Linguistic Landscape of Tourist Spaces from 2014 to 2022: A Review

Nurul Ain Hasni, Mohamad Syafiq Ya Shak, Norasyikin Abdul Malik, Aini Andria Shirin Anuarudin

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
http://hrmars.com/index.php/pages/detail/publication-ethics

Linguistic Landscape of Tourist Spaces from 2014 to 2022: A Review

Nurul Ain Hasni[1], Mohamad Syafiq Ya Shak[1], Norasyikin Abdul Malik[1], Dr. Aini Andria Shirin Anuarudin[2]

[1]Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA Perak Branch, Seri Iskandar, Perak, Malaysia, [2]Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Shah Alam, Selangor, Malaysia

Corresponding Author's Email: moham381@uitm.edu.my

Abstract

This paper reviews studies on the linguistic landscape (LL) field concerning tourism between 2014 and 2022 to offer insights into the development of LL, particularly in the tourism context. Furthermore, the review provides examples of using LL as a research tool and a data source to address several issues in tourist spaces. There has been a growing trend in the study of the written text in tourist spaces as it encompasses a wide variety of creative theoretical and empirical research, dealing with themes like multilingualism, multimodality, language policy, linguistic diversity, and minority languages, among others. This review examines past studies that aided in opening up this area of research and outlines some emerging themes that serve as a springboard for others to consider. Relevant articles for this review were identified from two leading databases: Google Scholar and Academia. Three main steps were involved in this review method: identification, screening, and eligibility processes. The selected articles revealed two main emerging themes that are prominently discussed in the area of tourism which are language dominance and multilingualism. Overall, LL research's emerging themes help deepen the understanding of language(s) use in tourist spaces, especially in multilingual settings. The review demonstrates the potential for LL studies in areas such as tourist space, pedagogy, inclusion, and public awareness.

Keywords: Linguistic Landscape, Tourist Space, Tourism, Language Dominance, Multilingualism

Introduction

Linguistic landscape (LL) studies the written form of languages on public signs in a particular territory (Gorter, 2006). It is considered as a new linguistic approach that explains the language used on public signs (Backhaus, 2007; Gorter, 2006). Gorter (2006) emphasised that human lives are inextricably linked to signs. Information is communicated through language via displays in shop windows, office notices, posters, banners, business signs, traffic signs, and others. LL is a study that looks into the content of publicly visible signs, often known as the 'written form' of languages in public space (Cenoz & Gorter, 2006).

LL studies are classified as a subfield of both sociolinguistics and applied linguistics (Cenoz & Gorter, 2006). It has evolved to be a field of study that has attracted the interest of scholars worldwide to analyse the textual information presented on signs. Landry and Bourhis (1997, p.25) first defined LL as "...the language of public road signs, advertising billboards, street names, place names, commercial shop signs, and public signs on government buildings that combines to form the linguistic landscape of a given territory, region, or urban agglomeration". Several scholars have recognised and utilised this term. Scholars also have expanded the definition of LL by incorporating various perspectives and characteristics observable in public space, based on Landry dan Bourhis' (1997) definition.

The study of LL has been examined and interpreted in various discourses and fields (Hoffman, 2017). As such, investigations on the interplay between LL and tourism have piqued the interest of scholars. According to Hamdiyah and Arts (2019), tourism is increasingly causal to LL studies, which provides essential information on language importance. This is attributable to the LL of tourism attractions being constructed, which is frequently driven by business and tourist demand. The construction of tourist spaces is believed to be intensely dependent on the LL of the investigated area (Bruyei-Olmedo & Juan-Garau, 2009; Jaworski, 2010; Moriarty, 2015), in which tourism activities are interrelated with the LL (Shang, 2018, cited in Lu, Li, & Xu, 2020). The prevalence of numerous holiday products, marketing segments, tourist profiles, and motivations has prompted many studies to investigate and unveil the language used on signs that serve to form particular tourist sites. Furthermore, tourist spaces are complex sites of language contact, and the use of language for tourism promotion is an essential source of information for potential tourists. By performing LL studies concerning tourism, individuals may better understand how language and tourism are connected and how social points of view and other identities in tourism are presented (Thongtong, 2016).

Over recent years, numerous studies have been conducted to investigate LL in the context of tourism. Due to the supremacy of research conducted in examining the written text in tourist spaces, scholars need to seek unique perspectives and relevant critical issues raised by scholars. Therefore, this study intends to review 21 past studies related to the research area to understand the development of LL in tourism. To be more specific, this research paper aims to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the emerging themes found in studies on linguistic landscape and tourism between 2014 and 2022?
2. What are the recommendations for future studies on linguistic landscape?

Methodology
In the first stage, a search strategy was conducted using key terms (and any combination of these terms), 'linguistic landscape,' 'linguistic signs,' and 'linguistic landscape and tourism,' in the search boxes from Google Scholar and Academia. The selection of articles was made by considering the title, key terms, and abstract of the research publications, as proposed by Tamilchelvan and Rashid (2017), with content partially or fully linked to LL and tourism.

