



English and Other Languages in the Linguistic Landscape of Koh Lipe, Satun: Distribution, Domains, Functions, and Glocalization

Pairote Bennui*

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Thaksin University, Songkhla, 90000 Thailand

Article info

Article history:

Received: 27 February 2023

Revised: 15 July 2023

Accepted: 25 July 2023

Keywords:

English, Other languages,
Linguistic landscape, Koh Lipe,
Distribution-domains-functions-
glocalization

Abstract

Koh Lipe, Satun Province is considered a multilingual island where locals and foreigners reside. This results in a remarkable phenomenon of linguistic landscape of this tourist community in which English plays a vital role. Thus, this study aims to describe the distributional, domain, and functional features of English and other languages in monolingual, bilingual, and multilingual signs of the island. It also discusses the features of glocalization of English as found in the data collected. Based on a quantitative and qualitative analysis using the linguistic landscape and World Englishes frameworks, results revealed that 370 signs were linguistically remarkable. They provided specific distributional patterns of language choices, domains of top-down and bottom-up conditions, and functions in which English contacts other Asian and European languages. Moreover, these linguistic landscape features mirror their glocalized English in a southern Thai context.

Introduction

Satun Province differs from other provinces in the Deep South of Thailand in that it contains the Adang Archipelago under the Tarutao National Marine Park, a popular tourist destination. One of the most popular island for tourism of the Adang Archipelago consists of white sandy beaches and turquoise blue waters is Koh Lipe (Daes, 2016). Mr. Panu Woramit, the director of the Satun Office of the Tourism Authority of Thailand stated that Malaysian tourists were the major target of Koh Lipe followed by tourists from Germany, United Kingdom, and Singapore (Worrachaddejchai, 2019). Consequently, Koh Lipe is a multilingual tourist island; thus, English is used to accommodate the tourism industry.

To facilitate local and foreign tourists on Koh

Lipe, linguistic landscape is a useful alternative. This is apparent in several signs around Koh Lipe. Signage texts provide the tourists with necessary information with functions. Created by the local administrators and business entrepreneurs, they convey specific language patterns to the readers. This yields the view of Shohamy and Gorter (2009) that linguistic landscape (LL) studies the “language in the environment, words and images displayed and exposed in public spaces” (p.1). In this regard, the notion of public spaces relates to the perspective of Landry and Bourhis (1997) that “linguistic landscape is concerned with the issue of language in the written form in the public sphere. It is the language of public road signs, advertising billboards, street names, place names, commercial shop signs and

public signs on government buildings combined to form the linguistic landscape of a given territory, region or urban agglomeration” (p.25). From this, it is interesting to analyze the elements of linguistic landscape in Koh Lipe.

Because many foreigners spend their vacation in tourist places, there is a need to provide signs in English to accommodate them. In this regard, Ben-Rafael, Shohamy, Amara, & Trumper-Hecht, 2006, Gorter, 2006, and Huebner, 2006 state that “English is displayed on signs in a number of tourist destinations and urban areas where it serves as a lingua franca and as a communicative language between local people and non-locals”. This shows a contribution of English to linguistic landscape. Further, the effective use of the language presented in public signs can also enhance their textual construction and tourism discourse.

Linguistic landscape is realized in research studies located in various provinces in Thailand. They provide different themes. In Bangkok, the research focus on the following topics: language choices and multilingualism (Smalley, 1994), language choice and language contact with an emphasis of Thai-English linguistic features (Huebner, 2006), language choice and World Englishes (Ngampramuan, 2010), language choice and strategies of multilingual writing (Siricharoen, 2016), and bilingual strategies (code-mixing) and advertising specialists’ perception (Sutthinaraphan, 2016). In Pattaya, Chonburi, the research concerns language choice and the globalization of English (Prasert & Zilli, 2019). In Chiang Mai, the research involves bilingual patterns and code-mixing strategies (Yanhong & Rungruang, 2013), language choice and linguistic strategies (Thongtong, 2016), language choice and local cultural identity of Lanna (Srichomthong, 2017), and language choice as well as roles and functions of English (Potisuwan, Methitham, & Rungrueng, 2020). In Chiang Rai, the research relates to language choice in a university campus (Chuaychoowong, 2019). In Khon Kaen, the research involves language choice, geo-semiotics, and language planning and policy (Draper, 2017). In Songkhla, the research emphasize language choice and the business owners’ perception (Thong-Anan & Sriwimon, 2019) and language prominence, functions of English, Thai English, and multilingual writing strategies (Vivas-Peraza, 2020). Further, in Phuket, the research focuses on language choices, language functions, and visual text structure (Choeirod & Chanthao, 2023).

The aforementioned research cover all regions and many tourist destinations. Moreover, they focus on the distributional patterns of English and other language choices in the signs. Some of the research pays attention to domains and functions of English and other languages as well as globalization of English. However, there is limited research emphasizing glocalization of English, a new trend in World Englishes (WE), in relation to LL. Glocalization of English involves a phenomenon where English and local languages interact in a non-Anglophone country, so English is important for the linguistic and cultural construction of people in this society because the global status of English serves the local people’s communicative needs (Friedman, 1999). Consequently, the present study aims to describe the distributional, domain, and functional features of English and other languages of signs on Koh Lipe. It also offers a discussion of the features of glocalization of English in the context of Southern Thailand.

This research is significant as it contributes to a development of public media, advertisements, and business signs about tourism written in English and other languages created by governmental and private sectors on the island. This will disseminate the sociolinguistic formations to the global visitors. Further, it will indicate the readiness of Koh Lipe and the Satun office of the Tourism Authority of Thailand to be an international hub in the southernmost area of Thailand in which English formation resources are publicized in signage to assist the foreign tourists. This information will provide guidelines for both local and international tourists on the island.

Objectives

- (1) To describe the distributional, domain, and functional features of English and other languages in monolingual, bilingual, and multilingual signs in Koh Lipe.
- (2) To discuss a reflection of the features of glocalized English in a southern Thai context.

Hypothesis

This study considers the following hypotheses:

- (1) It is hypothesized that English is used as the dominant language choice for the distribution of the signage, it contacts other prominent languages, and it has specific domains and functions in the signage.
- (2) It is hypothesized that the distributional, domain, and functional features of English and other

languages mirror significant phenomena of glocalization of English in a southern Thai context.

Theoretical Framework

Linguistic landscape is theorized in different aspects. For language policy, Spolsky and Cooper (1991) propose three conditions, namely rules of language choices used in the city and other places. For the first rule, signs are written in specific languages with regard to their orthographic system, and they contain some spelling errors if created in foreign languages. In light of the second rule, signs convey communicative goals among the presumed readers. This appears in monolingual and bilingual signs. The monolingual sign is based on the dominant language of a society while the bilingual sign is common in tourist places. The third rule is the use of language choices in signage to reflect language ownership. The sign writers seem to create signs in their own language to serve the symbolic value that contributes to their sociolinguistic identity. In a multilingual society, the order of languages on multilingual signs can also display the importance of its sociolinguistic conditions. Thus, this approach is vital as it is the early LL study providing the notions of monolingual, bilingual, and multilingual signs, distribution and display of language choices as well as LL functions. Similarly, Gorter (2006, as cited in Chuaychoowong, 2019) focuses on a script-based approach of LL that refers to the displayed languages in the signs. In this regard, a sign coding scheme emphasizes an analysis of public and private signs. The scheme can include features that surround the sign - the language feature, location, the size of the font used, the number of languages found, the sequence of languages on multilingual signs, the relative importance of languages, and the translation of texts. Hence, the LL approaches by Spolsky and Cooper (1991) and Gorter (2006) are similar in that the distributional patterns of language choices in the signs can be analyzed in relation to the scripts and the prominence of the language displayed.

