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ABSTRACT

This dissertation is the result of studies in two fields, the linguistic landscape (LL) and the economics of language (EL), and the relationship between them. In particular, this study concentrates on: (1) the analysis of the language used in public signs in two specific areas in the southern U.S., Ybor City and West Tampa, both located in the City of Tampa, Florida; and (2) the evaluation of the language skills and labor market performance of the agency involved in the public signs. The literature review focuses on the theories and methodologies more commonly used in previous LL research and language skills as an attribute of employees in previous studies of the EL. The definitions are synthesized to incorporate the connection among them. A mixed-method research approach is used to examine the LL and the EL in the target areas, consisting of qualitative and quantitative research approaches. U.S. Census data, historical documents, language policies, and laws and regulations regarding sign and education policies, direct observations, and units of analysis are examined. The database consists of 520 units of analysis, 260 from each site, obtained from the photographs taken in the two sites selected. The results suggest that: (1) the languages used on public signage in the LL of the two survey areas are primarily monolingual English, with a slight presence of signs in Spanish, and a much lower representation of the combination of those two languages and other Indo-European languages; (2) the strong symbolic function of the signs corresponds to the identities of the communities; (3) the relationship between the LL of the areas selected for the two case studies and their EL is that in the area of West Tampa, the linguistic attributes of the employees of several stores observed may have an impact on the earnings of those employees or the probabilities of employability. Therefore, the hypotheses initially presented are feasible.
DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my father, whom I lost on the way.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Landscape</td>
<td>LL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Economics of Language</td>
<td>EL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spolsky and Cooper’s linguistic landscape approach</td>
<td>SC’s LL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1</td>
<td>(H₁)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2</td>
<td>(H₂)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3</td>
<td>(H₃)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4</td>
<td>(H₄)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First or native language</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second or subsequent language</td>
<td>L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional language in a public space</td>
<td>RL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language policy and planning</td>
<td>LPP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION TO THE LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE – ECONOMICS

INTRODUCTION

This interdisciplinary Ph.D. dissertation consists of six chapters on the following subjects: (a) the ‘linguistic landscape’ (henceforth LL), (b) the ‘economics of language’ (henceforth EL), and (c) the study of the relationship between the LL and the EL in the areas selected as the objects of study for this work.

Florian Coulmas defines the LL as “the study of writing on display in the public sphere” (“Linguistic Landscaping and the Seed of the Public Sphere” 19). Coulmas added that “LL is a cultural scene, formed by interested agents whose motivations and intentions pertaining to information contents, language choice and symbolic significance, to the extent they can be inferred, must be reckoned with in the analysis” (“Linguistic Landscaping and the Seed of the Public Sphere” 23). Durk Gorter considers that the LL can be used as a tool to understand languages as they are presented in public spaces (“Methods and Techniques for Linguistic Landscape Research: About Definitions, Core Issues and Technological Innovations” 41). Bernard Spolsky “contextualized the LL into the sociolinguistics and language policy subfields: the study of public multilingual signage is developing into [a] sub-field of sociolinguistics and of language policy” (“Prolegomena to a Sociolinguistic Theory of Public Signage” 25).

The LL has been studied from broad and distinct perspectives around the world (e.g., English usage, the spread of the English language, identity, and multilingualism, among others).
My work explores the LL of two Tampa, Florida, neighborhoods and also examines the LL through the EL prism, which analyzes the impact of the linguistic variables on the economic variables and vice versa (Grin, “English as Economic Value” 68).

The EL field utilizes economics tools to examine the relationship of linguistic variables based on theoretical economic patterns (Cenoz & Gorter, “Language Economy and Linguistic Landscape” 59). The study of the relationship between language and economics is an emerging area of inquiry (Grin et al., The Economics of the Multilingual Workplace 55). The EL field in relation to the LL has previously been studied as, for example, when Edelman and Gorter discussed the relationship between the LL and the market in some parts of five shopping districts in Amsterdam (The Netherlands). Another example is the study by Cenoz and Gorter, who investigate the LL from the perspective of the linguistic diversity of the landscape (“Language Economy and Linguistic Landscape” 63). My work analyzes the language used in public signs in two specific areas in the southern United States (U.S.) and evaluates the language skills and labor market performance of the agency involved in creating and designing the public signs.

The two areas that were selected for the two case studies are as follows: (a) Ybor City, FL, and (b) West Tampa, FL (currently called “Old West Tampa”). Both research areas are located in the City of Tampa, in Hillsborough County, in the state of Florida, in the southern U.S.

The two areas selected for this study meet the characteristics required for this project due to the level of multilingualism present and their historic and demographic characteristics (U.S. Census

---

1 A few more examples of the LL in relationship with EL studies are described in the literature review in Chapter II.

2 Agency in public signage: According to (Spolsky, “Prolegomena to a Sociolinguistic Theory of Public Signage” 30–31) a sign is the result of a process in which some participants are involved, such as the sign-owner, the sign-maker, the reader, and the language management authority (local or national) who establish the policies for language choices.
Bureau, *Hillsborough County, Florida*). Some of the common characteristics of the two areas will subsequently be explained in detail. These common characteristics of the target areas are found within the boundaries of Hillsborough County, Florida, U.S., enabling me to apply the same methodologies in each survey area and to compare the outcomes.

My work contributes to the linguistics field as a study of the relationship between the LL and the EL to obtain a better understanding of how multilingualism works in an economic context. The findings of this investigation are also relevant to the broader society, considering that languages play a significant role in the EL. This study also:

1. helps identify the factors that generate the presence or the absence of languages displayed on the public signs in multilingual settings when the languages used on the signs do not correspond with the languages spoken by the population according to the demographic information reflected in the Census;
2. helps identify the factors that motivate makers of the signage to use a specific language instead of other languages;
3. helps identify the value added for their employers by employees' language skills; and
4. is valuable to the business field in general, particularly to the areas of design, marketing, and economic considerations used by business owners when designing their written communication on advertisements and public signs as part of their efforts to increase the profitability of their businesses.

My Ph.D. dissertation consists of six chapters. Chapter I briefly introduces the fields of the LL and the EL and presents the connection between these two fields, focusing on the effects of people's language skills on the labor market of the survey areas selected for the investigation.
In addition, several hypotheses and research questions that underpin this dissertation are presented and displayed in Chapter I. Chapter II and Chapter III are dedicated to an overview of the most relevant literature composing the present work in the fields of the LL and the EL respectively. Chapter IV presents the interdisciplinary framework approach of this work, beginning with the interpretative framework and philosophical assumptions and continuing with the theoretical framework and research designs. Chapter V presents the results and discussion and finally, in Chapter VI, the conclusions are presented.

LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE

Languages on signs in public space had been initially investigated by Y. Masai in 1972, Yehudit Rosenbaum, R.L. Cooper, J.A. Fisman and E. Nadel in 1977; Spolsky and Cooper in 1991 (Spolsky, “Managing Public Linguistic Space” 26) among others, before Rodrigue Landry and Richard Y. Bourhis used the term ‘linguistic landscape’ to describe the study of signs in public spaces. Landry and Bourhis conducted the first study under the name of ‘linguistic landscape’ (LL). Landry and Bourhis demonstrated that the LL is a sociolinguistic factor distinct from other language variables in multilingual settings (42). They state that “the language of public road signs, advertising billboards, street names, place names, commercial shop signs, and public signs on government buildings combine to form the linguistic landscape of a given territory, region, or urban agglomeration” (Landry & Bourhis 25). Another significant point in time in the field of LL occurred when Gorter published the first LL book, which includes a collection of four articles described below (Linguistic Landscape: A New Approach to Multilingualism). After the publication of Gorter’s first LL book, the LL has been an attractive field for many scholars. Finally, an even more crucial point in the establishment of the LL field
was in 2015 when Elana Shohamy and Eliezer Ben-Rafael created the Linguistic Landscape Journal. More recently, LL has been defined by other scholars in the field of LL. For example, Durk Gorter states that “the field of LL attempts to understand the motives, uses, ideologies, language varieties and contestations of multiple forms of languages as they are displayed in public spaces” (Gorter, “Methods and Techniques for Linguistic Landscape Research: About Definitions, Core Issues and Technological Innovations” 42). In other words, the LL can be used as a tool to understand languages as they are presented in public spaces, which consist of every space in a society or community exposed to the public (streets, shops, stores, offices, parks, billboards) (Scollon & Scollon 168). Therefore, LL refers to any written sign found outside of private properties and homes, including road signs, names of streets, shops, and schools. The study of LLs concentrates on analyzing the LL items according to the languages used, syntactic or semantic aspects, and relevance, and according to the actors of those linguistic symbols that shape the public space (Shohamy et al. 2). Some semiotic elements, such as images, photos, soundscape, music, smell escapes, graffiti, clothes, food, buildings, history, and people, are considered under the umbrella of LL by Shohamy and Ben-Rafael. However, Alastair Pennycook states that the LL is not about adding more semiotic elements to the inventory list but that we should look for the relationship of meanings (“Linguistic Landscape and Semiotic Assemblages” 77). He provides the concept of ‘semiotic assemblage’ (Pennycook, “Translanguaging and Semiotic Assemblages”) as a way to see the LL. That is, the ‘semiotic assemblage’ includes interactions among people, artifacts, and space.

---

I look for the [in]visibility and the languages written on the signs in the target areas from the perspective of their informational and symbolic function (Landry & Bourhis 25). Additionally, I analyze the languages found on the public signs from a multimodal semiotic perspective since, for many scholars, such as Gunther Kress, language is considered as one of the many available means for conveying meaning (36). Accordingly, more recent definitions of LL are used to provide a broader perspective of what people can linguistically perceive around themselves when circulating through an outside area of the community. For example, Gorter’s definition also permits the inclusion of some items that in Landry’s and Bourhis’ definition had been excluded, such as mobile elements, for instance planes, cars, buses, and any other type of vehicle used to transport provisional or permanent advertisements and information.

ECONOMICS OF LANGUAGE

Economists have been interested in and investigated the relationship between language and income for a long time (Grin et al., The Economics of the Multilingual Workplace 55). In particular, economists have been interested in the effect of a person’s language skills on that person’s income, that is, on the ‘labor income’ earned due to language skills, which is a central question in the field of EL (Grin et al., The Economics of the Multilingual Workplace 55). The empirical work in that area is extensive. François Vaillancourt was a pioneer in integrating the EL as a field of research, especially in Québec, Canada, and in the U.S., as a result of Vaillancourt's model developed in 1980 (Vaillancourt, Differences in Earnings by Language Group in Québec, 1970. An Economic Analysis. Québec- Centre International de Recherche Sur Le Bilinguisme, No. B-90. 152).

Another relevant scholar in the EL field is François Grin, who has extensively worked on
the EL. Particularly significant in Grin's work are his studies reported in 1996 and 1999 (Grin, “English as Economic Value” 68). Grin defines the EL as “the economics of language, as a field of research, [and] mainly focuses on the theoretical and empirical analysis of the ways in which linguistic and economic variables influence one another, usually within the framework of orthodox (or 'Neo-classical') economics” (Grin, “English as Economic Value” 68). The EL is based on patterns of mainstream theoretical economics that utilize economic tools to examine the relationship of linguistic variables (Cenoz & Gorter, “Language Economy and Linguistic Landscape” 59). However, the problem is that, while the value of language skills is recognized, the possible wage premiums for language skills are harder to measure. While it can be shown that people with language skills earn more, it is more challenging to show that those higher earnings are due to language skills rather than other factors, such as more education (Grin et al., The Economics of the Multilingual Workplace 55).

The current economy of language research trends includes (1) language and labor income, (2) language dynamics, (3) language and economic activity, (4) the economics of language policy (Grin, quoted in Cenoz & Gorter 59) and (5) environmental economics (Cenoz & Gorter, “Language Economy and Linguistic Landscape” 59). Among the above five trends in EL, this study is focused on number (1): the relationship between language and labor income. According to Grin et al., in 1980 Vaillancourt and Pes conducted the first study on the impact of the level of foreign language skills on earnings and concluded that language skills generate value because they are used, and this makes the level of language competence relevant (The Economics of the Multilingual Workplace).

Note: In the EL field, many local minority languages are considered a “foreign language.” Foreign language skills are seen in most countries as a cultural asset often related to above-average education (Grin et al., The Economics of the Multilingual Workplace 55). For example, for many jobs in Europe, language skills are required for candidates to be considered for the positions.
of the Multilingual Workplace 55). This investigation provided a new perspective on the economic value of language skills (see Chapter III for the EL’s literature review).

SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS STUDY

Considering that decisions as to how languages are used on public signs play a significant role in the economics of language, the findings of my investigation will be relevant to society for several reasons, which are synthesized in Figure 1 and described below.

1. Hypothesis 1 (Figure 1): If Hypotheses 2, Hypothesis 3, and Hypothesis 4 are shown to be valid, then some of the benefits provided by the relationship between the LL and the EL could be the following: (a) attracting industry and tourism and becoming a more diverse and global community; (b) improving the profitability of the businesses in the LL; and (c) increasing the earnings of employees in the businesses operating in the LL.

Figure 1: Hypothesis 1. Benefits of the relationship between LL and EL
2. **Hypothesis 2 (Figure 2):** If the factors that generate more or less use of the languages displayed on public signs in multilingual settings can be identified, then administrators and policymakers can adjust language planning policies to use those factors in the design of language policies. These policies may attract industry and tourism and lead to the area that the administrators and policymakers manage becoming a more diverse and global community.

![Figure 2: Hypothesis 2. Languages displayed on public signs](image)

3. **Hypothesis 3 (Figure 3):** If the factors that motivate makers of signage to use a specific language instead of other languages can be identified, then owners and entrepreneurs can improve the profitability of their enterprises by developing measures that mitigate the factors that may cause them to lose certain economic advantages, such as by providing language education to
their employees, by employing more multilingual employees, and by providing signage written in several languages to their clients.

Figure 3: Hypothesis 3. Use of a specific language

4. Hypothesis 4 (Figure 4): If identifying the ‘value-added’ by employees’ language skills is possible, then employees can use that information to increase the market value of their language skills and increase their earnings in the labor market. This study will help identify (a) the factors that generate more or less use of the languages displayed on the public signs in multilingual settings when the languages used do not represent the languages that the majority of the population speaks; (b) the factors (e.g., employees’ lack of language skills, readers’/clients’ language skills) that motivate makers of the signage to use a specific language instead of other
languages; (c) the ‘value added’ by employees’ language skills for those employees who are involved in designing, creating, and placing the signs in their workplaces, which in turn may help employees realize an increase in the market value of their language skills, thereby increasing their earnings in the labor market (Figure 4).

In addition, this work may provide guidance to the policy makers who formulate language planning policies and practices for the target areas as a part of their efforts to attract industry and tourism and become a more diverse and global community (Figure 2). Furthermore, my study can also inform owners/entrepreneurs, wishing to improve the profitability of their enterprises, by developing measures (e.g., providing language education to their employees, recruiting multilingual employees, and providing signage written in several languages to clients) that mitigate the factors that may cause them to lose certain economic advantages (Figure 3). Finally, for researchers in the linguistics field, this study can contribute as a pioneer work that introduces an analysis of the LL from the perspective of EL.

Figure 4: Hypothesis 4. Value-added by employees' language skills
RESEARCH GAPS IN THE LITERATURE

Scholars have taken some relevant steps in their attempts to unify theories, methodologies, and strategies that can provide a more precise way to conduct rigorous research in the LL field. For example, scholars are developing new and more focused definitions of LL, including how to identify a ‘unit of analysis,’ among others. However, despite the fact that prolific literature covering more than 40 years of LL studies worldwide has been published, including the numerous academic articles regarding LL published recently, several gaps remain. These include the need for systematic methods of collecting and classifying data, criteria for selecting the specific and appropriate areas in a city to study, the choice of the appropriate range of the number of units of study and, finally, the necessity of using customized software and other technologies for conducting LL studies, among others.

As for the EL field, (Grin et al., *The Economics of the Multilingual Workplace* 55) show that having adequate foreign language skills (as opposed to none or only basic skills) is rewarded well in the labor market. They claim that many studies have approached this issue from the field of labor economics rather than language economics. These studies are concerned with what goes on in the labor market (Grin & Sfreddo 520; Rivera-Batiz 165), including the determination of wages (Vaillancourt, “Chapter 9. Language and Poverty” 147; Vaillancourt, *Differences in Earnings by Language Group in Québec, 1970. An Economic Analysis. Québec- Centre International de Recherche Sur Le Bilinguisme, No. B-90. 1*), rather than with assessing the economic value of language. Based on these studies, it is not surprising that English language skills are profitable for people who want to work in the U.S. However, according to the scholars mentioned above, the value of immigrants’ skills in their native language has not been
extensively researched. No firm conclusions about the value of immigrant languages on the labor market can be drawn at this time.

Some other questions remain in the EL field as well. For example, Grin ("English as Economic Value" 68) states that the connection of more effective communication and variables that could indicate economic performance, such as productivity and profit, among others, have not yet been made. According to Grin ("English as Economic Value" 76), understanding how variables affect each other (language and economy) is the first step toward accounting for the relationship between language and economy, and that EL needs a model which specifies the causal links among the variables.

**RESEARCH OBJECTIVES**

The primary objective of my dissertation is to better understand multilingualism in the southern U.S. by using the LL as a tool to analyze the selected research sites. Additionally, this investigation studies and analyzes the connection between the LL and the EL; that is, the effect of language skills with any type of economic outcome. At the present time, there is no widely accepted and established way of measuring the value of a person’s language skills, particularly with reference to the impact of those language skills on the LL.

This study provides a contribution to both the LL and the EL fields by assessing the correlation between them. By conducting a multisite case study in multilingual settings in the southern United States, this investigation:

(a) examines the local status of the relevant languages in an attempt to identify the factors that generate the use of the languages displayed on the public signs in multilingual settings;
(b) analyzes the LL of the two selected survey areas in an attempt to identify the factors that motivate makers of the signage to use one specific language instead of other languages on their signs; and
(c) investigates the possible correlation between the LL and the EL in an attempt to identify the ‘value added’ by employees’ language skills for employers.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

To accomplish the objectives listed above for this study, three research questions have been developed:

RQ1: What languages other than English are used in writing on the public signs in the LL of the two survey areas?

RQ2: How are the languages on the public signs displayed? Are they primarily monolingual, multilingual, or translingual?

RQ3: What is the relationship between the LL of the areas selected for the two case studies and their EL?

To respond to the three research questions, I have conducted a mixed-method research process (Costa et al. 107), which includes: (a) a multisite case study of qualitative research; and (b) the general quantitative research approach of LL. The data collected in the multisite study was gathered, as described in Chapter IV, by means of observations, interviews, a review of artifacts and archival records, a review of the official sign policies of the county and cities that are the object of this study (Hillsborough County, Florida), and the analysis of photographs of the public signs found in the target survey areas.
The mixed-method research approach taken is combined with the use of Spolsky and Cooper’s taxonomies and with Spolsky’s competence model. First, in order to respond to RQ1, Spolsky and Cooper’s taxonomies are employed to classify public signs based on: (1) the function and use of the signs; (2) the languages used on the signs; and (3) the sign owner and the potential reader. Additionally, Spolsky’s theoretical model is applied to analyze the choice of the language used on signs in the areas that are the object of this study.

The multisite case study qualitative research is used to answer RQ2 and RQ3. Before discussing in Chapter V the approaches taken to address the research questions outlined here, a review of the literature is offered in Chapter II and Chapter III. Results and discussion are then presented in Chapter V, and conclusions are provided in Chapter VI.
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW OF THE LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE

Be open to discover the landscapes as their signs are shown ... or not. 
Marta Galindo

INTRODUCTION

The primary purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the concepts and goals of previous linguistic landscape (LL) studies. Some of the most relevant studies of the LL that concern this work are the theories and methodologies of LL. The literature review is completed in Chapter III, which includes (a) the theories and methodologies of the economics of language (EL) field and (b) a review of the combined LL and EL studies.

Chapter II and Chapter III are intended to discuss the major studies in the fields that are involved in my work. In the course of examining the history of these fields, this chapter also, where appropriate, mentions the criticisms found in the literature about the previous studies and methodologies used by the authors of such studies, with the goal of clarifying the methodologies that worked in previous studies and eliminating those methodologies that are found in the literature to be less successful. By discussing the literature in this way, the chapters are intended to provide guidance as to the relationship among the theories and methodologies that I have chosen for this study and the methodologies used by authors of the literature to support their claims.

Many researchers have been studying the LL worldwide from different perspectives since Landry and Bourhis published their study in 1997, Gorter (Linguistic Landscape: A New Approach to Multilingualism) published the first LL book in 2006, and Shohamy and Ben-
Rafael founded the *Linguistic Landscape Journal* in 2015. The literature of the relatively recent field of LL is extensive and consequently, only some of the theories and methodologies discussed in the LL literature that are most relevant to the purpose and goal of this study are explained herein.

Landry and Bourhis state that the LL refers to the degree of visibility of languages on commercial and public signs in a particular neighborhood, street, or area (25). Using the framework of the ethnolinguistic vitality\(^5\) theory, Landry and Bourhis proposed several hypotheses supported by the results of their empirical study showing that the LL emerged as an independent factor of language revitalization relative to the other factors present, which other factors included life experiences that involve linguistic contact between the L1 and L2 communities. They also state that the public signs in the LL have two main functions, the informational and the symbolic functions (Landry & Bourhis 25), which were previously identified by A.F. Verdoordt and J.C. Corbeil (Spolsky, “Prolegomena to a Sociolinguistic Theory of Public Signage” 28).

Following the landmark study by Landry and Bourhis, Gorter published a volume in 2006, that includes several articles related to the LL in different societies (*Linguistic Landscape: A New Approach to Multilingualism* 2).

These articles consist of the following works:

1) Eliezer Ben-Rafael, Muhammad Hasan Amara, Elana Shohamy, and Nira Trumper-Hecht, who compare the LL patterns in several cities and towns in Israel and East

\(^5\) Ethnolinguistic vitality refers to “a group's ability to maintain and protect its existence in time as a collective entity with a distinctive identity and language. It involves continuing intergenerational transmission of the group’s language and cultural practices, sustainable demography and active social institutions, social cohesion, and emotional attachment to its collective identity”(Ehala).
Jerusalem. Their study concentrates on the degree of visibility on private and public signs of the three major languages: Hebrew, Arabic, and English (7).

These patterns are: Hebrew/English (in Jewish communities), Arabic/Hebrew (in Israeli-Palestinian communities), and Arabic/English (in East Jerusalem). In addition, Ben Rafael et al. examine the relevant role that English played in the LL, in addition to the languages of other immigrant groups, such as Russian. Their findings show that the LL is not a reflection of the distinct groups, but the result of the negotiation process between the different groups in which Hebrew was the dominant language.

2) Thom Huebner explores language mixing and language dominance in fifteen different neighborhoods in Bangkok, Thailand (“Bangkok’s Linguistic Landscapes: Environmental Print, Codemixing and Language Change” 31). This study demonstrates the influence of English as a global language on the Thai language, such as lexical borrowing, orthography, pronunciation, and syntax. This study is an example of the use of English in a playful way.

3) Peter Backhaus studies the official and nonofficial multilingual differences on signs in Tokyo (Japan), under the lens of power and solidarity (“Multilingualism in Tokyo: A Look into the Linguistic Landscape” 52). The findings suggest two types of multilingualism to observe: the link to the power of the official signs (English, Chinese, and Korean) and the relationship to the solidarity of nonofficial signs (foreign languages).

3) Jasone Cenoz and Durk Gorter analyze minority languages, the state language, and English as an international language, by comparing the linguistic landscapes in Friesland and the Basque Country (“Linguistic Landscape and Minority Languages” 67). The study suggests that the LL has both informative and symbolic functions. The informative function refers to the language used in the communications of businesses, shops, etc. and the power of the different languages.
The symbolic function is related to the social identity of ethnolinguistic groups.

4) In the last chapter of Gorter’s volume, he discusses further possibilities for LL investigations, such as the development of technology in the investigations and the use of multidisciplinary approaches to better understand the linguistic landscape (Gorter, *Linguistic Landscape: A New Approach to Multilingualism* 86).

I mention the articles included in Gorter’s volume in the introduction of this chapter because the articles provide an example of the types of studies that have been undertaken by scholars in the field of the LL. By reviewing these different studies, from different authors, and by exploring the main currents of investigation in the field of LL, they provide an excellent introduction, in one volume, to a field of study that is expanding rapidly and opening exciting new channels of investigation.

THE THEORIES AND METHODOLOGIES

Linguistic landscape (LL) refers “to any display of visible written language. The signs are part of the textual decor that surrounds us every day, as we walk, ride, or drive through urban environments” (Gorter, “Linguistic Landscapes in a Multilingual World” 190). The main focus of LL studies is the use of language in its written form in the public space, being more relevant to a multilingual environment and in areas where the contact of languages occurs rather than in monolingual contexts (Gorter, “Linguistic Landscapes in a Multilingual World” 191). According to Gorter, LL involves a multitude of disciplines (e.g., sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, education, history, semiotics, and urban geography, among others) and perspectives (e.g., language policies) (“Linguistic Landscapes in a Multilingual World” 192). Moreover, he claims that LL studies provide critical additional tools to investigate new data sources and
theoretical ideas (Gorter, “Linguistic Landscapes in a Multilingual World” 190). According to Shohamy and Gorter, some of the approaches and theoretical perspectives of the study of LL are presented in the following sections which discuss: (1) the historical perspective theory, (2) the sociological approach theory, (3) the sociolinguistics perspective, (4) the theoretical approach of the ecology of language and the geosemiotics theory, (5) the theory of language choice, (6) the theory of linguistic diversity and the economy of language, (7) the theory of multimodal, (8) translanguaging (Shohamy & Gorter 5) and (8) the model of multilingual inequality in public spaces (Gorter, “Multilingualism Inequality in Public Spaces: Towards an Inclusive Model of Linguistic Landscape” 16).

1. A historical perspective theory

Florian Coulmas shows that “linguistic landscaping is as old as writing” (13). A historical perspective refers to the LL study concentrated on those historic items found in the LL. This type of LL investigation has to be made from a different approach since those remaining items or the surviving inscriptions from the past are the only signs or units of analysis being studied (15). After inspecting several surviving landmarks and inscriptions, such as the Rosetta Stone and the Taj Mahal, among others, he states that some inscriptions can be read by scholars who are knowledgeable in Classic Arabic such as in 17th Century Masjid-I Shah (21). He concludes that LL studies should consider the issues of the readers since landmarks include messages in the languages inscribed on the landmarks.

2. A sociological approach theory

A sociological approach theory based on Habernas’ 1989 and Delanty’s 2007 concept of the public sphere (Ben-Rafael 40; Coulmas, “Linguistic Landscaping and the Seed of the Public Sphere” 13).
According to Suzie Wong Scollon and Ron Scollon, spaces are built through interaction with others using the ‘same’ space (54). Public space consists of every space in a society or community exposed to the public (streets, shops, stores, offices, parks, billboards). LL refers to any written sign found outside the private properties and homes. That includes road signs, names of streets, shops, and schools. The study of LLs concentrates on analyzing the LL items according to the languages used, syntactic or semantic aspects and relevance, and according to the actors of those linguistic symbols that shape the public space. The ‘public sphere’ term should be understood as referring to an urbanized society. Since studies of the LL are usually concentrated on urban environments, some LL scholars prefer to use the term ‘linguistic cityscape’ instead of LL (Coulmas, “Linguistic Landscaping and the Seed of the Public Sphere” 14; Spolsky, “Prolegomena to a Sociolinguistic Theory of Public Signage” 25).

