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Chapter 1  Introduction

1.1 Background

In the wake of rapid expansion of globalisation, English has become increasingly popular in the world. This language is used in travelling, conducting business, attending conferences and exhibitions, studying in an English-speaking university, and communicating on the Internet. From a historical perspective, English was the leading global language since the nineteenth century, when British sea power destroyed France’s overseas trade and established numerous colonies throughout the globe. English thus replaced French and became the world’s lingua franca. The Industrial Revolution made the status of England’s trade, and consequently its language, grow even stronger. In other words, England’s commerce, industry, and imperial power made English the world’s leading language. Since the 1940s, “particularly after World War II, American economic hegemony and growing political and cultural importance proved the main spur for the spread of English, and the United States of America became the cultural and linguistic harbinger of the English language” (Rosenhouse & Kowner, 2008). Owing to pop music, cable television, and Hollywood movies, American English and American culture have spread quickly (Bamgbose, 2001); English thus is also a lingua franca in countries that have never been colonised. In simple terms, “[T]he history of British imperial dominance and American power” (Kayman, 2004) contributed to the spread of English to the establishment of the global status of English.

As the rapid spread of English to the world, the status of English as a lingua franca has been recognised among the world. We can see language signs on the
streets, in the countryside, in hospitals, at schools and in shops. Most of us sometimes notice the language or languages used on the signs, yet it is difficult to believe that everybody has a full knowledge of the linguistic environment around us which is disclosed through the language or languages on the signs. The term linguistic landscape therefore has been invented by Landry and Bourhis (1997, p. 25) that:

The language of public road signs, advertising billboards, street names, place names, commercial shop signs, and public signs on government buildings combines to form the linguistic landscape of a given territory, region, or urban agglomeration.

Therefore, the idea that we live in an environment filled with written languages, which are always surrounded by linguistic landscape completely as actual and material as the physical landscape, is an area of increasing interest in many areas of academic research, including sociolinguistics, discourse studies, and education.

Nowadays, with an increasing predominance of visual information there are more signs than ever before. When one takes a look at pictures or postal cards of shopping streets of many years ago, it is obvious that the number of linguistic signs has increased enormously. The highest density of signs can be found in cities and towns, in particular in the main shopping streets, commercial and industrial areas. This era of visual information is also reflected in school classrooms, corridors, and halls where official boards, children’s work, teaching material, notices and advertisements fill the walls that were barely used in the past.

1.2 Rationale

In the past few years, LL research commonly as a means to analyse written language in public areas, for example, of charting language change and language
contact (Huebner, 2006), or of outlining the position of minority languages in a community (Gorter & Cenoz, 2006). While many LL studies have focused on the description and quantification of different languages on public signage in a given area, there has also been considerable interest in the roles, activities and perceptions of participants as they produce and interpret the LL.

Other scholars have been more directly focused on the potential for linguistic landscape to be involved in language teaching. In spite of Cenoz and Gorter (2008a), Rowland (2013), Sayer (2009), and Thornbury (2012) who have discussed how creating opportunities for students to study their own linguistic landscapes could easily serve pedagogical purposes, Rowland became the only one who has studied these activities in practice. Therefore, there is a need for more detailed accounts of linguistic landscapes being used as a form of pedagogy in practice.

Furthermore, from the teaching experiences as a part-timer at Assumption University of Thailand, students from Basic English courses and English I academic course often seem poorly equipped for mastering English due to some difficulties they may encounter while learning English in context. Students usually show limitations of understanding English language with context in class and society. Some difficulties they may experience are: (a) What they have learned in class is different from what they are experiencing in the real world; (b) Students do not have many chances to use English outside classroom; (c) Students do not have confidence to use English in academic events, as they are afraid that their English might not be good enough; (d) Students sometimes worry about the forms, grammatical points, and pronunciation too much; (e) Big class size and focused teaching methods (translation and examination-oriented) that ignore the pragmatic use of English in social settings.
Therefore, how to alleviate the difficulties EFL students encountered in classroom becomes an important issue of this thesis.

Indeed, throughout the LL literature there are growing numbers of papers for ‘a greater commitment by linguistic landscape scholars to situate and contextualise our studies in the lives of those who read, write and conduct their lives amongst the signs of our field’ (Malinowski, 2009, p. 124). This research proposes that one way to make the commitment is to involve English as a foreign language student in the analysis of their local LLs and examine their responses to English language and their mother language on signs. Such investigations of the LL could serve both research and pedagogical purposes. On the one hand, academic LL scholarship would be augmented by the addition of experiential understandings provided by language learners to the wealth of observational and analyses performed by professional researchers. On the other hand, and from an educational perspective, involving students in a LL project decentralises the practice of language learning and ensures language learner interaction with a variety of highly contextualised, authentic texts in the public arena in context.

Although exhibiting a long pedagogical history in the area of L1 early literacy education (Neumann, Hood, Ford, & Neumann, 2011), the incorporation of LL studies into English Language Teaching (ELT) curricula is less well established. In recent times, however, various LL scholars have begun to promote the idea. Shohamy and Waksman (2009, pp. 325–328), for example, describe the LL as a ‘powerful tool for education’ and speak of the ‘need for students to be aware and notice the multiple layers of meanings displayed in the public space’. In a discussion of the role of the LL in Second Language Acquisition (SLA), Cenoz and Gorter (2008a, p. 283) conclude
that it is 'necessary to focus on [the LL's] role as an additional source of input for language learners'. Sayer (2009, p. 153) accepts, stating that there are 'numerous potential benefits to doing a student-led linguistic landscape project'.

However, searching for the references on using LL materials in the EFL classroom, there is a lack of research which looks into the area closely, and studies such as these go further than merely endorsing the idea of using LL projects in the classroom; they also specify a range of potential pedagogical benefits to language learners who engage with the LL as part of their education. The interests of this thesis is finding out how to use LL materials in EFL classroom effectively, to investigate the educational values of LL materials as a means to involve students with LL project in Thailand.

1.3 Objectives

The purpose of this research is to examine the claims made by LL scholars, regarding the educational value of involving language students in LL inquiry, through a discussion of a classroom LL project in an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context, in order to evaluate the utilisation of LL materials in classroom. It bases on a hypothesis that utilising resources of linguistic landscape in student's surroundings or communities can benefit EFL pedagogy, and thus to strengthen students' ability of communicating with one another. The research examines and classifies photos of public signs with English texts or multilingual texts (English, Thai, and other languages) in Thailand as a sampling of the linguistic landscape, and suggests how LL resources can be utilised in EFL classroom through the project, which created to facilitate English teachers in Thailand. The project should enable to examine which pedagogical benefit can be evidenced and how LL resources aid EFL students to
develop their language four skills (Reading, Listening, Writing, and Speaking) and improve their multicompetence.

1.4 Research Questions

In this research, the exploration of utilisation LL project in EFL classroom with the following questions:

1. What is the linguistic landscape of Bangkok through a group of Thai EFL students' observation and interpretation?
2. What evidence can be of pedagogical benefits through the application of a linguistic landscape project in the EFL classroom?

1.5 Thesis Organisation

This thesis is divided into five chapters and is organised as followed:

Chapter one provides the background of the role of the LL in language teaching, the main aim of this research, the research questions, thesis organisation, and the definition of terms.

Chapter two summarises the current methods and theories for teaching English, and categorised from broad to narrow; and provides the conceptual frameworks for teachers to utilise linguistic landscape to teach English in classroom, with a focus on the benefits proposed to students in different studies.

Chapter three details the methodology adopted in this research, and describes
the implementation of a pedagogical LL project in an undergraduate Intermediate English course in Thailand.

Chapter four is analysis and discussion of the research findings. The chapter organises analysis with chronological orders that analysis from each group has been laid out by different sections. Then the macro evaluation has been organised with a framework.

Chapter five concludes this study with the major findings followed by limitations and some directions for future research.
1.6 Definitions of Terms

**English as a foreign language (EFL)** is a traditional term for the use or study of the English language by non-native speakers in countries where English is generally not a local medium of communication.

**Linguistic Landscape (LL)** is referring to public road signs, advertising billboards, street names, place names, commercial shop signs, and public signs on government buildings, specifically on the English text in public signs.
Chapter 2  Literature Review

2.1  Introduction

Linguistic landscape research surfaced as a way of addressing issues about language vitality in multilingual settings (Leeman & Modan, 2009). Researchers were concerned with whether and how the LL informs and/or reflects language environment in a specific context. There are six themes have emerged from the literature as they relate to linguistic landscapes: language policy and planning; language status, attitudes and identity; the spread of English; language as a commodity/econolinguistics; power and political change; language ecology.

This last theme is of particular importance to me in order to conduct research in a monolingual community. The impact the linguistic landscape has on linguistic ecosystems relates to the above topics, but also requires attention when examining non-diverse communities. Although these themes have been separated, it is important to note their overlap and combined influence on the LL.

LL studies usually take a quantitative approach by counting and classifying all the public signs in a specific area of a city or urban landscape. These signs have been classified and compared according to the language(s) used in the landscape drawing parallels to the ethnolinguistic background, language attitudes of the producer(s) or agent(s) of the signs (usually government or private), linguistic capabilities, and from there proposed that the ratio of languages is related to the power of various ethnolinguistic groups (Ben-Rafael, Shohamy, Hasan Amara, & Trumper-Hecht, 2006; Gorter & Cenoz, 2006; Landry & Bourhis, 1997).
Along with empirical studies, another methodological approach uses theories and methods of multimodality (sounds, images, graffiti). This theory postulates that the LL consists of far more than just language signs (see description of Ben-Rafael’s gestalt theory later in this chapter). With this come discussions about what constitutes a sign and what should be included as a unit of analysis (described under genre later in this chapter). Ben-Rafael et al. (2006) distinguished the LL as a social construction; symbolic functions of language. These symbolic structures help shaping communities and can be very telling of the culture, power and personality of an area. “Texts themselves are among the most powerful tools for the production of social power relations” (Scollon & Scollon, 2003, p. 7). The LL needs to be viewed as a dynamic environment rather than static. Therefore, a qualitative form of research is employed by researchers trying to focus not only on what they are reading in the LL, but how to read it. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (Torkington, 2009) allows the description of a dynamic landscape to be explained along side the quantitative methods.

Almost all researchers have used digital photography as a method to collect and analyse the LL in various clearly defined locations. The signs and artefacts photographed can then be observed as a product of the environment, fixed in time. The data collected may be interpreted in different ways according to the approach taken (linguistic, sociocultural or political).

This section first provides a general review of the research of linguistic landscape through world English perspective, and then provides an analytical review of the research literature available on the topic of Linguistic Landscapes (LL). It seeks to explore the relationship between the languages represented on informational and symbolic signs and objects in public spaces and viewer’s perceptions of language,
identity and power. This section will be started by discussing the written language in public spaces and will then define the term linguistic landscape. The discussion of the functions, characteristics, and genres of linguistic landscape research will be preceded afterwards. From there, the discussion of the six themes or applications that have emerged from the research will be presented. In addition, the theoretical frameworks used for analysing LL and methodologies employed in the research will be reviewed. This section will conclude with an exploration of the application of linguistic landscape in EFL classroom.

2.2 English as Global Language

It is convenient for people of different countries to communicate with a common language when conducting international business and social discourse. English has become that convenient language. How English became the present global language, what the advantages are of using this global language, what Standard English is, how World Englishes are taught, and what the advantages are of knowing other languages will be addressed as followed.

2.2.1 The Alteration of Linguistic Hegemony

Issawi (2001) shows us how the global language changed from French to English. France was a giant among nations in the seventeenth century, and French was the leading language of Europe in the eighteenth century because of geographic, historical, political, social, and economic reasons. The founding of the French empire in Africa gave rise to several million people speaking French, and Napoleon’s conquest of many countries throughout the world helped the spread of the French language and culture immensely.
However, in the nineteenth century, English overtook that leading language status, due to commercial and industrial reasons. After the French Revolution, the British sea power destroyed France’s overseas trade, and Britain gained a commanding lead that lasted into the middle of the twentieth century. Britain owned 52% of the world’s merchant navy in 1850, and still 46% in 1910. The industrial Revolution made English’s leading status in trade grow even stronger. From 1840 to 1850, Britain produced more than a half of the world’s output of machine-made cotton textile, iron, and coal, and owned over a third of the world’s railways and steam-powered machinery. Accordingly, English became the leading scientific language in the world. From the 19th century onwards, English borrowed words and structures from German, Latin, and many other languages, and the number of English users advanced from 77 million to 860 million by 1970. British trade and finance spread all over the Far East as well, which made English the most popular communicative language in Asia (Issawi, 2001).

Business between the United States and Far East, as well as the population growth in America, also helped the spread of English. Since the 1940s, the United States became the leader of economic, military, political, and scientific fields. To put it simply, “the history of British imperial dominance and American power” (Kayman, 2004) contributed to the spread of English and to the establishment of the global status of English. It is estimated that English will maintain its leading world language rank for many decades to come (Issawi, 2001).

2.2.2 Evidence of English as a Global Language

A number of studies support the place of English as a global lingua franca. Bamgbose’s (2001) survey showed that 96.3% of 1,398 respondents from Nigeria
agreed or strongly agreed that English would remain the dominant language of world communication. Hasanova (2010) declared that the popularity of English in Uzbekistan was due to its being related to globalisation, modernity, and prestige. Demont-Heinrich (2008) searched through 275 articles from five famous American newspapers (Los Angeles Times, International Herald Tribune, the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal, and the Washington Post) ranging from January 1, 1991, to May 1, 2003, and shed light on how American prestigious press representations have passed American notions to the United States and to the world, thereby contributing to the global hegemony of English.

2.3 World Englishes

The term World Englishes (WE) as invented by Kachru (1985) to refer to regional or indigenised versions of English. The term is explained more detailed alongside the meaning of the three circles of English users in the following section.

2.3.1 Three Circles of English Users and World Englishes

There are three groups of English users in the world, each given a specific name by Kachru (1985). The first group is the Inner Circle; it consists of countries where English is spoken as a native language, such as Australia, the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand. The second group is called the Outer Circle; it consists of former colonial countries where English is spoken as a second language, such as Kenya, India, and Singapore. The third group is the Expanding Circle; it consists of countries where English is spoken as a foreign language, such as Japan, China, and Thailand.
Bolton (2009) explained further that WE stood for “English as an international (auxiliary) language, global English(es), International English(es), localised varieties of English, new varieties of English, non-native varieties of English, second-language varieties of English, world English(es), alongside more traditional terms such as ESL (English as a Second Language), and EFL (English as a Foreign Language)” (Bolton, 2009, p. 240). Bolton (2009) also defined WE in a narrower sense that the term referred to the new Englishes which had been developed in some countries of the Caribbean, West and East Africa, and Asia, where English was a second language. The same concept was also interpreted by Pakir (2009), who identified WE as a label which was “today accepted in the literature and adopted in all the three circles of English but especially with Outer Circle countries.” Pakir further described that although WE could be used for all varieties of English in the world, it usually referred to “new Englishes” (institutionalised ESL varieties, or notarised and indigenised varieties)” (Pakir, 2009, p. 225). Namely, WE are the varieties of English that originated in Outer Circle countries where English is second language, from the contact between English and local cultures. This process is what Kachru (1994) called indigenisation.

Wee (2008) restated the notion that indigenisation was the process in which English was indigenised by a local culture, such as stick pronounced as [sitik] and bus as [basi] in Hong Kong, and in Singapore with the use of arrow as a verb, meaning “delegation an unpleasant task” (Wee, 2008, p. 480). Yano (2009) also provided some interesting examples. The slang of I am nervous is I have butterflies in my stomach in American English, yet the sentence is changed to be I have a mouse in my chest in Asian English. Asians, especially those who do not have a refrigerator, greatly dislike mice, so the words of the phrase have been changed. Those creatures can hide inside a
house and eat all the food family has. In Southeast Asia, gender was added to cousin, which became cousin brother and cousin sister, because there are many specific terms to describe relatives in Asian society. In Thailand, for example, there is more than one term of address for a father’s elder brothers, younger brothers, a mother’s elder brothers, younger brothers, and more than one term for a father’s and a mother’s sisters and their spouses. These differences from Standard English cannot be viewed as deviant, deficient, or fossilised errors due to the fact that they are used within the sociocultural context of local Englishes. Every variety of WE is unique because its own culture is different from that of others.

2.3.2 Learning Diversity from World Englishes

Kubota (2001) noted that speakers of English from different countries might have a different accent and use different vocabulary, colloquialisms, or grammar. Namely, all English users use a variety of WE, and all English students can extend their knowledge and awareness of WE if teachers ask them to consider such linguistic diversity, and its relation to the history, geography, politics, and economics of their region. Kubota (2001) suggested several activities and materials for students, such as (a) watching videos to be aware of the varieties of English, (b) studying the history of English and discussing the contemporary influence of English on other languages, (c) reading copies of newspapers in different languages and looking for English words in news articles and advertisements to examine how they are used, (d) choosing countries in which two or more language are used as official languages and finding out whether English is dominant in them, and (e) inviting guest speakers from different countries to talk about how English is used in their countries. Those activities enable students to understand that there are many English varieties used in
Valuable pedagogical principles in teaching World Englishes have been proposed by a myriad of scholars. Baumgardner and Escobar (1998) suggested that teachers could use learners’ prior knowledge of the target language vocabulary (e.g., the English lexical borrowings in Spanish) as useful scaffolding in teaching English. In addition, Baumgardner (2009) emphasised that English teachers should integrate local culture into their classrooms. Moreover, he reminded us that the standardisation of English was “still an ongoing process” (p. 666). Teachers in the Inner-Circle should make “students aware of and tolerant of different varieties or world Englishes, including national varieties” and showed them that “local dialects should also be part of English,” as well as “bring world Englishes into Outer- and Expanding-Circle classrooms” (p. 668). This crucial concept is similar to that of Morrison and White (2005), who suggested that global listeners must appreciate all varieties of English. Baumgardner (2009) offered a helpful example of teaching English. He used “contrastive analysis to teach English complementation” to teach his students and other English teachers in Pakistani University, underlying the “differences between their own local or national variety of English and international English” (p. 668). Baumgardner also stated that the use of the mother tongue could be a useful tool in the language classroom. This concept acts as an encouragement to non-native English teachers, making them no longer feel inferior to their native counterparts.

2.4 English Imperialism and Critique of English as Global Language

Below is a brief restatement of the history of the development of English as a global language. It contains a discussion, which concerns English imperialism from a
different perspective.

2.4.1 English Imperialism

In the nineteenth century, Britain took the commanding lead from France after its sea power destroyed France’s overseas trade. In addition to the commercial reason, Britain established a leading position through its industrial technology and colonisation upon other continents. Britain trade and finance spread all over the world, making English the most popular communicative language on the globe. Since the 1940s, the United States has become the leader of the world because of its economic, military, political, and scientific power. These factors continuously contribute to the spread of English throughout the world, a phenomenon referred to some as linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992).

Phillipson’s definition of English linguistic imperialism stressed the thought that “the dominance of English is asserted and maintained by the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between English and other languages.” Structural refers to “material properties (for example, institutions, financial allocations)” and cultural to “immaterial or ideological properties (for example, attitudes, and pedagogic principles)” (Phillipson, 1992, p. 48). Phillipson observed an unfair situation resulting from the structural and cultural inequalities because they ensured more material resources “to English than to other languages and benefit those who are proficient in English” (Phillipson, 1992, p. 48). He raised a thought-provoking question: “What norms should learners of English in underdeveloped countries aim for?” Is the answer Standard British English or a local educated variety of English? In fact, the answer depends on the academic policy, classroom practice, teaching materials, learning strategies, as well as the relationship
between international norms and periphery English areas. From this answer comes other questions: “Why should norms from British be considered ‘global’ at all? Why should ‘experts’ from the core English-speaking areas be listened to rather than local people?” (Phillipson, 1992, p. 50). These answers compel one to reconsider why people rely on British global norms rather than their own self-sufficiency and confidence in their use of English.

Linguistic imperialism, similar to media, scientific, or educational imperialism, is one subtype of cultural imperialism, yet it can permeate all the other types since it is the means to mediate and express them. Language is the basic tool to communicate ideas in all fields, as well as the means to affect the cultural and societal contexts that can be interpreted by language. This fact explains why the British colonial authorities forced Indian people to learn British English through the elementary education system during its governance. Through the linguistic imperialism funded and organised by the State, the receiver will adopt new economic (e.g., make a living) and ideological (change attitudes and values) functions. The administrator can reach the repressive (impose sanctions) goal of education. There is always inequality between the imposer (rich countries) and the receiver (poor countries), and all activities incorporate the weak side into the modern world system. English linguistic imperialism is the same. English linguistic hegemony refers to “the explicit and implicit values, beliefs, purposes, and activities that characterise the English language teaching profession and which contribute to the maintenance of English as a dominant language” (Phillipson, 1992, p. 74). Subsequently, we are aware that young learners in ESL/EFL countries accept culture from English speaking countries, and native English teachers of lower education and less experience earn a much higher salary than local English teachers do. Adversely, immigrant children in
English-speaking countries belittle their parents’ mother tongues and their culture.

In recent decades, in order to combat linguistic imperialism, many educators, linguists, and scholars in world Englishes and ELF spheres have started to advocate appreciating other English varieties and culture of the Outer and Expanding Circles. They emphasise the importance of the cultural, social, and linguistic backgrounds of non-native speakers, recognising them as beneficial factors for learning English. Communicative functions and strategies are also emphasised by these researchers because communication in English is more crucial than having a native accent, and using Standard English may not be very effective in their societies. In short, English learners should not be annoyed by their own unchangeable accents and different usages, especially if they have a good enough command of English to communicate with any other English speaker.

Graddol (2006) predicted that English would be a basic skill, no longer a special talent in the near future. Yano (2009) stated that English was a means of cross-cultural communication in the modern era. Advances in transportation and communication systems have accelerated globalisation, changing our society to one that is more multiethnic, multicultural, and multilingual. Actually, people in ESL or EFL countries nowadays “do not feel they are victimised by the English imperialism” (Yano, 2009, p. 253). They use English as an additional, convenient language for cross-cultural communication and gaining useful resources. Phillipson (1992) considered Singapore to be a successful example of English application. In that country, English is a common language used to communicate among different ethnic groups who speak three main native languages: Chinese, Malay, and Indian. Although English is a tool of “de-ethnicisation of Singaporeans,” it does not hinder the
“maintenance of Asian values” (Phillipson, 1992, p. 315). Many other papers also discuss the linguistic case of Singapore, and it may indeed serve as the best model of English education for the three circles of English users.

