sciendo

The Relationship Between the Language of Tourism, Tourism and Sociology

Silvia Blanca Irimiea, PhD

Abstract

The unprecedented development of all areas of human concern, in particular the growth of tourism as a central and global phenomenon has drawn the researchers' attention to tourism and the investigative potential of the language used in tourism. This paper discusses the ways in which the English language relates to tourism and sociology, laying particular emphasis on the role language plays in revealing much about how tourism operates, how perceptions, identities are formed and, henceforth, how tourism as a system depends on the use of language. The article is grounded in the seminal works of Dann, G.M. (1996, 1996a, 2012; Mesthrie, R. Swann, J, et al., 2000; Cohen, D. 1984; Dann, G.M. and Cohen, E., 1996, 2001; Thurlow and Jaworsky, 2003; Fox, 2008) and their views on the sociological aspects of the language of tourism.

Keywords: the language of tourism, specialized language, the sociology of tourism, language and sociology, the relationship language of tourism-tourism-sociology

Introduction

Tourism as an industry has boosted at an unprecedented pace over the last decades. Tourism education and training has catched up both with the developments in the tourism sector and the remarkable advancements in other fields, such as linguistics, sociology and IT. In order to design a viable strategy for the development of tourism it is not enough to look at the progress registered by tourism-related areas or academic disciplines, but to consider the contribution of other research areas to tourism, amongst which research in linguistics and sociolinguistics plays an important role.

For some decades the study of the language of tourism has emerged as an ESP or a 'specialised' language, a language used in tourism by tourism staff for tourism purposes. Some decades later, the language of tourism, just like any other language variety, was investigated for its capacity to unveil some aspects of tourism as a prosperous, market-driven industry. At the same time, language was used, or rather exploited, to impose rules of conduct and constraints on the relationships established between actors/providers and beneficiaries of tourist services.

Then, tourism has been linked with the linguistic research carried out in the fields of discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis, interactional analysis, etc., some insight methods which proved helpful in unveiling many of the hidden aspects of tourism discourse and tourism.

While language studies were more driven towards sociological issues and theories and followed a sociological bend, tourism studies also turned to sociology for the clarification of some fundamental concepts which, however, kept the industry growing.The study of the relationship between tourism and sociology started in antiquity but, after some less mature and consistent studies, gained momentum during the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s. The turning point of the sociology-driven research on tourism and on the language of tourism was represented by the outstanding works of Dann (1996), followed by Thurlow and Jaworsky (2003), Jaworsky and Pritchard (eds) (2005), Cappelli (2006), Fox (2006b), Phipps (2006), Brice (2007), Jaworsky, Thurlow, Ylanne-McEwen and Lawson (2007) and others.

Finally, tourism researchers saw in sociolinguistics a valuable aid to the investigation of the world of tourism.

Within this broad context, which became unrecognisably interdisciplinary, the present paper seeks to shed light on the relationships between the language of tourism, tourism and sociology. In this respect, the paper is built around the following main issues: the emergence of tourism education, the study of the language of tourism, the language of tourism as a specialised language, the sociology of tourism, the language of tourism and its sociological turn, and finally, a transdisciplinary view of the language of tourism and its relationship to tourism and sociology. Within this intricate web, the paper also highlights the role played by discourse analysis as a valuable contributor to the sociolinguistic study of tourism.

Precursory steps to the study of the language of tourism: the emergence of tourism education

The concern for *the language of tourism* and its subsequent, more rigorous study is rooted in at least two areas of enquiry: on the one hand, its emergence pays tribute to the development of tourism studies and the rise of tourism education, and on the other, its development is the result of the focus of linguistic research on the language of tourism as a specialized language.

Tourism education emerged slowly but it has developed both steadily and outstandingly over the last 50 years. According to some researchers, it developed in *an ad hoc* and unplanned way in several countries, resulting thus in a visible fragmentation, which has been perpetuated up to the present (Irimiea, 2009). In 1988 Goeldner admitted that tourism education was still emerging as a discipline, while Airey (1988) offered four approaches to the origin of tourism education in the UK: a first approach that locates the beginnings of tourism education in the early 1900s when the first courses trained chefs and waiters, a second approach which attributed its beginnings to the 1950s when courses for ticket agents and travel agency staff were initiated, a third approach according to which tourism education emerged in the 1960s as a distinct domain for hotel management courses, and a fourth approach which suggests that tourism education has been always part of geography or economic studies.

The emergence of tourism education raised another question that about its status: should tourism education be considered 'a discipline *per se*, a relative new comer discipline to the academic world', or 'an older subliminal, accessorial discipline' that branches out from other disciplines? Despite the uncertainty that surrounds the rise of tourism education, it has developed in an unprecedented way in the last two decades (Irimiea, 2009: 283).

Cooper, Shepherd and Westlake (1996) take a look back at the evolution of tourism education and remark that tourism courses were organized in developed countries in the 1970s and 1980s and that since there were no accepted academic or institutional frameworks for these courses, they developed in an *ad hoc* and unplanned way. The courses were organized as part of geography studies, as recreation or sport-related activities, or as part of hotel management studies. Such an uncoordinated approach, unregulated by standards, let alone by quality standards, resulted in the development of loose and fragmentary training systems.

Cooper (1996) opinionates that there were three ways in which the study of tourism has matured into an academic discipline: (1) sector-based courses have developed and influenced tourism education and training, (2) tourism courses have developed as fertilizers to other business studies by providing them with a vocational orientation- in this particular case tourism training has become an industry application, (3) tourism has grown from other traditional and standing disciplines, such as geography, sociology, and linguistics) which have expanded their concern over tourism. However, gradually, from the status of 'add-on' discipline, tourism has become a stand-alone, autonomous area of study and practice which has drawn its characteristics from 16 different areas and disciplines, including: anthropology, business, law, psychology, economics, political sciences, etc. (Jafari and Richie, 1981). The growth of tourism and its interdisciplinary character has called for a more consistent, responsible and thorough curriculum design and organization of training activities.

However, tourism education has moved towards a sociological approach in many of the universities which teach tourism or carry out research on tourism. Lanfant (1995) suggests that the sociology of tourism and its sociological object should capture the multi-polarity of tourism as a ''total social phenomenon''. Lanfant (1995) also posits that to deal with tourism social theories does not mean only abstractly linking them with general sociology and its main paradigms, but also taking into consideration all social issues.