3. A sociolinguistics perspective

A sociolinguistics perspective based on Dell Hymes’ ethnography of communication and the SPEAKING mnemonic (Huebner, “A Framework for the Linguistic Analysis of Linguistic Landscapes” 70). Hueber contextualizes LL within the theories of sociolinguistics. Based on Hymes’ theory, SPEAKING—setting or scene, participants, goals, act sequences, key, instrumentalities norms, and genre—the author presents a tentative framework for LL linguistic analysis based on Hymes’ ethnography of communication and the SPEAKING mnemonic. The acronym, SPEAKING$^6$, is used to identify the various facets of the speech event.

$^6$ This acronym stands for: (S)etting, including time, place, physical aspects of the place. (P)articipant identity, including personal characteristics, including sex, age, relationship with each other, and social status. (E)nds, which means the purpose of the event and the goals of the participants. (A)ct, which means how speech acts are organized within the speech event and the
4. The ecology of language

The theoretical approach of the ecology of language\textsuperscript{7}, where the LL analysis and a nexus analysis can be used to serve ecological research about multilingualism (Hult, “Language Ecology and Linguistic Landscape Analysis” 88; Scollon and Scollon 19), nexus analysis refers to the junction of time and space of three elements of discourse: the discourses in place (e.g., a conversation, a meeting), the historical body (people’s experience), and the interaction order (relationship between historical space and the historical body) (Scollon and Scollon 19).

In 2003, Scollon and Scollon developed the geosemiotics theory, which analyzes public signs taking into account that the location in which public signs are placed has a social and cultural context. The term ‘geosemiotics’ refers to “the study of social meaning of the material placement of signs and discourses and of our actions in the material world” (Scollon & Scollon 2), in which the meaning of the sign is considered as any object that refers to something other than itself.

5. The theory of language choice\textsuperscript{8}

In his book, “Managing Public Linguistic Space,” Spolsky discusses a specific theory of language management, provides a model and explains how complex language management is.

\textsuperscript{7} The Ecology of language is defined as “the study of interactions between any given language and its environment” (Haugen 19).

Spolsky also reviews the language managers and management agencies and discusses language activists, international organizations, and human rights. He states that “language policy is all about choices” (Spolsky, “Managing Public Linguistic Space” 1). He believes that a bilingual person has to choose which language to use (even if one is monolingual, they will have to choose what dialect or style to use). Therefore, some of those selections are the result of management. Spolsky states that the public linguistic space refers to the language policy of developed urban zones that are not private or institutional (the city streets and squares, roads, parks, railways, bus stations, and stops). Public linguistic space involves written items such as public signs, books, newspapers, and magazines. It also includes spoken materials such as radio, television, announcements, or the Internet and computers. Each of those materials follows the same pattern in terms of participants involved in the public linguistic space.

That is, the owners of the signs, the producers, the general public, the authority (government local or federal), and, usually, the owners of the space where the signs are posted. The effect of globalization may add new participants; for example, Coca-Cola advertisements are spread worldwide on radio stations, Facebook, YouTube, etc. Spolsky reviews the early studies of public signage.

Although Spolsky prefers to name this field as linguistic ‘cityspace,’ it was labeled ‘linguistic landscape’ as the work of Landry and Bourhis 1997 was translated from French, and that term was subsequently used by Ben-Rafael et al. 2006. Previously, Fishman et al. 1977 and Rosenbaum et al. 1977 investigated the spread of English in Jerusalem. They counted the actual signs thus establishing an approach to a study of the sociolinguistic ecology of cities, which is the main method that LL studies have been using, such as the studies of Jerusalem (Fishman et al.; Spolsky & Cooper).
In Jerusalem, in 1983 and 1991, Spolsky and Cooper conducted a research project and wrote about the signs found in the Old City of Jerusalem, stating that “the language choice of the sign writer appeared to be determined by the expected literacy of potential customers” (Spolsky & Cooper 2). They did not use the common terminology from more recent studies of the LL, but their investigation was, in fact, a study of the LL. Spolsky and Cooper explain what the LL field means, review the history of the methodology, and propose a theory that had not been developed previously (“Prolegomena to a Sociolinguistic Theory of Public Signage” 25). They state that the study of public multilingual signage is evolving into the sociolinguistics and language policy subfields and point out the lack of a consensus for a theory or methodology as to how to collect and classify data and what data should be selected. The lack of a standard methodology can affect the results of a study differently. They also discuss the three main methodological problems that they find in this field: a) the state of literacy; b) the agency in public signage; and c) counting signs.

Spolsky proposed a theory of language choice in public signage: the ‘preference model’ (also called the ‘competence model’), which defines what performance success should look like within an organization for each individual job (“Prolegomena to a Sociolinguistic Theory of Public Signage” 25). First, this preference model proposed by Spolsky includes three rules or conditions (Conditions for Second Language Learning. Introduction to a General Theory 223):

Rule 1: “write signs in a language you know” (Spolsky, Conditions for Second Language Learning. Introduction to a General Theory 223). This rule is based on the necessary and graded condition for those who write the signs. Based on the condition of the writer, this rule can explain why a sign is written in a specific language. Thus, the language used to write on the sign
might not reflect the language that is used by the population in the setting that is being studied, but rather the language that the writer of the sign knows.

Rule 2: “presumed reader” (Spolsky, *Conditions for Second Language Learning. Introduction to a General Theory* 235). This rule means that the sign is written in the language that the potential reader is, in fact, able to read. This rule involves an economic motivation (Spolsky & Cooper 100).

Rule 3: “symbolic value” (Spolsky, *Conditions for Second Language Learning. Introduction to a General Theory* 235). This rule implies that writers prefer to write the signs in the language with which they want to be identified by others.

Second, Spolsky and Cooper’s taxonomy (1), which referred to the content and function of public signage, serves to classify public signs based on: (1) the function and use of the signs; (2) the languages used on the signs; and (3) the sign owner and the potential reader.

The classification clusters in Spolsky and Cooper’s taxonomy are (Spolsky & Cooper 80):

1) street signs
2) advertising signs
3) warning notices and prohibitions
4) building names
5) informative signs
6) commemorative plaques
7) labels on objects
8) graffiti

Spolsky observes that the informational and symbolic functions of the public signage have a relationship with the taxonomy as follows: warning notices and prohibitions (Cluster 3)
and informative signs (Cluster 5), are associated with the informational function of the signs, while building names (Cluster 4), and commemorative plaques (Cluster 6) are associated with the symbolic function of the signs (“Prolegomena to a Sociolinguistic Theory of Public Signage” 34) (see Table 1).

Other taxonomies proposed by Spolsky and Cooper (81) include:

1) Taxonomy 2: a classification based on sign materials or sign shapes
2) Taxonomy 3: a classification based on the languages used on the signs
3) Taxonomy 4: the presumed owner’s language on the signs
4) Taxonomy 5: the probable reader’s language on the signs

Table 1: Representation of the relationship between rules and taxonomy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rules</th>
<th>Clusters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>informational function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 2 (presumed reader)</td>
<td>informational function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 3 (symbolic value)</td>
<td>informational function</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table is based on Spolsky’s theoretical preference model (Spolsky, “Prolegomena to a Sociolinguistic Theory of Public Signage” 10).

Spolsky completes his theory with a theory on advertising signs. He categorizes advertising into the communicative function and divides those advertising signs by those developed by firms and by those influenced or governed by national policies. In studying the
effect of advertising on the LL, Spolsky applies a similar model for language policy. He emphasized that the choice of language for advertising is a relevant model of language management. He considers that the second condition, ‘choose the language of your presumed or desired reader,’ is the most important to advertising (although the third condition, that is, the symbolic condition, could also be the most important). He states that one of the advantages of Ray Jackendoff and Samuel Jay Keyser’s conditions model is that all three rules can be applied to a single sign resulting in stronger or weaker interpretation. Then, he classifies the advertisements into two clusters.

One cluster refers to those advertisements that are managed by the company, and the other cluster includes those advertisements that are influenced by national policies and laws. Spolsky explains that Grin (“The Bilingual Advertising Decision”) proposed a model to predict advertising choices in a multilingual society and to study the communicative function of advertisement. This model shows the relationship of sales to different language groups as the function of advertising in each prognosis, the language attitudes, incomes, and an advertising response feature. A monolingual business environment can generate indifference to the language, and great resistance among minority groups to the dominant language can increase the profitability of bilingual advertising. Many studies related to multilingual advertisements seek to find the symbolic function of using the language in an advertisement. Many other studies have investigated the spread of English into advertisements worldwide. Spolsky discusses the public signs in a theory of language management and also discusses the visual space for private use (newspapers and magazines, books), from sign to sound (sound on the

---

9 See Chapter III for more details about Grin’s model.
streets, radio, and television). He broadly discusses these topics from a political and power perspective.

6. The theory of linguistic diversity and the economy of language in connection with the LL and commodification

Cenoz and Gorter in “Language Economy and Linguistic Landscape” 55; Nunes et al. 28; and Aiestaran et al. conducted their studies of the LL from an economic perspective. Cenoz and Gorter sought the relationship between the LL and the market in the Netherlands, where Dutch is the official language. Their chapter focuses on the non-market value of LL, in which Cenoz and Gorter attempted to adopt an economic model for the study of LL, focusing on the linguistic diversity of the landscape without drawing conclusions beyond some definitions and some directions for future explorations. Nunes et al. investigate the influence that the LL may have on selecting the language used through an econometric analysis of the LL in shopping streets in San Sebastián, in the Basque Country of Spain, and in Ljouwer, the Netherlands. The results corroborate the findings of previous studies showing that multilingualism and language choice are both individual and social preferences; and that the structure of people’s language preferences is prior to the design of appropriate language and social policies. Finally, other studies are concentrated on commodification (Heller; Bourdieu; Coulmas, *Language and Economy*), that is languages have a market value or “value of a language” (Coulmas, *Language and Economy* 88).

7. The theory of Multimodal Discourse Analysis

The theory of Multimodal Discourse Analysis (MMDA), or DA from the semiotics perspective, refers to the theory that the text is a multimodal semiotic entity that includes gesture,

---

10 These theories are explained in detail in Chapter III.
speech, image, writing, and music (Kress, “Multimodal Discourse Analysis” 35). Discourse requires semiotic categories to provide the whole meaning in social situations since discourse itself is not sufficient. Kress considers that language (text or talk) is one means for making meaning, but a multimodal approach assumes that language is only one of the many available means for conveying meaning. The purpose of MMDA is therefore to produce instruments that can determine the meaning of the text as a complete and coherent semiotic entity in social interactions. Multimodality and social semiotics enable the researchers to ask questions about meaning such as the agency of meaning-makers, the identity in signs and making meaning, the limitations they encounter in making meaning, about social semiotics, and knowledge, how knowledge is produced and shaped, and by whom. It also includes questions about the potential affordances and how knowledge appears differently in different modes (Kress, “Multimodal Discourse Analysis” 38). The multimodality theory has been applied in many LL studies (Jaworski & Thurlow 2; Backhaus, “Multilingualism in Tokyo: A Look into the Linguistic Landscape” 6; Malinowski 107; Shohamy & Waksman 313).

8. Translanguaging

The theories of the LL studies that are most relevant to my work have been presented above in sections 1-7. However, other important concepts, such as the sociolinguistics of superdiversity and ethnography in the LL (see Pennycook 75) and translanguaging (Gorter & Cenoz, “Translanguaging and Linguistic Landscapes” 54; Cenoz & Gorter, “Minority Languages and Sustainable Translanguaging: Threat or Opportunity?”) are also considered for this study.

Gorter and Cenoz discuss the concept of ‘translanguaging’ in relation to a holistic view of the LL that is based on the analysis of individual signs (Gorter & Cenoz, “Translanguaging and Linguistic Landscapes” 56). Translanguaging is a concept that has recently gained wide
acceptance in applied linguistics. The theory holds that communication transcends individual languages and goes beyond words, and involves diverse semiotic resources (Gorter & Cenoz, “Translanguaging and Linguistic Landscapes” 56). They want to demonstrate the dynamics and the complexity of multilingualism in a community where translanguaging between the minority Basque language and the majority Spanish language is routine for bilinguals. However, in the area studied by Gorter and Cenoz, English as the global language also has a presence, and several other languages are seen and spoken to a larger or smaller degree.

In connection with the analysis of multilingual signage based on fieldwork in the United Kingdom, Guy Cook distinguishes the ‘atmospheric’ and ‘community’ multilingualism of signs (25). Community multilingualism is made up of signs that serve practical, informative purposes in different languages and atmospheric multilingual signs, such as signs that use Chinese characters, are designed to locate, attract, and inform, but there is no expectation that readers can understand languages other than English. Cenoz and Gorter expand the study of multilingualism in school settings to the study of the linguistic landscape using translanguaging in three dimensions: multilingual units, multilingual and multimodal repertoires, and social contexts (Cenoz & Gorter, “Minority Languages and Sustainable Translanguaging: Threat or Opportunity?” 64). Gorter and Cenoz analyze signs by looking at code-switching, the fonts used, colors used, and the languages used. Gorter and Cenoz believe that it is time to take a more dynamic approach to the analysis of linguistic landscapes that links multilingualism in the LL to the communication practices among multilinguals. Therefore, considering translanguaging in the signs is a promising way to study linguistic landscapes.
Gorter has developed a model from language policy called Multilingual Inequality in Public Spaces (MIPS) whose purpose is to explain linguistic and social inequalities on signs. He proposes to use his model for future LL investigations. The model addresses (a) language policy processes, (2) sign-making processes, (3) unequal languages on signage in urban space, (4) what people see and read, and (5) what people think and do. Gorter states that his MIPS model helps to think about multilingualism in the public space and empowers people to revitalize or promote the use of minority language (Gorter, “Multilingualism Inequality in Public Spaces: Towards an Inclusive Model of Linguistic Landscape” 24-25).

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

The main methodological approaches used in most previous LL studies include broad methods used in sociolinguistics and applied linguistics (Gorter, “Linguistic Landscapes in a Multilingual World” 198). The major methodological issues encountered in these studies are discussed in the following sections.

1. Lack of specific LL theories

The first problem found is the lack of theories in the LL field (Spolsky, “Linguistic Landscape”; Spolsky, “Prolegomena to a Sociolinguistic Theory of Public Signage”; Shohamy & Gorter; Franco-Rodríguez, “El Español En El Condado de Miami-Dade Desde Su Paisaje Lingüístico” 1; Backhaus, “Linguistic Landscapes: A Comparative Study of Urban
Spolsky explains what the LL field is, reviews the history of the methodology, and develops a theory that had not been developed previously. Spolsky states that the study of public multilingual signage is evolving to the sociolinguistics and language policy subfields. He indicates that there is no clear consensus for a theory or methodology as to how to collect and classify data and what data should be selected. Thus, the lack of a standard methodology can affect the results of a study differently. He then explains the studies of public signage conducted before Landy and Bourhis (1977) and labeled this type of study as the study of the LL.

Then, Spolsky discusses the three main methodological problems that he finds in the LL field:
(a) the state of literacy; (b) the agency in public signage (how signs are produced? And who produces them?); and (c) counting signs (how to count signs and what signs to count?). Spolsky proposed a theory of language choice in public signage presented above (see section 2.4).

Spolsky criticizes how many other researchers have ignored the sociolinguistic component of the community being studied and contends that there is a lack of effort from scholars to provide a theory of public signage (Spolsky, “Linguistic Landscape”). Moreover, he describes the problems found in this field: the failure to produce evidence of who produces the signs that are the object of study and that public signs are inaccurately presented in their sociolinguistic context, with the studies overlooking the impact of literacy on the language choice for the signs. He emphasizes the lack of semiotic studies of public signage and human production of the cityscape and the landscape. Spolsky concludes by presenting his tentative
theoretical methodology (explained in section 2.5.) and emphasizing the need to seek the answers and theories in the semiotic field, which already possess a theoretical foundation.

In response to Spolsky’s claims, Gorter and Cenoz argue that the semiotic theory proposed by Spolsky has been in the LL field for many years. For example, Scollon and Scollon introduced in 2003 their geosemiotics approach (Gorter & Cenoz, “Theoretical Development of Linguistic Landscape Studies” 19). Additionally, Gorter and Cenoz believe that it may not be likely that only one theory to analyze signs in public spaces exists. The numerous theoretical approaches without a particular one being the dominant approach have to be welcomed and they accept that “the kaleidoscopic nature of the field of LL is not problematic” (Gorter & Cenoz, “Theoretical Development of Linguistic Landscape Studies” 19).

Huebner also discusses some theories and flaws that affect research in the LL field (“A Framework for the Linguistic Analysis of Linguistic Landscapes” 70). Concentrating on the issues of selection, classification, and linguistic analysis of artifacts that researchers find when investigating LLs, Hueber discusses the issue of what is considered a unit of analysis of the LL and points out the arbitrariness used in the codification process when investigating a LL. The author also stated that there is a lack of agreement as to what a sign is and proposes the genre. He also criticizes the concept of the agents and audience, pointing out that the top-down and bottom-up\(^\text{11}\) theory does not capture the notion of agency and the language impact on the LL. He then explains the different purposes of the artifacts found in the LL, such as informing and regulating prohibitions. Huebner states that an investigation of the LL cannot ignore the context of the linguistic forms due to the motivations and reactions of people affected by them.

\(^{11}\) “Top-down and bottom-up” signs refer to those signs that are written by the government and by citizens respectively. (Ben-Rafael et al. 14)
2. Selecting the research areas

The second main issue is the criteria for selecting the research areas to be studied.

According to Gorter, previous works have concentrated on specific urban zones such as

(“Methods and Techniques for Linguistic Landscape Research: About Definitions, Core Issues and Technological Innovations” 42):

1) Shopping streets of a particular city (§2.1)
2) Neighborhoods of a specific city (§2.2)
3) Other studies: The examination of the area around the central mass transportation hub, roads, highways and enclaves, among others (§2.3)

The major LL studies and the geographical and demographical information provided as to how the researchers selected the survey areas are summarized in Table 2, which shows the arbitrariness and lack of standardized criteria used in previous studies to choose survey areas to investigate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Capital/State</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>PI 1000</th>
<th>S 1000</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Rosenbaum et al.</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>* One street</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English, Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Spolsky &amp; Cooper</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>* Marketplace</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English, Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Cenoz &amp; Gorter</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>Ljouwert</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>Friesland</td>
<td>3.36  643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frisian, Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Cenoz &amp; Gorter</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Basque Country</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Sebastián</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish, Basque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Blackwood &amp; Tufi</td>
<td>Italy and France</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Mediterranean coast</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Nice, Monaco</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marcella, Corsica, Sardinia (up to a total of 20)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Franch, Italian, Spanish, Catalan, Castilian, Occitan, Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Franco-Rodriguez</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Andalucía</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Almería</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arabic, Romanian, Bulgarian, Chinese, Russian, Japanese, Italian, English, Portuguese, Catalan, Latin, French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Franco-Rodriguez</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Capital/State</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>PI 1000</td>
<td>SI 1000</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Garvin</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>Three streets - traffic arteries</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Gorter, Aiestaran &amp; Cenoz</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Basque</td>
<td>5 neighborhods</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>S. Sebastián</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Franco-Rodriguez</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>46 cities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>Huebner</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Bangkok</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15 neighborhods</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Bangkok</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>Shohamy</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Tel Aviv</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2 neighborhods</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Tel Aviv and Jaffa</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Ban-Rafael &amp; Ban-Rafael</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>2 neighborhods</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>-French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Flemish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Capital/State</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>P1 1000</td>
<td>S 1000</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Tel Aviv</td>
<td>2 Downtowns and a middle-class environment</td>
<td>-central bus station</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tel Aviv</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-low-middle class religious neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Russian - Hebrew - Italian - Hebrew - French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Arab low and low-middle class neighborhood</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n Backhaus</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>Areas near a train station</td>
<td>28 train stations</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Hult</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Several neighborhoods</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p Laitinen</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Cities across the country</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Helsinki to Oulu</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q Fernandez-Juncal</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Cantabria</td>
<td>Specific non-urban areas</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>20 enclaves</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Information not provided. **SA**: Survey Area. **P1**: Population. **S**: Surface km². **C**: City. **P2**: Population. **L**: Language
2.1. Examples of LL studies focused on one shopping street:

a) Rosenbaum et al. studied the LL of one street in Jerusalem.

b) Spolsky and Cooper studied the LL of the marketplace in Jerusalem.

c) Cenoz and Gorter, following the Rosenbaum et al. study, compared the use of different languages in the LL of one shopping street, in Donostia-San Sebastián in Spain (“Linguistic Landscape and Minority Languages”), and

d) on one similar street in Ljouwert-Leeuwarden in Friesland, The Netherlands.

e) Blackwood and Tufi studied twenty sites (50 meters of streets) in commercial areas in several regions on the Mediterranean Coast.

f) Franco-Rodríguez analyzes the LL of several commercial streets in Almería, Spain. He explains that this city has a port through which many immigrants from Africa enter and that this city had experienced strong economic growth (until 2008) (Franco-Rodríguez, “An Alternative Reading of the Linguistic Landscape: The Case of Almería” 110).

g) Franco-Rodríguez studied the LL of twenty-one streets of Miami-Dade County, Florida, from the vitality perspective (“El Español En El Condado de Miami-Dade Desde Su Paisaje Lingüístico” 3).

h) Garvin conducted “walking tour” interviews of LL signs placed on three main traffic streets or arteries in the city of Memphis, TN (258).

2.2. Examples of LL studies focused on neighborhoods and cities:

i) Aiestaran et al. studied five neighborhoods in Donostia-San Sebastián in Spain.
j) Franco-Rodríguez also conducted a study of the Spanish variates other than standard Spanish in the LL of forty cities in Los Angeles County, California (*El Español En El Condado de Los Ángeles Desde La Señaléctica Comercial y Urbana*).

k) Huebner studied fifteen neighborhoods in Bangkok, Thailand (“Bangkok’s Linguistic Landscapes: Environmental Print, Codemixing and Language Change” 31). The 15 neighborhoods were chosen using no criteria.

l) Shohamy and Gorter evaluated two neighborhoods in Tel Aviv and Jaffa.

m) Ben-Rafael and Ben-Rafael studied the LL of several neighborhoods in Brussels, Berlin, and Tel Aviv (23).

2.3. Other studies examined the area around the main mass transportation hub, roads, highways, and enclaves, among others, for example:

n) Backhaus arbitrarily selected survey areas by choosing twenty-eight stations of the Yamanote Line, the most important train line in Tokyo (“Multilingualism in Tokyo: A Look into the Linguistic Landscape” 52).

o) Hult recorded a video while driving on the Highway through some neighborhoods in San Antonio, Texas ([linguistic landscape - YouTube](https://www.youtube.com/)) (“Drive-Thru Linguistic Landscaping” 507).

p) Laitinen rode his bicycle across 630 kilometers on the road from Helsinki to Oulu, Finland (55).

q) Fernández Juncal studied twenty enclaves in the north of Spain (328).

The numerous research studies listed above illustrate the researchers’ arbitrariness in selecting the survey area for LL investigations. It is clear that there is no established method for selecting the survey area. Depending on what the researchers are investigating, some have
chosen as a survey area the main shopping street of a city or town, while others examined the area around the main mass transportation hub, roads, highways, enclaves, etc. In this regard, Gorter, after summarizing some methods that researchers have used to determine the survey area to investigate, concludes that “it is not always clear how LL researchers chose their survey areas” (“Methods and Techniques for Linguistic Landscape Research: About Definitions, Core Issues and Technological Innovations” 47). To further illustrate his point, Gorter points out that, for example, Backhaus explains in detail the arbitrary decisions he made in his LL study of Tokyo. Blackwood and Tufi state that “seeking to take a representative sample of streets in a given city leaves that data collection exposed to the accusation of arbitrariness or [im]partiality” (14). Blackwood asserts that the selection of a survey area is still problematic and that this is an unsolved issue in the field of LL research “in part because the focus of the debate has shifted, and in part because there is no obvious solution” (Blackwood 41). However, as Gorter claims, researchers may start reporting the criteria used to make their survey area selections more precisely.

3. Unit of analysis

The third issue is related to the types of items or unit of analysis that should be selected in the target area, which has been amply discussed by researchers in LL for years. According to Gorter, the use of Backhaus’ definition of a ‘unit of analysis’ seems to be the trend followed by new researchers (“Linguistic Landscapes in a Multilingual World” 47). Backhaus defines a unit

---

12 Some references to the literature that includes this discussion are as follows: Cenoz and Gorter, “Linguistic Landscape and Minority Languages”; Backhaus, “Linguistic Landscapes: A Comparative Study of Urban Multilingualism in Tokyo”; Ben-Rafael et al.; Blackwood; Shohamy, “Linguistic Landscape after a Decade.”
of analysis as "any piece of the written text within a spatially definable frame" ("Linguistic Landscapes: A Comparative Study of Urban Multilingualism in Tokyo" 66).

Another problem is related to the characteristics of the items selected (Backhaus, “Linguistic Landscapes: A Comparative Study of Urban Multilingualism in Tokyo” 61). Both the item and its characteristics must be very well defined to avoid a certain arbitrariness in the results of the study. Development of a criterion that is accepted by most researchers in the field of LL as to what a unit of analysis consists of would allow studies to be comparable and to be replicated.

Some examples of the standards used in seeking the unification of the unit of analysis are found in Cenoz and Gorter, in Donostia-San Sebastián, Spain, and in (Cenoz & Gorter, “Linguistic Landscape and Minority Languages” 67) in Leeuwarden/Ljouwert in Friesland, the Netherlands. The equal systematic inventory enables them to compare the cities mentioned. However, there is presently no clear consensus in the existing LL studies on the specific characteristics that a unit of analysis should meet in order to be quantified. Many different arguments in this regard can be found in the above literature.

4. Publishing the collected data

The final problem found is “the use of the photograph as data in publications” (Backhaus, “Multilingualism in Tokyo: A Look into the Linguistic Landscape” 61); (Gorter, “Methods and Techniques for Linguistic Landscape Research: About Definitions, Core Issues and Technological Innovations” 43). Gorter states that researchers in this field should take the quality of the photographs more seriously in their publications (“Methods and Techniques for Linguistic Landscape Research: About Definitions, Core Issues and Technological Innovations” 43). The quality of the photographs is essential as they are the primary source of data for the LL
studies. The photos are the data that must be interpreted, analyzed, and will also be the source for presentations and publications. These are the reasons that the researcher, who is usually the person who collects the data, must ensure that they obtain photographs of good quality. Furthermore, the researcher must consider other aspects related to the distance of the object selected to be photographed, the perspective, the framing, and what the investigator intends to capture. On many occasions, the image captured from a sign without including part of its surroundings does not convey the reality of the image in its context.

The lack of specific LL theories, the selection of research areas, the determination of the unit of analysis and its characteristics, the linguistic analysis of the texts, and the publication of the collected data are the fundamental issues found in previous LL studies that have been described above. The quantitative and qualitative research approaches most used in the LL field are described below.

