
Adjective + Noun Collocations in Tourism Discourse – A Contrastive Corpus-Based Study of English and Serbian

Dragana Vuković Vojnović, University of Novi Sad, Serbia

Abstract

The main objective of the paper was to identify recurring *adjective + noun collocations* and to analyse their main morpho-syntactic, semantic and communicative features in the context of promotional tourism texts in English and Serbian on the Internet. Firstly, two comparable corpora in English and Serbian were compiled from the tourism-related websites of Great Britain and Serbia, and key *adjective + noun collocations* were extracted by means of two software tools. Based on their normalized frequencies per 10,000 words, the collocations were first analysed quantitatively. The subsequent qualitative analysis looked deeper into the specific use of *adjective + noun collocations* in the context of tourism texts as well as into the similarities and differences of these collocations in the two languages. The results of the study have implications for tourism discourse studies, language typology and lexicography as well as English for Tourism education.

Keywords: adjective + noun collocations, contrastive corpus analysis, tourism discourse, English-Serbian analysis

1 Introduction

Tourism discourse has been receiving increased attention in recent decades, particularly in terms of communication with the clients via the Internet and social media. This special type of discourse mainly features a combination of verbal and non-verbal elements used to promote destinations and services to a wider audience, following ethical principles of customer relations. The world has become a global village with increased mobility and accessibility, so the tourism discourse happening online is creating an image of global intercultural connectedness (Thurlow and Jaworski 2010, 4). Tourism professionals thus use language for the promotion of tourist destinations and tourism services in the way that they co-create value with the customers with the ultimate aim of selling tourism products to them. Promotional tourism discourse promotes tourism products as objects of desire, creating a sense of inequality and privilege (Thurlow and Jaworski 2010, 11).

The study focuses on the use and role of *adjective + noun* collocations in tourism promotion on the Internet.* It is expected that destination descriptions are rich in these collocations, whose main purpose is to create a positive, inspiring and intriguing description that will attract customers. Firstly, a brief overview of specific elements of tourism discourse relevant for this study is given. Secondly, the theoretical approach to collocations is explained, followed by the rationale behind the contrastive corpus-based method of analysis. The methodology comprises the extraction of *adjective + noun* collocations from two comparable corpora in English and Serbian compiled from the official promotional websites of tourism organizations of Great Britain and Serbia as well as two major travel agencies in these countries. The most frequent *adjective + noun* collocations in the two corpora are then analysed morpho-syntactically, semantically and pragmatically. This is followed by an overview of the similarities and differences, leading to an overall conclusion on the use of *adjective + noun* collocations in this type of discourse. The results can also be interpreted in view of the pedagogical implications they have for tourism language education at the university level.

* The results and findings presented here are based on a larger study that was conducted for a doctoral thesis.

2 Theoretical background

2.1 *Tourism discourse*

Jaworski and Pritchard (2005, 6–7) state that tourism discourse shapes our vision of reality, social identities and understanding of *the self* and *the other*. In addition, tourism discourse on the Internet is a specific form of advertising whose “ultimate goal [...] is to inform and persuade” (Bhatia 2019, 438). Advertising strategies rely on the rational principle (informational function of the message) and emotional principle (positive, negative, and neutral) (Bhatia 2019, 435), which are both relevant for the promotional tourism discourse. More specifically, in addition to being informative, tourism-related promotion is sensitive to positive emotions (unlike, for example, health-related advertising) with the aim of creating a desire for travelling and ultimately embarking on a journey.

The embellished descriptions of the physical space turn it into an ideal image, giving it special, symbolic meaning. Maci (2018, 33) explains that the use of adjectives in tourism discourse evaluates and enriches the information given in promotional texts in order to create a positive, emotional appeal, as well as contribute to destination differentiation. There are numerous important features of tourism rhetoric that are used to attract tourists to visit various destinations. They range from *authenticity*, *novelty*, *uniqueness*, and *magic* to the concepts of *play*, *conflict* and *appropriation* as well as the specific use of the *notion of time* (Dann 1996), and they are often marked by specific adjectives used in the descriptions. For example, the aspect of authenticity is used to attribute specific semiotic significance to tourist attractions and destinations to create the sense of uniqueness. Historic buildings, landmarks, even culinary specialties are treated as symbols of a region or tourist resort. To create such an image, advertising specialists use descriptive adjectives such as *actual*, *authentic*, *original*, *pure*, *real* or *true* (Vuković Vojnović 2020, 452). Another element that motivates tourists is their desire to find places that are different from those where they live, to explore something that has never been seen before. The aspects of novelty, strangeness and even magic are observed in the use of specific descriptive adjectives such as *unspoilt (nature)*, *pristine (beach)*, *remote (island)*, *picturesque*, *quaint (village)*, and *Magical Kenya*.¹ The element of play is evident in the promotion of recreational activities (e.g., *fun-filled activities*), whereas the aspect of intercultural conflict is explored through a specific

1 See <https://www.magicalkenya.com/mkse/>.

romanticized approach to local history and culture and is presented to tourists in a way that is considered the most acceptable. For example, festivals are the most popular way to promote local diversity, as found in the introductory text on the Canadian website *Destination Indigenous*:² *Bask in the joyful reclamation of traditional dances and songs, and sense the palpable pride of Indigenous dancers, drummers and singers as they embody the power of Pow Wow.*

2.2 Collocations

Collocations are relatively stable elements in language, but in addition to the creation of new ones they can occasionally disappear from language over time. For example, in Serbian the collocation *teška žena* [*heavy woman*] with the meaning of *trudna žena* [*pregnant woman*] has been lost (Pervaz 1984–1985, 607).