2.4.2 Some Critique of English as Global Language

For some decades, English has been a global language. It has an official status, and it is used internationally in various domains (e.g., in academia, education, and the media). According to The Cambridge Encyclopaedia of the English Language (Crystal, 1995), English is used in 134 countries to communicate globally, 75 of which use it as a native language. This English can be Standard English when used in the Inner Circle, with British and American varieties that are in a superior position in the world. Or this English can be World Englishes in the Outer Circle, which are the varieties derived from local culture within ESL countries. This English can also be a lingua franca in the Expanding Circle, where it is a foreign language used to communicate within EFL countries. In the twenty-first century, English is globally shared language, belonging to English users throughout the world. Although Standard English still plays an important role of the norm of English teaching and learning, it is gradually losing its imperial status. All varieties of English should be valued because they represent a union of equals (Saraceni, 2009), and often they are more suitable for being used in the Outer and Expanding Circles. From another perspective, native speakers in the Inner Circle can learn another language in addition to English in order to get more information and support from the world.

2.5 English in Asia

Asia is the largest continent among the five in the world. Its area is 17,212,000
square miles (44,579,000 square kilometres), which represents 29.9% of the Earth’s
total land area. It has approximately 3,879,000,000 people, spread over 47 countries,
accounting for 60% of the world’s current human population. Asia features not only a
huge range of culture, environments, historical ties, and government systems, but also
numerous languages, including both local and official varieties. Although Russian
was an important official language before the decline of Communism several decades
ago, and French continued to be an official language in some countries colonised by
France, English is the lingua franca in twenty-first century Asia. It is the means by
which Asians communicate with one another over a large region, as well as with the
rest of the world. In his review of the book *Asian Englishes: Beyond the Canon*, King
(2005) predicted that the economic power of Asia would eventually make Asian
English a giant among World Englishes.

The founding editor of the quarterly *English Today*, McArthur (2003),
alysed three possible options for an Asian lingua franca: (a) Mandarin Chinese, (b)
no Asian lingua franca, (c) English. Now, Chinese is competing with English in Asia,
but it has had very little impact on Russia and South and West Asia. There are also
two other widely used Asian languages, Hindi-Urdu and Arabic, which are
comparable with Chinese. As far as English is concerned. It fills void that Russian left
after the fall of Communism. In France’s colonised countries, English thrives because
business people and tourists use the language in trade and tour fields. In EFL
countries, such as Japan, China, South Korea, Malaysia, and Thailand, English is the
preferred language for international communication, and consequently an important
subject in school systems. McArthur concluded that English could be considered and
Asian language nowadays.
The development of linguistic landscape studies will be discussed in next section. The section will provide the analysis of how linguistic landscape as a research subject has been explored and developed by scholars.

2.6 Public Literacy

Written language in public spaces mediates our understanding and orientation to public places within our cities and communities. Scollon and Scollon (2003) wrote, "Everywhere about us in our day-to-day world we see the discourses which shape, manage, entice, and control our actions" (p. x). We live in a textually mediated world elucidated and framed by literacy events (Barton & Hamilton, 2005), which are situated, enacted, and understood in specific contexts. Not just information, but social, cultural and political knowledge are embodied and promulgated in the discourses of public literacy. In this study, the term public literacy will be used interchangeably with the notion of linguistic landscape. Public literacy will be understood as all literacy artefacts (languages, symbols, and icons) present and visible in public spaces. Not only informational, the language(s) on public signs carry symbolic meanings as well. "Because language is [also] a symbol expressing social attachments, aspirations, and values rather than just a method of communicating referential content, it provides clues to the social forces underlying contact among the groups. Language is not just the medium for the message; it is regularly, part of the message itself" (Spolsky & Cooper, 1991, p. viii).

In Discourses in Place, Scollon and Scollon (2003) wrote that 'all instances of language in the world occur in semiotic aggregates' (p. xii). They applied this concept by providing a system for analysing signage that takes into account code preferences (languages used), the material substance of inscriptions, and the placement of the sign
and its ecological relationship to the environment. Scollon and Scollon insisted that the property of indexicality, in other words, the situatedness of a sign 'where it is located in the world' is as important to meaning as its iconic and symbolic properties. All signs are situated and these '[v]isual representations exist within culturally and historically formed systems of representations, which, like that of language, are available for the socially motivated use by individuals with their specific interests' (G. Kress, Leite-Garcia, & Leeuwen, 1997, p. 264). Situated within a particular community of practice (Lave, 1991; Wenger, 1998); signs reify experiences and as literacy events - create points of focus around which the negotiation of meaning becomes organised (as cited in Barton & Hamilton, 2005, p. 26).

Written language on public signs mediates within the individual an understanding and orientation to a particular place as well as provides historical reference and prompts cultural/linguistic association or disassociation with people groups residing in these geographic spaces. Visual perceptions of this public text also mediate cognitive and emotional understandings of personal identity in time and place. Changes in the LL are often understood as changes in the community provoking identity re-negotiation for both new migrant and "old established" residents as well. All forms of public literacy, familiar and new, affect the self in a narrative of changing time and make identity a shifting form moderated through interaction with the familiar and different.

2.7 Defining the Linguistic Landscape

The term linguistic landscape (LL) is used to describe the language represented through words and images in public spaces. This relatively new and emerging topic of study is intended as a valid source to help explain the messages
passed both consciously and unconsciously to local and visiting people. These messages contain information regarding the cultural, political, historical, social and economic conditions of a specified location.

Using the theoretical framework of ethnolinguistic vitality, Landry and Bourhis (1997, p. 25) in their seminal paper define the linguistic landscape as:

'The language of public road signs, advertising billboards, street names, place names, commercial shop signs, and public signs on government buildings combines to form the linguistic landscape of a given territory, region, or urban agglomeration.'

This definition has been widely accepted by scholars in the field of linguistics (Backhaus, 2005; Gorter & Cenoz, 2006; Lou, 2009). According to Landry and Bourhis (1997), the study of linguistic landscapes has origins in three areas: language planning, ethnolinguistic vitality, and vitality perceptions of language minorities.

The definition given by Landry and Bourhis (1997) above, has been scrutinised by Ben-Rafael, Shohamy, Amara & Trumper-Hecht (2006) and Shohamy, Ben-Rafael, and Barni (2010) as being too limited and not paying attention to the dynamics of the LL as a field of its own and foregoing the consideration of the LL as a gestalt. Studying the linguistic landscape as a whole as performed by Ben-Rafael, Shohamy, Hasan Amara, and Trumper-Hecht (2006) within a setting is an interesting way of uncovering social realities. The combinations of professions, commercialism, and institutions are multitude. Neighbourhoods can be transformed in terms of demographic makeup and this leads to changes in language and affects the imprint of this language to compose the linguistic landscape.
The gestalt premise as described by Ben-Rafael et al. (2009) positions that the LL creates the accepted standards of the public space, together with architecture, newspapers, art, dance and music. These items appear together to make the viewer perceive the landscape as one whole rather than individual part. This whole view or ensemble, acknowledges that not all parts equally participate in what the LL stands for, but it confirms that the LL does not work alone. The LL represented through signs is one that is dynamic and can be a rich source of authentic language.

Architecture, on the other hand, contributes to the overall makeup of the landscape but it is far more static. Shohamy, Ben-Rafael, and Barni (2010) argue that this whole may become the emblem of societies or regions. These emblems can be represented by Times Square for New York and the USA or Piccadilly Circus for London and England.

2.8 Linguistic Landscape Studies

The interest in the study of signs has a long tradition in semiotics, but the specific study of the linguistic landscape is a relatively recent development. The increasing numbers of recent publications shows the interest in linguistic landscape studies. The study of linguistic landscape focuses on the identification of the informative and symbolic functions of linguistic signs. Nowadays most research studies are based on the analysis of digitised pictures.

One of the most influential studies of the linguistic landscape is the one by Landry and Bourhis (1997). These authors provide a definition of the linguistic landscape that is followed by many other researchers:

The language of public road signs, advertising billboards, street names, place names, commercial shop signs, and public signs on government
buildings combines to from the linguistic landscape of a given territory, region, or urban agglomeration (Landry & Bourhis, 1997, p. 25).

Landry and Bourhis (1997) make a clear distinction between the informative and symbolic functions of language signs. This distinction is from a social psychological perspective focusing on relationships between the in-group and the out-group. The informative function of language signs indicates the borders of the territory inhabited by a linguistic group and also the availability of a specific language to communicate in that territory. On the other hand the symbolic function refers to the perception that members of a language group have of the value and status of their languages as compared to other languages. When language is the most salient dimension of ethnic identity the linguistic landscape becomes the most ‘observable and immediate index of the relative power and status of the linguistic communities inhabiting a given territory’ (p. 29). The neighbourhood around inhabitants is usually the territory of their community for daily living, and it is the main domain for the language or languages they will encounter frequently. Furthermore, the perception of the inhabitants in the territory will be revealed by the value and status of language or languages they employ in the community.

Landry and Bourhis (1997) explore the relationship between linguistic landscape and specific aspects of vitality beliefs, ethnolinguistic identity and language behaviour in multilingual settings. Their study includes 2,010 Canadian Francophone students and their findings indicate that the linguistic landscape emerges as an independent factor in the individual network of language contacts and that it is strongly related to the subjective vitality scores. They consider that the linguistic landscape can be a very important factor in promoting the use of one’s own language and therefore in the processes of language maintenance and language shift.
The importance of the linguistic landscape as related to different areas has also been highlighted in other studies conducted in different parts of the world. In the rest of the section, the most prominent areas will be discussed in a number of recent papers on the linguistic landscape, which are multilingualism, the spread of English, and the differences between public and private signs.

2.8.1 The spread of multilingualism

Different factors including globalisation, immigration, the revitalisation of minority languages and tourism has influenced the development of multilingualism and multiculturalism at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Ethnic, socio-cultural, religious, and commercial diversity contribute to cultural diversity and linguistic diversity in many parts of the world. Studies on the linguistic landscape conducted in different settings indicate that there is cultural and linguistic diversity in the use of different languages when studying language signs. For example, Ben Rafael et al. (2006) compare patterns of linguistic landscape in Jewish, Palestinian Israeli and non-Israeli Palestinian settings in Israel. They report that multilingualism is one of the characteristics of language signs either when considering different signs in different languages or bilingual and multilingual signs. The main languages used in these settings are Hebrew, Arabic, and English but other languages such as Russian also contribute to multilingualism. There are important differences in the use of the three main languages in these settings and the use of Hebrew and Arabic is completely different in Jewish and non-Israeli Palestinian settings.

The use of different languages is also reported in two studies conducted in Asia. Huebner (2006) analysed different areas of Bangkok and reported the use of different languages including Thai, Roman, and Chinese scripts but also Arabic and
Japanese. Backhaus (2006) analysed bilingual and multilingual signs in Tokyo, which were a surprising 20% of the total number of signs. The most common languages in these signs were English and Japanese but in some cases the signs also included Chinese and Korean and many other languages. Cenoz and Gorter (2006) conducted a comparative study of two cities, Donostia-San Sebastian in the Basque Country and Ljouwert-Leeuwarden in Friesland. They found that 55% of the signs in Donostia-San Sebastian and 44% of the signs in Ljouwert-Leeuwarden were bilingual or multilingual.

These studies show that the study of the linguistic landscape can contribute to the study of multilingualism, because language signs are indicators of the language used in a specific setting. The study of the linguistic landscape in these studies confirmed the spread of multilingualism.

2.8.2 The spread of English

The linguistic landscape usually includes English as one of the languages used in different contexts in different parts of the world. The spread of English, due to different causes including historically the spread of the British Empire and more recently the important influence of the USA in different fields is visible in language signs. Globalisation and modernity are nowadays important reasons as well. At first sight, the use of English in commercial signs could be interpreted as informational mainly aimed at foreign visitors but it is obvious that its increasing presence has a strong symbolic function for a non-English speaking local population. The use of English can activate values such as international orientation, future orientation, success, sophistication or fun orientation (Piller, 2001, 2003).
The process of globalisation is made visible through the presence of English in the linguistic landscape in all the studies mentioned above. For example Ben Rafael et al. (2006) reported that between 25% and 75% of the items analysed in their study were in English, depending on the specific area. Backhaus (2006) and Huebner (2006) also reported the extensive use of English in Tokyo and Bangkok. Cenoz and Gorter (2006) found that English was present in 28% of the signs in Donostia-San Sebastian and 37% of the signs in Ljouwert-Leeuwarden. These data indicate that the spread of English is clearly reflected also in the linguistic landscape.

2.8.3 The differences between public and private signs

Studies on the linguistic landscape have found important differences between these types of signs:

1. Public signs are 'government' signs such as official signs for street names. These signs reflect a specific language policy: road signs, building names, street names, etc.

2. Private signs are mainly commercial or informative signs such as the signs on shops and they may be influence by language policy but mainly reflect individual preferences: shops, advertising, private offices, etc.

Both previous studies and recent studies on the linguistic landscape indicate that there are important differences between the two types of signs and as Landry and Bourhis (1997) point out there is more diversity in private signs.

Ben Rafael et al. (2006) reported differences between public (top-down) and private (bottom-up) signs in all the areas where they collected the data and they found
very interesting patterns. They reported interesting differences between the different languages used in public and private signs in the different areas mainly in the case of Hebrew and Arabic. Huebner (2006) reported that official signs were generally in Thai or in Thai and English, but other languages were used in commercial signs. Backhaus (2006) found that the languages eligible to be used on official signs were Japanese, English, Chinese, and Korean. Other languages were also used in non-official signs. Cenoz and Gorter (2006) also found differences between public (top-down) and private (bottom-up) signs mainly regarding the use of English.

2.9 Functions of Language Signs

The LL is created by agents and interpreted by an audience. The context of the sign is defined by Ben-Rafael et al. (2006) in terms of using a top down or bottom up approach or as Landry and Bourhis (1997) choose to word it: private and government signs. Top down signs are all government related signs. They are expected to reflect the dominant culture. Bottom up signs are all other signs. Bottom up signs are often regulated to some degree by the government; some regions have strict laws that individuals must follow. The creators of bottom up signs often seek out certain target audiences, depending on what they have to offer. Both top down and bottom up signs contribute to the LL of a region. More than 30 countries and regional states have laws to regulate the language used on public and private signs (Leclerc, as cited in Landry & Bourhis, 1997). This regulation contributes to the power and status of different languages in a specific sociolinguistic context (Gorter & Cenoz, 2006).

The agents or participants in the top down and bottom up production of the LL range from national agencies or corporation sponsors, to government bodies, to individual entrepreneurs or shopkeepers; all with numerous motivations. The
interpretation of top down and bottom up may vary depending on the audience. For example, a sign posted in an apartment building by the management company may be viewed as top down by the tenants, but bottom up from the perspective of the federal government. Huebner (2009) argues that the notion of top down and bottom up signs fail to capture the meaning of agency.

It is important to note that not all participants will compete or vie for the public’s attention in the same way. A top down sign such as a post office will simply state the name and location giving basic information, and perhaps remain more static, while a bottom up sign will give more details to promote the commercialism and financial gain of the proprietor of a store and be more dynamic.

Three different theories are outlined by Ben-Rafael et al. (2006) in their quantitative study that examined top down and bottom up signs that are significant for LL analysis. These theories range from first, a Bourdieusardian idea that power is evident in the LL from the languages and symbols that dominate the scene creating social structures that indicate a power hierarchy. Second, a presentation of self idea, that ethnic communities assert and imprint themselves on the public scene, to third, the “good reasons” perspective where the actors or creators of the LL consider and aim to attract the interests of the public and influence them with their signage. These perspectives are useful to help describe the symbolic structuring and help to reveal aspects of the dynamics of relationships between groups of people that would not be possible by alternate methodologies. This perspective may help describe the symbolic structuring of a public space that is dominated by many actors who have various motives.
2.9.1 The information function

Landry and Bourhis (1997) distinguish between the two basic functions the LL fulfills: informational and symbolic. The informational (communication) function of language signs shows the languages that are used for communication and mark the geographical territory inhabited by a given language community. The dominance of a particular language may indicate that only the observable language will allow individuals to access the goods and services they want or require. Personal frustration and a sense that one’s group language is not respected may be experienced when the languages on the public signs are not matched by services in the corresponding language within the establishment. This value and status that is consciously and unconsciously perceived can be regulated to some extent by top down policies (E. Shohamy & Waksman, 2009).

The informational function can reflect the power and status of competing language groups. Language signs may be written in the language of the dominant group with only a few signs of the weaker language group.

2.9.2 The symbolic function

The symbolic (solidarity) function conveys feelings of belonging, acceptance and value to the in-group when one’s own language is represented in the LL. When one’s language is not visible a negative social identity may develop by implying the language is not valued and has little status within society (Landry & Bourhis, 1997; Reh, 2004). Therefore, the LL may target a specific portion of people. To construct meaning from the LL, a process of interpretation and discursive negotiation is required. Individuals make meaning from print based on their prior experiences. The interpretations, therefore, will differ according to the perspectives of those who
observe them. Leeman and Modan (2009) pay special attention to the symbolic functions of language and their role in the assembly of social spaces.

The use of symbols within the LL is necessary to analyse. Some symbols are universal, and not dependent on written text to define them. The power that is displayed by use of language through written text must also be a consideration for people whose languages do not have a written script.

2.9.3 The mythological function

A third function has been noted in the literature. The mythological function (Hicks, 2002) relates to the LL in societies that have kept their native religion. This function, also seen as a folklore function, focuses on places in the landscape that are named to provide a focal point for traditional stories, sagas and myths that in turn help to recall a community’s past. These stories are made up the traditional culture of an area and add to a sense of timelessness and belonging for the in-group. When these names are changed or replaced, the community feels a loss or a sense of not belonging to a particular area.

2.9.4 Genre

The unit of analysis used in LL research (language signs only, or items such as newspapers, for example) has become increasingly important for researchers to identify to extend the work of Landry & Bourhis (1997). The research to date has been inconsistent with its genre of items used for analysis in studying LL. By not having a clearly defined unit of analysis, Huebner (2009) finds research frameworks problematic.

In order to address the need for clarification of genre to limit the controversy
over the collection and categorisation of written signs, Tufi and Blackwood (2010) advocate for the inclusion of brand names to be included in the analysis of the LL. Their quantitative study focused on the relevance of trademarks and their linguistic impact on individuals and groups in a globalised world.

Gorter and Cenoz (2006); Coluzzi (2009) considered one shop or business a unit of analysis, not every sign that each shop or business offered. When a shop had its name on the front but also some advertising signs in the window, it was considered one unit. Backhaus (2006) defines the unit of analysis as ‘any piece of written text within a spatially definable frame’. This allows for a broad approach.

Brockmeier (2001) encourages a gestalt, or as he terms it, a hybrid approach to research. In trying to determine national identity as it relates to text, his article takes a broad approach to the meaning of text to include not only transcribable language, but also architecture, art and music.

2.10 The Linguistic Landscape in the World

English is the common language used by global citizens, and English is therefore the primary language of the bilingual linguistic landscape. The term landscape has two meanings. The first meaning is more literal, for example, that of a “piece or expanse of scenery that can be seen at one time from one place” (Gorter, 2006). Oxford Dictionary illustrates that the meaning of the term “landscape” is everything you see when you look across a large area of land, especially in the country. The second meaning of the word “landscape” is that of a style of painting or of a picture that presents a view of natural inland scenery or countryside. As for the meaning of the term linguistic landscape, Gorter (2006) interpreted it as “the language
of public road signs, advertising billboards, street names, place names, commercial shop signs, and public signs on government buildings combines to form the linguistic landscape of a given territory, region, or urban agglomeration” (Gorter, 2006, p. 2), which derived from the definition that stated by Landry and Bourhis (1997).

Linguistic landscape can broadly include radio, television, the Internet, music, films, newspapers, magazines, as well as most public signs. Gorter (2006) narrowly defined it as "public road signs, advertising billboards, street names, place names, commercial shop signs, and public signs on government buildings" (p. 2). This research adopts Gorter's definition and focuses specifically on the English text in public signs. Because English stands for "modernity, affluence, high fashion and personal freedom" (Curth, 2009), it can be found extensively in the linguistic landscapes throughout the globe, including the capital of Thailand, Bangkok, where I have lived for more than three years. Bangkok is the largest city in Thailand, home to over ten million inhabitants. The increasing number of international visitors, residents, and businesses has resulted in many English signs throughout the city.

The linguistic landscape is found almost everywhere. Because English is a global language, English bilingual signs comprise the biggest part of the foreign-language category of signs. Gorter and Cenoz (2006) asserted the notion “the linguistic landscape contributes to the construction of the sociolinguistic context because people process the visual information that comes to them, and the language in which signs are written can certainly influence their perception of the status of the different languages and even affect their own linguistic behaviour” (Gorter & Cenoz, 2006, p. 68). Specifically, the English in signs will change people’s impressions or their consumption habits after they reading those signs. The effect of multilingual
communication not only exists in the linguistic landscape but also prevails in printed advertising and television commercials aimed at making products more appealing and purchasable (Martin, 2002, 2008).

2.11 The Linguistic Landscape in Thailand

Smalley (1994) provides a useful taxonomy of languages in Thailand. The official language is Standard Thai. This is the language appropriate for all political and cultural purposes including the conduct of internal governmental affairs, politics and ‘high prestige cultural activities’. As the national language, it is a symbol of national unity and identification of the Thai nation. It may be the first language of upper class Thais, but for others, it is learned in school, with a regional or marginal language learned as a first language and spoken at home and with friends.

In addition to Standard Thai, four major regional languages (Thaiklang, Lao, Kammuang, and Paktay), all closely related to each other and to Standard Thai, but all are somewhat distinct, and are the dominant languages of each of the four major geographical regions (Central plains, northeast, north and south, respectively) of the country. Smalley’s taxonomy also includes ‘marginal regional languages’, usually limited to specific geographical areas of the country or to urban centres. These may be related to Standard Thai (e.g., Tai Yai) but needn’t ‘be (e.g., Northern Khmer, Pattani Malay). Of lesser influence is other languages limited to prescribed rural or urban enclaves (e.g., Kuy in the lower northeast, Phlow in the Northwest). As Smalley points out, except in the case of Pattani Malay, the existence of these minority languages is not a cause of disunity in Thailand.

Smalley (1994) calls English the ‘language of Thailand abroad,’ by which he
seems to mean the chosen language for international communication. In the 1960s, it was spoken by only a few elite Thais; now, however, many people whose employment brings them into contact with the international community speak English with some degree of proficiency. Although the medium of instruction in most Thai schools is Standard Thai, English is a required subject from upper elementary school. At the higher levels of education, it is the language of specialised knowledge, and it is also a symbol of modernity.