In the next phase, a screening process was executed, which included deciding the eligibility, inclusion, and exclusion of publications based on a set of criteria defined by the researchers. The published research articles that met these criteria were analysed in the later phase.

a. Published in the English language or at least have an abstract in English
b. Providing data related to the study of LL in tourist space
c. Research studies were published from 2014 to 2022 in order for this review to disclose the latest insights into the investigated area

    d. The studies must be published in a journal or conference proceeding.

Based on the search strategy and the screening process, twenty-one (21) past studies were selected to be further analysed. At this stage, the compiled studies were coded into the following categories:

    a. Author
    b. Design
    c. Data
    d. Focus
    e. Main finding(s)
    f. Issue(s) raised

Once the past studies were coded, a qualitative analysis was executed by drawing significant themes from the compiled literature. Each study was categorised according to its overall theme. To do this, the past literature was segmented and classified under the same themes and categories. The thematic categorization was checked and certified by an inter-rater, a senior researcher in the LL field, to eliminate any issues relating to the validity and reliability of the qualitative findings.

Findings

The aims of this review are to (i) discover the emerging themes found in studies on linguistic landscape and tourism between 2014 and 2022 and (ii) enlist the recommendations for future studies on linguistic landscape and tourism. To meet the aims of this study, a content analysis of the selected past literature was conducted. Table 1 encapsulates the design, participants, focus, significant findings, and issue(s) raised in the chosen past literature.

Table 1
Content Analysis of The Selected Past Studies

Author	Design	Data	Focus	Main finding(s)	Issue(s) raised
Yan & Lee (2014)	Quantitative (questionnaire)	400 respondents at four main tourist sites: Senado Square, the Ruins of St. Paul's, A-Ma Temple, and Taipa Village.	a) Identify the factors influencing tourist perceptions of street names in Macau. b) Identify the attitudes of tourists from different cultural backgrounds toward the bi- and tri-lingual signposts in Macau. c) Identify the possible effect of the information on street signs on the tourists' destination experience.	a) Most tourists believe the street names and signs help explore the destination and understand its history and culture. b) Tourist perceptions of street names depend on certain personal factors. c) Respondents showed more interest in street names than those who travel independently. d) Understanding street names could stimulate an interest in and desire to visit certain streets.	The neglect of the physical features of street signs. The perception of street signs could involve the physical presence, including the placement or location, material, color, size, pattern, and character.
Moriarty (2014)	Qualitative -multi-sited ethnography (interviews, linguistic practices, and ideologies)	a) Ethno-graphic field notes. b) Key actors and tourists. c) Marketing material such as websites and brochures. d) LL data, both static and non-static signs.	Explore the LL of Dingle, Southwest of Ireland.	a) The State and the local community promote several discourse frames that show contesting language ideologies. b) The State promotes an Andersonesque (Anderson, 1983) modernist ideology of 'one Nation, one language. c) The local people promote a postmodernist ideology of multilingualism.	None.
Bruyèl-Olmedoa & Juan-Garaub (2015)	Quantitative (Signs categorization)	736-picture corpus of Bay of Palma, Spain.	Investigate the visibility of Catalan, its autochthonous minority	a) Limited presence of Catalan in the LL of the tourist areas considered.	Despite the clear regulations in force and at risk of being

