

A Look into Manila Chinatown's Linguistic Landscape: The Role of Language and Language Ideologies

Maria Eena Maxine A. Jazul

Faculty of Arts and Letters, University of Santo Tomas, Manila, Philippines
eenamaxinejazul@gmail.com

Alejandro S. Bernardo, Ph.D.

Faculty of Arts and Letters, University of Santo Tomas, Manila, Philippines
asbernardo@ust.edu.ph

Abstract

The study of public signage referred to as linguistic landscape (LL) is an approach to understanding multilingualism. It has been used as an attempt to examine diversity and power relations in a multilingual environment such as the Philippines. This paper intends to contribute to the growing body of research in this interesting field of sociolinguistic inquiry by examining the linguistic landscape of Binondo, Manila's Chinatown. Anchored on Ben-Rafael et al.'s (2006) notion of top-down and bottom-up categorization of signs and Scollon and Scollon's (2003) concept of place semiotics, this paper examines how languages are represented in the LL of, the predominant language in, and the language ideologies in Binondo Chinatown. The findings demonstrate that English occupies a hegemonic position in the LL of Binondo Chinatown, and this dominance challenges the presence of Filipino, the National Language, and that the use of Chinese is not primarily for communication but for commercial purposes to engender some sense of authenticity and cultural identity in relation to the Chinese culture and thus creating a transnational space for Binondo Chinatown to function as a cultural destination.

Keywords: *Linguistic landscape, Chinatown, multilingualism, signs, place semiotics, linguistic vitality*

1. Introduction

Linguistic landscape is traditionally referred to as the study of public signage (Akindele, 2011; Spolsky, 2009; Bolton, 2012). Landry and Bourhis (1997), though, elaborated on the notion of linguistic landscape (LL hereafter) as linguistic objects that mark the public space, which is often cited in various LL research as:

...the language of public road signs, advertising billboards, street name, place names, commercial shop signs, and public signs on governments buildings combine to form the linguistic landscape of a given territory, region, or urban agglomeration. (p.25)

Public signs are first and foremost used to disseminate messages of public interest, but they are also the visual representation of the linguistic situation in a particular area. It may be insignificant for most people, but when one looks deeper into it, LL has much to say about the sociolinguistic context, language function, power relations, language contact, and other linguistic issues in a particular place.

The concept of LL has been used in several different fields including sociolinguistics (Akindele, 2011; Backhaus, 2006; Huebner, 2006; Scollon & Scollon, 2003), psychology, pedagogy (Chesnut et al., 2013; Dagenais et al., 2009), world Englishes, and other fields (Huebner, 2006; Lou, 2012; Dimova, 2007; Bolton, 2012). Given the dynamic nature of LL, previous studies explored issues related to language contact and arrived at a common ground where LL plays an important role in revealing the linguistic situation and language ideologies of urban places (Ambion, 2013; Backhaus, 2006; Ben-Rafael et al., 2006; Cenoz & Gorter, 2006; Huebner, 2006; Masip 2015).

The study of LL is an emerging field in applied linguistics and sociolinguistics as an attempt to produce a quantifiable and detailed record of urban multilingualism. LL can be a suitable area of research for multilingualism since it could provide a concrete representation of language contact and how these languages interact (or interfere) with each other in a public setting. To Jaworski and Thurlow (2010 as cited in Bolton 2012), LL studies have much to say about issues relating to demographic and institutional power, ethnic and racial relations, linguistic vitality, and language ideologies. LL mirrors the status of languages, which languages are considered prestigious, and which are marginalized (Cenoz & Gorter, 2009; Dagenais et al., 2009; De Los Reyes, 2014; Dixon, 2015). LL studies have the capacity to uncover issues other than the analysis of the linguistic form. Ben-Rafael, Shohamy, and Trumper-Hecht (2006) also claim that LL constitutes the very scene where society's public life takes place. As such, "this scene carries crucial socio-symbolic importance as it actually identifies and thus serves as the emblem of societies, communities, and regions" (p.8). LL then has been considered as space where varying language ideologies can be uncovered.

1.1 Informative and Symbolic Functions of Linguistic Landscape

LL has two functions according to Landry and Bourhis (1997): informative and symbolic. The informative function, on the one hand, aims at providing information about the linguistic characteristics and limitations, as well as the geographical boundaries of a particular sociolinguistic group. Symbolic function, on the other, involves the LL as an indicator of prevailing ideologies and social arrangements within the environment observed. In other words, informative function shows how languages are used for specific purposes and what linguistic communities are present while the symbolic function refers to the value and status of languages compared to other languages. In a similar note, Spolsky and Cooper (1991 as cited in Finzel 2012) also contend that LL can serve to communicate the relative power and status of linguistic communities in a given territory. It could be inferred that the informative function of LL is to mark the territory of a linguistic group and to communicate public interest while its symbolic function is to reveal value and status of the languages as perceived by the linguistic group (Akindele, 2011; Cenoz & Gorter, 2009). Looking at these two functions of the LL would provide elucidation into the linguistic ideologies at play.

1.2 Linguistic Landscape Research

A number of LL research have started to tackle issues concerning multilingualism, mostly relating to language policy, language dominance, and language planning. As noted by Shohamy (2006), the presence or the absence of languages in the public domain communicates “symbolic messages about the importance, power, significance, and relevance of certain languages or the irrelevance of others” (p.10). Cenoz and Gorter’s (2006) findings showed that more signs are written using the minority language and this reflects the strong language policy of the region to protect the minority languages.

Akindede’s (2011) study on the LL of Gaborone, Botswana showed that English dominated. However, it was claimed that it hardly suggested that the nation speaks English more than the local language, Setswana; rather, it showed a result of globalization since English was used for business purposes. The use of English for economic purposes then increased its presence in the LL of Gaborone. In another study, Dégi (2012) found that local languages of Miercurea Ciuc were the dominant languages while English was less prominent. The findings showed that Hungarian and Romanian served several purposes of communication. Moreover, the predominance of Hungarian in the LL also served as a symbol of identity. The use of Hungarian was not only used for relaying information but also served an important symbolic function that related to Hungarian as a symbol of identity.

With the spread of English as a global language, previous researchers have focused on the impact of English and its relation to other languages. Their findings point to the visual prominence of English, which is interpreted as a reflection of globalization and something that hardly indexes a local group. De Los Reyes (2014), for instance, observed that English is more prominent than the local language, Filipino, in both top-down (official signs) and bottom-up (nonofficial signs) in the LL of two main train stations in Manila, Philippines. It shows that the Bilingual Policy of the country was undermined since English and Filipino were the official languages. It was noted that the saliency of English did not necessarily index an English speaking community since most Filipinos hardly used English in their day-to-day activities. De Los Reyes (2014) contended that this reflected the “Filipinos’ valorization of English,” (p. 45), which means English was believed to be beneficial for communication purposes in the Philippines.