Using the Landry and Bourhis' (1997) taxonomy, the public signs in Bangkok, Thailand can be categorised into government signs and private signs. Many signs contain foreign languages—especially English. Several reasons explain the proliferation of bilingual signs in this biggest city in Thailand. First, due to tourism and increased job opportunities; Thailand has become more international, attracting international visitors and residents. Foreigners are able to understand the meaning and information of those signs with English texts. English in commercial advertising also promotes the sale of advertised products to those people. Second, because English is an important subject in schools, prominent in almost all admission and certification examinations, and a tool for international communication, almost all Thai who have received the nine-year compulsory education can read English with varying proficiencies because English is taught at least starting from junior high school. English text in the linguistic landscape is thus a means by which many Thai can gain information from another language other than Thai. Third, the English in signs gives readers a feeling of modernity, elitism, fashion, and freedom. As Curtin (Curtin, 2009) described, the visual form of English script could “index certain qualities and identities” (p. 228). It indexes the functions of decoration or mood setting, a product’s high quality and a consumer’s fashionable taste, and “vogue cosmopolitanness, an
educated, often youthful, and fashionably hip and worldly identity" (p. 228).

2.12 Applications of Linguistic Landscape Studies

It is crucial to examine the effects of language use in public spaces. Landry and Bourhis (1997, p. 34) state, 'the linguistic landscape may be the most visible marker of the linguistic vitality of the various ethnolinguistic groups living within a particular administrative or territorial enclave'. The linguistic landscape can provide information about societies and the interrelationship of different groups of people. Since the LL is the people who create, ignore or obliterate the LL of an environment, this is so. The LL may also indicate the relative power and status of the local people that in turn assist in understanding the language attitudes.

The interdisciplinary concept of the LL further expands the definition of linguistic landscapes proposed by Landry and Bourhis (1997). The nature of LL has been related to other topics such as: language policy and planning (Backhaus, 2009; Coluzzi, 2009; Gorter & Cenoz, 2006; Huang, 2007; Roller, 2002); language status, attitudes and identity (Barker & Giles, 2002; Barni & Bagna, 2010; Ben-Rafael et al., 2006; Reh, 2004; Torkington, 2009); the spread of English (Backhaus, 2006; Griffin, 2004; Huebner, 2006; Kotze & du Plessis, 2010); language as a commodity/econolinguistics (Curtin, 2009; Gorter & Cenoz, 2009; Leeman & Modan, 2009; E. G. Shohamy, Ben-Rafael, & Barni, 2010); power and political change (Kotze & du Plessis, 2010; E. G. Shohamy & Gorter, 2009); and language diversity/ecology (Hult, 2009; E. Shohamy & Waksman, 2009).

2.12.1 Language policy and planning

Language laws, to some extent, impact all other domains of the LL. Linguistic
landscape legislation is a highly complex matter and has been studied by such scholars as Backhaus (2009). In his case study comparing language signs in Quebec and Tokyo, he states that the formation of LL is consciously shaped and controlled by laws. These laws can affect the linguistic ecologies of allocation. The visibility of a language in a public space has some bearing on the perceived linguistic vitality of a language (Landry & Bourhis, 1997). Quebec’s strict language laws are applied to public and private signs. The use of French on signs in Quebec not only shows the power of the political party that has been democratically voted in, but it is felt as necessary to see the French language survive. More often than not, there is greater language diversity in private signs than in government signs (Laundry and Bourhis, 1997). In comparison, Tokyo was seen as different in terms of linguistic ecology. Japan, for the most part, is a monolingual country. Therefore, the Japanese language remains unchallenged. While Quebec strives to limit all other languages, Tokyo encourages the use of languages other than Japanese which shows the linguistic landscape of Quebec is consciously controlled by rules and regulations (Backhaus, 2009).

Cenoz & Gorter (2006); Coluzzi (2009) conducted empirical studies that agreed with Backhaus. They found the effect of a strong language policy was to protect the minority language and influenced how language was displayed on both top down and bottom up signs in The Netherlands, Spain and Italy. Coluzzi (2009) concluded that no policies exist for the presence of minority languages in Italy and in order to slow down the shift towards dominant languages; effective language planning strategies need to be taken into account.

The centrality of language in the Catalan nationalist movement is similarly
discussed by Roller (2002). He describes “identity as a social construct and language as an adhesive” (p.274). Language creates boundaries and by maintaining a boundary, identity in turn, is maintained. With fear that Catalan would be absorbed by the more dominant languages of Spain, and to maintain the boundary described above, a need for linguistic policy resulted. The Catalan linguistic policy reported by Roller (2002), was put into place to create a common bond among individuals of diverse backgrounds; reinforce the history and culture as being different from the rest of Spain. These reasons resonate with Backhaus (2009) and Quebec’s wish to maintain its boundaries as separate from the rest of Canada.

Huang (2007) in his critical approach to language planning gives an account of Taiwan’s history in regards to the place names in both the public and private domain. This comprehensive study demands that researchers do more than just look at the government(s), people, and institutions involved in the LL such as Cottuzzi (2009) did, to really understand the social situation behind language planning and policy. The author’s accounts of research into Taiwan’s extensive history “further define, inform, and hence affect the actual policy outcomes” (Huang, 2007).

2.12.2 Language status, attitudes and identity

A bilingual or multilingual environment where one language predominates over other(s) can reflect the power and status of the other competing groups. Reh (2004) analysed multilingual written texts in the public space of Lira, Uganda. This study showed that the language used on signs combined with the language knowledge of residents and visitors can provide information regarding the ‘social layering of the community, the relative status of the various societal segments, and the dominant cultural ideals of the community’ (Reh, 2004, p. 38). Torkington (2009) found the
language used in the commercial setting of Portugal make clear statements about the identity of the businesses and the clients they serve.

In their comparative study, Bami & Bagna (2010) analysed the visibility and vitality of immigrant languages present in various Italian cities. They found that there was not a direct relationship between the presence of a language in an area, its vitality and its visibility. Although the conclusions of this study found these results, the authors still maintain that the more visible a language is, the greater it is potential for vitality and therefore a greater chance of being maintained in an immigrant context. They credit linguistic policies as playing a role in this. Less contact with minority languages in the LL supports the dominant language vitality as regulated by language policies (Barker & Giles, 2002). The perceived threat of minority languages appearing in the LL and its effect on the dominant population’s sense of identity are noted by Barker & Giles, (2002); Trumper-Hecht (2009) Illustrating minority languages in the LL can influence the degree of political, social and economic power in a society (Trumper-Hecht, 2009). Ethnolinguistic group members experience the LL as a distinct contribution to their vitality independently of other factors such as contact with the media, in schooling, and in the social network (Landry & Bourhis, 1997).

2.12.3 The spread of English

The study of LL in bilingual or multilingual settings is interesting since there are usually top down policies in place that direct the use of an official language on street signs and names of official buildings. But the impact of the top down policy on individuals is reflected in bottom up signs such as posters or shop signs Cenoz & Gorter (2006). The above researchers found that English is indeed the language of international communication; its use is no longer marginal.

The use of English can be viewed as both informational and symbolic. It is informational for foreign visitors who wish to access good and services, but with the increasing use of English it can have a strong symbolic function for local populations (Landry & Bourhis, 1997). Using English can be seen as more prestigious and modern than using local languages (Piller, 2001, 2003), and there can be implications for the future of other languages (Phillipson, 2003 as cited in Cenoz & Gorter, 2009). The spread of English is a large part of the economic piece of the LL.

2.12.4 The LL as a commodity/econolinguistics

The LL can be viewed as competitive and influential. In today’s urban landscape, businesses produce the majority of the LL. The LL that is produced from a culture of consumption can influence ideas about what individuals and groups of people believe is necessary to feel included as part of the society at large. Advertising plays on this as a way of swaying beliefs about what is cool or hip or as Curtin (2009) refers to it as ‘the relationship between social identity and the indexical information in the public space’. A yearlong ethnographic study by Curtin (2009) in Taipei, documented the local Taiwanese prestige that indexed a shop when it used European languages on its signs. The language was seen to create a mood as much as it was to create a message. Curtin (2009) refers to this as ‘display English’; text that is not read
denotatively, but the script designates it as cool and fashionable. The images and text that are projected can indicate prestige, affluence, and status in the community. People can be categorised accordingly.

Paying attention to linguistics can influence business. When more people use a language, it becomes more useful to other people. This usefulness has an effect on the attractiveness of particular languages (Gorter & Cenoz, 2009). When business owners adapt to the needs and wants of their customers they can avoid future dissatisfaction with business (Bruyel-Olmedo & Juan-Garau, 2009). Leeman & Modan (2009) describe this in their qualitative approach (case study) that showcases Washington DC’s Chinatown as using Chinese ethnicity and culture (graphics, language and architecture) to market Chinatown as a commodity for consumption.

2.5.5 Power and political change

Power relations refer to the extent to which certain individuals are able to impose patterns of behaviour on others. This may come about through the dominant individual’s ability to exert their language or wordings and thereby limit the weaker individual’s use of their own linguistic power (Ben-Rafael, 2009). The national language is rarely challenged by the LL, however, second or third languages often do not receive the same treatment.

Politicians are inclined to see the public space as an area to exercise their influence and deliver messages (Shohamy and Gorter, 2009). Because of the ability of the LL to offer these opportunities, the work of Kotze & du Plessis (2010) analyses the change from apartheid to democracy in South Africa, particularly the Free State Province. These researchers found that despite the change in government the power
that certain languages held (Afrikaans and English) still show the unchanged power relations between the languages of ethno-linguistic groups. The wish for the black population to be viewed as powerful is shown in the use of English signs, the language of status.

2.12.5 Language diversity/ecology

'In the language of ecology, the strongest ecosystems are those that are the most diverse. Diversity is directly related to the stability; variety is important for long term survival. Our success on this planet has been due to an ability to adapt to different kinds of environment over thousands of years. Such ability is out of diversity. Thus language and cultural diversity maximises chances of human success and adaptability' Baker (as sited in Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 2008).

Language diversity is entwined in the biological and cultural diversity of life. ‘The diversity of life is made up not only of the diversity of plants and animal species, habitats, and ecosystems found on the planet, but also of the diversity of human culture and languages’ (www.terralingua.org accessed March 13, 2015). There are many languages used in the world today. With 7,299 languages currently existing in the world (Harmon & Loh, 2010), some languages are strong and not at risk of extinction, while others are used by a token few. The strong languages most frequently used: Mandarin, Hindi, Spanish, English, Bengali, Portuguese, Arabic and Russian (Onofri, Nunes, Cenoz & Gorter accessed online March 13, 2015) are seeing people give up their mother tongue and switch to one of the before mentioned world languages. With this switch it seems evident that the linguistic and cultural diversity they represent will also diminish. Zent (2001) (as quoted in Maffi, 2002) states...

evidence suggests that losing one's heritage language(s) often implies losing the
knowledges, beliefs, values, and practices that the language(s) encode(s) and convey(s).’

Crystal (2002) states the following reasons to promote language diversity: ecological diversity; languages express identity; languages are repositories of history; languages contribute to the sum of human knowledge; languages are interesting themselves. He warns that in order to protect language diversity, people need facts and arguments to motivate change. People also need to believe that language is a valuable part of the human race.

From an ecological perspective, the display of languages in the LL can promote or limit the public’s view of the value of bilingualism, multilingualism and linguistic diversity. Language ecology is closely linked to language policy and planning as found in the work of Backhaus (2009), Huang (2007), and Roller (2002). Languages that are more visible have a greater potential for vitality and therefore a greater probability of being maintained in an immigration context because they are used and viewed in public (Barni & Bagna, 2010). A conscientious role on language policy is necessary by the parties in power.

Maffi (2005) relates the lack of language richness to a lack of cultural richness. A lack of language diversity may limit the adaptability of people since they have less knowledge to draw from.

There is no direct relationship between the presence of a language in an area, and its vitality and its visibility. This relationship depends on numerous linguistic and contextual factors (Barni & Bagna, 2010). Cenoz & Gorter (2009) take an economic approach to the study of linguistic diversity and see the study of linguistic diversity as having market and non-market value in the LL. They focus on the non-market value
of the LL. The market value also needs to be considered, however, since it is sometimes necessary for people to abandon their native languages and adopt the language of the majority to be able to advance their economic situation.

Furthermore, linguistic landscape

2.13 The Linguistic Landscape and English Language Teaching

There are numerous materials for LL and English language teaching (ELT), yet the limited resources of cross-fields researches between LL and ELT, disclose that the more research about utilisation of the text of the linguistic landscape can also be used as instructional materials in the teaching of language and literacy should be conducted in the future.

2.13.1 Exploiting the linguistic landscape for language

Despite a rich history in mainstream literacy education, pedagogical uses of publicly displayed texts have a more limited tradition in language learning classrooms. Dagenais et al. (2008) report on an investigation of multilingual elementary school children’s appreciation of linguistic diversity as displayed in their local LLs in Montreal and Vancouver, Canada. The study examines how the LL can be utilised for language awareness activities involving children working outside the classroom and documenting the many and various languages on display in public spaces. The authors claim that such activities develop a child’s capacity for critical literacy, in which children come to recognise the ‘non-neutral nature of written communication’ (p. 257) in multilingual contexts and begin to understand how power, ideology and inequality are represented in society through the texts of the LL.
Overall, the interaction between the children and the LL is said to help the students appreciate how language is manipulated by the producers of signs to mark territory, shape identities, and value/devalue the interests of certain groups in their communities.

Kramsch (2006) argues that readers of the linguistic landscape not only learned language and literacy but also developed critical thinking and the competence of interpreting symbolic systems. Shohamy and Waksman (2009, p. 326) state a notion that the LL “serves as a powerful tool for education, meaningful language learning, towards linguistic activism,” in addition to reflecting and establishing social and cultural relations in the public space of the community. Each LL can be an educational settings, such as “each building, each site, ... a billboard ... is actually a LL text that has to be critically ‘read,’” because “more complex meaning” which embedded in histories, cultural relations, politics and humanistic interrelations can be excavated. The authors further claimed that utilisation of the sophisticated and rich context of education could be “a powerful resource for connecting language education and the public sphere” (p. 328).

Cenoz and Gorter (2008a, p. 272) state that where L2 learning specifically is concerned, the relationship between LL and Second Language Acquisition (SLA) has ‘hardly been explored’. They outline five potential benefits to L2 students accruing from interaction with their local LL: (1) the possibility of incidental language learning from LL texts; (2) the development of pragmatic competence through analysis of texts with different social functions; (3) the acquisition of multimodal literacy skills; (4) the stimulation of language learners’ multicompetence, which is the interaction between a language learner’s linguistic competence in their L1 and in their subsequent
languages, through the provision of multilingual input; (5) and the cultivation of students' appreciation of the symbolic and affective power that language exudes through connotation. The authors conclude with a call for more SLA-focused LL research using ethnographic sources of data, such as learner diaries and language learning narratives, to confirm the pedagogical benefits they propose in the article.

2.13.2 Using the Linguistic Landscape as English Teaching

As stated above, English texts in the linguistic landscape in students' environments can be used as a good resource for teaching materials. Dagenais, et al. (2009) states that different people had different representations of the printed texts in their surroundings, depending on individuals' variegated interest and experiences. In addition, there are many social functions of signs in the linguistic landscape. Sayer (2009) states that an EFL teacher can focus on the social aspects of the English texts in the linguistic landscape. The teacher can also focus on the "language forms," such as the "vocabulary," "idiomatic expression," and "grammatical features" (p. 152) in signs to help students learn English from the texts in the linguistic landscape. Sayer's article, “Using the Linguistic Landscape as a Pedagogical Resource,” served as a practical and helpful model, which enables EFL teachers to employ available resources in stimulating students' awareness and interest in learning English from the English texts of the linguistic landscape. In his paper, Sayer designed for his students a small classroom-based research project conducted in their Mexican community where English was a foreign language.

While linguistic landscape research has continued to map and explore how languages are displayed throughout the world, some scholars have begun to discuss how to use linguistic landscapes and linguistic landscape research as pedagogy (Jason
Thornbury, in his popular blog, outlines for a more general readership the potential of making linguistic landscapes part of a language-learning curriculum. He advocates asking learners to engage in a simplified analysis of the languages used in the local linguistic landscape, stating that this “is not beyond the reach of English language learners” (Thornbury, 2012). Thornbury’s short discussion examining linguistic landscapes for pedagogical benefits shows the relatively widening circulation of this idea; however, his lack of examples indicates the need for more research that delves into students’ experiences of doing these projects and the difficulties and success that arise when they do.

Thornbury’s very short introduction draws primarily on Sayer’s (2010) article on using linguistic landscapes as a pedagogical resource. Sayer outlines his primary reason for focusing on linguistic landscapes:

As an EFL teacher, I often struggle to find ways to connect the content of my language lessons in the classroom to the real world students encounter outside the classroom. We know that exposure and practice are two essential elements for L2 acquisition; however, in most EFL settings throughout the world, students’ opportunities for exposure and practice beyond the classroom walls are limited. (p. 143)

Connecting students with English and English language learning in EFL contexts is a challenge and an important potential use of linguistic landscapes. Additionally, Sayer believes these types of projects can lead to learners developing an understanding of their own sociolinguistic worlds, allowing students to develop understandings of language use, appropriateness, and the larger sociolinguistic ecology surrounding them. Sayer investigates these learning possibilities by asking:
“Why do people in Oaxaca use English in public places?” (Sayer, 2010, p. 145) and conducting a small linguistic landscape study himself, arguing that students can easily follow his example. Advocating that students can examine their own linguistic landscapes as “language detectives” (Sayer, 2009, p. 144), Sayer demonstrates the possibilities for learning that come from a simple linguistic landscape project. However, his article did not involve any student participants or any student analysis of linguistic landscapes, creating a further need for detailed studies of students’ experiences investigating linguistic landscapes.

Sayer (2009) presents his own LL project, involving photographing signs featuring English in the Mexican town of Oaxaca, as a possible model for teachers to use with language students in EFL contexts. In order to understand how and why English was used on signs in a predominantly Spanish-speaking area of Mexico, Sayer categorised his photographs according to six social meanings that he believed were conveyed to the local community through symbolic uses of English. He identified that English was associated with fashion, sophistication, ‘coolness’, sex, love and subversive identities. Sayer proposes that a similar type of LL study could be carried out by language students, rather than by professional language researchers, to help students develop their sensitivity to connotational aspects of language, in ling with Cenoz and Gorter’s (2008) final suggestion above. The author suggests that such a project would see students shift identities from language learners to sociolinguists. In this new role, they would connect classroom language study with language use in wider society, and thereby begin to formulate their own inductive theories of language.

While Sayer discussed only two major benefits of using linguistic landscape
research as a pedagogical resource, Cenoz and Gorter (2008), in an earlier and more theoretical exploration of linguistic landscapes and pedagogy, discussed the possible benefits of exploring the linguistic landscape, describing five possible areas of learning: incidental learning; pragmatic competence; multimodal literacy skills; multicompetence; and the symbolic and emotional power of language. However, as in Sayer’s article, Cenoz and Gorter did not explore this concept in practice.

Rowland (2013), seeking to evaluate the claims of Cenoz and Gorter (2008a) and Sayer (2009), completed a research project in which 27 university students in Japan conducted a linguistic landscape study as part of an English writing class. Following Sayer’s project, Rowland asked these students to explore the question: “How and why is English used on signs in Japan?” (Rowland, 2013, p.4). These students then began collecting photos, but then struggled to categorise them as Sayer easily did in his example project. Rowland, in the interest of avoiding steering his students towards any particular views, devised a rubric of questions that helped guide these students past their initial confusion and feelings of being overwhelmed. The students then continued their project, eventually producing written reports that became data for Rowland’s analysis. Rowland concluded that linguistic landscape research done by learners can, at least potentially, lead to development in the five areas outlined by Cenoz and Gorter, and can also aid in developing critical literacy skills stating:

Overall, the six claims summarised from the literature were corroborated to different degrees in the students’ reports. This study then generally supports the contention that language learners in EFL contexts can benefit in various, important ways from pedagogical interaction with their local L.L.s. (p. 10)
Rowland's article offers limited confirmation that students can benefit from conducting linguistic landscape research in the ways Cenoz and Gorter (2008) as well as Sayer (2009) considered. While a vitally important study of this pedagogy in practice, his article offered limited insight into students' experiences of doing linguistic landscape research, what questions students want to ask about the linguistic landscapes that surround them, and the confusion that flows from students' struggles to understand their own linguistic landscapes. Further, Rowland's method to aid students' efforts to categorise their linguistic landscape may have shaped much of how they approached their project, with Rowland writing:

"The author also acknowledges that the list of questions provided as a categorisation aid to the students may have narrowed the students' perspectives of the LL by focusing them on particular aspects of public signage. A different set of questions may have produced different reports and opinions from the class. (p. 10)"

While the guidance Rowland provided was valuable, it limited examination of student ideas about linguistic landscape questions and interests. A greater focus on the confusion of students, the meandering paths they attempted to take, and their initial ideas about their own sociolinguistic ecology would be valuable for understanding the pedagogical possibilities of these activities, by highlighting the causes of such confusion and students' initial interests in examining the textual world around them. Additionally, a more open project, allowing students to ask their own linguistic landscape questions and pursue them as they see fit, may reveal previously unknown benefits, not discussed by Cenoz and Gorter (2008), Sayer (2009), or Rowland (2013).
Chapter 3  Methodology

3.1  Introduction

This study, as an experimental research, utilised the linguistic landscape as the mean to evaluate what extent linguistic landscape can facilitate EFL students in English studying. The research methodology that was utilised to collect and analyse information in order to increase understanding of the topic of linguistic landscapes was one of a qualitative nature. Qualitative research allowed researcher to explore the topic in a natural setting; the setting was not controlled or manipulated. Using broad research questions, a deeper understanding of what the LL transmits to local and visiting travellers will be gained. Students from five groups gathered the data by digital photography and from there, the researcher developed a description of themes. Moreover, Sayer's (2009) modal will be adapted in this research, which provides a hypothesis that linguistic landscape could be the resources of English language teaching pedagogy. Rowland (2013) sustains that linguistic landscape cannot only provide the pedagogical resources, but benefit EFL students in various facts. The research will based on their studies, and utilise their modal and method, in order to satisfy the theoretical demand for the aim of evaluating what and in what extent the linguistic landscape can benefit EFL students.