THE QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH APPROACH: PERSPECTIVE, SIGNIFICANCE, AND IMPLICATIONS IN THE LL FIELD

The first studies in LL concerned the representation of languages in public spaces. The data collection is usually made by taking pictures or videos of the units of analysis and using software and technology to complete the quantitative statistical data analysis processes followed by interpretations based on language policy, linguistics, and globalization theories (Shohamy, “Linguistic Landscape after a Decade” 28; Backhaus, “Linguistic Landscapes: A Comparative Study of Urban Multilingualism in Tokyo” 71). Several examples of quantitative approaches in the LL field regarding this work are discussed below.

In one example of the quantitative approaches used in the study of the LL, Aiestaran et al.
collected and updated previous works carried out from 2006-2012 (28). These empirical studies employ the methodology of taking photographs of linguistic signs or the methodology of surveys taken by people. The studies were conducted in Donostia-San Sebastián, Spain, and Leeuwarden-Ljouwert, in Friesland, The Netherlands. The first work presented, Cenoz and Gorter, (“Linguistic Landscape and Minority Languages”), was a quantitative study of the LL and a comparison between two cities: San Sebastián and Friesland. Both cities have the peculiarity of being cities in which a minority language is spoken. The methodology used consisted of taking pictures of the visible signs on one street in each city, counting the number of different languages on the signs in each city, and comparing those results for each city. The results indicated that the use of several languages was common in both cities. However, in San Sebastián, the linguistic policy to promote the Basque language (euskera/vascuençe) has a significant impact on the presence of this language on the signs.

This quantitative study was replicated in Barcelona and Rome by other researchers. The publication of the results revealed the significant presence of signs written in vascuençe, as encouraged or required by governments of the region and those who design the signs. Governments asked the authors to investigate nine neighborhoods. In the second study (Cenoz & Gorter, “Language Economy and Linguistic Landscape”), an economic focus was used. The authors sought information about the preferences and perceptions of the population regarding the LL. The results showed that those who spoke euskera as their first language were willing to pay a higher production cost to have signs written in their first language (euskera) than the Castilian (Spanish) speakers. The authors used surveys as their methodology. The results showed that the population considers Spanish as the common language. This result corresponds with and confirms their previous quantitative study. The third work studies (Gorter, Aiestaran, et al.), the
linguistic policies of the cities regarding street signs and the influence that these policies have on the way street signs are evaluated. The authors concluded that many local and global factors constructed and influenced the LL, and thus, the linguistic policy must be taken into account. Aiestaran et al. sought information about the preferences and perceptions of the population regarding the LL. This article includes three studies updated with different goals and methodologies and its importance is increased because the studies were replicated by other researchers.

In 2008, Monica Barni and Elana Bagna made a contribution to the definition of the methodological paradigm, specifically to map linguistic diversity in multicultural contexts (Barni & Bagna, “A Mapping Technique and the Linguistic Landscape” 126). The LL is only one part of the whole of the vitality of language contact and language use. The study aims to describe changes in the LL between the Italian and “old (regional)” and new minority languages.

The authors state that the LL is a contributing factor since it describes the language presence and uses in a specific area. However, they also believe that the concept of the LL does not exclude other theories on social action (such as power relations and sociopolitical forces, among others). Barni and Bagna’s study also present a new methodology that can be interpreted differently depending on the approach taken (linguistic, sociological, or political). This methodology allows researchers to collect and compare the different linguistic traces belonging to different types of texts and generates a large corpus. The methodology detects the “static” visibility and vitality of languages. The data is collected by georeferenced points on a map of the region, implying that it is linked to the place and the precise location; that is, it is based on geographic coordinates. The specific software that the authors used for linguistic analysis of the
traces detected is MapGeoLing 1.01 and ArcGIS by ESRI\textsuperscript{13}.

Then, the authors present the disadvantages that this software has and describe the classifications used to analyze the data after the data is collected. The classifications used by the authors are:

a) textual genre (signs, menus, leaflets, posters, advertisements, announcements, etc.);

b) external position location (position and degree of visibility of the semiotic function—outdoor, open area, etc.);

c) domain (public, private, work-related);

d) context (subcategories of each domain, for example: catering, hospitality, public health administration, public services, etc.). Subcategories of the educational domain, such as lifetime education courses for adults. These subcategories are defined as places (Catering places are bars, kiosks, fast-food diners, etc. The lists are open)); and

e) people (information about people present, mixed staff, local staff, foreign staff).

Therefore, the classification should be done simultaneously with taking the pictures, so that the characteristics of the text photographed are identified and the researcher can provide

\textsuperscript{13} ArcGIS (Geographical Information System (GIS)) is used by geographers and spatial analysts to map, manipulate, visualize, and analyze geographical data (Buchstaller & Alvanides 211). The GIS is a particularly useful tool for researchers of the LL to select survey areas and organize the data collected. The visualization produced by ArcGIS can also be beneficial to LL researchers for storing and analyzing their data. ArcGIS online, or in any of its versions, such as Pro, is increasingly popular and is used in universities, private companies, and governments. For example, the U.S. Census, National Register of Historic Places and The University of South Florida use this GIS technology. However, as Buchstaller and Alvanides, and other scholars noted, high technical knowledge is necessary for users to produce and customize maps, data analysis, etc., using ArcGIS. In addition, this technology requires specific hardware that meets particular requirements to function adequately. All of the necessary elements, plus the fees charged by ESRI for the use of its platform and the excessive costs and time-consuming training courses, make this system very expensive and complicated to use, especially for an individual researcher who may not use it for more than a one-off research project.
indications of the semiotic function of the texts which can be recorded on the georeferenced map. The next steps consist of the following:

1) linguistic analysis of the text (semiotic analysis);

2) macro-description of the text, which assumes a symbolic value that links with the recognition of someone’s identity (if a monolingual text cannot be explained by social function, the analysis should look for other reasons, such as prestige);

3) micro-linguistic analysis (occurrence and frequency should be entered and analyzed).

This technology can make it possible to detect the different dynamics of linguistic traces generated within an area. This methodology also provides a means of identifying and analyzing power relationships and proposing a particular linguistic identity, which potentially provides more information about the LL than other methodologies can provide.

Barni and Bagna (2015) discuss twenty years of the development, analysis, methods, and tools of research in the LL and provide a critical discussion of this progress in the field of LL. By using their research in Italy, Barni and Bagna describe how methodologies and analysis units have changed over the previous years, from the use of mapping technologies to interviewing techniques when speaking with people about the LL. Barni and Bagna also provide a detailed explanation of the LL subfield and issues regarding methodology (“The Critical Turn in LL: New Methodologies and New Items in LL” 6). They focus on the written use of language or languages in public spaces; specifically, on the correlation of different groups of people in a specific area and the presence of their language. Their purpose is to understand the dynamics of the LL and the roles played by several factors that influence language visibility (a city’s size, the size of migrant communities, employment opportunities, local language policies, etc.). For mapping, they designed and implemented a specific software program for georeferencing objects
in an area, combined with linguistic data-processing software that enabled the researchers to gather a wide range of materials synchronically and diachronically in a short time. To interpret the collected data, a qualitative approach was necessary, which they undertook by conducting interviews. The study results confirm the authors’ hypothesis that there is no direct relationship between the visibility of a language and its vitality.

The quantitative-statistical perspective can provide relevant information such as the distribution of the signs, languages used, designs, and texts categorizations (Ben-Rafael 52). By interpreting quantitative data, researchers can draw implications related to niches of certain languages such as ethnic conflicts, solidarity, official and unofficial signage power, and police languages (Hult, “Language Ecology and Linguistic Landscape Analysis” 91).

THE QUALITATIVE RESEARCH APPROACH: PERSPECTIVE, SIGNIFICANCE, AND IMPLICATIONS IN THE LL FIELD

The more recent studies involve qualitative research approaches which use one or more of the following techniques; for example, the method of taking “walking tours” of local areas and interviewing people passing by Rebecca T. Garvin (252). However, this qualitative study is based on self-reported understanding (Shohamy et al. xxv). Self-reported understanding means, in this case, that the people being interviewed are reporting their own understanding of the signs. Another example of the qualitative approach used in the LL studies is introspective interviews conducted after interactions (Ziegler et al. 264). Other LL studies have used only a qualitative approach such as the ethnographically oriented investigations by Scollon & Scollon; Jaworski & Thurlow; Leimgruber et al.; as well as other methods that enable researchers to observe the use of the natural language, such as detailed observations; attitudinal studies; and historical
In 2003, Scollon and Scollon introduced the geosemiotics approach mentioned above (2). An innovative approach to LL methodology, eye-tracking, is presented by Leimgruber et al. (16). Geosemiotics and eye-tracking, although different approaches, are both examples of how the techniques available to study the LL are in a constant state of development. This publication addresses the unfortunate lack of a well-defined technique to measure what people actually observe in the LL. They argue that in a multilingual LL, systematic and rigorous research is critical to understanding the LL. The authors propose and encourage future researchers use eye-tracking as the method for qualitative research regarding a LL. Their assumption for using eye-tracking in such research is that there is a connection between eye fixations and mental processes. They explain how eye-tracking works in detail and some of the difficulties and limitations of applying this innovative technique. After preliminary research conducted by Vingron et al. using this technique as a method, they conclude that eye-tracking methods to investigate a LL are relevant to the field. A qualitative approach has also been used in explanatory investigations related to education, such as second language acquisition that are not within the scope of this work.

THE MIXED METHOD: QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH APPROACHES IN THE LL FIELD

Increasingly researchers use a qualitative research approach along with the quantitative approach to describe, analyze, and interpret the LL in a specific area. From the theoretical concepts of ideology, identity, language policy, minority languages, and multilingualism Aiestaran et al. researchers conduct investigations using qualitative perspectives to study the
significance of the meaning of signs.

One example of a qualitative and quantitative investigation is a study by Malinowski, who explores the authorship of the LL as the product of four months of interviews, participant observations, photographs, media analysis, and interpretive walking/driving tours through the Oakland/Berkeley area near San Francisco, California, and another neighborhood in Irvine, California, near Los Angeles (Malinowski 107). Participants were individuals who had immigrated from Korea and lived in the U.S. for between three and thirty years.

The interviews were conducted in a narrative fashion, recorded, and transcribed. He describes in detail how he and his interpreter discussed in interviews the authorship and meaning of signs with the business owners. Based on these interviews, Malinowski presumed that the control of ‘bottom-up’ signs is significantly more complex than is often assumed. In the interviews, the authors of the signs explained that the role of using Korean script (hangul) on their signs was to help Korean-reading passersby identify the shop and to create an affinity through the use of the familiar script (107). Another author of the signs said that “of course” Korean script provides a sense of connection to potential clients. The author theorizes a tentative notion of LL authorship that is mutually constituted by individual intention and social convention. The Korean business owners understood that the use of Korean and English words on their signs spoke to multiple audiences. At a minimum, the English words were directed toward English-dominant readers, while the Korean words targeted Korean-dominant readers. Malinowski believes that it is necessary to determine who was responsible for the sign. Some of the business owners interviewed had purchased their businesses and simply used the sign used by the previous owners. During the interviews, he also discovered that unexpected meanings of the signs emerged. That is, the signs might mean more or have different meanings than the
individuals who were the authors of the signs could have intended. Malinowski concludes that a parallel can be drawn between speech acts and the sort of multimodal texts that populate signs in the LL. In the same way that speech acts often convey more because body language may also be important, multimodal signs may convey more than just the text of the sign (Malinowski 107).

The comments of the interviewees, like those in Malinowski’s study, illustrate an aspect of LL authorship that appears to have been produced in the dialogue between human interlocutors, a changing social setting, the various communicative modes present in the LL of street and shop signs, and the interrelationships therein. Malinowski points out that we may be disappointed with the implications of these findings. The interviews show that the intentional meanings can, in fact, remain hidden to the writers of signs and that they instead arise from larger historical processes that have been incorporated into practices of literacy and technologies of design of which the authors are not aware. At the very least, researchers in the LL have to distinguish between the multifaceted and distributed process of LL authorship and individual LL actors. Malinowski believes that ethnographically informed and multimodal analyses of the LL can provide at least a partial resolution of the complex relationship between “symbolic” and “indexical” meanings. Malinowski believes that researchers investigating the LL must also consider the lives of those who read, write, and conduct their lives within the LL. In connection with that, in his Navajo and Old City of Jerusalem investigations, Spolsky demonstrates the relevance of authorship on the LL studies (“Linguistic Landscape” 6).

Although the recent increased level of qualitative research, in particular the use of ethnography as a method for LL investigations, is striking, it is important to mention that there is a consensus in the LL field that “any method is legitimate if it addresses the research questions and goals” (Shohamy, “Linguistic Landscape after a Decade” 34; Shohamy, “Linguistic
Landscape after a Decade” 34).

SUMMARY

In this chapter, the theories and methodologies were reviewed, including the historical perspective theory, the sociological approach theory, the sociolinguistics perspective, the theoretical approach of the ecology of language, the theory of language choice, the theory of linguistic diversity and the economy of language, the theory of multimodal discourse analysis, the geosemiotics theory, the model of multilingual inequality in public spaces and translanguaging. In addition, methodological issues in the field of LL were reviewed, including the lack of specific LL theories, the selection of research areas, the selection of the unit of analysis, the systematic linguistic analysis of the text in public signs, and the publication of the collected data. The primary purpose of this chapter has been to provide an overview of the concepts and objectives of previous LL studies. Some of the most relevant studies of the LL that concern this work in terms of theories and methodologies of LL have been presented. In Chapter III, the theories and methodologies used in the EL field and a review of the studies that have combined LL and EL are explained. Chapter III completes the literature review for this dissertation.

The primary purpose of Chapter III below is to provide an overview of the concepts and goals of previous studies in the economics of language (EL) field, which includes (a) the combined LL and EL studies and (b) the theories and methodologies of the field of the EL. Some of the most relevant studies of the EL that are pertinent to this work concern the theories and methodologies of EL. Chapter III completes the literature review for this work that began in Chapter II.
CHAPTER III: LITERATURE REVIEW OF THE ECONOMICS OF LANGUAGE

*Only those who use another language know the value of it.*
*Marta Galindo*

INTRODUCTION

In Chapter II, the literature review summarized the research in the LL field of study that has developed and is still in the process of change and development. The LL field can be expected to develop rapidly in the future as techniques and methods that are assessed and validated in other fields are adopted and refined for use in the LL field. In addition, Chapter II shows that the study of the LL may be an instrument to be used in combination with numerous other disciplines, such as sociolinguistics, multilingualism, economics, discourse analysis, and history, among others. Tufi and Blackwood argue that the evaluation of the LL in a given area can provide significant sociolinguistic information that has not usually been examined. They encourage other scholars to conduct LL studies in combination with other disciplines such as politics, sociology, etc., stating that in those multidisciplinary studies, LL can be a significant instrument to contribute to language revitalization, issues of language and power, and identities, among others. In their Mediterranean sites study, Tufi and Blackwood described numerous socioeconomic factors that affected the spread of the national languages at specific times in the history of the regions that they chose in Italy and France (Tufi & Blackwood). As a result, Blackwood proposed “a mixed economy for data collection with LL research into the revitalization of Rls” (Blackwood 48) as a potential benefit of a symbiotic approach to data collection. Grin also points out that the discipline of economics needs other disciplines to study
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14 Rls: regional languages in public spaces (Blackwood 38).
languages, and that linguistics also often needs the economics discipline (Grin, “Fifty Years of Economics in Language Economics” 22; Ginsburgh & Weber, The Palgrave Handbook of Economics and Language).

Despite the connection between economics and language, with regard to the study of the LL in connection with economics, in particular with the economics of language (EL), there is, to my knowledge, little available literature other than some correlational and descriptive studies related to linguistic diversity in an economic context by Nunes et al.; Edelman & Gorter; Fernández Juncal; Onofri et al. This lack of studies using the combined concepts of both the EL and the LL provides an occasion to fill this gap in the literature of both fields and to contribute to the research in an area that has not yet been explored in depth.

LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE AND ECONOMICS

Paulo A. Nunes, Laura Onofri, Jasone Cenoz and Durk Gorter investigated the LL using techniques involving economics. Their investigation was a multidisciplinary one concentrated on studying linguistic diversity in the LL from the perspective of sociolinguistics and economics. The authors use an empirical economic research method to investigate the influence that the LL may have on choosing the language used. As the first economic work conducted in the LL field (until 2008), they carried out an econometric analysis of the LL in several shopping streets in the Basque Country, San Sebastián, and in Ljouwert, the Netherlands where minority languages have a presence. Nunes et al. describe in detail the steps followed and the methodology used for collecting and analyzing the data. The results of this research corroborate the results of previous studies showing that multilingualism and language choice are both individual and social.
Similar to the Nunes et al. investigation, Carmen Fernández Juncal’s work includes a socioeconomic study, a quantitative and qualitative LL investigation conducted in two towns (in the Basque Country and Cantabria) in the North of Spain. This study analyzes the rural LL’s unique characteristics in these regions and evaluates the impact of linguistic policies on the LL of these areas, using a methodology that the author has shown to be efficient in an area where languages are in contact. The results show that the linguistic elaboration and development of the LL within the borders of the two regions are significantly affected by the linguistic policies of the regional governments. The 50% of the corpus used in this study includes bilingual texts, 90% of which are issued by the government, which contrasts with the preferences of users in the private sphere, whose users prefer Spanish as the language of communication (341).

Another recent LL investigation studied the relationship of the LL and the market in some parts of five shopping districts in Amsterdam (The Netherlands) (Edelman & Gorter 96), where Dutch is the official language and English, German, and French are spoken as well. Loulou Edelman and Durk Gorter conducted quantitative research in five commercial areas of the Amsterdam districts that serve as an example of the LL in Amsterdam (100). These five shopping centers can be seen as different consumer markets with distinct groups of shoppers and different demand for services and commodities. The results show that the language used on a sign depends on the interaction of two market-related factors: neighborhood composition and commercial domain (104). They also found a connection between global and local. For example, stores such as shops for electronics and music have percentages of signs using English that are higher than the percentages of signs in English in the food domain, in which higher percentages of “other languages” were found (105). In addition, store owners use English to attract more consumers since many tourists speak English, either because they are native English speakers or
because English is their lingua franca. The market, therefore, determines which language is used more than other languages in the LL (105).

The studies discussed above are the few published investigations in which the LL is studied in connection with economics. However, the EL, as opposed to commodification\(^\text{15}\), refers to the study of the relationship between economic and linguistic variables, such as social return for those who possess bilingual skills. Therefore, EL can be used to identify, measure, and assess certain language policy decisions (Hogan-Brun). A review of the literature of the EL is presented in detail in the next section.

ECONOMICS OF LANGUAGE SINCE MARSHAK

The study of diversity and culture is not new but relevant to economic interactions in the work of Mills and Marx (Ginsburgh & Weber, “The Economics of Language” 349). Likewise, the importance of language to sociolinguistics and anthropologists, among others, as a factor in political, social and economic outcomes was emphasized by Fishman, Jonathan Pool, and many others (Ginsburgh & Weber, “The Economics of Language” 349).

For example, the linguist Joseph Greenberg was the first who suggested developing indices of diversity that could be linked with geographic, historic, and political factors, etc. Following this idea, many scholars connected language, economics, and business, which connections involve migrations, consumers' choices, and earnings, among many other topics. Therefore, language problems are of interest not only to language specialists but also to all social science.

\(^{15}\) The term ‘commodification,’ created by Coulmas, is defined as “the process of turning something into an object for commercial use. Examples are when languages (and specific language skills) are used as a marketable product in translation services or in heritage tourism” (Hogan-Brun Loc 2699).
practitioners, as language problems are present in all aspects of human experience (Grin, “Language Planning and Economics” 3). Initial research on the relationship between language and economy came about in 1965 from Marschak, who proposed language as an object of choice and policy (Marschak 138) and presented the costs and benefits of economic concepts to the language analysis (Ginsburgh & Weber, “The Economics of Language” 349). However, his work refers to the ‘language of economics,’ as Jiménez points out, rather than the ‘economics of language,’ which is the latest economic concept and the object of the current work (5).

1. Defining the economics of language (EL)

EL refers to the economic perspective with which languages are seen, explicitly, the study of the relationship between economic and linguistic variables. The EL is also defined as (Grin, “Language Planning and Economics”):

the paradigm of mainstream economics and uses the concepts and tools of economics in the study of relationships featuring linguistic variables. It focuses principally, but not exclusively, on those relationships in which economic variables also play a part. (16)

2. The economy in terms of language

The use of the economy in terms of language branches into two areas:

(1) Theoretical and empirical assessment of language policies. Economics is useful in this area because it helps to illustrate the advantages and disadvantages of language policies in monetary terms, which enables researchers and governments to compare the costs of various language policies. One area studied is the choice of official languages in multilingual structures like the European Union (EU). The use of a common language reduces costs, making cost reduction an empirical question that depends on the use by the trading partners of linguistic communication.
Estimating the return on foreign language skills. Political debates on language planning and language policy raise the question of language value, assuming that languages are valuable to society and, thus, are also economic-intensive. However, the non-market value relates to the way people value linguistic diversity for its own sake. It is not possible, currently, to really compute the ‘value’ of a language (Grin, “Language Planning and Economics” 19).

The EL can provide useful insights on certain language-related issues. There is a complementarity between the contributions that different disciplines can make in language process research, and one of these contributions can be made by the study of the EL (Grin, “Language Planning and Economics” 4).

3. The EL’s history

The history of the EL as a field of research on the fringes of economics as a discipline dates back to the mid-1960s. Over the years, economists have used three different approaches to operationalize language (Grin et al., The Economics of the Multilingual Workplace 58):

(1) The first generation of studies consists mostly of empirical studies in the 1960s and its formal analytical application to language. These studies view language primarily as an ethnic attribute. Having a particular language as one’s native language places a person in a specific group, and this language-based placement may influence that person's socioeconomic status, particularly their earnings. This approach relates to the ‘identity’ function of language and has been used to analyze earning differences between black and white residents of the United States or between Anglophones and Francophones in Canada. The first generation of studies is based on the racial discrimination theory of Gary S. Becker, in which language is considered an ethnic characteristic. Likewise, the theoretical work in the U.S. from 1965 to 1970 describes earning differences between black and white Americans. This approach focuses on people’s first
language as determining their socioeconomic success. While valuable in highlighting issues of
the economic impact of social stratification, it ignores the role of language as a tool for
communication that people can choose to learn and thus increase their human capital. It does not
contemplate foreign language skills.

(2) The second generation of studies, which coincides with the 1970s and early 1980s,
emphasizes the human capital nature of language, which is linked with the study of the
economics of education. Language skills can be interpreted in the same way as other types of
skills, as a form of capital, because language skills are an area in which individuals and societies
can profitably invest.
Deliberately acquired language skills can therefore be seen as a source of economic advantage.
This concept has been applied in empirical work on the socioeconomic status of immigrants in
the United States (particularly to native speakers of Spanish) to assess the value to them of
learning English. Under this approach, language skills are seen as part of human capital, playing
a relevant role in labor market performance, academic performance, and financial investment,
among others (Chiswick & Miller). This approach ignores the fact that language is also a means
of expressing identity. This approach allows economists to calculate the returns on learning
language skills in the same way that returns on financial or educational investments are
estimated.

(3) The third generation of studies, beginning in the 1980s, jointly considers both language
functions of capital and identity as determinants of labor income. Languages are seen not only as
elements of identity or as potentially valuable communication skills but also as a set of linguistic
attributes (embodied in individuals) which together influence the actors’ socioeconomic status.
This third approach in the research was initiated in 1980 by Vaillancourt, who considers the
functions of language as regarding both identity and communication. Since that time, examining identity and communication has remained the standard practice in most empirical work in this field (Vaillancourt, “Language and Poverty: Measurement, Determinants and Policy Responses” 152). Using this approach, researchers try to explain labor income as a dependent variable using, among other factors that determine earnings, the person’s ‘linguistic attributes.’ By ‘linguistic attributes,’ Vaillancourt means both a person’s L1, which serves as an indicator of ethnic identity, and their L2 or foreign language skills, which serve as indicators of the linguistic portion of their human capital (Vaillancourt, “Language and Poverty: Measurement, Determinants and Policy Responses” 152).

Accounting for these attributes allows the researcher to distinguish the relative contribution to earnings based on the different components of a person’s linguistic repertoire. The statistical methods applicable to these calculations are well established, and the estimates of rates of return are supported statistically.

4. Contextualization of the EL field

The EL field is framed as three sets of relationships among linguistics [L], economics [E], and classes of variables [X] (Grin, “Fifty Years of Economics in Language Economics” 28). Namely, the EL assesses: (a) how linguistics impacts economic variables [L→E]; (b) how economics impacts linguistic variables [E→L]; and (c) how economics is used as a framework in the study of the evolution of linguistic variables [X→L|E], (28). These three relationships are described below.

(a) [L→E]: Economic factors affect the destiny of different languages (Grin, “Language Planning and Economics” 3). This category of studies may have a formal policy in place (regulated) (i.e., focused on the economic implications of language policies) or not (unregulated)
(30). A study of the prediction of the impact on Catalonia’s unemployment rates based on the imposition of only 25% of the Spanish language as an optional language teaching option in schools in Catalonia is an example of a contribution focused on the economic implications of language policies. Figure 5 presents the classification of the contributions that explain the influence of linguistic variables on economic variables (Gazzola et al. 60–82).

**Figure 5: Economics of language status**
Source: (Gazzola et al. 60–82)

(b) [E→L]: Language variables have an impact on economic variables (“Language Planning and Economics” 3). For example, a person’s language skills can help in earning a higher salary for that person. Skills in some languages lead to higher salaries than skills in other languages, which shows another way of observing competition among languages. In addition, the demographic size of a language community stimulates the overall demand for language-specific goods and services consumed in that community (3). For example, books in English have a
larger market than books in Spanish in a country like the U.S., where English is the dominant language, because the demand for books in English is larger. Figure 6 presents the classification of the contributions that explain the influence of economic variables on linguistic variables (Gazzola et al. 82–90).

Figure 6: Economics of language status
Source: (Gazzola et al. 82–90)

(c) [X→L| E]: Economic arguments may be made by different parties in language conflict and over competing language policy options (Grin, “Language Planning and Economics” 4). Authorities developing language policies may be required to assess the costs of the policies to bring those costs in line with budget constraints, which analysis requires an economic assessment of those costs. Language policies have a direct impact on the economy. Therefore, a language economics perspective is more often needed to assess possible action plans in language policy
(Grin, “Language Planning and Economics” 4).

(d) Some areas are complicated to assign to \([L \rightarrow E]\) or \([E \rightarrow L]\) or \([X \rightarrow L|E]\) (Grin, “Fifty Years of Economics in Language Economics” 31). On the one hand, the relative prices of different language-specific goods and services (such as books in different languages) may affect language use patterns; and, on the other hand, patterns of international trade are likely to affect language dynamics in the interaction among economic actors (Grin, “Language Planning and Economics” 3). For example, the choices made by large multinational corporations favor certain languages (such as English) for internal communications. Another example is the cost of producing books and computer programs in a minority language, such as Basque, which requires either higher sales prices for the products in the minority language or government subsidies. These areas include information of the importance of either of \([L \rightarrow E]\) or \([E \rightarrow L]\) or \([X \rightarrow L|E]\) these directions (Grin, “Fifty Years of Economics in Language Economics” 31).