Other LL studies conducted in the Philippines have observed the high visibility of English. Ambion’s (2013) study of the LL patterns in Amadeo, Cavite, dubbed as the coffee capital of the Philippines, found that the inhabitants in Amadeo valued their local language, Amadeo dialect, as a way of showcasing their identity as Amadeans and preserving the pride in their local product, coffee. However, they put equal or more value on foreign languages, English and Spanish, used to make their products more elegant and to market their products internationally. Magno (2017), in a separate study, investigated the LL in an academic context focusing on Higher Education Institutions offering Communication programs in Cebu City. The study analyzed signs on bulletin boards and found that English dominated. To Magno (2017), this manifested the influence and prestige of English in higher education institutions. English served as the official language of correspondence in the signs present in the universities investigated.

1.3 Methodological Considerations

Linguistic landscape research has been done mostly in urban areas as these have large quantities of signs (Barni & Bagna, 2009; Finzel, 2012; Backhaus, 2006; Coupland, 2012; Kasanga, 2012; Dixon, 2015). Further, these studies have focused only on main streets where public institutions are located and major commercial activities occur.

Some have documented the LL of schools (Yavari, 2012; Magno, 2017); others such as Backhaus (2006) and De Los Reyes (2014) selected transportation sites particularly train stations and bus stations in their analysis of the LL because these sites were populated every day and accessed by many commuters who in turn, were exposed to the LL. However, Said (2011) argued that although this methodology was appealing, it was problematic because it made the study weak in terms of the city's holistic representation. To abate these methodological problems, pre-selecting not just one but several different areas deemed to be significant within the chosen city or territory was suggested.

Various studies have offered different techniques in categorizing signs. Spolsky and Cooper (1991 as cited in Finzel 2012) categorized signs in their study of the LL in the Old City of Jerusalem according to eight types: warning notices, building names, street signs, advertising signs, prohibitions, commemorative plaques, informative signs, and graffiti. Dixon (2015) adopted this method in examining the LL of Buffalo, New York. This was done to determine the informative function of the LL since this was closely tied with the basic function of signs. The most common categorization involved classifying according to authorship or sign-maker. Determining the producer of the signs was seen significant as they were responsible for designing the signs including material used, form, and most importantly the language(s) used. Huebner (2006), for instance, categorized signs according to government versus non-government. Government signs were either national, provincial, or municipal while non-government signs referred to commercial and private sectors. Tan (2014) used the term *official and private*. Scollon and Scollon (2003) used *municipal discourses* and *commercial discourses* to categorize signs. *In-vitro* referring to static signs and *In-vivo* referring to dynamic signs were coined by Calvet (1990 as cited in Backhaus 2005). Although varying terms were used to distinguish the two categories, they, nonetheless, refer to the same concepts established by Ben-Rafael et al.'s (2006) top-down and bottom-up categorizations. Ben-Rafael et al.'s (2006) distinction between top-down and bottom-up signs has been considered an important variable in numerous LL research studies that followed, e.g., Akindele (2011), Backhaus (2006), Burdick (2012), Dégi (2012), De Los Reyes (2014), and Yavari (2012). This indicates that categorizing authorship of signs is relevant in the study of LL since the sign maker plays an important role in understanding how public signs are constructed.

1.4 Significance of the Study

English has been deeply ingrained in the Filipino culture as a result of both historical and global forces. Significant events from the past particularly with respect to language policies have shaped the linguistic context at present. Tracing back the colonial past of the Philippines, English was deliberately established in the linguistic repertoire of Filipinos. English became the language of government and schools. It was not just used as a medium of instruction but as the *sole* medium of instruction, which meant that the use of Philippine languages was prohibited (Sibayan 1985). English had a significant role in the public institution activities. As Tupas (2008) puts it, English became the “unifying language for a people who were perpetually engaged in political anarchy and ethnic strife due to many dialects and languages of the country” (p.144). Filipinos were made to believe that English is the key to language disparities and proficiency in English would put one in an advantage over others. Filipino, which was the national language back then, was put as a mere subject in schools. Although the invasion of the Japanese prohibited the use of English during their time, English still found its way back to the linguistic repertoire as the Philippines gained back its independence in 1946.

There have been several attempts in putting the local languages at use and this resulted in the Bilingual Policy which mandated the use of both Filipino and English as medium of instruction and communication. However in 2004, President Gloria Macapagal Arroyo made English as the primary medium of instruction, and this was followed by an English-only bill to make English as the primary medium of instruction in all schools. English was strengthened with the objective of developing the proficiency and competence of students and maintain their competitive edge in the growing international industries (Arroyo, 2003). At present, the use of local languages is pushed through the implementation of the Mother-Tongue Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE) with the goal of achieving L1 and L2 fluency of students and achieve academic competency (Malone, 2007).

The Philippines is known to be a multilingual country with over 170 languages and, as stated earlier, had long adopted a Bilingual Policy where Filipino and English are officially used in various domains. Hence, bilingual signs in English and Filipino are evident in the landscape of the Philippines. With the implementation of the MTB-MLE, 19 languages are recognized as official auxiliary languages and with the growth of tourism industry and the influx of foreigners, it is interesting to examine the role of foreign languages in contact with the local languages.

The study of LL in the Philippines seems limited. Further, a considerable amount of research has been done on urban multilingualism (Masip, 2015; Backhaus, 2005; Huebner, 2006; Dixon, 2015), but only few research studies have focused on transnational areas such as small districts like Chinatown. Binondo, the locus of the present study, is known to be Manila's Chinatown, a hub of Chinoy or Chinese Filipino community and a center of trade and commerce. Examining the coexistence and competition of various linguistic varieties in a multicultural setting such as Chinatown is of sociolinguistic value. Thus, this study will be a contribution to the growing research on urban multilingualism in a different context, specifically in Binondo, one of the existing Chinatowns in the Philippines.

1.5 Research Objectives

This study examines the linguistic landscape of and the language ideologies in Binondo, Manila's Chinatown. Specifically, it seeks answers to the following questions:

1. What are the languages used for wider communication in Binondo?
2. Which language plays a predominant role in all LL investigated?
3. To what extent is English present in the LL of Binondo?
4. How does the use of environmental print distinguish Binondo?

2. Theoretical and Methodological Lenses

A great deal of LL research has explored and employed three levels of analysis offered by Barni and Bagna (2009): (1) semiotic analysis examines the function of signs in relation to their properties (i.e., location, communicative function, degree of visibility); (2) macro-linguistic analysis deals with the signs' internal function (languages used, their spatial organization, the dichotomy between authorship and readership and signs' informational and symbolic functions); and (3) micro-linguistic analysis deals with the qualitative evaluation of the texts displayed.