With regard to vocabulary learning pedagogy, Nation (2007, 328) emphasizes that it is necessary to dedicate part of such studies to collocations. According to this author, in order to choose the collocations that should be paid attention to when learning a foreign language, it is necessary to gain knowledge about:

- a) which collocations are very frequent
- b) which collocations are unpredictable and composed of very frequent words
- c) which common collocations deserve special attention
- d) which collocations are less frequent and should be included in collocation dictionaries to facilitate their learning.

In terms of the definition of collocations, it can easily be observed that various authors apply different approaches and do not always agree on the matter. In the attempt to find the best definition, collocations are often compared to and distinguished from other word combinations, such as compounds, phrasal verbs, idioms, fixed phrases, etc. Compared to these, collocations represent a less strong but still a rather stable bond between two or more words, with different levels of connectedness of their constituents, i.e., the collocates. Most often, collocations are defined and classified either from the phraseological or frequency approach. The first authors who paved the path for the study of collocations were Palmer (1933) from the phraseological and pedagogical aspect and Firth ([1951] 1957a; 1957b) from the frequency aspect.

2 See <https://canadianpowwows.ca/>.

Cowie (1978, 127–39) defines collocations as co-occurrences of two or more lexical units that are realized within syntactic structures, and also in different grammatical constructions that can be transformationally connected (e.g., *a drastic fall*, *fall drastically*). Cowie (1978) further observes that the relationships between the words that make up a collocation are influenced by their relative freedom to combine with other words. The flexibility of these combinations is expressed through Cowie's continuum (1981) or a combining scale, at one end of which there are *strictly limited collocations* whose constituents cannot be replaced by their synonyms (e.g., *foot the bill* is an acceptable collocation in English, while *foot the account* is unacceptable), via *relatively limited collocations* where synonym replacement can be observed (e.g., *conduct research* or *carry out research*) to *open collocations*, where there is a large selection of combinations (e.g., *run a business*, *run a company*, *run a car*).

According to Crystal (1987, 105), collocations are characterized by a syntagmatic tendency of lexemes to connect in a predictable way, and they can be very different in different languages, so it is understandable that they are not easily acquired in a foreign language. On the other hand, Lakoff (1987, 148) suggests that the meaning of a collocation is motivated by the meaning of its components but cannot be predicted. Van Roey (1990, 46) offers the broadest definition of collocations by explaining that a word “chooses” to combine with a particular word and not its synonym based on their usage and not on their conceptual restrictions, i.e., their meaning or syntactic restrictions. Sinclair (1991, 170) defines a collocation as the occurrence of two or more words that are at a short distance from each other in the text and distinguishes between *statistically significant collocations* that have a high frequency of occurrence, and the so-called *casual collocations* that are not frequent.

The importance of the context and usage for understanding the meaning of lexemes was first emphasized within lexical semantics and its concept of dynamic construal approach, especially by Croft and Cruse (2004, 97–100) who said that “neither meanings nor structural relations are specified in the lexicon, but are construed ‘on-line’, in actual situations of use” and that “an isolated sign certainly has semantically relevant properties, [...] but they are to be distinguished from the interpretations themselves”. This is further supported by the theory of a lexical field, which is a set of semantically related lexemes whose meanings are mutually dependent and represent a certain conceptual structure that reflects reality (Geeraerts 2010, 52). Dragičević (2010, 221) also noted the importance of the context for determining the meaning of a lexeme used in a collocation, and that context can be the collocation itself, where the

meaning of one element determines the meaning of another, or the wider context in which the collocation occurred.

According to Dražić (2013, 387), who investigated collocations in Serbian, collocations are word combinations where either both collocates are in their primary meaning or one is in its primary meaning and the other is in its secondary meaning, with a narrow collocational range, low replaceability and great stability. Regarding the connectedness of their constituents, there is the continuum which includes open, bound and restricted collocations (Dražić 2014, 72). Concerning the collocability and connectedness of the constituents in *adjective + noun collocations*, Dragičević (2011, 114–15) found that frequent adjectives collocated with a larger number of nouns and were not under a great influence of the meaning of the noun, whereas less frequent adjectives had a more restricted ability to collocate, so that the noun, i.e., the collocational context narrowed the meaning of such adjectives.

2.3 *Contrastive approach*

Contrastive analysis first developed within the context of foreign language teaching, and one of the first advocates for the importance of contrastive linguistics for teaching and learning foreign languages was Robert Lado (1957, 2, 215), who pointed out how a comparison of the target language with the native language, and a discussion about their similarities and differences, could be used to facilitate learning a foreign (target) language. The author further developed the model of contrastive linguistic analysis in his later work (Lado 1964).