In terms of functions, Landry and Bourhis (1997) theorized that *The informational function* is a linguistic marker of the geographical area for community members. Further, members of a language group are provided informative services with signs of government and private sectors. In light of language, public signs can be written in monolingual, bilingual, or multilingual modes, mirroring the linguistic diversity. *The symbolic function* involves the use of the in-group language in signage to

express their ethnic and social identity. This is obvious in public signs implying the sociolinguistic power on education, health, defense, and administration. The public signs written in this language can also mark the strength of this ethnic group that controls cultural production and commercial and religious activities. Further, domains of signs are classified by Ben-Rafael et al. (2006) into 'top-down' and 'bottom-up' conditions. *Top-down texts* are based on public or government ones. They consist of four sub-types: (i) public institutions such as religious, governmental, municipal cultural and educational, and medical units; (ii) public signs of general interests; (iii) public announcements, and (iv) signs of street names. *Bottom-up texts* belong to the private sectors. There are three sub-types of this text as follows: (i) shop signs (clothing, food, and jewelry), (ii) private business signs (offices, factories, and agencies), and (iii) private announcements (wanted advertisements, sale or rentals).

As linguistic landscape is globally recognized, it can be extended to 'glocalization of English'. 'Glocalization' was firstly conceptualized by Robertson (1995). Localization and globalization have influenced human life since the late 19th century. Further, it provides two main concepts. Firstly, cultural homogenization of a society may be replaced by cultural heterogenization due to features of multilingualism and multiculturalism constructed by locals. Secondly, the relation between people and society involves space and time because of the specific global communication. Specific strategies of the glocalization are discourse of cultural imperialism, cultural producers of globalization, resources symbolizing nationalism, which is globally interpreted and consumed, and national identities, among others. Further, Friedman (1999) defines glocalization as "the ability of a culture, when it encounters other strong cultures, to absorb influences that naturally fit into and can enrich that culture, to resist those things that are truly alien, and to compartmentalize those things that, while different, can nevertheless be enjoyed and celebrated as different." English is naturally assimilated into local languages and culture of non-native speakers. Additionally, Sharifian (2016) theorizes glocalization of English through *nativization of English* or new varieties of English, *Englishization* in the spread of English and Anglophone culture to other local languages and cultures, and *the blending of cultural conceptualizations*. Overall, the works of Robertson (1995), Friedman (1999) and Sharifian (2016) are grounded in only glocalized English,

not directly in LL. However, only the view of Bolton (2012) concerns LL and WE through two levels. Firstly, the increasing use of English in the global public space such as signs involves economic and cultural globalization, namely 'glocalization', as seen in language and cultural mix in music, food and clothing. This feature spreads throughout bilingual and multilingual signage. Lastly, English is the main tool in language planning in a multilingual society. English travels around the world through information, media, and technology. In this regard, signage is a visual text in the public space in which English is used as a major medium of written discourse. The global use of English is connected to other international, national and local languages. As LL and glocalization of English are crucial, it is interesting to study English and other languages in signage on Koh Lipe using the integrated framework that combines the works of the aforementioned prominent scholars.

Research Methodology

1. Data source and language samples

Located in Koh Sarai Sub-district Administrative Organization, Muang, Satun Province, Koh Lipe is only four-square kilometers (Satun-Geopark, 2023). In 2019, it was divided into two villages - Village no. 7 (*Ban Koh Lipe*) and Village no. 8 (*Ban Lipe Pattana*) (Ratchakitchanubeksa, 2019). Approximately, a population of 1,300 local people live in the two villages, but it contained approximately additional population of 4,000-5,000 people consisting of laborers, entrepreneurs, local officers, and tourists (Rawichaiwat, 2018). In this regard, there are three main languages used in this island: (i) local Malay spoken by Urak Lawoi or sea gypsy people (the indigenous people of the island), (ii) southern and standard (central) Thai by Thai laborers, entrepreneurs, and officers, and (iii) English by foreigners. This creates Koh Lipe as a multilingual community. Further, three popular beaches were purposely selected as the major data source. They are well-known and most important places on the island which are full of hotels and resorts, shops, restaurants, groceries, rented houses and rooms, local communities, and governmental buildings. Firstly, *Pattaya Beach* in the middle of the island is the most bustling beach. Secondly, *Sunrise Beach* in the east is suitable for relaxing, swimming, and snorkeling. Lastly, *Sunset Beach* located in the south is opposite Sunrise Beach (Emagtravel, 2021). These three beaches are full of language samples which only refer to the signs. The

classification of the signs relies on the framework of the key scholars (Spolsky & Cooper, 1991; Gorter, 2006) and on the notion of top-down and bottom-up signs of Ben-Rafael et al. (2006). These language samples were based on the photographic processes done in data collection.

2. Instruments

The instruments consist of a smart phone, field notes, and computer files. Firstly, the smart phone was used to photograph the signage is *realme C3* smartphone. It can contain 4000x3000 pixels. Secondly, field notes refer to a small notebook to make notes on the specific features of specific signs based on the photographs taken along the three beaches. Lastly, the computer files used the Microsoft Word program set up by the researcher. These files contain pictures of the signs in each category available for the analysis.

3. Collection of data

The data included monolingual English, bilingual, and multilingual signs. It excluded monolingual Thai signs even though some English romanized letters are translated into Thai. The collection of the data involved two phases. Firstly, pre-data collection was done by end of March, 2021. The researcher asked for permission from the key persons of the island, namely the chief executive of Koh Sarai Sub-district Administrative Organization and the village heads of Koh Lipe, to take photos. Lastly, the actual data collection was a linguistic fieldwork that lasted two days, from April 3 to 4, 2021. The researcher's taking photographs of the signs along the three beaches was assisted by the two village heads, the villagers near the beaches, resort staff, vendors, and taxi drivers, who were helpful to give the researcher information on the area and direct the way to get to the beaches and their surrounding areas. The researcher started taking photographs from Pattaya Beach in the afternoon of April 3, 2021, and resumed in the morning of April 4, 2021 along Sunrise Beach. In the afternoon, the researcher photographed the signage along Sunset Beach. This data collection had some limitations. Signs that were unclear, old, and broken as well as those of non-English texts were not photographed. Moreover, some resorts are located in the private area, so it was difficult to access them. Further, the researcher faced time constraints in gathering the data during the COVID-19 pandemic, and it was raining for a while on the final day. After this, all the photos of the signs were transferred into the computer files for the ease of categorization.