Top-down and Bottom-up Distinction. Ben-Rafael et al.'s (2006) notion of top-down and bottom-up signs was drawn from Landry and Bourhis' government-private signs dichotomy. Ben-Rafael et al., (2006) defined top-down signs as "LL elements used and exhibited by institutional

agencies which act under the control of local or central policies” (p. 10). It is through these signs that the language policy of the state is most evident since the state has less control over the languages used by private signs (Shohamy, 2006; Cenoz & Gorter, 2009). Private signs, on the other hand, include commercial signs and any signs owned by private individuals and business institutions (Landry & Bourhis, 1997). Ben-Rafael et al., (2006) defined bottom-up signs as “those utilized by an individual, associative or corporative actors who enjoy the autonomy of action within legal limits” (p. 10). The essential difference between the two broad categories lies in the fact that top-down signs are expected to conform to the state’s ideology while bottom-up signs are not restricted and designed according to individual preferences or purposes. Accordingly, the choice of language(s) in top-down signs indicates that the culture of the majority is taken into consideration while the preferential use of language in bottom-up signs would reflect the attitude of the actor or the maker of a sign towards the language in question.

The study of LL provides information between the official language policy as reflected in top-down signs and the impact of the policy as reflected in bottom-up signs. In other words, authorities’ language preference is shown in top-down flow while bottom-up flow would show whether the policy is followed or accepted by the populace (Puzey, 2012; Yavari, 2012).

It is useful to distinguish between top-down and bottom-up primarily to put order in the analysis of LL (Ben-Rafael et al., 2006). Essentially, this would also show difference in the examination of the LL, e.g., whether the state and the people have similar or different attitudes or whether the private domain and the public domain demonstrate similarities or differences on the choice of language(s) and how they use it.

2.1 Place Semiotics. Semiotics or the study of signs and symbols are frequently consulted as the fundamental theory underlying LL research. Several researchers have noted that it is important to look beyond the linguistic material with regard to its spatial organization and symbols because they constitute meaning other than themselves (Akindele, 2011; Burdick, 2012; Gorter, 2006).

Given that language territories are hardly homogenous or coherent in the LL, analyzing through its symbols could provide information about the sociolinguistic composition of the linguistic groups in the given territory (Landry & Bourhis, 1997). Meaning making and emplacement of signs, then, has been an important area of inquiry in the study of LL especially in multilingual settings because diversity is frequent in places where different linguistic groups co-exist.

Scollon and Scollon (2003) systematically explored the concept of geosemiotics or “how language and signs make meaning in relation to where and when they are physically placed in the world” (p 5). It was noted that geosemiotics is primarily focused on indexicality, which means that signs depend on their context or environment to form meaning. They introduced the concept of place semiotics as useful in analyzing language contact in which some principles were drawn from visual semiotics and geosemiotics. In their framework, they provided key elements of place semiotics namely code preference, inscription, and emplacement. These are the elements that need to be taken up in analyzing meaning through languages.

In analyzing semiotic signs, code preference may be exhibited through the following: center-margin, top-bottom, left-right, and earlier-later, or other semiotic conventions (Ogasawara, 2005). Backhaus (2006 as cited in De Los Reyes 2014), elaborated code preference as referring to “how signs represent the geopolitical world through the choice of languages, their graphic representation, and their arrangement if more than one language is present” (p. 32).

In signs where there is more than one code used, there must be a spatial order or arrangement of code, and this is often called *spatial organization* (Huebner, 2006). In bilingual and multilingual signs, the dominant language in relation to the other(s) could be displayed either at the top, on the left, or at the center while the inferior language may be placed at the bottom, on the right, or on the sides.

However, it was noted that the arrangement of codes may “symbolize something but not necessarily index a particular group” (Ogasawara, 2005, p. 3). For instance, English may be shown as the dominant language in a bilingual sign. However, it does not necessarily mean that the whole community speaks English. It was suggested, then, that other factors outside the signs themselves be considered to know whether code preference is based on “geopolitical indexing or sociocultural associations” (Ogasawara, 2005, p. 4). It could be a result of globalization or social and cultural factors that have been shaped by history and other elements that have influenced the condition of the signs. Scollon and Scollon (2003) contend that local laws may also dictate the placement of language in a more preferred position in a sign. Thus, the dominance of a language may sometimes signify language policies.

The second element of place semiotics, *inscription*, refers to the materiality of the sign. Language preference could also be exhibited through its “physical materiality” or “what material signs are made of” (Ogasawara 2005, p. 4). This includes fonts, materials, layering, and other state changes. Finzel (2012) added size, colors, and texture as components of inscription. For instance, traditional Chinese characters may have an association with the most ancient or the most modern value. Simplified writing, on the other hand, shows conservative and socialist values (Ogasawara, 2005). Sizes and fonts are also used in giving emphasis to the more preferred language. For example, the dominant language could be inscribed in a larger size. Additionally, the dominant language may be emphasized using bright colors such as red and neon.

The position of sign or the *emplacement*, as the third element in place semiotics, is regarded as the central concern of geosemiotics (Ogasawara, 2005). Scollon and Scollon (2003) provided three systems emplacement: decontextualized, transgressive, and situated, which explore the question of whether emplaced discourse is “socioculturally authorized” (Ogasawara, 2005, p. 4).

Decontextualized semiotics are described as those which “always appear in the same form no matter what the context” (Scollon & Scollon 2003, p. 4) such as brand names like McDonald's, Starbucks, and other famous brands. Transgressive signs are “signs that are situated in a wrong place” (Scollon & Scollon 2003, p.4). These include unauthorized signs, e.g., graffiti, vandals, torn notes, and the like. Situated semiotics deals with meaning that depends on the location of the signs. These include common regulatory signs like those signaling directions e.g., *Entrance, Exit, One Way*. Situated semiotics renders clearer meaning than decontextualized semiotics but is susceptible to overgeneralization.

In analyzing the contact of languages, the present paper employed place semiotics in determining the predominant language in bilingual and multilingual signs and in evaluating the semiotic functions of the languages in the LL investigated. Needless to say, to conduct a more thoughtful analysis of the LL in Binondo, this study employed the three levels of analysis suggested by Barni and Bagna (2009), Ben-Rafael et al.'s (2006) top-down and bottom-up dichotomy, and Scollon and Scollon's (2003) concept of place semiotics.

Study Locale. Binondo is a district in Manila, Philippines and referred to as the city's Chinatown. Binondo is composed of 10 barangays with estimated 12,985 residents (NCR Population and Housing Census, 2010). It is known as the hub of the so-called Chinoy or Chinese Filipino

community and the center of trade and commerce in Manila, where all types of businesses run by Chinese Filipinos thrive. With its very rich culture, historic landmarks, and rows of Chinese restaurants, Binondo has become more attractive to tourists. It reflects diversity for people from different backgrounds and from all walks of life, and thus it is interesting to examine the coexistence and competition among linguistic varieties in a multicultural and diversified setting such as Binondo.