Research regarding collocations in a second or foreign language often focuses on the difficulties non-native speakers experience when having to make the right choice of a lexeme. For example, Bahns and Eldaw (1993, 102) concluded, after investigating the knowledge of English *verb + noun collocations* among German speakers through translation and cloze tests, that even very advanced English language learners could not easily predict adequate and acceptable collocations. On the other hand, research shows that native speakers can easily make the right choice of lexemes to combine into collocations (Ackermann and Chen 2013, 236).

One of the first large-scale contrastive investigations of English and Serbian can be traced back to the *Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian English Contrastive Project* (1968–1980). Of particular interest for this research was Vladimir Ivir's paper

entitled *An Outline for the Contrastive Analysis of English and Serbo-Croatian Adjectives* (1969), in which the author dealt with adjectives in the narrowest sense of the word, excluding attributive and predicative nouns, participle forms, adverbs, demonstrative pronouns, possessive adjectives and pronouns, indefinite pronouns, articles and numbers (Ivir 1969, 31). The author gave a thorough analysis of the morphosyntactic characteristics of adjectives and concluded that there were certain similarities between adjectives in English and Serbo-Croatian (1969, 32). Namely, in both languages the majority of adjectives are attributive (prenominal position) descriptive adjectives, which is a trend observed in the current study as well. Đorđević (1989) went further in comparing and contrasting all words in the nominal group. In particular, the author dealt with the properties of adjectives, primarily in their attributive – descriptive or classificatory function, and their role in *adjective + noun collocations*. As seen in Table 1, Đorđević (1989, 570–72) also drew attention to the diverse possibilities of translation options in Serbo-Croatian for the English *adjective + noun collocations*, which has implications for the contrastive analysis of the two languages.

TABLE 1. Corresponding Serbian expressions for English *adjective + noun collocations* (Đorđević 1989).

ENGLISH	SERBIAN
adjective + noun <i>a Portuguese priest</i>	noun + noun <i>sveštenik Portugalac</i>
adjective + noun <i>happy tears</i>	noun + noun in Genitive case <i>suze sreće</i>
adjective + noun <i>African woman</i>	noun <i>Afrikanka</i>
noun <i>nursery</i>	adjective + noun <i>dečija soba</i>
adjective + noun <i>horrid thing</i>	indefinite pronoun + adjective <i>nešto loše</i>
adjective + noun <i>silent meeting</i>	noun + prepositional phrase <i>sastanak u tišini</i>
adjective + noun <i>hesitant dawn</i>	noun + relative clause <i>... u pravcu zore koja je oklevala</i>
adjective + noun <i>windless day</i>	adverbial clause <i>...kada nije bilo vetra...</i>

adjective + noun <i>haggard look</i>	deverbalized adjective + noun <i>iznuren pogled</i>
adjective + noun He demanded my <i>speedy entrance</i> . His mother gave him <i>a long and fervent kiss</i> .	adverb + verb Zahtevao je da <i>brzo uđem</i> . Majka ga <i>poljubi vatreno i dugo</i> .
determinator + noun He had <i>his wits about him</i> , we had not.	adjective On je bio <i>priseban</i> , a mi ne.

In English, the attributive function of adjectives is often performed by present and past participles as well as gerunds, which are all difficult to distinguish from adjectives with the same endings, so on the surface these phrases are often understood as *adjective + noun collocations*. In Serbian, the situation is similar regarding the participles. Furthermore, in most situations adjectives in Serbian also precede nouns, but in some instances they are not secondary collocates but primary collocates or nodes.³ Dražić (2013, 393–94) classified *adjective + noun collocations* based on their surface structure and the meaning of adjectives into four major groups as follows:

1. Adj + N (*olakšavajuća okolnost [mitigating circumstance], retka prilika [rare occasion], vremenski uslovi [weather conditions]*);
2. Adj^{primary} + N (*dnevna politika [daily politics], klimatske promene [climate change], lična odgovornost [personal responsibility]*);
3. Adj^{secondary} + N (*vlažan vazdub [humid air], mutno sećanje [vague memory], stari prijatelj [old friend]*);
4. Adj^{incomplete} + N (*sklon praštanju [prone to forgive/forgiving], željan znanja [willing to learn], okovan ledom [bound by ice/ ice bound], svestan posledica [aware of the consequences]*).

The first group has an abstract noun as the node and the change on the paradigmatic level depends on the semantic range of the words (Dražić 2014, 138–40). The adjective can often be replaced by its antonym (e.g., *olakšavajuća/otežavajuća okolnost [mitigating/aggravating circumstance]*). The *adjective^{primary} + noun collocations* where the adjective is in its primary meaning are the most stable ones and are very close to phrasemes or terms (e.g.,

3 In the theory of collocations, the main constituent that carries the meaning of a collocation is the primary collocate which is modified or further specified by the secondary collocate (Prčić 2008, 151). Primary and secondary collocates are referred to as the node and collocate respectively by Sinclair (1966, 415).

tekuća voda [running water]), whereas those with the adjective in its secondary meaning are less stable. The last group is structurally different from the previous ones because the primary collocate is actually the adjective with an incomplete meaning that needs to be followed by a noun that specifies it, and the connection between the collocates is not so strong as in the first and second groups.