			language, and their impacts on the LL of the Bay of Palma, an international holiday destination	b) Its use is unbalanced, as it primarily concentrates on top-down signage, with minimal presence in bottom-up signs. c) The driving forces of the mass-tourist market and the little prestige that the local industry assigns to Catalan are found to be barriers to its broader introduction in the LL of tourism	imposed heavy fines, bottom-up sign initiators still make very little use of the autochthonous language in signage.
Thongtong (2016)	Mixed methods: Quantitative (classification of signs) Qualitative (types of linguistic, literary and rhetorical devices)	Photo documentation of signages of Nimmanhemin Road (from Rincome intersection on Huay Kaew Road to Chiang Mai University Convention Center).	a) How does the linguistic landscape create and reflect a tourist space on language choices in creating signs. b) What linguistic devices are used to create the signs?	a) Tourism in Chiang Mai has influenced language choices in sign creation. b) Monolingual, bilingual and trilingual signs can be found. c) Transliteration, word formation, lexical relations, speech acts, and politeness strategies were the identified linguistic devices.	None
Koschade (2016)	Mixed methods: Quantitative (linguistic landscaping survey, coding of signs) Qualitative (brief qualitative descriptions notes)	80 linguistic signs located near the main street of Hahndorf, Australia.	a) Examine the LL of Hahndorf. b) Compare the LL of Hahndorf with the town's linguistic profile. c) Examine the socio-historical, socio-political, and socioeconomic factors influencing the LL of Hahndorf.	a) Monolingual signs predominantly used English, while most bilingual signs were written in English and German. b) Discrepancies between the LL and languages spoken at home for languages other than English. c) Socio-historical (settlement history and community), socio-political (heritage listing, government regulations/laws, and war-related anti-German sentiment), and socioeconomic (tourism and advertising) factors were identified as having a significant impact on the LL.	None
Jocuns (2016)	Qualitative (textual analysis of geosemiotic data)	Pictures of signs at Thai heritage sites.	Focus upon the geosemiotic nature of signage in Thai heritage sites explicitly drawing attention to interactivity, prayer, ephemerality, ethnicities, and a discussion of the notion of boundary objects in Thai heritage sites.	a) The makeup of the linguistic landscape within Buddhist temples where tourists (both Asian and Farang) are asked to make donations. b) The elements of everyday Thai Buddhist religious practice (attending temple, prayer, making merit) become commodified in the tourist gaze.	None
Ruan & Lee (2017)	Quantitative (statistical analyses such as frequency analysis, independent-samples t-test, and analysis of variance (ANOVA))	400 respondents among Macao residents.	a) Investigate the relationship between Macao's street names and residents' perceptions. b) Identify residents' support for Macao's street names as a tourism attraction.	a) Trilingual street names consisting of Chinese, Portuguese, and English might satisfy residents' needs more than bilingual street names written in Chinese and Portuguese. b) Residents with a longer length of residence or residents who are willing to work in tourism Related industries tend to support Macao's street names for becoming a tourist attraction.	a) The attributes chosen as independent variables could be limited because other attributes not used in this study could impact residents' perceptions. b) The population sample for the survey instrument presented some challenges because of

					insufficient information. c) There was no post-evaluation of the attributes--respondents may not have provided answers in a very similar way to their perceptions, thus making distinctions.
Ruzaitė (2017)	Quantitative (coding of signs)	515 digital pictures of multilingual signs were collected in the 3 Lithuanian and 2 Polish resort towns.	a) Identify the authorship of multilingual signs. b) Determine the types of establishments that employ multilingual signage. c) Analyse which languages coexist in popular tourist destinations.	a) Some major tendencies in language displayed in LL does relate to tourist exchange and tourists' needs. b) Linguistic heterogeneity in Lithuanian and Polish LLs do relate to tourist exchange in neighbouring countries. c) English dominates here as a lingua franca and as a primary language of tourism. d) Neighbouring with a country does not necessarily lead to the presence of its language in LL. e) In Lithuania and Poland, multilingual signs dominate restaurants and shops.	On Polish signs, there are no instances of Russian, though one might expect a different trend based on tourist flows. Thus, the results in Lithuanian resorts cannot be explained solely by the large tourist flows from Russia and Belarus
Hoffman (2017)	Qualitative (landscape-focused narrative)	35 images representing 17 individual pharmaceutical establishments in San Miguel.	Analyse the linguistic and material signs of pharmaceutical shops as experienced from a tourist's perspective.	The pharmaceutical signs operate within a broader touristic ideology that positions medicines as souvenirs striving for legitimacy while also acting as a reminder of a tourist's own historical and contemporary health and healthcare needs.	The exploration is limited within the writer's interpretative imagination and does not represent the multiplicity of distinctive identities and bodies welcomed onto Cozumel Island each day.
Darmawan (2018)	Mixed methods: Quantitative (classification of signs & questionnaire) Qualitative (interview & library research)	a) Language makers in public spaces in Simanindo District (Lake Toba area). b) Photos of the use of language in public spaces in Simanindo District (Lake Toba area). c) Past studies on LL and language skills.	Find and describe the language skill of tourism actors in the Simanindo sub-district, which reflected on the results of using language in public by using the LL approach.	a) Linguistic situation - the most dominant form of bilingual (mix of Indonesian and English). b) LL in Simanindo District is oriented to denotative and connotative meanings. c) There is a difference between the use of LL by the government and private institutions. d) Language will determine whether the tourists will linger or leave the area immediately.	The language skills of tour operators are generally still lacking. This is evident from the morphology of words, phrases, clauses, and sentences in Indonesian and English by not applying the rules of writing and good translation.
Fakhiroh & Rohmah (2018)	Quantitative (signs categorization)	200 signs in public places and along the main roads of Sidoarjo City, Surabaya, Indonesia.	a) Identify visible languages in the LL of Sidoarjo (both top-down and bottom-up signs). b) Identify the functions of the different languages in the signs.	a) Indonesian language dominates the LL. b) English is used more frequently than Arabic. c) Javanese (mother tongue) is rarely used. d) Some other Asian languages are also apparent. e) There are six functions of signs in Sidoarjo LL (provide information and regulation; symbolize something; conserve the local language; show and	An interview or questionnaire as the instrument to gather more qualitative data will enrich LL research.