Moreover, Binondo seems to be a strategic location as it is occupied by shopping centers (11), churches (3), schools (4), hotels (7), commercial banks (11), restaurants, and other establishments. As a result, Binondo is also flooded with tourists, businessmen, and other non-residents. This makes Binondo populated every day and people in turn are exposed to the LL of the area.

Backhaus (2006) posits that one of the fundamental points that need to be considered for a well-grounded data collection procedure is the geographic limit of the survey area. In order to systematize data collection and achieve a comprehensive representation with limited time and resource, numerous LL researchers have chosen areas that have prolific LLs (Cenoz & Gorter, 2006; Akindele, 2011; Ben-Rafael et al., 2006; Said, 2011). In the present study, three zones were selected for sampling, namely, Ongpin St., Reina Regente St., and Dasmariñas St. These are considered to be the main and most frequently visited streets in Binondo, Manila where numerous establishments are located including schools, church, stores, banks, and government buildings. Additionally, these are the largest streets in Binondo with estimated 650m, 600m, and 500m lengths, respectively. Thus, these important areas are selected as it would well represent the whole territory being investigated.

2.2 Data Gathering Procedure. The data included an inventory of signs taken from December 2016 to March 2017 through a digital camera. To systematize data collection, the following criteria for choosing the signs were followed: (1) the signs were posted at a location where a passerby could see. Hence, only signs that were posted along the street were included; (2) the signs should be in a standard definable size or could be easily seen; (3) if same signs were posted in different locations, they were only counted as one.

For commercial establishments, only one sign was considered as a representative of the whole establishment regardless of the number of signs posted. This follows Cenoz and Gorter's (2006) suggestion that one single unit belongs to a larger whole (the company).

The collected signs were then categorized according to top-down and bottom-up following Ben-Rafael et al.'s (2006) distinction, i.e., government or official for the former and private, nonofficial, and commercial signs for the latter. After categorizing, they were classified according to the languages used: Filipino only (F1), English only (E1), Chinese only (C1), Filipino and English (FE2), Filipino and Chinese (FE2), English and Chinese (EC2), or Filipino, Chinese, and English (FEC3). Code-switched and code-mixed signs were considered as bilingual. It should also be noted that all Roman script with English lexicon, syntax, and orthography were considered English. The term Chinese was used to refer to all Chinese varieties including Mandarin, Cantonese, and Hokkien.

The second categorization of signs was according to their textual genre or type of sign and classified according to languages used. This was done to identify what language was often attributed to each type of text. Then, the signs were evaluated using the concept of place semiotics. The predominant language and the secondary language in bilingual signs were identified and were subsequently counted according to the number of occurrences.

3. Results and Discussion

The following section presents the results of the categorization process, i.e., (1) top-down and bottom-up and languages used (2) textual genre and languages used. Analysis of signs anchored on Scollon and Scollon’s (2003) concept of place semiotics is also presented.

3.1 Top-down and Bottom-up Distinction

Table 1 shows the distribution of signs according to top-down and bottom-up of all the streets investigated.

Table 1.

Language distribution according to top-down and bottom-up flows

Category	Top-Down	Bottom-up	f	%
Filipino only (F1)	3	2	5	2.37
English only (E1)	19	76	95	45
Chinese only (C1)		4	4	1.90
Filipino-English(FE2)	3	3	6	2.84
Filipino-Chinese(FC2)				0
English-Chinese(EC2)	7	93	100	47.4
Others		1	1	0.474
Total	30	181	211	100 %

A total of 211 environmental prints were collected; 72 from Ongpin St., 78 from Reina Regente St., and 46 from Dasmarinas St.. In terms of frequency, Binondo Chinatown’s LL can be described as largely bilingual with English-Chinese signs having 47.4% of the distribution. English, one of the official languages of the country, is closely tied with EC2 signs constituting the second highest number of distribution at 45%. The most striking result to emerge from the data is that Filipino, the national and official language of the Philippines, is hardly seen in the LL having only 5.4 % of the distribution, bilingual signs combined. The results point to a strong presence of English in the LL either alone or in combination with other languages.

3.2 Top-down context

In top-down signs or government-controlled signs, those written in English only appeared to have the most number of occurrence followed by English-Chinese. This indicates that the government preferred using English while Chinese was only secondary and Filipino was the least used language. Filipino was weakly represented in the LL given that it was contained only on six signs. Furthermore, signs written in Filipino only appeared mostly on local or barangay level signs (See Figures 1 and 2) but rarely on municipal government-controlled signs. It suggests that the municipal government and the local or barangay government have opposing ideologies. While the municipal government prefers English, the local government promotes Filipino. This may be attributed to the fact that the municipal government serves a wider range of audience from Filipino residents to tourists and non-Filipino speakers, whereas the local or barangay government is

limited to a smaller community particularly, the Chinese Filipino community. Top-down signs using Chinese were limited to entrance arches and commemorative markers which were referential in nature.



Figure 1. F1 Proper Waste Disposal Sign Figure 2. F1 Sign about Sanitation



Figure 3. FE2 Directive Sign

Figure 4. E1 Traffic Sign

3.3 Bottom-up Context

Bottom-up signs dominated the landscape at 85% distribution. Perhaps because the areas investigated were mostly commercial areas. This demonstrates that the LL of Binondo, Chinatown is controlled more by business owners and settlers than the authorities. Bottom-up context was so far in agreement with top-down; the data showed that English was prevalent considering that monolingual English signs constituted the second highest distribution following Chinese-English.

The following examples highlight Barni and Bagna's (2009) contention that the use of a single language may indicate that it has the "power to stand alone" (p. 32). In these examples, English is used both in naming businesses as well as describing the commodities sold or the services offered. This reflects the power and prestige of English. The shop owners may view English as influential for it does not need other languages to convey messages.



Figure 5. E1 Autoparts Product Naming Sign Figure 6. E1 Courier Service Product Naming Sign

Chinese was also prominent in the signs even though there was no particular policy that required establishments to use Chinese. As noted by Barni and Bagna (2009), this carried socio-symbolic value probably linked with their own identity being recognized. However, the use of Chinese on signs was regularly paired with an English equivalent (See Figures 7 and 8).



Figure 7. EC2 Jewelry Store Product Naming Sign Figure 8. Pharmacy Product Naming Sign

In most cases, Chinese-English signs displayed direct translations from either English name to Chinese name or the other way around. This suggests that business establishments also preferred English on their signs either alone or combined with Chinese.

Generally, English was the most visible language in the LL of Binondo Chinatown. Chinese, on the other hand, seemed to function as a secondary language while Filipino was the least favored language in the LL. Given that LL serves two functions: informative and symbolic, the question now pertains to the functions performed by these languages in the LL. In view of this, the next section presents an overview of the textual genres ascribed to each language. Signs have several and distinct purposes of communication. Textual genre refers to the type of sign or the basic function of the sign e.g., sign used for announcements, sign used for calling attention, or sign used for directions.