3 Research design

Bearing in mind the importance of field-specific lexical collocations in the language of profession, the current study was designed with the aim of exploring lexical collocations in promotional tourism discourse, establishing similarities and differences of the two languages in this domain, and investigating possible further implications for English for Tourism, as a language for specific purposes.

Regarding methodology, the source language was English and the contrastive analysis was done with a comparable corpus in Serbian. The main focus of the study was to extract *adjective + noun collocations* that are specific for the institutional promotional tourism discourse and could be characterized as key collocations. More specifically, the study investigated the collocations in which the primary collocate was a noun and the secondary collocate was an adjective in the attributive function considering the surface syntactic structure. Semantically, the adjectives in question are descriptive or qualitative adjectives with the meaning *have a characteristic of* or classificatory adjectives with the meaning *be connected to* (Đorđević 1989, 504). In English, the present and past participles also perform an attributive function before the noun in the same way as adjectives, and as such were treated as *adjective + noun collocations* for the purpose of this study.

The study was aimed at establishing the following:

1. the most frequent *adjective + noun collocations* in the two comparable corpora,
2. the morpho-syntactic and semantic characteristics of these collocations,
3. the similarities and differences between the two comparable corpora,
4. the potential to implement the research results into ESP education at tertiary level.

3.1 *Corpus*

The total number of words in the English Tourism Corpus (ETC) was 98,567, and for the Serbian Tourism Corpus (STC) it was 87,489 words. For a more objective comparison, after extracting the absolute frequencies from the corpora (*f*), relative frequencies (*nf*) normalized to 10,000 words were calculated. The text input for the creation of corpora was a random selection of texts obtained from official website presentations of the national tourism boards of Great Britain and Serbia, along with the text input from official websites of two leading travel agencies from the respective countries. The texts were copied and converted into .docx files and inserted into software for the collocation extraction.

3.2 *Procedure*

Firstly, collocations from the ETC were compiled by means of the software tool *TermoStat Web 3.0* which automatically extracts *adjective + noun* and *noun + noun collocations* that are considered to be terminological for the specialized corpora. The software applies a log-likelihood test that compares the uploaded technical (i.e., specialized) corpus with the general corpus. Another criterion that is applied is the specificity score, which shows how specific the extracted collocations are for the analysed corpus when compared to a general corpus. These are the collocations that appeared four or more times, and they were considered as specific for the context of tourism. On the other hand, collocations in the STC could not be extracted by means of this software tool, so *AntConc* was used for a more manual-like extraction of collocations. After identifying key adjectives and nouns in the wordlist, collocate and concordance options in the software were used to identify collocations that appeared four or more times to keep it consistent with the principle that is automatically applied in *TermoStat Web 3.0*. As has already been mentioned, normalized frequencies (*nf*) per 10,000 were calculated for both corpora. Furthermore, the collocations whose normalized frequencies were 1 or above were considered as the most frequent key collocations for the context of promotional tourism texts on the Internet. Due to the different sizes of the two corpora, this meant that for the corpus of texts in English the minimum absolute frequency of the collocations was 10, and in the corpus of texts in Serbian these collocations occurred at least nine times and more.

Following the quantitative analysis, the qualitative analysis first included the lexical and semantic overview of the extracted collocations and their constituents. The communicative functions of the collocations were analysed based on the rhetorical features of tourism discourse introduced in the theoretical section. Next, dominant topics of the promotional tourism texts were also identified based on the most frequent key collocations in the two corpora. Finally, an overview of the similarities and differences of the analysed corpora was prepared.

4 Results and discussion

4.1 Adjective + noun collocations in the English tourism corpus

A total of 142 key terminological collocations were found in the English Tourism Corpus (ETC), and their subtypes are listed in Table 2.

TABLE 2. Total number of key Adj + N collocations in ETC.

SUBTYPE	f	nf (per 10,000)
Adj + N	119	12.07
Adj (hyphenated compound) + N	12	1.22
Adj + [Adj + N]	5	0.5
Adj + [N + N]	5	0.5
Adj + [Adj + [N + N]]	1	0.11
TOTAL	142	14.5

As shown in Table 2, the most frequent structure was the binary structure with 119 collocations, and 12 collocations that contained a hyphenated compound adjective. The normalized frequency for Adj + N collocations was 12.07, and 18 frequent key collocations (whose normalized frequency per 10,000 words was 1 and above) were identified in this group, including *live music* (nf 4.26), *sandy beach* (nf 3.96), *old town* (nf 2.64), *outdoor pool* (nf 2.4), *double room* (nf 2.23), *indoor pool* (nf 1.92), *twin room* (nf 1.92) *extra beds* (nf 1.83), *national park* (nf 1.72), and *private beach* (nf 1.72). The adjectives in these collocations tend to have referential, informative functions, so most of them are mono-referential, i.e., their meaning is obvious in the context of tourism discourse and does not need further clarification.