The most important area of research in the history of language economics is the study of the effect of linguistic attributes on earnings. The basic idea driving this area of research is that linguistic attributes can influence earnings in two separate ways:

(a) membership in a particular language group may give some advantage in the labor market and put others at a disadvantage; (b) second (or foreign) language skills can be a profitable investment for several reasons if employers reward them. Employers will reward them if bilingual employees, all other things being equal, are more productive than monolingual employees—typically because they can perform duties that monolingual persons cannot.

**ECONOMICS OF LANGUAGE IN THIS STUDY**

In terms of the number of studies conducted in the EL field, ‘language, earnings, and the
labor market’ is the most important category\textsuperscript{16} (Gazzola et al. 65). This category focuses on the effects of language attributes on earnings; that is, to determine the earnings of those who can speak a second or third language (L2, L3, ...) (65). Additionally, especially in multilingual settings, languages skills and patterns of language use are compiled in the category of contributions of ‘language skills and production’ \textsuperscript{17} (75). These categories are closely related to ‘language use’ \textsuperscript{18} and include contributions related to indigenous and migrant labor (66). In the following section, some examples of the categories mentioned above are presented. A few examples among the extensive literature of the categories described: (A) ‘language, earning, and the labor market,’ (B) language skills and production,’ and (C) ‘language use,’ are presented below.

A. Language, earnings, and the labor market

More research on the relationship between language, earnings and the labor market comes from Canada, involving the study of the income inequalities between native speakers of English and native speakers of French in Quebec (Grin et al., \textit{The Economics of the Multilingual Workplace} 58). This type of investigation is concentrated on the value taken by an economic variable, income, and some linguistic background indicator as an independent variable (i.e., age or schooling) (Grin, “The Economics of Language: Match or Mismatch?” 28). The results are consistent in statistical significance with most of the cases on the coefficients of language abilities as a factor of income. Several economists’ theories explain that employees with the same experience and abilities earn differently. In the U.S., similar investigations have been

\textsuperscript{16} See Figure 5, point 4
\textsuperscript{17} See Figure 5, point 5
\textsuperscript{18} See Figure 6, point 12
conducted using the income of Hispanic Americans and Spanish-speaking migrants in the U.S. by Grenier; Mcmanus (28).

1. Indigenous labor. Among the literature ‘language, earnings, and the labor market’ category related to indigenous labor are found the studies *Differences in Earnings by Language Group in Québec, 1970* by Vaillancourt; or “English as Economic Value” by Grin.

2. Migrant labor. Among the literature ‘language, earnings, and the labor market’ category related to migrant labor is the book *The Economics of Language; International Analyses* by Chiswick and Miller. It includes a collection of 20 articles (1998-2005) focused on the U.S., Canada, Australia, Israel, and Bolivia and approaches two main topics: (a) the determinants of dominant language proficiency among immigrants, and (b) the labor market consequences of this proficiency. Results of these research studies showed that dominant language proficiency is greater with: (a) more exposure to the dominant language, (b) greater efficiency in acquiring dominant language skills, and (c) greater economic benefits from proficiency.

In the first article, the authors created a model of investment in destination-language skills. The model was evaluated using the 1991 Census of Canada. They demonstrated that a systematic economic model can be developed and applied successfully to analyzing the language practice of immigrants in Canada.

Language skills are part of human capital since they meet the three requirements for human capital: productive (increase earnings in the labor market), embodied in the person, and sacrifice (time and money). The costs of learning destination-language skills are lower. The benefits of learning destination-language skills are greater, such as returning to the labor market through higher wages or greater employment and greater participation in the destination’s 
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19 Destination-language refers to the language of the immigrant’s new country.
cultural, social, or political life. According to the authors, measuring dollars invested in
destination-language proficiency is impossible, but it is possible to measure destination-language proficiency.20

According to Chiswick and Miller, the determinants of language proficiency are as follows:

1) Exposure: Exposure to the destination language can occur before or after immigration. It also can occur with more or less intensity: (a) neighborhood, (b) ethnic networks, (c) family (children as teachers and translators for their parents; mothers vs. fathers), and (d) marriage (if the marriage happens before or after the immigration).

2) Efficiency: This concept refers to the extent of improvement in destination-language skills per unit of exposure. The following are the most relevant variables: age at migration, school attainment, linguistic distance (e.g., between Chinese and French, the linguistic distance is more significant than between Spanish and French).

The following are the reasons for migrating and how the reasons are categorized:

(a) ‘economic migrants’: those who move with the goal of improving their labor market opportunities;

(b) ‘tied movers’: those who accompany or join another family member;

(c) ‘refugees’: those who move because of fear or perception of persecution or discrimination due to their race, ethnicity, political orientation, or social class; and

(d) ‘ideological migrants’: those who move for nationalistic or political reasons.

20 LANG: destination-language proficiency. LANG= f (EXPOSURE, EFFICIENCY, ECONOMIC INCENTIVE, WEALTH)
The Economic Incentives for destination-language proficiency depend on the following factors: (1) the increment in wages (it is hard to determine because of the econometric reason, basically the difficulty in developing and identifying variables); (2) the expected duration of employment; and (3) the duration of the stay in destination (the geographic distance of the country of origin is associated with a lower expectation of return migration and thus with a greater incentive to invest in destination-specific skills, such as language skills).

The variables that lower the interest cost of funds encourage greater investment in ‘destination-language proficiency’ from the supply of the market for funds for investment in human capital. Greater wealth encourages investment in language skills and hence enhances language proficiency. Greater wealth may be associated with a higher level of schooling when no more direct measures are available\(^{21}\)—other individual characteristic that are factors in the investment in destination language proficiency are characteristics such as innate language ability and personality traits.

In the second article, Chiswick and Miller (1992, 1995, 1998, 1999) showed that English language skills are greater among those who are (a) better educated, (b) migrate when they are young, (c) have a longer time of residency in the U.S., (d) married after migration, and (e) reside outside areas of concentration of immigrants with whom they share a mother tongue. The studies mentioned above also demonstrated that English language skills vary: (a) directly with the physical distance of the country of origin from the U.S., (b) inversely with the expected

\[^{21}\text{LANG} = f[\text{AGE AT MIGRATION}(-), \text{YEARS SINCE MIGRATION}(+), \text{EDUCATION}(+), \text{MARRIED BEFORE MIGRATION}(-), \text{MARRIED AFTER MIGRATION}(?), \text{CHILDREN}(?), \text{LINGUISTIC DISTANCE}(-), \text{GEOGRAPHIC DISTANCE}(+), \text{MINORITY LANGUAGE CONCENTRATION INDEX}(-), \text{REFUGEE}(-), \text{COLONY}(+)]\]
propensity for return migration, and (c) inversely with the linguistic distance between English and the immigrant’s native language. As for women, English proficiency varies inversely with the age and number of their children living at home. These findings are helpful in a range of policy contexts.

The United States Census is based on self-reported measures of language skills. For example, those who spoke a language other than English at home were asked to report their English-speaking proficiency as “very well,” “well,” “not well,” or “not at all.” However, the self-reporting in the Census may not be accurate depending on the individuals’ perception and context, such as English language skills at work. Therefore, a study of language proficiency at work may provide a more critical focus for analyzing labor market outcomes.

This chapter investigates whether the findings from the study of language proficiency among migrants concerns variations in the definition of proficiency. The Legalized Population Survey (LPS) is used to analyze the measurement of the language skills of ‘legalized aliens’ (IRCA). Data from this source (that is, data concerning illegal aliens who were granted amnesty under the 1986 IRCA), was assessed based on the following factors which were used as a model of language attainment:

(a) the alien’s ability to speak or read English in specific situations;
(b) the alien’s self-assessment of their English-speaking skills;
(c) the self-assessment by the aliens as to the question of whether their language skills limit their job opportunities in the U.S.; and
(d) measures of speaking and reading proficiency at work.

Two clusters were selected in this study: a cluster from 40 legalization offices and sub-samples of applicants within the sampled legalization offices.
The following variables are derived from demographic characteristics: language proficiency, the year of entry, reasons for staying in the U.S., reasons for leaving the U.S., country or region of citizenship, state of residency in the U.S., employment prior to entering the U.S., components of the family, health reasons, need to use social services, level of education, and family income, among others. Respondents in the Legalized Population Survey (1989) from non-English speaking countries tend to have the following demographic characteristics: young (34 years old), not well-educated, Mexican origin (70%), Central and South America origin (18%), first language: Spanish (90%), and 12 years in the U.S. (at the time of the interview).22

The models of language fluency estimated in this section are based on the model proposed by Chiswick and Miller. The equation for the study of language proficiency skills (LPS) is modified from the Chiswick and Miller language model as follows:

\[
\text{LANG} = f \text{ [Age at Migration (-), Duration in Destination (+), Education (+), Marital Status (?)}, \text{ Language Concentration (-), Relatives in US (-), Children (?)}, \text{ Location (?)}, \text{ Country of Origin (?)]} \]

Using the Census of the data for the U.S., Chiswick (1978, 1979) compared, for the first time, the earnings of newly arrived immigrants with those who had spent many years in the U.S. Borjas 1985 and others used the Census for two or more decades. Many other countries have done similar investigations (Italy, Germany, Denmark, Swedish, Australia, UK, and Canada). Recently, how immigrants fare in the labor market has taken on a greater sense of urgency because of the well-documented decline in the initial earnings of immigrant men in the U.S. and other host countries. This decline persists, controlling for inter-cohort changes in immigrant schooling levels and ages. The importance of this decline depends on whether the initial

22 See questions added to the list of questions in the Census in Appendix 1.
disadvantage experienced by recent immigrants persists throughout the working lives of the migrants.

B. Language skills and production

Michele Gazzola and Daniele Mazzacani provide empirical results on the relationship between foreign language skills and the employment status of natives of three European countries: Germany, Italy, and Spain (Gazzola & Mazzacani 714). The authors use a probit model and data from Eurostat's Adult Education Survey 2011. They develop two models. In model 1, language skills are considered the unique variable; that is, having foreign language skills and the probability of being employed. In model 2, foreign language skills are various variables that can impact employment. The general procedure in labor economics research controls age, experience, education, family status, and regional effects (719). The results indicate that men who possess skills in English have a 3.4% probability of being employed in Germany, a 4.3% probability in Italy, a 5.2% probability in Spain, and that women have a 5.6% probability in Germany. 5.6%, a 5.7% in Italy, and Spain shows no significant difference. The authors also found that the better the English proficiency, the higher the probability of being employed. Finally, the authors interpret that having language skills in English is less rewarded as English skills are more widespread among the population (733).

C. Language use

In “The Bilingual Advertising Decision” Grin examines the relationship between

---

23 Model 1:
Pr \[ y_i = 1 | X_i, FLA_i, FLB_i \] = \[ \Phi(\beta_0 + \beta' X_i + \gamma_1 FLA_i + \gamma_2 FLB_i + \epsilon_i) \] (Gazzola & Mazzacani 719)

24 Model 2:
Pr \[ y_i = 1 | X_i, SFLA_i, SFLB_i \] = \[ \Phi(\beta_0 + \beta' X_i + \sum_{l=0}^{3} \theta_{1l} SFLA_i + \sum_{l=0}^{3} \theta_{2l} SFLB_i + \epsilon_i) \] (Gazzola & Mazzacani 719)
linguistic plurality and the reasoning of advertising decisions. The author observes that the presence of two or more languages in one market modifies the traditional advertising problem. The paper presents a simple model developed by the author regarding sales to different language groups as a function of the level of advertising in each language, language attitudes, the income levels of each language group, and what the author calls an “advertising response function.” According to the author, although there is a great deal of literature about marketing strategies, there is not much literature providing formal, theory-based guidelines telling businesses how to adapt advertising to the cultural and linguistic characteristics of the market. He states that a majority of theorists and practitioners of advertising either forget about linguistic differences and assume that uniformity is the norm (especially in any particular national market), or they rely on their business knowledge and skills to develop ad hoc responses to the different cultural and linguistic conditions that they encounter. This article focuses on the behavior of businesses that face linguistic and cultural diversity, and outlines some of the conditions under which such diversity should encourage these businesses to advertise in more than one language (or to avoid doing that), so as to contribute to (or detract from) the pluralistic character of the society in their market area. First, the article describes the diverse types of advertising as follows:

(1) Commercial advertising: can be divided into three main groups:

(a) Industrial advertising: aimed at professional clients and promotes production goods and services.

(b) Consumption advertising: promotes the purchase and sale of final goods and services and is aimed at the general public.

(c) Prestige advertising: can target any segment of the market, but its goal is to spread or maintain awareness of a particular brand name and generate positive responses to the brand
name rather than to sell specific goods and services.

(d) Non-commercial advertising: includes messages from governments, administrations, or non-profit organizations, dealing with issues such as hunger or traffic safety, for example. The so-called “public service advertising” falls in this category.

(e) Advertising media: uses a variety of media: radio, television, cinema, newspapers, magazines, leaflets, billboards, and inserts in telephone books and similar publications. In addition, advertising can appear on objects such as carrying bags and clothing. Because it relies exclusively on hearing, the radio typically uses at any given time only one language. Print messages can use more than one language. In addition, printed messages could not use any language and rely solely on pictures and the name or logo of the company. The latter option is usually only used by larger companies that are already well-known. This paper focuses on visual (usually printed) messages using words or complete sentences.

(f) Extensive multilingual marketing: includes, for example, the situation within the EU where the same company may advertise in different languages in the different nations of the EU, for example, Spanish in Spain, English in Great Britain, French in France, and German in Germany. The advertising campaigns operate in parallel fashion in each market and do not consider the campaigns taking place in other markets. In this situation, multilingualism is not a part of each individual advertising campaign.

(g) Multilingual marketing: multilingualism is an essential feature of the advertising campaign when the targeted market is multilingual. In a particular market, some residents speak language A, and other residents speak language B. In this type of market, the companies may engage in what the author calls “intensive multilingual advertising.” This type of advertising may use language A and B in the same printed material or separately printed advertisements with
similar but separate ads in each language. What is important is that these different linguistic 
messages will be visible within a geographic area: such as a nation, a province, or a state. This 
paper concentrates on intensive multilingual advertising.

(h) Language factors: Grin lists some factors that will be relevant in the decisions by 
companies as to which languages to use in advertising. The first two of these factors are 
language corpus and language status.

The concept of an adequate language corpus means that there must be an alphabet and 
stable norms of spelling and grammar so that ads in the language are easily understood. 
Language status is important because languages that are generally recognized as low in status (in 
the particular market) are usually disqualified for use in advertising because the use of that 
language would associate the product with backwardness or lack of education or social status. 
Some languages have more status than others because they have more speakers, because the 
speakers of that language have more money to spend, or because the speakers of that language 
have more military power. The dominance of a language usually implies demographic 
superiority (that is, more people speak the language). However, in some cases, the language 
spoken by people who have socio-economic privilege may be strong enough to overcome the 
language spoken by the majority of the people. Because of these factors, advertisers cannot 
afford to ignore the status of the languages they use in their advertising.

(i) Decisions made by advertisers: the author then explores economic factors that influence 
advertising decisions. Each company must not only use those factors to decide how much to 
spend in total on advertising but also how much advertising to do in each language in the 
targeted market area.
Grin has developed an extensive mathematical model that is explained in detail as a way to determine the most efficient way to allocate advertising expenditures in a multilingual market. He believes that the modeling of the interplay of a standard marketing problem with linguistic data will be of more use to businesses than to government agencies involved in language policies. However, he also believes that such language policy agencies could also benefit since it can help them choose those businesses that are more likely to be persuaded to increase their advertising budgets and include minority-language advertising. The article concludes with examples of applying the model developed by the author in specific advertising situations in multilingual markets.

SUMMARY

In this chapter, the EL has been defined and described to provide a notion of the relevance of conducting interdisciplinary investigations, particularly linking both the economic and linguistic fields. The necessity for an economic outlook on language issues and the difficulties in computing the value of a language are the fundamental issues found in the literature of the EL. My study attempts to fill some of the gaps critiqued in the literature discussed. Specifically, my study attempts to connect the effect of better language skills or more effective communications skills with economic outcome, “variables that might denote economic performance such as productivity, market share, turnover, and profit” (Grin, “Fifty Years of Economics in Language Economics” 39).
CHAPTER IV: METHODOLOGY, DATA COLLECTION, AND ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES

INTRODUCTION

After careful examination of the considerable number of data collection and analysis techniques that scholars have been using for LL studies and the constraints associated with those techniques, it becomes clear that selecting the appropriate method when designing a LL study is complicated and critical. As Peter Backhaus observes, “...even though they may appear trivial, [methodological issues] can constitute a major obstacle to conducting empirical research into the linguistic landscape” (Backhaus, “Multilingualism in Tokyo: A Look into the Linguistic Landscape” 12). Fishman states that public linguistic space should belong in a domain (Fishman 23). Fishman also claims that language choice is largely subconscious, and since the signaling of social information is crucially dependent on context, single-person informant interviews are essential starting-points for the discovery of basic grammatical information; yet, once this information is known, such methods hardly seem suitable for eliciting natural conversations (23).

Along the same line, Blackwood and Tufi also claim that the language choice in public signs must not be ignored. Bakhtin considers that the election of a language to build a narrative is not an unintentional act (Blackwood & Tufi 205). Spolsky also claims that the language choice in public signs must be examined (“Linguistic Landscape” 33). After spending eight years of LL fieldwork in France, Robert Blackwood understood that when investigating languages in public spaces, a hybrid approach is needed (50); that is, the qualitative analysis must be included after
using a quantitative study as the starting point, thereby avoiding the method of simply “counting signs” (Blackwood 52).

Due to its complexity, this interdisciplinary work, which involves the linguistic landscape (LL) and the economics of language (EL) fields, demands a dynamic structure that provides valid and reliable results built on the foundation of a robust methodology. This chapter presents that structure and the critical interdisciplinary framework approach, which consists of a mixed-method research approach:
(a) the general quantitative research approach of LL; and
(b) the multisite case study of qualitative research.

This chapter begins with the interpretative framework and philosophical assumptions to present the methodology applied for this study and the theoretical framework research design.

INTERPRETATIVE FRAMEWORKS AND PHILOSOPHICAL ASSUMPTIONS

According to Peter De Costa, Aek Phakiti, Luke Plonskyan and Sue Starfield, the innovative approach in applied linguistics research included in studies of the last decade is a concept referred to as “layered approaches” (105), allowing researchers to use multiple methods and stances in their investigations. The term “layered approaches” refers to blending not only methods but also epistemological perspectives (Costa et al. 104). More than an epistemological perspective, which corresponds to a single-sited methodology, and thus, does not adequately address the current, globally-connected world (Candea 26), my stance for this investigation falls under the interpretative frameworks of “pragmatism” (Creswell & Poth 35). The philosophical assumption associated with the interpretative frameworks is “methodological beliefs” (Creswell & Poth 20–21); that is, I use a “mixed research method” and several sources for collecting data. I
concentrate on the practical implications and conduct this inquiry to obtain the best results to answer the research questions using experience in the field. Considering the claims above and the interpretative frameworks and philosophical assumptions underlying those claims, the methodology selected to conduct this research is described in the outline below.

RESEARCH DESIGN: MIXED METHOD

Mixed methods research has been widely used in the sciences for years, but in applied linguistics only for a decade (Costa et al. 104). In applied linguistics research, while some scholars describe ‘triangulation’ as a particular type of mixed-method design, other scholars, such as John W. Creswell 2003, consider triangulation as the use of multiple methods; that is, using several types of sources. Combining several methods and two or more forms of data, data collection, and analysis in one study are other definitions for mixed methods (Costa et al. 104). Michael Quinn Patton states that one method of analyzing data collected from different research methods is referred to as triangulation (556).

Norman K. Denzin describes four basic types of triangulation (Patton 579–80):

(a) data triangulation, using a variety of data;

(b) investigator triangulation, which involves the use of several different researchers;

(c) theory triangulation, which includes the use of more than one perspective to analyze the data; and

d) the use of multiple methods of collecting data, which he calls methodological triangulation.

For my study, I employ data triangulation, theory triangulation, and multiple methods of collecting data (methodological triangulation) to minimize possible errors and to produce high-quality data so that this investigation will be accurate and credible (Patton 556). Therefore, a
mixed-method research approach is conducted to respond to the three research questions for this study presented in Chapter I (repeated below):

RQ1: What languages other than English are used in writing on the public signs in the LL of the two survey areas?

RQ2: How are the languages on the public signs displayed? Are they primarily monolingual, multilingual, or translingual?

RQ3: What is the relationship between the LL of the areas selected for the two case studies and their EL?

The mixed-method research process applied consists of (see Figure 7):

(1) multisite case study of qualitative research (Creswell & Poth 96); and

(2) the general quantitative research approach of LL (described in Chapter II).
Figure 7: Methodology for this study
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1. Research Design 1: Multisite case study of qualitative research

A qualitative research approach focusing on a multisite case study, consisting of exploring a real-life case or multiple cases, a case description, and case themes, is used to select research areas (see Figure 7, Research Design 1). It uses in-depth data collection methodology involving multiple sources of information (e.g., observation, audiovisual material, documents, and reports) (Creswell & Poth, 2017). According to Robert K. Yin, a case study is “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries and contexts are not clearly evident” (quoted in Heigham & Croker 68). In contrast, Yin, Creswell and Poth consider case study research as a methodology:

- a type of design in qualitative research that may be an object of study as well as a product of the inquiry. Case Study research is defined as a qualitative approach in which the investigator explores a real-life, contemporary bounded system (a case) or multiple bounded systems (cases) over time, through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information (e.g., observation, interviews, audiovisual material, documents, and reports), and reports a case description and case themes. The unit of analysis in the case study might be multiple cases (a multisite study) or a single case (a within-site study). (96)

To develop a clearer understanding of the issue (Heigham & Croker 70) and to show several views on the issue (Creswell & Poth 99), the multisite case study has been chosen as the appropriate type of approach for this investigation (see Figure 8). According to Denzin, “multisite approaches aim to place a given practice within a particular site into a larger geographical context, thereby simultaneously illuminating both – a strategy thought particularly useful in addressing the challenges of globalization in place-based studies” (Denzin 605).
1.1 Site selection procedure, step 1

In these multisite case studies, the factors considered in selecting the survey areas include their demographic, geographical, linguistic, and economic data, and other sources to provide extensive sources that enabled me to determine the survey areas to investigate. As a result, the specific research areas selected for the study are two sites located in Hillsborough County, located in the state of Florida in the southern United States. According to Felice Coles, the South is an emerging area of interest for Spanish in the U.S. for dialectology and socioeconomics (Coles 8).

As extensively discussed in the section of ‘Linguistic Landscape: Theories and Methodologies’ in Chapter II, there are no specific and widely accepted criteria in the LL field as
to how to select the survey area to be studied. Concentrating on shopping streets or neighborhoods and examining the areas around the central mass transportation hubs of a specific city have been the most common procedures applied in previous research (Gorter, “Methods and Techniques for Linguistic Landscape Research: About Definitions, Core Issues and Technological Innovations”). Therefore, some considerations for selecting the two survey areas of this study are the following:

First, the ‘language spoken at home’ has been considered as an important demographic and linguistic variable for selecting the survey areas. According to Fishman, one of the fundamental issues in the study of multilingual communities is recognizing the variables that can contribute to an understanding of who speaks a specific language, what they say, to whom they speak, and when (Spolsky & Cooper 93). He believed that establishing the factors that are involved in stable multilingualism situations may be easier to understand than in the less stable situations.

Fishman asserts that “social domains” identify the main areas of activity in culture (e.g., family, education, religion, etc.) (Cooper & Greenfield 166). Fishman et al. demonstrated that the choice between Spanish and English could have been made based on social domains. In other words, those social domains influence the choice of the language spoken at work or school and the language spoken at home. Based on the Fishman et al. study, to obtain information about the languages other than English spoken at home in the U.S., reports of data developed by the U.S. Census Bureau have been used (Figure 8 and Table 3). The U.S. map (Figure 9) displayed below shows where languages other than English are spoken at home and the extent to which the language spoken at home is a language other than English
(in Figure 8). The darker a state is shaded, the higher the extent of the other languages spoken at home).

Figure 9: Language other than English spoken at home.
Source: United States of America. Language spoken at home

The type of languages spoken at home in the US and the percentage of each language are described in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Types of languages spoken at home in the U.S.</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Indo-European languages</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander languages</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other languages</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, United States of America. Language spoken at home
The second consideration used for selecting the survey areas for this study has been geographical (states, cities, and counties) and economic data (significant industries and economic development). To connect linguistic and economic processes, it is necessary first to estimate the ‘value added’ by multilingualism (Gazzola & Grin), that is, to identify the ways in which the language intervenes in the process by which value is created. Then, the ‘production function’ is the essential tool for connecting economics with the language (Grin et al., *The Economics of the Multilingual Workplace* 106).

1.2 Site selection procedure, step 2: Sites selected

Step 2 uses the multisite case study histories, their language policies for the public signs, and other sources to determine the survey areas to investigate. Step 2 also uses direct observation as sources of data for the two sites selected, which is explained in the next section on data collection.

As for how to select the survey area, after step 1, in which I looked at the data for “language other than English spoken at home” in the U.S. Census and discarded the areas with a very low percentage; (2) in the areas remaining, I searched for industry data in the U.S. Census; (3) after completing steps 1 and 2, I searched the areas remaining for and discarded those areas where other published LL studies had already been done; and (4) finally, in the remaining areas, I reviewed their historical and economic relevance (Figure 10).
Among the cities located in Hillsborough County, the City of Tampa was chosen for this study, and, in particular, the areas of Ybor City and West Tampa, both located within the City of Tampa, are the specific sites selected for this investigation (Figure 11).
And finally, I delimited the sites in accordance with the historic district maps showing the period of historical significance of these sites (See Figures 12, 13, and 14)

Figure 12: Survey areas: (1) West Tampa (ZIP Codes 33604 / 33603 / 33607 / 33609) (2) Ybor City (ZIP Codes 33602 / 33605 / 33606)
Figure 13: West Tampa National Historic District Map (1886-1940)
Figure 14: Ybor City Historic District Map. Period of Historic Significance 1886-1940
Ybor City has been designated as a U.S. National Historic Landmark District since 1974 (Rajtar 100) and “has a unique background and diverse cultural heritage” (Ybor City CRA). The Tampa community received national acknowledgment due to its multiethnic/multiracial (mainly Cubans, Spaniards, Sicilians, and also, to a lesser extent groups of German, Romanian Jewish, and Chinese) and industrial heritage (Charleton 15). The Spaniard\(^{25}\) Vicente Martínez Ybor brought the industry of cigars to Ybor City (Rajtar 37), and MacFarlane brought the same industry to West Tampa (University of South Florida, Digital Collections). These two areas have been selected as the specific sites to be investigated due to their similar characteristics: in both Ybor City and West Tampa, cigar production was established in the 19th century, Ybor City in 1886, and West Tampa\(^{26}\) in 1894, respectively. This historical parallel enables me to apply equal methodologies in the study of each site and to compare the outcomes and the evolution of both areas over time.