3.4 Communicative Functions

The results demonstrated that English had an overwhelming significance in the communicative sphere of Chinatown's LL. Although Chinese-English bilingual signs were frequently used for product naming, it is undeniable that English still plays an important role in conveying messages to the public.

Product Naming. Product naming are signs used for branding or assigning a brand name. It is one of the important aspects in business and marketing for it affects the whole marketing process and the image of the company, group, or institution. One thing that companies consider in developing a name for their product is the choice of language. As posited by Barni and Bagna (2009), sign owners also attempt at evoking a unique image that would appeal to potential clients.

The analysis indicates that Chinese and English were the languages most frequently used in product naming to achieve their commercial aim and to attract as many potential customers as possible. Chinese-run establishments frequently exemplified the use of both English and Chinese.



Figure 9. EC2 Restaurant Sign



Figure 10. EC2 Drug Store Product Naming sign

It appears that the use of both English and Chinese in their signs was intended to reach both English and Chinese-speaking customers. However, it was observed that most of these establishments only used Chinese in their brand names, but other informational materials such as menus, prices, and other descriptions were written in English. This indicates that Chinese had more of a symbolic value than a communicative one. For Chinese stores, it was used to depict a sense of authenticity. Chinese was used not primarily to communicate with Chinese speakers but rather to communicate that their place is authentic Chinese. To evoke an authentic and uniquely Chinese style food, service, or product which attracts a good number of local customers. This is similar to De Los Reyes' (2014) and Ambion's (2013) observation that the use of local languages, Filipino and Amadeo, respectively, on commercial signs signified that the store was authentic and Dixson's (2015) observation that Italian signs in Buffalo, New York were used to promote the authenticity of the food sold at the establishments, not to attract Italian speakers considering that English dominated the signs and the Italian inscriptions were intelligible even to native speakers of English.

There were some instances where even non-Chinese and famous brands such as *McDonald's* and *J.CO* used a Chinese translation alongside their original brand name. Similar to the previous observation, informational materials inside the store entirely written in English and Chinese were used solely for the storefront. Aside from the sign outside the stores, there were no other indications that they intended to serve the Chinese-speaking population. In this case, Chinese seemed to be used merely as a decoration for non-Chinese speakers and not primarily to

communicate with Chinese speakers. This furthers the contention that Chinese had more of a symbolic value than as a communicative function.



Figure 11. EC2Mcdo- Product Naming



Figure 12. EC2 J.CO Product Naming

There were also some instances where English had a symbolic value. To demonstrate, in the following examples, (See Figures 13 and 14) English was used in naming their products (*Fire on Ice and Happiness*). However, product details such as descriptions of the commodities and services were written in Chinese.



Figure 13. EC2 Jewelry Store sign



Figure 14. EC2 Feng Shui shop sign

Chinese inscriptions were not a translation of the product name but rather a description of the store, product details, and services offered. Here, English was not used as a communicative tool but rather functioned as an accessory language. English did not have any function but to evoke an image of sophistication or modernity, which was often the symbolic value attached to English (Bolton, 2012; Dixon, 2015). This corroborates Kelly-Holmes' (2000 as cited in Spolsky, 2009) contention that the use of a foreign language in European advertisements is not for their communicative function but for their symbolic value. Kelly-Holmes (2000) avers that "it is unimportant whether the advertisee (sign owner) understands the foreign words in an advertisement so long as it calls up the cultural stereotypes of the country with which the language is associated" (p.36).

All things considered, Chinese was found to have a symbolic value in the commercial domain. Although it was frequently used, English was still the preferred language in terms of brand

naming. This highlights the role of English as language used for economic prosperity. For business establishments to make profit, the chosen language should attract potential customers. Thus, it could be deduced here that both languages are used for commercial aims. English was often used for communicating and reaching a wider range of customers and Chinese to evoke an image of uniqueness or authenticity. This correlates with Duchene and Heller's (2009 as cited in Masip, 2015) insight that the use of a foreign language "may be used to provide products and premises with an added value of exoticism and authenticity with mere commercial aims" (p. 30).

Advertising. Advertisement signs are public notices designed to persuade, promote, and/or to inform. This type includes informational ads such as posters for job vacancies, rental spaces, and those that promote products, services, and events. The difference of this type from the previous, product naming, is that this may or may not have any commercial value. This type of signs is produced with the intention of publicizing or making something known. The analysis shows that English was the most frequently used language in advertising. Chinese was sometimes used but would always be accompanied with an English translation.



Figure 15

Driver Ad



Figure 16. CE2 Grab Driver Ad

The first two examples (Figure 15) are written in English except for the word *yaya*, which is a Filipino colloquial term for 'nanny'. The sign made use of a borrowed word *yaya*, which has been a popular term in the Philippines. The second poster (Figure 15) demonstrates that the target audience was English speakers considering that it was entirely in English. In the third poster (Fig. 16), the sign used both Chinese and English. The dominant language here based on its placement was Chinese. This gives an impression that the owner of the sign was preferably looking for a Chinese descent and the use of English was intended for those who could not understand Chinese. Hence, it could be inferred here that the use of language is based on the sign-owner's expectations about readers' proficiency of that specific language (what language the readers understand). In other words, the sign maker is assuming that the people or the target audience could comprehend English. Hence, this suggests that the advertisements were addressed to a broad range of audience; from English speakers to non-English speakers, to different social classes, and to people from different backgrounds. Albeit this, English is the preferred language in terms of publicizing information, which further highlights the strength of English to reach a wide range of audience.

Given these points, it can be said that English is the language of advertising; the language used to persuade, inform, and entice people. These findings validate several researches that have also found that English is a language of modernity and sophistication used most frequently in commercial and advertising domains (Bolton, 2012; Cenoz & Gorter 2006, 2009). This implies that English appeals to the masses may they be to locals and foreigners.

Place Naming. Place names are composed of street signs that name places, avenues, or buildings. They also refer to commemorative markers and public signs of general interest. This type of signs is informative in nature, commissioned by the government and non-government institutions such as schools, hospitals, and churches to demarcate a given territory.



Figure 17. FE2 Veronica and Reina Regente



Figure 18. E1 Ongpin Street Name



Figure 19. EC2 Manila Doctors Hospital Sign

The figures above demonstrate that place names cannot stand alone without English. The findings showed that there was no occurrence of a monolingual place name except for those in English. Place names with the presence of Chinese and Filipino were always accompanied with English. Interestingly, English was the dominant language in these signs based on the arrangement of code, which further highlights the preferential attitude towards English. Hence, this finding showed that English is used in defining a physical space.