A closer look at the adjectives shows that 23 frequent key adjectives were found in the ETC, and that they were mostly referential, informative adjectives. In this group, only five of the adjectives expressed an emotional function or an opinion about the described nouns: *beautiful*, *great*, *perfect*, *spectacular*, *stunning*. In addition, examples of the semantic prosody of *age* were found, e.g., *ancient ruins*, *old village*, and *modern centre*, then examples for *importance* as *main restaurant*, *national park*, and *international cuisine*, and examples for *authenticity* as in *local dishes* and *local produce*. Other adjectives expressed specific features such as *extra beds*, *extra charge*, and *golden beaches*, or physical features such as *winding streets*, *sandy beach*, and *sandy cove*, or positioning in the physical sense – *indoor pool*, *outdoor pool*, *seaside resort*, *seaside village*. It is also interesting to observe that statistically significant superlative forms were not found in the ETC, which was unexpected based on the main features of tourism discourse, as explained in the introductory section.

There were 12 collocations in the second most frequent subtype. Such adjectives were used to create a more concise and effective description than would have been achieved with a longer phrase or clause, as in the following examples:

- (1) It's a *five-minute walk* to the beach and Chaniotis town centre.
- (2) There are *late-night bars* and shops down here, but the real star is the *white-sand beach*.
- (3) ... thanks to its winding streets and *café-lined square* ...

In the subtypes with more than two collocates, there were only 11 different collocations that appeared four or more times in the corpus, but none of them had the normalized frequency of 1 or above. They can be further subdivided into two groups. In the first group, *adjective + noun collocation* can be considered as the primary collocate which was then further modified by an adjective, e.g., *historic old town*, *original winding streets*. The other subtype had the collocation *noun + noun* as the primary constituent, which was then further modified by an adjective, e.g., *tiny fishing villages*.

Considering the stability and connectedness of the collocates, it is evident that the nouns with a more general meaning were given a more specific meaning when modified by adjectives, and at the same time these collocations were more open, i.e., at the paradigmatic level it was easier to replace the adjective as in the examples *ideal place*, *perfect place*, *great place*. There was also a group of adjectives that described specific physical features of the noun, for example,

the material (e.g., *sandy beach*, *pebbled beach*), or gave a key characteristic that classified the noun (e.g., *private beach*, *secluded beach*), often creating a restricted set of collocations (e.g., *single room*, *double room*, *twin room*, *triple room*). Finally, there were collocations that denoted a unique term where secondary collocates replacement was not possible (e.g., *stately homes*, *mini bar*, *light bite*, *warm hospitality*).

As has been observed in the literature on tourism discourse as well as in the results of the current study, tourism texts aimed at attracting tourists perform a dual communicative function. On the one hand they are informative, referential and provide facts about a target destination, which was also evident in the *adjective + noun collocations* found in the corpora shown in sentence 4. On the other hand, they also use adjectives expressing emotion, value or opinion about the noun, thus creating a positive, embellished image of the destination (5) or emphasizing uniqueness and authenticity (6).

- (4) Enjoy *complimentary meals* accompanied by your choice of wine.
- (5) The *quiet sandy beaches*, *stunning scenery*, abundance of wildlife, *fresh, quality cuisine* and *warm welcoming hospitality* make these islands an *ideal place* for a *relaxing visit* or an *action-packed* holiday.
- (6) Low-rise buildings and *cobbled streets* give the place an *authentic flavour of Spain*

Another special feature of promotional tourism discourse is that certain adjectives when isolated from the context of the collocations and descriptive tourism texts would be considered as neutral and factual, but in the context of the image creation of a destination they represent a special quality and add to the authenticity and/or attractiveness of the place, such as *winding streets*, *cobbled café-lined square*, *white-sand beach*, *a short stroll*, *complimentary meals*, etc.

4.2 *Adjective + noun collocations in the Serbian tourism corpus*

In the Serbian Tourism Corpus (STC), 193 key terminological collocations were found with the overall normalized frequency of 22.05, so it can be concluded that the Serbian corpus was rich in *adjective + noun collocations*. More precise findings of the collocation subtypes are given in Table 3.

TABLE 3. Total number of key Adj + N collocations in STC.

SUBTYPE	f	nf
Adj + N	175	20
Adj (semi-compound) + N	2	0.22
Adj + [Adj + N]	7	0.8
Adj + [N + N]	9	1.03
TOTAL	193	22.05

As shown in Table 3, the most frequent structure was the binary structure, with 175 collocations and the normalized frequency of 20. The ten most frequent collocations in this subtype were *nadmorska visina* [*above sea level*] (nf 6.86), *fakultativni izlet* [*optional excursion*] (nf 5.94), *peščana plaža* [*sandy beach*] (nf 5.47), *slobodno vreme* [*free time*] (nf 5.47), *standardna soba* [*standard room*] (nf 4.57), *švedski sto* [*buffet*]⁴ (nf 4.46), *sopstveni prevoz* [*your own transportation*] (nf 4), *direktan čarter-let* [*direct charter flight*] (nf 3.66), *stari grad* [*old town*] (3.66) and *izabrani hotel* [*chosen hotel/ hotel of choice*] (nf 3.43).