				introduce identities; show readiness to welcome foreign visitors; attract more customers in business)	
Rong (2018)	Mixed-methods case study: Quantitative (classification of signs & questionnaire) Qualitative (interview)	a) 159 digital photographs & inventories of linguistics signs in Beijing. b) Public service workers and English-speaking foreign tourists visiting the sites	Explore the use of the English language in the market-driven Chinese tourism context in light of more comprehensive questions concerning LL from a sociolinguistic approach.	English is becoming an inherent part of the linguistic landscape of Beijing 5A tourism spots; China now actively participates in the globalizing process of English language commodification.	More than half of the signs collected in this study are monolingual Chinese signs.
Prasert & Zilli (2019)	Quantitative (coding of signs & descriptive statistics)	542 photographs of commercial signs in Pattaya, Thailand.	a) Identify the main languages visually displayed on public signs in Pattaya. b) Learn how the languages are used in different business types.	a) English remains an essential international language, although monolingual signs that show languages other than English and Thai can sometimes be found. b) LL helps new service providers or business owners to plan new businesses that can support the demand or market requirements and help relevant authorities in a particular area plan their policies.	LL study of an area cannot describe the complete picture of what goes on in the area. A bigger-scale data collection such as statistics of incoming and outgoing visitors combined with lengths of stay is required.
Johnson (2019)	Quantitative (classification of signs)	A corpus of 418 public signs was recorded from a sample area between Kohan Dori and Route 2 in Lake Toya, Japan.	a) Examine the state of foreign language signage in a local Hokkaido community. b) Explore the utility of linguistic landscape surveys as a means for evaluating and improving upon foreign language signage and to promote positive visitor experiences and tourism in local areas in Hokkaido.	a) The results indicated bifurcated top-down and bottom-up trends in public space language use with an overall dominance of monolingual signage and a varied state in multilingual signage. b) Official signage on prefectural road signs appears to follow regulations (fonts, sizes, & translations). c) Municipally-sourced street signs were non-standardized and distributed in an inconsistent manner.	a) The high percentage of monolingual official signage and inconsistent nature of official multilingual signs indicate a lack of official municipal policy requiring foreign languages on public signage. b) Inconsistent distribution of languages in municipal street signs are an example providing directions only in Korean and Chinese. c) The high proportion of monolingual commercial signage is surprising since it is a tourist spot.
Sholikhah, Kholifah, & Wardani (2020)	Quantitative (signs categorization)	30 signs were gathered from Baturraden in Banyumas.	a) Identify the patterns of LL in Baturraden. b) Disclose the language situation of the culture of Banyumas society	a) Banyumas tourism resorts employ monolingual, bilingual, and multilingual signs: English, Arabic, Indonesian, and Bahasa Ngapak. b) Bahasa Ngapak is a cultural identity, and the Indonesian language is used to meet informative functions. Arabic is an identity, and English is closely related to cultural commodification. c) LL found in tourism resorts represent Banyumas culture which accepts multilingualism.	None.
Lu, Li, & Xu (2020)	Mixed methods (case study):	a) 1978 image records of Hongcun Village.	a) Analyse the multidimensionality of the linguistic	a) Hongcun is becoming multilingual with tourism development.	a) Private signs are more diversified and less informative,

	Quantitative (questionnaire & coding of linguistic signs) Qualitative (in-depth interviews)	b) 50 domestic tourists. c) 5 foreign tourists.	landscape in ancient villages as a tourist destination. b) Discuss the choice of language in the linguistic signs in ancient villages.	b) Standardized Chinese characters dominate, while traditional Chinese characters and English are prominent. c) Tourists have shown overall satisfaction with Hongcun's linguistic signs. d) Official signs are standardized and private signs are more diversified. e) The construction of official signs is mainly affected by policies, while private signs are mainly driven by commercial profit.	made by shop operators themselves with no compulsory regulations in language usage, because there exists no formal policy but only verbal requirement for the style and outlooking of shop signboards. b) Tourism's influence on linguistic landscape has rarely been studied in tourist destinations. c) Only visible outdoor signs and signs with text were selected, and this research did not cover signs with QR codes.
Dong, Peng & Uddin (2020)	Qualitative – ethnography (interview)	a) 260 photos of cultural heritage sites at Dhaka and tourism scenic spots at Cox's Bazar. b) 12 local participants	1) Identify the language choices observed at Dhaka's cultural heritage sites and Cox's Bazar's tourism scenic spots. 2) Investigate the language ideologies embedded in these linguistic landscapes.	Multidimensionality marks the linguistic landscape in Bangladesh. The sociopolitical dimension signifies the officially laid-down monolingual Bangla-oriented policies, which accentuate compulsory use of the national language Bangla standing for Bangladeshi nationalism and identity. English as a post-colonial reproducer of linguistic hegemony is presented in various aspects in Bangladesh. The economic dimension is manifested in the prominent use of Chinese as a newly emerging foreign language and the employment of Arabic, which is a symbol of Bangladeshi main religion Islam	The study is only based on two cities of Dhaka and Cox's Bazar, and the number of the figures and participants is also limited to what the author can have access
Sibarani, Deliana, Yanti, & Liyushiana (2021)	Qualitative (interactive model)	Data on language landscape collected from the Internet.	Discuss the concepts of landscape anthropolinguistics and language landscape.	a) LL is divided into three: advertising/ promotion, names of shops/businesses, & directions/tourist guides. b) LL of tourist guides is divided into five parts: welcome greetings in an area, directions at tourist sites, greetings at tourist object locations, LL of folk discourse at tourist object locations, & empirical or geographic LL at object locations. c) LL has a psychological message that enters the psyche that reads it so that the message is stored in the reader's memory. d) LL has text that is written in an attractive way (fonts, images, & engravings). e) The text and the context are generally related to the local community's culture.	In addition to the types of language landscapes described in this paper, other possible types can be identified if in-depth research is conducted on the various uses of language landscapes in public spaces.