Directives. The presence of English in most directive signs or those signs commissioned by either the government or the private sector informing about regulations and laws is in agreement with De Los Reyes' (2014) contention that English is used for instilling proper behavior and following regulations. One notable observation is that the use of Filipino was frequent on directives but were limited to following proper decorum which was mostly about sanitation and proper waste disposal, e.g., *Bawal Magtapon ng Basura* 'Throwing Garbage is not Allowed', 'Bawal Umihl Dito' 'Urinating is Not Allowed Here'. The use of English was frequent in traffic signs such as *No Parking, One Way, No Entry*. Similar to De Los Reyes' (2014) observation, in the present paper, English has a conative function, which means it is a powerful tool used in commanding and directing people to do something.



Figure 20. E1 NO Littering Sign



Figure 21. E1 No Parking Sign

Looking at the communicative function of languages, English confirms its status as the most useful language in terms of conveying information. Further analysis on the placement of signs reveals that English is not only visually prominent but also semiotically dominant. The results are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2.

Distribution of signs according to which is the predominant language

Category	Top-Down	Bottom-up	Percentage
Filipino			0
English	6	62	64
Chinese	2	36	36
Total	8	98	100

3.5 Predominant Language in Bilingual Signs and Preferential Attitude

The elements of place semiotics coding preference, inscription, and emplacement were used to determine the dominant language in bilingual signs. Barni and Bagna (2009) extended the notion of the dominant language and pointed out that the presence of another language in relation to the dominant language carries a symbolic value and serves a particular function.

This notion was supported by Spolsky (2009) stating that aside from the communicative function of the sign, the choice of language carries a symbolic value condition and the order of languages in multilingual signs signal the symbolic value. Similar to previous findings, English appears to be the dominant language in terms of its placement. Chinese, on the other hand, functions as a supplementary or secondary language in most of the bilingual signs examined. Both in top-down and bottom-up contexts, no sign had Filipino as the dominant language. This may be attributed to the fact that there was no occurrence of any Filipino-Chinese sign, and in the few Filipino-English signs, English was still semiotically dominant. The first two examples illustrate the visual prominence of English.



Figure 22. EC2 Manila Chinatown Arch



Figure 23. EC2 Chinese Deli Sign

In the first example, the entrance arch at Ongpin Bridge (Figure 22), the order of languages indicates that English is the dominant language since it is placed on top, written in bold, and larger than the Chinese inscription, *The Chinese district welcomes you*. Likewise, the second example (Figure 23) demonstrates English or the Romanized proper name as the dominant language based on the position, size, color, and materiality. The English inscription is placed at the center in a large bright red font and three-dimensional blocks. In contrast, the Chinese inscription is posted flatly, on the sides of the English inscription, and in a smaller pale red font. It was observed that in both cases, the English inscriptions serve a communicative function as all the important information is written in English.

The analysis suggests that the English inscription was intended to be read or recognized first before the Chinese inscription considering that it was the one that stood out and drew people's attention while the Chinese inscription acted as the secondary language either functioning as communicative (for Chinese speakers) or symbolic.

As observed, most of the Chinese inscriptions in bilingual signs served as an accessory language or not the main language. Take for example Figure 26, informational details (i.e., *Chinese Deli, Since 1912, Home of the Best Hopia*) were written in English. Moreover, signs inside the store (i.e., sign for opening doors, menus, prices) were in English. Chinese inscriptions are less prominent and are used solely to name the establishments.

A majority of monolingual and bilingual Chinese-English signs were exhibited in what Scollon and Scollon (2003) described as situated semiotics. It was observed that these signs were often made of high-quality materials such as metal blocks, vinyl banners, aluminum signs, and coroplast materials, which were durable and suited for long-term and outdoor use. These signs

then reflected permanence. In other words, these signs were intended to be there for a long time. Examples of these are given below.



Figure 24. EC2 Uncle Fish Balls



Figure 25. EC2 Chinese-Filipino Friendship Bridge

Filipino monolingual and Filipino-English bilingual signs, on the other hand, were mostly found on transgressive semiotics or those that veered away from expected medium. Some examples of transgressive semiotics were vandals, graffiti, fallen receipts, torn notes and the like. An example of this is shown in Figure 26.

A significant number of Filipino monolingual and Filipino-English bilingual signs were displayed on nondurable materials, while English and Chinese written signs were posted for a very long time. In contrast, Filipino written signs reflected a temporary quality. These signs were not expected to be permanent and subsequently implied that the use of Filipino was not intended to be maintained.



Figure 26. F1 Graffiti Warning Sign

The example given is a graffiti with a warning note alongside that was understood as *Bawal umihi dito* translated as ‘Urinating here is not allowed.’ Apparently, *D2* is a shortcut for ‘dito’ or ‘here’ a word formed from replacing bits of words with phonetic equivalent that originated from netspeak or the language of text and Internet, which is informal per se. Graffiti is not only illegal and speaks something about the author’s writing style. The language used appeared to be casual and informal considering that netspeak is not used in formal situations. Additionally, it is noticeable that the writings in Filipino bilingual or monolingual signs were either faintly painted, disorganized, or improperly structured. In stark contrast, those in English and Chinese were printed and not handwritten, thus giving an organized and properly structured sign. There appeared to be

no occurrence of grammatical lapses, use of colloquial terms, and use of netspeak in English or Chinese signs. This gives an impression that Filipino is informally used if the writing style were to be considered.

Although English is the predominant language in Chinese-English signs, there were still a significant number of signs exhibiting Chinese as the dominant language. These are often seen in Chinese business establishments but seldom in government-controlled signs. This points out that business establishments preferred Chinese and therefore used Chinese as the language for marketing strategy and profit gain. On another note, the local government preferred English in their signs although most of the residents were Chinese-speaking. As previously stated, top-down signs would most likely reflect the language of the dominant culture (Filipino-Chinese in this case), but that notion seemed to deviate. It implies that the authors of these government-controlled signs expected the readers to comprehend English since most of their signs pointed to the dominance of English. The following examples illustrate the visual prominence of Chinese.



Figure 27. EC2 New Quan Yin Chinese Restaurant



Figure 28. EC2 First Hotel

These examples have shown Chinese as the dominant code by placing it at the top and larger than the English inscription or the Romanized proper names. This implies that these businesses were not exclusive for Chinese speakers alone as their signs were accompanied with an English translation. Moreover, informational materials had an equivalent translation in English. Chinese in this case both functioned as informative and symbolic. Chinese was not just used to convey information about the businesses but to represent identity. It is also interesting to note that aside from placing Chinese as the dominant language, the signs heavily used color red (and sometimes gold) which were the colors often associated with the Chinese identity, adding to the Chinese quality of the signs. In their culture, red symbolizes good fortune and joy. It remains a very popular color in modern China. In addition, a large number of signs made use of imageries and symbol alongside the inscriptions associated with the Chinese identity. This included fire dragon, lanterns, images of Buddha, tea cups, and other symbolic images. The use of these seemed to be a way of representing the Chinese identity or culture and hence, creating a symbolic space, evoking an image of China.