1.3 Historical documents

To support the data collection, I have also examined other sources, such as historical documents, historic maps, digital collections, and literary sources related to the public buildings in the selected research areas. Some of these historical documents are: National Register of Historic Places Interagency Resources Division by Charleton; Evolution of Historic Ybor City’s 7\(^{th}\) Avenue by Vicen Pardo, Tampa’s National Historic Landmark District; The Story of Tampa by TampaPublicArt; Tampa Historical by tampahistorical.org; Tampa History by tampa.gov;

\(^{25}\) The Spaniards Ignacio Haya and Gavino Gutiérrez along with Vicente Martinez Ybor were the initiators of cigar manufacturing in Tampa (University of South Florida, Digital Collections).

\(^{26}\) Currently, Ybor City and West Tampa are part of the City of Tampa. However, West Tampa was its one City at the beginning of the 19\(^{th}\) century: the City of West Tampa.
Ybor City and West Tampa Collections, and Digital Collections from the University of South Florida.

1.4 Language policies in signs, education and other normative documents

The City of Tampa is regulated by its Code of Ordinances, which includes relevant content related to the preservation of historic buildings, the Downtown/Historic Ybor Tampa Tourism Marketing District, and different sections dedicated to the regulation of the signs in the City of Tampa. (City of Tampa Sign Code). In terms of education, the educational system in the U.S. is generally regulated by the states, although there are some requirements of the federal government that apply nationwide. The state of Florida does not establish any specific requirements for foreign language education. As a result, the need to have skills and abilities in a foreign language is informally regulated by the market. As an example, it is sometimes necessary to have taken a minimum of two years of a foreign language to be admitted to a college or university to obtain an undergraduate degree.

1.5 Direct observation

Observing participants, interactions, conversations, etc., is a significant tool in collecting data in a qualitative approach (Creswell & Poth 166–77). However, preparation to conduct observations was necessary before the observations actually took place. The following outline describes the steps that were taken prior to beginning the observations:

(a) selecting the two specific sites to observe;
(b) identifying what and whom to observe;
(c) deciding the type of observation to conduct;
(d) designing and using the observational protocol; and
(e) recording aspects (such as descriptions and interpretations).
I conducted observations inside some of the shops and outside other shops (following Spolsky and Cooper’s model in their Jerusalem study (100-01) during May and October 2021. I was a ‘participant as observer’ for this investigation (Heigham & Croker 167). That is, I participated in the activities and the places found in the LL by interacting with people, taking pictures, and recording videos.

2. Research Design 2: The general quantitative research approach of LL

To respond to Research Question #1 (What languages other than English are used in writing on the public signs in the Linguistic Landscape of the two survey areas?); and Research Question #2 (How are the languages on the public signs displayed? Are they primarily monolingual, multilingual, or translingual?), I have applied the general quantitative LL method described in detail in Chapter II and in Section 2.3 in this Chapter IV (see also Figure 15).

Figure 15: Research design 2: General quantitative linguistic landscape method and Spolsky and Cooper’s taxonomies and Spolsky competence model
2.1 Artifacts: Units of analysis

The first step is defining the unit of analysis to be used in the selected survey areas. In my investigation, I have described the characteristics of the ‘units of analysis,’ including every written text that is part of the usual scenery in the specific setting being studied. The units of analysis collected for this work meet the attributes under Backhaus's definition: “any piece of the written text within a spatially definable frame” (Backhaus 66). Additionally, the processes of productions or “orchestrated multimodal ensembles” are considered for the analysis of the units of analysis (Kress, *Multimodality* 159).

2.2 Data collection

I have taken photographs as the primary method to collect data about the LL. I also recorded some videos on a specific unit of analysis when it is considered relevant for the investigation or when a photograph of the unit of analysis cannot capture the important features of the image for some reason. To make it easier to compare both survey areas (Onofri et al. 9), the data for this study consists of a total of 260 units of analysis obtained from photographs taken within the target area of West Tampa (FL); and 260 units of analysis obtained from photographs taken within the target area of Ybor City (FL). The photographs were taken of the LL on public signage in the areas selected during May and October 2021. A series of photographs of the units of analysis found in each area were taken and electronic copies of the images and videos are saved in an external storage device that enables storing a large number of images collected. Each

---

27 See Appendix 2 and 3 for the full list of languages and photography.

28 Photos of the individual products for sale inside the stores where the observations were conducted also were taken. These photos were used only for the purpose of supporting the observations and, therefore, have not been included in the database.
photograph was checked immediately after it had been taken, allowing me to consider whether it would be necessary to repeat some of the photographs taken to have acceptable images for use in the study. I used several devices and applications in the collection and organization of the photographs, such as the Apple Photos application, ArcGIS Pro, and Excel/Data Analysis.

Finally, the photographs collected were classified and organized based on the SC’s LL research method (see section 2.3, below). The steps of this process are:

1. The table of the SC’s LL research method (see Section 2.3 on next pages) has been set up in an Excel document.
2. Each photograph has been classified and placed in the appropriate cluster depending on the characteristics of each unit of analysis.
3. Any photographs that are of low quality have been eliminated. Those images that are not related to or interesting for the purpose of this study have also been deleted.

2.3 Taxonomies: Classifying the units of analysis

What I have denominated as the “SC’s LL research method” is employed to classify the public signs in the survey areas. The “SC’s LL research method,” as I have defined it here, are:

1. Spolsky and Cooper’s taxonomies (76); and
2. Spolsky’s sociolinguistics theory of a preference model of public signage (10) (see Chapter II).

The SC’s LL research method

The application of Spolsky and Cooper’s taxonomies serves to collect, organize, and classify the photographs taken of signs in the areas that are the object of this study (76). The SC’s LL research method is employed to (See Figures 16 and 17, and Chapter II):

1. classify the collected data of public signs based on

---

29 See ArcGIS description on Quantitative Research section, Chapter II
(a) the function and content; The classification clusters in Spolsky and Cooper’s taxonomy are (Spolsky & Cooper 80) (See Figure 16):

1) street signs;
2) advertising signs;
3) warning notices and prohibitions;
4) building names;
5) informative signs;
6) commemorative plaques;
7) labels on objects;
8) graffiti.

(b) the languages used on the signs; and

(c) the sign ownership and reader.

Figure 16: SC’s LL research method 1: Taxonomies 1, 2 and 3
analyze the choice of the language used on signs in the areas that are the object of this
study. The application of Spolsky’s theoretical preference model helps to provide the explanation
for the selected language written on the signs in each location (Spolsky, “Linguistic Landscape”
10). Spolsky’s theoretical preference model of public signage has been used previously to
investigate the LL in multilingual settings. For example, Spolsky and Cooper studied the signs in
an area of the Old City of Jerusalem. Other applications of the use of this theoretical model are
Additionally, Backhaus claims that “language choice on official signs is determined by power
relations, whereas nonofficial signs tend to make use of foreign languages in order to express
solidarity” (Backhaus, “Multilingualism in Tokyo: A Look into the Linguistic Landscape” 62).

Spolsky supplements his theory with a theory on advertising signs. He categorizes
advertising into the (2) communicative function and divides those advertising signs by those
developed by firms and by those influenced or governed by national policies. In studying the
effect of advertising on the LL, Spolsky applies a similar model for language policy. He
emphasized that the choice of language for advertising is a relevant model of language
management. He considers that the second condition, ‘choose the language of your presumed or
desired reader,’ is the most important to advertising (although the third condition, that is, the
symbolic condition, could also be the most important). He states that one of the advantages of
Ray Jackendoff and Samuel Jay Keyser’s conditions model is that all three rules can be applied
to a single sign resulting in stronger or weaker interpretation. Then, he classifies the
advertisements into two clusters. One cluster refers to those advertisements that are managed by
the company, and the other cluster includes those advertisements that are influenced by national
policies and laws.
Spolsky explains that Grin ("The Bilingual Advertising Decision") proposed a model to predict advertising choices in a multilingual society and to study the communicative function of advertisement\(^{30}\). This model shows the relationship of sales to different language groups as the function of advertising in each prognosis, the language attitudes, incomes, and an advertising response feature. A monolingual business environment can generate indifference to the language, and great resistance among minority groups to the dominant language can increase the profitability of bilingual advertising. Many studies related to multilingual advertisements seek to find the symbolic function of using the language in an advertisement. (See Table 1 and Figure 17).

---

**Figure 17: SC’s LL research method 2: Spolsky’s sociolinguistics theory of a preference model of public signage**

\(^{30}\) See Chapter III for more details about Grin’s model.
Spolsky also observes that the informational and symbolic functions of the public signage have a relationship with the taxonomy as follows (see Figure 17): “warning notices and prohibitions (Cluster 3), and informative signs (Cluster 5), are associated with the informational function of the signs, while building names (Cluster 4), and commemorative plaques (Cluster 6) are associated with the symbolic function of the signs” (“Prolegomena to a Sociolinguistic Theory of Public Signage” 34).

SUMMARY

This chapter has outlined the methodology that is used to respond to the research questions of this study. The multisite case study (for LL and EL) is employed for selecting the target areas that are the object of this study and the qualitative and quantitative research approaches are used to answer the research questions. The content of the following Chapter V is dedicated to presenting the analysis of the data collected to answer the research questions. The next chapter will provide the results of my data collection and offer suggestions about how the LL and the EL are correlated in these cities and how the social identities of the cities are revealed by the LL and the EL.
CHAPTER V: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

INTRODUCTION

This chapter concentrates on presenting the results of my study and the discussion of those results. To determine the languages used in writing on the public signs in the LL of the two target areas, how those languages are displayed, and what the relationship between the LL and EL is, I used a mixed-method research approach, consisting of: (1) a multisite case study of qualitative research (Creswell & Poth 96); and (2) the general quantitative research approach of LL (described in Chapter II). The results obtained after applying the mixed-method research methods mentioned are explained in this chapter.

RESULTS OF RESEARCH DESIGN 1

1. Results of Research Design 1: Multisite case study of qualitative research

Multiple sources of information and data collection have been used to explore the two case studies, such as documents and reports, observations, and audiovisual materials of the two areas studied. Ybor City and West Tampa, located in the City of Tampa, Hillsborough County, Florida, U.S., were selected as the specific target areas to be investigated. Cigar manufacturing was established in both locations in the late 19th century, and the continued demographic and economic development for decades afterward make these areas worthy of research. Other considerations for selecting the survey areas are related to demographic, geographical, and economic data, as discussed in earlier chapters of this work. Historical documents and digital
collections also corroborated the historical significance of both areas, both locally and nationally. Moreover, the significant artistic development of the target areas over the last few decades, some of which are described below, are important in understanding the LL of the target areas.

1.1 Historic documents: Archival records

There is extensive documentation of the history of both survey areas. In 1885, the first cigar factory in Ybor City was established by the Spaniards Ignacio Haya, Serafin Sanchez, and Vicente Martinez Ybor (Rajtar 37). Hugh MacFarlane developed this same industry a few years later in West Tampa (University of South Florida, Digital Collections).

Cigar manufacturing changed the two survey areas drastically in several ways: (a) the factories led to an increase of the population of the survey areas, (b) the factories attracted a multicultural, multiracial, and multilingual population, (c) infrastructure in the survey areas was expanded to support the manufacturing and the increase in the population, and (d) the economies of the survey areas grew because of the economic development. There was an enormous increase in population in both areas as the cigar factories needed skilled labor to manufacture each cigar by hand. For example, the area of West Tampa became part of the City of Tampa in 1925, after 50 years of being an independent city. The City of Tampa grew from a population of approximately 1,000 persons initially to a population of 101,161 in 1930 (U.S. Census Bureau, “Population of the 100 Largest Urban Places: 1930”), and to a population of 384,959 in 2020 (U.S. Census Bureau, “QuickFacts. Tampa City, Florida; United States”). Immigrants contributing to the population growth moved mainly from Cuba, Spain, and Sicily (Italy). Because of the growth in the population, other businesses arrived to provide the infrastructure necessary for the population and the industry. Development of the target areas during this period ranged from building houses for the workers and their families, to constructing the infrastructure
necessary to supply clean water, and other facilities to help the population avoid yellow fever, which was prevalent at the time. The infrastructure was developed quickly. Vicente Martinez Ybor built houses for the employees and their families, and a streetcar was developed. Additionally, a bridge was built to replace the ferry over the Hillsborough River, thus connecting both areas to make the neighbourhoods more appealing. By doing so, the cigar factories were able to recruit more employees who previously had to spend extra time crossing the river by the ferry. The newcomers developed clubs for socialization and entertainment (e.g., El Centro Español, El Centro Asturiano, Círculo Cubano, L’Unione Italiana, etc.), some of which are still active today. Hospitals and clinics were also built to provide medical care for the workers and their families, and schools were opened in which English was taught as a second language.

Currently, Ybor City is a designated National Historic District, and Ybor City and West Tampa have numerous historic buildings that are listed in the National Register of Historic Buildings (Charleton 15). Technology for manufacturing cigars and the embargo against imports of cigars and tobacco from Cuba were the main reasons that the cigar factories have changed over time. Today, the cigars are not made manually (except some that are made in small batches). The embargo imposed on imports to the U.S. from Cuba, the primary provider of tobacco for cigars, made the cigar factories take a different direction. The history of both areas is reflected today in the LL of their streets, such as well-maintained historic factories, murals, graffiti, commemorative plaques, and historic buildings. Figure 18 displays the cigar factories developed at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century. Table 4 shows the names and locations of those factories.
Figure 18: Cigar factories in West Tampa and in Ybor City, FL

Source: ArcGIS Pro (Esri Geospatial) (University of South Florida, Digital Collections)

Table 4: List of cigar factories in West Tampa and Ybor City at the beginning of the 20th century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIGAR FACTORIES</th>
<th>West Tampa</th>
<th>Ybor City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Del Pino Company</td>
<td>2312 W. Union Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andres Díaz &amp; Company</td>
<td>3102 N. Habana Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Santella Cigar Company</td>
<td>1906 N. Armenia Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguelles, Lopez &amp; Bros. Company</td>
<td>545 E. Main Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arturo Fuente Cigar Company</td>
<td>813 Francis Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balbin Bros. Cigar Company</td>
<td>1202 N. Howard Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berriman Bros. Cigar Company</td>
<td>1403 N. Howard Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bustillo Bros. Cigar Company</td>
<td>2111 N. Albany Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calixto Lopez &amp; Company</td>
<td>3502 N. Gomez Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celestino Vega Cigar Co./Serrano Bros. Cigar Co.</td>
<td>3302 N. Armenia Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corina Cigar Company – Jose Escalante &amp; Company</td>
<td>202 S. 22rd Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corral – Wodiska &amp; Company</td>
<td>1302 N. 19th Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuesta Rey Cigar Company</td>
<td>2416 N. Howard Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Regensburg &amp; Sons. Co., S. Fernández &amp; Coo.</td>
<td>2701 N. 16th Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Garcia &amp; Brothers Company</td>
<td>1114 Garcia Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Lozano, Son &amp; Company</td>
<td>1408-1410 N. 21st Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando Rodríguez &amp; Company</td>
<td>402 S. 22nd Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIGAR FACTORIES</td>
<td>West Tampa</td>
<td>Ybor City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvador Rodriguez Cigar Company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia &amp; Vega Cigar Company</td>
<td>3102-3104 N. Armenia Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzalez, Fisher &amp; Company</td>
<td></td>
<td>2311 N. 18th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius Elliger &amp; Company</td>
<td></td>
<td>1322 9th Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Cigar Company</td>
<td>2802 N. Howard Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Halloran &amp; Company</td>
<td>2312 W. Union Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. San Martin &amp; Leo Company</td>
<td>2202 N. Howard Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfecto García &amp; Bros.</td>
<td></td>
<td>16th S2808 N. 16th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvador Rodriquez Cigar Company</td>
<td></td>
<td>22nd Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel I. Davis Cigar Company</td>
<td>900 N. Howard Ave.</td>
<td>Angel Oliva Senior Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanchez &amp; Haya Cigar Company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santos Buzaglo Cigar Company</td>
<td>901 N. Howard Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa-Cuba Cigar Company</td>
<td></td>
<td>1702 E. 5th Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tierra Del Lago</td>
<td></td>
<td>1908 N. 36th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicente Martinez Ybor Cigar Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td>1910-1916 N. 14th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William J. Seidenberg &amp; Co. – Havana-American Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2205 N. 20th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y. Pendas &amp; Alvarez Cigar Company</td>
<td>2301 N. Albany Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: University of South Florida, Digital Collections (Charleton)

1.2 Language policies and code of ordinances in the City of Tampa

As in most cities and counties in the United States, the City of Tampa has a lengthy Code of Ordinances, which includes relevant content related to the preservation of historic buildings (Article V, Division 7), regulations that apply to the Downtown/Historic Ybor Tampa Tourism Marketing District (Article VI, Chapter 24.5), and different sections dedicated to the regulation of signs in the City of Tampa (Article V, Division 6). A specific section in the Code of Ordinances that regulates the languages to be used on signs in the City of Tampa has not been found. Uniquely, in the Ybor City Child Protection Ordinance, there is a specific section of the
Code of Ordinances that states that these particular signs must be written in English (City of Tampa Sign Code). This is the only ordinance that specifically requires the use of a specific language on public signs, and it is written as follows:

It shall be a violation of this section for any owner/operator of an establishment in the restricted area, who remains open for business during the restricted hours, to fail to do the following: Post a conspicuous sign at least eighteen (18) by twenty-four (24) inches, in or at the entry to the establishment, printed in English, in type or print equivalent to one hundred (100) points or one (1) inch in substantially the following language:

WARNING: UNLESS OTHERWISE EXEMPT AS PROVIDED IN CHAPTER 14-29, CITY OF TAMPA CODE, IT SHALL BE A VIOLATION OF THE TAMPA CITY CODE FOR ANY PERSON UNDER THE AGE OF EIGHTEEN (18) TO REMAIN IN RESTRICTED AREAS AS DESCRIBED IN SAID ORDINANCE, INCLUDING THESE PREMISES, BETWEEN THE HOURS OF 11 P.M. AND 4 A.M. ON ANY THURSDAY, FRIDAY, OR SATURDAY.

The current City of Tampa Sign Code was adopted on June 22, 2017, and replaced the previous ordinances regarding signs in the City of Tampa Sign Code (Ord. No. 2017-103, Sec. 8 (Exh. A)). The ordinances regulating signs in the City of Tampa are referred to as the “City of Tampa Sign Code” (City of Tampa Sign Code Sec. 27-289.1-Short Title), whose purpose “is to establish a set of standards for the fabrication, erection, use, maintenance and alteration of signs, symbols, markings or advertising devices within the city” (City of Tampa Sign Code Section 27-289). However, the City of Tampa Sign Code does not “regulate or control the copy or the contents of signs. It is not the intent of this Chapter to afford greater protection to either commercial or noncommercial speech” (City of Tampa Sign Code).

A review of the City of Tampa Sign Code reveals that it is concerned with providing a permit and approval process for signs (City of Tampa Sign Code Sec.27-289.2). The following signs are exempt from the permitting requirements of the City of Tampa Sign Code: Government signs necessary for the purposes of public health and safety used to identify public services or
public facilities, for traffic control, for events, for wayfinding or directions, or to provide information to the community (City of Tampa Sign Code Sec. 27-289.3(a)(2)). Likewise, no permit is necessary to display flags on residential or commercial properties, subject to limits on the number of flags and the size of the flags (City of Tampa Sign Code Sec. 27-289.3(a)(2)). Sec. 27-289.5(a) of the Code governs historic signs outside the Ybor City Historic District, and Sec. 27-289.5(b) provides regulations for signs in the Ybor City Historic District. The City of Tampa Sign Code does not contain any requirements for the use of a particular language on signs, nor are there any language restrictions for commercial signs.

The only exception is in the Child Protection Ordinance for the Ybor City Historic District, prohibiting minors from visiting restricted areas between 11:00 PM and 4:00 AM. Signs warning of that prohibition must be written in English.

The Code of Ordinances also regulates the business tax in Article IV. Section 24-120 provides a list of businesses that will be charged a business tax and also imposes the tax on any person who owns a permanent business location or branch office within the City of Tampa. Among the businesses listed in this Section of Article IV, there is a provision that is related to the use of languages that reads as follows: “(3) Theater where foreign language films are shown exclusively and operating only 4 days a week regardless of capacity.” The tax charged for this type of business is $231.52. Obviously, this is not evidence of an official language policy, but is an interesting reference to language in the Code of Ordinances.

1.3 Results of the Direct Observations

1.3.1 The following results are from the direct observations that I made in Case Study 1, West Tampa, response to Research Question 3: What is the relationship between the LL of the areas selected for the two case studies and their EL?
1. The letters in English are approximately twice the size of the letters in Spanish on the signs.

2. The words written in English are posted above and the words in Spanish are below on the signs.

3. Most products from Spanish-speaking countries are labeled in Spanish in large letters and shiny colors, the flag of the country of origin, with short translations to English (small letters and flat colors). However, some labels on products from Spanish-speaking countries are not always written in Spanish. Those products include the flag from the country of origin, but they are written in English (big letters and shiny colors matching the colors of the flag).

4. Spanish is the language used as the means of communication between clients and customers of the businesses in this site.

5. Spanish language skills may be a necessary condition for a person to be able to work in the stores.

6. The following quote from one of the interviews in the stores supports the conclusion that this employer values the language skills of its employees—the language skills add value in the economic sense.

   “Aquí todos hablamos español (...) Solo la manager es americana y ella también habla español. (...) Sí, pa’ los customers hispanos. (...) Yo soy de aquí, de los estados, pero mis papás son cubanos. (...) En la casa hablamos el español. (...) Esa de allá, esa es colombiana, pero lo que más habemos [hay] somos [son] cubanos, bueno también de Venezuela y Colombia hay bastante” (Interviewee during direct observation).

   “Here everyone speaks Spanish (...) Only the manager is an American, and she also speaks Spanish (...) …to talk with the Hispanic customers. (…) I’m from here, from the states, but my parents are Cuban. (…) Yes, at home we speak Spanish. (…) That one is Colombian but what there are the most are Cubans, well there are also a lot of people from Venezuela and from Colombia too” (Interviewee during direct observation; my translation.)
7. Employment signs in this store are bilingual in English and Spanish supporting the idea that
the goal of the business is to hire bilingual employees. The employment announcements are
posted on the doors and walls in the store. Half of each employment sheet is written in English
and the lower half of the sheet is dedicated to a translation of the text to Spanish. For example,

NOW HIRING / Various Positions / Get started right away! / Inquire and apply
online at FrescoyMas.com/careers. ESTAMOS CONTRATANDO / Varios cargos /
¡Comience de inmediato! / Consulte y aplique en linea FrescoyMas.com/careers /
FRESCO y Más?

1.3.2 The following result from the direct observations was founding in Case Study 2, Ybor
City, and it responds to Research Question 3: What is the relationship between the LL of the
areas selected for the two case studies and their EL?

1. English is used as the means of communication between clients and customers in those open
restaurants and cafes which I could observe from inside and outside the establishment, such as
observations on the terraces of a few restaurants and in ice cream stores. In my interactions with
some of the staff, I realized that they could not understand Spanish.

2. The menus posted inside and outside of the open restaurants observed were written only in
English. The restaurants offer some Spanish and Italian dishes, but on the menus, the
descriptions of those menu items are written in English; for instance,

SOUP/ SPANISH BEAN/ BLACK BEAN/ CHICKEN NOODLE/ SALAD/
LARGE GRILLED CHICKEN / SMALL SPANISH HOUSE/ SMALL TOSSED
ITALIAN/ SMALL CAESAR/ HAND/ HELD/ TAMPA CUBAN / BREADED
CHICKEN/ CUBAN ROAST PORK/ (..).

3. The banners found were placed near those open restaurants, and other objects (chairs,
magazine boxes, etc.) were labeled or written in English; for example, “IF YOU DON’T
BELONG… DON’T BE LONG!” (That sentence was written on a chair placed at the door to a
store named “Dysfunctional Grace”).
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4. A banner placed at the door of an ice cream store says, “ENJOY/ ICE CREAM/ WE MAKE OUR OWN.”

5. On one of the banners, some names of popular Spanish drinks are displayed, for example,

   DRINK SPECIALS/ ALL DAY EVERY DAY/ $6 SANGRIA/ $6 MARGARITA/ HAPPY HOUR/ MON-FRI 4-7 PM/ BOGO RIFEBALL/ $1 DRAFT.

6. Of the street signs found on 7th Ave, some are written in English and in Spanish, and some are written in English and two Spanish linguistic varieties, such as 7th Ave / La Sétima / La Séptima.

Table 5 describes the more relevant direct observations in detail and immediately after Table 5 the most relevant field notes from the direct observations are presented.

Table 5: Direct Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>Direct Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length of Activity: 65 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Descriptive Notes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Saturday, October 23, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td>3:10 PM (EST)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place:</td>
<td>Pharmacy, Armenia Ave, Tampa, FL 33604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to observe:</td>
<td>What are the languages used by the employees and customers of the shops/stores being observed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to observe:</td>
<td>Participant observer (I am acting as a customer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the parking area</td>
<td>I see several monolingual banners in Spanish (“Reserva ya tu vacuna contra el COVID-19 gratis””)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To preserve the confidentiality of the people with whom I spoke, details of this location have been omitted in accordance with IRB regulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#2</th>
<th><strong>Direct Observation (See Field Notes 1)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length of Activity: 90 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Descriptive Notes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Saturday, October 23, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td>5:30 PM (EST)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place:</td>
<td>West Tampa (FL)(^{31})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to observe:</td>
<td>What are the languages used by the employees of the shops/stores being observed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to observe:</td>
<td>Participant observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entering the store.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People speaking in Spanish at the end of the store.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are two people together, one is an employee, and the other one seems to be a friend of the employee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An employee is placing merchandise on a shelf and speaking on her cellphone in Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talking with the employee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After looking for some products, the employee gave me those that she thought would help me with my problem!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{31}\) To preserve the confidentiality of the people with whom I spoke, details of this location have been omitted in accordance with IRB regulations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaching the pharmacy section.</th>
<th>I saw several employees in the pharmacy section. I cannot determine what language they are speaking.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While waiting in line.</td>
<td>Everyone in the line is speaking Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking with more employees.</td>
<td>An employee talks to me in English and I switch to Spanish as soon as I can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cashier speaking in Spanish.</td>
<td>While approaching the cashier to pay, I noticed that the cashier is also speaking Spanish.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**#3 Direct Observation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description Notes</th>
<th>Reflective Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong> Saturday, October 24, 2021</td>
<td>I expect to find more people on Saturday than a weekday since the general population is not working.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time:</strong> 12:35 PM (EST)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place:</strong> Fresco y Más, N Armenia Ave, Tampa, FL 33604</td>
<td>I expect to find products from Spanish-speaking countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What to observe:</strong> What are the languages used by the employees and customers of the shops/stores being observed?</td>
<td>I expect to hear people speaking in Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What to observe:</strong> What products are they selling? Are the products from Spanish-speaking countries? What language/s is used to label the products?</td>
<td>I expect to find some products from Spanish-speaking countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How to observe:</strong> Participant observer (I am acting as a customer)</td>
<td>I am acting as a customer, pretending that I am buying some groceries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking inside of the store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking inside of the store and looking around.</td>
<td>There are some announcements posted on the doors and walls in English and Spanish.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Walking inside of the store and looking at the products offered.

There are many products from Spanish-speaking countries, all of which are labeled in Spanish; for example, from Colombia, Spain, Venezuela, Mexico, Cuba, and Puerto Rico. There are multiple products from the countries mentioned above. Even *turrón* from Spain! I am taking numerous pictures and a few videos of the products.