Danuwijaya & Abdullah (2021)	Qualitative (observation, interview, & library research)	Primary data – field observations & interviews with managers of two tourist attractions. Secondary data - previous research, local government policies, and digital media through websites and social media.	Identify programs that have been carried out by managers of tourist attractions in the North Bandung area.	The tourist attractions of Tebing Keraton and TWA Tangkubanparahu have multi-language communication through online and offline media.	a) Lack of attention by the managers of the tourist attractions on multilingualism programs in increasing satisfaction for foreign tourists and global competitiveness. b) The study focus is limited to multilingualism in two tourist attractions in the North Bandung area.
Khazanah & Kusumaningputri (2021)	Mixed methods (explanatory sequential): Quantitative (signs categorization) Qualitative (observation)	500 photos of shop fronts around the peripheral areas of Bali's four famous beach tourism areas: Kuta beach, Padma beach, Sanur beach, and Segara beach.	a) Unravel the salience and visibility of languages manifested in the shop-fronts in Bali tourism peripherals. b) Identify the principles that drive the emergence of such degree.	a) English is the dominant language in Bali tourism peripheries, driven by the perceived power attributed to English and its economic benefits. b) The principle of presentation-of-self is not prioritized. The local shop owners' perception of targeted clients is the determining factor influencing it.	The LL portraits captured in this research is limited as it is too specific to the context of beach tourist destination peripheries.
Da Silva, Tjung, Wijayanti, & Suwartono (2021)	Quantitative (sign categorization, questionnaire)	a) 729 public signs in Malioboro. b) 40 respondents.	a) Examine how language is presented in Malioboro's LL. b) Identify the preferred language among the tourists. c) Determine whether the signs are sufficient for local and foreign tourists.	a) The dominance of Indonesian in the LL of Malioboro. b) The LL of Malioboro displays an exclusiveness and reflects the implementation of Indonesia's language policy. c) The survey shows both Indonesian and English prevailing in commercial, regulatory, and infrastructural signs, most of which are informative.	Multilingualism hardly gets a look in the LL of Malioboro, even though it is a student and tourist destination.

Based on the content analysis in Table 1, most of the past studies used a quantitative approach that primarily dealt with either sign categorization or survey, or even both methods in the research design, whereas the past studies that employed a qualitative approach shared a similar percentage with the ones that used mixed-method approach. Furthermore, most of the selected past studies also involved tourist sites from different parts of the world (e.g., Asia, Europe, and Western countries). In terms of the research focus, most of the selected past studies paid attention in analysing the LL of different tourist spot(s). Based on the analysis made, it revealed findings that are associated with the issues of multilingualism, multimodality, language policy, linguistic diversity, and minority languages. Apart from that, there are also past studies that examined the tourists' perception towards the LL and the impact of LL towards the public. This highlights the importance of LL in the tourism development. LL studies on ideology were also discovered among the selected studies that were reported to be useful in the construction of LL. Finally, these previous studies emphasised their recommendations on how LL constructions and methodological approaches can be improved over time, particularly in the context of tourism.

To meet the aims of the research, a discussion on the emerging themes and recommendations of future research based on the content analysis of the research findings and issues of the past studies was done. The revelation of these themes and recommendations answers the research questions: RQ1-What are the emerging themes found in studies on linguistic

landscape and tourism between 2014 and 2022?; and RQ2-What are the recommendations for future studies on linguistic landscape and tourism?