Overall, the analysis of signs anchored on the concept of place semiotics revealed a preferential attitude towards English. Chinese appeared to have a symbolic value and served as an accessory language, which was not primarily intended for communication. Filipino, the national

and official language of the country, appeared to be devalued or undermined for aside from being minimally present, it appeared weak in terms of its role in the LL.

3.6 Informative and Symbolic Functions of the Linguistic Landscape

Informative Function. Generally, the findings show that English, Chinese, and Filipino were the languages used in the LL of Binondo. Chinese and English were found to have an important role in achieving entrepreneurial prosperity. English managed to assert its importance in almost all communicative functions: advertising, notifying, commanding, and demarcating a place. Filipino, although having the weakest role in the LL, was found to assume a function limited to warning about proper behavior.

As Landry and Bourhis (1997) noted, the use of language in the public sphere is expected to mark the identity of the linguistic group present. Although the Chinese speaking community was asserted in the LL, the Filipino identity was hardly indexed. However, it should be noted that this was limited to the present study's findings. Furthermore, the predominance of English over Filipino confirmed its prestige or as the high-status variety in the diglossic nature of the Philippines. English stands as the language of the education sector, political domain, and higher socioeconomic echelon while the local language, Filipino, serves other purposes (Mahboob & Cruz, 2013 as cited in De Los Reyes 2014).

The results point to the pervasiveness of English in the LL. It was seen that the LL does not reflect the reality of the linguistic situation in the Philippines where Filipino is the language of the majority group. The saliency of English does not index an entirely English speaking community but rather more of English-knowing bilinguals. As Pakir (1991 as cited in Tan 2014) contextualized *English-knowing bilingualism*, it is the use of English as a second language and sometimes the primacy of English in the use of two languages. Both Filipino and the Chinese-speaking community have relative proficiency (fundamental to expert level proficiency) in English and have their respective home languages as their first language.

The pervasiveness of English in the LL may be explained by looking at the history of language policies and reforms. English continued to dominate the public setting up until now as it is heavily influenced by sociopolitical forces. Similarly, the majority of Chinese Filipino in the Philippines have basic-to-expert level proficiency in English (Ang-See, 1997). English is not anymore considered a foreign language by the Chinese Filipino community. The use of Mandarin and Hokkien as first languages is confined to the older generation of immigrants and among the new generation, English and Filipino serve as their first languages.

Symbolic Function. The heightened presence of English in a largely Filipino-Chinese speaking community confirmed its status as a prestige language. Aside from serving as the language of wider communication, it served as an index of globalization. It was not just used as the *bridge language* across language and cultural barriers. English was also seen as a fundamental tool in expanding business as well as socioeconomic relations. The predominance of English in the LL extended to the point that it appeared to fulfill the role of Filipino as the known lingua franca in the Philippines. The use of Taglish and Hokaglish and Philippine Chinese English (Gonzales, 2017) as lingua franca as English varieties, however, may likewise be acknowledged. Filipino is supposedly the common language among people who have different native languages in the Philippines. However, English appears to be the medium for wider communication. LL signaled the marginalization of Filipino as English emerged as the preferred language in both the government and the public domain. The LL showed that the government continues to reinforce

English in the public setting. This undermines the Bilingual Policy of the country and disdains the multilingual situation in the Philippines (De Los Reyes, 2014). There is no active competition between English and Filipino for Filipino has a weak role in the LL while English functions as a *staple* language, always attached to various types of signs. This furthers the contention of De Los Reyes (2014) that Filipinos continue to valorize English as advantageous for different purposes.

The LL of Chinatown is largely shaped by the commercial sector and the foregoing analysis revealed that the language was commodified. Language appears to have an added value (prestige, authenticity, exoticism), used as an instrument to attract customers. Burdick (2012) had a similar observation in the LL of Strasbourg. Language was used to mark authenticity and the local culture through the analysis of semiotic conventions. The use of Chinese in the LL of Binondo was basically what makes it different from other areas. The use of environmental print symbolically constructed an abroad-like place, which makes it unique and distinguished. It was seen that the use of Chinese was not merely used as a means of communication for the Chinese speakers but mainly to symbolically embody Chinese culture. Chinese functioned as primarily symbolic for non-Chinese speakers, used to evoke images of uniquely Chinese culture including products and services. For the Chinese community, it served a symbolic function to preserve culture as well as express identity. The function of English was to navigate this ‘imagined space of China’.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

Analyzing through the LL lenses provided an understanding of multilingualism and the impact of English as a global language. The study showed different patterns of usage and functions assumed by languages in shaping the LL. Categorizing signs according to top-down and bottom-up contexts showed subtle differences in the patterns of language use but in agreement as far as English is concerned. The Bilingual Policy was not evident in top-down context where it is expected to be. It provided evidence that the government favors English more than the local language. Through place semiotics, a preferential attitude towards English was shown; it has also demonstrated that Chinese served a symbolic function. The Chinese culture appeared to be commodified (Masip, 2015). It demonstrated that language has the power to shape a space into a cultural destination.

The study has also demonstrated that English occupied a hegemonic position in the LL of Binondo. This dominance challenged the presence of Filipino. Landry and Bourhis (1997) noted that the absence of language could threaten its ethnolinguistic vitality. This calls for a reconstructing of the LL and revitalize the presence of local languages. According to Landry and Bourhis (1997), “the visibility of their own-group language on public signs helps maintain or restore this language in key domains of language use” (p. 46). The presence of Filipino in the LL could possibly contribute in changing the perceptions about its relevance. With the recent implementation of MTB-MLE, this study could be the basis for language planners to consider the importance of LL in achieving one of its objectives, i.e., to preserve and maintain love and respect for the local language and heritage (Malone, 2007). LL could be a way for the local language to assert its importance, relevance, and power (Shohamy, 2006).

As this study was limited to the linguistic practices in Manila Chinatown, future researchers could do a cross-analysis into the same transnational area and validate if similar observations are made.

With the pervasiveness of English in the LL of the Philippines as observed by this study in a commercial area and that of De Los Reyes (2014) in a government domain, and Magno (2017)

in an academic context, future undertakings in the LL of the Philippines could observe those residential areas where LL research is limited. It would be of great interest to do a comparative study as the investigation of LL in the Philippines is still fertile.