Finally, if we turn to the curricula design process of many European universities which embraced tourism studies we

understand that the process was prevailingly influenced by the European projects under the coordination of the European Union. The projects' most remarkable achievement was the collaboration of universities in view of bringing about cornerstone changes through reforms in tourism education. Most of the advances were the result of exchanges of good practices and intake of innovative teaching and learning strategies. The education and training programs offered to European students and staff under the framework of Tempus, Leonardo da Vinci, Grundtvig, Erasmus and other community programs gave a strong impetus to East and Center-European universities to develop rigorous and competitive tourism programs in line with the EU models. Teaching English for tourism purposes developed side by side with the development of tourism studies.

The evolution of *English for tourism* in an educational environment, in particular that of the Babes-Bolyai University of Cluj, has been accounted for by Irimiea (1998, 2008, 2009).

From understanding the broad picture which tourism education became part of, we shall move on to the language of tourism and show its staged development. It should be noted that before acquiring the status of 'specialised' language or ESP, the language of tourism emerged in the vicinity of tourism and business studies.

The language of tourism

The development of teaching materials on the language of tourism

The 1990s represented a period in which many linguists turned their attention to the study of other specialized languages as part of the endeavours to serve ESP (English for Specific Purposes) and EFL (English as a foreign language) teaching and learning needs. In this context, applied linguists became more inclined to research the language of science and technology, the legal language, the language of business communication and genre studies, varieties of languages, areas that tended to be more in demand. The language of tourism and its discourse attracted the interest of English language teachers only later as a consequence of the tremendous development of international tourism and the need to provide the tourists and the professionals with teaching methods and materials that could teach them the efficient or proficient use of English. Thus, tourism discourse became an object of scholarly concern in this thriving context. At the same time, tourism training materials were released to worldwide users, both teachers and students in the form of prolific and proficient teaching/course books (Duckworth, 1994; Jacob and Strutt, 1997).

The books on *English for tourism* adopted a communicative, topic-based and student-centred approach, while seeking to develop all the four skills involved in the use of tourism-related English. Second, the course books provided professional information in a friendly and interactive way aiming to improve the trainees' familiarity with the professional areas of work. Third, the books provided excellent preparation opportunities for the major European examinations in English for Tourism, including the London Chamber of Commerce and Industry English for Tourist Industry exams.

The books written on *English for international tourism* thrived or prospered in the vicinity of other books for professionals and trainees, in general in the field of teaching business English. Such books were written in the 1970s and 1980s and included English on Business (Collins, 1984), English for Business (Ferrier Mavor, 1971), Write for Business (Doherty, M. et al., 1987), to mention just a few.

Tourism studies took off in close connection with concerns which addressed tourism-based topics. The range of books which turned attention to these topics included: The Good Tourist (K. Wood and S. House, 1992), The *Business of Tourism* (Holloway J.C.), *Tourism: The International Business* (Mill, R.C.), *Working in Tourism* (Times Newspapers and The Careers and Occupational Information Centre), *The Travel Agent* (Bottomley, R.M, 1992), etc. Such professional English language teaching books were included in various book series, one of which is the *Professional Reading Skills Series* (Prentice Hall International English Language Teaching series) issued in the 1990s.

These attempts to serve such teaching needs of English for tourism were continued in the first and second decade of the 21st century by writers such as Peter Strutt, Margaret O'Keeffe, Iwonna Dubicka (English for International Tourism), Anna Cowper (Pearson Education Limited, 2013), etc. Digital and friendlier *.com* support materials have known a wide distribution and consumption after the tremendous development of the internet. Such internet-shared materials included: https://www.learnenglishfeelgood.com/travelenglish/english-travel-airport1.html,

https://www.fluentu.com/blog/english/english-for-tourism-and-hospitality/, etc.

The language of tourism as a specialised language

Side by side with these advancements in the teaching of English for tourism came the recognition of the *language of tourism* as a distinct, specialised or special language. The recognition was the result of the conjoined efforts and consensus among researchers such as Febas Borra (1978), Moeran (1983), Hollinshead (1999), Selwyn (1993), Boyer and Viallon (1994), Dann (1996) that tourism has 'a language of its own' (Dann, 1996).

From this recognition, it follows that its discourse, regardless of the medium of communication used, has a persuasive function or 'even a social control' one, where 'the goals of the promoter are merged with the attributed satisfaction need of the consumer' (Dann, 1996:247). Dann asserts that 'Through pictures, brochures and other media, the language of tourism attempts to seduce millions of people into becoming tourists and subsequently to control their attitudes and behaviour. As tourists, such people then contribute further to this language through the communication of their experiences'(summary to the 1996 volume). Dann's book represents a hallmark for the development of the language of tourism, since it provides the earliest sociolinguistic treatment of tourism and its language. In addition, in the same book Dann further postulates that 'once a linguistic paradigm for tourism is accepted, it follows that the type of language it employs will vary according to the object of promotion and the corresponding needs which it attempts to fulfill'(idem.).

Following this consideration, Dann (1996) claims that the language of tourism can take the form of several registers as a result of the differences in topic and of the envisaged motivational appeal. From among the possible registers, Dann provides the example of 'Greenspeak' which he defines as the language of 'eco-tourism'(1996:48). He further explains that this register 'exists not only on account of its subject matter (the environment), but also through the myriad ways it addresses the associated "green concerns" of its clients' (idem.).

The sociology of tourism

Prior to engaging in the discussion of the language of tourism and its related sociological aspects, first we should take a closer look at the sociological insights into tourism. A remarkable work in this direction is David Cohen's book *The Sociology of Tourism: Approaches, Issues and Findings* (1984: 373), which, in the 'Introduction', asserts that 'The sociology of tourism is an emergent speciality concerned with the study of touristic motivations, roles, relationships, and institutions and of their impact on tourists and on the societies who receive them'. The author provides a brief survey of early contributions to the sociology of tourism, admitting that they were in German (cf Homberg 1978:36-37). Cohen notes the following stages in the development of sociological insights into tourism. The first stage is represented by early investigations written in German, beginning with L. von Wiese's (1930) classic article and leading to the first full-length sociological work on the subject by H. J. Knebel (1960). A second stage was marked by Ogilvie's (1933) book on tourism, the first social scientific treatise on the subject in English. Another, more consistent stage, characterised the post-World War research, when the 'the rapid expansion of tourism provoked some spirited, critical writings (Mitford 1959; Boorstin 1964:77-117) and the first empirical studies (Nunez 1963, Forster 1964)'(1984:373). The rise of the disciplinary studies was followed by the marked sociological turn in the 1970s:

The study of tourism as a sociological specialty rather than merely as an exotic, marginal topic emerged only in the 1970s with Cohen's (1972) typological essay and MacCannell's (1973) first theoretical synthesis. Since the mid- 1970s, the field has grown rapidly, which is attested by the publication of a series of treatises and reviews (Young 1973; L. Turner & Ash 1975; MacCannell 1976; Noronha 1977; de Kadt 1979:3-76) and general collections of articles (V. L. Smith 1977c, 1978a; Cohen 1979d; de Kadt 1979:77-335; Lengyel 1980; Graburn 1983b). (1984:373-4).