The type of qualitative research that was conducted in the first step in this study, is inspired by the spirit of ethnographic studies. Ethnographies show "... communities differ significantly in ways of speaking, in patterns of repertoire and switching, in roles and meanings of speech. They indicate differences with regard to beliefs, values, reference groups, norms, and the like" (Hymes, 1972, p. 42).
Ethnographic designs are “qualitative research procedures for describing, analysing, and interpreting a culture-sharing group’s shared patterns of behaviour, beliefs, and language that develop over time” (Creswell, 2012, p. 473). The key word culture is further defined by Creswell as ‘everything having to do with human behaviour and belief’. To understand the LL of Bangkok, Thailand students from the EFL class needed to spend time in their community to gather photographs to understand the language and beliefs of the group. According to Creswell (2012), ethnography is conducted when there is a culture-sharing group to study that has been together for a time long enough to develop shared values, beliefs, and language. The homogenous (unilingual, Christian, similar skin tones) look and feel of Bangkok makes it an ideal setting.

McMillan (2004) describes three common methods for collecting data for ethnographic studies: observation, interviews, and analysis of documents. Two of these three methods had been adopted: observation, and [critical discourse] analysis of documents (digital photographs) to achieve an understanding of how the language and surroundings contribute to the social and cultural milieu of Bangkok. The specific approach which utilised in the research in order analyse the language found on signs was modelled after Fairclough’s (1989) critical language study (CLS). This method was adopted to show the relationship between linguistic elements and social interactions and relationships.

This chapter, therefore, will elaborate methods employed in this research for both collecting data and results analysing purposes. This chapter starts with the restatement of the research questions, followed by details in method of data collection and means of data analysis including not only students’ group discussion and
presentation recordings, but students’ group report. Both quantitative and qualitative methods will be employed to examine the claims made by LL scholars, regarding the educational value of involving language students in LL inquiry, through a discussion of a classroom LL group project in an EFL context, and hence endeavour to solve the difficulties EFL students demonstrated in classroom.

3.2 Restatement of Research Questions

In alignment with my interest in enhancing student’s ability of communication in appropriate context, this study contributes to the research in EFL education and LL in Thailand by answering the following research questions:

1. What is the linguistic landscape of Bangkok through a group of Thai EFL students’ observation and interpretation?
2. What evidence can be of pedagogical benefits through the application of a linguistic landscape project in the EFL classroom?

3.3 Description of Research Context

3.3.1 Research Participants

In Thailand, universities are categorised into public and private. The university that has been chosen for this research is a private Catholic university with three campuses, which are Hua Mak of Bangkok, Central World Plaza in downtown Bangkok, and Suvarnabhumi areas of Samut Prakan Province, Thailand. The university is led by the Brothers of St. Gabriel, who have been active in education in Thailand since 1901. Assumption University is noted for attracting large numbers of foreign students from more than 80 countries. It is also the first international
university in Thailand. The university had been chosen for this research were derived from three reasons, one is the international background of the university provides multicultural and multilingual background for students in the site. Second, the students who enrolled in the university use mainly English as the means for learning. Students usually do not have the vast obstacles for communication through English. Last, the location of the university is the capital city of Thailand, Bangkok, where students have various accesses to multilingual linguistic landscape of Thailand.

In this university, English is the only language for teaching and learning. However, there are many students from non-English countries, and they do not have effective language competences to support learning activities at first stage, therefore, all non-native students need to study Intensive English as preparatory course, Basic English (Basic English I and Basic English II) for those who failed Entry Test after Intensive English. Then, students need to attend Academic English (English I - English IV) afterwards for English language studying from lower intermediate to advance level.

Samples in this research are twenty-five English I course (intermediate level) students between the ages of 17 and 21. Most students study the course for the first time. They are mainly from Martin De Tours School of Management and ABAC School of Law. In the class, all students come from Thailand, and most of them live in different areas of Bangkok. While their language levels varied, most students were between 4.5 and 5 on the International English Language Testing System scale, according to the standard of ABAC’s English language evaluation system, or those who passed Basic English II course. According to the standard, students who are in English I class should foster reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills in English
through communicative activities in a meaningful academic context. Therefore, students in this English I class have abilities to collect bilingual or monolingual signs, evaluate language or languages on each sign, lay out language or languages' function and categories, and provide utterance to their views and opinions for signs.

The twenty-five students had been formed as five different groups with six or seven members. They had been instructed to choose a group leader for each group. The leader has responsibilities to assign workload for members, and organise a schedule for the linguistic landscape project. They had been informed in class that the linguistic landscape project should be conducted as the calendar, which was half term long for the project. The students in the class followed the instruction, and conducted the project well without major reluctance. They showed their willingness to carry out the project around their neighbourhood, because the project interested themselves in the research of English usage in Bangkok.

3.3.2 Research Measurements

This section will present the instruments that had been applied in this research. Student's LL project, Recording of students' presentation, Journals of class observation, and Pictures of signs collection will be illustrated chronologically.

3.3.2.1 Pictures of signs

The picture of signs is another important instrument in this research. Apart from student's interpretation and evaluation of each sign, each sign will be analysed discursively. The picture can reveal each sign's surrounding environment, and it can be the evidence for the data that the pictures of signs own their legitimacy. Apart from the languages on the signs, colour, shape, text alignment, font size, fonts, etc., can be
supportive materials for the analysis of linguistic landscape project. Therefore, the pictures can be supportive to illustrate linguistic environment of different areas in Bangkok.

3.3.2.2 Categories of signs

Students were provided a list of questions as a heuristic for the students to apply to the photos, which for both research and pedagogical reasons. This list was adopted from Rowland's (2013) research, and the list of questions is following:

1. What types of sign is it (e.g., advertisement, road sign, map, menu, etc.)?
2. Where is the sign located (e.g., residential area, near a train station, etc.)?
3. Who made the sign (e.g., a shop, a restaurant, the police, a private citizen, etc.)?
4. Who is the intended audience of the sign?
5. Why do you think English is used on the sign?
6. Why do you think Thai is not used in place of English on the sign?

These questions were proposed to guide students to break the task of photograph categorisation into an activity with manageable chunks in response to specific prompts. The students were advised to draw up tables to record their answers to the questions, and overall the heuristic was successful in providing the students with more control over the task demands. The students utilised the list of questions to form a categorisation of the signs collection.
3.3.2.3 Recordings of class observation

The presentation of students had been recorded in class. The recording can evident that how students interpret the signs they collected around community. Throughout the interpretation, evidence can be grasped to reveal that how EFL students can gain through LL project as its purpose of improving students’ communication skills, and hence, in order to facilitate them with comprehensive understanding for the social meanings of English usage around their community. The recordings had been transcribed, and the analysis of recordings was conducted through the transcript.

3.3.2.4 Teaching journal

After each session for the teaching of linguistic landscape project, a teaching journal was formed to record student’s questions and responses. Nunan (1992, p. 118) asserts, “diaries, logs and journals are important introspective tools in language research.” The journal provides learners’ responses in classroom and perceptions of learning. There are five teaching journals were carried out, that each one is about 400 words. The journal provides the reflection of student’s performance in the classroom, especially about the linguistic landscape project. The analysis of the teaching journals was under the qualitative methods.

3.3.2.5 Student’s report of the linguistic landscape project

In this research, the LL project which had been conducted by 4 groups of EFL students is the key instrument to analyse to what extent, for the purpose of improving students’ understanding of English usage around their community, EFL students in Thailand can gain through linguistic landscape project. The report was conducted by
each group within two weeks duration. Students chose eight pictures of their signs collection, and combined them into the report, with their evaluation of each sign afterward. Having spent one week analysing and categorising the photos, the students spent a further two weeks writing reports in their groups offering their conclusions. Students have been asked to choose five signs to form their report. The report was in English and between 500 and 1000 words long, and thus has been analysed discursively. As the project was an assessable part of the course, feedback to the students on structural, syntactical and lexical aspects of their wiring had been provided. The students gave written consent to have their reports analysed and reported on for research purposes under conditions of anonymity.

3.4 Method of data collection

3.4.1 Introduction

In this section, the design of this research will be presented. The research will adapt Sayer’s (2010) proposed linguistic landscape research modal, which is about the utilisation of linguistic landscape as the pedagogical materials in EFL classroom, to design a framework for this research. In addition, Rownald’s (2013) linguistic landscape project that had been conducted for his EFL class in Japan will be reshaped and utilised in this research, in order to accommodate the English usage environment differences and the linguistic context in Thailand. Sayer applies the idea of linguistic landscape and describes a small-scale research project undertaken in a local EFL community in Mexico using public signs to analyse the social meanings of English. He asserts that social meanings of English by utilising linguistic landscape concepts into a small-scale research project undertaken in a local EFL community in Mexico.
Then, he presents a framework that distinguishes between intercultural and intracultural uses, as well as iconic and innovative uses of English on signs. In this research, the vital part is the project that undertook by students of an EFL class around their community, which used the linguistic landscape to analyse the meanings of English with social and cultural factors in Thai context.

3.4.2 Data Collection Procedure

This study adopted a qualitative approach for data collection and analysis. This research was conducted in the 2013/2 semester (January - April, 2013) of Assumption University. Applying Sayer’s (2009) (above in 2.13.2) proposed linguistic landscape research model, a classroom project was initiated with the English I class of twenty-five students, which requiring them to form four small groups and investigate the question: How and why is English used on signs in Thailand? In order to explore the question, students need to use seven weeks to conduct the project. There were one class each week for ninety minutes long, therefore, seven classes had been assigned to the project, and a conclusion presentation at the last class was the final point of the linguistic landscape project.

First class, students had been informed about the project at the first class of the research. They acquired the instruction for the special project from presentation of teacher. Teacher of the class presented the question first: How and why is English used on signs in Thailand? Then they chose their members to form a group of six or seven members due to the uneven amount of students in the class. Then the instruction of how to do the project had been presented by the teacher through the power point presentation. After the presentation, students acquired limited acknowledgement of linguistic landscape through the presentation which teacher
provided the concept of linguistic landscape and the examples of signs with different genres and functions. In the first class, students had been asked to discuss about the signs they had been spotted around their daily living. After all, students acquired the foundation knowledge of how to do the project.

Then, students need to take pictures of multilingual sings they have spotted around their community, by using digital camera or smart mobile phone. They need to use two weeks to collect pictures of signs. Students have been encouraged to begin photographing any instances of English they came across in public of their community. The students were given two weeks to collect as many photos as they could, print copies and bring the pictures of signs to class to discuss with their group members. Second class was the half point of the sampling process, and students showed their collection of pictures to class. Students discussed the samples, and tried to put different signs into category.

Moreover, the groups need to sort their pictures into categories of their own choosing reflecting how and why English was being used on the signs. The process of categorisation was a challenge for the students. As a professional researcher, Sayer (2009, p. 145) explains his use of qualitative content analysis in organising his pictures of signs into categories, but unsurprisingly my students were not familiar with such techniques. Thus, their first efforts at categorising the signs resulted in confused looks and stilted conversations as they filtrated through the numerous photos they had collected. For both research and pedagogical reasons, students were not steered towards particular understandings of English in the Thai LL, and they were not provided with example categories as such. Rather, a list of questions (above in 3.3.2.2) as a heuristic for the students to apply to the photos has been devised. The
students were encouraged to draw up tables to record their answers to the questions, and overall the heuristic was successful in providing the students with more control over the task demands.

Having spent one week analysing and categorising the photos, the students spent a further two weeks writing reports in their groups offering their conclusions. Before they submitted the report, they needed to present their findings in class as a group. The presentation required students to carry out a comprehensive analysis for the pictures they collected, and share their opinions and ideas to the class. Finally, the reports were in English and between 400 and 500 words long needed to submit after the presentation, and thus has been analysed discursively.

3.5 Method of Analysis

A theoretical framework is the rational or base for conducting research. It is a conceptual model of how one theory or makes logical sense of the relationship between several factors that have been identified as important to the research problem (Bogan & Biklen, 2002). The theoretical framework of the research to analyse the digital photographs that students collected will stem from Huebner’s (2009) suggestions that research in the LL should focus on selection, classification, and linguistic analysis. Along with Hymes’ (1972) perspective of ethnography of communication, Scollon and Scollon’s (2003) geosemiotic framework, Kress and van Leeuwen’s (2006) grammar of design, and Fairclough’s (1989) critical language study was applied.

The meaning of public texts like road signs, notices and brand logos can be interpreted by taking into account the physical and social world that they are found in.
Geosemiotics is "the study of the social meaning of the material placement of signs and discourses and of our actions in the material world" (Scollon & Scollon, 2003, p. 2). This framework helps to interpret the meaning of text found in public spaces, the I.I., by considering the social and physical world where the texts are found. This framework takes into account not only where a sign is placed and what is imprinted on it, but what the sign is made of. A steel sign cemented into the ground may, without words, imply that the business is permanent, whereas a sign made from a piece of paper taped on the door may imply something that is temporary. Three systems showing how social semiotics are interconnected at a site of social action are proposed by these authors as studying the (1) interaction order – how humans form social relations; (2) visual semiotics – the way in which text, pictures, signs are produced for visual interpretation; (3) place semiotics – this includes architecture, highway engineering.

Kress and van Leeuwen's (2006) work on visual representation uses a theoretical framework of social semiotics. They view representation as a process in which the makers of signs try to make a representation of some object or entity, while at the same time the signmakers' interest in making the sign is related to their cultural, social and psychological history. Focus is put on the motivation of signmakers to put together the form and the meaning of a sign.

Fairclough's (1989) critical language study (CLS) helps increase consciousness of language and power, and how language contributes to the domination of some people by others. He encourages people to acknowledge their own social experiences, background knowledge, values and political commitments to understand how they would perceive and interpret language and social matters. CLS
is used to show connections that may be hidden from people, such as connections between language, power and ideology.

The signs students collected from their community will be categorised based on the method Landry and Bourhis (1997) provided that the signs can be categorised into two different ways, one is the public another is private, and the function of the signs can be informative and symbolic. Analysis and evaluation of the signs from students will be conducted from the framework. Moreover, the data collected from pictures of signs, class discussion, and students' reports are analysed through pedagogical benefits discussed previously (above in 2.13.2). The list below summarises the pedagogical benefits proposed in the studies discussed previously.

Overall, pedagogically motivated interaction with the LL is claimed to:

1. Develop students' critical literacy skills.
2. Improve students' pragmatic competence.
3. Increase the possibility of incidental language learning.
4. Facilitate the acquisition of multimodal literacy skills.
5. Stimulate students' multi-competence.
6. Enhance students' sensitivity to connotational aspects of language.

Essentially, all six of these benefits can be related to language students' literacy skills, although not in the traditional sense of merely reading and writing.

Although traditional literacy or 'mere literacy' (The New London Group, 1996, p. 62) sees communication as language-centric and rule-governed, without much attention to other semiotic modes and involving students' ability to match sounds to letters and so
forth, pedagogical LL projects are thought to develop students’ literacy skills in a multiliteracies sense (Cope & Kalantzis, 1999). A multiliteracies approach to literacy emphasises the constantly multimodal and highly contextual nature of communication and representation.
Chapter 4  Data Analysis

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, an evaluation analysis and interpretation of the data collected from the participants in this research will be presented. The data includes three aspects: bilingual or monolingual sings collected by participants, class discussion and presentation (video recording); and students' group report. In this section, data from five different groups will be not only presented chronologically, but each group's comments and evaluations for their sign collection will be portrayed as well. Data students collected from multi-area of Bangkok will be compared and analysed, in order to uncover the inherent pattern and characters of English usage with its social meaning in Thailand.

4.2 The Linguistic Landscape of Bangkok, Thailand

4.2.1 Introduction

This section will first portray the students' data for the linguistic landscape of Bangkok. In total twenty-five signs will be presented in each group's section. The analyses of the signs through the idea of linguistic landscape will be portrayed afterwards. The analysis will contain two major parts, one is the description of the sign through students' view, the other is the interpretation of the sign that will be evaluated from both students' and researcher's point of view. The interpretation of the sign will follow the spirit of Landry and Bourhis (1997), which each sign will be put into different categories, and then each sign will be analysed critically. The spirit of critical analysis will be admired through the interpretation of the signs.
Thus, the signs in total of twenty-five, had been organised by students’ report, and then will be organised into top-down (official) and bottom-up (non-official) firstly, then informative and symbolic categories. However, the locations of signs will be portrayed and explained. The location’s background will be introduced in order to provide the crucial spine for the research that where the signs have been collected by students. In addition, the languages on signs will be evaluated.

4.2.2 Locations of Signs

The locations of signs are variable in Bangkok of Thailand. Group one took the pictures of signs from Yan Nawa district of Bangkok; group two chose Bangkapi district of Bangkok for its sampling area; group three observed Huai Khwang district of Bangkok to take the pictures of signs; group four use Watthana district of Bangkok for collecting the pictures of signs; and group five chose two different locations for the pictures, one is the major commercial area - Silom, another is one of the most important transport hub in Bangkok - Don Muang Airport. The signs from various areas of Bangkok may shows the diversification of linguistic landscape of the specific territory, and could enhance the materials of linguistic landscape of Thailand. As the table (Table 4-1) and Figure (Figure 4-1) below show that the locations of the signs students collected covered major commercial areas and highly developed districts in Bangkok.

Table 4-1. Locations of the signs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group One</td>
<td>Rama 3, Yan Nawa District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Two</td>
<td>Bangkapi District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Three</td>
<td>Huai Khwang District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table (Table 4-1) and figure (Figure 4-1) above, the signs students collected from Bangkok spread in almost the entire Bangkok. The locations contain major commercial areas and main residential area in the capital city of Thailand. The variable and enriching geographical attributes of the collection of signs not only enriched the number of signs in Bangkok, and also increased the richness of signs from varied areas of Bangkok. In Huebner’s (2006) research of linguistic landscape in Bangkok portrays the collection of signs which had been taken by his students that focus on the area of Chinese inhabitants in Bangkok. His research does not provide samples from mainly Thai residents areas, however, this research intend to enrich the
data from various areas of entire Bangkok which includes residential and commercial areas. However, this research does not contain the signs from the most popular commercial area of Bangkok, because students from the English I class do not live around that area.

4.2.2.1 Groups one’s sample location

Figure 4-2. Rama 3, Yan Nawa District, Bangkok, Thailand

Yan Nawa (Figure 4-2) is the district group one had chosen for their linguistic landscape project. Yan Nawa or Yannawa is one of the 50 districts of Bangkok, Thailand. The district is bounded by Rat Burana, Bang Kho Laem, Sathon and Khlong Toei districts of Bangkok. In this area, two major bridges are over the Chao Phraya River, Rama III Bridge and Rama IX Bridge. The Rama III Bridge is a bridge crossing the Chao Phraya River in Bangkok, and the bridge was completed in 1999 and was designed to alleviate traffic congestion on the adjacent Rama IX Bridge. It connects the Yan Nawa district to Rat Burana district as a part of the Dao Khanong – Port Section of Chalerm Maha Nakhon Expressway. The RAMA IX Bridge was the
first cable-stayed bridge in Thailand and had the second longest cable-stayed span in
the world when it opened in 1987. The two bridges connect west bank and east bank
of Chao Phraya River in Bangkok. The areas around these two bridges turn out to be
the major transportation hub and commercial areas due to the convenient
transportation. Students chose the areas to collect the pictures of signs will expand the
examples of linguistic landscape in major transportation and commercial areas of
Bangkok, Thailand.

4.2.2.2 Groups two's sample location

Figure 4-3. Bangkapi District, Bangkok, Thailand

This group collected pictures of signs from Bangkapi district of Bangkok
(Figure 4-3), especially from the Mall Bangkapi. Bangkapi is one of the 50 districts of
Bangkok, Thailand. It is bounded by other Bangkok districts: Bueng Kum, Saphan
Sung, Prawet, Suan Luang, Huai Khwang, Wang Thonglang, and Lat Phrao. It is a
major area of Bangkok for shopping and people gathering. Group two chose this area
as the target to precede the study exemplifies the English usage in local commercial
area. Moreover, there are some major universities located in this area, such as Assumption University, and Ramkhamhaeng University. Therefore, foreign visitors and residents will choose nearby area to live, and Bangkapi District is a convenient choice for them. The pictures of signs from the Bangkapi area can expand the evidence of the linguistic landscape in Bangkok, Thailand.

4.2.2.3 Groups three's sample location

Figure 4-4. Huai Khwang District, Bangkok, Thailand

Group three chose the RAMA 9 area of Huai Kuang in Bangkok (Figure 4-4). This area is a major public transportation hub in Bangkok, which is the cross point of MRT underground and Airport Link high-speed train system. Local residents and visitors can access to most major commercial and residential areas in Bangkok through this RAMA 9 station of Huai Khwang.
4.2.2.4 Groups four’s sample location

Figure 4-5. Watthana District, Bangkok, Thailand

Watthana (Figure 4-5) is a major commercial and residential area for residents in Inner Eastern Bangkok. Group four chose this place as the similar sample place as group two, because Watthana is a neighbour district for its members. The district is close to Bangkapi district, and it accommodates major shopping centres and tourist attractions, such as the Thailand Culture Centre, The Central Plaza Rama 9, the major transportation hub MRT RAMA 9 station, and the Embassy of China. Students of the group chose this area to do their research provide its focus on the commercial domain of the linguistic landscape of Bangkok, Thailand.
4.2.2.5 Groups five’s sample location

Group five conducted the research in multi-areas of Bangkok (Figure 4-6). This group decided to observe the signs from various locations, because members of the group live in different areas, and they intended to present splendid examples of signs with languages in Bangkok. A discussion had been formed with the group, and the group guaranteed that their picture would be legitimate and concrete. The location they chose to sample the signs is Silom District and Don Muang Airport area.

4.2.2.6 Analysis for the locations of signs

From the signs students collected from the sites, the locations of signs mainly are the commercial area around their community. The table (Table 4-2) shows the locations of signs, which illustrates that the English signs are mainly presented in commercial areas in Bangkok.
Table 4-2. Function related types of signs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indoor</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table (Table 4-2) above presents that students’ nearby community are usually the shopping area and the means to access to it. The shopping related signs play a dominated share of the total signs, which is nineteen in total with 76% share. This means the signs collection in this research are mainly from the commercial area, and the twenty-two indoor signs reflect that the signs from students’ collection mainly from inside of the shopping related buildings. This result reflects that the signs with English or languages other than Thai are mainly from commercial buildings, especially from its inside area.

The linguistic landscape special project provides EFL students in the English 1 class an opportunity to access to the English language materials in their society. The chance of reaching the English learning materials in students’ neighbourhood facilitate students to observe the current utterance of English on signs, and to be able to cogitate how the English is developing in their community. In addition, the signs from various locations of Bangkok provide students a picture of how English is using in this city in the class. Through the class discussion, students felt surprised that the signs are mainly from commercial areas, and the municipal authorities are not able to provide high quality linguistic services for visitors and foreigners. Students from the class thanked for the opportunity that it developed their knowledge of where the
English language are in their society, and they will observe the exposure of English language around them closely.