4. Data analysis

Firstly, the researcher studied all the pictures in the computer files thoroughly and categorized them into three main types according to their language choices or display – monolingual, bilingual, and multilingual signs. Monolingual signs refer to only English texts and those in Romanized Thai. Bilingual signs are those in which English and other languages are orthographically formed. Multilingual signs are those written in three languages. With many signs in Thai, English, and Chinese, the typing process was assisted by the researcher's former student who is Chinese literate. The data categorization was coded and tabulated such as M01 (Monolingual signs), B01 (Bilingual signs), and T01 (Multilingual signs). Secondly, linguistic units are vital for the analysis with regard to sociolinguistic and language contact aspects. The distributional patterns of English and other languages in the signs were analyzed in light of language choices, written scripts, and language arrangement. Moreover, their domains and functions were examined according to semantic and communicative domains. Finally, the findings were quantitatively presented in tables, percentage, and some visual texts, and they were qualitatively discussed in relation to the framework and previous studies. After that, the features were interpreted based on the framework for reflection of glocalized English.

Results and Discussion

The results consist of two main parts-classification of the collected signs and linguistic analysis. For the first part, the results appear in the following table:

Table 1 Classification of Monolingual, Bilingual, and Multilingual Signs in Koh Lipe

Type of Sign	Monolingual Signs	Bilingual Signs	Multilingual Signs	Total
Number	173	160	37	370
Percentage	46.76 %	43.24%	10%	100%

According to Table 1, the language choices were used for classifying the collected signs. The total number of 370 signs which were purposely selected showed that the monolingual signs and the bilingual signs appeared to be close in number in – 173 and 160, subsequently. Nevertheless, the total number of both monolingual and bilingual signs was higher than the multilingual signs. Among the three types of the signs, English was considered the most prominent language choice used by the sign writers on Koh Lipe,

The second part of the findings is divided into four sections – distributions, domains, functions, and glocalization of English and other languages in the signage texts. Each is presented below.

1. The distribution of English and other languages in the linguistic landscape of Koh Lipe

The distributional patterns of language choices in the signs are described in this section. First of all, the English monolingual sign has a total number of 173. English is the dominant language on the island because it is widely used in a vast number of signs and as a lingua franca. This distributional pattern of the language can be observed into two sub-themes, namely *English only* and *English-Romanized Thai*, which is summarized below.

Table 2 The Distribution of English in Monolingual Signs

Criteria	The Distribution of English		Total
	English Only	English-Romanized Thai	
Language Choice(s)			
Number	114	59	173
Percentage	65.90	34.10	100 %

From Table 2, the English only signs are based on purely English and other European loans. Alternatively, other western words, except Thai, incorporated into English words are also included due to their relative language family and the Romanized orthographic system. This was the highest number of this category, but the pattern of *English-Romanized Thai* appeared in almost a half of the English-only signs. In this regard, Romanized Thai words or transliteration are also considered under the monolingual English signs as they are transferred into English letters which are convenient for the foreigners. Only some outstanding illustrations are presented below.



Figure 1 M01



Figure 2 M72



Figure 3 M124

Figures 1 and 2 are similarly based on the distribution of English only, but the latter contains some Spanish loans, namely *Pura Vida*. Figure 3 parallels the distribution of *English-Romanized Thai* because the word *Kalasee* is mixed in this sign. Other examples of the signs with English only and other European loans appear in the following: “Pizza”, “Massage”, “*Forra Diving*”, “Fishing Trip Information”, “Family Song 500”, and

“Zodiac Sea Sun Resort”. Meanwhile, other instances of the *English-Romanized Thai* signs are “*Leelawadee Massage*”, “*Adang Sea*”, “*Koh Lipe Satun Thailand*”, and “*Ricci House Koh Lipe Satun*”.

Further, the bilingual signs seem to be different from the monolingual ones. English is still recognized in the bilingual signs, but other languages in their orthographic forms are added meant for the foreign tourists. There are four sub-themes of this distributional patterns of language choices in which English is the dominant language – *English-Thai (Thai-English)*, *English-Chinese*, *Italian-English*, and *English-Spanish*. This is shown below.

Table 3 The Distribution of English and Other Languages in Bilingual Signs

Criteria	The Distributional Patterns of English and Other Languages				Total
	English-Thai (Thai-English)	English-Chinese	Italian-English	English-Spanish	
Number	152	6	1	1	160
Percentage	95%	3.75%	0.625%	0.625%	100%



Figure 4 B02 (Thai-English)



Figure 5 B19 (English-Thai)

Regarding Table 3, the distribution of *English-Thai* has the highest number. This is drastically different from that of *English-Chinese* and that of *English-Spanish* and *Italian-English*. Although foreigners are the most important targeted tourists, the local Thais are also considered. That is, the patterns of *English-Thai* and *Thai-English* are the salient language choices distributed in the bilingual signs. Meanwhile, instances of Chinese scripts are somewhat fewer than the Thai-English (English-Thai) pattern. Some examples of signs are shown below.

According to Figures 4-5, an arrangement of Thai and English is interchangeable. In Figure 4, Thai is written prior to English, but in Figure 5, English comes after Thai. These two figures do not include translations. Interestingly, the use of the Chinese scripts in Figure 6 is attached to English, namely a direct translation. Besides, the Spanish letters in Figure 7 appear in the cuisine terms “*Gambas Al Ajillo* and *Patatas Bravas*”. Finally, the Italian letter style in Figure 8 is the name of the Italian restaurant. Spanish and Italian languages are used to attract the customers who prefer the authentic western cuisine.

In light of the multilingual signs, there were only 37 signs, but their distribution of English and other languages appeared to have the highest varying pattern as in the following table:

Based on Table 4, the multilingual signs mostly stand out as there appear to be nine language choices with three major distributions – three, four, and five languages. The trilingual one which has the highest number of signage belongs to the distribution of *Thai-English-Chinese*. This orthographic distribution reflects the most popular languages used in signage in Thai society. This number is much higher than that of the distribution of *Thai-English-Arabic* which is followed by the distribution of *Thai-Italian-English*. This is illustrated below.



Figure 6 B107 (English-Chinese)



Figure 7 B111 (English-Spanish)



Figure 8 B 146 (Italian-English)

Table 4 The Distribution of English and Other Languages in Multilingual Signs

Language Choice(s)	Thai-English - Chinese (English-Thai-Chinese /Chinese-English- Thai)	Thai-English-Arabic (Arabic-English-Thai)	Thai - Italian - English	Malay-Thai - English-Arabic	Thai- English -Chinese-Swedish	English -Malay - Chinese - Thai	English - Italian - French - Spanish	Thai-English-Chinese - Swedish -Burmese	Total
Number	25	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	37
Percentage	(67.567%)	(16.216%)	(2.703%)	(2.703%)	(2.703%)	(2.703%)	(2.703%)	(2.703%)	100.001 ≈ 100 %



Figure 9 T03
(Arabic-English-Thai)



Figure 10 T15
(Thai-Arabic-English)



Figure 11 T13
(Thai-English-Arabic)

Regarding Figures 9-11, English is not written as the first language used in the signs, but only the second and third ones. The use of English written formations appears in both 'pure English' and 'Romanized Thai'. These three signs are similar in that the Arabic word *حلال* comes along with its English version 'halal', which is a universal symbol for the term which refers to the Islamic permissible food.

In line with the four-language-distribution, the number of the signs become adjacent. Considering the percentage, the distribution of *Malay-Thai-English-Arabic* is equal to that of *English-Thai-Chinese-Malay-Chinese-Thai*, *English-Thai-Chinese-Swedish* as well as to that of *English-Italian-French-Spanish*. Likewise, the five-language-distribution belongs to only one sign distributed in *Thai-English-Chinese-Swedish-Burmese*. An example of this pattern is given.