Cohen (1984) chooses eight conceptual approaches from the number of general philosophical, ideological and theoretical approaches to tourism:

Tourism as commercialized hospitality with focus on the visitor component (Cohen 1974:545-46) of the tourist's role.

Tourism as democratized travel, with emphasis placed on the traveler component of the tourist role, where the tourist is viewed as a kind of traveler marked by some distinct analytical traits (Cohen 1974; P. L. Pearce 1982:280). Cohen opinionates that the authors who pioneered this approach regarded modern mass tourism as a democratized expansion of the aristocratic travel of an earlier age (Boorstin 1964:77-117). He also suggests that this perspective generated some important work on the historical transformation of touristic roles (e.g. Knebel 1960, L. Turner & Ash 1975).

Tourism as a modern leisure activity, where tourism is viewed as a type of leisure (Dumazdier 1967:123-38; P. L. Pearce

1982:20) and the tourist as a "person at leisure who also travels" (Nash 1981:462). The promoters of this perspective focus less on the deeper cultural significance of leisure activities, and take a functionalist view instead, one which identifies leisure-and hence tourism-with recreation (e.g. Scheuch 1981:1099; see also Cohen 1979b:183-85). Cohen estimates that this approach 'informs much of the macrosociological and institutional research on modem tourism (e.g. Dumazdier 1967:123-38; Scheuch 1981)'(1984:375).

Tourism as a modern variety of the traditional pilgrimage, a perspective that focuses on the deeper structural significance of modem tourism and identifies it with pilgrimages in traditional societies (MacCannell 1973 :589; Graburn' s 1977) i.e. tourism as a form of the "sacred journey".

Tourism as an expression of basic cultural themes, an approach which emphasises the deeper cultural meaning of tourism as perceived by tourists themselves (Gottlieb 1982: 167; cf Graburn 1983a).

Tourism as an acculturative process focused upon the effects that tourists have on their hosts and strive to integrate the study of tourism into the wider framework of the theory of acculturation (Nunez 1963:347-78).

Tourism as a type of ethnic relations, an approach that seeks to integrate the analysis of the tourist-host relationship into the wider field of ethnicity and ethnic relations (Pi-Sunyer 1977, Gamper 1981).

Tourism as a form of neocolonialism, which deals with the role of tourism in creating dependencies between tourism-generating, "metropolitan" countries and tourism-receiving, "peripheral" nations that replicate colonial or "imperialist" forms of domination and structural underdevelopment.

Cohen (1984) also specifies the major issues that should receive attention in the sociology of tourism, which, according to him, are: the tourist, tourists and locals and their relationships, the structure of the tourist system and the impact of tourism. Cohen recognizes in the conclusion to his article that 'sociology has only recently discovered tourism as a field of systematic inquiry, but that many sociologists still view it with suspicion or even disdain' and that 'It is hoped that this review helped to bring theory and empirical research closer together and to codify the field, as well as to further recognition of it as a legitimate and significant sociological specialty' (1984:388).

Another seminal book, similarly called *The Sociology of Tourism. Theoretical and Empirical Investigations* edited by Apostolopoulos, Yiorgos, Stella Leivadi, Andrew Yiannakis (first edition published in 1996, reprinted in 1999, 2000, 2001), is 'a pioneering work aimed at introducing and legitimizing the sociological study of tourism in international academia'. Addressing tourism as an academic concern, in the 'Introduction' to the book Apostolopoulos contends that the book 'is intended to "reinvent" an area first presented three decades ago' based on the premise that 'tourism as a far-reaching transnational industry continues to affect crucially the "post-industrial" world'(2001:4). The author admits that in the book 'tourism is addressed in a conventional sociological text manner with all the major societal areas covered as they relate to the touristic phenomenon'(idem.). The authors of the volume approach the following themes that are tourism-bound: *A sociological understanding of contemporary tourism, The tourism system and the individual, Structures of social inequality in the tourism system, Tourism, underdevelopment and dependency, Tourism and social change, and, finally, Towards a 'new' sociology of tourism.* The editors and the authors state firmly that 'a formal sociological approach to tourism will serve as a long-overdue vehice for moving beyond a limited examination of the touristic phenomenon to a comprehensive understanding of all its socioeconomic, political, and cultural effects through a careful integration of grounded theory and empirical investigation' (idem.)

In the same book, Dann Graham and Erik Cohen provide a synthetic 'Sociological treatment of tourism' (2001:304). Their sociological survey of tourism studies tackles: developmental (evolutionary and cyclical) perspectives or macro-level perspectives (showing how tourism has been institutionalized, industrialized and internationalized, with little emphasis on its impact on individuals); neo-Durkheimian perspectives, conflict and critical perspectives, functionalist perspectives, Weberian perspectives, formalism, phenomenology and ethnomethodology, and symbolic interactionism. They conclude their study with the words: 'it appears that sociology itself provides only a partial interpretation of the multifaceted phenomenon of tourism. For a more complete picture, it is necessary to combine sociological insights with those from other social science disciplines.'(1996:313).

It is noteworthy to point out that from the sociology-based approaches to tourism the ones that view it from a language and discourse perspective are *ethnomethodology* and *symbolic interactionism*. Both approaches are micro-approaches and

focus on the individual in society. In regard to ethnomethodology, the authors admit that it seeks to investigate the 'undeclared assumptions of human action and discourse, and in that sense could be appropriate for an examination of touristic stereotypes and clichés'(1996:310). In spite of the fact that Dann Graham and Erik Cohen (1996) mention only one example, that of McHugh, Raffel, Foss and Blum (1974), who have adopted an ethnomethodological perspective for the study of tourism, they emphasize the relevance of such an approach to the analysis of the tourists' conduct and the tourism industry.

From among the surveyed approaches, the symbolic interaction approach turns to be more influential on tourism researchers and linguistics. Although, in its debut years, symbolic interactionism was mainly focused on the development of 'Self' through its components of 'I' and 'Me', later on the trend took to the detailed examination of 'the process of role negotiation by individuals, through which definitions of situations were exchanged, accepted, modified or rejected' (Dann & Cohen, 1996:311).