Employees are very busy.

Probably this is not the best day or time to talk with employees. They are very busy assisting customers and will not spend time talking with me.

Employees and customers speak Spanish.

I have not heard a word in English during my time in this store!

Leaving the store.

---

**#4 Direct Observation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Notes</th>
<th>Reflective Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong> Sunday, October 24, 2021</td>
<td>I expect to find local people and tourists walking around, having lunch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time:</strong> 11:30 PM (EST)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place:</strong> 7th Street Ybor City, Historic District, Tampa, FL</td>
<td>This is the main street of Ybor City (known as <em>La Séptima</em>), on which several cigar manufacturing factories, clubs, theaters, bars, and restaurants were located, and others were located on the blocks around it at the end of the 19th century. West Tampa currently is part of the City of Tampa. Many of these clubs, bars, and restaurants are still operating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What to observe:</strong> What is the language(s) displayed on the public signs? What semiotic elements are displayed in this area?</td>
<td>I expect to find many signs written in Spanish and English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How to observe:</strong> Participant observer</td>
<td>I am acting as a regular tourist who is visiting Ybor City for the first time, looking around, posing questions to people in the area, taking photos, getting some food on the terrace of restaurants and cafeterias, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Field Notes: The more important field notes from the direct observations are set out below.

**Field Note #2** (from Direct Observation #2)

Linguistic Landscape-Economics

Marta Galindo

Date: Saturday, October 23, 2021, 5:30 PM (EST). Place: West Tampa (FL)³²

This is one of the main streets of West Tampa, on which several cigar factories were located at the end of the 19th century. West Tampa currently is part of the City of Tampa. I expect to hear people speaking in Spanish and in English. I am entering the store. There are not too many people in the store (this is during the COVID-19 Pandemic).

I am acting as a customer, pretending to look for a product that is intended to heal a particular problem. This topic enables me to have a few minutes of conversation with the employees.

I am hearing people speaking in Spanish at one end of the store. Thus, I decide to approach them, pretending I am looking for something to purchase. I do not think that they noticed my presence. There are two people together, one is an employee, and the other one seems to be a friend of the employee. Their conversation is very casual and friendly. They are speaking in Spanish. I would say that the Spanish linguistic variety is Cuban.

I continue walking around and see that an employee is placing merchandise on a shelf and speaking on her cellphone in Spanish. She seems to be a very nice person, so I decided to wait until she finishes the conversation and approach her to ask some questions.

Initial segment of the conversation with the employee and my translation into English:

³² To preserve the confidentiality of the people with whom I spoke, details of this location have been omitted in accordance with IRB regulations.
1 Investigador: ¡Hola, buenas tardes! ¿Hablas español, verdad? Te he oído hablar en español antes y... bueno no solo a ti, también a tus compañeras y me alegra ver que la gente habla en español, ¡es estupendo...!

1 Investigator: Hello, good afternoon, you speak Spanish, don't you? I heard you speak Spanish before and... well not only you, but also your colleagues and I'm glad to see that people speak Spanish, it's great...!

2 Empleado: ¡Sí! Aquí todos hablamos español (...) Solo la manager es americana y ella también habla español.

2 Employee: Yes! Here we all speak Spanish (...) Only the manager is American, and she also speaks Spanish.

3 Investigador: ¡Oh! ¿en serio?

3 Investigator: Oh, really?

4 Empleado: Sí, pa’ los customers hispanos

4 Employee: Yeah! to talk with the Hispanic customers.

5 Investigador: Perdona mi curiosidad, pero... ¿de dónde eres? No te saco el acento...

5 Investigator: Excuse my curiosity, but where are you from? I cannot get an accent out of you...

6 Empleado: Yo soy de aquí, de los estados, pero mis papás son cubanos.

6 Employee: I am from here, from the states, but my parents are Cuban.

7 Investigador: ¡Pues qué bien que tus papás te ensenaran español! Me imagino que hay mucha gente de Cuba en esta zona...

7 Investigator: Well, it's a good thing your parents taught you Spanish. I imagine there are a lot of people from Cuba in this area...
8 Employee: Sí, en la casa hablamos el español. ¿De dónde es usted? ¿De España, right?

8 Employee: Yes, at home we speak Spanish. Where are you from? You are from Spain, right?

9 Investigator: Sí, soy de España, me has notado el acento...

9 Investigator: Yes, I am from Spain, you noticed my accent...

10 Employee: Sí, el “tú” y esto...(sonríe)

10 Employee: Yes, the "tú" and that... (smiles)

11 Investigator: ¡Sí, yaa...! (sonríe). Pues, es la primera vez que vengo por aquí por eso estoy tan sorprendida de ver que mucha gente habla español aquí. Y tus compañeras son de Cuba o son también de aquí.

11 Investigator: Yeah!... (smiles). Well, it is the first time I have come here, that's why I'm so surprised to see that many people speak Spanish here. And are your colleagues from Cuba or are they from here too?

12 Employee: Esa de allá, esa es colombiana, pero lo que más habemos [hay] somos [son] cubanos, bueno también de Venezuela y Colombia hay bastante. …

¿Y cómo le puedo ayudar, señora?

12 Employee: That one (pointing out one of her coworkers in another section of the store), that one is Colombian, but most of us are Cubans, well, there are also a lot of people from Venezuela and Colombia...So, how can I help you, ma'am?

13 Investigator: ¡Oh, sí, disculpa que te estoy entreteniendo! Pues, quería algo para...

13 Investigator: Oh, I'm sorry I'm taking your time. Well, I was looking for something to...

(Interview during direct observation; my translation.).
During my conversation with the employee, I am asking the questions described in the interview protocol\(^{33}\). However, I am skipping those questions which I can clearly answer based on my observation. She is looking for some products. The employee gives me those products that she thinks would help me with my problem. The employee is reading the components and directions as to how to use those products. This situation gives me the opportunity to ask her some more questions.

Now I am approaching another section of the store. I see several employees in this section. I cannot determine what language they are speaking, so I decide to approach them to be able to observe the conversation more clearly. While waiting in line, I see that everyone in the line is speaking Spanish. There is a couple speaking with their child. They are trying to correct their child's behavior (the child is approximately 4 or 5 years old) and sometimes use some words in English (translingualism). I say hello to the child in Spanish. The child is looking at me but does not say anything.

I think it is a good opportunity to speak with some of the other employees. An employee asks me in English, “How can I help you?” I am asking for some products in English too. The employee turns around and asks questions about my products in Spanish to the other two employees. This gives me the opportunity to speak in Spanish with them and I am asking questions about their origin. They say that they are from Colombia and Cuba. They are preparing my products, so I get them and say goodbye to those helpful employees. I am now walking toward the cashier. While approaching the cashier to pay, I noticed that the cashier is also speaking Spanish. No one was in line, so I did not hesitate to start asking her questions. The cashier says that she is from Cuba and has recently moved to the U.S. She seemed not to be very

\(^{33}\) See Appendix 1. Interview Protocol.
comfortable with my questions, so I decided that I should leave. I paid and left the store to avoid further upsetting her.

Field Note #3 (from Direct Observation #3)

Linguistic Landscape-Economics
Marta Galindo
Saturday, October 24, 2021, 12:35 PM (EST)

I am entering one of the main stores of the area, “Fresco y Más,” located on N Armenia Ave, Tampa, FL 33604. This is a suitable place for me to see how the languages used by employees and customers of the store are used in a natural environment. I am also curious about what products this store offers and the origin of those products.

I am acting as a customer, pretending that I am buying some groceries. I see that the employees are very busy. I expect to find more people on Saturday than a weekday since I assume that the general population is not working on the weekend. I am walking inside the store. I expect to find products from Spanish-speaking countries and hear people speaking in Spanish. I can hear music in the background. The music in the store is mainly in Spanish. I am recording the music, but it is also easy to use the video to record everything. I think no one notices that I am recording video. The music stopped and some announcements regarding COVID-19 regulations are made over the store sound system, including the requirement to wear masks. The announcements are being made in Spanish. I recorded a couple of the announcements. I am observing various departments in the store, and I notice that the section names are bilingual in English and Spanish. For example, “BUTCHER, CARNICERIA;” “SEAFOOD, MARISCOS.” The letters in English are approximately twice the size of the letters in Spanish on the signs.
Also, I note that the words written in English are posted above and Spanish below on the signs. I see that the languages on the signs (English and Spanish) and the location of the languages on the signs (English above and in a larger font) are repeated in all of the departments of the store. I am taking some pictures and videos of those signs. The banners are also all bilingual banners. The font is bigger in English than in Spanish. The text in English is placed above and the text in Spanish is below. For example, “Start the grill & end the summer. *Encienda la parrilla y termine el verano.*”

While walking around the store, I see that there are some announcements posted on the doors and walls. Half of each sheet is written in English and the lower half of the sheet is dedicated to a translation of the text to Spanish. For example,

NOW HIRING / Various Positions / Get started right away! / Inquire and apply online at FrescoyMas.com/careers. *ESTAMOS CONTRATANDO / Varios cargos / ¡Comience de inmediato! / Consulte y aplique en línea FrescoyMas.com/careers / FRESCO y Más.*

I am walking inside the store and now approaching shelves on which I can see products offered that seems to be Hispanic products. I realized that there are many products from Spanish-speaking countries, all of which are labeled in Spanish (big letters and shiny colors, usually those colors are the colors of the flag from the country of origin) and short translations to English (small letters and flat colors). For example, from Colombia (“*El Latino. Sabor Auténtico. Quesito Colombiano.*” “Authentic Colombian Cheese”), Spain (“*El Jarón. Queso Manchego Artesano*” – a picture of *Don Quijote de la Mancha* is included on the package), Venezuela (“*PAISA. Nata Venezolana.*” “Venezuelan Soft Cream”), Mexico (“*Ole Fresco.*” “Authentic Mexican Crumbling Cheese”), Cuba (“*La Cubanita*” /“*Guayaba Mechada,*” /“Guava with Jelly”), Puerto Rico (Puertorican Bread by Cidrines. “*Lo mejor de lo nuestro, siempre.*”).
There are multiple products from the countries mentioned above. Even turrón from Spain! I am taking pictures of the products.

I try to speak with one or two of the employees, but I cannot see a convenient time for that. Probably this is not the best day or time to speak with employees. They are very busy assisting customers and will not spend time answering my questions. They are speaking Spanish among themselves and with the customers. I have not heard a word in English during my time in this store! Leaving the store.

**Field Note #4** (from Direct Observation #4)

Linguistic Landscape-Economics

Marta Galindo

Date: Sunday, October 24, 2021, 11:30 AM (EST)

This is the main street of Ybor City, 7th Street Ybor City, Historic District, Tampa, FL (known as La Séptima), on which several cigar manufacturing factories, clubs, theaters, bars, and restaurants were located, and others were located on the blocks around La Séptima at the end of the 19th century. West Tampa currently is part of the City of Tampa. Many of these clubs, bars, and restaurants are still operating. I expect to find local people and tourists walking around and having lunch. I also expect to find semiotic elements displayed in this area. I am acting as a regular tourist who is visiting Ybor City for the first time, looking around, asking people in the area questions, taking photos, getting some food on the terrace of restaurants and cafeterias, etc. I also expect to find many signs written in Spanish and English and I see many urban furniture items that have symbolic functions given the history of the area.
2. Results of Research Design 2: The Quantitative Research approach of LL

The following research questions were developed to explore the visibility of the
language(s) in the two areas selected for these case studies:

RQ1: What languages other than English are used in writing on the public signs in the LL of the
two survey areas?

RQ2: How are the languages on the public signs displayed? Are they primarily monolingual,
multilingual, or translingual?

As the first step, the general quantitative LL method was used. This method relies on
photography and visual analysis. For the second step, the application of “SC’s LL research
method” was employed to classify each unit of analysis based on the function and content of the
sign, the languages used on the sign, and the ownership and reader of the sign (Spolsky &
Cooper). This model permits the analysis of the choice of the language used on the signs in the
two case studies (Spolsky, Conditions for Second Language Learning. Introduction to a General
Theory; Spolsky, “Linguistic Landscape;” Jackendoff & Keyser).

See also Chapter II for a broad description of the general quantitative method used in LL
studies.
Figure 19: SC’s LL research method 1: Taxonomies 1, 2 and 3

According to Spolsky the informational and symbolic functions of the public signage have a relationship with the taxonomy as follows (see Figure 20): “warning notices and prohibitions, (Cluster 3) and informative signs (Cluster 5), are associated with the informational function of the signs, while building names (Cluster 4), and commemorative plaques (Cluster 6) are associated with the symbolic function of the signs” (“Prolegomena to a Sociolinguistic Theory of Public Signage” 34).
2.1. Case Study 1: West Tampa, FL: Representing and visualizing the data

The findings obtained after applying the SC's LL research method\(^{35}\) are presented in case study 1 hereafter.

2.1.1. Step 1: Taxonomies 1 and 2 (based on Figure 19)

Table 6: Taxonomy 1 and 2, Case Study 1: West Tampa, FL\(^ {36}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo #</th>
<th>1)</th>
<th>2)</th>
<th>3)</th>
<th>4)</th>
<th>5)</th>
<th>6)</th>
<th>7)</th>
<th>8)</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>E &amp; S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{35}\) See Chapter IV for the description of SC’s LL research method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo #</th>
<th>1)</th>
<th>2)</th>
<th>3)</th>
<th>4)</th>
<th>5)</th>
<th>6)</th>
<th>7)</th>
<th>8)</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>E &amp; S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0015</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0017</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0018</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0019</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0020</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0021</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3442</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3683</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5826</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5827</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5829</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5835</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5963</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5972</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5973</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5977</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5981</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5982</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5985</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5989</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5995</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6003</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo #</th>
<th>1)</th>
<th>2)</th>
<th>3)</th>
<th>4)</th>
<th>5)</th>
<th>6)</th>
<th>7)</th>
<th>8)</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>E &amp; S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6019</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6020</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6024</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6028</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6029</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6031</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6032</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6033</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6037</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6039</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6049</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6053</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6054</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6056</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6057</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6058</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6059</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6062</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6065</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6066</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6068</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6069</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6071</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6072</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6074</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6075</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6077</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6079</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6081</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6083</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6084</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo #</td>
<td>1)</td>
<td>2)</td>
<td>3)</td>
<td>4)</td>
<td>5)</td>
<td>6)</td>
<td>7)</td>
<td>8)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>E &amp; S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6086</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6090</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6093</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6095</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6096</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6097</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6098</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6099</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6101</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6108</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6109</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6113</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6113</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6115</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6116</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6117</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6118</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6119</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6121</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6121</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6122</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6122</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6123</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6139</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6142</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6144</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6147</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6148</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo #</td>
<td>1)</td>
<td>2)</td>
<td>3)</td>
<td>4)</td>
<td>5)</td>
<td>6)</td>
<td>7)</td>
<td>8)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>E &amp; S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6152</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6154</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6155</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6158</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6160</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6160</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6167</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6170</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6172</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6175</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6179</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6185</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6187</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6201</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6205</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6209</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 21 shows the results after classifying the units of analysis collected in West Tampa, FL (Table 6). This classification was based on the function and use of the signs, Taxonomy 1 (see Figure 19). From a total of 260 units of analysis, 30 are signs identifying “street names,” 96 are “advertising signs,” 26 signs are “warning notices and prohibitions,” 65 signs fall in the category of “building names,” 12 are “informative signs,” 1 is in the category of “commemorative plaques,” 19 are “labels on objects,” and 11 are “graffiti.”

![Case Study: West Tampa, FL. The function and use of 260 signs](image)

Figure 21: Taxonomy 1, based on the function and content
Table 7 displays the languages found on the units of analysis in this study site, the number of units of analysis by languages. The results in percentages obtained after applying Taxonomy 2 are presented in Figure 21. This classification is based on the languages used on the public and private signs in West Tampa, FL. The total number of units of analysis written in English is 202, along with 31 units of analysis written only in Spanish, 24 written in both English and Spanish, 2 units of analysis were found to be written in Portuguese; and 1 unit of analysis was written in Italian.

Table 7: Languages displayed on the signs in West Tampa, FL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language(s) displayed</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Portuguese</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>English &amp; Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit of analysis by language</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 7, the percentage of the total units of analysis written in English and Spanish is 9.23%. The percentage of the total of units of analysis written in Italian is 0.38%, Portuguese is 0.77%, Spanish is 11.92%, and English is 77.69%. (See Table 8 and Figure 22).

Table 8: Languages displayed on the signs in West Tampa, FL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language(s) displayed</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Portuguese</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>English &amp; Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit of analysis by language</td>
<td>77.69%</td>
<td>11.92%</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>9.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables 6, 7, and 8 and Figures 21 and 22 respond to Research Question #1: What languages other than English are used in writing on the public signs in the LL of the two survey areas?

From Tables 6, 7 and 8, the percentage of the total units of analysis written in two languages is 9.23%. These include the signs written in English and Spanish. The percentage of the total of units of analysis written in only one language (English, Spanish, Portuguese, or Italian) is 89.99%.

Table 9: Monolingual and Bilingual percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monolingual units of analysis</td>
<td>89.99 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual units of analysis</td>
<td>9.23 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 responds to Research Question #2.

How are the languages on the public signs displayed? Are they primarily monolingual, multilingual, or translingual?
2.1.2. Step 2: Taxonomy 3

Taxonomy is based on the sign ownership and presumed reader “The Rules of the Signs” (see Figures 19 and 20)

Table 10: Taxonomy 3, Case Study West Tampa, FL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rules</th>
<th>Clusters</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rule 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rule 1 (write signs in a language you know); Rule 2 (presumed reader); Rule 3 (symbolic value).
C 1: Street signs; C 2: Advertisements, C 3: Warning notices & Prohibitions; C 4: Building names; C 5: Informative signs; C 6: Commemorative plaques; C 7: Signs on Objects; C 8: Graffiti.

Summary Table 10: Taxonomy 3, Case Study West Tampa, FL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informational function</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic function</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>25.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative function</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>44.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language activism</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 23 displays the results obtained after the application of Taxonomy 3, “the Rules of the Signs,” showing the choice of the languages on public and private signs in West Tampa, FL.

We see that 48.85% of the units of analysis follow Rule 1, “write signs in a language you know”; Rule 2, “presumed reader” applies to 26.15% of the units of analysis; and almost 25.00% of the units of analysis correspond to Rule 3 and fall into the category of “symbolic value.”
Figure 23: Taxonomy 3, based on the ownership of the signs and the reader
“The Rules of the Signs”

The main functions of the public and private signs in West Tampa, FL, are displayed in Figure 24. The results show that 44% of the signs have a “communicative function,” that 25% have a “symbolic function,” that the “informational function” represents 19% of the signs, and that 12% of the signs have been categorized as “language activism.”
2.1.3 Beyond the theories

To this point, “SC’s research method” (Spolsky & Cooper’s Taxonomies and Spolsky’s competence model) has been developed and applied to the data obtained for this study. Spolsky and Cooper’s Taxonomies and Spolsky’s competence model were not based on monolingual settings, but on multilingual research areas.

However, in the next step, SC’s research method is applied in this study on the units of analysis written in Spanish to obtain the specific information related to Spanish in the particular survey areas for this study, starting with the West Tampa, FL research area.

2.1.3.1 Step 1: Taxonomies 1 and 2 (based on Figure 19) related to only units of analysis written in Spanish found in West Tampa, FL (See Table 11 and Figure 24).
Table 11: Taxonomy 1 and 2 (only Spanish), Case Study 1: West Tampa, FL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo #</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5973</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5995</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6019</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6031</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6069</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6075</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6077</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6079</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6081</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6083</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6099</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6119</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6122</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6201</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6205</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6209</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37 1) Street signs; 2) Advertisements, 3) Warning notices & Prohibitions; 4) Building names; 5) Informative signs; 6) Commemorative plaques; 7) Signs on Objects; 8) Graffiti.
Figure 25 shows the results after classifying the units of analysis written in Spanish collected in West Tampa, FL (Table 11). This classification was based on the function and use of the signs, Taxonomy 1 (see Figure 24). From a total of 31 units of analysis in Spanish, 2 are signs identifying “street names,” 15 are “advertising signs,” 0 signs are “warning notices and prohibitions,” 8 signs fall in the category of “building names,” 1 is an “informative signs,” 0 signs are in the category of “commemorative plaques,” 4 are “labels on objects,” and 1 is “graffiti.”

Figure 25: Taxonomy 1, based on the functions and content of the signs written in Spanish.
2.1.3.2. Step 2: Taxonomy 3, is based on the sign ownership and presumed reader “The Rules of the Signs” (Figures 19 and 20).

Table 12: Taxonomy 3 applied on signs written in Spanish. Case Study West Tampa, FL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rules</th>
<th>Clusters</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C 1</td>
<td>C 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sums</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rule 1 (write signs in a language you know); Rule 2 (presumed reader); Rule 3 (symbolic value). C 1: Street signs; C 2: Advertisements, C 3: Warning notices & Prohibitions; C 4: Building names; C 5: Informative signs; C 6: Commemorative plaques; C 7: Signs on Objects; C 8: Graffiti

Summary of Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language activism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 26 displays the results obtained after the application of Taxonomy 3, “the Rules of the Signs,” showing the choice of the languages on public and private signs written in Spanish in West Tampa, FL (Table 12). We see that 64.52% of the units of analysis follow Rule 1, “write signs in a language you know”; Rule 2, “presumed reader” applies to 9.68% of the units of analysis; and almost 25.81% of the units of analysis correspond to Rule 3 and fall into the category of “symbolic value.”
The main functions of the public and private signs written in Spanish in West Tampa, FL, are displayed in Figure 27. The results show that 61% of the signs have a “communicative function,” that 26% have a “symbolic function,” that the “informational function” represents 7% of the signs, and that 6% of the signs have been categorized as “language activism.”

Figure 27: Functions of the signs written in Spanish in West Tampa, FL
Figure 28 is a picture of two street signs which include a Spanish proper name, St Isabel St. This is an example of language activism. Street signs and road signs are considered the focus of language activism in many countries (Spolsky, “Prolegomena to a Sociolinguistic Theory of Public Signage” 34).

Figure 28: W St Isabel St 2300, West Tampa, FL
Source: Intersection of 2300 W St Isabel St and N Armenia, West Tampa, FL, 33607. IMG_6075. MG

38 St. Isabel, Pedro III de Aragon’s daughter. She was born in Aragón, Spain in 1271. She was Queen consort, and daughter, mother, and sister of Kings.
Figure 29 displays advertisement written in Spanish and posted on a billboard. This is an example of the communicative function of signs according to Grin. (See Figure 27)

`tampa hoy/ Un Nuevo Noticiero para tu Comunidad/ LUNES A VIERNES 9p/ great 38
(“tampa today/ A New News [program] for your Community/ MONDAY TO FRIDAY 9p/ Great 38” (my translation).

Figure 29: Billboard advertisement

Source: N Dale Mabry Hwy. IMG_5827. MG
2.1.4 Examples: Case Study 1 West Tampa, FL: Linguistic and multimodal data examples

2.1.4.1 Figure 30 displays a Cuban Restaurant located in West Tampa. The upper sign shown in the photo is written in English, “CUBAN FOOD. $7.05 LUCH SPECIAL.” The lower banner in the image includes the translation of the sign above to Spanish, “COMIDA CUBANA,” while the advertisements of “$6.99 / LUNCH SPECIAL” and “$7.95 / CUBAN SANDWICH COMBO” maintain the use of the English language. The street signs in this photograph are written in English and the streets have kept the original names since the 19th Century.

Figure 30: Santi’s Restaurant & Cafeteria, West Tampa, FL
Source: Intersection of 2100 W Chestnut St and 1800 Howard Armenia Ave, Tampa, FL, 33607. IMG_0022. MG
2.1.4.2 The warning sign presented in Figure 31 reads as follows:

NO TRESPASSING / NO TRESPASO /NO PASAR/ PROPERTY OF THE CITY OF TAMPA VIOLATORS WILL BE PROSECUTED.

The “NO TRESPASO” message seems to be an attempt to translate the “NO TRESPASSING” message. However, “NO TRESPASO” is not a correct translation of “no trespassing” in English, Spanish, Italian, or Portuguese. It seems to be a mistaken translation of this official sign.

Figure 31: Warning sign
Source: 410 S Howard Avenue, West Tampa, FL, 33606. IMG_0014. MG
In Figure 32, the business name, a description of the products that clients can purchase, and the hours the business is open are displayed. The name is written in Spanish and its corresponding translation in English is also provided, as follows:


A minor orthographic mistake is found in the word “Miercoles” which should use an accent mark over the vowel “e,” as in: “Miércoles.”
In Figure 33, the business name and the description of the services offered are displayed. The name is written in English, and its corresponding translation in Spanish is also provided:

**INFINITY, MANUFACTURED HOMES. MOBILE HOMES SALE / VENTA DE CASA MOBILES. Buy – Sell – Lease / Comprar – Vender – Alquilar. 813-915-5335.**

However, the translation to Spanish has a few orthographic mistakes, as follows: “CASA” should be plural, and “MOBILES” should be written with a ‘v’ instead of a ‘b,’ and the first syllable should have an accent over the vowel ‘o.’ Finally, the verb “lease” should be translated as *alquilar* or *rentar* instead of *listar,* which means ‘to list’ in English. Therefore, the correct translation of this unit of analysis to Spanish should be read as: **VENTA DE CASAS MÓVILES. Comprar – Vender – Alquilar.**

---

Figure 33: Business name and description of services offered
Source: 6715 N Armenia Ave, Tampa, FL. 33604. IMG_3637. MG
2.1.4.5 Figure 34 shows Don Pancho’s Restaurant which is located in West Tampa.

Figure 34 presents several units of analysis including the following content: (1) “Don Pancho/ TACOS AND CERVEZA;” and (2) “TACO WENESDAY $1 TACO EMERGENCY CALL 9 JUAN JUAN.” On unit of analysis number 1, nouns in Spanish are used. However, between the nouns tacos and cerveza the English conjunction “and” is used instead of the Spanish conjunction y. It should also be noted that according to the Spanish prescriptive grammar there is a lack of concordance of number (singular/plural) between the two nouns tacos and cerveza. Proper use of the Spanish language would require tacos y cervezas, if the owner and/or writer of the sign intended to use correct Spanish. Another interesting note is the phonetic play with “CALL 9 JUAN JUAN” in unit of analysis number 2 (Figure 34). In Spanish, Juan is a
proper name whose phonetic transcription is as follows: [ˈxwân]. If it is read as an English term, it would be read as “call 911” [kɔːˈnæmˈwaːnˈwaːn].

Figure 34 could also represent what some scholars have described as mockery in the use of Spanish in white spaces (Schwartz). Applying the interpretation of what some authors have named “Mock Spanish” leads to a much less acceptable interpretation of the motives of the sign maker (Schwartz 648). Schwartz refers to this as the “production of Spanish-inspired humor in monolingual English discourse. Schwartz theorizes that “(...) Spanish and Spanish speakers provide an endless repertoire of linguistic (and non-linguistic) resources to be appropriated by White speakers and audiences” (646). Hill, a linguistic anthropologist and one of the leading proponents of this area of analysis, posits that Anglo-Americans in the southwestern United States use the Spanish language in limited and specialized ways in an attempt to dominate Spanish speakers both socially and economically (Hill, quoted in Schwartz 647). In other words, use of supposedly funny phrases in Spanish could, in fact, be a form of covert racism used by the English-speaking population to assert in a covert way its dominance over the Spanish-speaking population. According to Hill, the use of the word *cerveza* by English speakers carries an indirect index (i.e., indirect indexicality) that implies that in this case the English speakers will be relaxed in their use of alcohol, in the stereotypical way that Spanish speakers consume alcohol. This use of innocent sounding words in Spanish is supplemented by indirect indexicality to raise covertly some ugly stereotypes about the supposedly drunken speakers of Spanish.