The results are discussed using Spolsky and Cooper's (1991) work. For the first rule, the collected signs are written in 10 language choices that use their orthographic systems – *English, Thai, Chinese, Malay, Arabic, Spanish, French, Italian, Swedish, and Burmese*. For the second rule, the monolingual signs are grounded in only English and Romanized Thai. These two patterns can be communicative and understood by the locals of the island. For the bilingual signs, they are familiar to the tourists. The most prominent pattern of the signs is *English-Thai* which can accommodate the locals and foreigners. For the final rule, the use of 10 language choices in the signs indicates the language ownership. There are native speakers of the language used in the signs. With the notion of World Englishes, both native and non-native English speakers have the ability to write signs in English, so their sociolinguistic identity can be



Figure 12 T14
(Thai-English-Chinese-Swedish-Burmese)



Figure 13 T26
(English-Italian-French-Spanish)



Figure 14 T06
(English-Malay-Chinese-Thai)

Based on Figures 12-14, English is combined with nine other languages of Asian, Middle Eastern, and European regions – *Thai, Chinese, Malay, Arabic, Burmese, Italian, French, Spanish, and Swedish*. English is arranged in different positions. For the trilingual ones, English is written in only the first or second position. For the signs with four and five languages, English is written in only the first, second or third position.

mirrored. For example, a Thai identity of English can be seen in the *Romanized Thai orthographic form*. Further, the sequence of the language choices in the signs indicates sociolinguistic conditions. The distributions of English and other language choices in the signs mirror their prominence. Because Koh Lipe is full of foreign tourists, the monolingual signs favor the English only signs rather than the Romanized Thai signs. Moreover, the

pattern of English-Thai is used often as the language choice in the bilingual signs compared to other languages because the number of Thai tourists visiting the island are increasing. That English is more important than Thai can imply that English is a lingua franca perceived by both Thais and foreigners. In light of the multilingual signs, the sequential pattern of Thai-English-Chinese and vice versa has a sociolinguistic condition. In Thailand, Thai is the official language while English and Chinese are foreign languages. English is a compulsory subject in the Thai educational institution, but Chinese is not. Thus, the Chinese sign on Koh Lipe is based on Mandarin to accommodate Chinese tourists from China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan. Finally, English is never written last in the signs because it is the most vital language on the island.

The results are interpreted with several studies. For the English only sign, this study highlights the notion of ‘Romanized Thai’. The use of Romanization of the Thai language seems to be supported by Huebner (2006) who states that “Thai lexicon could also be transliterated in English or (Roman) script, using English or Thai syntax” (p.35). In this regard, the term ‘Romanized Thai’ can be a crucial phenomenon in linguistic landscape in which pure English interacts with Romanized Thai. Next, the patterns of English-Thai and Thai-English in the bilingual signs in this study are common in many studies based in Bangkok and Pattaya (Huebner, 2006; Prasert & Zilli, 2019; Siricharoen, 2016; Sutthinaraphan, 2016). Another vital pattern ‘Thai-English-Chinese’ in this study is similarly found in studies conducted in Chiang Mai by Yanhong and Rungruang (2013), Chiang Rai by Chuaychoowong (2019), and Songkhla by Thong-Anan and Sriwimon (2019). Moreover, the patterns of English-Arabic and Thai-Arabic are found in the signs along Pattaya beach (Prasert & Zilli, 2019), so this is partially related to this present study in which the patterns of Thai-English-Arabic is evident in the multilingual signs on Koh Lipe. Further, the pattern of French-English in the signs on Koh Lipe involves the use of French with an English translation in the signs in Bangkok airports (Ngampramuan, 2010) and to the pattern of English-French in the linguistic landscape of Mae Fah Luang University campus, Chiang Rai (Chuaychoowong, 2019). Finally, the use of Burmese, Italian, and Spanish additional to English is evident in this study, so this can be partially connected with the linguistic landscape of Chiang Mai in which the choices of Italian-Spanish (Siricharoen, 2016) and Burmese- Italian are used

(Srichomthong, 2017).

It can be inferred that ‘translation’ and ‘transliteration’ are important strategies that are involved in the bilingual and multilingual signs. These signs are created to communicate with non-Thai sign readers. Their messages in Thai are translated or transformed into English and other languages to convey sufficient and equivalent messages in the signs to make the foreign sign readers understand. Likewise, in some signs, their messages in Thai are transliterated or transferred into English and other foreign written forms to help the foreign tourists simply become familiar with the Thai language. Hence, the two strategies are used to facilitate the tourists and to contribute to the ‘multilingualism’ of this island.

2. Domains of English and other languages in the linguistic landscape of Koh Lipe

The 370 collected signs can also be categorized into two main types according to the study of Ben-Rafael et al. (2006) – *top-down* and *bottom-up*. Each contains different domains or areas of activities by social actors with regard to the geographical distribution of English and other languages.

2.1 Top-down signage in Koh Lipe

It was found that there were only 48 top-down signs on the island. This number is not high, but it is normal that Koh Lipe is full of foreign tourists, so there are many signs created by many private sectors or entrepreneurs. The public signs can be categorized into different domains as presented in the following table:

Table 5 Domains of Top-Down Signs in Koh Lipe

Type of Sign /Number	Domains			
	Public Institutions	Public Signs of General Interests	Public Announcement/ Advertisements	Signs of Street Names
Monolingual Signs	2	5	2	-
Bilingual Signs	14	13	5	-
Multilingual Signs	1	5	1	-
Total number:48 (100%)	17 (35.42%)	23 (47.92 %)	8 (16.66%)	0 (0%)

According to Table 5, the public signs of general interests represent the major domain in the monolingual, bilingual, and multilingual signs, indicating 47.92 percent. This is followed by the domain, ‘public institutions’, with 35.42 percent, and the domain ‘public announcement and advertisements’ with 16.66 percent. However, there are no signs of street names found. Thus, this can be a limitation of the study.

Each domain provides a variety of sub-domains. First of all, public institutions consist of six sub-domains: religions, royal activities, local politics and administration, education, internationally legal acts, medication and health. Moreover, public signs of general interests consist of four sub-domains – directions, warning and regulation, welcoming, and geography-history. Here, there are five aspects of directions – (i) directions to the public beaches, (ii) directions to the cities, community, and cemetery, (iii) directions to the official place, (iv) directions on streets, and (v) directions for safety. Finally, public announcement and advertisements provide the followings: (i) community and environment campaigns; and (ii) public advertisement of shop service of the police station, local-cultural tourism; and a government shop. Some remarkable illustrations are shown below.



Figure 15 M 68



Figure 16 T8

Figures 15-16 are of public institutions of religions on Koh Lipe. Figure 15 is the church where the majority of the Christians are foreigners due to the use of English only. Meanwhile, Figure 16 presents the Buddhist temple in the trilingual sign that communicates not only to the locals but also Chinese and foreign tourists.



Figure 17 B06



Figure 18 T21

Figures 17-18 involve the beach. Figure 17 presents the direction to the public beach. It has a visual form that directs the Thai and foreign tourists who can walk to the beach. Figure 18 located along the beach aims to warn the Thai, Chinese, and other foreign tourists about their safety as reflected in the languages used in the signs.