In his research on tourism and the language of tourism Dann (1989) examined the 'tourist as a child' posture and how it is checked by the industry through its 'language of social control (in brochures, travelogs, advertisements, couriers, guides, etc)'. The researchers who adopted the interactional approach (Dann, 1989; Mayo and Jarvis 1981) found that *transactional analysis* can be applied to many kinds of relationships that involve participants who are involved both directly and indirectly in the tourism industry. The practice has been taken up by airlines and hotels which use the transactional approach to train their staff. Other researchers have investigated the dynamics of role negotiation in touristic encounters, in particular the asymmetric one-to-one relationships. The *interactionist perspective* has also been applied to the content of tourist interviews. The interactionist perspective also permitted referencing back to Goffman's (1959) 'presentation of self in everyday life'. Dann & Cohen (1996:311) suggest that 'Yet, there is a great deal in Goffman which has been underutilized by tourism researchers'. Interactionist analysis has also taken the direction of semiotics and semiology (Barthes, 1984). Such studies have applied the semiotic approach to the exploration of tourism promotional literature, some of which have focused on the 'people content' of brochures. They have also investigated the way in which the industry attempts to control the interaction of tourists, hotel staff and locals through the use of pictures and verbal descriptions.

Finally, all these developments stay proof of the vastness of the issues that tourism works with or is related with, its multimodal and inter- or multidisciplinary character, while language has always been its medium. Indeed, the work began by Dann & Cohen (1996) surely calls out for more and further collaboration initiatives and openness, if sociological theorizing on tourism should progress.

A while later, in 2010, Thurlow and Jaworsky admitted that

'tourism as the world's single largest international trade and as a truly global cultural industry (Urry, 2002), is a major site (a social, cultural and economic domain) for the banal enactment of globalization. Tourism is a deeply "semiotic industry" committed to the production, commodification and representation of culture and cultural difference; language is clearly an essential resource in this cultural production' (2010:227).

The language of tourism and its sociological turn

Language and sociology

The relationship between language and sociology goes back to some early and key stages that marked the rise of sociolinguistics. The first step is that represented by the oral treaties on phonetics and language structure produced by Pănini and his followers in India in 500 BC, which stimulated the development of independent traditions. The second achievement was the year 1786 when Sir William Jones delivered a seminal speech concerning the relations between Sanskrit, Latin, Greek and other ancient languages. This is the moment when 'linguistics enters a historical phase in which principles of language comparison and classification emerge' (Mesthrie, R, Swann, J., et al., 2000:3). The third step forward was the emergence of 'structuralism' promoted by Ferdinand de Saussure in Europe and Leonard Bloomfield and others in the USA in the early twentieth century. Their linguistic concern was focused on the internal systems of languages rather than on the historical comparison of languages. The fourth major linguistic event was the publication of Noam Chomsky's *Syntactic Structures* in 1957, which shifted attention to psycho-biological aspects, in particular to the way in which a language is acquired by children on the basis of a 'universal grammar' common to all languages. Scholars like Franz Boas, Leonard Bloomfield and Edward Sapir contributed a cultural or anthropological interest in languages. Such anthropological studies of language represent the forerunners of some branches of sociolinguistics, in particular the ethnographical

approach to language study.

The term 'sociolingusitics' is considered to have been first used by Haver Currie, who was a poet and a philosopher and who noticed that research into language matters did not pay any attention to the sociological aspects that could be involved in the use of language. Further significant works on sociolinguistics belong to Weinreich (*Languages in Contact*, 1953), an account of bilingualism, and Einar Haugen, whose two volumes were an account of the social history of the Norwegian language spoken in America (1953). To these works, Joos (1962) added discussions on the dimensions of style.

Chomsky's contribution to linguistics and sociolinguistics in the 1960s by 'abstracting language away from everyday contexts ironically led to the distillation of a core area of sociolinguistics, opposed to his conception of language' (Mesthrie, R., Swann, J et al., 2000:4). Chomsky shifted thus attention on an 'idealized competence' and noted:

'Linguistic theory is concerned primarily with an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogeneous speech community, who knows its language perfectly and is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention and interest, and errors…'(1963:3)

In spite of the recognized merits of his theory, in particular of the theory of syntax and phonology, Chomsky's approach marked a break between the sociolinguists who approached language use within human societies and Chomsky's followers, whose interest rested with an 'idealized, non-social, psycholinguistic competence'(Mesthrie, R., Swann, J. et al., 2000:4). While Chomsky's work deals with the structures that can be generated in language and with the means that enhance that generation/production, the social approach to language seeks to explain what can be said in a language, by whom, when, where, in what ways and under what social circumstances (Fishman, 1971; Hymes, 1971; Saville-Troike, 1982, quoted in Mastrie et al, 2000). These sociolinguists viewed language acquisition not as a mere cognitive process, based on a predisposition in the human brain, but as a social process as well, which takes place in a social context through social interaction. Hence, they argue that the child's acquisition of its first language is not a passive process, but one which is sensitive to social contextual ('environmental') conditions, including the social identity of the people it closely interacts with.

Dell Hymes departed from Chomsky's definition and study of *linguistic competence*, claiming that a child who produces a sentence without due regard to the social and linguistic context would be a 'social monster' (1974:775), very much likely to be institutionalised. Hymes defined 'comunicative competence' as the ability to use language appropriately in different contexts and circumstances. He took his study further in the direction of social-bound aspects indicating when it is appropriate to talk or to keep silent, providing rules of turn-taking, the amount of simultaneous talk and so on.

One issue that generated debate among scholars and was noted by Mesthrie, R., Swann, J. et al., (2000) as persistent in 2000, was the distinction between sociolinguistics (proper) and the sociology of language. Mesthrie, R., Swann, J. et al. (2000:5) suggest that

'some scholars believe that the former [sociolinguistics] is part of the terrain mapped out in linguistics, focusing on language in society for the light that social contexts throw upon language. For these scholars, the latter (sociology of language) is primarily a sub-part of sociology, which examines language use for its ulimate illumination of the nature of societies'.

Mesthrie, R., Swann, J. et al. (2000) viewed the two areas as *alter egos* and not as a dichotomized pair and agreed that the terms *macro-* and *micro-linguistics* could and would express this distinction. According to them, macro-studies involve 'the examination of large-scale patterns relating to social structures (the focus is broad, as in the study of multilingualism in a country). Micro-studies examine finer patterns in contexts (for example, conversational structure or accents in a particular community)' (Mesthrie, R., Swann, J. et al., 2000:5).