In this research project, no attempt was made to determine if this particular example in Figure 34 is an example of the use of Mock Spanish for these purposes or simply an attempt at humor.
I do not have any evidence that these particular signs are overtly or covertly an attempt to express negative images of those who speak Spanish.

2.1.4.6 In Figure 35, the sign on the front of the business giving the name of the business reads “Tam Barato.” The word “Tam” at first appears to be a misspelling of the Spanish word “Tan.” If that is the word intended, the final consonant in the word “Tam” should be the letter ‘n’ instead of the letter ‘m.’ That is, it should be read as “Tan Barato” and the translation would be “so cheap.” However, “Tam” is also used locally as an abbreviation for Tampa. That usage may not be understood by people who are not from the Tampa area. Several businesses have been found in the Official Site of the Florida Department of Business & Professional Regulations for Tampa with the same name. This further information seems to support the assumption that the usage of the word “Tam” is not an error in orthography but idiosyncratic (Grin, “Language Planning and Economics” 58).

Figure 35: Business name: “Tam Barato”
Source: 6735 N Armenia Ave, Tampa, FL, 33604. IMG_3648. MG
Figure 36 is a picture of a mural in Salcines Park, located in West Tampa. The mural depicts what is called “Face of West Tampa” (Krol & Sawyer) and represents the diverse history of West Tampa. It was created to honor the diverse history of West Tampa. The figures in the painted mural are Mr. and Mrs. Salcines, immigrants from Spain, and their son, E.J. Salcines, Jr., Blas O’Halloran, and Leon Claxton, among other well-known historic figures recognized in this mural for their contributions to this area. This is one example of the multimodal signs found in the West Tampa area.

Figure 36: “Face of West Tampa”
Source: Salcines Park. 1705 N Howard Avenue, West Tampa, FL, 33607. IMG_2846. MG
2.1.4.8 Figure 37 presents another example of the symbolic function of the signs and the relevance of multimodal meaning. This unit of analysis shows the mural called “Change the Whirled” and it is located in the West Tampa Center for the Arts. The mural was created in 2021 by Brandan Odums to support the local businesses and community organizations, as well as to contribute to the vibrancy of Old West Tampa. This mural was also created to honor Colin Kaepernick and his activism against racism and police violence” (Ben & Jerry’s).

(“The Blueprint to tomorrow is in our imagination” / “Know my rights / Power to the people/ Know your rights/ 10 Points”)

Figure 37: “Change the Whirled”
Source: 1906 N Armenia Ave, Tampa, FL, 33607. IMG_27. MG
2.2. Case Study 2: Ybor City, Tampa, FL: Representing and visualizing the data

The findings obtained after applying the SC's LL research method\textsuperscript{39} are presented in Case Study 2 hereafter.

2.2.1. Step 1: Taxonomies 1 and 2 (based on Figure 19).

Taxonomies 1 and 2 related only to only of analysis found in Ybor City, FL (See Table 13 and Figure 37).

Table 13: Taxonomy 1, Case Study 2: Ybor City, Tampa, FL\textsuperscript{40}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo #</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>E &amp; F</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>E &amp; I</th>
<th>E &amp; S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3463</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3471</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3472</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3474</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3475</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3476</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3477</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3478</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3479</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3492</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3493</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3494</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3496</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3499</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3501</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3503</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3504</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3510</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{39} See Chapter IV for the description of SC’s LL research method.

\textsuperscript{40} 1) Street signs; 2) Advertisements, 3) Warning notices & Prohibitions; 4) Building names; 5) Informative signs; 6) Commemorative plaques; 7) Signs on Objects; 8) Graffiti.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3511</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3512</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3517</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3521</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3525</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3527</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3529</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3533</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3534</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3535</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3536</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3537</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3538</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3541</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3542</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3543</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3544</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3545</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3546</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5191</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5194</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5196</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5231</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5297</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5298</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5300</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5301</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5302</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5303</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5304</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5305</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5306</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5307</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5309</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5310</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5311</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5312</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5313</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5318</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5322</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5323</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5325</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5329</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5329</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 38 shows the results after classifying the units of analysis collected in Ybor City, FL. The classification was based on the function and use of the signs. From a total of 260 units of analysis, 14 are “street names,” 38 are “advertising signs,” 25 are “warning notices and prohibitions,” 70 units of analysis correspond to “building names,” 15 are “informative signs,” 7 are “commemorative plaques,” 78 are “labels on objects,” and 13 are “graffiti.”

![Case Study 2: Ybor City, Tampa, FL](image)

The functions and uses of 260 units of analysis.

Figure 38: Taxonomy 1, based on the functions and content of the signs
Table 14 displays the languages found on the units of analysis in this study site, the number of units of analysis by languages. Figure 39 displays the percentages of units of analysis by languages in Ybor City, Tampa. The results in the percentages obtained after applying Taxonomy 2 are presented in Figure 39 below. This classification is based on the languages used on the public and private signs in Ybor City, Tampa, FL. The total of the units of analysis written in English is 206. There are 21 units of analysis written only in Spanish, 10 units of analysis written in both English and Spanish, 1 unit of analysis was written in French; 1 unit of analysis was written in English and French; 8 units of analysis were written in Italian; and 3 units of analysis were written in English and Italian. Finally, the percentage of the total units of analysis written in two languages is 5.38%

Table 14: Languages displayed on the signs in Ybor City, Tampa, FL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language(s) displayed</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>English &amp; French</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>English &amp; Italian</th>
<th>English &amp; Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit of analysis by language</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 14, the percentage of the total units of analysis written in English and Spanish is 3.85%. The percentage of the total of units of analysis written in English and Italian is 1.15%, Italian only is 3.08%, English and French is 0.38%, Spanish only is 8.08% and English only is 79.23%. (See Table 15 and Figure 39). The percentages do not total 100% because some graffiti does not include text. However, graffiti has been counted since it has an informative function (Spolsky & Cooper 93).
Table 15: Languages displayed on the signs in Ybor City, Tampa, FL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language(s) displayed</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>English &amp; French</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>English &amp; Italian</th>
<th>English &amp; Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit of analysis by language</td>
<td>79.23%</td>
<td>8.08%</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>3.08%</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 39: Taxonomy 2, based on the languages used on the signs in Ybor City, Tampa, FL
Tables 13, 14, and 15, and Figures 38 and 39, respond to Research Question #1:

What languages other than English are used in writing on the public signs in the LL of the two survey areas. From Tables 14 and 15, the percentage of the total units of analysis written in two languages is 5.38%. The percentage of the total units of analysis written in only one language (English, Spanish, Portuguese, or Italian) is 90.77%.

Table 16: Monolingual and bilingual percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monolingual units of analysis</th>
<th>90.77 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual units of analysis</td>
<td>5.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 responds to Research Question #2: How are the languages on the public signs displayed? Are they primarily monolingual, multilingual, or translingual?

2.2.2 Step 2: Taxonomy 3

Taxonomy 3 is based on the sign ownership and presumed reader “The Rules of the Signs” (see Figures 19 and 20).

Table 17: Taxonomy 3, Case Study Ybor City, FL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rules</th>
<th>Clusters</th>
<th>C 1</th>
<th>C 2</th>
<th>C 3</th>
<th>C 4</th>
<th>C 5</th>
<th>C 6</th>
<th>C 7</th>
<th>C 8</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rule 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sums</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>260</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rule 1 “write signs in a language you know”; Rule 2 “presumed reader”; Rule 3 “symbolic value”. C 1: Street signs; C 2: Advertisements, C 3: Warning notices & prohibitions; C 4: Building names; C 5: Informative signs; C 6: Commemorative plaques; C 7: Signs on objects; C 8: Graffiti.
Summary Table 17: Taxonomy 3, Case Study Ybor City, Tampa, FL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informational function</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic function</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>29.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative function</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>44.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language activism</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 40 displays the results obtained after applying Taxonomy 3, “the Rules of the Signs;” the choice of the languages for public and private signs in Ybor City, Tampa, FL. We see that 52.31% of the units of analysis follow Rule 1, “write signs in a language you know;” Rule 2, the “presumed reader” contains 20.77% of the units of analysis, and almost 26.92% of the units of analysis correspond to Rule 3, the “symbolic value.”

Case Study 2: Ybor City, Tampa, FL
The choice of the language of public and private signs

Figure 40: Taxonomy 3, based on the sign ownership and reader “The Rules of the Signs”
The main function of public and private signs in Ybor City, Tampa, FL, is displayed in Figure 41. The results show that 45% of the signs have a “communicative function,” 30% of the signs have a “symbolic function,” that the “informational function” represents 20% of the signs, and that 5% of the signs represent “language activism.”

Figure 41: Function of the signs in Ybor City, Tampa, FL

2.2.3 Beyond the theories

As mentioned in Section 2.1.3. of this Chapter, to this point, “SC’s research method” (Spolsky and Cooper’s Taxonomies and Spolsky’s competence model) has been developed and applied to the data obtained for this study. It should be noted that Spolsky and Cooper’s Taxonomies and Spolsky’s competence model were not based on monolingual settings, but on
multilingual research areas. However, in the next step, SC’s research method is applied in this study on the units of analysis written in Spanish to obtain specific information related to the use of Spanish on the units of analysis in the particular survey area of Case Study 2, Ybor City, Tampa, FL.

2.2.3.1  Step 1: Taxonomies 1 and 2 (based on Figure 19) related only to units of analysis written in Spanish that were found in Ybor City, Tampa, FL (See Table 18 and Figure 42).

Table 18: Taxonomy 1 and 2 (only Spanish), Case Study 2: Ybor City, Tampa, FL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo #</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8 Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3463</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3471</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3476</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3496</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3501</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3521</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3534</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3535</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3536</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5310</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5335</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5347</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5374</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5377</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5381</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5471</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41 1) Street signs; 2) Advertisements, 3) Warning notices & prohibitions; 4) Building names; 5) Informative signs; 6) Commemorative plaques; 7) Signs on objects; 8) Graffiti.
Figure 42 shows the results after classifying the units of analysis written in Spanish collected in Ybor City, Tampa, FL. This classification was based on the function and use of the signs, Taxonomy 1 (Table 18). From a total of 21 units of analysis in Spanish, 6 are signs identifying “street names,” 0 signs are in the category of “advertising signs,” 1 sign is in the category of “warning notices and prohibitions,” 7 signs fall in the category of “building names,” 1 is an “informative signs,” 0 signs are in the category of “commemorative plaques,” 12 are “labels on objects,” and 0 signs in Spanish are in the category of “graffiti.”

![Case Study 2: Ybor City, Tampa, FL. The functions and uses of 21 units of analysis in Spanish.](image)

Figure 42: Taxonomy 1, based on the functions and content of the signs
2.2.3.2 Step 2: Taxonomy 3

Taxonomy 3 is based on the sign ownership and presumed reader “the Rules of the Signs” (see Figures 19 and 20)

Table 19: Taxonomy 3, Case Study Ybor City, FL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rules</th>
<th>Clusters</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C 1</td>
<td>C 2</td>
<td>C 3</td>
<td>C 4</td>
<td>C 5</td>
<td>C 6</td>
<td>C 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sums</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rule 1 (write signs in a language you know); Rule 2 (presumed reader); Rule 3 (symbolic value).

C 1: Street signs; C 2: Advertisements, C 3: Warning notices & prohibitions; C 4: Building names; C 5: Informative signs; C 6: Commemorative plaques; C 7: Signs on objects; C 8: Graffiti

Summary of Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informational function</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic function</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative function</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language activism</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 43 displays the results obtained after the application of Taxonomy 3, “the Rules of the Signs,” showing the choice of the languages on public and private signs written in Spanish in Ybor City, Tampa, FL (Table 19). We see that 44.44% of the units of analysis follow Rule 1, “write signs in a language you know”; Rule 2, “presumed reader” applies to 29.63% of the units of analysis; and 25.93% of the units of analysis correspond to Rule 3 and fall into the category of “symbolic value.”

Figure 43: Taxonomy 3, based on the sign ownership and reader “the Rules of the Signs.”
The main functions of the public and private signs written in Spanish in Ybor City, Tampa, FL, are displayed in Figure 44. The results show that 45% of the signs have a “communicative function,” that 26% have a “symbolic function,” that the “informational function” represents 7% of the signs, and that 22% of the signs have been categorized as “language activism.”

Figure 44: Functions of the signs written in Spanish in Ybor City, Tampa, FL.
Figure 45 is a picture of two street signs which include a Spanish proper name, Angel Oliva. For the same street two names are used: Angel Oliva Senior Street and 18th Street. This is a fact that occurs on several other street signs in Ybor City, such as the street sign on 7th Ave / La Séptima. This is an example of language activism (see Figure 44). Street signs and road signs are considered the focus of language activism in many countries (Spolsky, “Prolegomena to a Sociolinguistic Theory of Public Signage” 34).

Figure 45: N 1900 Angel Oliva Sr. St, Ybor City, Tampa, FL
Source: Intersection of N 1900 Angel Oliva Sr. St / N 1900 and 18th St E 1800 9th Ave, Ybor City Tampa, FL, 33607. IMG_6075. MG

42 Angel Oliva: Oliva Tobacco Company
Figure 46 displays a building name written in Spanish. This is an example of the symbolic function of signs (see Figure 44): CENTRO ESPAÑOL “SPANISH CENTER” (my translation). This is one of the numerous historic buildings listed in the National Register of Historic Buildings, constructed by the Spaniards in 1892 for entertainment events.

Figure 46: Centro Español
Source: 7th Ave. La Séptima, Ybor City, Tampa, FL. IMG_3536. MG
2.2.4 Examples: Case Study 2: Ybor City, Tampa, FL: Linguistic and multimodal data examples

Figure 47 displays the store front of a retail shop, closed and empty at the time this investigation occurred. One of the windows is covered with an advertisement of “BUD LIGHT” (a beer brand). This advertisement uses a photograph showing workers inside a cigar factory in which they were rolling cigars by hand.
Figure 48 represents a tobacco leaf. The sidewalk art in Figure 48 is one of many tobacco leaves that a pedestrian will see while walking on the sidewalks of La Séptima street in Ybor City. The text written on the leaf shows the feelings of Ybor City’s population toward their community: “(...) in the day of fast-food chains, shopping centers, and high-mobility life, it seems impossible to realize that the housewife of Ybor City did not actually need a car” by Pacheco (a local writer). This is one more example of the multimodal signs found in the Ybor City area, with a significant nod to the historical tobacco industry of the area.
Figure 49 shows the building in which one of the main cigar factories was located at the beginning of the 20th Century, 1928 Corral Wodiska y CA. (see it listed in Table 4). The building is currently occupied by a variety of business offices.
Figure 50 shows a mural called “Tampa Welcome.” (One), located on Adamo Street, the access to Downtown from Highway I-275 (exit at 801 E. Scott Street) and designed to welcome visitors into the area. This artwork is the largest in Florida (12,000 square feet) and addresses the following topics: (1) the journey through life, (2) the conflict between tradition and progress, and (3) the American experience (yborartorihect.com).

Figure 50: Art in Ybor City
Source: Adamo Street, Tampa, FL, 33605. IMG_2814, MG
Figure 51 shows three different units of analysis found in Ybor City. They are some of the many bricks on the pedestrian areas along Seventh Ave. These bricks include messages in English or Spanish ("SOMOS LATINOS / QUE VIVA YBOR / FAMILIA REYES") or a combination of both languages (LA FLORIDANA / CIGARRERIA / REYES FAMILY).
COMPARISON RESULTS OF CASE STUDIES 1 AND 2

1. Comparing the language displayed on the signs of Case Study 1, West Tampa, FL, and Case Study 2, Ybor City, Tampa, FL shows a slight difference in the percentage of the English used. In West Tampa, 77.69% of the units of analysis are in English only, but in Ybor City the percentage is 79.23%, with only a slight difference of 1.54% in the use of English in both areas. The only significant difference is found in the bilingual English and Spanish units of analysis in the two survey areas. West Tampa has 5.38% more bilingual signs than the area of Ybor City. Additionally, French has no presence in West Tampa, but there are signs in Italian and Portuguese in West Tampa, although the percentage for each such language is less than 1 percent. There were no bilingual signs in English and Italian in West Tampa, while in Ybor City, Italian is visible in 3.08% of the units of analysis and Italian in combination with English appears on 1.15% of the units of analysis (see Table 20).

Table 20: Comparison of the presence of languages in West Tampa and Ybor City, Tampa, FL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>English &amp; French</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>English &amp; Italian</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English &amp; Spanish</th>
<th>Portuguese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Tampa</td>
<td>77.69%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>11.92%</td>
<td>9.23%</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ybor City</td>
<td>79.23%</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>3.08%</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>8.08%</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When comparing the units of analysis written in only one language and those written in two languages in the two survey areas, we see that in West Tampa the percentage of the units of analysis which use two languages on the signs is 9.23% and in Ybor City the percentage is 5.38%. The percentages do not total 100% because some graffiti does not include text. However, they have been counted since they have an informative function (Spolsky & Cooper 93).
Table 21: Comparison of the presence of units of analysis written in one or two languages in West Tampa and Ybor City, Tampa, FL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Only one language</th>
<th>Two languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Tampa</td>
<td>89.99%</td>
<td>9.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ybor City</td>
<td>90.77%</td>
<td>5.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. A comparison of the choice of the languages on the public and private signs in the two sites reveals that in both areas more than 50% of the units of analysis are written in the language that the writer knows. Rule 1 (“write signs in a language you know”) can be used to explain why a sign is written in a specific language. The language used to write on the sign may not reflect the language used by the population of the area, but rather the language that the writer of the sign knows. Rule 2 (“presumed reader”) involves an economic motivation in the choice of the language used on a sign. Under Rule 2, the sign is written in the language that the potential reader can understand. Finally, the more relevant difference in the review of the signs studied in the two survey areas is found in Rule 3, the “symbolic value.” Under Rule 3, the person writing the sign is presumed to prefer to write the sign in their own language or in the language with which they want to be identified by others (Spolsky, “Linguistic Landscape” 10). The signs that appear to be written in accordance with Rule 3, symbolic value, is elevated in both study areas, but the comparison of the two areas shows that use of signs based on symbolic value is considerably higher in Ybor City than in West Tampa.

Table 22: Comparison of the choice of the language used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rule 1</th>
<th>Rule 2</th>
<th>Rule 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Tampa</td>
<td>48.85%</td>
<td>26.15%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ybor City</td>
<td>52.31%</td>
<td>20.77%</td>
<td>26.92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R1: write signs in a language you know. R2: presumed reader. R3: symbolic value
3. The comparison in Table 23 shows that the main function of the signs in both areas have primarily symbolic and communicative functions (Vaillancourt, “Language and Poverty: Measurement, Determinants and Policy Responses” 152). The symbolic function of the language is related to identity. The communicative function of the signs is related to economics (Grin, “The Bilingual Advertising Decision”).

Table 23: Comparison of the main functions of the language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language activism</th>
<th>Informational function</th>
<th>Symbolic function</th>
<th>Communicative function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Tampa</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ybor City</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The comparison in Table 24 shows that the main function of the signs written only in Spanish in both survey areas have primarily symbolic and communicative functions (Vaillancourt, “Language and Poverty: Measurement, Determinants and Policy Responses” 152). The symbolic function of the language is related to identity. The communicative function of the signs is related to economics (Grin, “The Bilingual Advertising Decision”).

Table 24: Comparison of the main functions of the Spanish language signs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language activism</th>
<th>Informational function</th>
<th>Symbolic function</th>
<th>Communicative function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Tampa</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
<td>25.81%</td>
<td>61.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ybor City</td>
<td>7.41%</td>
<td>25.93%</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

The primary purpose of this section is to present the discussion of the results shown above. This discussion includes: (1) a summary of the findings regarding my research questions, and an interpretation of the results; (2) the limitations found while conducting this study; and (3) some recommendations for future investigations.
1. Summary of the findings and interpretation of the results

1.1 Qualitative Research: Results

1.1.1 Relevant foundational information obtained from the historical documents

From the multisite case study of qualitative research, the historical documents found show the significance of both survey areas, Ybor City and West Tampa, and that both developed rapidly from the late 19th century through the beginning of the 20th century due to the cigar manufacturing industry then being established in both areas. This fact has been highlighted by the artistic development of the survey areas that began in the later part of the 20th century. Currently, the National Register of Historic Buildings includes numerous historic buildings located in both Ybor City and West Tampa (Ybor City CRA). Additionally, Ybor City is recognized as a National Historic District (Charleton).

1.1.2 Relevant foundational information obtained from the City of Tampa Code of Ordinances

This qualitative research has also demonstrated that the City of Tampa Code of Ordinances includes important historic building preservation regulations, regulations for the Ybor Tampa Tourist Marketing District, and a limited number of sign regulations (City of Tampa Sign Code). These government regulations indicate an interest in maintaining these landmark areas, and respecting the history and diversity of these areas. The Code of Ordinances clearly demonstrates that the City of Tampa is interested in maintaining the multiculturalism that emerged in the survey areas more than a century ago. In addition, it is important to note that the City of Tampa Sign Code does not regulate the content of signs. Likewise, there are no regulations in the City of Tampa that require the use of a specific language in the signs displayed. It is interesting to note that the City of Tampa Sign Code makes no attempt to impose any language policy or restrictions on the use of language on signs (City of Tampa Sign Code). It
is also interesting that in none of the redevelopment or maintenance laws, codes and regulations adopted for Ybor City and the City of Tampa in an attempt to preserve and protect the legacy of particular neighborhoods, are there language policies that promote a particular language or languages. There is no English language requirement for commercial signs, except as noted with respect to the Child Protection Ordinance for the Ybor City Historic District (prohibiting minors from visiting restricted areas between 11:00 PM and 4:00 AM) (City of Tampa Sign Code). Therefore, the lack of language policy regulations on the public and private signage in the City of Tampa Sign Code allows the owners of establishments and businesses the freedom to choose the language or languages for their signs that are the best for their business objectives.

1.1.3 Answering Research Question #3

Research Question #3 related to the relationship between the LL of the areas selected for the two case studies and their EL has been answered. This relationship was found in: (a) market share or employability and (b) productivity (Gazzola & Mazzacani 713; Grin, “Fifty Years of Economics in Language Economics” 39). The relationship was found through direct observations and also based on the written text on the public and private signs found in both target areas and the relationship is explained below.

1.1.3.1 Direct Observations: Results of Case Study #1

From my direct observations, the analysis suggests that in the West Tampa area, the results indicate that Spanish is the language used as the means of communication between clients and employees of the businesses located in the West Tampa site used in Case Study 1. The people (customers and employees) observed are bilingual in English and Spanish, and some of those observed have little proficiency in English. Spanish is the language used to communicate with the employees and customers of the business establishments found in the West Tampa area.
The informal interviews conducted during these observations indicate that Spanish language skills may be a necessary condition for a person to be able to work in the stores as can be inferred from the portion of a conversation with a store employee reproduced below:

“Aquí todos hablamos español (...) Solo la manager es americana y ella también habla español. (...) Sí, pa’ los customers hispanos. (...) Yo soy de aquí, de los estados, pero mis papás son cubanos. (...) ...en la casa hablamos el español . (...) Esa de allá, esa es colombiana, pero lo que más habemos [hay] somos [son] cubanos, bueno también de Venezuela y Colombia hay bastante.”

“Here everyone speaks Spanish (...) Only the manager is an American, and she also speaks Spanish (...) …to talk with the Hispanic customers. (...) I’m from here, from the states, but my parents are Cuban. (...) Yes, at home we speak Spanish. (...) That one is Colombian but what there are the most are Cubans, well there are also a lot of people from Venezuela and from Colombia too”
(Interviewee during direct observation; my translation.)

From direct observations inside several stores in the West Tampa site in Case Study 1, the font used for the English portion of the signs is approximately twice the size of the font for the text in Spanish on the signs, indicating that English is considered more relevant than Spanish by the owners of these stores, which is also corroborated when observing that the words written in English are posted above and the words in Spanish are below on the signs. However, most products from Spanish-speaking countries are labeled in Spanish in large letters and shiny colors, show the flag of the country of origin, and have only short translations to English (with the translations to English in small letters and flat colors). Nevertheless, some labels on products from Spanish-speaking countries are not written in Spanish. Those products include the flag from the country-of-origin packaging, but the labels on the packaging are written in English (with the English text in a large font with and shiny colors matching the colors of the flag on the package). This is the type of advertisement is referred to as ‘multilingual marketing,’ which occurs when the target market is multilingual (Grin, “The Bilingual Advertising Decision”). Additionally,
employment signs in this store are bilingual in English and Spanish, further providing support for the idea that the goal of the business is to hire bilingual employees. Moreover, based on observations, Spanish is the language that is predominately used to communicate between employees and customers of the businesses on this site. Consequently, Spanish language skills may be a necessary requirement for employees who are hired to work in the stores, corroborating Gazzola and Mazzacani’s empirical study in which their results indicate that the probabilities of being employed are higher for those who have foreign language skills.

1.1.3.2 Direct Observations: Results of Case Study 2

From direct observations in the Ybor City site in Case Study 2, the people observed (customers, employees, the local population, and tourists) mainly used English in interactions with the customers of the business establishments found in this area to which I could have access. The observations in this study area were made from both inside and outside the establishments. It appeared that the majority of the employees in the businesses observed could not understand Spanish. The menus posted inside and outside the restaurants that were open and could be observed were written only in English. The restaurants offered some Spanish and Italian dishes, but on the menus, the descriptions of those menu items are written in English. The banners placed near these open restaurants, near an ice cream store, and on other objects were labeled or written in English, with the exception of some names of popular Spanish drinks that were displayed on one banner. This is the “consumption advertising” category which promotes the purchase and sale of final goods and services and is aimed at the general public (Grin, “The Bilingual Advertising Decision”). In this area, the general public is the local population who speak English and tourists who may speak English as their first language or as their lingua franca.
The fact that some street signs are written in English and in Spanish, and some are written in English with two Spanish linguistic varieties, may indicate the government’s strong efforts to the preservation of the languages used in this historic area in the past, which may indicate the presence of the “language activism” described by Fishman (quoted in Spolsky, “Managing Public Linguistic Space” 197).

1.2. Quantitative Research: Results

1.2.1 Answering Research Questions #1 and #2

1.2.1.1 Mirroring the Census data

From the quantitative research approach of LL the results indicate that in Case Study 1, West Tampa, FL, and Case Study 2 Ybor City, FL, the percentages for the various languages displayed on the public signs are in the range of 77.69-79.23% for the English language alone. This percentage is close to the percentage of the population (74.9%) that speaks English only according to the U.S. Census estimates for 2019 in Tampa City, FL. These results may indicate that the use of English in the LL in these survey areas reflects the linguistic background of the population of the two survey areas. The use of the Spanish language on the units of analysis in the survey areas has been found to fall in the range of 8.08-11.92%.