2.2 Bottom-up signage in Koh Lipe

Different from the top-down signs, the bottom-up signs were plentiful on Koh Lipe. The 322 items of the signs consists of three domains in which English is the dominant language. The summary is presented in the table below.

Table 6 Domains of Bottom-Up Signs in Koh Lipe

Type of Sign /Number	Domains		
	Shop Signs	Private Business Signs	Signs of Private Announcements and Advertisements
Sub-domain			
Monolingual Signs	46	81	38
Bilingual Signs	48	51	27
Multilingual Signs	21	10	-
Total number: 322 (100%)	115 (35.71%)	142 (44.10%)	65 (20.19%)

Based on Table 6, the domain ‘private business signs’ has the highest number, namely 142 items or 44.10 percent. It is closely followed by the domain of shop signs with 115 items or 35.71 percent. This is rather higher than the domain of private announcements and advertisements with only 65 items or 20.19 percent.

The signs cover three main types with different sub-domains. Firstly, shop signs contain six areas: (i) food and beverage shops covering food stalls, snack, dessert, menus, roti, food to order, and Thai pancake; (ii) bars and restaurants containing karaoke, café, food and bar, and bakery and restaurant; (iii) drugstores; (iv) minimarts; (v) clothes; and (vi) an ice-plant. Secondly, private business signs comprise nine areas: (i) massage and spa, massage and resorts, and massage and salon; (ii) accommodation which can be resorts, bungalows, villas, hostels, hotels, room services, and homestay; (iii) tour agents which include travels, booking, and speedboat; (iv) sport concerning diving and fishing agents; (v) laundry; (vi) medication and health; (vii) tattoo and body piercing; (viii) money exchange; and (ix) hair and nail beauty. Lastly, private announcements and advertisements contain the followings: (i) hotel announcements including exit, car parks, a bin, a liquor bucket, and no entrance; (ii)

directions to hotels, hostels and resorts, restaurants, bars, and homestays; (iii) bar and restaurant advertising involve food, beverages and food delivery; (iv) product and business advertising on fences, trees, walls, and arch of the community; (v) sales and renting of lands, rooms, and equipment; (vi) sport advertising which includes yoga, camping, and a football club; and (vii) a private warning sign for paying tips in a hotel. Some outstanding visual texts are given.



Figure 19 M144



Figure 20 M101



Figure 21 B145

Figures 19-21 differently present three major domains. Figure 19 relates to a beverage shop. It provides a variety of bubble tea and bingsu menus in colorful pictures that can invite the customers. Figure 20 represents a sign for rental equipment. The pictures provided can help the customers to visualize the snorkeling equipment. However, this sign is suitable for the foreign customers rather than the locals because of the use of English only. Figure 21 is related to a local tour agent. This sign provides Thai information which is written first before English, but it communicates more with foreigners than the locals because the English fonts used are larger.

The findings can be observed in relation to Reh's (2004) social domains of written texts in multilingualism. There are six major domains of signs in which English is used. Firstly, a health sector can be related to hospital, pharmacies (drugstore), and water

kiosks. However, any sign for water kiosks is not found. Secondly, an agricultural sector that consists of agricultural implements and chemical is not directly found. Nevertheless, the notion of agriculture appears in a bank for agriculture and agricultural cooperatives that supports the tourist community. Thirdly, bookshops, photocopying, and computer services that include library are not found in any signs in this tourist destination, which is not a metropolitan city. Fourthly, for post-office and banks, the post-office is actually found on this island, but its picture was not taken because its location was not known by the researcher. Thus, only the bank is present, but it is indirectly related because it belongs to B129, namely tourist community advertised by the agricultural and cooperative bank. Fifthly, politics that focuses on election campaign and electoral posters is not apparent in this study as campaign signs and election posters are not found. During the time of the data collection, namely April, 2021, there was no election campaign. Only some relevant signs of the local public administration and a district office were found. Sixthly, advertising of alcoholic and soft drinks is manifested in this study as it is seen in the signs of bar advertising and beverage advertising. Finally, other additional domains are about state-run and municipal institutions, NGO institutions, photo studies, supermarkets, and advertising (inter) nationally manufactured products. Thus, only the domains of photo studies and advertising (inter) nationally manufactured products are not found in this study.

3. Functions of English and other languages in the linguistic landscape of Koh Lipe

The results of this part follow two main functions of the signage, namely informational and symbolic, by Landry and Bourhis (1997). They also rely on the two other functions, namely 'commercial function' (Potsuwan, 2019), and 'integrated function'. The commercial function is based on a view of Hornsby (2008) on the language commodification in the signs of the Brittany community in France as a result of the process of capitalism, globalization, and McDonalization. This function is evident in certain signs in which English functions as the language of promotion and provides marketing strategies of products that include prices. For the integrated function by the researcher, it refers to specific signs that combine the said two or three functions. This result is evident below.

Table 7 Functions of English and Other Languages in the Signs

Function(s) /Signage text(s)	Informational function	Symbolic function	Commercial function	Integrated function
Monolingual Signs	141	8	17	7
Bilingual Signs	115	7	28	10
Multilingual Signs	22	2	5	8
Total Number: 370 (100%)	278 (75.14%)	17 (4.59%)	50 (13.51%)	25 (6.76%)

According to Table 7, the use of English and other languages in the signage on the island mostly serves the informative function, at 75.14%. This is considerably higher than the subsequent functions – commercial, integrated, and symbolic ones – which are equal to 13.51%, 6.76%, and 4.59%. This island is full of bottom-up signs that convey informational and commercial language to the tourists. Each function is illustrated.

In light of informational functions, the 141 monolingual signs have three sub-functions – advertising only (88 signs), warning-instructing-guiding (13 signs), and advertising-informing-directing (40 signs). Some monolingual English signs show their remarkable feature of advertising.



Figure 22 M100 (Advertising Only)



Figure 23 M102 (Instructing-Requesting)

In Figure 22, the advertising of this hostel is written in English. The information is highlighted in the large English fonts and alphabets to attract the passing tourists. Meanwhile, Figure 23 functions as instructing and requesting. The information written in English only is politely used to request tourists to follow the instruction.

There appears to be 115 bilingual signs in which English functions as an informational language. The majority of the signs belonged to the advertising only function, 72 items. This is followed by the *informing-warning-instructing* function and the *advertising-informing* function – 23 and 20 items, respectively. However, the 22 multilingual signs provided 9 items of advertising only, 8 items of advertising-informing, and 5 items of informing-warning-guiding. Each of the signs is illustrated below.



Figure 24 B23



Figure 25 T28

Figure 24 shows that the use of English functions as the advertising and informing language. It communicates to readers who are both local and foreign customers because of the bilingual informational function. For Figure 25, the function of English of this sign is advertising, and it provides the arrow to point to the direction of the hostel.

In terms of the symbolic function, there were only 17 items that consist of 8 monolingual English signs, 7 bilingual signs, and 2 multilingual signs. This function covers many aspects of the way English is symbolized – socio-cultural, economic-commercial, political, legal, environmental, local governing, campaigning, geographical, royalty, religious, industrial, and international. Some salient signs are discussed.



Figure 26 M148



Figure 27 B68

Figure 26 represents the graffiti campaign. This sign calls for the local and foreign tourists to take care of this island. Thus, the use of English in this sign symbolizes an environmental and geographical campaign. In Figure 27, English symbolizes the local governing of this island. Koh Lipe is merely a village that is part of Koh Sarai Sub-district. This sign thus represents the official sector.