4.2.3 Language(s) on Signs

The special project of the English I class provided students in the class to carry out a fieldwork to take samples of signs with English language. The signs reveals the linguistic landscape of Bangkok through the very group of Thai students’ observation, and thus the observation could reveal the linguistic landscape of Bangkok through their opinions and views. The following section will show the language(s) on each sign, and the analysis of the language(s) on the signs will be followed.

4.2.3.1 Analysis of Languages on Signs

The table (Table 4-3) shows the language(s) used on each sign. As the Table 4.3 illustrated, the language on the signs has an even distribution between English and Thai. There are twelve signs are English only, and twelve English and Thai signs. There is only one sign from students’ collection with three languages (English, Thai, and Chinese).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language(s)</th>
<th>No. of signs</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Thai</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-Thai-Chinese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total signs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-3. Language(s) on signs in Bangkok, Thailand
Before students proceeded the fieldwork, a discussion in class had been arranged to assume that what the major language or languages of signs would be presented. Students presumed that both Thai and English would be the major languages on the sign around their community. However, the table (Table 4-3) shows that the result shows that English only signs occupy the half share of the total 25 signs students presented in their report. In students’ report, the result did not catch their attention, this lead to another fact that English only sign for the whole English I class is not an issue which can draw their attention, although students noticed that English language only on the sign is a remarkable finding, and they did not expect that English only sign will exist around their community. In addition, the result shows the shortage of municipal regulation about signs in Bangkok. The signs students collected present the flexibility of language choice, which completely depend on the creator of each sign.

Table 4-4. Percentage of language(s) on signs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>% of all signs displaying a language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When considering the total number of signs that display some use of each language found in the LL of Bangkok, the English appeared on around all signs (Table 4-4). Only 52% of signs contained Thai, which means that striking 48% did not, even Thai is the only official language in Thailand. Chinese figured only once in the LL of students’ collection, and other languages were not presented by students. As the locations students chose for their special project, some areas are highly attractive
tourist visiting area (such as Silom and Don Muang), English shows its dominance of the means for mass communication among visitors and locals.

4.2.4 Categorisation of Signs

This section will portray students' categorisation of signs first. Students organised their signs collection into a categorisation based on the guideline teacher provided in the class, and the discussion with teacher and classmates about the signs. The signs had been put into three categories, advertisement, notice and transportation. In addition, the discussion of signs concerned the cultural factors of signs. Students considered the cultural meanings behind the languages on the signs, and presented their findings in their reports. The second part of the section is a reorganisation for the categorisation of signs under the spirit of Landry and Bourhis (1997). Landry and Bourhis (1997) provide an evident distinction between the informative and symbolic functions of languages signs, and the top-down (official) and bottom-up (non-official) categories.

4.2.4.1 Students' categorisation of signs

This section will examine the signs that five groups collected from their community based on the framework, in order to reveal that what functions English as a lingua franca provided in the communities by the private and public creators of signs, especially through students' interpretation, and what perceptions of English are endued by the inhabitants of the communities from students' point of view. Students' categorisation table will be organised in Appendix (Appendix K). The categorisation of signs from five groups will be portrayed sequentially through the table groups summarised in the reports. In addition, the evaluation and reorganisation of the categorisation will be formed, in order to compare each group's collection of signs.
and then reveals the linguistic landscape of Bangkok, Thailand.

Table 4-5. Categorisation of Signs from students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group One</th>
<th>Group Two</th>
<th>Group Three</th>
<th>Group Four</th>
<th>Group Five</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students organised their signs into three categories, Advertisement, Notice, and Road Signs. From the table (Table 4-5), there are ten signs are advertisement, fourteen signs are informative notice, and only one sign is road sign which is from local government. This result shows that the road sign had been taken by students only once in the special project, and student did not notice that road signs provide remarkable examples of bilingual or multilingual signs. This shop fronts and billboards were students' focus on the bilingual or multilingual signs, which exposes that the English on signs or languages other than Thai on signs in Bangkok usually have been applied in commercial areas or areas with large group of foreign inhabitants. The authority itself does not provide an effective and adequate guideline for how to format signs and notices for governmental building and public areas, for example, public hospital, police station, tax office, public park. Most sign students took is advertisements and notices, and most sign is from commercial areas. From Table 4.5, the only public sign that is the road sign discloses that bilingual or multilingual signs in Bangkok mainly are contributed by private sectors. Public areas are lack of evident bilingual or multilingual signs even Bangkok is the recognised international city.
4.2.4.2 Reorganisation for the categorisation of signs

Landry and Bourhis (1997) provide an evident distinction between the informative and symbolic functions of languages signs. The informative function indicates the specified language that inhabitants in a territory to communicate with one another. The symbolic function refers to the perception that members of the specific territory have of the value and status of their languages as compared to other languages (above in 2.9). According to students’ collection of signs, the table (Table 4-6) summarises the reorganisation of the categorisation of signs, and illustrates the categories of signs under the guideline of Landry and Bourhis (1997), which is based on the data from the appendix (Appendix K).

Table 4-6. Reorganisation of the categorisation of signs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production type</th>
<th>Type of discourse</th>
<th>No signs (n=25)</th>
<th>Languages used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>Official Regulatory</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Thai, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Thai, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thai, English, Chinese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table (Table 4-6) shows that there is only one sign is public, others all are private. The result comes from one discrete foundation that students in this English class ignored the signs in public buildings, and students prefer to live around private entities. There is another possibility that signs in private entities provide more bilingual forms than public areas. As the special project requires that students need to digitalise the sign contains at least two languages, this may be the reason that the only one public sign had been taken by students.
Another category is the informative and symbolic function, which the table (Table 4.7) below summarises the result.

Table 4-7. Symbolic and Informative function of signs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table (Table 4-7) shows that the informative function of signs is the major collection, and ten symbolic function signs show that the function of sign is not mainly for the symbolic purpose; rather, the informative function is the dominant purpose for the collection of signs. However, there are some signs contain both informative and symbolic functions, which means the sign creator usually does not notice the symbolic function behind the sign. The creator usually intends to provide information for its intended reader, but the symbolic interpretation will be made by readers diversely.

4.2.5 Students' interpretation of signs

This section will provide students' interpretation of the signs. The section will be divided in five parts, which is from group one to group five. The interpretation is cited from students’ writing report at the end of the special project.

4.2.5.1 Group one's interpretation

This section will present the interpretation of signs from group one. The pictures of signs are listed in Appendix A.
4.2.5.1.1 Sign one

This sign is a one in the department store of Central Plaza Rama III. The sign provides the information for the foreign audience. However, due to the limitedness of the photo, it is difficult to reveal the complete picture of the information the creator of the sign intends to deliver. "The sign we can’t understand at all. There’s no Thai at all around the sign. We don’t know why the owner put the sign at this place". From group one’s comment, we could find out the sign cannot fulfil its intended function that delivery correct information to its target audience. Money back may means that this is the place for customers to have some discount voucher, however it is difficult to find out exact meaning of the sign due to its limitation of language usage and group one’s picture.

4.2.5.1.2 Sign two

The sign provides clear information that the home delivery service provided by the supermarket. However, group one’s report shows that they cannot grasp the meaning of the ‘HOME DELIVERY’ sign "we can’t understand it. Why ‘HOME DELIVERY’ all in capital letters? We think the owner want to put some stresses on this sign. But we think we should not use English like this way. And ‘HOME DELIVERY’ together is quite confusing. I think this is a sign only for foreigners, but the market is a place mostly for locals. Then we feel confused why the owner only use English on it." According to group one’s comments, we could grasp the general picture of English usage in Thai context.

4.2.5.1.3 Sign three

This sign is an example of English language usage in Thai context. According to group one’s comment, the sign is useless for other drivers on road. "We think the
owner of the van put the sign in a wrong place. The owner may want to other drivers know that there are kids in the van and hope them drive safely and slowly. But the owner may forget that most Thai don’t understand English comprehensively. We don’t know why the owner only use English. It can’t provide proper information to other people. Maybe he or she wants to show that he or she is rich or in higher class in the society.” This comment shows that the English language still owns its prestige in Thai society. People in Thailand use English for not only the informative function, but other functions as well.

4.2.5.1.4 Sign four

This sign is a remarkable example of bilingual utilisation in Thailand. There are two languages on the same sign, one is English and the other is Thai. In addition, important information in English on the sign is “Factory SALE up to 60%, opening time and contact information under it. The creator of the sign intends to provide useful information for audience in order to promote its special sale. However, “the sign is very strange. If people read it and want to go the shop, they can’t find any address information. Because address is in Thai. We don’t understand what kind of people is the company’s target customers. Sale information is in English, but address is in Thai.” Next, students comments that “we assumed that English which was used on these [multilingual] signs had a Thai translation but we noticed some signs were different. The English writing and the Thai writing on a sign were very different sometimes.” The creator of the sign may think all Thai people who drive through the sign can understand English, in the contrast, all foreigners can understand Thai. The creator use two languages to provide different information, the sign, therefore, the purpose of the sign which provides clear instruction for the factory sale eludes
intended audiences.

4.2.5.1.5 Sign five

This is a typical road sign in Bangkok, Thailand. Bangkok as the capital city always provides bilingual signs to its inhabitants and visitors. The sign above provides an instruction for a ‘Shorter Route’ to ‘Rama IX’ but there is only one Thai phrase lacks its English translation below. All other Thai phrase has its English translation, for example, ‘Shorter Route’ and ‘Rama IX’. “The sign doesn’t provide clear information. Why they don’t translate ‘Rama IX soi 26’? We think people may feel confused when they look at it, especially those visitors and travellers.” According to students’ comment, the sign should provide more information than it has provided, in order to enhance its intelligibility. Otherwise, the sign cannot provide its functional means to arrive at its purpose. Foreign visitors could spot on many signs as similar as the sign above in all around Bangkok, and “visitors may get lost in the city because they may not understand the meaning of those signs. We think that if the government want to put two or more languages on any sign, it should find some professionals to do it.”

4.2.5.2 Group two’s interpretation

This section will present the interpretation of signs from group two. The pictures of signs are listed in Appendix B.

4.2.5.2.1 Sign one

This picture contains a sign with black background and white fonts in the middle, others are the image of the H&M fashion shop. The sign is a simple illustration, which was only showed “BEST BUY FROM $150”. There are only three
English words on the sign, “BEST BUY FROM”, that all in capital. According to group two’s report, they “don’t understand why all letters is in capital.” The students asserts that words in capital have to be with the special function, for example, the name of place, the country, the name for newspaper or magazine, etc. This comment shows that students in English I class do not have the perception of language usage in society that if the speaker wants to stress on something, or wants to shout, the letters can be all capital. It also shows that students are lack of acknowledgement that the creator of the sign attempts to attract its audience to grasp the information on the sign, and hence to persuade them to walk into the shop for shopping. Moreover, “These signs in English tell us the sales information about price and place. These information can help customer to buy products in their shop.” Overall, the sign is a typical example that reveals English language usage in society depends on its functional and societal purpose, and it may not need to follow grammatical rules strictly.

4.2.5.2.2 Sign two

The location of the sign is in the supermarket of the Mall Bangkapi, and it locates at ground floor of the market in fresh food section. The sign is not a bilingual one, and there is only one language is presented on it - English. The sign provides a suggestion for daily diet, that people should have 3 kinds of vegetables and fruits everyday. Group two criticises that the sign should present at least two languages, instead, there is only English on it. “We do not notice it when we go shopping before, but when we look at it closely, we feel surprised that there is only English on it.” Group two shows their doubt that English language has been spoiled by people in Thailand, that people add too many attributes into it. “This is a supermarket for Thai people mainly, but they don’t use Thai or Thai and English together.” Then, group
two arises the question “How could other people to get the information if they don’t understand English?” Their comment shows that English may has its prestige attribute in the society. They conclude that “people will feel happy and ‘high-so’ (prestige) if they see English only.”

4.2.5.2.3 Sign three

This sign is in the supermarket of The Mall Bangkapi, which provides promotional information for customers who want to purchase the product. English on the sign is “BUY GET 1”, and group two explains that “the Thai on the sign is ‘buy 1 get 1’, but English is ‘buy get 1’. We think the English may confuse foreign customers.” Group two continue to comments “we think the sign provide strong information for customers that purchase this as soon as possible, then you will have 1 for free. English here is a function for promotion.”

4.2.5.2.4 Sign four

This sign is in the Uniqlo fashion shop which locates on third floor of the Mall Bangkapi. The picture do not cover the whole sign, but according to group two report, the words that do not covered by the picture is “offer”. The sign is in red background with white letters. “DISCOUNT TAKEN AT REGISTER” and “$590” are the chunks are showed on the sign. The sign provides sales information for intended audience, which informs customers that the price of the products is $590 and how to acquire the offer. The English words are all in capital, and it is above the Thai. “OFFER” is in capital and the font size is bigger than Thai. Group two criticises that “The sign is for both Thai people and foreigners, but we think it’s difficult to see the Thai. We don’t like the way they use Thai.” Group two presents their agitation that
Thai as the only official language of Thailand cannot serve the businesses’ demand for prestige purpose. They query that “why we can’t feel proud to use Thai here?” Moreover, group two present that the word “register” is confusing for them to understand. They criticise that “it should be ‘cashier’,” which reveals that their limited ability to understand synonyms.

4.2.5.2.5 Sign five

This sign is in the food court of the Mall Bangkapi, Bangkok. Take home shows us the meaning that the food court is a place to provide take away food for customers. However, group one students showed their confusion of the English language on the sign “we feel difficult to understand the meaning of ‘Take Home’. We think the meaning should be ‘take away’. We think the owner uses English mistakenly.” The comment shows that Thai students may have difficulties to learn English language in different context. They can only know that the meaning of take something back home only matches the phrasal words ‘take away’. Therefore, the limitation of classroom language teaching has been revealed by the comment that students should have the chances to access to the learning language in different context outside the classroom.

4.2.5.3 Group three’s interpretation

This section will present the interpretation of signs from group three. The pictures of signs are listed in Appendix C.

4.2.5.3.1 Sign one

One student from group three said that the sign is provided by the shop owner, and for the audience who are travellers from overseas. They claimed that the sign is
vague for the target audience, "people would feel confused about the information on the sign. This sign looks like the creator of it piles English vocabularies on one another, but the combination of English words is not a sentence, or even a chunk that deliver the information to its target group of visitors." After that, they asserted "Discount, the word on the sign, is easy to understand, which can provide clear gesture for audience that there is a promotion under going." However, "people may not understand the information the creator of sign wants to present, because people may feel confused about the number, for example, 109. People cannot access to the information under the number 109."

4.2.5.3.2 Sign two

This sign is a bilingual sign that demonstrates the information clearly that the place has a function to provide information for the place under the signage. "Weigh station, we don’t understand why the creator put this two words above the Thai words. They are different." They use Oxford Dictionary to check the meaning of ‘Weigh Station’ that “Weight station is a roadside station where commercial vehicles are required to stop and be inspected, thus protecting the road from travel by overweight or unsafe vehicles,” “but the Thai words on the sign tell people the place is for people to weigh the things they want to buy in the supermarket.” They therefore commented “People like to use English in public at Bangkok, but there are many mistakes or vague English usage on those signs. People may need to find professionals to help them to provide correct words.” However, this group provides an interesting comment that “some information on signs are made for especially Thai people, because two languages on the sign give two different information, and Thai words are lower than English in business area.” This comment portrays that the
English language owns its position in linguistic landscape of Thailand.

4.2.5.3.3 Sign three

This sign is in the food court of the Mall Bangkapi, Bangkok. Take home shows us the meaning that the food court is a place to provide takeaway food for customers. However, group three students showed their confusion of the English language on the sign “we feel difficult to understand the meaning of ‘Take Home’. We think the meaning should be ‘take away’. We think the owner uses English mistakenly.” The comment shows that Thai students may have difficulties to learn English language in different context. They can only know that the meaning of take something back home only matches the phrasal words ‘take away’. Therefore, the limitation of classroom language teaching has been revealed by the comment that students should have the chances to access to the learning language in different context outside the classroom.

4.2.5.3.4 Sign four

This sign provides the information of promotion for the selected products. “Red Hot is the words we could not understand completely. Red is the colour, Hot is an adjective to describe the feeling under heat, or the feeling of excitement. But when the two words has been put together, we can’t get the meaning of them. We think these two words together don’t have meaning in English.” And then group three’s report continually commented “But in Thai, Red means exciting things, Hot has the same meaning. When they put together, we understand the meaning like the selected product is very popular and in discount price.” According to group three, cultural difference has been demonstrated; therefore, different meaning from even the same language can be interpreted by different groups of audience. For locals, they
understand the meaning comprehensively, but for foreigners, they may not access to the complete information the inventor of the sign intend to distribute.

4.2.5.3.5 Sign five

This sign is evidently shows that English language is only using for prestige. “Meaning of ‘Shopping list’ is easy to understand. But the words there can’t provide any meaning to people. We can’t understand why the mall use English words here. The sign is on a door, and give people who read it a feeling that this place is a nice and luxury place. We think if the mall use Thai, the sign can’t give people the same feeling like English.” According to groups three’s comment, the creator of the sign is a remarkable gesture that English is a language can provide stature. When audience receives the impression the sign implied, they would enhance the image of the mall’s prestige and luxury stance.

4.2.5.4 Group four’s interpretation

This section will present the interpretation of signs from group four. The pictures of signs are listed in Appendix D.

4.2.5.4.1 Sign one

This sign is in the Uniqlo fashion shop that locates at Terminal 21 Shopping Centre. The sign is in red background with white letters. “DISCOUNT TAKEN AT REGISTER” is the English language on the sign. Group four criticises that “The meaning of cashier and register is different,” and they comments, “the sign should use cashier not the register. We think this is wrong.” The comment shows that students from the English I class doesn’t understand multi-vocabularies for similar meaning, which reveals their limitedness of meaning recognition in social context,
and the textbook is the main source for their vocabulary building. And this comment is as similar as the group two for the sign that locates at Uniqlo shop in different places. This represents that the case is not unique one; instead, it is an extensively representative case that could reveal that Thai EFL students use the textbook as the major source for vocabulary building and English language recognition. Therefore, students require multi-source rather than single-source over the vocabularies.

4.2.5.4.2 Sign two

There are two signs in this picture, one is the shop front “SQUEEZE”, the other is “HEALTH FROM TOP TO TOE”. The shop front is the brand of the shop, and the name is all in capital. The advertisement of the shop provides an “opinion gives people a image about the shop, which the products of the shop is healthy.” However, “healthy from top to toe is not a sentence, and people cannot see Thai from the sign, we think it is interesting that the shop only use English here.” Group four arises their question that “Why there is only English but not Thai?” This question asked by other groups as well, such as group one’s sign 2 (Appendix A), group two’s comment for sign 2 (Appendix B). Those questions asked by students in this class shows that they feel doubtful about English language usage in the society that English as the foreign language in Bangkok has been provided with prestige attributes in the society. People feel luxury and advanced when they spot English, and the feeling will persuade them to conduct the action of purchasing. “We think the sign will lead people to buy the drinks, because the English makes them feel happy and luxury.”

4.2.5.4.3 Sign three

This sign gives people the instruction about location of the toilet in the shopping centre. Group four asserts, “The sign is in front of the toilet, and it is very
interesting." The sign contains two words, one is “BAKER” and another is “RESTROOM”. Each vocabulary has its own meaning, however, it is rare to spot the combination of these two vocabularies together. “We have never seen any name like this, ‘baker restroom’, before. We think this sign is an interesting one that make a new meaning for these two words.” Group four’s comment shows that the sign not only expands their understanding about English vocabularies, but shows them a new way to use English in the society as well.

4.2.5.4.4 Sign four

This sign is another one for the instruction of toilet in the same building. It is a sign should provide clear instruction of where the toilet is. However, “we can’t get it. It is not clear enough for visitors. I think people can’t find the toilet if they look at the sign.”

4.2.5.4.5 Sign five

This sign is in the entrance of Terminal 21 Shopping Centre. It is an informative one which gives instruction for people about how to deal with the wet umbrella if they need to go into the building. There are three points on the sign, which include both Thai and English. But the title of the sign is in Thai, and the points have been arranged chronologically. The English sentence for point one is “Put wet umbrella straight down into the slot.”, “And then umbrella is automatically wrapped in plastic bag.” for point two, and “Pull out umbrella forward from slowly,” for point three. The sentences on the signs provide a evident instruction for visitors, and they are easy to follow it.

However, according to group four, “The Thai and English is quite different.
Pull out and pull in in Thai are the same word, but it is different in English.” Group four use this sign to criticise that “This is a good example about how to use English correctly. There are many signs just translate Thai to English directly, and the meaning usually is very confusing for foreigners. These sign uses ‘pull out’ instead of ‘pull in’ even ‘pull out’ and ‘pull in’ in Thai is the same vocabulary.” The sign reveals that it is a mature society where English has been treated as a lingua franca for all foreigners and society itself has its standard for how to use English widely.

4.2.5.5 Group five’s interpretation

This section will present the interpretation of signs from group five. The pictures of signs are listed in Appendix E.

4.2.5.5.1 Sign one

According to group five, “This signs in English tell us the sales information about price and place. These information can help customer to buy products in their shop.” However, this group put a similar comments as other groups “register is not cashier”.

4.2.5.5.2 Sign two

The sign is an informative one that provides information for travellers of the MRT underground system about the instructions for how to wait for the train. The English on the sign is “Please wait behind entry arrow signs”, which provides a clear instruction that ask people to stand behind the arrow which points at the entry direction of the carriage. Group five further states that “We found signs that said No Parking, No Smoking and Please wait behind entry arrow signs, and we thought they are important to prevent accidents and disorder of the city.” However, the group five
criticises that “the sign is not clear enough. People will feel confused about which one is entry arrow. Entry in the station could be interpreted into two different ways, one is the way to entry the station, and another is the way to entry the train.” The comments show that students acknowledged the function of the instruction signs, and also they think about the signs critically.

4.2.5.5.3 Sign three

Group five comments that “this sign tells people keep right to stand on the escalator, and can help people to avoid accident or chaos in airport.” And hence, they states that “the sign is clear to show other people who use the escalator about the instruction of how to use it.”

4.2.5.5.4 Sign four

Group five comments, “sometimes we find incorrect English [on signs]. If children see it they will learn wrong English from it so people need to use correct English” and “They [i.e. sign makers] should pay more attention to grammar and spelling. We found some mistakes on them [i.e. the signs].” They continue to criticise that “English on the sign is ‘Forbidden Island Glass’ which make other people feel loss of its meaning. Other people cannot understand it.”