Discussion
A. Emerging themes in LL and tourism studies between 2014 and 2022
Dominant language
From the selected past studies, there are two main themes which can deduced. The first theme concerns the dominant language in the linguistic landscapes analysed by these studies. In multiple contexts of the studies, the English language has emerged as the primary language used for the observed linguistic landscapes (Darmawan, 2018; Da Silva et al., 2021; Dong, 2020; Fakhiroh & Rohmah, 2018; Sibarani et al., 2021; Solikha et al., 2020; Thongtong, 2016). Some of these studies also reported that the English language had dominated the observed linguistic landscapes compared to local or other languages (Khazanah & Kusumanungutri, 2021; Koschade, 2016; Prasert & Zilli, 2019; Rong, 2018; Ruzaite, 2017). These findings mirror previous studies (Kandel, 2019; Peng et al., 2021; Salameh Alamoush, 2018; Sianipar, 2021; Tang, 2018; Vivas-Peraza, 2020), which also disclosed the predominant role of the English language in this matter.

This could be happening due to the language's status as a global language, as suggested by Crystal (2003). Another reason for the dominance of English language is for communication purposes, especially in tourist spots, as suggested by Alomoush (2018, p.7) "The English language has recently become an integral part of the socio-cultural life". Vivas-Peraza (2020) asserted that the English language provides an air of westernisation, attractiveness, modernity, and reliability" (p.52). Kandel (2019) went further by declaring that the dominance of the language in linguistic landscapes is "necessary for survival" (p.25). Hence, the use of English language is expected in the LL of tourist spaces.

Nevertheless, the dominance of the English language in the observed linguistic landscapes is feared to result in the marginalization of the local language. Kandel (2019), for example, pointed out that English signs were drastically larger than non-English signs. In multiple instances from the selected studies in this review, the English language was observed to be very visible, occupying the most or first seen area of billboards, which relegated the local language to a less visible or second spot on the same billboards. Thus, it is not surprising that Peng et al (2021, p.46) posited that English is "profoundly challenging the predominant status" of local languages.

Multilingualism in the Tourist Space
The second common theme is the rise of multilingualism in the observed linguistic landscapes in the selected studies in this review (Danuwijaya & Abdullah, 2021; Ruan & Lee, 2017; Ruzaite, 2017; Solikhah et al., 2020; Tongthong, 2016). Multilingualism in the linguistic landscape is defined as the use of multilingual signs which include more than two languages. This finding matches earlier studies that documented multilingualism in linguistic landscapes in multiple contexts (Belles-Calvera, 2019; Coluzzi, 2020; Dong et al., 2020; Husin et al., 2019; McKiernan, 2019; Woo & Nora Riget, 2020), where several factors were revealed as the reason for this phenomenon.
The most obvious reason for this situation could be the multi-ethnic composition or a particular area, as suggested by (McKiernan, 2019). Dong et al (2020, p.242) agreed, as they

highlighted that multilingualism "… is embedded in a place's complex socio-political, economic, and cultural facets." There is also an argument about multilingualism and the different functions that it caters to. Husin et al. (2019) believed that multilingualism in an area "… boils down to different languages being used and functioning in differing ways" (p. 1). At the same time, multilingualism is also credited with identity preservation, as Belles-Calvera (2019) asserted that multiple languages coexist in the linguistic landscape because it "… may reflect the need for local authorities to preserve their identity" (p.18). Coluzzi (2020) concurred as he argued that in a place like Macao, multilingualism happens because a language, Portuguese, is used in its linguistic landscape as a heritage language. This matter transpires even though only a tiny percentage of Macao's population can speak the language, as they are predominantly Chinese and English speakers.

B. Recommendation for Future Research
Based on the selected studies in this review, the researchers have identified four areas that future studies can further explore especially relating to inclusiveness

1. Inclusiveness in the linguistic landscape
It is recommended that more thorough studies on the linguistic landscape be conducted based on social inclusiveness. Two recent studies have identified the significant need for such analyses. Hopkyns and van den Hoven (2021), for instance, suggested that the language on signage needs to match languages spoken in specific speech communities. They then called for "… a desired inclusive model that would involve ethnographic observations and analysis of social contexts to tailor signage to the dominant speech communities within specific areas" (p. 228).

2. Inclusiveness in linguistic landscape and gender
Apart from catering to the languages spoken in a community, another interesting observation came from Bosworth (2019), who suggested that gender inclusivity should be another aspect that requires further examination in the linguistic landscape. Bosworth, who studies gender inclusivity in the linguistic landscape of universities in France, called for language on signs and billboards to be aware of "… the use of feminine terms alongside masculine ones, a progressive elimination of the 'generic masculine,' and an equal overall representation of women and men in the text, through manipulation of structure and style" (p. 188). This could be a new endeavour, especially in the field of tourism.