In line with the commercial function, English is used in 50 signs, namely 17 monolingual English signs, 28 bilingual ones, and 5 multilingual ones. They possess special features that suit the commercial function of English. The majority of the signs used the strategy of pricing, special promotions, providing additional services, and other marketing gimmicks. Some distinct signs are illustrated below.



Figure 28 M107 (price)



Figure 29 M140 (special promotion)

Figure 28 shows that English is used for the commercial function as it displays the pricing lower than 100 Baht. This can invite the consumers of this island to buy the ice-cream. Likewise, the sign of the well-known telecommunication company in Thailand uses the English phrase ‘special promotion here’ to commercially function in order to persuade the foreign consumer of Koh Lipe to avail its services.

Regarding the integrated function, there appeared to be 25 signs which included 7 items of monolingual English, 10 bilingual, and 8 multilingual. The function is based on an integration of informational (advertising) and symbolic as well as an interplay between commercial and symbolic. Some remarkable signs are illustrated below.



Figure 30 M20



Figure 31 B141

Figure 30 reflects the informational and symbolic functions. Generally, this sign functions as an informational language because English is used to advertise this hostel through the word ‘home’. Additionally, the term ‘Buffalo Thai’ symbolizes Thai identity. This animal is connected to a local way of Thai life. Buffaloes are crucial animals for farming, and they are being kept in many traditional Thai villages. Thus, this sign is to advertise the Thai way of living in this hostel. However, Figure 31 is based on the informational, symbolic, and commercial functions. Here, the information denotes the use of English to advertise the shop promoted by the government campaign of commerce that is symbolized through the word ‘blue flag’. Moreover, the word ‘saving’ is commercially functioned to attract the local and foreign customer.

The results show that the signs conform to the framework. It is supported by Landry and Bourhis’s (1997) work. However, under the informational signs,

private signs on banks were not found in Koh Lipe. Only some ATM booths near the Walking Street were found. For the symbolic function, the concept of the language of the in-group and out-group members was not clearly evident on this island. As the dominant languages in the signs were Thai and English used by the ethnic group of this island who are sea gypsy people and other Thai residents, the balancing status of the two languages contributes to the linguistic vitality of this island. Further, the findings show that the informational function appears to be the highest followed by the commercial function. This is similar to the LL study of Yanghong and Rungruang (2013) in Chiang Mai downtown in which the informational and commercial functions of the signs were 76 and 15 percent, respectively. Moreover, the symbolic function of the sign in Chiang Mai appears to be a small number – 6 percent, which is similar to the symbolic function of the sign in Koh Lipe. The informational, commercial, and symbolic functions of English in the signs of Koh Lipe yield the study of Potisuwat (2019) regarding the metropolitan area of Chang Mai. The informational function has a wide range of messages providing the audience with specific purposes that include “rules and regulations, instructions, shop names and related information, addresses, contact numbers, and business hours” (p.56). In this study, the informative function covers six areas of the signs in Koh Lipe – advertising, warning, informing, instructing, guiding, and directing. Likewise, the commercial function by Potisuwat (2019) is similar to this study in that the signs in Koh Lipe provide specific information on prices, promotion, marketing strategies, marketing gimmick, top quality, free wifi, free delivery, and recommendation. The integrated function in this study can be partially similar to a LL study of Pipattarasakul (2021) of the old Bangkok Railway Station. Although she did not analyze the signs in terms of the informational and symbolic function separately according to Landry and Bourhis (1997), she found 11 functions of the signs at this station. Some functions were individually provided-providing information, giving directions, advertising, disease prevention, and prohibition. The rest of the functions were integrated, namely warning, greetings and farewell messages, providing information and giving directions. That is, the signs with more than one language function were 1.91% while the signs with two and three language functions were 0.32%. Indeed, this percentage may be lower than that of the present study, but it can indicate that the integrated function

seems to be a must in some signs in which the sign writers want to save the space and the signs are aimed at the readers.

4. Glocalization of English in the signs in Koh Lipe

The collected signs reflect glocalization of English through different aspects. Regarding Robertson (1995), glocalization of English in Koh Lipe's LL is apparent in two perspectives. Firstly, the notion of cultural heterogenization yields the terms 'multilingualism' and 'multiculturalism' constructed by the locals. This is obviously found in the third type of signs, namely the multilingual ones. There are 9 languages used as the language choices of the linguistically distributional patterns in the signs: Thai-English-Chinese, Thai-English-Arabic, Thai-Italian-English, Malay-Thai-English-Arabic, Thai-English-Chinese-Swedish, English-Malay-Chinese-Swedish, English-Malay-Chinese-Thai, English-Italian-French-Spanish, and Thai-English-Chinese-Swedish-Burmese. The strategies of glocalization found in the domains and functions of English and other languages in the signs are as follows:

(i) Discourse of cultural imperialism relates to the influence of the Western cultures. Several signs in which functions indicate cultural imperialism include church, bungalow, villa, hostel, hotel, café, bar, resort, ice-cream, snack, bakery, money exchange, tattoo and body piercing, diving business, reggae music, football club, immigration rules and offices.

(ii) Cultural producers of globalization relate to the signs based on the local producers of culture that are globally implied such as halal food, yoga advertising, roti, karaoke, homestay (cultural tourism), food delivery (the original country is Korea), and directions for tsunami safety.

(iii) Resources symbolizing nationalism globally interpreted and consumed are evident in the signs of Thai cultural symbols that can be globally recognized such as Thai massage, Thai pancake, and symbol of blue flag.

(iv) National identities are seen in the signs specific to national identities of Thailand: temples, an ice-plant, advertising and a local culture symbol of art and music (sea gypsy people), a direction to the cemetery of the sea gypsy people, royal activities/place (monarchical country), and a sign of cultural and community based tourism.

These four strategies of glocalization are semantically embedded in the domains and functions of

English which is a global language that interacts with other languages in the signs. These signs convey messages that represent the local products and services of the island through the use of English to serve the local and foreign tourists' communicative needs and wants. Although the languages presented in the distributional patterns are different, they can be compatible because they are intentionally created by the sign writers to promote the notions of 'multilingualism' and 'multiculturalism' of the sign readers.

With regard to Friedman (1999), glocalization of English was observed in this study. The distributional features of the signs in monolingual, bilingual, and multilingual signs show that English meets many local and international languages as seen in the patterns of diverse language choices in which English is the most prominent language that serves the local people's needs. The local people of the island use southern Thai and local Malay, and many tourists are Thai and Malay. Thus, they have created a number of signs to facilitate the customers. This becomes apparent in the patterns of Thai-English and Malay-English in the signs.

Considering Gorter (2006), glocalization is a crucial trend in the 21st century in a multilingual world in which ethnic, sociocultural, religious, and commercial diversities construct linguistic diversity. The idea of multilingual society is found in two aspects – multilingual signs and Koh Lipe with many locals and foreigners. Further, 'ethnic diversity' is evident in signs in local Malay, Thai, Chinese, and other eastern and western languages. Moreover, the notion of sociocultural diversity is obvious in the use of eastern and western languages and cultures in the patterns of distribution in the signs. Moreover, the concept of religious diversity is evident in a number of signs about religious functions such as Buddhist temples, halal food (Muslim), and the church. Finally, the term 'commercial diversity' is found in the commercial function and the integrated function of the signs.