4.2.5.5.5 Sign five

This sign is a restaurant front that locates at Srinakarin Road of Bangkok. Students from group five comments that “If they [i.e. the restaurant] don’t use ‘亚南餐厅’ and ‘活海鲜’ in Chinese characters which means “Yanan Restaurant (name of the restaurant)” and ‘live seafood’ [English], we would think that the restaurant are
old and traditional ones. Actually it is a western style coffee and steak restaurant, and they are selling western style modern food.”

4.3 Pedagogical Benefits of the Linguistic Landscape Project

4.3.1 Developing students’ critical literacy skills

The way people speak and are spoken to help shape them into the people they become. Through words and other actions, people build themselves in a world that is building them. That world addresses them to produce the different identities they carry forward in life. Yet, though language is fateful in teaching students what kind of people to become and what kind of society to make, discourse is not destiny. Shor (1999) states that the critical literacy questions power relations, discourses, and identities in a world not yet finished, just, or humane.

Table 4-8. Developing students’ critical literacy skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of critiques for English Only</th>
<th>No. of critiques for English and Thai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group One</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Two</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Three</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Four</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Five</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table (Table 4-8) summarises how many times each group criticising on why and how the English on the signs. Throughout the reports students submitted at the end of the semester, students made comments such as ‘There are many English
signs in Thailand but why? Are they necessary? We never thought about is before we started to research because it is a natural thing for Thai people.’ From the table (Table 4.8), there are ten times students criticises on the English only sign, and ten times critiques on the bilingual (English and Thai) signs. The total number of signs is twenty-five, however, there are twenty times that students from the English I class showed their doubts and critiques on the signs they collected on sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of critiques</th>
<th>No. of students’ critiques on signs</th>
<th>Percentage of students’ critiques on signs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for English Only</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for English and Thai</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This result (Table 4-9) is surprising that the total percentage of the students’ critiques on why there is only English on the signs and how English has been applied on the signs is eighty per cents, which means students think about why and how English has been used around their environment critically.
Group two showed the sign (Figure 4-7) is in The Mall Bangkapi food court, which is on the ground floor of this shopping centre. The sign shows 'Take Home, SPECIAL ... Corner,' which provides the function of this food court. It is a place to sell takes away food, and as it states that food sold here is special, and each alphabet of the word ‘special’ is in capital, therefore the sign want to stress that it is a very unique place for food, and food here should be delicious. However, you can only find one language on the sign that is English. The Mall Bangkapi is a major shopping centre for residents who live around Bangkapi Area, and this area is not a tourist hot zone in Bangkok. Thai nationalities are major inhabitants in this area, which means they use Thai language as their main language for daily life, such as shopping.

According to their report, they commented that ‘we go to the food court many times, but we never notice this sign. We think it’s normal to put English there, and we feel happy about the English. When we start to do the project, we find that there is only
English on the sign, you cannot find Thai at all. Why there’s a sign tells people what they can buy in the food court, and their intended audience should be Thai, because this is a major shopping centre for local residents, and most people are Thai.

Group two further made some comments on this issue, ‘We don’t know why, but we think the reason they use English because they want to be more high-so, and we think English used on products can increase the sale and sell as higher price than others.’

Figure 4-8. Sign 3-4, Supermarket, Central Plaza, Rama 9, Huai Khwang, Bangkok

Group three provided similar sign as Sign 3-4 (Figure 4-8) shows. This sign is in the supermarket of Central Plaza, Rama9, Huai Khwang district of Bangkok. The ‘Red Hot’ sign is on the rack of snack products, and it is in a flame shape. There is only English on it, and it has to be noticed that the sticker of product besides it provide bilingual information. Group three states in their report “the sign want to push people to buy the product, but why people who created the sign did not put That on it? The sign should provide information for local customers rather than foreigners, but the sign shows everything opposite. We guess the supermarket want to show they are
international, and the snack is imported product. Then they can make more money."

Such remarks suggest that the pedagogical LL project aroused the students’ curiosity regarding the presence of English on signs in Thailand, and this could be considered an initial step in developing their critical literacy skills. Their comment attests to the idea that the thorough ubiquity of English on signs in Thailand may conceal its presence, to some extent, from members of the Thai public; in a sense, English has become so commonplace in the Thai LL that it is now unremarkable. From an educational standpoint, this makes the Thai LL a prime target for activities intended to engender a questioning stance in language learners. McLaughlin and Devoogd (2004, p. 56) point out that ‘becoming critically literate is a developmental process’ which requires practice, reflection and, crucially within educational contexts, a teacher’s guidance in how to engage with and interrogate texts. The heuristic served this purpose in the current study, providing sample questions, which the students could use to develop their opinions on the role of English on signs in Thai society.

Moreover, while the students did not make explicit reference to issues of power or particular ideologies in their reports, they did describe aspects of inequality in the representation of languages other than English on signs in Thailand, with one group stating, for example, "We found a lot of English signs, but we couldn’t find other languages on signs so often, even we couldn’t find Thai language on some signs. And we thought why." As group two’s sign (Figure 4-7) and group three’s sign (Figure 4-8) demonstrated, students noticed the spread of English around their neighbourhood, and they tried hardly to find answer for the English dominance on those signs they spotted, especially they endeavour to provide a reasonable causes for this phenomenon, such as ‘higher price’, ‘privilege’, and ‘good quality’. It showed
that they were confused by the appearance of the signs throughout their report. Because they are Thai, they feel unhappy about the English only on those signs. Group two’s report points out “we don’t feel happy about this. Because there are many Thai people can’t understand English. The sign should provide two languages on it.”

As the guiding research question for the pedagogical project explicitly focused the students on the use of English in the Thai LL, it is notable that some groups queried the absence of other languages in the public space. One might conclude that a pedagogical LL project, with its emphasis on the analysis of written texts in public, can increase EFL students’ appreciation of language diversity, or lack thereof, in their local.

4.3.2 Improving students’ pragmatic competence

Raising students’ awareness of the connection between a language user’s communicative intention or desire, the linguistic form they choose to use, and the context of the situation in which the communicative act is taking place is a key responsibility for language teachers (Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor, 2003; Cenoz & Gorter, 2008b). In EFL settings, where there are fewer examples of authentic, contextualised spoken and written L2, the task may seem more difficult for teachers and students alike. Although focusing on the pragmatics of spoken language, Eslami-Rasekh (2005) suggests that language students in either ESL or EFL settings can benefit from taking on the role of ethnographers and recording the contextual details of actual language use as they encounter it outside the classroom. In a similar vein, Cenoz and Gorter (2008b) suggest that there may be value in EFL students examining the pragmatic functions of written L2 in their local LL. The class discussion revealed
that the students’ categorisation of their photographs relied heavily on their perceptions of the various functions that English performed on the signs.

The linguistic landscape can provide input for second language learners and it can be particularly interesting for the development of pragmatic competence. Texts written in the public space tend to include different speech acts and often use indirect language and metaphors. The linguistic landscape includes utterances that are sometimes full sentences but in many other cases they are just single words or groups of words that have a meaning as related to the context in which they are written. One of the characteristics of the linguistic landscape is that it is a type of literacy that is multimodal and multilingual.

For example, the students developed categories of signs based on informational functions of English. Group 3 provides a sign (Figure 4-9) in Uniqlo at Silom as below.

Figure 4-9. Sign 2-1, H&M, The Mall Bangkapi, Bangkapi, Bangkok.

According to group two, “These signs in English tell us the sales information..."
about price and place. These information can help customers to buy products in their shop.”

Group five provided an example for regulatory functions as sign (Figure 4-10) below.

*Figure 4-10. Sign 5-2, MRT Silom Station, Silom, Bangkok*

Group five states “We found signs that said No Parking, No Smoking and Please wait behind entry arrow signs, and we thought they are important to prevent accidents and disorder of the city.” Group five also provides an example (Figure 4-11) of regulatory functions as below.

*Figure 4-11. Sign 5-3, Don Muang Airport, Bangkok*
They said, "This sign tells people keep right to stand on the escalator, and can help people to avoid accident or chaos in airport."

About persuasive functions of signs, Group three showed an example as above (Appendix C, Sign 3-2) that "the sign was on the second level of a supermarket snack products shelf: 'Red Hot.' We thought it attracted people to buy that product." These categories showed that the students made connections between the communicative intentions behind the signs, the linguistic forms displayed on the signs and the social contexts that the signs existed in. All of this may have raised their sensitivity to pragmatic issues in English.

4.3.3 Increasing the possibility of incidental language learning

Incidental language learning is the understanding of language that accrues through exposure to language and without conscious intention to learn; its opposite is intentional language learning (Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001). As far as pedagogical LL projects are concerned, the suggestion in the literature is that students may unwittingly improve their linguistic ability in an L2 through a sociolinguistic investigation of that language's presence on public signs. While Cenoz and Gorter (2008b, p. 273) raise the possibility of incidental language learning occurring through student interaction with LLs, they are quick to acknowledge that it is 'very difficult to isolate the effect of the linguistic landscape on language learning from the effect of other types of input'. To do so properly would likely require a full experimental study under controlled conditions. Accordingly it is difficult to claim whether any incidental language learning took place during the current project.

However, the discussion did reveal that the students attended to lexico-grammatical features of the signs during the project. Observations (Figure 4-12) such
as, "sometimes we find incorrect English. If children see it they will learn wrong English from it so people need to use correct English" and "They should pay more attention to grammar and spelling. We found some mistakes on them" were common throughout the discussion.

Figure 4-12. Sign 5-4, Tops Supermarket, Silom, Bangkok

These comments demonstrate that the students were attending to the formal linguistic properties of the English used on the signs. Recognising the mistakes involved the students comparing the English on the signs with their own linguistic knowledge base, and consequently becoming aware of discrepancies. Overall then, regardless of whether measurable incidental language learning took place, it can be said that the current project may have served to reinforce the students existing L2 knowledge.

4.3.4 Facilitating the acquisition of multimodal literacy skills

'Multimodality describes approaches that understand communication and representation to be more than about language, and which attend to the full range of
communicational forms people use — image, gesture, gaze, posture, and so on — and the relationships between them’ (Jewitt, 2009, p. 14). The linguistic landscape, as written text, is linked to the development of second language literacy skills. In literacy studies the focus is on literacy as social practice, as Moss (2003, p.76) points out the focus of literacy studies is “upon the event itself, the socially structured moment when reading take place...it is the interactions between participants in the literacy event that will both establish and steer what the text will mean.” Such approaches are not intended to downplay the importance of language as a means for representing the world; language is recognised as an important mode of representation, too. Rather, multimodal approaches, especially within language learning contexts, seek to improve learners’ comprehension, production and integration of modes, including language, in making meaning (Royce, 2002). Developing students’ abilities in this regard is seen as helping them become multimodally literate.

Although the main focus of the pedagogical project was on the linguistic features of signs, the students often referred to the interplay between other semiotic modes, such as colour and font, and also commented at times on the relationships between text and image, and the relative positioning of different languages on signs. Referred to as intersemiotic relations (Jewitt, 2009), this interaction between modes is at the heart of the concept of multimodality. As an example of this, one group demonstrated an understanding of how the layout and typography of multilingual signs often worked in conjunction with the languages featured on the sign to convey a particular message to a particular audience. Group three observed that (Figure 4-13), “some information on signs are made for especially Thai people, because two languages on the sign give two different information, and Thai words are lower than English in business area.”
Drawing on Kress and Van Leeuwen (2006), Scollon and Scollon (2003, p. 130), in their seminal work on geosemiotics, or the meanings that a sign derives from its placement in the material world, support the students’ analysis here, stating that:

“[W]hen a text is in multiple codes [i.e. languages] or multiple orthographies there is a system of preference. The mere fact that these items in a picture or in the world cannot be located simultaneously in the same place produces a choice system. The preferred code is on the top, on the left, or in the centre.

The linguistic landscape is multimodal because it combines visual and printed texts. As Cenoz and Gorter (2008) point out “the information in the linguistic landscape is on different types of material objects such as signs, billboards, stickers, posters, shop windows or vending machines. The characteristics of these materials in combination with the text and images displayed and the space where they are located provide different affordances that interact with the readers resources in the process of re-making of the text.” The research provides examples students collected to reveal
the process that reading the signs will include the recognition along with the printed text in languages. The sign (Figure 4-14) shows the price tag in Uniqlo shop at the Mall Bangkapi of Bangkok. The reader can recognise the price sign because of its shape or the material is made of, and also because of the Uniqlo brand, which have some specific characteristics such as the shape or the red colour.

*Figure 4-14. Sign 2-4, Uniqlo, The Mall Bangkapi, Bangkapi, Bangkok*

The linguistic landscape, along with other resources, can provide opportunities to acquire literacy skills in a second or foreign language by considering language as part of a semiotic system. Obviously, there are possibilities to develop literacy skills but the linguistic landscape provides an additional opportunity to experience non-linear multimodal texts in the public space.
4.3.5 Stimulating students' multicompetence

Multi-competence refers to the knowledge of and interaction between multiple languages in a person’s mind (Cook, 1992). Cook’s (1992, p. 557) central thesis in this regard is that multilingual people are ‘not simply equivalent to two monolinguals’ but rather possess a merged language system which provides them with unique understandings of both their L1 and L2 (and any subsequent languages they know). Instead of viewing L2 users as representing a deficient model of native speakers, an L2 user is seen as operating at a higher linguistic level than monolingual users; in effect, a multi-competent language user combines their control of an L2 (to whatever extent) with their existing L1 ability. This has implications for language teaching too, in that the goal for language teachers becomes ‘to produce multi-competent individuals not ersatz native speakers’ (Cook, 1992, p. 558).

The languages that bilingual and multilingual speakers use are not completely compartmentalised, but rather they influence each other. Multilingual have different degrees of competence in different languages because they use them for different purposes and they also use phenomena such as code-switching as a resource to communicate in a more efficient way (Cook, 2006). Languages are not separated into isolated compartments in the linguistic landscape, and as we have already seen, one of its characteristics is multilingualism (Cenoz & Gorter, 2008b).

If one accepts that multilingual people possess a unique, combinative appreciation of languages, it would seem optimal to provide them with multilingual input that stimulates all aspects of their linguistic repertoire. A LL project in an EFL context appears well placed to achieve this goal, and the students’ reports in the current study were rich with references to aspects of multi-competence. The issue of
translation on signs, for example, received considerable attention and the students’
comments showed that the project was providing them with insights and challenging
their assumptions about multilingual signs especially. Through the example (Figure
4-15), Group one explained that, ‘we assumed that English which was used on these
signs had a Thai translation but we noticed some signs were different. The English
writing and the Thai writing on a sign were very different sometimes.’

Figure 4-15. Sign 1-4, RAMA IX Bridge, Yan Nawa District, Bangkok

Furthermore, a number of groups explained that monolingual signs in English
in the Thai LL, which one might assume are intended for English-speaking tourists or
expatriates, were often read and used by Thai people because English resonates with
them in a different way to Thai; one could say that it appeals to a different facet of
their multi-competence. The excerpts from their report underline this point: “English
is fresher and has more impact than Thai for Thai people, so they work effectively to
warn Thai people,” and “the notices are easy to understand if there are short phrases
of English. We can know it more easily than Thai because some English words are
short, easy and clear.”
4.3.6 Enhancing students’ sensitivity to connotational aspects of language

Affective factors such as attitudes towards languages and language learning have been traditionally identified as factors influencing ELT (Gardner, 2002) and the study of emotions in ELT and multilingualism has developed related to social cognition and discourse studies. As Javier (2007, p. 57) points out, individuals have different affective relationships with different languages. Languages are also tied to national and ethnic identities and can become symbolically linked to specific ethnolinguistic groups.

The students displayed an aptitude for analysing the unwritten, symbolic meanings and associations attached to written texts in the LL. All the groups, for example, noted how English was associated with ‘coolness’ in the Thai LL, with group two stating that, “Thai people regard English as a tool to make something cool” and group three suggesting that, “sometimes Thai people use English on signs just to be cool.” Although such observations may appear unsubtle, they do indicate that with instruction in this area and with further opportunities to refine these skills of analysis these EFL learners could develop more sophisticated insights into how language is a vehicle for more than just literal, denotational meaning. Language also projects social meanings and social values through connotation, and the English on signs in EFL contexts is a prime example of this.

Indeed, the students were able to identify a limited number of other social meanings connected to English. Group five, for instance, described a restaurant sign and how the use of English and other languages (Thai and Chinese) on the sign conferred a sense of modernity on the restaurant that was being advertised. The group wrote that, “If they don’t use ‘南餐厅’ and ‘活海鲜’ in Chinese characters which
means "Yanan Restaurant (name of the restaurant)" and "live seafood" [English], we would think that the restaurant are old and traditional ones. Actually it is a western style coffee and steak restaurant, and they are selling western style modern food."

Figure 4-16. Sign 5-5, Srinakarin Road, Ban Lai, Bangkok

The students discerned that the English on this sign represented newness and allure, in contrast to the Thai and other language's associations with age and tradition. Piller (2003, p. 175) validates the students' analysis here by explaining that English has become 'a general symbol of modernity, progress and globalisation' throughout the. For teachers who see value in helping students become more adapted at inferring the unwritten meanings attached to written texts, the LL, especially in EFL contexts, constitutes an incredibly rich resource.
4.4 Using the Linguistic Landscape as a Pedagogical Resource

4.4.1 Using the linguistic landscape in current EFL classroom

The linguistic landscape of Bangkok can be an effective resource for the current EFL classroom. The project that has been modelled in this research can easily be reproduced as a classroom project, with the students taking on the role of detectives for the languages around their community. They become the researchers who collect the data by taking photographs and analysing it by organising the photos into categories. If the linguistic landscape project is used with other students rather than this sample class, they should be allowed to discover or identify their own themes. The six categories used in this study to explain the social meanings in Bangkok may or may not fit other contexts, and students should be encouraged as researchers to be able to explain and defend their own conclusions. It could be argued, for example, the signs of ‘being cool’ could be different or just be interpreted in the category of ‘marketing function’. The project should encourage a lively discussion about what categories students can use to organise their own linguistic landscape. Thus, rather than giving the meanings by stating signs for the students, the project should start with the guiding questions: why do people use English on signs in our community? From there, students should present their analysis and defend the interpretations they made in organising and identifying themes in their photographs.

The EFL teachers can also adapt the project in various ways to make it more suitable for different contexts and learners’ ages. Although the project in this research has been modelled by looking at especially social functions of language, it could also be adapted to focus on language forms, such as vocabulary, idiomatic expressions, and grammatical features. Students could find out the way non-standard forms of
English are used in public spaces. This would help students become more aware of standard and non-standard grammatical forms. The example of innovative uses of English from this research included spellings (‘veggies’, Sign 2-2), interesting noun-noun combination (‘Baker Restroom’, Sign 4-3). Students raised the doubts that why the creator of signs put ‘baker’ and ‘restroom’ (Sign 4-3) together. The combination of the two nouns cannot be interpreted into a clear meaning. Receiver of the sign could misunderstand the meaning because of its position and the way they use languages. For local residents, they would feel confused of the single language usage on the sign. In the contrast, visitors would feel confused of the combination of two nouns. The creator of the sign intends to provide an interesting or amusing way for the ‘toilet’ sign, however the creator forgets the rule for the instruction of public facility that the instruction should be clear and simple without any misunderstandings. Teachers and students could use the example above to discuss English grammar and vocabulary usage. The teaching land learning materials of current EFL classroom will enriched from the utilisation of linguistic landscape resources.

4.4.2 Using the linguistic landscape in future EFL classroom

The linguistic landscape can be an important resources for future EFL classroom. The bank of signs collected in the research could be a resources for other classes. As the increases number of signs collected by students from different classes, teachers and students can draw a detailed picture of the linguistic landscape of the very geographical area. Teachers and students can input the pictures into a collection in order to find out the changes of each linguistic landscape area, therefore the collection could be a method to reveal the changes in the whole area in cultural and societal perspectives. For the EFL classroom, students can easily receive the
knowledge of how to use English in their community without mistakes and misunderstandings. Because all mistakes and misunderstanding have been judged and analysed by themselves, they have the knowledge and motivation to revise the signs into a model that balances linguistic power between local people and visitors. Students would have the strength to eliminate the language inequality among different groups of people in the society.

In addition, the household inventory could be a topic for EFL class. Students could not only focus on the signs in public space, but the linguistic environment besides them. For example, students could find examples of English on appliances and electronics in their house: ‘3 disc changer’ on their stereo, ‘Defrost’ in their refrigerator, ‘swing’ on their air-conditioning remote controller, or ‘grind’ button on the blender. Teacher could lead students to discuss what these mean and why they are in English. Also, teacher could use the English in household inventory to expand students’ vocabulary building for the daily life.

Moreover, clothing and accessories could be another topic for the EFL class. Students could study the English used on T-shirts and backpacks. Teacher could ask students to collect the English from clothes and backpacks, and discuss the ways that the language differences of boys’ and girls’ clothes, or they ways people use English to mark social status.

New loan words could be another topic for EFL class. Students could identify words that seem to have been integrated from English into their L1. The remarkable example in Thailand is ‘high-so’, which represent the meaning for prestige. ‘High-so’ is the abbreviation for ‘high social or high society’, which is used for the description of a person that is from high level in the society or a thing that is prestige. Students
could explore their L1 to identity the examples like this, and discuss the ways that the language difference from 'native speaker' and local resident.

The linguistic landscape is changing everyday by the contribution and influences of local residents and outsiders from all over the world in Bangkok. Students state in the discussion that they would change the bilingual signs in their family’s business buildings if there are any linguistic mistakes on the signs. This comment shows that students would be force to shape the linguistic landscape in the geographical area they are living. The linguistic landscape will be influenced by the students from the small settings (family business building or household) to bigger areas (the town or city). The snowball effects will be increased by thoughts and ideas of linguistic landscape which created by students who conduct the linguistic landscape project. The changes for the linguistic landscape of the very geographical area will be triggered by the utilisation of the linguistic landscape project in EFL classroom. Throughout the process of the sample class, students showed their motivation and willingness for the better signs. For example, the road sign (Sign 1-5), group one states that they would like to change it to clearer language if they have the authority to revise it, or they could put forward the suggestion to the authority. The linguistic landscape project can be an effective method to help students to realise what is the English environment around them, and hence could be a power of changing the whole linguistic landscape. Therefore, the EFL classroom will be an important one of the origins of power to change for the linguistic landscape in Thailand.
4.5 Influences of Linguistic Landscape Project

4.5.1 Influences for EFL classroom

The linguistic landscape can benefit the EFL classroom lessons in various ways. First, activities derived from the linguistic landscape framework can compensate for the limited English class time, because students can learn English whenever and wherever they come across a bilingual sign in their communities.