Mesthrie, R., Swann, J. et al. (2000:6) emphasise the relations between language and society in their 2000 book. They go out from the statement that, bside its denotative function, language provies signals about the speaker's social and personal background, being thus 'indexical of one's social class, status, region of origin, gender, age group and so on'. Sociolinguists also argue that language 'not only reflects societal patterns and divisions but also sustains and reproduces them. Thus, ways of talking do not reflect the social organisation of a community but form a practice that becomes a part of the social organisation, and as such become involved in exprssing the power relations in a society'(idem.).

The relationship between language and thought has been expressed by Benjamin Lee Worf and Edward Sapir, who argued that speakers of different languages may be led to different types of observations and evaluations of exactly similar phenomena. This assumption became known as the Worf-Sapir hypothesis and was recorded by Whorf (1956:213) in the

following words: 'we dissect nature along the lines laid down by our native language'. However, language does not have such a strong hold on communities or its members and cannot prevent individuals from viewing things from different perspectives. This assumption was rendered in Gillian Sankoff's (1986:xxi) words: 'in the long term language is more dependent on the social world than the other way around...Language does facilitate social intercourse, but if the situation is sufficiently compelling, language will bend'(idem.).

Their hypothesis resulted yet in another suggestion, that 'real translation between widely different languages is not possible' (Mesthrie, R., Swann, J. et al., 2000:7).

Mesthrie, R., Swann, J. et al. (2000) also tackle language 'as a social construct' and languages as individual entities which belong to specific societies. They use the term 'variety' to avoid sensitive debates over the identification of a 'language' or a 'dialect' and conclude that what counts as a language and what does not is judged according to sociopolitical issues. They exemplify this concern with the exmple of Danish and Norwegian, where for centuries Danish was the official language (as Norway was ruled by Denmark), while Norwegian was regarded as a dialect. Norwegian became the 'offical language' upon the declaration of Norway's independence. They also hold that language varieties exist as 'geographical continua without natural divisions into "languages"(2000:10)'.

The language of tourism and its sociological turn

Dann's contribution to the development of the sociolinguistic perspective to the language of tourism (1996)

From language and its relationship to society, we turn to the langue of tourism, its social functions and the underlying social aspects. Dann's seminal work *The Language of Tourism: A Sociolinguistic Perspective* (1996) claims that tourism has a discourse of its own, that 'tourism, indeed, *constitutes* discourse', that the language of tourism performs many social functions: as an instrument of the consumers' active involvement (both in the process of consumption and in the process of co-creating language, which, in turn, induces them to consume), as a process of social control (by the norms and values), and as a medium of socialization (employed by all stakeholders involved in activities and the development of their identities).

Dann notes that 'The language constitutes a very special type of communication, one which differs from other forms of human exchange since it represents the largest industry in the world- that of tourism.' (1996:1). He further deplores the lack of interest shown by researchers to it: 'amasingly, no one has expansively investigated it as a phenomenon in its own right' and insits that 'Certainly there have been some studies which have alluded to the linguistic features of tourism promotion, but none has so far brought them together and systematically examined tourism as a language per se.' (1996:2)

He compares the language of tourism with other 'languages' such as the language of architecture', or the 'language of music' and admits that 'These have various facets of life, have various ways of communicating to us' (1996:2). Dann enumerates their fnctions:

They are structured. They follow certain grammatical rules and have specialized vocabularies. They are in many senses language-like in their properties. Analogically, too, these languages convey messages, they have a heuristic or semantic content, they operate through a conventional system of symbols and codes. Many also include the equivalent of dialects and registers. (1996:2)

Dann recognizes the role language plays in tourism given that tourists read about destinations before their departure, and become driven to those destinations by the power of the language. This dependence of tourists on the persuasive power of language is a two way process. Tourists do

feed back into this discourse. They have their own way of constructing images from the information supplied to them by the tourism industry and other independent sources. They build their own systems of expectation, and, when these do not mesh with the promises held out by the language of tourism, one will clearly discern the voice of complaint. On the other hand, when tourists are satisfied with their experiences, they contribute to the language of tourism by becoming promoters themselves' (1996: 3)

Dann argues that the language of tourism is a 'code' whose praxis has the value of language for a group (Thurot, 1989). Quoting Kemper (1993: 594), he states that 'too can one legitimately refer to the "language of tourism" as a "language of modernity", promotion and consumerism. Indeed, so extensive and pervasive is the language of tourism that it merits

thorough investigation by tourism researchers' (1996:4). Referring to the language and discourse of tourism, he also admits Hollinshead's view (1993 a:527, 529) that 'although language can be considered neutral, discourse is value-committed. Discourse, through the processes of domination and subjectification, is said to commit violence on people and things and to impose authoritative limits on thought and action' (1996:4). He further explains that this led to several authors' reflecting on the notion of social constraint- and using the term 'discourse' or 'the discourse of tourism'.

Trying to point out the difference between the language of tourism and *rhetoric*, Dann states:

Some academics also refer to the "rhetoric of tourism", which similarly implies the use the power by the speaker to impress the addressee. Rhetoric differs from discourse in its "manner of exercising such power, since above all it is 'the art of persuasive or impressive speaking or writing" (Concise Oxford Dictionary,1959: 1050)- based on eloquence and deceit. (1996:5)

Dann also refers to the 'increasing evidence of various semiotic approaches towards the analysis of tourism and speaks of 4 major theoretical approaches which have contributed significantly to understanding tourism: authenticity, strangerhood, play and conflict. He states that their sociolinguistic correlates are: authentification, differentiation, recreation, and appropriation.

In Chapter 4. 'Tourism as a language of social control in prototypical forms of tourism', Dann looks back at the history of tourism and provides evidence of the type of tourism carried out in ancient Rome and other more attractive resorts and places. Hash (1979, citing Balsdon, 1969) also describes the leisure and travel activities of Romans (games, festivals, pilgrimages, trips to spas) and the excesses associated with resorts. Dann holds that 'He [Hash] quotes passages from Seneca and Cicero to show that these pursuits were expressed in the literature and oratory of the period. In other words, and even at this early stage, there was a definite connection between the language of tourism and tourism itself' (Dann, 1996:70).

Dann emphasizes the power of words providing as example the discussion between St. Augustine and St. Ambrose over the Roman tradition of fasting (on Saturdays as opposed to the Christian tradition of fasting on Sundays). Ambrose's solution was rendered in the saying: 'When I am here (i.e. in Milan) I do not fast on Sabbath. When in Rome I do'. This explanation has been recorded in the words: 'When in Rome I do as the Romans do'. This saying records the assumption that 'the normative requirements of travel have their origins in the language of tourism, a language of prescription and proscription' (1996:70). Going out from this example, Dann quotes the history of the evolution of tourism in relation to language, opinionating that the later centuries provided other guides to travelling and relaxation. Travel writers gave a greater impulse to tourism, again certifying the contribution of language to the development and promotion of tourism.