According to Bolton (2012), glocalization of English in the Thai context is also explicit. Firstly, English brings the popular brands of the world such as '7 ELEVEN' and 'PIZZA HUT'. These two brands are found on signs of Koh Lipe; '7 Eleven' (stores) appears in the bilingual English sign while 'pizza' is in the monolingual sign. These two brands are globally popular as they are considered prestige, modernity and western consumerism. Secondly, the global use of English links other international, national, and local languages as found

in the distributional patterns of language choices in the signs: (i) the distribution of English in monolingual signs -English-Romanized Thai; (ii) the distribution of English and other languages in bilingual signs-English-Thai (Thai-English), English-Chinese, Italian-English, and English-Spanish. Here, Thai is a local language, Chinese is another international language in Asia, and Spanish is another international language in the Americas and Europe; and (iii) the distribution of English and 9 other languages in multilingual signs as aforementioned. Thirdly, English is a main vehicle used in language planning in a multilingual society. The notion of language planning is relevant to linguistic landscape. Koh Lipe is a multilingual society where many signs are written in English and Thai as well as other eastern and European languages. Fourthly, linguistic forms of English in the signage meet the economic and cultural components of the world. Glocalization is related to economic and cultural globalization. The signs appear to have various semantic functions: music, food (food and beverage, food menus, ice-cream, beverage, snack, roti/Thai pancake, dessert, food to order, food stall), and clothing. Lastly, English travels around the world through information, media, and technology and is found in the signs as follows: (i) the notion of information is evident in the informational function according to Landry and Bourhis (1997). It provides varying sub-functions (warning/informing/instructing/ guiding- advertising-directing); (ii) 'media' is observed in the advertising sub-function (under informative function), the commercial function (price, recommended, wifi, special promotion, and marketing gimmick); and (iii) the notion of technology is directly found in the advertising of Dtac, a popular telecommunication company in Thailand.

In Sharifian's (2016) notes that glocalization of English, only the concept of nativization involves the distribution of language choices in the monolingual sign, regarding English and Romanized Thai. The Thai language is Romanized through the orthographic system. This is also in line with the study of Manan, David, Dumanig, and Channa (2017) in which glocalization of English in Pakistani is grounded in English in non-Roman script as well as English in Roman and non-Roman scripts. This also parallels the study of Alomoush (2018) on the linguistic landscape of northern Jordan in which a number of signs are distributed with regard to Romanization, namely Romanized Arabic.

The concept of glocalization can be discussed through the process of Romanization in this study. This

becomes obvious in the monolingual English signs which are constructed in the patterns of English only and English-Romanized Thai. Here, the English-Romanized Thai pattern shows that the Thai orthographic forms of the messages representing 'localization' are transferred into Romanized letters which are internationally or globally used. The interaction between Thai and Romanization through the English formation in the signs can contribute to the nativization of English; Thai language items are acculturated into English. Hence, the Romanization of the Thai language in the signs aims at assisting the foreign tourists' understanding of the linguistic landscape of Koh Lipe and promoting the Thai identity of English in the global community of tourism.

Hence, the glocalization of English in the distribution, domains, and functions of English in the signs of Koh Lipe can indicate the following aspects of English in the southern Thai context: (i) cultural heterogenization of English in the southern Thai context; (ii) cultural imperialism, cultural producers of globalization, national symbolism of globalization, and national identities; (iii) the southern locals' linguistic and communicative needs; (iv) the ethnic, sociocultural, religious, and commercial grounds in linguistic diversity; (v) the global branding, an interplay among international, national, and local languages, the main vehicle of language planning, the economic and cultural globalization, and the informative, media, and technological journey of global English; and (vi) the nativization or Romanization of Thai language and culture.

Conclusion and Suggestions

This study examined 370 signs along the beaches of Koh Lipe, Satun. The analysis of the signs is consistent with the hypothesis. Evidently, the signs are constructed with the various distributional patterns of the language choices in which English is the most salient one interfacing other local, eastern, and western languages. Moreover, the signs convey semantic and communicative domains of top-down and bottom-up texts. Further, the signs function as informational, symbolic, commercial, and integrated languages. In addition, they imply glocalized English that serves this multilingual community of Southern Thailand.

The study is fruitful in that it can be applied to society. The distribution, domains, and functions of English and other languages in the signage in Koh Lipe mirror the local and foreign sign writers' sociolinguistic

ability and skills in constructing the linguistic landscape by using English as the dominant language to advertise businesses and services as well as to disseminate governmental information. The results of this study can be considered by Koh Sarai Sub-district Administrative Organization, Muang, Satun and the Satun Office of Tourism Authority of Thailand to develop a local tourism toolkit for training tour guides to understand linguistic landscape.

This study focuses on a textual analysis, so it is suggested that further studies employ an in-depth interview, group discussion or use an open-ended questionnaire to elicit ideas or attitudes towards different types of language facilitation of the sign readers, producers and providers as well as the business owners. It is also suggested that further studies apply the notion of glocalized English to study linguistic landscape in many other tourist destinations in Thailand. This will further enrich linguistic landscape studies of English in a Thai tourism context.

Overall, the presentation of the distributional, domain, and functional features of English and other languages in relation to glocalization of English in the southern Thai context in this study reflects the distinctive linguistic diversity of the linguistic landscape in Koh Lipe. This community is inhabited by the, Urak Lawoi people, as well as many Thai and foreign workers, so its linguistic landscape in English and other eastern and western languages in this study has highlighted 'multilingualism' in a southern Thai tourism.

Acknowledgements: This research article is part of the research report "Characteristics of English Used in Signage in Koh Lipe, Satun Province: A Linguistic Landscape

Study" which was funded by the Research Fund of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Thaksin University, Songkhla, in 2021.