Second, an "authentic" environment is rare in a language classroom in Thailand. English text in the bilingual linguistic landscape from various social settings functions as authentic learning materials, provides students with a pragmatic use of English, and allows them to better learn the four basic language skills - listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Third, class size is usually large in an English classroom, and the grammar-translation method is used more than other pedagogies (e.g., total physical response, silent way, and audio-lingual) because it conserves the instructor’s teaching time. Consequently, Thai students are accustomed to this translation means, and the juxtaposition of English and Thai language in the linguistic landscape offers a running translation model, which help students learn the English text readily by reading its Thai counterpart. Students can access to the English language usage in Thai context from the Thai counterpart and the mistakes or limits of the English translation, and hence, students could bring the confusing translation on signs to class. Therefore, the gap between English in classroom and English in society will be bridged by the communication between students and teachers through the questions students bring to classroom.
4.5.2 Influences for teaching techniques in EFL classroom

Knonvaliouk (2005) has shown that students need technology-support activities to gain competence in manipulating the technology in their program. They also need grammar-teaching activities in order to learn the language well. By the act of connecting these two kinds of activities to technology-based activities, students are able to acquire the four language skills and promote their language proficiency. Knonvaliouk's concept and experience have offered a helping model, which allows instructors to integrate technology into their teaching efficiently.

Compared with other English teaching approaches and methods, not much attention has been paid to the utilization of materials from linguistic landscape in society. The classes conducted for the thesis exemplify for English instructors the process of combining electronic devices, Internet access, online websites, and the bilingual or multilingual linguistic landscape with their language teaching. College students are familiar with information technology and they are well equipped with many technological tools, such as computers, software, the Internet, smartphones, and digital cameras, which are utilized in the activities of the lessons.

Technology is advancing with the times. Similarly, new theories, approaches, and methodologies of English teaching are being developed. English instructors need to examine and learn these new pedagogical approaches, and apply them in their language classrooms. Through doing teamwork projects and using electronic gadgets in their computers and in their communities, students will feel a heightened interest, because they are learning English in a way that is very different from the experience of learning language in a traditional classroom. The better learning effect of the
activities by using materials of linguistic landscape from their society thus meets an English teacher’s main goal – how to help students learn English well.

4.5.3 Influences for teaching methods

There are numerous potential benefits to doing a student-led linguistic landscape project for the ELT methodology. In general, the project accomplishes two main goals. First, it facilitates students to build connections between the content of EFL classroom and the world beyond the classroom walls. Second, it allows students to think creatively and analytically about how language is used in society and become more aware of their own sociolinguistic context.

The project can accomplish the first goal by having students explore the meanings of authentic texts. This is fun and motivating since it requires students to engage with authentic language as they go out in their communities to find the signs and then combine their technological skills (using digital cameras and PowerPoint slides and/or Flickr or other social networking sites) with their critical thinking skills (to figure out how to organise them). It encourages them to develop their oral language by engaging meaningfully with the language as they explain and defend their ideas.

The project can achieve its second goal by shifting the students from language learner to language researcher. Students can approach a linguistic problem as a professional through a constructive perspective, and approach a linguistic problem in the natural world as a scientist through detailed examination. The linguistic landscape project compels the student to see the world through the critical eyes of a sociolinguist, who questions how and why people use language differently according to different social identities or purposes. Students can engage in concrete, experiential
learning, where their understandings of the topic are built ‘bottom-up’ or inductively from their own exploration. Clearly, this perspective also underlies approaches in ELT that promote learner autonomy through the use of student-centred activities.
Chapter 5  Conclusion

The present study was conducted with the aim of answering the following research questions:

1. What is the linguistic landscape of Bangkok through a group of Thai EFL students’ observation?

2. What evidence can be of pedagogical benefits through the application of a linguistic landscape project in the EFL classroom?

The influence of the visible language in the linguistic landscape of Bangkok can be summarised into four themes: the power of language; capitalism; values/lifestyle; inclusion/exclusion. These themes intertwine and connect to one another. Although these themes have surfaced in previous literature, they take on a unique perspective when studied in an urban geographical setting. This setting has shown that the local population values their personal freedoms: political, religious, and physical space. The following section will look thorough the lenses of these four themes to describe the linguistic landscape study of the language used in the public space of Bangkok. The following section will answer the second research question, and hence to reveal the pedagogical benefits of linguistic landscape project which had conducted by the group of Thai students.

5.1  Findings from Research Question One

5.1.1  Power of Language

Fairclough (1989) sees language as important enough to merit the attention of
all citizens since it contributes to the domination of some people by others and therefore 
exerts power. The power of languages is visible in the signage in Bangkok. The 
linguistic landscape serves as a visual index to bilingualism or linguistic oppression of 
minorities.

Within the context of Bangkok, power can be seen at all levels of signage; 
bottom-up and top-down. From a bottom-up perspective the language displayed 
reflects on Spolsky and Cooper’s (1991 as cited in Spolsky, 2009) conditions for 
language choice. The first condition is writing a sign in a language you know. As the 
major tourist destination in the world, this rule explains the language known by signs 
writers in and for Bangkok is both Thai and English. These appear to be the only two 
languages known by bottom-up sign writers in these areas. The signs reflect a strong 
linguistic as well as cultural knowledge of English. This is evident in word spellings 
and connotations. Although people in Bangkok may be able to read English, they may 
not be culturally aware of all the nuances. This knowledge is assumed on the part of 
the writer.

The second condition states write a sign in a language that intended readers 
are assumed to read. Most signs in Bangkok are written in both Thai and English. 
Some government (top-down) signs are given both Thai and English, more for 
acknowledgment than for actual meaning, as the signs were found to be unclear 
meaning. This second condition may also blend with Ben-Rafael’s et al. (2006) “good 
reasons” principle where sign writers aim to attract the interests of the public and 
influence them with their signage. The writers must know that the audience in this 
community is able to communicate in both Thai and English. Through the position of 
the English text next to the Thai and grammatical errors these signs pass a message
that a second language is not valued as people usually think so.

The third condition postulated accounts for language choice and is seen as the symbolic condition; write signs in a language with which you wish to be associated. The bottom-up sign writers in Bangkok are not being misleading to their readers. They have been exclusive in their language choice of English. Top-down signs, however, imply that services would be available in Thai inhabitants only. Power in terms of domination of some people by others is evident in this landscape. It is unconscious power; something taken for granted from a community that has had a homogeneous makeup for many years.

5.1.2 Capitalism

Capitalism surfaced as a theme within the data in terms of marketing goods to consumers for economic gain and in the role of prescribing what signs will be erected to promote this gain. The business sector of Bangkok as displayed in the LL has determined that the local population values immediacy and convenience; it agrees with the hopes of achieving a higher standard of living; it deems value for their money as important. The capitalist sector has honed in on the potential for revenue from sporting facilities. The signs in Bangkok appear to have a persuasive tone by trying to prescribe how people should live and at the same time acknowledging the lifestyles at present.

5.1.3 Values/Lifestyle

The linguistic landscape helps shape the character of an environment by informally relaying messages about what is culturally and socially acceptable and
unacceptable by its members. The city of Thailand presents itself as a community that values personal space and has a respect for that personal space. This physical space may be something that people become accustomed to; take for granted. Newcomers, however, may find this space overwhelming. Due to the amount of space, people will have to become accustomed to the lack of public transportation and the necessity of each family owning one or multiple vehicles.

From analysis of the LL, Bangkok seems to promote the family as an integral part of the community. Along with family, physical health and fitness are endorsed. In terms of language, the existence presence of English or any language other than Thai relates to the marginal place that minority languages have in education and the emphasis the government puts on promoting bi or multilingualism. It may also be a reflection of the tolerance of local community members and their frustration that may come from looking at another language. With this in mind, it may be plausible that the attitudes portrayed in the LL are deliberate in a country looking to increase immigration. Bangkok may want to maintain the homogenous look and feel and not want to be challenged or to be made to feel uncomfortable by changing food choices available and language shown on signs. The city may purposefully be looking at sustaining its current status quo.

5.1.4 Inclusion/Exclusion

The LL creates an impression relating to the cultural ideals and attitudes towards diversity that will be encountered in the community. Inclusion and exclusion surfaced as a theme when the linguistic landscape analysis clearly showed the language base, religious choice, and assumed cultural knowledge. Distinct language boundaries have been created. The entrances to Bangkok support large signs stating
“Bangkok Welcomes You”. Multi-nationalities, middle class, English speaking people is what is implied from an analysis of the linguistic landscape.

### 5.2 Findings from Research Question Two

As the gradual erosion of the profiles of previously distinct national identities, ideologies and culture by fast development of globalisation, and because the quantity of bilingual language users continue to grow throughout the globe, the foreign language students these days are progressively possible to search out themselves take part in exchanges through multiple semiotic modes with other bilingual people maintaining various identities, values and histories. The challenge of productive communication then becomes substantially more complex as a result of there is significantly more to get wrong: interpersonally, modally, pragmatically, historically and ideologically. In light of this, Kramsch (2006) argues that language educators should offer their students more than the mastery of traditional literacy practices and discusses the necessity for language learners to develop symbolic competence. She contends that ‘it is no longer appropriate to give students, a tourist-like competence to exchange information with native speakers of national languages within well-defined national cultures. They need a much more sophisticated competence in the manipulation of symbolic systems’ (Kramsch, 2006, p. 251).

Foreign language education is thus presented with new challenges requiring new approaches. To equip them properly, language learners deserve opportunities within the language classroom to experiment with different combinations of semiotic modes, to critically analyse their own (multiple) identities and the identities that others may assume, to bring to bear different lenses and perspectives on culturally ingrained beliefs and values, and to explore the historical and discursive forces which
govern human ways of making meaning. This is the essence of the multiliteracies
approach to literacy: helping students to recognise and exploit the diversity of modes
and subject positions that are available in making meaning (Cope & Kalantzis, 1999).
Crucially, such opportunities would encourage foreign language students to
appreciate the importance of their own agency and activity as meaning makers so that
they come to see themselves as ‘both inheritors of patterns and conventions of
meaning and at the same time active designers of meaning’ (The New London Group,

The pedagogical benefits of the linguistic landscape project in EFL classroom
are revealed by the research. First, students' critical literacy skills are developed
throughout the linguistic landscape project which had been conducted by the group of
English I students. They examine their neighbourhood critically, especially for the
cultural factors and power related issue. The frequent question students asked is 'why
there is only English'? This question students asked provide an implication that
students finally are able to notice the English around them with questions. Second,
students' pragmatic competence has been improved through the linguistic landscape
project. The project raised students' awareness of the connection between a language
user's communicative intention or desire, the linguistic form they choose to use, and
the context of the situation in which the communicative act is taking place is a key
responsibility for language teachers. Students are able to record the contextual details
of actual language use as they encounter it outside the classroom. Third, the linguistic
landscape project increased the possibility of incidental language learning for the
group of EFL students. Incidental language learning is the understanding of language
that accrues through exposure to language and without conscious intention to learn.
Students are able to think about and find out the grammatical mistakes from the signs.
Fourth, students are able to facilitate the acquisition of multimodal literacy skills. Multimodality describes approaches that understand communication and representation to be more than about language, and which attend to the full range of communicational forms people use — image, gesture, gaze, posture, and so on — and the relationships between them. The students often referred to the interplay between other semiotic modes, such as colour and font, and also commented at times on the relationships between text and image, and the relative positioning of different languages on sign. Fifth, the linguistic landscape stimulated students’ multi-competence. Multi-competence refers to the knowledge of and interaction between multiple languages in a person’s mind. Students showed their ability to provide references to aspects of multi-competence in students’ writing report. The issue of translation on signs, the insights about multilingual signs, are the examples of this ability. Finally, the project enhanced students’ sensitivity to connotational aspects of language. The students displayed an aptitude for analysing the unwritten, symbolic meanings and associations attached to written texts in the LL. The students discerned that the English on this sign represented newness and allure, in contrast to the Thai and other language’s associations with age and tradition. The students showed that they are able to apply the sensitivity to connotational aspects of language in their daily life.

This study can reasonably interpret how doing this linguistic landscape project led to language development and greater multilingual and transcultural communicative abilities for the group of EFL students. Further, it is possible to broadly speculate on how other students would experience a similar project. This is a more limited form of knowledge than claimed by other more scientific approaches to educational research; however, as there is only limited research into students'
experience of doing linguistic landscape projects, this study should further illuminate this relatively unexplored area of scholarship.

This analysis highlights how these students moved from indifference towards the linguistic landscape surrounding them to a more active interest in the texts they see everywhere, how they became more aware of how a speaker’s identity can shape understandings of communication or texts, and how they developed a greater understanding of how communication and texts can shift in meaning across different places.

5.3 Implications of the Research

The LL represents a vital resource for lecturers in this regard, particularly among EFL contexts. This is because of the LL is an ideologically loaded space formed by both local and global forces and displaying a full variety of communicative modalities. It exists as an authentic, dynamic, public mega-text. It serves real world purposes; it is perpetually changing; and it is accessible to all or any. Moreover, and significantly for professional LL researchers and language learners alike, the LL is explicable from an wholistic perspective, as an indicator of broad social policies and values, and from an atomistic stance, as a repository of individual decisions and representations of society at a micro-level. Thus, lecturers have a large scope in coming up with LL projects to suit their numerous educational goals, students and contexts. To other teachers inquisitive about instigating LL projects with their own classes, it is worth suggesting that most, if not all, of the six pedagogical benefits might be enhanced by explicitly instructing students regarding about certain features of the LL, like multimodality, before they start a LL project. For instance, an introductory lesson on how signs are designed to convey meaning through the
interaction of varied semiotic modes would supply students with some basic resources for participating in deeper analysis of the signs all around them. The following LL project would then present a decent chance for students to develop their new, meaning-making skills.

Finally, this study sheds light on how conducting a linguistic landscape project influenced the group of EFL undergraduate students in English communication with others. The discussion of the teaching implications of this study ought to aid any instructors or scholars interested in making a program wherever students conduct linguistic landscape analysis so as to develop their language abilities and communicative skills. Overall, working with linguistic landscape analysis for these students, perceived to have multiple advantages. Participants reported greater understanding of language and communication, specifically when considering how culture and language form language perception, and accumulated awareness of how different readers view different aspects of language. In addition, this linguistic landscape project used within the analysis allowed students the chance for field analysis and an opportunity to interpret analysis findings as well as writing and presenting their results. This research shows how for some students conducting a linguistic landscape research project can be powerful tool for learner development.

5.4 Conclusions and Limitations

The objective of this thesis was to determine whether or not claims created within the literature regarding the pedagogic advantages of LL project could be known in EFL students' group work, and to judge what the results are going to be discovered through students' linguistic landscape project. Overall, the six claims summarised from the literature were verified to different degrees in the class.
discussion and students' reports. This research thus supports the contention that language learners in EFL contexts will gain benefits in various, vital ways from pedagogic interaction with their native linguistic landscapes.

Through the analysis from the research, this linguistic landscape project shows that it can be a powerful tool in the language classroom, allowing students to consider how people use language within local settings and independently develop meaningful understandings of language use in particular places. It could prove even more powerful, when students are more open to freely explore the publicly displayed languages around them in student-led projects, enabling them to interact with their environment as well as investigating and discussing how language is used (Sayer, 2009, p. 144).

However, using linguistic landscape research as a tool in the classroom is not without difficulty or complicating issues, as this article highlights. The primary issues that shaped the pedagogical possibilities for these EFL students were: the difficulty of pursuing open ended research questions; the lack of linguistic landscape literature written in a form accessible to EFL students, especially students struggling to develop their English academic literacy skills; and finally, the complications and opportunities that arise from having an instructor with a different language background and point of view from the students.

One major difficulty for all students in this project was the open-ended nature of this particular linguistic landscape research. As this is a relatively new area of interest, students may not have been exposed to the basic concepts regarding linguistic landscapes and may not be aware of linguistic diversity within their own environment. Students may feel uncertain of project goals, benefits, and concepts.
even after they are introduced. Unfortunately, this problem appears to be exacerbated by a lack of introductory research and reference materials related to linguistic landscapes. When limited in their outside source information, students may feel overly reliant on the supervising instructor for information and confirmation that ideas are correct.

Ultimately, linguistic landscape research, while focusing on publicly displayed language can be pursued in widely varying approaches and scales and this caused confusion and difficulty for these three students. However, this also allowed these students to ultimately explore issues they found interesting, and independently design their own approaches to this research, gaining both experience and knowledge from that experience.

In addition, the EFL students who participated in the linguistic landscape project had discussion in class and writing reports afterwards after completing their linguistic landscape project. While the information gathered from them was useful in understanding their overall perception of the project, it would be more useful to interview students throughout the research project to document their changing views and perceptions regarding linguistic landscape research, as well as to document when and to what degree shifts in their ideas about language occurred. Further examination into the process and additional pre-project and post-project interviews would help generate further information about the benefits of linguistic landscape projects, and allow educators to examine more in-depth the effects of this educational practice.

Finally, this form of limited narrative research is incapable of producing knowledge that directly links teaching practices with results across contexts, but the hope of both these students and researchers is that this study will lead to greater pedagogical
opportunities for students studying English and other languages.
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APPENDIX A: GROUP ONE’S PICTURES OF SIGNS

Sign 1-1: Department Store, Central Plaza Rama III, Yan Nawa, Bangkok

Sign 1-2: Tops Market, Central Plaza Rama III, Yan Nawa, Bangkok
Sign 1-3: RAMA IX, Yan Nawa, Bangkok

Sign 1-4: RAMA IX Bridge, Yan Nawa, Bangkok
Sign 1-5: RAMA IX, Yan Nawa, Bangkok
APPENDIX B: GROUP TWO'S PICTURES OF SIGNS

Sign 2-1: H&M, The Mall Bangkapi, Bangkapi, Bangkok
Sign 2-2: Supermarket, The Mall Bangkapi, Bangkapi, Bangkok

Sign 2-3: Supermarket, The Mall Bangkapi, Bangkapi, Bangkok
Sign 2-4: Uniqlo, The Mall Bangkapi, Bangkapi, Bangkok
Sign 2-5: Supermarket, The Mall Bangkapi, Bangkapi, Bangkok
APPENDIX C: GROUP THREE’S PICTURES OF SIGNS

Sign 3-1: Department Store, The Central Plaza Rama 9, Huai Khwang, Bangkok
Sign 3-2: Supermarket, The Central Plaza Rama 9, Huai Khwang, Bangkok

Sign 3-3: Food Court, Central Plaza, Rama 9, Huai Khwang, Bangkok
Sign 3-4: Supermarket, Central Plaza, Rama 9, Huai Khwang, Bangkok

Sign 3-5: Outside Wall of Shop, 3rd floor, Central Plaza, Rama 9, Huai Khwang, Bangkok
APPENDIX D: GROUP FOUR’S PICTURES OF SIGNS

Sign 4-1: Uniqlo, Terminal 21 Shopping Centre, Bangkok

Sign 4-2: Squeeze Juice Stand, Terminal 21 Shopping Centre, Bangkok
Sign 4-3: Restroom Sign, 3rd floor, Terminal 21 Shopping Centre, Bangkok

Sign 4-4: Toilet Sign, 4th floor, Terminal 21 Shopping Centre, Bangkok
Sign 4-5: Near entrance, Terminal 21 Shopping Centre, Bangkok
APPENDIX E: GROUP FIVE'S PICTURES OF SIGNS

Sign 5-1: Uniqlo, Silom, Bangkok

Sign 5-2: MRT Silom Station, Silom, Bangkok
Sign 5-3: Don Muang Airport, Bangkok

Sign 5-4: Tops Supermarket, Silom, Bangkok
Sign S-5: Srinakarin Road, Ban Lai, Bangkok.
APPENDIX F: GROUPS ONE'S REPORT OF THE LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE PROJECT
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English I Special Project

Report

Signs in Thailand

Introduction

Our group choose Sasinida’s home area to do this linguistic landscape project. We choose Yan Nawa area to do it. We think Yan Nawa is a good place to do, because there are many people from other countries, and many people can read some English words. Yan Nawa is a commercial area as well, there are many shopping centers and shops. Sasinida says she likes to go many places in this area when she and her family have time. They usually go the Central Plaza Rama III during the weekends. She took the pictures on the weekend, and we choose five of all pictures to do this report.
Signs Analysis

Sign 1

The sign we can’t understand at all. There’s no Thai at all around the sign. We don’t know why the owner put the sign at this place. We think the sign can provide information for other people, but only not Thai. Thai people can’t understand it. Many people in Thailand can’t read English, for example, Sasinida’s parents can’t understand the meaning. We guess the meaning of the sign is: if people buy product, they can have money back to them. But the sign is on the wall, and there is not cashier near it. We think the owner of the shopping center doesn’t know how to do with signs properly.
Sign 2

The sign is very confusing. Why 'HOME DELIVERY' all in capital letters? We think the owner want to put some stresses on this sign. But we think we should not use English like this way. And 'HOME DELIVERY' together is quite confusing. I think this is a sign only for foreigners, but the market is a place mostly for locals. Then we feel confused why the owner only use English on it. But we asked our foreigner friends, they said it's the meaning of that the shop will help customers to deliver products back to their home. We feel angry about it, because this English sign means the shop only provide the delivery service to foreigners, and Thai people can't have the service. We think if a sign wants to tell other people about some important information in Thailand, it should have at least two languages, not like this only English.
The sign is interesting. Preeyanun saw it on the road with her father. We think the owner of the van put the sign in a wrong place. The owner may want to other drivers know that there are kids in the van and hope them drive safely and slowly. But the owner may forget that most Thai don’t understand English comprehensively. We don’t know why the owner only use English. It can’t provide proper information to other people. Maybe he or she wants to show that he or she is rich or in higher class in the society.
This sign is very strange. If people read it and want to go the shop, they can't find any address information. Because address is in Thai. And the English 'FACTORY SALE UP TO 60%' is very big. It's so big that people can see only English far away. We think the sign is for Thai people, but English is the only language we can see on the sign. The Thai is very small. People usually can't see it. We don't understand what kind of people is the company's target customers. Sale information is in English, but address is in Thai. We assumed that English which was used on these signs had a Thai translation but we noticed some signs were different. The English writing and the Thai writing on a sign were very different sometimes. English is fresher and has more impact than Thai for Thai people, so they work effectively to warn Thai people. The notices are easy to understand if there are short phrases of English. We can know it more easily than Thai because some English words are short, easy and clear.
The sign doesn't provide clear information. Why they don't translate 'Rama IX soi 26'? We think people may feel confused when they look at it, especially those visitors and travellers. Visitors may get lost in the city because they may not understand the meaning of those signs. We think that if the government want to put two or more languages on any sign, it should find some professionals to do it.

Conclusion

We feel quite happy about the spacial project, because we finally know something we have never known before. We don't know anything about signs before, because we usually don't look at them when we go shopping or outside. But this time, we feel that the languages on the signs are very interesting, and we could learn many things from them. After the project, we feel that the road signs are quite different, if compare with the signs in shopping centers. We think the government should work hard to improve the signs on streets, just like the signs in the shopping center. The owner of those shopping centers know how to do signs with other languages, especially if the shops or supermarkets want to increase their sales to foreigners. In addition, there are many English signs in Thailand but why? We saw many signs only has English on it. We know the English is a language can give other people a feeling about high social class. Are they necessary? We ask ourselves many times. We think if we can speak fluent English, people in Thailand will feel we come from high social class family. If we see...
English in a shop, we may feel the products in it should have good quality and nothing to worry about. Thanks to the project that it gives us a time to see the signs together. It is a good opportunity for us to learn many new things.
Signs in Bangkok

English I Special Project Report
Signs in Bangkok

English I Special Project Report

Introduction

Our group chose the Bangkapi area to do the research for the signs around our community. Because Supannee lives near here, we decided to choose Bangkapi to do. Actually, there are many foreigners in this area, and we can see many English signs. Bangkapi district is a very big area, and it's an important place for people to live and work. In Bangkapi, there are many big shopping centers, people like to come here to shop and work. When we take pictures of signs together, we see many English signs in shopping center, but there are not many on the street. There are five signs will be examined below.

Sign 1
This sign is interesting. These signs in English tell us the sales information about price and place. These information can help customer to buy products in their shop. There is not any Thai word on it, and we can only see English. I think it is not a clear sign for Thai people. In my family, my mum and dad can’t speak English, and only me and my sister can read and speak, because we study in international university. I asked my mum about this sign, she says that the ‘$’ and ‘150’ are easy to understand, but the ‘best buy from’ is not easy to understand. She says that she knows the meaning of the sign, she thinks the meaning is about how much for the pants and coats. Actually, the meaning is not like this. I think H&M should improve this sign. One more thing, we don’t understand why all letters is in capital. ‘BEST BUY FROM’, the three words are in capital. We know that the meaning for capital is like you want to strengthen your tones and voice. The capital maybe means it’s important
about the information. But, again, my mum can't understand how important the information is, because there is no Thai. Finally, these signs in English tell us the sales information about price and place. These information can help customer to buy products in H&M shop.

Sign 2

![Sign 2: Freshmart Supermarket, The Mall Bangkapi, Bangkapi, Bangkok](image)

This sign is in Freshmart supermarket of The Mall Bangkapi. We do not notice it when we go shopping before, but when we look at it carefully, we feel surprised very much. There is only English on it. This is a supermarket for Thai people mainly, but they don't use Thai or Thai and English. How could other people to get the information if they don't understand English? We understand the meaning, and it tells other people about the rule for health. The rule is 3 vegetables and 2 fruit in one day. But we think it's not clear. Many Thai people can't read English, and they don't care about English. For us, English is a thing can make us feel happy and high so. We see English in the supermarket, we feel this supermarket has good product and imported food. We think people will feel happy and high so if they see English only.
We think the 'VEGGIES' is a wrong word. It should be 'vegetables'. We can't find the word from dictionary. But we guess 'VEGGIES' means 'vegetables'. And again, Why the sign use only capital letters? We think it's wrong about grammar.

Sign 3

This sign is in the Freshmart supermarket of The Mall Bangkapi. We think the English on the sign is not clear. The Thai on the sign is 'buy 1 get 1,' but English is 'buy get 1'. We think the English may confuse foreign customers. We think the sign provide strong information for customers that purchase this as soon as possible, then you will have 1 for free. English here is a function for promotion. But we think it's not a good way to use English. We will ask a same question again: why there is the capital letters only on the sign? We can't find good answer. We hope teacher can help us.

Sign 4
This sign is in the Uniqlo shop of The Mall Bangkapi. We think the sign is for both Thai people and foreigners, but it's difficult to see the Thai. The Thai is too small to see. We don't like the way they use Thai. Why we can't feel proud to use Thai here? 'Offer' and '$' is bigger than Thai words. When we walk in the shop, we can see many English, but it's difficult to see Thai. We don't understand why all international shops come into Thailand without show their respects to Thai language and Thai culture. We feel international feeling inside, but Thai culture and Thai language is gone. One more thing, 'register' is difficult to understand. We think the word 'register' is confusing for them to understand. It should be 'cashier.'
We go to the food court many times, but we never notice this sign. We think it’s normal to put English there, and we feel happy about the English. When we start to do the project, we find that there is only English on the sign, you cannot find Thai at all. Why there’s a sign tells people what they can buy in the food court, and their intended audience should be Thai, because this is a major shopping centre for local residents, and most people are Thai. We don’t know why, but we think the reason they use English because they want to be more high-so, and we think English used on products can increase the sale and sell as higher price than others. Moreover, We feel difficult to understand the meaning of ‘Take Home’. We think the meaning should be ‘take away’. We think the owner uses English mistakenly. We can guess the meaning, but we really don’t care about the English there. We know this food court can buy many food, and take back home. But the ‘special...corner’ is confusing. Why they don’t use ‘special corner?’ It’s interesting they use ‘...’ in that sign. We don’t know what the ‘...’ means.
Conclusion

After the special project about signs, we learn many things. We understand how people use English language on signs. Usually, when we walk in Bangkok, we don’t look at English on signs. Thai people regard English as a tool to make something cool. We only read Thai to have information we want. English in our mind is not important. But this time, when we look at the signs closely, we find that how important English is in Bangkok. Thai people like to use English on signs in shops, and they think it’s high so and looks great. We never thought about it before we started to research because it is a natural thing for Thai people. People feel high so about the place if they see the English, even they don’t understand it. We think it’s bad for Thailand. We should feel proud about our language, not the English. We know, English is an important language, and it’s popular to speak it with foreigners. We think the shops want to make more money; this is why they use English, because they want to sell products to foreigners. But we think the sign should not only be created for foreigners, Thai people should be more important than foreigners. Thanks teacher to give us the opportunity to look at signs closely. We enjoy the moment we spent together.
APPENDIX H: GROUPS THREE'S REPORT OF THE
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Signs in Thailand Report

Research on Signs around Huai Kuang

Introduction

We choose Huai Kuang to do the special project. Nut’s house is near there, and Saiyaree live there with her sister at there. We choose Huai Kuang because there has MRT station, and many shops. Many foreigners want to go there for fun.

Signs in Thailand

Sign 1
Sign 1: Department Store, The Central Plaza Rama 9, Huai Khwang, Bangkok

People would feel confused about the information on the sign. This sign looks like the creator of it piles English vocabularies on one another, but the combination of English words is not a sentence, or even a chunk that deliver the information to its target group of visitors. ‘Discount,’ the word on the sign, is easy to understand, which can provide clear gesture for audience that there is a promotion under going. People may not understand the information the creator of sign wants to present, because people may feel confused about the number, for example, ‘109.’ People cannot access to the information under the number 109.
"Weigh station, we don’t understand why the creator put this two words above the Thai words. They are different." We use Oxford Dictionary to check the meaning of ‘Weigh Station’ that “Weight station is a roadside station where commercial vehicles are required to stop and be inspected, thus protecting the road from travel by overweight or unsafe vehicles,” “but the Thai words on the sign tell people the place is for people to weigh the things they want to buy in the supermarket. People like to use English in public at Bangkok, but there are many mistakes or vague English usage on those signs. People may need to find professionals to help them to provide correct words. Some information on signs are made for especially Thai people, because two languages on the sign give two different information, and Thai words are lower than English in business area.
This sign is in the food court of the Mall Bangkapi, Bangkok. We feel difficult to understand the meaning of ‘Take Home’. We think the meaning should be ‘take away’. We think the owner uses English mistakenly. The Thai is easy to understand. And the English words are bigger than Thai, we think this means English is more important than Thai. We don’t feel happy.
Red Hot is the words we could not understand completely. Red is the colour, Hot is an adjective to describe the feeling under heat, or the feeling of excitement. But when the two words has been put together, we can’t get the meaning of them. The sign was on the second level of a supermarket snack products shelf: ‘Red Hot.’ We thought it attracted people to buy that product. We think these two words together don’t have meaning in English. But in Thai, Red means exciting things, Hot has the same meaning. When they put together, we understand the meaning like the selected product is very popular and in discount price. The sign want to push people to buy the product, but why people who created the sign did not put Thai on it? The sign should provide information for local customers rather than foreigners, but the sign shows everything opposite. We guess the supermarket want to show they are international, and the snack is imported product. Then they can make more money.
This sign is evidently shows that English language is only using for prestige. "Meaning of 'Shopping list' is easy to understand. But the words there can't provide any meaning to people. We can't understand why the mall use English words here. The sign is on a door, and give people who read it a feeling that this place is a nice and luxury place. We think if the mall use Thai, the sign can't give people the same feeling like English." According to groups three's comment, the creator of the sign is a remarkable gesture that English is a language can provide stature. When audience receives the impression the sign implied, they would enhance the image of the mall's prestige and luxury stance.

**Conclusion**

We think the project is different. We use lots of time to do this. But after the project, we learn a lot. We think the project helps us to learn English easier. We finally know what English people use in Bangkok, and how people use them. Sometimes Thai people use English on signs just to be cool, sometimes they use English without any reason. We think people in Bangkok really need to think why they use English and how they want to use it.
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Introduction

In Thailand has many sign that show about advertisement, warning, and promotion. We chose Terminal 21 for our research. It is surrounding with international shops. It has floors for each country. We took pictures of signs from many floors such as near toilet, near restaurant and near the exit and shop. We think some shop owners want to promote their shops by using or spelling wrong word. And some shops spell the wrong word to make them funny and attract customers. They want attract customers to interest their shops.

Signs in Thailand

This is an example of English Sign of Thailand.

Sign 1: Uniqlo Shop, Terminal 21 Shopping Center, Watthana, Bangkok
This sign is in Uniqlo shop at The Mall Terminal 21. It is a warning sign. They want to tell the customer to go to the cashier if the goods have a discount. But this sign says ‘DISCOUNT TAKEN AT REGISTER.’ And the meaning of register and cashier is different. In my opinion I think the meaning of English and Thai is so different. In any language has own meaning that cannot instead.

**Sign 2**

This sign is in SQUEEZE shop at Terminal 21 Shopping Center. It is an advertisement sign. They want to tell others to see the advantage of the smoothie. They want to say their smoothie is a healthy drink and have a lot of advantage to all parts of the body. In my opinion I think it is interesting. They use the words ‘HEALTHY FROM TOP TO TOE’ that can invite some people to buy their smoothie.

**Sign 3**
Sign 3: Restroom Sign, 3rd floor, Terminal 21 Shopping Centre, Bangkok

This sign is in front of the toilet at The Terminal 21 Shopping Center. It is an information sign. They say the bakery and restroom is in the same place. In the first time that I see, I think that how the bakery and restroom is in the same place. Then when I came in the toilet I found the toilet that look like bakery, and it's so interesting. In my opinion I think that this is an interesting thing that can invite many people to go to Terminal 21.

Sign 4
Sign 4: Toilet Sign, 4th floor, Terminal 21 Shopping Centre, Bangkok

This sign is in front of the toilet at The Terminal 21. It is an information sign. They say no parking between signs. In the first time that I see, I think it may have the exit to the parking near here but it is on the fourth floor and no way to have any exit to the parking. In my opinion I think this sign is a shop or restaurant sign that want to promote their shop or restaurant by the confusing sign.

Sign 5

Sign 5: Near entrance, Terminal 21 Shopping Centre, Bangkok

This sign is near the entrance at The Mall Terminal 21. It is an information sign. It is an introduction of keep an umbrella. But the meaning of Thai and English is so different. Such as Pull in and pull out in the meaning of Thai is pull out. In my opinion I think the meaning of English and Thai is so different. In any language has own meaning that cannot instead.
Conclusion

In conclusion, this research helped us to learn English such as new words, new sentences. And we learned about relationship between friends in our group that if we do not work together. The performance will not be successful. It also makes us to have a new friends. In addition, we think the English sign environment of Thailand is not so good because some place show the wrong sign that it make foreigner don't understand the meaning. Sometime they use a word which it has a meaning like Thai word. And we want to those sign to be good that they make too easily for people to understand. Such as use easy word, use the picture with the sentence together, and the most impotent the producer should learn English before make the sign.
APPENDIX J: GROUPS FIVE’S REPORT OF THE LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE PROJECT
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Research on Signs around Silom and Don Muang Airport

Term 2/2013
Introduction

In Thailand there are many signs but in each sign were different such as information sign, warning signs. Bangkapi is the major location. When Achira and Supawit look at the sign I found the mistake from the sign. So we take a photo of them. During we find a sign to take photos we confront obstacles such as this sign we want to take a photo but it is opposite site of the river. It is difficult but we don't give up. I present about how to use the word in the sign correctly.

Sign 1: Uniqlo, Silom, Bangkok

This signs in English tell us the sales information about price and place. These information can help customer to buy products in their shop. But register is not cashier. We think it's wrong.
We found signs that said No Parking, No Smoking and Please wait behind entry arrow signs, and we think they are important to prevent accidents and disorder of the city. But the sign is not clear enough. People will feel confused about which one is entry arrow. Entry in the station could be interpreted into two different ways, one is the way to entry the station, another is the way to entry the train.
Sign 3: Don Muang Airport, Bangkok

This sign tells people keep right to stand on the escalator, and can help people to avoid accident or chaos in airport. The sign is clear to show other people who use the escalator about the instruction of how to use it.

Sign 4: Tops Supermarket, Silom, Bangkok

English on the sign is wrong. The Thai words means be careful about the
glass, but English is 'Forbidden Island Glass.' The meaning of the English can't be understood. Sometimes we find incorrect English. If children see it they will learn wrong English from it so people need to use correct English. They should pay more attention to grammar and spelling. We found some mistakes on them. English on the sign is 'Forbidden Island Glass', which make other people feel lost of the meaning. Other people cannot understand it.

Sign 5

Sign 5: Srinakarin Road, Ban Lai, Bangkok

If they [i.e. the restaurant] don't use '亚南餐厅' and '活海鲜' in Chinese characters which means "Yanan Restaurant (name of the restaurant)" and "live seafood" [English], we would think that the restaurant are old and traditional ones. Actually it is a western style coffee and steak restaurant, and they are selling western style modern food.
Conclusion

This research helped us to be better English because we did a lot of things or activities in English. We learned a lot of experience to work with group. We improve a skill of English, have a spirit in group, work with teamwork, communicate with together, relationship will be close and better with together and so on. We assumed that English which was used on these [multilingual] signs had a Thai translation but we noticed some signs were different. The English writing and the Thai writing on a sign were very different sometimes. We want to suggest them. You should make it carefully before you exposure in public. If you show your wrong sign, tourist or foreigner will misunderstand about your sign and they will do their wrong behave to something or someone. I caution mentioned above to them. The English sign environment of Thailand is not quite good because the skill English of thai people is not quite well. It has the minorities that is better in English. This is chief reason to make sign in Thailand that is so confuse. When the tourist or foreigner come to Thailand. They complain a lot of mistake of sign or something that is so confuse. If Thailand doesn’t improve this problem, in the future the tourist will come to Thailand a few.
**APPENDIX K: FIVE GROUPS’ CATEGORISATION OF SIGNS**

**Group one’s categorisation of signs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Creator</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Language Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign 1-1</td>
<td>Advertisement Indoor, Shopping Centre</td>
<td>Department Store</td>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 1-2</td>
<td>Notice Indoor, Supermarket</td>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>Locals, Foreigners</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 1-3</td>
<td>Notice Outside, Van</td>
<td>Owner of the Van</td>
<td>Locals, Foreigners</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 1-4</td>
<td>Advertisement Outdoor, Highway</td>
<td>Shop</td>
<td>Locals, Foreigners</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 1-5</td>
<td>Road Sign Outdoor, Roadside</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Locals, Foreigners</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group two’s categorisation of signs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Creator</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Language Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign 2-1</td>
<td>Advertisement Indoor, Fashion Shop</td>
<td>H&amp;M Fashion Shop</td>
<td>Locals, Foreigners</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 2-2</td>
<td>Notice Indoor, Supermarket</td>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>Locals, Foreigners</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 2-3</td>
<td>Notice Indoor, Supermarket</td>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>Locals, Foreigners</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 2-4</td>
<td>Notice Indoor, Fashion Shop</td>
<td>Uniqlo Fashion Shop</td>
<td>Locals, Foreigners</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 2-5</td>
<td>Advertisement Indoor, Supermarket</td>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>Locals, Foreigners</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Group three's categorisation of signs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Creator</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Language Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign 3-1</td>
<td>Notice Indoor, Shopping Centre</td>
<td>Department Store</td>
<td>Locals, Foreigners</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 3-2</td>
<td>Notice Indoor, Supermarket</td>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>Locals, Foreigners</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 3-3</td>
<td>Notice Indoor, Supermarket</td>
<td>Food Court</td>
<td>Locals, Foreigners</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 3-4</td>
<td>Advertisement Indoor, Supermarket</td>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>Locals, Foreigners</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 3-5</td>
<td>Advertisement Indoor, Shopping Centre</td>
<td>Shopping Centre</td>
<td>Locals, Foreigners</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Group four's categorisation of signs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Creator</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Language Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign 4-1</td>
<td>Advertisement Indoor, Shopping Centre</td>
<td>Department Store</td>
<td>Locals, Foreigners</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 4-2</td>
<td>Advertisement Indoor, Shopping Centre</td>
<td>Juice Stand</td>
<td>Locals, Foreigners</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 4-3</td>
<td>Notice Indoor, Shopping Centre</td>
<td>Shopping Centre</td>
<td>Locals, Foreigners</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 4-4</td>
<td>Notice</td>
<td>Indoor, Shopping Centre</td>
<td>Shopping Centre</td>
<td>Locals, Foreigners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 4-5</td>
<td>Notice</td>
<td>Indoor, Shopping Centre</td>
<td>Shopping Centre</td>
<td>Locals, Foreigners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group five's categorisation of signs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign 4-1</th>
<th>Advertisement</th>
<th>Indoor, Shopping Centre</th>
<th>Uniqlo Fashion Shop</th>
<th>Locals, Foreigners</th>
<th>Informative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign 4-2</td>
<td>Notice</td>
<td>Indoor, MRT Station</td>
<td>MRT Company</td>
<td>Locals, Foreigners</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 4-3</td>
<td>Notice</td>
<td>Indoor, Don Muang Airport</td>
<td>Airport Company</td>
<td>Locals, Foreigners</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 4-4</td>
<td>Notice</td>
<td>Indoor, Supermarket</td>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>Locals, Foreigners</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 4-5</td>
<td>Advertisement</td>
<td>Indoor, Restaurant</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>Locals, Foreigners</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX L: REORGANISATION OF THE CATEGORISATION OF SIGNS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group One</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Informative</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign 1-1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign 1-2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign 1-3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign 1-4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign 1-5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Two</td>
<td>Sign 2-1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign 2-2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign 2-3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign 2-4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign 2-5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Three</td>
<td>Sign 3-1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign 3-2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign 3-3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign 3-4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign 3-5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Four</td>
<td>Sign 4-1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign 4-2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign 4-3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign 4-4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign 4-5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Five</td>
<td>Sign 5-1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign 5-2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign 5-3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign 5-4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign 5-5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX M: STUDENT LIST OF ENGLISH I SECTION 8 IN TERM 2/2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5037398</td>
<td>SASINIDA MANGMEESUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5610298</td>
<td>ITTIPAT KROBTEANCHAI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5610337</td>
<td>KUNLANIT BOONMEETAWESAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5610385</td>
<td>KANOKORN SUTTHITAVIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5610389</td>
<td>THANAPHON SAETANG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5610420</td>
<td>CHAYodom KULSIRIARTORN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5610491</td>
<td>PANISA KARNCHANAPREECHAKUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5610513</td>
<td>SAIYAREE SUEBIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5610558</td>
<td>KUKKANANG FINDBOON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5610559</td>
<td>RUNGARUN CHOOVATJANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5610634</td>
<td>NATTADA LOWARUNPHANIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5610674</td>
<td>PREEYANUN SAKDAMNOENSAKUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5610677</td>
<td>ROSMEE JUMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5612003</td>
<td>SUPUNNEE GRITSNARUNGRUENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5612052</td>
<td>NUT KARAKARN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5612058</td>
<td>CHAITACH PHAIROJSAKUNSUJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5612091</td>
<td>BHATCHARABHON SANGMEK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5612105</td>
<td>SUPAWIT THAESAYAIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5612122</td>
<td>PIMJUTHA BOONROD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5612125</td>
<td>PHONLAWAT INTHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5612197</td>
<td>SATTRAVUDH RATCHAMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5612212</td>
<td>KOTCHANAN TASSANAKULPHAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5613404</td>
<td>THANIK AMATAYAKUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5613707</td>
<td>ACHIRA JoonKIAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5613856</td>
<td>SIVAKORN SAENGHARN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX N: GROUP LIST OF ENGLISH I SECTION 8 IN TERM 2/2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5037398</td>
<td>Sasinida M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5610420</td>
<td>Chayodom K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5610558</td>
<td>Kukkanang F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5610634</td>
<td>Nattada L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5610674</td>
<td>Preeyanun S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5610677</td>
<td>Rosmee J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5612003</td>
<td>Supanee G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5612197</td>
<td>Satravudh R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5612125</td>
<td>Phonlaiwat I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5610389</td>
<td>Thanaphon S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5610298</td>
<td>Ittipat K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5610537</td>
<td>Kunlanit B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5610385</td>
<td>Kanokorn S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5610513</td>
<td>Saiyaree S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5612052</td>
<td>Nut K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5610559</td>
<td>Rungarun C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5613856</td>
<td>Sivakorn S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5612058</td>
<td>Chaichai P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5613404</td>
<td>Thanik A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5610491</td>
<td>Panisa K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5612091</td>
<td>Buatcharabhon S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5612103</td>
<td>Supawit T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5612122</td>
<td>Pimjutha B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5612212</td>
<td>Kotchanan T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5613707</td>
<td>Achira J.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>