In the STC, 53 adjectives were found whose normalized frequency was 1 or more than 1 per 10,000. They are among the collocations from the list of key terminological collocations, functioning as secondary collocates and having an attributive function. From this group, certain collocations are distinctly mono-referential and restricted with a narrow meaning within a specialized tourism context, such as *pomoćni ležaj*, *francuski ležaj*, *rani buking*, *fakultativni izlet*, *švedski sto*, *sopstveni prevoz* [*extra bed, double bed, early booking, optional excursion, buffet*]. The last example *sopstveni prevoz* is never used in English tourism texts in its literal translation [*your own transportation*]. Instead, the terms *accommodation only* or *hotel only* are used. Such tourism-related terms are particularly specific for the Serbian language, and their English translations do not reflect similar combinations apart from the obvious borrowings from English into Serbian (e.g., *rani buking* [*early booking*]).

As for the connectedness of the collocates, there were also collocations in the STC that could be grouped into limited sets of terms such as *standardni ležaj*, *pomoćni ležaj*, *francuski ležaj* [*standard bed, extra bed, double bed*] or *standardna soba*, *jednokrevetna soba*, *dvokrevetna soba* [*standard room, single room, twin/double room*]. At the other end of the collocation range there were collocations with adjectives that were very productive and modified a large

4 The collocation was often part of a larger phrase such as *večera na bazi švedskog stola*, which then translates into English as *buffet dinner*.

number of nouns, such as the adjective *tourist* which was found in the corpus 73 times in the extracted key collocations, such as *turistička agencija* [*travel agency*], *turistička destinacija* [*travel destination*], *turistička manifestacija* [*tourism event*], *turistička mesta* [*tourist resorts*], *turistička ponuda* [*tourist/tourism offer*], etc. This particular adjective was not productive in the ETC, which is also evident in the translations because it is often the case that the lexemes *travel* or *tourism* were used instead. Another adjective that was very productive in the STC was *hotelski* which was found 65 times in the most frequent collocations. Some of the examples include *hotelska pravila* [*hotel rules*], *hotelska soba* [*hotel room*], *hotelske usluge* [*hotel services*], *hotelski kompleks* [*hotel resort*], *hotelski obrok* [*hotel meal*], *hotelski sadržaji* [*hotel amenities*], *hotelski smeštaj* [*hotel accommodation*], etc. In English, such collocations are of a different type, namely, *noun + noun collocations* where the noun *hotel* is the secondary collocate in an attributive modifying function. The adjectives *individualni* [*individual*] and *prirodni* [*natural*] were also found in a larger number of less restricted collocations. The collocations with the adjective *individualni*, such as *individualna razgledanja* [*individual tours*], *individualne aktivnosti* [*individual activities*], *individualni transfer* [*individual transfer*], *individualni troškovi* [*individual expenses*] were connected to the explanation of legal matters to tourists and what was included in the holiday package. Such examples were not found in the ETC. Regarding the adjective *prirodni*, for example, *prirodno bogatstvo* [*natural wealth/resources*], *prirodne vrednosti* [*natural values*], *prirodne lepote* [*natural beauty*], *prirodne retkosti* [*natural rarities*], *prirodni fenomen* [*natural phenomenon*], it was found in the section where a lot of details were given regarding geographical characteristics of the area, which was rare in the ETC as this focused more on the amenities and activities a resort had to offer.

In the Serbian corpus, unlike the English one, the superlative forms were used to describe a destination more effectively and intensely. The most frequent adjective was *najlepši* (e.g., *najlepše plaže* [*the most beautiful beaches*], *najlepši grad* [*the most beautiful town*]) followed by the collocations *najbolja cena* [*the best price*] and *najbolji grad* [*the best town*]).

As in the English corpus, the adjectives in the STC were mostly informative, referential and when combined with nouns they provided accurate information about the destination and services. There were only three of the most frequent adjectives that had an emotional connotation, as in the examples *posebna atrakcija* [*special attraction*], *najlepše plaže* [*the most beautiful beaches*], *prelepe plaže* [*outstandingly beautiful beaches*]. Additionally, the adjective *čist* [*clean, clear*] described physical characteristics, but it actually created a strong

positive connotation regarding the described destination, for example *čist vazduh* [clean air], *čisto more* [clear sea], *čista voda* [clean/clear water]. A certain number of adjectives classified nouns into special categories, for example *arheološko nalazište* [archeological site], *sportski tereni* [sport ground], *mineralni izvori* [mineral springs], *lekovito bilje* [medicinal plants]. Furthermore, there were examples with the semantic prosody of *age* – *stari grad* [old town], *istorijski spomenik* [historic monument], then *importance* – *glavni grad* [capital city], *lokalni partner* [local partner], *nacionalna asocijacija* [national association], *specificity* or *special quality* – *posebna atrakcija* [special attraction], *privatna plaža* [private beach], *location* or *position* – *gradska zona* [urban area], *seosko domaćinstvo* [rural homestead], *centralni deo* [central part], *spoljašnji bazen* [outdoor pool].

As for the other subtypes, the second most frequent collocations were those where the primary collocates were *noun + noun collocation* that was further modified by an *adjective* which was actually crucial for the construal of the meaning of the collocations:

- (7) ***Panoramsko razgledanje grada*** uz posetu Akropolju i slobodno vreme.
[*Panoramic tour of the city/ panoramic city tour* including the Acropolis visit and free time.]

In the context of tourism, a *panoramic tour* means that you do not get off the bus for the duration of the tour.

The third subtype with normalized frequency of 0.8 included collocations where *adjective + noun* collocations were further modified by another adjective which added to a more effective, detailed description:

- (8) Ono što Kasandru čini popularnom je: blizina Soluna, mnogobrojna ***živopisna turistička mesta***, tradicionalna sela, grčke taverne, barovi i diskoteke.
[What makes Cassandra popular is: proximity to Thessaloniki, numerous ***picturesque tourist resorts***, traditional villages, Greek taverns, bars and discotheques.]

Unlike the findings in the ETC, the Serbian corpus had only two different collocations containing a hyphenated compound adjective that were part of the most frequent list, which was due to specific features of the Serbian language. According to orthographic rules in Serbian (Pešikan, Jerković and Pižurica 2007, 53), two lexemes which otherwise represent separate concepts and usually stand alone should be hyphenated when they are combined into one concept:

- (9) Hvar i njegova okolina bogati su *kulturno-istorijskim spomenicima* kao što su tvrđava...
 [Hvar and its surroundings are rich in *cultural and historic monuments* such as the fortress ...]

4.3 Corpora comparison

Referring to Table 2 and Table 3 with the number of collocations in each corpus, it is evident that *adjective + noun collocations* were more frequent in the STC than in the ETC, which can be explained by the more frequent distribution of *noun + noun collocations* in the ETC, since these are more frequently used in English, and in Serbian they would be translated as *adjective + noun collocations*, and *vice versa* (Vuković Vojnović 2021, 63). For example, *gradska plaža* or *letnji meseci* would be translated into English as *city beach* or *summer months*.

There were only seven collocations that can be considered as genuine translation equivalents, and all were very frequent in both languages: *peščana plaža* – *sandy beach*, *stari grad* – *old town*, *pomoćni ležaj* – *extra bed*, *otvoreni bazen* – *outdoor pool*, *spoljašnji bazen* – *outdoor pool*, *zatvoreni bazen* – *indoor pool*, *privatna plaža* – *private beach*.

Furthermore, there were several examples where English *adjective + noun collocations* have translation equivalents in Serbian with the same adjective in superlative form or a similar adjective with a more distinctive meaning – *beautiful beach* vs. *najlepša plaža* or *prelepa plaža*. In the ETC, collocations with adjectives in superlative forms were not found to be significant for the quantitative analysis in this study.

It is interesting to observe that the adjectives *local* in English and *lokalni* in Serbian were both included in the list of the most frequent items but with a different semantic prosody and context. In the STC the adjective *lokalni* belongs to the category of hierarchy and importance and was mostly found in the collocations from the section of online texts where tourists can find information on the organization of the trip – *lokalna agencija*, *lokalni vodič*, *lokalni partner*. In contrast, in the ETC the adjective *local* was used in the meaning of authenticity in the section where resort amenities are discussed – *local dishes*, *local produce*.

As discussed previously in the section about collocations, in Serbian there are *adjective + noun collocations* where the adjective is the primary collocate

complemented by the noun that follows it, as noted by Dražić (2013, 393–94), but statistically significant examples were not found in the STC, and ultimately this subtype was beyond the scope of this research.

5 Conclusion

Considering the theoretical underpinnings and findings presented in this paper, several conclusions can be drawn regarding the topic of *adjective + noun collocations* in promotional tourism texts. Overall, the results obtained in this work have implications for the further study of lexical collocations in tourism discourse and tourism promotion, intercultural similarities and differences of the two languages, as well as for vocabulary learning within the context of English for Tourism as a language for specific purposes. Based on the studied literature and quantitative and qualitative research conducted on a specially collected corpus in English and Serbian, several more specific observations and recommendations for further research can be made.

Using software tools for corpus analysis makes it easier for researchers and foreign language teachers to identify key words and collocations in the corpus, and understand the specific lexical-semantic, syntactic and communicative features of the key vocabulary. However, software tools need to be accompanied by a critical approach towards the results they produce, and therefore certain manual analytic procedures are still needed.

Applying a contrastive approach to the analysis of lexical collocations, especially in a specialized language context, provides a new perspective and deepens knowledge about the morphosyntactic and lexical-semantic characteristics of the compared languages, revealing some universal features on the one hand, and on the other determining some of the similarities and differences between them. In this way the lexicon of one language is systematized, and a more detailed insight into the semantic relations between lexical units of the same language is provided.

In the context of the language of tourism, the use of a corpus-based contrastive approach helps in building up the lists and eventually glossaries of frequent collocations, which will help students to familiarize themselves more easily with the nature of the language of tourism in English and compare it with the same discourse in their mother tongue, thus consequently gaining insight into the effects these texts have on potential clients. Students can also gain access to expressions attested in the authentic corpus, and by adopting

them they may be able to achieve greater fluency in expressing themselves in a foreign language, extract key words and collocations, create their own glossaries, create a collocation network, semantic maps, and so on.

In further research, it is necessary to investigate the most effective ways of applying corpus analysis in foreign language teaching. We believe that this could contribute to a more systematic approach to the acquisition of collocations and specialized vocabulary in the language of the tourism profession, among others, as well as to the development of communicative competence in English among non-native speakers for whom tourism will be part of their future or current profession.