References

- Alomoush, O. (2018). English in the linguistic landscape of a northern Jordanian city. *English Today*, 35(3), 1-7. Retrieved October 2, 2022, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/328106786_English_in_the_linguistic_landscape_of_a_northern_Jordanian_city
- Ben-Rafael, E., Shohamy, E., Amara, M. H., & Trumper-Hecht, N. (2006). Linguistic landscape as symbolic construction of the public space: The case of Israel. In D. Gorter (ed.), *Linguistic landscape: A new approach to multilingualism* (pp. 7–30). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Bolton, K. (2012). World Englishes and linguistic landscapes. *World Englishes*, 31(1), 30–33.
- Choeirod, R. & Chanthao, R. (2023). Linguistic landscape at Patong, Phuket, Thailand: Language perception on public signs. *NeuroQuantology*, 21(1), 250-261. DOI: 10.48047/nq.2023.21.01.NQ20017
- Chuaychoowong, M. (2019). *Linguistic landscape on campus: A case study of a Thai university*. Proceedings of the 4th RSU International Research Conference on Science and Technology, Social Science, and Humanities 2019, Rangsit University, Pathumthani, April 26, 2019, pp. 1242-1249. Retrieved June 15, 2022, from <https://rsucon.rsu.ac.th/files/proceedings/inter2019/IN19-212.pdf>
- Daes, I. (2016). *Koh Lipe Thailand*. Retrieved February 10, 2023, from <http://kohlipethailand.com>.
- Draper, J. (2017). Implications of the urban landscape: Aspects of the Isan cultural maintenance and revitalization program. *Journal of Urban Culture Research*, 14, 58-79. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14456/jucr.2017.4>
- Emagtravel. (2021). *Kohlpeekormoonkarndoernthang (Koh Lipe: Trip information)*. Retrieved August 11, 2021, from <https://www.emagtravel.com/archive/koh-lipe.html>
- Friedman, T. L. (1999). *The Lexus and the olive tree: Understanding globalization*. New York: Farrar, Straus, & Giroux.
- Gorter, D. (2006). Introduction: The study of the linguistic landscape as a new approach to multilingualism. In D. Gorter (ed.), *Linguistic landscape: A new approach to multilingualism* (pp. 1–6). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Hornsby, M. (2008). The incongruence of the Breton linguistic landscape for young speakers of Breton. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 29(2), 127-138. Retrieved January 5, 2022, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/249024066_The_incongruence_of_the_Breton_Linguistic_Landscape_for_Young_Speakers_of_Breton
- Huebner, T. (2006). Bangkok's linguistic landscapes: Environmental print, code-mixing and language change. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 3(1), 31–51.
- Landry, R. & Bourhis, R.Y. (1997). Linguistic landscape and ethnolinguistic vitality. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 16(1), 23-49.
- Manan, S. A., David, M. K., Dumanig, F. P., & Channa, A. L. (2017). The glocalization of English in the Pakistan linguistic landscape. *World Englishes*, 36(4), 1-21. Retrieved December 2, 2021, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/301628340_The_glocalization_of_English_in_the_Pakistan_linguistic_landscape
- Ngampramuan, W. (2010). *Linguistic landscape: A case study of signs in major transport hubs in Thailand*. Unpublished Master of Research (Education) Thesis. The Open University, UK. Retrieved August 20, 2021, from <http://oro.open.ac.uk/61991/1/13837653.pdf>

- Pipattarasakul, P. (2021). Linguistic landscape of the legendary century-old Bangkok railway station. *RJSH: Rangsit Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 8(2), 53-66. DOI: 10.14456/rjsh.2021.12.
- Potisuwan, S. (2019). *Exploring the role of English in shaping the linguistic landscape: A case study of the metropolitan area of Chiang Mai, Thailand*. Unpublished Master of Arts Thesis, Naresuan University, Pitsanulok.
- Potisuwan, S., Methitham, P., & Rungrueng, A. (2020). *Exploring the role of English in shaping the linguistic landscape: A case study of the metropolitan area of Chiang Mai, Thailand*. Proceedings of 11th International Academic Conference “Global Goals, Local Actions: Looking Back and Moving Forward”, 27 March, 2020, 73-82.
- Prasert, K. & Zilli, P. J. (2019). A linguistic landscape analysis of Pattaya, Thailand’s sin city. *Discourse and Interaction*, 12(1), 75-95. Retrieved June 28, 2021, from <https://doi.org/10.5817/DI2019-1-75>.
- Ratchakitchanubeksa (2019). *Prakatchangwatsatunruang-tanglaekamnoddketmooban (Satun’s official announcement of locations and areas of villages)*. Retrieved August 2, 2021, from <https://dl.parliament.go.th/backoffice/viewer2300/web/previewer.php>
- Rawichaiwat, S. (2018). Khwamchingbon “Koh Lipe” daensawankarndamnankabsampanhayaidanraksapayabarn (*The truth on “Koh Lipe”, a diving paradise and three big problems of medical care*). MGR Online. Retrieved July 30, 2021, from <https://mgronline.com/qol/detail/9610000042673>
- Reh, M. (2004). Multilingual writing: A reader-oriented typology—with examples from Lira municipality (Uganda). *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 170, 1–41.
- Robertson, R. (1995). Glocalization: Time–space and homogeneity–heterogeneity. In M. Featherstone, S. Lash, and R. Robertson (eds.), *Global Modernities* (pp. 25–54). London: Sage.
- Satun-Geopark. (2023). *Koh Lipe (Lipe island)*. Retrieved February 16, 2023, from <http://www.satun-geopark.com/ชมหมู่เกาะตระหง่าน-ภาค/เกาะหลีเป๊ะ-koh-li-pe/>
- Sharifian, F. (2016). “Glocalisation” of the English language: A cultural linguistics perspective. *KEMANUSIAAN*, 23(2), 1-17. Retrieved July 8, 2022, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312416638_Glocalisation_of_the_English_Language_A_Cultural_Linguistics_Perspective
- Shohamy, E. & Gorter, D. (2009). *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery*. New York: Routledge.
- Siricharoen, A. (2016). Multilingualism in the linguistic landscape of the Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand. *Manusya: Journal of Humanities*, 22, 12-25. Retrieved from June 2, 2022, from https://brill.com/view/journals/mnya/19/3/article-p12_2.xml?language=en
- Smalley, W. A. (1994). *Linguistic diversity and national unity: Language ecology in Thailand*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Spolsky, B. (2009). Prolegomena to a sociolinguistic theory of public signage. In E. Shohamy & D. Gorter (eds.), *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery* (pp. 25-39). New York: Routledge.
- Spolsky, B., & Cooper, R. L. (1991). *The language of Jerusalem*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Srichomthong, P. (2017). *Language landscape in Lanna (northern Thailand)* (2nd ed.). Chiang Mai: Mae Jo University Press.
- Sutthinaraphan, K. (2016). A linguistic landscape study of advertising signage on Skytrain. *Manusya: Journal of Humanities*, 22, 53-71. Retrieved July 23, 2021, from http://www.manusya.journals.chula.ac.th/files/essay/8.%20%20Advertising%20Signage%20on%20Skytrain_Kritnucha_p.%2053-71.pdf
- Thong-Anan, W. & Sriwimon, L. (2019). *The readiness of Songkhla as a world heritage site tourist attraction: A linguistic landscape view of business owners’ perceptions of language choices in shop signs in Songkhla old town*. Proceedings of La’ i-CELT 2019: The 1st Langkawi International Conference on English Language Teaching Lankawi Island, Kedah, Malaysia, 29 November – 2 December, 2019.
- Thongtong, T. (2016). A linguistic landscape study of signage on Nimmanhemim road, a Lanna Chiang Mai chill-out street. *Manusya: Journal of Humanities*, 22, 72-87. Retrieved July 2, 2021, from http://www.manusya.journals.chula.ac.th/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/2016190306_Thongtong_72-87- S22.pdf
- Vivas-Peraza, A. C. (2020). English in the linguistic landscape of Thailand: A case study of public signs in Hat Yai. *Language Value*, 13(1), 23-57. Retrieved July 16, 2022, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348413176_English_in_the_Linguistic_Landscape_of_Thailand_A_Case_Study_of_Public_Signs_in_Hat_Yai
- Worrachaddejchai, D. (2019). Satun prepares for high seasons’ influx. *Bangkok Post*. Retrieved May 23, 2021, from <https://www.bangkokpost.com/travel/1786564/satun-prepares-for-high-seasons-influx>.
- Yanhong, M. & Rungruang, A. (2013). Chiang Mai’s linguistic landscape in the tourist attraction areas: A study on the English language use on signs. *The Golden Teak: Humanity and Social Science*, 19 (2), 1-12. Retrieved August 24, 2021, from <https://so05tci-thaijo.orj/index/php/tgt/article/view/15111/13859>.