3. Inclusiveness in the linguistic landscape and people with different abilities
Additional studies on inclusivity and linguistic landscape should also focus on the impact of linguistic landscape on people with different abilities, as suggested by (Hancock, 2022; Adekunle et al., 2019). In a study involving Chinese undergraduate students' engagement with the linguistic landscape in Scotland, Hancock (2022) noted that the respondents in his study reacted well toward signs and billboards that include assistance for people with different abilities, such as the braille for the blind. Hancock then claimed that "… the world becomes more tolerant than before as disabled people have the same right as normal ones" (p.5). Meanwhile, in connecting gender and people with different abilities in the linguistic landscape, Adekunle et al (2019) earlier observed that the degenderisation of people with disabilities appeared to be prevalent in South Africa's higher learning institutions. They then warned of dire consequences should this situation remains unaddressed by saying that "… the

degenderisation of disability and the little or no acknowledgment of gender differences, as observed on the toilet doors of the institutions, may unfortunately only be a reflector of other discriminatory and unequal measures with which people or processes are maintained in society" (p. 9).

4. Inclusiveness in the linguistic landscape and COVID-19

Studies on COVID-19 and how it has impacted the linguistic landscapes worldwide have been continuously conducted since the onset of the pandemic. However, these studies focused more on the types of linguistic landscape employed by various parties during the pandemic and their functions. It is believed that studies regarding COVID-19 and linguistic landscapes could be further enriched with an extended focus on how inclusivity could affect the delivery of information through language signs during the pandemic. As discovered by Hopkyns and van den Hoven (2021) in their study about linguistic diversity and inclusion in Abu Dhabi's linguistic landscape during the COVID-19 period, the inclusion of minority languages is still minimal in language signs for COVID-19. Therefore, they suggested that greater inclusion of these languages is crucial to "ensure optimal access of information at a street level and validate the linguistic identities of diverse groups of people" (Hopkyns & van den Hoven, 2021, p.228).

Conclusion

From the review above, the main themes drawn by the current LL studies concerning tourism appear to be grounded on similar issues. The selected studies reveal two significant emerging themes that are prominently discussed in the field of tourism namely language dominance and multilingualism. What can be concluded is that the visibility of the English language in most linguistic signs available in tourist sites is primarily due to communication purposes. English has emerged as a symbol of social currents, which indexes modernity and globalisation. Undoubtedly, the English language has shaped an internationalized environment in most tourist destinations. However, it is feared that the dominance of the English language in most of the observed tourist sites will marginalize local languages. This situation emphasises the importance of linguistic diversity, particularly in multilingualism, which leads to the next widely contested topic and theme. As part of modern capitalism, multilingualism in most tourist sites indicates that language, which was previously acclaimed as a cultural asset and symbol to build community solidarity, now also represents the community to tourists and commercial products and brands. Apart from being inextricably linked to its locality and authenticity, the presence of linguistic diversity is thought to add value to the tourism industry. It is hoped that the significant issues discussed will help to develop the discipline of LL further and spark future debates on other perspectives and concepts. A new LL perspective, specifically in tourism, should be introduced and evaluated over time.

Acknowledgement

References

Adekunle, T. O., Mheta, G., & Mathonsi, M. R. (2019). Exploring linguistic landscapes in selected South African universities: A case study of the University of Cape Town and the University of the Western Cape. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus*, 56, 123-153.

Backhaus, P. (2007). Linguistic Landscapes. A Comparative Study of Urban Multilingualism in Tokyo. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Bosworth, Y. (2019). Gender Inclusivity in the Linguistic Landscape of Parisian Universities. *The French Review*, *93*(2), 175–196.

Bruyei, O. A., & Juan, G. M. (2009). English as a Lingua Franca in the Linguistic Landscape of the Multilingual Resort of S'Arenal in Mallorca. *International Journal of Multilingualism*. 6(4). 386-411.

Bruyei, O. A., & Juan, G. M. (2015). Minority languages in the linguistic landscape of tourism: the case of Catalan in Mallorca, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, DOI: 10.1080/01434632.2014.979832

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2006). Linguistic landscape and minority languages. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 3(1), 67-80 (special issue edited by D. Gorter)

Cocq, C., Granstedt, L., Lindgren, E., & Lindgren, U. (2020). Developing Methods for the Study of Linguistic landscapes in sparsely populated areas.

Da Silva, A. M., Tjung, Y. N., Wijayanti, S.H., & Suwartono, C. (2021). Language use and Tourism in Yogyakarta the linguistic landscape of Malioboro. *Wacana*, 22(2), 285-318.

Danuwijaya, A. A., & Abdullah, C. U. (2021). Multilingualism of Tourism Attraction in Bandung. *Journal of Tourism Education*, 1 (1), 28 – 32.

Darmawan, R. (2018). A Study of Linguistics Landscape Towards Tourism Entrepreneur Language Ability at Simanindo District, Samosir Regency, North Sumatera Province. *Scientific Journal of Linguistic, Literature, and Education, 7(1), 4-14.*

Dong, J., Peng, M., & Uddin, M. G. (2020). Mapping the Linguistic Landscape of the Cultural Heritage Sites and Tourist Spots in Bangladesh. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 8, 228-244.