References

- Akindele, D. O. (2011). Linguistic landscape as public communication: A study of public signage in Gaborone, Botswana. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 3, 1-11.
- Ambion, L. J. (2013). The linguistic landscape of Amadeo: A study of the presence of different languages in the public space. *Humanities and Social Sciences Review*, 2, 223-238.
- Ang-See, T. (1997). *The Chinese in the Philippines: Continuity and change*. Retrieved June 21, 2016 from <http://www.asj.upd.edu.ph/mediabox/archive/ASJ-33-1997/angsee.pdf>.
- Arroyo, G. (2003). Department of Education. DEPED Order No. 36. Establishing the policy to strengthen the use of the English language as a medium of instruction in the educational System. Retrieved June 22, 2016 from <http://www.deped.gov.ph/orders/do-60-s-2008>.
- Backhaus, P. (2005). Signs of multilingualism in Tokyo: A diachronic look at the linguistic landscape. *International Journal of Sociology and Language*, 175, 103-121.
- Backhaus, P. (2006). Multilingualism in Tokyo: A look into the linguistic landscape. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 3, 52-66.
- Barni, M., & Bagna, C. (2009). A mapping technique and the linguistic landscape. In Shohamy, E., & Gorter, D., *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery* (pp. 126-140). New York: Routledge.
- Ben-Rafael, E., Shohamy, E., Amara, M.H., & Trumper-Hecht, N. (2006). Linguistic landscape as symbolic construction of the public space: The case of Israel. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 3, 7-30.
- Bolton, K. (2012). World Englishes and linguistic landscape. *World Englishes*, 31, 30-33.
- Burdick, C. (2012). *Mobility and language in place: A linguistic landscape of language commodification*. *CHESS Student Research Reports*, 7, Retrieved June 23, 2016 from https://scholarworks.umass.edu/chess_student_research/7.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2006). Linguistic landscape and minority languages. In Gorter, D., *Linguistic Landscape: A New Approach to Multilingualism* (pp. 67-80). Multilingual Matters LTD.
- Cenoz, J. & Gorter, D. (2009). Language economy and linguistic landscape. In Shohamy, E., & Gorter, D., *Linguistic Landscape and Expanding the Scenery* (pp. 55-69). New York: Routledge.
- Chesnut, M., Lee, V., & Schulte, J. (2013). Linguistic landscape and language awareness. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 12, 102-120.
- Coupland, N. (2012). Bilingualism on display: The Framing of Welsh and English in Welsh public spaces. *Language in Society*, 41, 1-27.
- Dagenais, D., Moore, D., Sabatier, C., Lamarre, P., & Armand, F. (2009). Linguistic landscape and language awareness. In Shohamy, E., & Gorter, D., *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery* (pp. 253-269). New York: Routledge.
- De Los Reyes, R. A. (2014). Language of order: English in the linguistic landscape of two major train station in the Philippines. *AJELS: Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 3, 24-51.

- Degi, Z. (2012). The Linguistic landscape of Miercurea Ciuc. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica*, 3, 341-356.
- Dimova, S. (2007). English shop signs in Macedonia. *English Today*, 23, 18-24.
- Dixon, A. (2015). Analyzing the multilingual linguistic landscape of Buffalo, New York. Master's Thesis. Fredonia, New York: State University of New York at Fredonia.
- Finzel, A. M. (2012). English in the linguistic landscape of Hong Kong: A case study of shop signs and linguistic competence. Master's Thesis. Institutional Repository of the University of Potsdam.
- Gonzales, W. D. W. (2017). Philippine Englishes. *Asian Englishes*, 19, 1-17.
- Gorter, D. (2006). Further possibilities for linguistic landscape research. In Gorter, D., *Linguistic Landscape: A New Approach to Multilingualism* (pp. 81-89). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Huebner, T. (2006). Bangkok's Linguistic Landscape: Environmental print, codemixing, and language change. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 3, 31-51.
- Kasanga, L. A. (2012). Mapping the linguistic landscape of a commercial neighbourhood in central Phnom Penh. *Journal of Multilingualism and Multicultural Development*, 32, 553-567.
- Kelly-Holmes, H. (2000). Bier, parfum, kaas: Language fetish in European advertising. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 3, 67-82.
- Landry, R. & Bourhis, R. (1997). Linguistic landscape and ethnolinguistic vitality. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 16, 22-49.
- Lou, J.J. (2012). Chinatown in the linguistic landscape of Washington, DC: The bilingual landscape. *World Englishes*, 31, 34-47.
- Magno, J. (2017). Linguistic landscape in Cebu city Higher Education offering communication programs. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 5, 94-103.
- Malone, S. (2007). Mother tongue-based multilingual education: Implications for education policy. Retrieved June 1, 2016 from <https://www.scribd.com/document/179133197/Mother-Tongue-Based-Multi-Lingual-Education-Implications-for-Education-Policy-pdf>.
- Masip, C. G. (2015). *Linguistic Landscapes: A snapshot of multilingualism and language ideologies in Cabbagetown (Toronto)*. Master's Thesis. Autonomous University of Barcelona.
- National Capital Region Final Results (2010). Census of Population and Housing Archived 2012-11-15 at the Wayback Machine.
- Ogasawara, N. (2005). *Discourse/applied linguistics: Scollon & Scollon-Wong UAB*. Retrieved August 1, 2016 from linguistlist.org: https://www.uab.edu/education/esl/images/LINGUIST_List_16.1600_Discourse_Scollon_Scollon-Wong_2004.pdf.
- Puzey, G. (2012). Two-way traffic: How linguistic landscapes reflect and influence the politics of language. In Gorter, D., Marten, H.F., & Mensel, L.V. (eds). *Minority Languages in the Linguistic Landscape* (pp. 127-147). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Republic of the Philippines Department of Education (2009). Institutionalizing Mother Tongue-based Multilingual Education (DO No. 74). Retrieved August 21, 2016 from <http://www.deped.gov.ph/orders/do-74-s-2009>.
- Said, S. B. (2011). Data triangulation as a resource in multilingual research: Examples from the linguistic landscape. *Doing Research in Applied Linguistics*, 17, 62-70.
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. (2003). *Discourses in place: Language in the material world*. London: Routledge.

- Shohamy, F. (2006). *Language Policy: Hidden Agenda and New Approaches*. New York: Routledge.
- Sibayan, B. P. (1985). The Filipino people and English. In Janowsky, K.R. (Ed.), *Scientific and humanistic dimensions of language* (pp. 581-593). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Spolsky, B. (2009). Prolegomena to a sociolinguistic theory of public signage. In Shohamy, E., & Gorter, D., *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery* (pp. 25-39). London: Routledge.
- Tan, P.K. (2014). Singapore's balancing act, from the perspective of the Linguistic Landscape. *SOJOURN: Journal of Social Issues in Southeast Asia*, 29, 438-466.
- Tupas, R. (2008). Bourdieu, historical forgetting, and the problem of English in the Philippines. *Philippine Studies*, 56, 47-67.
- Yavari, S. (2012). Linguistic landscape and language policies: A comparative study of Linköping university and ETH Zurich. Master's Thesis. Linköping University.