From the older times Dann moves on to 'Tourism as the language of social control in contemporary tourism' and starts from the paradoxes of tourism: freedom (external, internal) *versus* constraints. He views tourists as determined by the place they are coming from and states that their place of origin will define them who they are and how they interpret what they see. At the other end of the interaction, the tourist's demand has to be channelled and mastered by the tourism industry. In this regard, Dann (1996:75) quotes Micoud's words (1994: 307) that 'International tourism becomes a monolithic system with its own set of formalities to which the individual is subjected and all but disappears'.

In discussing 'The linguistic underpinnings of tourism as a language of social control' Dann goes out from the illocutionary force of the imperative, which is expressed through a request or command (as in 'Eat your breakfast', 'Let's have lunch'). In turn, requests or commands can also be expressed through other means (declarative, interrogative, exclamatory). It is through such devices that a language can exercise control over people. To emphasise his point he quotes Burke (1966) who sustains that 'language is essentially hortatory, a medium through which the cooperation with others is sought. This basic quality is more evident in rhetoric where the attempt to persuade or dissuade is even more evident'(1996:79).

How does social control come into play in the use of language? To prove his point, Dann shows how the tourism industry through its specific establishments and organised activities sets up constraints as to what and how tourists should behave and act as tourists. His book thus turns into the argument that, in spite of the apparent freedom promised by tourist agencies, hotels and other forms of tourism, tourism as a set of institutionalized activities restricts this liberty. First and foremost, according to Roberts (1994:4-5):

All sociologists hesitate before describing any time as totally free, or any experience as freely chosen…Most people's

leisure is constrained by economic and political structures, social stratification and prevailing moral conceptions of proper conduct… (Even though) people distinguish leisure from work, they say it is intrinsically motivated, rather than externally constrained.

In line with these assertions, Roberts assumes that although individuals are freed from their professional or social duties, 'they are not automatically free to do anything they wish, since they come under a new set of constraints'(idem.).

Dann looks further at how tourism acts 'as a language of social control in hotels and resorts'. According to Dann, *a* hotel, for example, can be considered 'as an establishment which encapsulates tourists protecting them from outside dangers' and affirms that 'Through its total institution-like qualities, the hotel above all manages its protégés'(1996:88). Dann quotes Wood's assumption that hotels 'are in essence agents of social control' (Wood, 1994 quoted in Dann, 1996:88), and that 'the larger the hotel the greater the social control exercised by the management' (Wood, 1994 cited in Dann, 1996:88). In a most general sense, social control is a regulation of human behavior and tourists recognize that there are both implicit obligations to use the services provided by a hotel as well as constraints upon their enjoyment. This assumption led to another trend that of self-catering and to some other forms, such as *mass tourism, Club Méditerranée* (Club Med), etc. in tourism.

Dann's book stimulated and influenced other sociolinguistic investigations into the language of tourism (Thurlow and Jaworsky, 2003; Jaworsky and Pritchard (eds) 2005; Cappelli, 2006; Fox 2006b; Phipps, 2006; Brice, 2007; Jaworsky, Thurlow, Ylanne-McEwen and Lawson, 2007), which insisted rather on language as 'a creator of identities, power and social differences in the context of tourism' (Fox, 2008: 20).

2. Further achievements

From the groundbreaking analysis and conclusions expressed by Dann (1996), the present paper will discuss the further achievements of the sociolinguistic approach to tourism.

Giving credit to Dann's book, Fox (2008) notes that over the last decade the prominent turn in the language of tourism research and in tourism is the *sociolinguistic turn*, represented by Dann (1996), Jaworski and Pritchard (eds.) (2005), Jaworski, Thurlow, Ylanne-McEwen and Lawson (2007). Fox explains that 'The new angle has redirected the research into English language in tourism towards explicit links between theoretical and empirical perspectives on the tourist experience, identity, performance and authenticity within the frame of sociolinguistics and discourse analysis' (2008:14).

The dominant sociological bend noticed in western tourism research has been acknowledged by Dann and Liebman Parrinello (2009: 1), who note in the *Abstract* to their book: 'Currently there is abundant evidence of the quasi-total domination of the sociology and anthropology of tourism by academics from the English-speaking world, a situation that appears to be aided and abetted by the publishers of books and articles in English. The authors claim that 'This volume is the first attempt of its kind to familiarise readers in the US, UK, Australia and the English speaking regions of Africa and Asia with such evolutionary thinking. In such a manner, also, it will be possible to discern, contextualize and better appreciate the European roots of subsequent theorising in the Anglophone world, thereby enabling a more accurate assessment of its hitherto unchallenged claims to originality' (Idem.).

In the book written in 2009, Dann Graham an**d** Liebman Parrinello Giuli take a closer and a more ambitious look at tourism in its relation to social theories and their emergence in various countries in Europe. Their study was aimed at drawing up a comparative study of tourism-related social theories that emerged in Europe.

On the other hand, the relationship between language – tourism- sociology was enriched by the intake of discourse analysis as a more reliable method. Critical discourse analysis has been given the greatest credit for unveiling the sociological underpinnings of tourism.

As the promoter of Critical discourse analysis (CDA), Fairclough defines it as a form of critical social analysis which focuses upon relations between discourse and other aspects of social life, claiming that its critique is in part ethical. Fairclough states that CDA is both normative critique and explanatory critique (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999: 33, 59-69; Fairclough 2015: 10-13), while his more recent works point to an ethical critique which is a part of normative critique. In his 2015 article, he regards *ethical critique* as primarily a critique of actions, but, at the same time, actions are conditioned and constrained by social practices, institutions and structures, so ethical critique needs to be extended to them, he suggests. It should be understood with no doubt that what Fairclough defines ethical critique will expand over much of what is being said or written

as part of any discourse.

Discussion: Transdisciplinarity.The relationship between language, tourism and sociology

All these achievements, in particular the adoption of sociolinguistics by the tourism-based disciplines, disciplines such as destination management, marketing or branding, hospitality, etc., represents a proof of the transdisciplinarity of tourism as a field of study, which grows on the contribution of other disciplines. In addition, according to Fox, 'the adoption of sociolinguistics as an accredited theory (or a set of theories) by the scholars in tourism and the tendency to work with other disciplines would dispel its "undisciplined" character (Tribe, 1997)' (2008: 20). Fox argues that 'sociolinguistics can provide a researcher with an objective insight into the language – tourism relationship', explaining that 'more precisely, it offers a theoretical frame for the systemic and critical analysis of the use of language in tourism from a variety of perspectives' (2008:21).

