Time | 15 | 0.38 | 20 | 0.13 | + | 9.34 | 198.70 |
| never | 6 | 0.15 | 3 | 0.02 | + | 9.16 | 696.52 |
| perfect | 17 | 0.43 | 25 | 0.16 | + | 9.11 | 170.82 |
| All | 17 | 0.43 | 25 | 0.16 | + | 9.11 | 170.82 |
| Now | 13 | 0.33 | 16 | 0.10 | + | 9.03 | 223.59 |
| Like | 11 | 0.28 | 12 | 0.08 | + | 8.87 | 265.07 |
| Yours | 5 | 0.13 | 2 | 0.01 | + | 8.58 | 895.65 |
| Treat | 5 | 0.13 | 2 | 0.01 | + | 8.58 | 895.65 |
| should | 5 | 0.13 | 2 | 0.01 | + | 8.58 | 895.65 |
| Hot | 7 | 0.18 | 5 | 0.03 | + | 8.42 | 457.57 |
| Well | 4 | 0.10 | 1 | 0.01 | + | 8.29 | 1493.05 |
| waiting | 4 | 0.10 | 1 | 0.01 | + | 8.29 | 1493.05 |
| things | 4 | 0.10 | 1 | 0.01 | + | 8.29 | 1493.05 |
| rather | 4 | 0.10 | 1 | 0.01 | + | 8.29 | 1493.05 |
| Pools | 4 | 0.10 | 1 | 0.01 | + | 8.29 | 1493.05 |
| number | 4 | 0.10 | 1 | 0.01 | + | 8.29 | 1493.05 |
| San_Francisco | 4 | 0.10 | 1 | 0.01 | + | 8.29 | 1493.05 |
| See | 11 | 0.28 | 13 | 0.08 | + | 8.05 | 236.99 |
| One | 21 | 0.54 | 38 | 0.24 | + | 7.65 | 120.09 |
| City | 19 | 0.49 | 33 | 0.21 | + | 7.54 | 129.30 |
| Take | 10 | 0.26 | 12 | 0.08 | + | 7.18 | 231.88 |