Fakhiroh, Z., & Rohmah, Z. (2018). Linguistic Landscape of Sidoarjo City. *Journal of Literature and Language Teaching,* 9(2), 96-116.

Gorter, D. (2006). Introduction: The Study of the Linguistic Landscape as a New Approach to Multilingualism. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 3(1), 1–6.

Hamdiyah, M. Z., & Arts, F. O. F. (2019). A Linguistic Landscape of Tourist Spaces: Multilingual Signs In Surabaya And Mojokerto's Heritage Sites.

Hancock, A. (2012). Unpacking mundane practices: Children's experiences of learning literacy at a Chinese complementary school in Scotland. Language and Education, 26(1), 1–17.

Hoffman, L. (2017). Pharmaceuticals and tourist spaces: Encountering the Medicinal in Cozumel's Linguistic Landscape. Acme, 16(1), 59–88.

Hopkyns, S., & van den Hoven, M. (2021). Linguistic diversity and inclusion in AbuDhabi's linguistic landscape during the COVID-19 period. Multilingua. https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2020-0187

Jaworski, A. (2010). Linguistic Landscapes on Postcards: Tourist Mediation and the Sociolinguistic Communities of Contact. Sociolinguistic Studies 4/3. 469–594.

Jocuns, A. (2016). Discourses of tourism in Thailand: The nexus of religion, commodification, tourism, and "other-ness." Journal of Liberal Arts, 16 (2).

Johnson, M. (2019). An Exploratory Survey of the Linguistic Landscape of Lake Toya. Muroran Institute of Technology, Vol 17, 69–79.

Khazanah, D., & Kusumaningputri, R. (2021). Unpacking Multilingualism in Tourism Peripheries in Bali:Taking a Look into Private Shop-fronts. University of Jember, Indonesia. 28-37.

Koschade, A. (2016). Willkommen in Hahndorf: A Linguistic Landscape of Hahndorf, South Australia. International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies, 3(1), 692–716.

Landry, R., & Bourhis, R. Y. (1997). Linguistic Landscape and Ethnolinguistic Vitality: An Empirical Study, Journal of Language and Social Psychology, Vol 16, 23–49.

Lu, S., Li, G., & Xu, M. (2020). The linguistic landscape in rural destinations: A case study of Hongcun Village in China. Tourism Management, 77 (August 2019), 104005. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2019.104005

Moriarty, M. (2014). Languages in motion: Multilingualism and mobility in the linguistic landscape. International Journal of Bilingualism, 18(5), 457–463. DOI: 10.1177/1367006913484208

Moriarty, M. (2015). Indexing authenticity: The linguistic landscape of an Irish tourist town. International Journal of the Sociology of Language (232), 195–214.

Praset, K., & Zilli, P. J. (2019). A Linguistic Landscape Analysis of Pattaya, Thailand's Sin City. Discourse and Interaction, 75-95. https://doi.org/10.5817/DI2019-1-75

Rong., X. (2018). The Linguistic Landscape of Beijing Tourism Spots: A Field-Based Sociolinguistic Approach. International Journal of Languages, Literature, and Linguistics, 4 (1). 23–28.

Ruan, M., R., & Lee, M., Y. (2017). Residents' Perceptions of Multi-linguistic Landscape in Tourism Destination. Chinese Business Review, 16 (2), 82-95. doi: 10.17265/1537-1506/2017.02.002

Ruzaite, J. (2017). The linguistic landscape of tourism: Multilingual signs in Lithuanian and polish resorts. Eesti Ja Soome-Ugri Keeleteaduse Ajakiri, 8(1), 197–220. https://doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2017.8.1.11

Sibarani, R., Deliana, F., Yanti, D., & Liyushiana. (2021). The Role of Language Landscapes for Tourist Destination at Toba Caldera Geosites: A Landscape Anthropolinguistic Study. Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 17(4), 2419-2434.

Shang, G. W. (2018). Tourism linguistic landscape study: A macro sociolinguistic perspective. Journal of Zhejiang International Studies University, 2018(5), 46–56.

Sholikhah, I. M., Kholifah, A. N., Wardani, E. (2020). Multilingualism Through Linguistic Landscapes in Baturraden Tourism Resorts. Advances in Social Science. Education and Humanities Research, 509, 321-326.

Tamilchelvan, S., & Rashid, A. R. (2017). Being a Muslim gay man: A systematic review. Trames: A Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences, 21(3), 273. https://doi.org/10.3176/tr.2017.3.05

Thongtong, T. (2016). A Linguistic Landscape Study of Signage on Nimmanhemin Road, A Lanna Chiang Mai Chill-Out Street. MANUSYA: Journal of Humanities, Special Issue (22).

Yan, L., & Lee, M. Y. (2014). Tourist Perceptions of the Multi-Linguistic Landscape in Macau. Journal of China Tourism Research, 10(4), 432–447. https://doi.org/10.1080/19388160.2014.953658