Unlike the results for English, the percentage of the units of analysis on which the Spanish language is displayed does not closely coincide with the percentage of the population that uses the Spanish or any other language in their homes (U.S. Census Bureau, Language Spoken at Home. Tampa City, Florida). These percentages do not correspond with the results

---

43 See section 2, Results of General Quantitation on this chapter.
44 Spanish is 23.3 %, “other Indo-European languages” is 4.2% and “Asian and Pacific Islander languages” is 2.6%, and in the category of “other languages” 0.7%.
for the units of analysis displayed in which only 2.5% were found in the category of “other Indo-
European languages” and 0% for the rest of categories.

1.2.1.2 Language choice

In considering the choice of the language in which signs are written in both survey areas, West Tampa and Ybor City respectively, the results showed that a range of 49-52% of the signs were written in the language known by the persons designing or making the signs; a range of 20-26% were written in the language known by the presumed reader; and in a range of 25-27% the languages used in the signs were chosen because of their symbolic value, that is, the signs were written in the language with which the owners/writers identified themselves or in a language with which they wish to be identified. The units of analysis in Ybor City have a slightly more significant percentage of signs in which the languages used were chosen for their symbolic value than the percentage in West Tampa. This choice of signs for their symbolic value is a logical result because the owners of the signs in Ybor City are presumably seeking to maintain the historic atmosphere of the Ybor City Historic District as a neighborhood which developed as a result of the businesses and industries developed by Spanish-speaking immigrants. However, it is interesting that, despite the goal of maintaining the historic atmosphere of the Ybor City Historic District by the use of symbolic signage, there is a lower percentage of signs in Spanish in Ybor City than in the other survey area, West Tampa. In West Tampa, the use of Spanish on signs is encouraged by the factor that many of the customers of the commercial establishments in that area speak Spanish. The more touristic area of the Ybor City Historic District probably attracts a higher percentage of English-speaking tourists.
1.2.1.3 Functions of the signs

In relation to the main function of public and private signs in both areas for all the languages found, we see that the communicative function includes 44-45% of the signs, signs that have a symbolic function constitute 25-30% of the signs, and signs that have an informational function represent 19-20% of the signs. As in the previous analysis, the percentage of the signs that have a symbolic function is higher in Ybor City than in West Tampa. A range of 5-8% is found to be based on language activism. Language activism is shown in graffities, murals, and other multimodal units of analysis found in the survey areas.

As for the choice of the language in which signs are written only in Spanish in both survey areas, the results showed that a range of 44.44-64.52% of the signs were written in the language known by the persons designing or making the signs. The number of signs written in the language known by the presumed reader in West Tampa and Ybor City, ranged from 9.68-29.63%, respectively. This result shows that in the Ybor City area, businesses make their advertising decisions considering their potential target consumers at almost three times the rate of those used in West Tampa. That ratio may be justified by the fact that the Ybor City area receives a large number of tourists, while West Tampa is an area used for shopping by the local population. Finally, in a range of 25.93-25.81%, the languages used in the signs were chosen because of their symbolic value, that is, the signs were written in the language with which the owners/writers identified themselves or in a language with which they wish to be identified.

As for the main function of public and private signs in both areas considering only those signs using the Spanish language, we see that the communicative function includes 44.44-61.269% of the signs, those that have a symbolic function constitute 25.93-25.81% of the signs, and signs that have an informational function represent 6.45-7.41%. In addition, a range of 6.45-
22% of the units of analysis is found to be based on language activism. However, these results obtained from the public and private signs written in Spanish found in the target areas, should be considered with caution since (a) the number of units of analysis may be too small to make any conclusion; and (b) the number of units in Spanish extracted from the database of 520 units of analysis used in this study are not similar in both study sites (from the West Tampa study area there are a total of 31 units of analysis written in Spanish and from Ybor City there are only 21 units of analysis written in Spanish). This difference in the numbers of units of analysis in Spanish makes the comparison unequal and may impact the results of the comparison.

To summarize Section 1.2, the results of this study have provided answers to the research questions. The languages other than English that are used in writing on the public signs in the LL of the two survey areas have been identified, and the usage of such languages has been described above. In addition, the findings provide a response to the second research question as to how the languages on the public signs are displayed. As previously indicated, the languages are presented mainly in the dominant English language, and to a lesser degree in English and Spanish in combination. The usage of the English language on the signs usually lacks grammatical mistakes when compared to the use of Spanish on the signs, which often shows grammatical mistakes. The use of other languages found in the two survey areas are not linguistically significant but are connected with heritage and historical identity.

Finally, the third research question related to the relationship between the LL and the EL has also been answered. As explained above in Section 1.1., the relationship has been found in: (a) market share or employability and (b) productivity.
2. Limitations

The limitations of this study were related to the data obtained from the U.S. Census. The two study areas, (Old) West Tampa and Ybor City, are a part of the City of Tampa, which complicated the process of isolating the data needed for analysis when comparing both survey areas because much of the necessary data is reported on a city-wide basis rather than by neighborhoods or ZIP Codes. Other limitations of this study that may influence the findings, were due mainly to the restrictions that limited business activity in the survey areas due to COVID-19 regulations, or to health precautions taken in those areas due to the pandemic. I found, during my visits to the survey areas, that many business locations were permanently or temporarily closed, and there was only limited foot traffic in the tourist areas. In addition, the pandemic limited the number of patrons having lunch or dinner in the restaurants and cafeterias. Some other locations in the survey areas, such as the *Centro Español*, were used to provide community vaccination and testing centers during my first and second periods of field research. Another limitation of this study has been the time spent in the field which was limited by the circumstances. My first visit to the study areas lasted a week. However, at that time, the IRB approval was still in process, so the research that could be done on that trip was limited to research that could be done without IRB approval. On the second field trip, I spent several days investigating the LL in an area that (unbeknownst to me) was already being investigated by other researchers who published their research a month later. As a result, I discarded that area since the LL in that area had already been investigated in published research. These circumstances resulted in the need to travel again. That final field trip was made during the Fall Semester, complicating the possibility of an extended stay in the survey area. Although impacted by the circumstances and limitations discussed above, this study has accomplished its objectives in answering the
research questions due to the use of data triangulation, theory triangulation, and multiple methods of collecting data (methodological triangulation) to minimize errors and to produce high-quality data to ensure that this investigation is accurate and credible (Patton 556).

3. Recommendations for future investigations

Future research should focus on the neighborhoods in which the diverse working population of the two study areas live. Such future research should focus on the neighborhoods bordering the areas studied where the employees of the businesses located in the study areas live. It might be interesting to conduct a study into why the employees who work in West Tampa or Ybor City choose to live in areas adjacent to West Tampa and Ybor City, but not in the two study areas themselves. This might be related to economic factors, such as the cost of housing, rents in the various neighborhoods, public transportation, or some combination of economic and lifestyle factors.
CHAPTER VI: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

In the previous Chapter V, the discussion of the results was presented, including a summary of the findings on my research questions, the interpretation of the results, the implications of this study and the limitations found while conducting this study. This conclusion chapter presents three things. This conclusion (1) summarizes the key outcomes of the discussion section presented in Chapter V, (2) provides some recommendations for futures investigations, and (3) explains the contributions of my study to the fields of LL and EL.

This dissertation sought to understand multilingualism in the southern U.S. by using the LL as a tool and also to analyze the relationship between the LL and the EL fields that link the effect of language skills with any type of economic outcome. To address these objectives: (a) I looked for the [in]visibility and the languages written on the signs in the target areas to identify the factors generating the use for the languages displayed on the public signs in multilingual settings; (b) then I analyzed the languages found on the public signs to identify the factors that motivate the people making the signs to use a specific language on their signs; and (c) investigated the correlation between the LL and the EL in an attempt to identify the value added by the language skills of the employees. This chapter provides the conclusions, recommendations and contributions that arise from this study.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

After applying mixed-method research techniques, with both qualitative and quantitative approaches, the most significant results are as follows:

1. Historical significance of the target areas

The areas subject to this study, West Tampa and Ybor City, FL, have relevant historical significance, as evidenced by the historical documents still preserved about both areas. Both areas developed rapidly from the late 19th century to the early 20th century due to the cigar manufacturing industry that was established at that time. The National Register of Historic Buildings currently includes numerous historic buildings in both areas, and Ybor City is recognized as a National Historic District. Local governments and private actions promote and encourage the preservation of the historic and multicultural environments of these two survey areas. This effort of preservation is obvious in their LL as shown on some of the units of analysis presented in the previous chapter. Some of those units of analysis also reflect the identity of the population in both areas and the pride of the people in their history and ethnicity. This pride in their ethnic identity does not seem to conflict with a feeling of being American, but rather the opposite. They are proud of the contributions that their language and ethnicity make to the multicultural society of the U.S.

2. Languages used on public signage in the LL of the survey areas

The languages used on public signage in the LL of the two survey areas were primarily monolingual English, at approximately 80%, with only 10% of the signs in Spanish, and a much lower representation of the combination of those two languages and other Indo-European languages (e.g., Italian, German, Portuguese, and French). The results obtained for the English language may correlate with the percentage that U.S. Census population data reports for English
usage in the survey areas selected for this study (74.9%). However, the visibility of Indo-European languages in the two selected areas was lower than the U.S. Census data indicates\(^4\), considering the strong multiethnic and multilingual culture that developed in the survey area, and the strong preservation efforts from the local government of the historic areas as mentioned above. These differences may indicate that the people who use languages other than English at home may not use those languages in their working environment or, in the case of Spanish, may use both English and Spanish at work.

The results of this study related to the language used shows that business objectives led to the selection of the language in the range of 20-25% of the units of analysis. The decision to choose the language(s) depending on the proficiency or literacy of the designer of the signs in the language used seemed to govern the selection of the language in 50% of the cases. And, on approximately 25% of the units of analysis, the chosen the language was selected because it was the language that the designers of the signs identified with or wanted to be identified by.

The results related to the language used shows that business objectives led to the selection of the language in the range of 20-25% of the units of analysis. The decision to choose the language(s) depending on the proficiency or literacy of the designer of the signs in the language uses seemed to govern the selection of the language in 50% of the cases. And, on approximately 25% of the units of analysis, the chosen the language was selected because it was the language that the designers of the signs identified with or wanted to be identified by.

\(^4\) Spanish 23%, “Other Indo-European languages” 4.2%, “Asian and Pacific Island languages” 2.6%, and “other languages” 0.7% (U.S. Census Bureau, \textit{Language Spoken at Home. Tampa City, Florida})
3. Spanish used on public signage in the LL of the survey areas

Regarding the choice of language for the signs that are written in Spanish only in the two survey areas, the results showed that a range of 45-65% of the signs were written in the language known to the people designing or making the signs. In the Ybor City area, businesses make their advertising decisions with their potential target consumers in mind at almost three times the rate used in West Tampa, probably due to the fact that Ybor City is a tourist area frequented by tourists who primarily speak English and West Tampa is more of a shopping area for the local population, many of whom are Spanish-speaking immigrants or their descendants. Finally, more than 25% of the languages used on the signs in both survey areas were chosen for their symbolic value. That is, the language chosen is the language with which the owners of the signs personally identify with or is the language with which the owners of the signs wish to be identified.

As for the main function of the public and private signs in both zones, considering only the signs that use the Spanish language, we see that the communicative function is between 45% and 60% of the signs, the signs that have a symbolic function constitute more than 25% of the signs, and the signs that have an informative function represent approximately 7% of the signs. In addition, a range of 6.45-22% of the units of analysis that are in Spanish is found to be based on linguistic activism.

However, these results obtained from the public and private signs in the survey areas written in Spanish should be considered with caution since: (a) the number of units of analysis may be too small to make any conclusion; and (b) the number of units in Spanish extracted from the database of 520 units of analysis used in this study are not similar in both study sites (from the West Tampa study area there are a total of 31 units of analysis written in Spanish, and from Ybor City there are only 21 units of analysis written in Spanish). This difference in the numbers
of units of analysis in Spanish makes the comparison sample unequal and may impact the results of the comparison.

Based on the units of analysis written in Spanish, it can be inferred that the owners/designers of the signs make an effort to use Spanish only or in combination with English. However, grammatical errors are found on signage written in Spanish. When English and Spanish are combined on one sign, it can be observed that the Spanish is limited, is used in a way that can be understood by those who lack knowledge of written Spanish, or in a humorous way, as in the example in Figure 34. This use of Spanish in Figure 34 may well be an example of the use of Mock Spanish, as discussed in more detail in Section 2.1.4.5. above. However, it is impossible to determine the intent of the maker of this sign without more data which could probably only be obtained through an interview of the designer of this sign. I chose not to classify the sign in Figure 34 as an example of the use of Mock Spanish because classifying it in that way carries with it all the negative connotations of Mock Spanish and it is not fair to presume that the designer of the sign had the intention to use the language on his or her sign as Mock Spanish without more data. The results have shown that there is extensive evidence of the expression of identity through orchestrated multimodal ensembles (Kress, *Multimodality* 159). Some of those examples have been presented in the results section above within which the respect for history is manifested and, more recently, expressions of the identity of the population through urban art (i.e., murals). Finally, respect for the multicultural history of the area is also presented in Ybor City as shown in several examples presented in the results section.

4. Language policy

The lack of language policy regulations in both the state of Florida and the local areas investigated, indicates that it may be one of the factors for the low visibility of languages other
than English. Additionally, the lack of language policy on the public and private signage in the City of Tampa Sign Code allows the owners of establishments and businesses the freedom to choose the language(s) for their signs that may be the best for their business objectives.

As discussed in this study, there is no established official language in the two survey areas, nor is the teaching of a second language mandatory in elementary or high schools, leading to the indication that the educational system may be another factor for the low percentage of visibility of other Indo-European languages. This notion is supported by the grammatical errors found both in the text on signs (Figures 31, 32, and 33), and in conversations during direct observations with employees in the West Tampa area. Although Spanish is spoken at home in 23.3% of the homes in the area (U.S. Census), the results of this study seem to indicate that Spanish is learned orally across generations and that it is not reinforced by knowledge of the techniques and grammar for proper writing. Because Florida does not have a language policy, such as mandatory or elective bilingual education at the elementary/middle/high school levels, the lack of exposure to Spanish in the schools may have led to the decline in Spanish-language skills in third generation Hispanics, particularly in their ability to produce grammatically correct written Spanish.

5. Language legacy

Although there is little presence of other languages on the signs in the study areas, such as Portuguese, Italian, and French, used alone or in combination with English, there is a clear link to the ancestry of the population in both survey areas.

The symbolic function found on the units of analysis seem to be based on language activism. Language activism is shown in graffiti, murals, street signs, and other multimodal units of analysis found in the survey areas.
6. Relationship between LL and EL in this study

As mentioned above, the relationship has been found in: (a) market share or employability and (b) productivity (Gazzola & Mazzacani 713). This relationship is also found in the linguistic attributes and language skills of the employees of several stores observed. The effect of better language skills or more effective communications skills for those employees is connected with an economic outcome, “variables that might denote economic performance such as productivity, market share, turnover, and profit” (Grin, “Fifty Years of Economics in Language Economics” 39). In the area of West Tampa, linguistic attributes may have an impact on the earnings of the employees and/or on the probability of employment. As the results from direct observations indicated, the ability to speak the Spanish language seems to be a requirement for employees to work in some stores in the West Tampa area. Those employees use the Spanish language to communicate with the customers. The ability to speak Spanish is a necessary requirement to be employed in the stores observed. Additionally, all the signs inside the stores that were observed were bilingual in English and Spanish. The employees also needed Spanish language skills to produce the signs displayed above the products in those stores. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that Spanish language skills provide a value added in the economic sense because those skills are used by the employees and that use of their language skills produces a certain outcome, i.e., they are employed by employers who need and value employees who are bilingual in English and Spanish. Therefore, Spanish language skills may provide an advantage in the labor market that causes employers to prefer bilingual employees over potential employees who do not speak Spanish, thus demonstrating another factor found in the literature of the economics of language. Additionally, second language skills can be an investment for some employees. If bilingual employees are more productive than monolingual
employees, they may be rewarded by the employers with higher income. Bilingual employees may also be able to perform more duties than monolingual employees and are thus more productive. In the area of Ybor City, however, linguistic attributes may not have an impact on earnings if English is considered as the employees’ first language.

The results may indicate that Spanish language skills are not required by the employers of the businesses in the Ybor City area. Since Spanish is not used at work by the employees in the Ybor City area, bilingual employees may not be rewarded with higher labor income or higher probabilities of employment. Section 6 has presented the findings on how the LL and the EL are correlated in the two survey areas and also showed how the social identities of the two survey areas are reflected in the public signs located in the survey areas.

7. Hypothesis

Several hypotheses were presented at the beginning of this study and, considering the results of this study and the explanations above, it is possible to say that the initial predictions could be tested based on the results and assumptions of this study.

It was hypothesized (H₁) that the relationship between the LL and the EL could provide evidence for the benefits of: (a) attracting industry and tourism and becoming a more diverse and global community; (b) improving the profitability of the businesses in the LL; and (c) increasing the earnings of employees in the businesses operating in the LL if some determiners could be identified. This study has identified some of the factors that generate more or less use of the languages exposed in public signage in multilingual environments (H₂); therefore, this study provides additional information that may enable these historic areas to develop language policies that may attract industry and tourism and engage policymakers in efforts to protect the historically multilingual environment of these areas for future generations, thus generating a
more diverse and global community. Some of the factors that motivate the use of a specific
language over others have also been identified (H3). Knowing those factors, business owners can
improve the profitability of their businesses by developing measures to mitigate the factors that
lead to less multilingualism, such as providing language education to their employees, employing
more diverse and multilingual employees, and providing multilingual signage to their customers.
The added value of employees’ language skills was not quantitatively identified in the areas of
this study as expected prior to this study (H4). However, data from a naturalistic setting have
been used in this study which is the type of data economists claim as necessary data to measure
people’s language skills, that is, actual language use, rather than self-reported language skills, to
be connected with “better people skills with a specific outcome” (Grin 39).
Knowing that the employability of employees with better language skills is higher, as has been
shown by scholars in the field of economics with respect to English language skills, this
information can be used to invest in the acquisition of language skills by employees to increase
the market value of their language skills and to increase their income in the labor market.

IMPLICATIONS

One of the theoretical implications my investigation may have for other researchers is the
use of Spolsky’s theoretical competence model that I have developed and used for this
investigation. This competence model, as well as the use of Spolsky and Cooper’s taxonomies
that I have also used, have been tremendously important for my research since they provide the
language use data needed for the purpose of my study. Finally, another implication that this
dissertation may have for others is that the methodology used consisted of multiple methods to
obtain data, which has increased the credibility of this study.
CONTRIBUTIONS

This work contributes to the field of linguistics in several ways. First, the fact that the two areas selected for the study of the LL are in West Tampa and Ybor City and have not previously been studied from the perspective of the LL. Second, it is one of the few studies on the relationship between the LL and the EL and the first one carried out in the United States; therefore, it also represents a geographical contribution to both the LL and the EL fields. Third, this study served to identify some of the factors that generate the visibility of languages in the context of a multilingual LL, primarily when the languages used do not correspond with the languages spoken at home by the population as presented in the data from the U.S. Census Bureau. Fourth, this study has also helped identify the factors that determine why businesses use a specific language(s) on their signs rather than other language(s). Fifth, this study has attempted to identify the value added by the language skills of employees of businesses. Finally, this study contributes to the practical aspects of LL research by providing some additional techniques and procedures that can be used or extended by other researchers in different ways in the future—for example, employing techniques and procedures for classifying and organizing data systematically, using criteria for selecting study areas, and conducting studies that combine a study of the LL with an analysis using other disciplines, such as economics.

As mentioned above, Spolsky’s theoretical language choice or competence model has been applied in this study in a manner that has not been used in any previous studies. LL and the Spolsky theoretical model and the Spolsky and Cooper taxonomies can provide important language use data as has been shown in this study. It is hoped that scholars will continue to use data regarding the LL in combination with economic data to further illuminate the reasons for language choice on the public signs in the LL. This study and such future work may provide the
governments and private organizations that manage the development and preservation of historic neighborhoods with evidence and justification for their efforts to also preserve and protect the linguistic diversity that is a major part of the history of these neighborhoods. Without such efforts, the linguistic diversity of these neighborhoods, which is such an important part of the atmosphere of such neighborhoods, would be lost over time.
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APPENDIX
APPENDIX 1: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. Recruitment Script

Interview Protocol Project: Linguistic Landscape-Economics
Time of interview:
Date:
Place:
Interviewer:
Interviewee:
Position of interviewee:

Hello, I am Encarnación Galindo Parra. I am a graduate student in the Department of Modern Languages at the University of Mississippi. I am investigating the use of languages other than English on public signs in this area of Florida. I am looking for some employees or owners of the businesses or offices where the signs appear to participate in a brief interview related to the public signs visible from the outside of their workplace or business or government office. The interview will take approximately 5 minutes. It is completely voluntary, you are not required to participate, and if you change your mind, you can stop at any time. If you are willing to participate, I will ask you to read and sign a brief Consent Form that documents that you are voluntarily agreeing to participate in this interview and explains your rights in more detail. If you would like to have it, I will leave a copy of the Consent Form with you.

Are you willing to participate, and is now a good time for you to answer a few brief questions?

1.1 Questions:

1. Are you in charge of writing or designing the shop banners /advertising billboards/ commercial shop signs/ street name signs/ public signs on government buildings?
   a. Yes, I am
   b. No, I am not. I only place them when the manager/owner asks me to do that.
   c. No, I am the owner/manager, so I delegate that work to my staff.
   d. No, I am not in charge of the creation of the signs, but I approve the text of the signs and supervise the placement of the signs once they have been produced.
   e. _________________________________

2. When you are designing the signs, are you thinking about:
   a. Appealing to your clients or customers to get them to enter your office/store/restaurant/shop?
   b. Appealing to tourists that you expect to do business with?
   c. Simply providing directions or information to the general public?
3. The signs in this shop/restaurant/store are written in Spanish/Italian/Portuguese/ __________ (Other language)? Why did you choose to use that language or those languages on these signs?

4. The signs in this shop/restaurant/store are multilingual. They are written in English and Spanish/Italian/Portuguese/ __________ (Other language)? Why did you choose to use multilingual signs?

5. How many languages do you speak?
   a. Only English
   b. Only Spanish
   c. English and Spanish

6. Do you speak languages other than those languages I mentioned? If you speak languages other than those I mentioned, what additional languages do you speak?

7. Where are you from?
8. When did you move to the US to stay?
9. Is this your first job in the US?
10. What did you do for a living when you were in your country?
11. Why are not you working on ______ here in the US?
12. Did you bring your family with you when you moved to the US?
13. Do they speak English?

1.2 List of questions of English reading and speaking proficiency in specific situations (Chiswick and Miller):

1. If you have to read in English, can you read and understand:
   a. A newspaper written in English?
   b. A magazine written in English?
   c. Recipes written in English?

2. If you have to speak English, can you speak in English:
   a. With a sales clerk?
   b. With a doctor, nurse, or teacher?
   c. On the telephone?
3. How much do you speak English at work?
   a. All the time.
   b. Most of the time.
   c. One-half of the time.
   d. Very little.
   e. Not at all.

4. If you have to read in Spanish, can you read and understand:
   a. A newspaper written in Spanish?
   b. A magazine written in Spanish?
c. Recipes written in Spanish?

5. If you have to speak Spanish, can you speak in Spanish:
   a. With a sales clerk?
   b. With a doctor, nurse, or teacher?
   c. On the telephone?

6. How much do you speak Spanish at work?
   a. All the time.
   b. Most of the time.
   c. One-half of the time.
   d. Very little.
   e. Not at all.

Thank you for participating in this interview.
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Spring 2022
SPAN 311: Business Spanish (1 course, remote)  
Fall 2020
SPAN 304: Comp. & Conversation II (1 course, remote)  
Spring 2021
SPAN 303: Comp. & Conversation I (1 course, remote)  
Fall 2020
SPAN 303: Comp. & Conversation I (1 courses, face-to-face)  
Spring 2022
SPAN 303: Comp. & Conversation I (4 courses, face-to-face)  
Fall2019, 2021
SPAN 303: Comp. & Conversation I (2 courses, face-to-face & remote)  
Spring 2020

*Georgia State University 2017-2018 (GTA and IS)*

SPAN 2001: Intermediate Spanish I (5 courses)  
2018
SPAN 1002: Elementary Spanish II (1 course, face-to-face)  
Summer 2018
SPAN 1001: Elementary Spanish Hybrid (1 course, face-to-face)  
Fall 2018
SPAN 1001: Elementary Spanish I (3 courses, face-to-face)  
2018, 2017
Georgia State University 2017 (TA)

SPAN 4480: Metafiction (1 course, face-to-face) Spring 2017
SPAN 3310: Culture and Civilization of Spain (1 course, face-to-face) Spring 2017

Georgia College and State University 2015-2016 (TA)

SPAN 4110: Advanced Spanish Grammar and Conversation (1 course, face-to-face) Spring 2015
SPAN 3240: Contemporary Hispanic American Literature (1 course, face-to-face) Spring 2015
SPAN 3210: Comp. & Conversation (1 course, face-to-face) Fall 2016

Research Experience

Research Assistant. Dr. Peter B. Swanson. Georgia State University Fall 2016
Research Assistant. Dr. Elena del Rio Parra. Georgia State University Spring 2017

Languages

Spanish: native speaker | English: advanced | Portuguese: reading proficiency

University and Community Services

2021 – Present Service to the Community, Oxford, MS:

2019 – Present Service to The University of Mississippi, Oxford, MS:
Department of Modern Languages:
Member of Search Committee, interviewing candidates for academic positions
Development Editorial Committee, Founder & Reviewer for the Journal University of Mississippi Working Papers in Linguistics (UMWPL)
Development Committee, Founder, Administrator & Webmaster for Website for Ph.D. Students in SLS
The UM Graduate Student Colloquium in Applied Linguistics and TESOL, Coordinator
Worked to revise Abstracts for the 87th Southeastern Conference on Linguistics (SECOL)
Wrote letters of recommendation for students

2017 – 2019 Service to Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA:
Department of World Languages and Cultures:
Member of departmental committee for selecting textbooks, developing exams, educating, and supervising GTAs
Conducted a pilot project: software to provide automated feedback on writing assignments
Wrote letters of recommendation for students
Participated in conversation events for international students

2014 – 2016 Service to Georgia College and State University, Milledgeville, GA:
Department of World Languages and Cultures: developing a textbook with digital material International Students Center: represented Spain at International Events
2014 – 2016 Service to the Community, Milledgeville, GA:
Mary Vinson Memorial Library: RSO Project. Designed, developed, and implemented Spanish language and cultural instruction for adults, and reviewed unit lesson plans prepared by undergraduate students
Communities in Schools of Milledgeville-Baldwin County, GA: volunteer Spanish interpreter for Spanish-speaking parents, and teachers; and assisted after-school tutoring for Spanish-speaking students in core curriculum classes

2009 – 2010 Service to the Community, Atlanta, GA:
Latin American Association: taught Computer Technology and Spanish classes for adults. American Red Cross: taught Spanish classes to ARC employees
Cathedral of Christ the King taught Spanish language and culture classes
St. Vincent de Paul Society in the Hispanic Ministry: worked with low-income Hispanic families as a client interviewer