On the other hand, in the first decade of the 21st century, the language of tourism acquired a distinctive status and became a means of investigating other areas of concern to tourism, such areas as destination marketing, management, branding, hospitality, advertising, sociology of tourism. In this respect, according to Fox (2008:13-14), *English in tourism*

'has been highlighted as a factor of the process of "language brokerage" (Cohen and Cooper 1986), as a means of promoting a global lifestyle (Thurlow and Jaworski 2003), as a key element of tourist destination branding (Morgan, Pritchard and Pride /eds./ 2002), as enabling individuals to experience their identity through tourism (Palmer 2005), as shaping a tourist destination (Cappelli 2006), as a key factor of tourists' perceptions (Phipps 2006), as a carrier of a destination's "sovereign subjectivity" (Bryce 2007) and, not least, as crucial for the new theorising of tourism (Ateljevic, Pritchard and Morgan /eds./ 2007)'.

Fox (2008) assumes that the growth of transdisciplinarity in any field of study, including tourism, accounts for the fast progress towards *mode - 2 knowledge*; according to her *mode –2 knowledge* is a new type of knowledge which involves a variety of mechanisms of creating/communicating knowledge, participants from numerous disciplinary backgrounds, and a great diversity of sites in which knowledge is produced. Fox explains the significance of 'mode - 2 knowledge':

'Unlike traditional forms of knowledge, usually referred to as mode- 1 knowledge, which are disciplinary, homogenous, hierarchical and dictated by the interests of academic communities, mode - 2 knowledge production is transdisciplinary, heterogenous, heterarchical and transient' (2008:20).

Fox (2008: 20) resumes the benefits of the transdisciplinary character of tourism and the contribution *sociolinguistics* can bring to its growth:

'Therefore, the adoption of sociolinguistics as supportive to the theory of tourism will constitute a decisive move towards a new paradigm of tourism research which will lead to the generation of new types of knowledge and, in turn, enable new insights into the increasingly complex relationship between language and tourism.'

Fox further suggests that 'a sociolinguistic understanding' of, for example, a tourist destination's public discourse enables researchers, and practicing managers too, to recognise a tourist destination's public discourse as much more than just *feeding information cum promotion* to the consumer'(2008:21). In addition, Fox concludes that

A tourist destination language/discourse researchers' awareness of the indispensability of sociolinguistics to a systemic understanding of a destination's public discourse will gradually make sociolinguistics an integral part of a metatheorising tourism: a process aimed both at an improved understanding of the existing theories within tourism as a field of study, and at further development of the theory of tourism itself, that is, at creating perspectives that overarch the existing theory by involving a seemingly distant field of study: sociolinguistics.(2008:21)

She agrees that sociolinguistics can contribute a theoretical multi-perspective frame to the analysis of the language used in tourism, which is what other scholars have tried to demonstrate as well.

Conclusion

Tourism has become a global phenomenon in the post-modern society, owing much of its development to its relationship with language. Over the last two decades, the use of language in tourism has attracted interest from many other tourism-related fields and has drawn in considerable sociolinguistic research.

From a timid start up in the 1950s and 1960s, tourism education has gained more focus and has acquired a steady growth in the last decades of the 20th century. Against the background of the development of tourism education and applied linguistics, the present study argues that the language of tourism slowly made its way into tourism, tourism education and sociolinguistics. However, the relationship between the language of tourism and tourism and sociology is a two way relationship, to which, indeed, both tourism and sociology bring their useful contribution.

The present study surveyed the development of teaching materials on the language of tourism by emphasising the role played by the rise of English for tourism as a *specialised language* in the larger context of the 1990s advancements in linguistic studies.

The link between tourism and sociology was noted by Lanfant (1995) who also suggested that the *sociology of tourism* and its sociological object should capture the multi-polarity of tourism. To give relevance to the sociological turn of the language of tourism, the present article tackled the relationship between language and sociology and then the relation that sociology bears to tourism. The remarkable and seminal works of Cohen (1984), Apostolopouslos, et al. (1996), Dann (1996), and Dann and Cohen (1996) in the field of the sociology of tourism have been discussed.

However, the article's main focus has been the sociological turn of the language of tourism, a phenomenon that marked the 21st century. Broadly speaking, the 21st century has resulted in two firm and discernable perspectives on the language of tourism and its study. On the one hand, the language of tourism has acquired a more investigative turn which headed in the direction of applied linguistic studies, moving towards discourse analysis, multimodal analysis (Faircough, 2012) and semiotic discourse analysis. On the other hand, the transdisciplinary studies have gone in the direction of tourism. Such investigations have been carried out in multiple tourism-related fields or other areas of concern to tourism, such as: destination marketing, destination management, branding, hospitality, advertising and so on. For these tourism-related areas of scholarly concern the study of the language of tourism turned into an active and useful contributor to their study (Fox, 2008).

On the other hand, another research perspective which liaises English for tourism with sociology, has resulted in the adoption of a profound sociological approach to tourism, a phenomenon detailed in the final sections of the article. In this respect, the paper also sought to underscore the deep and interdependent relationship between tourism, the language of tourism and sociology. Then, quoting Fox (2008:14), the article mentions the new angle represented by Dann (1996), Jaworski and Pritchard (eds.) (2005), and Jaworski, Thurlow, Ylanne-McEwen and Lawson (2007) who have 'redirected the research into English language in tourism towards explicit links between theoretical and empirical perspectives on the tourist experience, identity, performance and authenticity within the frame of sociolinguistics and discourse analysis' (2008:14). The dominant sociological bend noticed in western tourism research has been acknowledged by Dann and Liebman Parrinello in their 2009 work.

Finally, as a corollary of the presented views and assumptions, the article points out the transdisciplinary character of the language of tourism. The growth of transdisciplinarity in any field of study has become an incontestable reality and *English in tourism* is no exception. As suggested by Fox (2008) it has become a factor of the process of 'language brokerage', a means of studying other areas of concern to tourism, from destination management, branding, advertising, hospitality to sociological issues and investigations that pertain to the individual's perception of tourism, tourist experience, idntity, prfromance and authenticity (Fox, 2008).