References

- Ackermann, Kristen, and Yu-Hua Chen. 2013. "Developing the Academic Collocation List (ACL) – A corpus-driven and expert-judged approach." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 12 (4): 235–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2013.08.002>.
- Bahns, Jens, and Moira Eldaw. 1993. "Should we teach collocations?" *System* 21 (1): 101–14. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(93\)90010-E](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(93)90010-E).
- Bhatia, Tej K. 2019. "Emotions and language in advertising." *World Englishes* 38 (3): 435–49. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12420>.
- Cowie, Anthony Paul. 1978. "The place of illustrative material and collocations in the design of a learner's dictionary." In *In Honour of A.S. Hornby*, edited by Peter Strevens, 127–39. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 1981. "The treatment of collocations and idioms in learners' dictionaries." *Applied Linguistics* 2 (3): 223–35.
- Croft, William, and D. Alan Cruse. 2004. *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, David. 1987. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dann, M. S. Graham. 1996. *The Language of Tourism. A Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Wallingford: CAB international.
- Dragičević, Rajna. 2010. *Leksikologija srpskog jezika*. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike.
- . 2011. "O značenju prideva kao uslovu i posledici njihove leksičke spojivosti." In *Južnoslovenski filolog LXVII*, edited by Predrag Piper, 109–19. Beograd: Institut za srpski jezik SANU.
- Dražić, Jasmina. 2013. "Parametri za identifikaciju leksičkih kolokacija u srpskom jeziku." *Jezici i kulture u vremenu i prostoru II* (2): 385–96.
- . 2014. *Leksičke i gramatičke kolokacije u srpskom jeziku*. Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet.
- Đorđević, Radmila. 1989. *Engleski i srpskohrvatski jezik. Kontrastivna gramatika imeničke grupe*. Beograd: Naučna knjiga.
- Firth, Jon Rupert. (1951) 1957a. "Modes of Meaning." *Papers in Linguistics (1934–1951)*: 190–215. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- . 1957b. "A synopsis of linguistic theory, 1930–1955." In *Studies in Linguistic Analysis, Special Volume of Philological Society*, edited by Jon Rupert Firth et al., 1–32. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Geeraerts, Dirk. 2010. *Theories of Lexical Semantics*. Oxford: Oxford Linguistics.
- Ivir, Vladimir. 1969. "An outline for the contrastive analysis of English and Serbo-Croatian adjectives." In *Reports 1, The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian English Contrastive Project*, edited by Rudolf Filipović, 31–38. Washington D.C and Zagreb: Center for Applied Linguistics Washington D.C. and Zagreb University, Institute of Linguistics.
- Jaworski, Adam, and Annette Pritchard. 2005. *Discourse, Communication and Tourism*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Lado, Robert. 1957. *Linguistics Across Cultures: Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- . 1964. *Language Teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Maci, M. Stefania. 2018. "An introduction to English tourism discourse." *Sociolinguistica* 32 (1): 25–42. <https://doi.org/10.1515/soci-2018-0004>.
- Nation, I. S. Paul. 2007. *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Palmer, E. Harold. 1933. *Second Interim Report on English Collocations*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Pervaz, Draginja. 1984–1985. "O nekim kolokacijama sa pridevom težak." *Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku, XXVII-XXVIII*: 603–8. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
- Pešikan, Mitar, Jovan Jerković, and Mato Pižurica. 2007. *Pravopis srpskoga jezika – pravila i njihovi osnovi – rečnik uz pravopis*. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
- Prčić, Tvrtko. 2008. *Semantika i pragmatika reči*. Novi Sad: Zmaj.
- Sinclair, McHardy John. 1966. "Beginning the study of lexis." In *In Memory of J. R. Firth*, edited by Charles E. Bazell, John Cunnison Catford, M. A. K. Halliday and Robert Henry Robbins, 410–30. London: Longman.
- . 1991. *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thurlow, Crispin, and Adam Jaworski. 2010. *Tourism Discourse – Language and Global Mobility*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Van Roey, Jacques. 1990. *French-English Contrastive Lexicology. An Introduction*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.
- Vuković Vojnović, Dragana. 2020. "Multimodal discourse analysis of tourism websites – the promotion of cultural values through the language of tourism." In *Belgrade English Language and Literature Studies: BELLS90: proceedings. Vol. 1 / International Conference to Mark the 90th Anniversary of the English Department*, edited by Biljana Čubrović, 449–70. Belgrade: Faculty of Philology.
- . 2021. "Key Noun + Noun collocations in the language of tourism: a corpus-based study of English and Serbian." *ELOPE* 18 (2): 51–68. <https://doi.org/10.4312/elope.18.2.51-68>.

Corpus – Electronic Sources

Kontiki Travel Agent, www.kontiki.rs.

Thomson-Tui Travel Agency, www.tui.co.uk.

Tourism Organisation of Great Britain, www.visitbritain.com.

Tourism Organisation of Serbia, www.serbia.travel.

Electronic Tools for Corpora Analysis

Anthony, Laurence. 2017. "AntConc (Version 3.5.0) [Computer Software]." Tokyo: Waseda University. <https://www.laurenceanthony.net/software>.

TermoStat Web 3.0. http://termostat.ling.umontreal.ca/index.php?lang=en_CA.