Bibliography

[1] Apostolopoulos, Yiorgos, Leivadi, Stella, Yiannakis, Andrew (eds) (2001, 3rd edition) *The Sociology of Tourism,* Routledge

[2] Apple, M. (1986) Book review: 'Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste. Pierre Bourdieu, Richard Nice' in *Comparative Education Review*, Vol. 30, Number 2/May 1986

[3] Billig, M. (1997). The Dialogic Unconscious: Psychoanalysis, Discursive Psychology and the Nature of Repression. *British Journal of Social Psychology,* 36: 139-159

[4] Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*, Routledge
https://www.amazon.com/Distinction-Critique-Judgement-Routledge-Classics/dp/0415567882

[5] Boyer, M., and Viallon, P. (1994) *La Communication Touristique,* Paris, Prsss Universitaires de Fance

[6] Chomsky, N. (1957) *Syntactic Structures,*

https://archive.org/stream/NoamChomskySyntcaticStructures/Noam%20Chomsky%20-
%20Syntcatic%20structures_djvu.txt, visited 15.06.2018

[7] Chomsky, N. (1963) 'Formal properties of language', in D. Luce (ed.), *Handbook of Mathematical Psychology*. John Wiley & Sons

[8] Chouliaraki, Lilie and Fairclough, Norman (1999) *Discourse in late modernity: rethinking critical discourse analysis.* Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, UK

[9] Cohen, D. (1984) *The Sociology of Tourism: Approaches, Issues and Findings* (1984) Ann. Rev. Socio/.1984.10:373-92,https://www.researchgate.net/publication/234838269_The_Sociology_of_Tourism_Approaches_Issues_and_Findings

[10] Cooper, C.P. , Shepherd, R. and Westlake , J. (1996) E*ducating the Educators in Tourism: A Manua of Turism and Hospitality Education,* Guildford and the University of Surrey

[11] Dann Graham M.S., Liebmann Parrinello, Giuli (2009) *The Sociology of Tourism. European Origins and Developments*, Emerald

[12] Dann, G. (1996) *The language of tourism: a sociolinguistic perspective*, Wallingford, Oxon, UK : CAB International, http://0-www.worldcat.org.novacat.nova.edu/title/language-of-tourism-a-sociolinguistic-perspective/oclc/35054169 (visited on 3/17/2018)

[13] Dann, G.M.S. (1996) 'Greenspeak: An Analysis of the Language of Eco-tourism', *Progress in Tourism and Hospitality Research*, Vol. 2, 247-259

[14] Dann, Graham and Cohen, Erik (1996) 'Sociological treatment of tourism' in Yiorgos Apostolopoulos, Stella Leivadi and Andrew Yiannakis (eds) *The Sociology of Tourism,* Routledge

[15] Fabas Borra, J. (1978) 'Semiologia del languaje turisti*co', Estudios Turisticos, 57-58, 17-203*

[16] Fairclough, N. (2015) The power in language - Norman Fairclough , *Language and Power*. (3rd edn.) London: Routledge

[17] Fairclough, N. (2005) 'Critical discourse analysis', *Marges Linguistiques*, no. 9, 2005, pages: 76-94

[18] Fox, R. (2008) 'English in tourism: a sociolinguistic perspective', Tourism and Hospitality Management, Vol. 14, No 1, pp 13-22

[19] Goeldner, C.R. (1988) Travel 1987: 'The Year In Review', *The Journal of Travel Research*, http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/004728758802600408

[20] Hauger, Elinar (1953) 'The Norwegian Language in America: a study of bilingual behaviour', *The Bilingual Community.* Vol. II, *The American Dialects of Norwegian*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1953. Pp. xiv, 695. $8.00.

[21] Hollinshead, K. (1999) 'Tourism as public culture: Horne's ideological commentary on the legerdemain of tourism', International Journal of Tourism Research, https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/%28SICI%291522-1970%28199907/08%291%3A4%3C267%3A%3AAID-JTR171%3E3.0.CO%3B2-Z, visited on 21.06.2018

[22] Hymes, D. (1974) Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach, University of Pennsylvania Press

[23] Irimiea Silvia Blanca, 'European and National Recognition of Vocational Qualifications and Competences in Tourism', *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai, Geographia,* 2/2009, pp 283-291

[24] Irimiea Silvia Blanca, (2008) 'Tracing the Evolution of English for Tourism Purposes at the Faculty of Geography', *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai, Geographia*, LIII,2, 2008, pp 163-170

[25] Irimiea Silvia Blanca, 'Designing a Syllabus for an English for Tourism Course', *Studia Universitatis "Babeş-Bolyai", Geographia*, Cluj-Napoca, 1, 1998, pp 155-160

[26] Jacob, M. & Strutt, P. (1997) *English for International Tourism*

[27] Jafari, J.& Riche, J.R.B. (1981) 'Towards a framework for tourism education: propblems and prospects', Annals of Tourism Research, 8, 13-34

[28] Jaworski, A., Thurlow, C., Ylanne-McEwen, V. and Lawson, S. (2007) Language, Tourism and Globalisation: The Sociolinguistics of Fleeting Relationships. London: Routledge

[29] Lanfant, M-F. (1995) 'International Tourism, Internationalization and the Challenge to Identity' in International Tourism: Identity and Change (Eds) Marie-Françoise Lanfant, John B. Allcock & Edward M. Bruner DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446250402.n2

[30] Mayr, A. 2008, *Language and Power,* Continuum (52574769-Language-and-Power-an-Introduction-to-Institutional-Discourse.pdf, visited 25/11/2018)

[31] Mesthrie, R., Swann, J. et al. (2000) *Introducing Soiolinguistics,* Edinburg University Press

[32] Moeran, B. (1983) 'The language of Japanese tourism', *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol.1, Issue 1, 93-108, Elsevier

[33] Roberts, B., Donahue, E.M. (1994) 'One Personality, Multiple Selves: Integrating Personality and Social Roles', Journal of Personality, Vol. 62, Issue 2, 1994, pp 199-218, https:/doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1994.tb00291.x

[34] Sankoff, G. (1986) *The Social Life of Language*, University Pennsylvania Press, 1986

[35] Selwyn, T. (1993) 'Peter Pan in South East Asia. Views from the brochures', in M. Hitchcock, V. King, and M. Parnwell (Eds.) *Tourism in South Asia*, London, Routledge

[36] Thurlow, C. and Jaworsky, A. (2010) 'Conclusions' in Thurlow and Jaworsky (Eds) *Tourism Discourse*, Palgrave macmillan

[37] Razusova, M., 'The language of tourism',in http://www.pulib.sk/elpub2/FF/Ferencik2/pdf_doc/27.pdf

[38] Weinreich, U. (1953) *Languages in Contact*: *Findings and Problems*, Walter de Gruyter

[39] Whorf, B. L. (1956) Language, thought, and reality; selected writings, Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge