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Abstract

The official language of Sāmoa is Samoan, but the majority of the population speak English as a second language. Because of early contact with missionaries and colonial powers, the English language soon became widely acknowledged and used in Sāmoa. Even after Sāmoa became independent from New Zealand, the English language was and is still recognised, but not made official, in the Constitution of Sāmoa and education policies.

This paper reports on the languages that are present in the linguistic landscape of Sāmoa. The main purpose of the study was to identify the predominant language used in Sāmoa, and to analyse ‘hybridity’ or ‘dualism’ on signs that contained the Samoan language. The data consists of 987 signs taken from two survey areas, Apia and Salelologa, using a digital camera. Scollon and Scollon’s (2003) ‘Place Semiotics’ was used to give an overview of the preferred code in the LL of Sāmoa. The ‘Motu Analysis’, a reconceptualization of Backhaus’s ‘part writing’ types, was used to analyse how two or more languages are used and positioned on signs in the LL; this analysis responds to the research question on ‘hybridity’. The final step involved a closer analysis of the subset of signs containing the Samoan language to detect signs of hybridity through loanwords and semantic extensions.

The results of the analyses indicated that English is the dominant language in the linguistic landscape of Sāmoa despite lacking official status in the language policies of Sāmoa. The findings further reveal that the English influence on the Samoan language on the signs is reflected more in semantic loans than loanwords, revealing a healthier picture of the Samoan language. The study concludes with possible lines of research for further studies in Sāmoa and the Pacific.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

There are different languages spoken all around the world and people are constantly surrounded by the textual forms of these languages. The way language is used, its presence, existence, and extinction, has been studied by many researchers in the past using different methods and approaches. One of the most recent and nascent approaches in studying different languages is the study of ‘Linguistic Landscapes’ which contributes to the field of sociolinguistics and Applied Linguistics. The concept was first popularized by Landry and Bourhis (1997) and defined as:

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

The term ‘Linguistic Landscape’ refers to the urban areas where signs are displayed and viewed by the public. The analysis of the visual messages of signs not only reveals the languages that are present in the LL, but also gives information on multilingualism within a physical domain (Shohamy & Gorter, 2009). LL research also reveals rich information about the languages contained in the LL. For instance, the investigation of the languages within the LL can reveal the ‘salience or silence’ of a language (Macalister, 2010). The LL also offers an insight into how dominant languages and minority languages are used within a specific context (Cenoz and Gorter, 2006).

LL studies can provide information on the groups of actors, official and non-official, who created the signs (Backhaus, 2007). Official signs such as those inserted by government institutions, insurance companies, schools, and hospitals, more likely align with language regulations and language policies. Non-official signs are more likely reflective of the community and are designed more freely (Rafael et.al. 2006). As mentioned by Cenoz and Gorter (2006):

The study of the linguistics landscape can also be interesting because it can provide information on the differences between the official language policy that can be reflected in top-down signs such as street names or names of official buildings, and the impact of that policy on individuals as reflected in bottom-up signs such as shop names or street posters (p.68)

Further, a strength of an LL study is how it reflects the language policies, language attitudes, and language practises of a certain context. In the context of Sāmoa,
insights from the LL can offer a backdrop of the use, limited use, or absence of a language. Additionally, a review of language policies, for example, the Constitution of Sāmoa, and Education Policies regarding language use, can add further explanations on how and why people choose to use a language within a public domain. Therefore, an LL study offers an understanding of not only the languages that are present (or absent), but of the language speakers as well.

**Aim**

This thesis explores the languages of a Pacific Island state. Using the case of Sāmoa, previously known as Western Sāmoa, this study analyses the languages that are present in its LL, and the language preference of the actors who inserted the signs in relation to official language policies. Most significantly, this study aims at analysing hybridity of languages on signs within the LL of Sāmoa.

Sāmoa has been chosen for exploring the languages that are present in the LL and its relation to language use and language policies for four main reasons:

(1) to contribute to the linguistic interests of a significantly understudied Pacific island nation
(2) to explore historical contact with foreignness during the Colonial Era
(3) to explore Sāmoa’s journey as an independent nation and how it shaped the language policies that are in place today
(4) to analyse how Samoan language speakers Samoanise foreign concepts and ideas, as reflected through language mixing and language shifting.

**Sāmoa: Background Information**

Sāmoa is an independent country which was once colonized by Germany, Britain, and New Zealand. It became independent from New Zealand rule in 1962. It is home to a population of 197,798 people (Sāmoa Population, 2019). Sāmoa consists of ten islands, four of which are currently inhabited: Apolima and Manono, Upolu and Savai’i (Sāmoa Bureau of Statistics, 2016). The total geographic area of Sāmoa is approximately 2,842 km², with Savai’i consuming the most land area with approximately 1,700 km², followed by Upolu with a total land area of 1,110 km² (Sāmoa Bureau of Statistics, 2016). The people of Sāmoa speak Samoan as a first language, and English as a second language.

The economy of Sāmoa is predominantly agricultural. Its main exports are agricultural or primary products such as bananas, coconut, and copra. Due to the value of primary products within the market, little is ever made from these exports. As commercial actors have been
seen to be important in LL studies, it is worth mentioning that Sāmoa not only relies on agriculture but also tourism (Sāmoa Tourism Sector Plan, 2014-2019).

Figure 1: Map of Sāmoa
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Linguistic Landscape research aims to examine the languages that are present in the LL of a specific area. Researchers of this field share a goal of making sense of the LL as a foundation of how public space is symbolically constructed (Shohamy et al., 2010); examples of these will be discussed below.

Over the years, there has been a growing number of LL studies around the world. Calvet (1990) conducted a study of Dakar (Africa) and Paris (Europe), Marten (2010) in Europe, Curtin (2008) and Backhaus (2007) in Asia, Landry and Bourhis (1997) and Ben Rafael and others (2006) in West Asia, Backhaus (2008) in The Americas, and Macalister (2010; 2012) in Asia-Pacific (New Zealand and Timor Leste). While studies have been conducted in different parts of the world, to the best of my knowledge there have been no thorough studies on the LL of Pacific Island states. There have been studies (Nicholls, 2014; Goundar & Kaur, 2016) acknowledging the multilingual and diverse Linguistic Landscape of Fiji, but there was no analysis of the signage of Fiji. This paved the way for a potential study of the LL of Sāmoa.

The literature review will review early studies in the field of LL in order to give background information of how LL studies have developed over the years. The review will evaluate the functions of a Linguistic Landscape and how it is relevant to the understanding and examination of languages on signs within the LL. An evaluation of the relationship between the LL and language policies will also be reviewed. A review of the literature regarding the language practises and attitudes of the people as revealed by the languages used on signs will follow. Lastly, the literature review will unpack the current language situation in Sāmoa: the history of the existing languages, the language policies, and those who are in the position of policy making. This will set the foundation for the motives behind undertaking an LL study in Sāmoa.
Early Studies on LL
Before the term ‘Linguistic Landscape’ was introduced by Landry and Bourhis, there were already contributions to the field. Calvet (1990) conducted a comparative study of the cities of Paris and Dakar where French is the official language. The study shows that the similarities and differences between the two cities can be revealed by analysing how language is used on signage. Interestingly, the distinction between official signs and non-official signs is referred to as ‘in vitro’ and ‘in vivo’ and is applied in the study of Dakar. As cited by Macalister (2010, 2012) and Backhaus (2007), Calvet established a binary opposition between ‘in vitro’ and ‘in vivo’ signs; “…‘in vitro’ means static, while ‘in vivo’ means dynamic” (Macalister, 2012, p.31).

Another early study on LL was by Bernard Spolsky and Robert Cooper (1991) who studied the linguistic richness of the Old City of Jerusalem. The main aim of their study was to show that a multilingual study within a multilingual community contributes to our knowledge of understanding the dynamics of the different ethnic groups that exist in that community. Using qualitative (survey and interviews) and quantitative (study of language signs) methods, the authors were able to give a sociolinguistic background of the Old City, carry out a survey regarding peoples’ language use, analyse the “language of signs” (Chapter 6), and observe how people use language(s) in the linguistic landscape. From an analysis of the language planning of the Old City, the authors conclude that the planning:

...seems to have been directed chiefly toward the legitimization and maintenance of Jewish hegemony over Palestine/Israel, the spread of Hebrew as a second language amongst the Arab population, and the gathering and assimilation of Jewish immigrants. Palestinian language planning...seems to be directed towards the rejection of Israeli suzerainty rather than towards the legitimization and strengthening of Palestinian claims to autonomy (p.125).

The strength of the study came from the authors’ attempt to study more than what they had intended. By expanding the sociolinguistic picture of the Old City, the authors were able to show that the city is a breeding ground for political and religious conflict. Also, the interrelationship of the functions of each language shows that there is a great history behind existing languages and how they are used within the Old City of Jerusalem.
Symbolic and Informational Function of LL

Over the years, many studies have built on Landry and Bourhis’ (1997) definition of LL and the well cemented theoretical framework they created for the study of Linguistic Landscapes. They proposed that the linguistic landscape either has an ‘informational function’ or a ‘symbolic function’. If a linguistic landscape of an area has an ‘informational function’, it means that the LL informs its audience on the “linguistic characteristics, territorial limits, and language boundaries of the region they have entered” (Laundry & Bourhis, 1997, p.25). Therefore, the informational function of a LL is to indicate what language is used for which purposes, outlining clear boundaries between the usages of multiple languages in an area.

A ‘symbolic function’ of a LL on the other hand, can refer to language attitudes of the audiences of public signage. The LL can also symbolise the positioning of a language(s) or the power of a language within society. A ‘symbolic function’ is discussed in a study by Cenoz and Gorter (2006). They suggest that the linguistic landscape symbolizes “…the relative power and status of the different languages in a specific sociolinguistic context” (p.67). The study indicates an important aspect of the symbolism of the LL and the people: when people read signs, they process the information they see, and they decide on how to perceive the languages used to convey the messages on signs. This goes to show that the symbolic function of the LL potentially highlights the language attitudes of those who associate with the signs within a given language community.

Ben-Rafael and others (2006) resonates with Landry and Bourhis’ ‘symbolic function’ of the LL, and refer to the linguistic landscape of Israel as “a symbolic construction of the public space”. In this study, the authors analysed the three predominant languages - Israeli-Hebrew, Arabic, and English on public and private signs in three different localities; Jewish localities (Kfar Shmaryahu, Tel Aviv-Jaffa, Upper Nazareth, West Jerusalem), Israeli-Palestinian localities (Tira, Adjami-Jaffa, Nazareth), and a Non-Israeli Palestinian locality (East Jerusalem). The methodological approach used by the authors to define a sign or signs is relevant to the explanation of ‘who’ the LL actors are and what their contribution is to the LL. The authors categorised the public and private signs into two categories – top-down signs, and bottom-up signs. The former refers to signs created by public institutions: road signs and public notices, while the latter refers to private signs such as shop signs or business signs, signs by private and commercial actors. The study of signs in Israel concludes that the Hebrew language is pre-dominant in the Jewish and Israeli-Palestinian areas. The study also points out how
symbolic the absence and presence of a language is, depending on the number of its speakers who reside in the different parts of the LL.

**Language Policies and LL**

LL studies point out the role of language policies in the salience and absence of signs in the LL. In their study, Cenoz and Gorter (2006) analysed the use of minority languages in two different survey areas. The survey compared the LL of a main street in Friesland (Netherlands) and a main street in the Basque Country (Spain), investigating the role of Frisian and Basque (minority languages). The study focused on the use and the position of minority languages in the LL, and the analysis of other languages present in the LL of both areas. The study shows that there are more Basque signs than Frisian signs and this is due to the differences in language policies in both LLs (2006, p.78). In Basque country, the government encourages the use of Basque; since it is a minority language, it is highly protected by Basque language policies. However, in Friesland, although Frisian is not visibly reflected in the language of signs, as is the case of the Basque language, it is used more commonly for oral communication. The study clearly shows that the language policies of a country have the power to either encourage the use of a language within the LL or limit its use. It also shows how language policies act as one of the major contributors to the ‘positioning’ of languages within a country.

Similarly, a comparative study of the linguistic landscapes of Quebec and Tokyo (Backhaus, 2008) highlighted the power of language policies in the visibility of languages on signs. The study pointed out the differences in political systems of both study areas; Quebec has “great political autonomy” while Tokyo has a “metropolitan prefecture...a centralized state bureaucracy” (p.166). Another difference is seen in the way rules and regulations are instigated. In the case of Quebec, the laws regarding language use in public spaces are legally binding; however, in Tokyo, although there are existing language policies, they are used as guidelines for the use of language in the LL and are not legally binding (p.167). The comparative study shows that although both cities consist of different political systems, legal statuses of the laws, and linguistic ecology, their language policies share similarities in containing status and corpus planning elements. The study concludes that the LL does not reconstruct naturally; it is continuously shaped and impacted on by language policies (p.170).

Marten (2010) explained the role of language policies in reversing the history of Soviet occupation by analysing the linguistic landscape of Rezekne, the regional centre of Eastern Latvia. Before Soviet occupation, Latvian and Latgalian were the “vernacular languages”
(p.115), however the percentage of Latvian speakers fell drastically after the Soviets’ arrival. After gaining independence, the Latvians created language policies that aimed at reversing language shift. The State Language Law recognises Latvian as the official language, and in the case of public signs and announcements, all signs were to be in Latvian; exceptions were made to include other languages in the public eye, except for the Russian language. The Russian language is clearly marginalised compared to other minority languages which explain the high number of English signs compared to the number of signs in Russian. Quantitatively, Latvian dominated the linguistic landscape of Rezekne (p.119). This study gives credit to LL research as it investigates the sociolinguistic background of existing languages and creates links between such histories and existing language policies; such an approach explains the marginalisation of languages, and how they are depicted and visualised in the LL.

**Language Policies vs Language Practises in the LL**
Although Language Policies are potentially powerful contributors to the LL, in some cases, they are not always reflected in the language practises of actors within the LL. This is shown in the three case studies that are discussed below:

Marten’s (2010) ethnolinguistic survey on the Latvian and Russian language, found that over 90% of the people are competent in both languages (p.116) despite the Latvian language receiving more official support than the Russian language. However, the qualitative results show that people prefer to use the Russian language wherever and whenever they can, for instance, when sharing information about a job (p.128). The study shows that although a country has guidelines or policies regarding language, it does not mean that the people it is intended for prefer it or are positive about it.

In a study on the LL of New Zealand, Macalister (2010) was able to pinpoint how the recently developed language policies of New Zealand are not reflected in the LL of Picton. Although New Zealand has recently recognised both the Māori language and Sign language as official languages, Macalister’s analysis of its LL suggests that New Zealand is still strongly monolingual with English as the dominant language. The study found that te reo Māori appeared on only 8.8% of the signs and always alongside the English language in the LL. There were no signs containing only te reo Māori, and English was the predominant language in the LL. Macalister concludes that this signifies NZ as a predominantly monolingual society and the language policies of New Zealand are not reflected in the language practises of its people.

A similar result was shown in the study of the Linguistic Landscape of Dili, capital of Timor Leste (Macalister, 2012). In the constitution, Tetun and Portuguese are the official
languages of Timor-Leste, and English and Bahasa Indonesian are recognised as languages used in the workplace (p.29). An important finding from this study was that although the English language is regarded as a working language in the constitution, it was the dominant language in the LL of Dili which suggests that in terms of LL that language policy has a weak effect. Where the language policy was seen to be most effective was on the small number of official signs but even there, it was Portuguese and not Tetun that had the main presence.

**New Directions in LL research**

From the review of previous studies, it is clear that over the years the field of linguistic landscape has moved and changed. Shohamy and Gorter (2008) illustrate this change in how recent studies of the LL have contributed to the “expanding of the scenery”. They argue that the LL is a “fluid space” that is constantly negotiated and contested, space that can be “conceptualised”. A space where various factors are constantly interweaved, inter-related, and overlapped. The argument continues to support recent theories of multilingualism that reject “notions of languages as closed, finite and homogenous; a notion that dominated language theories for some time” (p.318). The authors discussed the fluidity and the fertility of the public space as an area that needs further exploration. In their study of the Haapala site, a “multimodal, multilingual site” located on the shore of Tel Aviv, the authors show how the site became a space that is constantly conceptualised and constructed by different factors. The study overall argues for the push of LL studies further and beyond to include the history of an area, the social and political factors, the authors, and other multiple modalities that are all at play in the “meaning-making process”. After all, “LL refers to texts situated and displayed in a changing public space which is being redefined and reshaped” (p.314).

Following the previously reviewed studies, it can be seen that there is motivation for further research in the field of Linguistic Landscapes. The field is still fertile and open for further exploration of languages in other parts of the world. This has therefore paved the way for research to be conducted in the country of Sāmoa, a Pacific Island state.
The language situation in Sāmoa
The official language of Sāmoa is Samoan, and the unofficial second language is English. In order to build a thorough review of the current language situation in Sāmoa, it is necessary to survey the arrival of the missionaries, the European settlers [during the colonial era], and the Chinese settlers; all are considerable factors in understanding the past. The early accounts of European arrival to Sāmoa is a possible source in analysing the current language situation of Sāmoa. Samoan contact with the Europeans can be reflected in the languages that are used today. Drawing from Marten’s (2010) contribution to LL research, the sociolinguistic background of the languages is important in analysing the LL of a given area more clearly. By doing so, potential links between the history of Sāmoa and the use of languages today can be drawn and reviewed.

Old Sāmoa
Before the missionaries arrived, the village and family were the main institutions for transmitting culture in Sāmoa (Thomas & Postlethwaite, 1984). The Samoans had what Keesing and Keesing referred to as “...a talking, orally transmitted culture” (1956, p.6). IN the village, Samoans communicated in Samoan through daily conversations, gossip, myths and legends, and storytelling, but never in writing because the Samoan language was unwritten at the time. Culture and traditions were passed on from generation to generation through word of mouth, and sacred information about family affairs were kept in secrecy by those with high status within the family. This was the way Samoans passed on their knowledge before Missionaries developed an orthography for the Samoan language.
Missionaries
Upon arrival, the missionaries established a formal education system in Sāmoa as a means of carrying out religious and cultural reformation (Meleisea, 1987). The newly established education system was superimposed on an already existing Samoan education system and took place in the village, as well as through academic institutions set up by the missionaries. “The principal locations in which religious study took place were the village church, the pastor’s or missionary’s home, the individual homes of church members, and the central seminaries for teaching training” (Thomas & Postlethwaite, 1984). The missionaries taught written Samoan language to enable the Samoan people to read, write and study Christianity (Keesing & Keesing, 1956); this contributed to the conversion non-believers. Missionaries played an important role in improving the literacy rate in Sāmoa. For the Samoans, the ability to read and write in their own language meant more than just ‘Christianity’; it became a tool in acquiring knowledge, status and power within the community (Vaai, 2011). Education on reading and writing in the Samoan language spread like fire throughout the nation. As a result, the literacy rate in the Samoan language was estimated to be close to one hundred percent by the time Germany annexed Sāmoa in 1900 (Keesing, 1934; Tuia & Schoeffel 2016).

Colonialism
In the late 1800s, interest grew over Sāmoa being a potential colony. The three colonial powers (Germany, Britain, and the USA) fought for dominance over the Samoan islands which eventually led to the signing of the Berlin Act in 1889 to avoid war (Meleisea, 1987). As a result, the islands of Sāmoa were divided; the eastern islands of Sāmoa (Tutuila and Manu’a) were annexed by America and the western islands were annexed by Germany. The western islands of Sāmoa soon became known as Western Sāmoa (or German Sāmoa during the German administration’s take over) while the eastern islands became known as American Sāmoa. The German administration did not make drastic changes to the mission schools already established by missionaries; however, they required that German language was also taught in schools (Thomas & Postlethwaite, 1984). The partition of Sāmoa into two separate countries brought about distinct changes in the Samoan language. For instance, the word ‘esikegi’ is a borrowing from English into the American Samoan lexicon to mean ‘accident’, while in Western Sāmoa it is known as ‘fa’alavelave’ (Kruse - Va’ai, 2011). To date, the eastern islands (American Sāmoa) remains a territory of America.

The German administration only lasted until the outbreak of World War 1; Britain sent New Zealand to take over German Sāmoa (Meleisea, 1987). When New Zealand took full political control of Sāmoa from Germany, a [secular] free education system was introduced.
Throughout the early years of their rule over Sāmoa, school lessons were taught in Samoan, and English was being studied by elite individuals – pastors, high chiefs, foreign residents, and part-Samoans (Keesing & Keesing, 1956; Thomas, 1967). As a result, Samoans began to place a high value on the English language, and students who were highly proficient in the English language were praised (Tuia & Schoeffel, 2016).

**Independence**

Fast-forward to Independence in 1962, there was an increase in the number of established colleges that taught students using the New Zealand school curriculum (Tuia & Schoeffel, 2016). The New Zealand school curriculum adopted by Sāmoa was in English and therefore the medium of instruction for all subjects was ‘English’. However, due to increasing concerns by parents about possible language loss, the Samoan language was introduced as a subject into the school system in the late 1960s (post-colonialism) (Mayer, 2001).

At this point, it is important to mention that the relationship between Sāmoa and New Zealand remains intertwined even after Sāmoa’s move to be independent from the hands of colonialism. This is evident through the Quota scheme where Samoan citizens are encouraged to apply for a Samoan Quota Resident Visa to be able to work and live in New Zealand. The Seasonal Employment Scheme is also another program where NZ and Sāmoa work collaboratively to provide employment for Samoan people. Another example are the scholarships offered by NZAid to Samoan students and public servants to study in New Zealand or in Pacific Island states via the University of the South Pacific. It is possible that the relationship between NZ and Sāmoa may have influenced the display of languages and the use of languages in the LL of Sāmoa.

**Chinese Settlement in Sāmoa**

Chinese people have contributed greatly to commercial activity in Sāmoa. Their presence in Sāmoa is evident through the businesses that they have established in both Upolu and Savai’i, for example, Chan Mow Ltd, Pat Ah Him Co Ltd, Ah Liki Wholesale, Ah Fook Ltd, just to name a few. The difference in the time periods that they arrived in Sāmoa is a potential factor in analysing the different Chinese commercial actors within the Linguistic Landscape of Sāmoa. In a presentation at the ‘China and the Pacific: The View From Oceania Conference’, Leung Wai (2015) divided the topic of Chinese Migration into four waves:

- First wave (1840’s – 1890s) - the Chinese free settlers.
Second wave (1900s – 1930s) - Chinese contract indentured labourers

Third wave (1950s – 1990s) - full blooded Chinese who are related to the Chinese who were residing in Sāmoa at the time

Fourth wave (2000 – present day) - full blooded Chinese who have relatives in Sāmoa, and full-blooded Chinese who have no blood connection to Sāmoa.

The Chinese, from the first wave to the third, who intermarried with Samoans and established businesses, embraced the Samoan culture and customs and later identified themselves as Samoans (Leung Wai, 2015). However, the final wave of Chinese migration into Sāmoa is receiving much criticism from not only the local citizens, but also those of Chinese-descent from previous and more ancient waves of migration. For instance, in Upolu, a local businesswoman of Chinese descent raised concerns relating to the influx of new Chinese business people into Sāmoa, threatening the local businesses (Goerling, 2016). A similar concern was raised in Savai’i, where the village council of Salelologa banned Chinese businesses from being established on customary land in Salelologa as a means of protecting indigenous lands and improving local businesses (Likou, 2017). This caused an upheaval between the government, who own parts of the land in Salelologa, and the village council of Salelologa. These incidents which relating to the Chinese businesses are important to investigate within a Linguistic Landscape study because they may count towards the explanation of who the actors are within two distinct areas.

In the year 1912, the legal status of Chinese migrants was changed from native to European despite not having any European ancestry (Meleisea, 1987). The Chinese then received the “legal privileges of Europeans”. Interestingly, this meant that Chinese names were also converted or written in English. This is evident in Leung Wai’s account on the names of Chinese labourers from the second wave of Chinese migration:

...I recall the many descendants of Chinese labourers who came to see my Chinese grandmother about tracing their Chinese ancestors’ origins. Generally, only the surnames of Chinese labourers were used when they were converted into English eg Ah Fook, Ah Chong. Converting them back to Chinese was therefore a problem if the first name is not known. No proper records relating to their identification could be
found. It also did not help when the labourers were usually referred to at the time by
numbers instead of their names, eg Yue Yiek was known as “Coolie No. 398”...

The conversion of Chinese surnames into English names rather than Samoan names shows
how prestigious the English language was during the early years of European contact. Also,
the change from a native Samoan legal status to a European legal status reveals the power
and influence of the Europeans during the colonial era.

### Language Policies in Sāmoa

“Language policy refers to the tacit habits and to the set of explicit rules and laws which,
whether established by a government or by any other institution or human group, are
concerned with the use of languages, dialects and registers in a community” (Emilio Crespo,
2013). LP explicitly or implicitly recognise the status of a language or languages within a
country. In the case of Sāmoa, there are national policies relating to language use. These
policies are established against the global backdrop of English being widely recognised as the
global lingua franca. For Sāmoa and many other nations of the world, knowledge of English
has high instrumental value. These policies will be discussed in the following sub-sections.

### Constitution of Sāmoa

In the Constitution of Sāmoa, which was drafted before Independence and amended
over the years, it recognises the collaborative use of the Sāmoa language and the English
language in the Legislative Assembly. However, it does not state the official status of either
language. In Clause 54 it states:

1. All debates and discussions in the Legislative Assembly shall be conducted in the
Samoan Language and English Language.  
2. The Minutes and the debates of the Legislative Assembly, every bill introduced therein, every paper presented thereto, and all minutes of proceedings, minutes of evidence, and reports of committees of the Assembly hall be in the Samoan language and the English language.

### Sāmoa Language Commission Act

The explicit recognition of the Sāmoa Language as the official language in Sāmoa is later
stated in an independent statutory body titled, ‘Sāmoa Language Commission Act 2014’, i.e. 52 years after Independence. The purpose of the Act is:

...to ensure the Samoan language is and remains a vibrant language, to declare the Samoan language as an official language, and to establish the Samoan Language Commission to provide its functions, duties and powers, and for related purposes
The objectives of the Act give respect and acknowledgement to the Samoan language in all government or state institutions. It ensures the respectful use of the Sāmoa language when relaying information and services to the public, and when conducting work within government divisions. The Act also promotes the use of the Samoan language as a “living language” within the community. The commission has various functions and powers. With relevance to the purposes of the present study are the following functions:

To promote the Samoan language…and its use as a living language [...], to monitor any developments or changes in the Samoan Language [...], to provide interpretation and translation services [...], undertake research into the use of the Samoan language.

**Education Policies regarding language planning and use**

Education policies have their fair share of influence on how language is used within the social and economic spheres. To some extent, the way language is taught and acquired influences the use of language within a society. For instance, one of the earliest noted policies involving the Samoan language is the exclusion of the diacritic marks, macron (-) and glottal stop (‘), from the education policy in 1969, soon after Independence, as mentioned by various authors (Tualualelei et.al 2015; Efi, 2005). Tualualelei mentioned that the diacritic marks are important in the Samoan language due to their role in differentiating words with homographic counterparts, i.e. words that are spelt the same but are pronounced differently and have different meanings. The exclusion of the diacritics from the education policy by the Director of Education at the time was due to two reasons:

...the idea was to sweep away the inconsistencies that were becoming commonplace in Samoan texts. Another rationale was to teach Samoan students contextual reading skills, skills that English readers employ, for instance to distinguish between [ri:d] or [red] (eg. I like to read; I have to read the book) (Efi, 2005; Le Tagaloa, pers comm 2002, as cited in Tualaulelei et.al 2005)

The given reasons for excluding diacritics indicates how the importance of learning English in the early years of Independence also influenced the learning of Samoan. However, it is possible that the purpose of avoiding inconsistency in Samoan text by excluding diacritics may have created a space for inconsistency in the Samoan language instead, that is through the mispronunciation and misunderstanding of certain terms. The authors reviewed the history of diacritic marks in written Samoan and also found that the bible which is the first written text of the Samoan language, used diacritics inconsistently in the Samoan language. Altogether, the history of diacritic inconsistency in the earliest policies and the earliest
Samoan book is important information in the current study as it involves the analysis of the Samoan language in the linguistic landscape of Sāmoa.

Other policies that followed include The Western Sāmoa Education Policy 1995 – 2005. The policy aimed at providing students with equal access to thirteen years of education, not just in the urban areas but also in the rural areas. The policy stated that:

...all schools will follow bilingual teaching methodologies that recognise Samoan as the first language of the vast majority of children; basic literacy in Samoan will be established before the introduction of English – although provision for children whose first language is English will continue in both the government and non-government systems; Samoan and English must be taught systematically, according to an approved bilingual methodology; literacy programmes will ensure systematic teaching and learning of Samoan throughout primary schooling, and of English from Year 4 to Year 8.

The policy advocated for a bilingual education system that best fits the heterogenic society of Sāmoa where English and Samoan are used collaboratively in various domains. The policy advocates for the use of the first language (Samoan) as the medium of instruction up until Year 6, when the child is 11-12 years old, then it is ceased and replaced by the English language from Year 6 onwards. However, a policy review conducted in 1999-2000 highlighted some of the consequences of this practise. The review stated that the policy had a great impact on the status of the Samoan language amongst its native speakers and within the community and affects the development of both Samoan and English given the time of transition between the two mediums (Lameta, 1999). It indicated that “the practice has the effect of excluding Samoan from opportunities to develop the vocabulary and the mechanisms for its use in a wide range of contexts”. The review clearly stated the inconsistency caused by the intentions of the bilingual system on its learners and the development of the Samoan and English languages.

The policy review report was later acknowledged in the Ministry of Education, Sports, and Culture’s new education policy document, the Strategic Policies and Plan, June 2006 – June 2015, (MESC 2006) under the ‘Language Policies in Education’ section 3.9. The background of the section stated the importance of language policies in education:
The first is that language is a fundamental factor in the interplay between education, culture and participation in society. The second is that language in education influences language status and language structures (MESC 2006)

It was then followed by the ‘specific problems’ of its antecedent i.e. Western Sāmoa Education System 1995-2005. One of the errors addressed the inconsistent use of diacritic marks in education in the years prior to independence, as mentioned previously. Another practical error addressed were the negative perceptions and assumptions of the Samoan people towards both the Samoan language and the English language in and outside of the education realm. The generalisation of the effects of bilingualism to include not just the education of Sāmoa but also the lifestyle and attitudes of its people in other disciplines, environments or contexts, shows the effects language policies in education can have on a society.

The notion of ‘Hybridity’

There are various possible outcomes that can result from the contact of two or more languages. At the most extreme there is language death, with other possible outcomes being language loss, language shift, and language maintenance. Languages are constantly impacting on each other and at times, the contact may lead to the endangerment of the one of the other. Janse & Janse (2003, p.x) mention that a language proceeds through certain levels of endangerment until it is considered a dead language:

A language is potentially endangered if the children start preferring the dominant language and learn the obsolescing language imperfectly. It is endangered if the youngest speakers are young adults and there are no or very few child speakers. It is seriously endangered if the youngest speakers are middle-aged or past middle age. It is terminally endangered or moribund if there are only a few elderly speakers left. A language is dead when there are no speakers at all.

An example can be taken from a study by Meakins and O’Shannessy (2016) on the loss of the Indigenous languages of Australia. Before colonialism, indigenous Australians spoke more than 250 languages, however, since colonialism many of these languages have been lost and today only 18 are still being used (p.7). The contact between English and Indigenous languages limited the use of the indigenous languages and created varieties of Australian languages that result from the contact of existing languages. An example is Kriol, “a creole language which uses English vocabulary while preserving the sound system, semantics and
grammatical features common to many Indigenous languages” (p.8). The study highlights possible disadvantages of language contact on the maintenance of indigenous languages and how such can lead to the loss or death of a language. The people shifted to using English and to creating English dominant dialects possibly due to changes in administration, political policies, and introduction of new social norms introduced by colonialism.

Language contact, however, has not always had extreme consequences on the languages of a country. Take for instance Honi Bhabha’s (1994) notion of ‘hybridity’ which has been widely used by scholars (Kruse-Vaai, 2011; Giffard-Foret, 2013; Tuia & Iyer, 2014; Dai, 2016) to interpret and refer to the cultural and linguistic situation of a country due to its historic experience with foreignness in the colonial era. Hybridity is defined as the intertwining of two or more cultures to produce a unique and acceptable way of life that takes into consideration the characteristics of each culture involved (Bhabha, 1994). Bhabha’s intentions for transforming the term is to not only discuss the impact of colonisers; it shines light on the actions taken by the colonies to not necessarily rebel against foreign impact, but to rearticulate the elements of all cultures involved. Post-colonial discourse on language has used the concept of hybridity to refer to the mixture of two or more languages within various places, considering the native language and the colonizers’ language, thus forming the term ‘linguistic hybridity’. Hybridity is therefore an outcome of language contact that is evident in post-colonial discourses which, at often time references the aftermath of colonialism.

Hybridity in post-colonial discourses has been examined and analysed by researchers over the past few years. For instance, Giffard-Foret’s (2013) examination of Merlinda Bobis’ poems highlighted the use of ‘linguistic hybridity’. Bobis is a Filipina Australian whose mother tongue is Tagalog and is a second language speaker of English. Following the Australian English (only) Citizenship Test in 2007, Bobis wrote the poems, ‘Siesta’ and ‘word gifts for an Australian critic’, using both Tagalog and English. The poems expressed concern towards the ‘appropriation’ of the English language by migrants. In the poem ‘Siesta’ the first stanza and the third are in English, and the second stanza and the fourth are in Tagalog. In the poem ‘word gifts for an Australian critic’, Bobis uses Tagalog and English interchangeably. The interchange between the two languages in both poems deconstructs the boundaries between the predominant language (English) and the minority language (Tagalog). Bobis poems created a ‘Third Space’ for the poet persona to hybridise the English language and Tagalog. The poems suggest the importance of analysing the hegemonic position of the
English language in Australia before considering it as multicultural and all-embracing of other cultures.

Linguistic hybridity has also been examined by Klotzl (2014) in ‘English as a lingua franca’ (ELF) interactions between couples who do not share the same mother tongue. Klotzl found that although couples communicate with each using English, they also draw from their own cultural values to achieve better communication. For example, Sue (first language is Hebrew) and Henry (first language is German) are a couple who communicate in English. In one of their recorded conversations, Henry says ‘ichsa’ which is later explained as the couple’s slang word for ‘disgust’ coined from the Hebrew word ‘ichs’. The word ‘ichsa’ is therefore a hybrid word that is incorporated into the ELF space shared by Sue and Henry. The study concluded that modifying the English language in private conversations using hybrid forms is “pretext dependent” rather than “cultural oriented”.

During Germany’s brief colonization of Western Samoa in the early 1900s, linguistic hybridity between the two colonial languages, German and English, and the native tongue, Samoan, were highlighted by Stolberg (2013). By the time Germany took over Samoa, the English language had already acquired a status in Samoa as the lingua franca between some locals and European expatriates. This is because the English language was first introduced by the London Missionary Society which arrived before the Germans. Through the analysis of linguistic and metalinguistic data – early travellers’ and settlers’ reports, archive materials, and the Samoanische Zetungat (a German newspaper) – Stolberg mentioned that the first German colonisers spoke Samoan German, a German settler variety. The Samoan German variety consisted of a merge of mostly German and English, and a few loanwords from the Samoan language. From an analysis of the Samoanische Zetungat, Spolberg found various integrations of the English language, i.e. pullst du und gewinnst nicht [...] – ‘if you pull and don’t win’, and a few integrations of the Samoan language, i.e. Jahresfest der Fita fititas , ‘one-year celebration of the Fita fititas [member of the local police]. The integration of the English language and the Samoan language into the German language, creating a Samoan German variety, is an element of linguistic hybridity.

However, despite the hybridized Samoan German variety that resulted from the contact of languages in Samoa, the study by Spolberg concludes that the Samoan German variety was short lived. There was a limited opportunity for the German language to develop as a lingua franca in Samoa as compared to Namibia, a former German colony where German is still spoken. After the arrival of the missionaries, and during the colonial era, the
English language had already acquired a prestigious status and was widely used between locals and European expatriates, and it was also used by the Germans in Samoa for the same reasons. “[...] after the end of the German colonial rule in Samoa the colonial German speech community dissolved and the use of Samoan German was (most likely) discontinued” (p.347).

In the case of Sāmoa, scholars, Tuia & Iyer examined the extent of hybridisation and heterogenisation on the Samoan Way, Education, and Culture through the analysis of Sāmoa’s Education Policy (Strategic Policy and Plan, June 2006 – June 2015). The scholars mention that the hybrid values of the policy, i.e. “to provide an ideal education system to guide the spiritual, cultural, social, intellectual and physical potential of all participants” (p.129) presumably supports a hybrid education system in Sāmoa. However, Tuia and Iyer argue that in the policy there is a lack of explicit recognition and integration of the core Samoan values of the Samoan way of life; these values are (Tuia & Iyer, 2014, p.127):

Alōfa (love); fa’aaloalo (respect); va tapuia (sacred relationship); va feiloai (mutual respect); ava fatafata (behaviour accorded to others); usitai (obedience); tofiga po’o tiute tauave (responsibility); feavatai/fetausiai (reciprocity); soalaupule (consultation) and galulue faatasi/fesoasoani ai (collaboration); fa’asinomaga (identify); tautua lelei (good services); and fai mea amiotonu (honesty)

The scholars claim that the education system of Sāmoa needs to embrace hybridity by merging the Samoan values mentioned above and global values that are imbedded in the policy to create a space suiTable for the development of skills and knowledge of the Samoan citizens. Because the study by Tuia and Iyer is on the analysis of the Education Policy, Strategic Policy and Plan, June 2006 – June 2015, it also takes into account the language policies on section 3.9 of the policy which has been discussed previously in the ‘Language Policies in Sāmoa’ section of the literature review. The suggested merge of Samoan values with global values to form a more fitting hybrid education system can influence the language policies of Sāmoa and the language use of its people. This is because the Samoan Way of life (fa’asamoa) also consists of the Samoan language. An integration of Samoan values into language policies would mean, to love (alōfa) and respect (fa’aaloalo) the Samoan language, to use the Samoan language wisely to show mutual respect (va feiloai), and to use the Samoan language to consult (soalaupule) and collaborate (galulue faatasi) with others in an honest (amiontonu) and obedient (usitai) manner.
In the same vein, Kruse-Vaai (2011) used the notion of ‘hybridity’ as a linguistic feature to discuss the language situation of post-colonial Sāmoa. Kruse-Va’ai claims that the interactions between the Samoan language and English language during the pre-colonial period reinvented and created a hybridised Samoan language. As mention by the scholar, linguistic hybridisation is noticeable in various domains within the now heterogenous society of Sāmoa. For instance, it is imbedded in the Samoan Counting System (adapting the Arabic symbols for numbers i.e. 1, 2, 3); the calendar used today (Ianuari – January, Fepuari – February); children’s talk (songs and rhymes); language use by Fa’afafine - males who identify themselves as women and dress like women (Monday – Montrella, sister – sistra, taxi – traxi); and other ways language is used in everyday life.

Kruse-Va’ai’s argument on the ‘Linguistic and Cultural Hybridisation’ in Sāmoa is in relation to various claims that the Samoan language situation in Sāmoa is ‘dualistic’. She explains that “Dualism is a term which suggests a co-existence without interaction” (p.11). Keesing’s (1934) landmark study, Modern Sāmoa as quoted by Va’ai (p.42) claims that:

The Samoan people are undoubtedly entering a period in which linguistic dualism is going to be a necessity...there is what might be called a margin of linguistic utility beyond which it is more profitable to use the wider means of communication. This does not mean that the vernacular breaks down entirely at this point, rather it indicates the place where language dualism emerges distinctly.

Kruse-Va’ai states that ‘dualism’ is seen as an unfit concept to describe language diversity in Sāmoa because it suggests that the Samoan language and the English language only exist alongside each other but do not impact on or interact with each other. This quote relates to the idea that English is a global lingua franca and its influence on the languages in any given nation state.

Thus far, it is apparent that ‘linguistic hybridity’ has been identified as being used in poems as a form of expression towards English appropriation (Giffard-Forets, 2013); in ‘English as a lingua franca’ interactions between people who do not share the same mother tongue (Klotzl, 2014); in the education policy of former colonies with an explicit position (Tuia & Iyer, 2013); and it is used to describe the language situation of Sāmoa (Kruse-Vaai, 2011). However, in the case of Sāmoa, an examination of ‘language hybridity’ on signs in the Linguistic Landscape of Sāmoa has never been conducted.
Gaps in the Literature

The previous reviews on the history of Sāmoa, i.e. the arrival of the missionaries, education during the colonial era, influx of migrants, and post-independence Sāmoa, opens a portal of statements and questions about the languages that are salient [or silenced] in the Linguistic Landscape of Sāmoa. Given the history of Sāmoa with foreigners, it is possible that there are other languages present in the Linguistic Landscape of Sāmoa. The languages, if any, that exist in the LL of Sāmoa all have a sociolinguistic background on why they are salient. Drawing dots from historical information to present data is a possible tool in analysing these languages. Those who are responsible for the insertion of signs and notices that utilise these languages contribute greatly to the study of a Samoan LL, as well as other unknown factors that can be found only through the conducting of research.

An LL study has never been conducted in Sāmoa before, therefore this study will give new insights into the field of LL by examining the languages that exist in Sāmoa, placing special attention on the Samoan language in order to analyse ‘hybridity’ or ‘dualism’ in the language. The present research will explore the distinct and unique linguistic features and blended identities of Sāmoa as imbedded in the LL. It is important to note that ‘Linguistic Landscape’ can also be referred to as ‘Linguistic Cityscape’ (Gorter, 2006). This is relevant to the current study of the LL of Sāmoa because of the areas chosen for the study. This study will include, in the same vein as Shohamy et al. (2006) a collection of quantitative data from the cityscape of Sāmoa (Apia), and the townscape of Salelologa. The study will also discuss whether the Samoan people are resilient in maintaining its gagana (language), and it will examine the language attitudes of the people towards existing languages and how such attitudes are linked to historical events. Historic information on Sāmoa can play a role in analysing and discussing the languages of Sāmoa as well as any possible changes to the language use of the Samoan people. Most importantly, the present study will contribute to the study of Pacific Languages and their maintenance within a fast-changing world where contact between countries is becoming more common than it was 100 years ago.

In the section that follows, an outline of the research questions for the proposed study will be discussed one by one. These questions have been created with regards to the gaps in the literature that has been reviewed.
**Research Questions**

The study analyses the languages that exist on signs in the linguistic landscape of Sāmoa. It intends to analyse the townscapes of the two main islands of Sāmoa – Upolu and Savai’i. The analysis of the existing languages will then be analysed further to find out the factors that contribute to their presence and salience in the linguistic landscape. The last question of the research will then examine if the results point at the ‘hybridity’ of the present languages within the community, or if it shows a ‘dualistic’ reality of languages in Sāmoa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. What are the similarities and differences between the linguistic landscape in urban Upolu and urban Savai’i?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. What languages are present in a Samoan Linguistic Landscape?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. What factors contribute to the presence of these languages?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. To what degree does the Samoan Linguistic Landscape depict the ‘hybridity’ or ‘dualism’ of languages in Sāmoa?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 3: Methodology

This section provides a description of the methodology of this study. This study is purely quantitative in nature. In this respect the broader objective of this study is to analyse the signs that form the Linguistic Landscape of Sāmoa, i.e. “public road signs, advertising billboards, street names, place names, commercial shop signs, and public signs on government buildings” (Landry & Bourhis, 1995, p.25). Graffitti, posters and stickers (Kallen, 2010) are also analysed in this study. More precisely, the study uses various approaches and analyses to collect, classify, and analyse the data from the two survey areas, Upolu and Savai’i, in order to examine the languages in Sāmoa. The following sections will present the following: (1) the survey areas chosen for this study, (2) explain the continuum used for analysing the actors in the LL, and (3) give detailed descriptions of the analyses used to examine language on signs in the LL of the chosen survey areas.

Survey areas: Upolu and Savai’i

The data were collected from the 27th of May to the 2nd of June 2019 in Upolu, and from the 4th of June to the 9th of June in Savai’i. In order to avoid any methodological issues, weather patterns and the geographic landscape of the area were considered first before collecting the data. The most suitable time to collect the data was between 7am – 8am and 5:30pm - 6pm on weekdays, and 2pm onwards during the weekend. During these times, traffic congestion is low, and the heat and humidity is bearable.

The two main islands, Upolu and Savai’i, were chosen for this study to analyse patterns of language change, language shift, or differences in language preference. The two areas are located in densely populated parliamentary constituencies and traditional districts (Sāmoa Socio-Economic Atlas 2016). Although Apia is the official capital city of Sāmoa, the focus of the study is expanded to include the rural town area of Salelologa. The reason being is Salelologa caters to a great number of people on Savai’i Island which is geographically larger than Sāmoa in land mass.

Survey Area 1: Vaea Street is in the traditional district of Tuamasaga and under the parliamentary district of Vaimauga West (refer to Figure 2). The chosen street is an accessible route into the heart of Apia. It is adjacent to Vaitele Street and ends at the Apia Town Clock Tower, the landmark of Apia. The landscape is surrounded by local, national, and international businesses and shops.
Figure 2: Satellite image mapping Vaea St in Upolu

**Survey Area 2:** Salelologa Street (see Figure 3) is under the traditional district of Fa’asaleleaga and under the parliamentary district of Fa’asaleleaga 1. The chosen area begins at the Salelologa Wharf, the main point of entry into Salelologa town and the island of Savai’i itself. All travel to and fro Savai’i is funnelled through this area; it is an area of commercial activity where many signs are found. Like Vaea Street, survey area 2 is surrounded by the island’s main businesses and shops which mark the centre of the townscape. The area surveyed ends at the only traffic lights of Savai’i.
What constitutes a sign?
In any linguistic landscape study, the decision on what signs are to be counted is often a challenge. Ben Rafael et al (2006:10) in their study included “street signs, commercial signs, billboards, signs on national and municipal institutes, trade names, and personal study plates or public notices” Cenoz and Gorter (2006) on the other hand considered all signs on a storefront as one token and other signs that were not stuck on a storefront as a single token. Backhaus (2006: 55, 2007:55) in his studies referred to a sign as “…any piece of written text within a spatially definable frame.” This makes more sense as it avoids the miscount of the number of signs in the LL, as well as avoids the exclusion of the written text on each sign that appear on a shopfront. Ben Rafael (2009) later added that the LL consists of items that mark the public sphere, from road signs, street signs, shops or school signs. For the purposes of this study, Backhaus’s (2006; 2007) definition will be used.

Figure 3: Satellite image mapping the Salelologa Street
Analysis of the Signs

The analysis of the languages on signs in Sāmoa will follow a logical sequence to ensure the findings of the study are clearly presented and discussed. There are two layers used for the analysis. The first step is to analyse and categorise the signs into distinct language categories followed by the determination of the dominant language in the LL. The second layer of the analysis is to analyse the languages used on a sub-set of signs using Scollon and Scollon’s *Place Semiotics*, and a variation on Backhaus’s part writing, called the Motu Analysis, as explained below. The final step of the analysis is to analyse Samoan language use on signage in Sāmoa to examine and discuss the extent of language contact on the Samoan language. The steps of the analysis will be further discussed in the following sections.

Categorisation of the Languages

The languages used on the signs were categorised into seven different categories: English Only, Samoan only, Samoan + English, Samoan + Other, English + Other, English + Samoan + Other, and Other. Signs are considered to be ‘English Only’ signs in the following cases: (1) the proper noun ‘Sāmoa’ is inserted in a dominantly English sign without the macron over the /a/ for example, ‘The Magic Circus of Sāmoa’; and (2) the proper noun ‘Savai’i’ is inserted in a dominantly English sign without the apostrophe between /i/ and /i/ for example ‘Gateway to Savaii’.

Furthermore, it is decided that a sign written in Chinese characters is considered as a Chinese sign and therefore falls under the category ‘Other’ [languages], and signs that contain Chinese words but written in Chinese Pinyin (Romanised) are considered English words. For example, if the Chinese surname, ‘Chen’ is written in roman letters then it is an English word, but if it is written using the Chinese character then it is considered a Chinese word. A similar method of analysis was used by Backhaus (2007) in categorising Kanji characters and Romanised Japanese language.

For the purposes of this study, it was decided that proper nouns, i.e. the name of a shop, company, product or brand, in the English or Samoan language are considered and counted. In the case of loanwords in Sāmoa, all will be counted as Samoan words, for instance, ‘Ofisa’ (Office) and ‘Loia’ (Lawyer). In the case of English borrowings, a French word like ‘café’ is only counted as English if it is spelt without the acute accent above the /e/.

To avoid issues with the existence of two or more writing systems on signs in the LL, ‘transliteration’ and ‘translation’ are analysed carefully. Transliteration is to replace or transfer the words or letters of one script into another (Wehmeier et al, 2005), for instance
from the Chinese Script into the Roman Script, more famously known as Chinese Pinyin. Transliteration not only means, to transfer from one writing script to another, but it could also refer to the spelling variations of the same word(s) from one language into another that has a similar writing system, for example ‘Francis’ is the English equivalent of the French surname, François. Translation on the other hand, is the process of transferring a text from one language to another, for example the Samoan translation for the English word ‘tree’ is la’au.

Classification of the Signs
Different studies have used different coding categories in order to categorize the signs. Cenoz and Gorter (2006) used a coding scheme that used 16 variables. Ben Rafael and others (2006) classified the signs of their study into ‘top-down’ and ‘bottom-up’ signs. However, Backhaus (2007) retained the essential binary division of signs. It categorized monolingual and multilingual signs, considered the languages on the signs, the geographical area, and the relationship of language elements in the linguistic landscape (Androutsopoulos, 2013). According to Macalister (2012, p.31), “these distinctions...do not capture the dynamism within a linguistic landscape or the degrees of permanence within the landscape”. Macalister summarised the binary oppositions of previous studies,

... ‘private’ and ‘government’ signs (Landry & Bourhis 1997: 26), ‘top down’ and ‘bottom up’ signs (Ben Rafael and others 2006), and ‘in vitro’ and ‘in vivo’ signs (Calvet 1990, 1994, cited in Backhaus 2007. The essential difference is between signs that are official and those that are not... (Macalister 2012, p.30).

With these examples taken into consideration, Macalister proposed a dynamism continuum that can be used to analyse the different actors within a linguistic landscape, and to analyse influential groups who contribute to the salience of signs. The ends of the continuum are labelled; in vitro on the left of the continuum and in vivo on the right of the continuum. This dynamism continuum will be used for the proposed study of languages on signs in the LL of Sāmoa in order to get a wider perspective of who the contributing actors are, how they influence the presence of signs in the LL, and how long the signs are intended to last within the LL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In vitro</th>
<th>Official</th>
<th>Commercial national</th>
<th>Commercial local</th>
<th>Community local</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>In vivo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Place Semiotics – Language Dominance**

Scollon and Scollon (2003) discuss how to analysis the indexicality of languages on signs, and geosemiotics. Indexicality is how “language indexes the world in many ways” (p.3), and geosemiotics refers to the “social meaning of the material placement of the signs” (p.4). The analysis they proposed is a useful approach to use in analysing the response of creators of a linguistic landscape and how those responses are shown on signs. This analysis looks at the representational structures (p.86) of the signs and how to read them, the “modality” (p.90) of the images of the signs, and the composition (p.91). Using this analysis to further analyse the data that will be collected for this study will help in elaborating how the signs or the images that are physically bounded represent the social world.

Scollon and Scollon’s (2003) ‘Place Semiotics’ gives an overview of what the preferred code is within the LL, that is, if the code is located top, top-left, or in the centre, it is the preferred code (p.120). ‘Place semiotics’ analysis examines multiple codes or languages on signs, if any, to explain the system of preference used by the creators of the signs. It considers the font(s), letterform, type of material used for inscription, layering, state changes, and quality of physical item used for the inscription (p.129). Focusing on these aspects of a sign gives an insight of why the producers used specific inscriptions for the signs, and whether the signs were intended to be permanent or temporary. Lastly, the emplacement semiotic resource analyses the whereabouts of the signs within the linguistic landscapes chosen for the study. The three systems used to analyse the emplacement of the signs are - decontextualized, transgressive, and situated. **Decontextualized** refers to inscriptions that do not change but constantly appear on signs in different settings, for example, the ‘M’ sign for Mac Donald’s (refer to Figure 4). **Transgressive** refers to signs that are not supposed to be where they are found for instance, the discarded ‘Le Vai’ water bottle in Figure 5 used as a stand for a metal pole. **Situated** refers to signs that consist of notices or regular instructions such as ‘open’ and ‘closed’ signs, and ‘push’ and ‘pull’ signs (refer to Figure 6).
Figure 4: McDonald’s – an example of a decontextualized sign

Figure 5: Le Vai water bottle – an example of a transgressive sign

Figure 6: a ‘pull’ sign – an example of a situated sign
**Motu Analysis**

Backhaus (2007) reviewed the methodological problem of distinguishing translation and transliteration further and insisted on using musicology jargon to distinguish the signs, and to answer the question *Linguistics Landscape for whom?* The ‘homophonic’ signs are signs that have a complete translation or transliteration of each other, the mixed signs refer to signs that only include some details of all the languages, the polyphonic signs contain some details in one language and several in the other but vary in meaning and context, and the monophonic signs contain one language only (Backhaus, 2007, p.90-102). For the purposes of this study, therefore, and to respond to the research question relating to ‘hybridity’, Backhaus’s ‘part writing’ types are reconceptualised to allow a more simplified analysis of how two or more languages are used on signs, i.e. to indicate the predominant language, and to show the intended audience of the signs. The other reason for reconceptualising Backhaus’ musicology jargon is to avoid using western cultural references to make sense of a Pacific world. The study aims at applying Pacific understanding of the world to understand the world that we are looking at and more importantly, to reflect the Pacific way of knowing.

Drawing from the Samoan taxonomy of islands, the reconceptualised analysis will be referred to as the ‘Motu Analysis’, or in other words ‘Island Analysis’. In the Samoan language, the term *motu* means ‘island’, i.e. *motu o Salafai*, the island of Salafai. Other words associated with this term are *atunu’u*, *atumotu*, *itumalo*, and *nu’u*. The term ‘atunu’u’ refers to a country, for example, *Le atunu’u o Sāmoa* (the country of Sāmoa). *Atumotu* refers to an archipelago or a group of islands, i.e. *Atumotu o Sāmoa* (the islands of Sāmoa). *Itumalo* refers to the districts within the atunu’u (country), and *nu’u* refers to a village that is situated within the *itumalo* (district). These concepts will be transferred into distinct categories that resemble the ‘part writing types’ by Backhaus in order to analyse multiple language use on signs. The category *nu’u* refers to homophonic signs, *itumalo* refers to mixed signs, *atumotu* refers to polyphonic signs, and *atunu’u* resembles monophonic signs.

Motu analysis partially deviates from Backhaus’s ‘part writing’ types by purposely excluding the monophonic category in order to focus more on two or more languages on a sign rather than one foreign language on a sign. The motu analysis has included the four multilingual categories used in this study to distinguish the languages used on signs, i.e. Samoan + English, English + Other, Sāmoa + Other, and English + Samoan + Other.
Analysis of the Samoan Language
The study of how historic contact between Sāmoa and foreign countries such as Germany, New Zealand, and Britain influenced the way of life in Sāmoa can be studied further by looking into the Samoan language itself. The aforesaid contact means that languages were also in contact and were impacting on each other (Kruse-Va’ai, 2011). This brings the study to the final step that is to analyse the use of the Samoan language on signs. Each Samoan word will be analysed to identify possible changes or developments due to language contact and impact. To ensure the reliability of interpretation, the Samoan signs were discussed with first language speakers of the Samoan language. The analysis explores the possibility of the Samoan language containing loanwords/borrowings from other languages or show how the Samoan lexicon is used to cater to newly introduced concepts. The analysis is relevant for the discussion of ‘hybridity or dualism’ in the Samoan language.
Chapter 4: Results and Analysis
This section of the research provides the quantitative and descriptive data of the Linguistic Landscape of Sāmoa. An elaboration and analysis of the data in the two survey areas will be discussed in subsequent sections. The analysis will begin with general observations of the languages that are present in the linguistic landscape of Sāmoa. An analysis of each survey area includes the languages present, and the actors who created the signs.

Note: The term Upolu will be used in place of Apia to refer to the island on which Apia is located, and the term Savai’i will be used in place of Salelologa for the same reason.

Figure 7: An image of Vaea Street
The Linguistic Landscape of Sāmoa

Table 1 gives the overall count of signs found in Sāmoa. The overall count is a result of combining the total number of signs found in Upolu and in Savai’i. As noted previously, Upolu and Savai’i are the two main islands of Sāmoa. Survey area 1 (Vaea Street, see Figure 7) is located in Apia on the island of Upolu. Survey area 2: (Salelologa Street, see Figure 8) is located in Salelologa on the island of Savai’i.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Samoan</th>
<th>E + S</th>
<th>S + O</th>
<th>E + O</th>
<th>E + S + O</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Dist. (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Upolu</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Savai’i</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Signs in the Linguistic Landscape of Sāmoa. N=signs

Note: E + S = English plus Samoan, S + O = Samoan + Other languages, E + O = English + Other, E + S + O = English + Samoan + Other (N = signs)

A total of 987 signs were counted within the two survey areas. Out of the total number, 551 signs were found in Upolu within a distance of approximately 936m. In Savai’i, 436 signs were found within a distance of approximately 1354m. The number of signs found in Upolu
exceeds the number of signs found in Savai’i by 26.4% despite the longer distance of Salelologa Street.

In terms of languages, majority of the signs in Sāmoa are in the English language with 800 signs; that is 81% of the total number of signs in Sāmoa. Signs that used both the English and Samoan language followed with 120 signs which is 12.2% of the total percentage of countable items. Both categories, ‘English only’ and ‘English + Samoan’ exceed the number of signs found to be in the official language, Samoan. Only 48 signs out of 987 used the Samoan language, i.e. 4.6% of the total number of signs in Sāmoa. Signs containing other languages were found in the Upolu survey area only.

Languages contained in Upolu

This sub section focuses on the languages that are found in Upolu only. The languages that are present in Upolu are presented in Table 2. As can be seen, English is notably the most prominent. The English only category accounted for 79.3% of the total number of signs found in Upolu. Equally notable is its appearance with the Samoan language on 12% of occurrences, with other languages on 1.8% of signs, and with both Samoan and Other languages in 0.9% of cases. This demonstrates that 94% of the signs in Upolu contain English text individually or alongside other languages.

Monolingual Samoan signs were used on 5.3% of signs in Upolu. Samoan and English occurred together on 12.9% of signs under the categories: E+S and S+E+O. The Samoan language appeared alongside a foreign language other than English on one (1) sign (0.2%). In total, the Samoan language is visible on 18.6% of signs in Upolu.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language of signs</th>
<th>Number of signs (n = 551)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan only</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English + Samoan</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan + Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English + Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan + English + Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>551</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: Languages that are present in the Linguistic Landscape of Upolu (N = signs)*
The presence of foreign languages other than English was seen on signs in Upolu. These languages that appeared independently on signs, and alongside the English or Samoan language (or both) included Chinese, French, Italian, Spanish, Malaysian, and Māori. In total, 3.4% of the signs in Upolu contained either one or two of the mentioned languages.

An example of a sign containing foreign languages other than English is given in Figure 9. The word ‘uno’ is either Italian or Spanish and means ‘one’ as in number ‘one’. The word ‘café’ is a French word that means ‘coffee’. Because it is spelt with an acute accent (’), it is regarded as a French word. This contrasts with Figure 10 where café is spelt as ‘cafe’ without the acute accent and is treated as an English word.

0.9% of the signs in Upolu used Samoan, English, and other languages. For instance, in Figure 11, the sign contains Samoan words, English words, and a Malaysian word. The
Malaysian borrowing used in this sign is ‘sarong’. A ‘sarong’ is material wrapped around the waist, traditional wear in Malaysia (Tan, 2009). It is prominently used in place of the Samoan word for a ‘sarong’ which is *lavalava*, perhaps to indicate a foreign taste in fashion.

Figure 11: A sign containing a Malaysian word

Figure 12: A sign containing a Māori word
A significant result of analysing the languages in the LL is that it gives an overview of commercial activities in Upolu. The presence of foreign languages gives an insight into the relationship between the language(s) used on signs, and the products and services offered by the creator of the sign. For instance, the links between New Zealand and Sāmoa through a money transfer business is evident on Figure 12 with the inclusion of a New Zealand address, 22 Station Rd, Unit 3, Otahuhu. Otahuhu is a Māori term and a suburb in Auckland. Another example is given in Figure 13, an Air New Zealand sign using multiple languages on its welcome sign: Māori, Fijian, Tongan, Samoan, French, Rarotongan, and Chinese, indicates the commercial relationship between New Zealand and the countries of which these languages are used and spoken. The languages found in the LL therefore explains the commercial relations between the actors or producers of the sign(s) and the community in which the sign is placed.

In addition, the choice of language to be used on a sign not only indicates the commercial link between businesses and their audience, but it also signifies the language preference of official and non-official actors within the LL. Table 3 shows the languages used by the different actors: official, commercial national, commercial local, community, and individuals.
Table 3: Languages used by actors in the Linguistic Landscape of Upolu (N = signs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Type</th>
<th>Official</th>
<th>Commercial National</th>
<th>Commercial Local</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English + Samoan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan + Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English + Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English + Samoan + Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In relation to the categorisation of signs, it was previously stated in the methodology that if an English dominant sign contained the word ‘Sāmoa’ without the macron (-) or ‘Savai’i’ without the glottal stop (’) then the sign would be counted as an English sign. The study recognises that this had the potential to distort the picture of the languages used and over count English, but in reality, it did not have that effect. Also, a lack of diacritics on the two place names was never a sole example identified as an English word on a sign.

As can be seen in Table 3, a total of 437 signs used the English language only. The ‘English Only’ category includes signs that are monolingually English, signs that are in Chinese Pinyin, English dominant signs that use ‘Sāmoa’ without the macron over the /a/, and English dominant signs that use Savai’i without the apostrophe (’). From the total number of English signs, 319 English signs were created by commercial local actors, 80 were created by commercial national actors, 28 by official actors, 6 by the community, and 4 by individuals. The commercial actors, both local and national, generate most of the signs that are in English.

A particularly prominent point is the predominant use of the English language over the official state language (Samoan) by official and non-official actors. Commercial national actors use English as the preferred language on 85.1% of the total number of commercial national signs. Commercial local actors use English on 83.1% of the total number of commercial local signs. The Official agents used English on 58.3% of the total number of official signs despite their contribution to 51.7% of the total number of Samoan signs. The community and individuals, although inserting the least number of signs in the LL of Sāmoa, used English on 60% of community signs, and 50% on individual signs. Therefore, English is
used dominantly on official signs, commercial signs, and signs by the community and individuals.

Official actors contributed the majority of the Samoan only signs (see Figure 14). Official signs are inserted by official bodies such as government institutions or ministries, banks, insurance firms, and hospitals. Official actors inserted 15 out of 29 of the total number of Samoan only signs, and 15 out of 48 of the total number of official signs found in Upolu. Yet, the number of official signs using ‘Samoan only’ is exceeded by the number of official signs that are in ‘English only’. In other words, official actors prefer the use of the English language on signs despite its contribution to the highest number of Samoan signs.

In addition, there were no official signs using languages other than Samoan and English. The dominant use of the English language, the use of the Samoan language, the use of both English and Samoan, and the absence of foreign languages on official signs gives an insight into the explicit and implicit roles of the languages in the language policies of Sāmoa.

Figure 14: A road sign by an official actor

Commercial local actors inserted the majority of signs that used English and Samoan together. Out of 66 English + Samoan signs, 53 were created by commercial local actors, 5 by official actors, 5 by commercial national actors, and 3 by the community. An example of an E + S sign is given in Figure 15. The So’oula Traders (commercial local actor) window front uses the Samoan and English language to present a range of products offered by the business; the shop-name itself is in E + S.
The signs that used languages other than English and Samoan were mostly inserted by commercial actors. Commercial national actors used foreign languages on 9 signs, i.e. 5 on E + O signs and 4 on E + S + O signs. Commercial local actors used foreign languages on 6 signs, i.e. 1 S+O sign, 1 E+O sign, 1 E+S+O sign, and 3 ‘Other’ signs. In total, 15 commercial signs, both local and national, used languages with or other than English and Samoan.

Shown in Figure 16 is a picture of two signs that use two codes: English and French. These two signs (and two more of the same kind) were inserted by individuals; they are temporarily placed in the LL. The last show time for the Magic Circus of Sāmoa was in August 2018, and during the time of data collection, the circus was in New Caledonia, a French speaking country.
Languages Contained in Savai’i
Shifting the focus from Upolu, the following section focuses on the languages that are present in Salelologa, Savai’i. The languages that are present in Savai’i are given in Table 4. A total of 436 signs were counted in Salelologa Street.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language of signs</th>
<th>Number of signs (#)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan only</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English + Samoan</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan + other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English + Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English + Samoan + Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Languages that are present in the Linguistic Landscape of Savai’i (N = signs)

Table 4 gives details on the languages that are present in the LL of Salelologa Street, Savai’i. As with Upolu, the English language is predominant in Savai’i and accounts for more than 80% of the signs counted, i.e. 363 English signs in total. In comparison to Upolu, the percentage (83.3%) of English signs in Savai’i is 4% more than the total percentage (73.9%) of English signs in Upolu. Signs that contain both English and Samoan (English + Samoan category) make up 12.4% percent of the total number of signs in Savai’i, exceeding the number of Samoan only signs which accounts for 4.4% of the total number of signs. In comparison with Upolu, there are more English + Samoan signs than there are Samoan only signs.
There were no signs containing foreign languages on the Salelologa Street. Signs that contained foreign languages were only found in Upolu. Only one sign in the Salelologa Street contained a foreign word that was otherwise counted as a borrowing into the English language (refer to Figure 17). The sign is in Samoan (maua), English (ice cream, hot coffee, bowl noodle, ice, etc), and it also contains a Korean (Romanised) word (kimchi). Because this study counts a word or phrase as a foreign term or phrase only when it is written in the writing system of that language as previously stated in the methodology, the Romanisation of the Korean word 김치 to kimchi therefore counts it as an English word rather than a Korean word.

In Table 5, the signs are categorised further according to the actors who created the signs and inserted them into the Linguistic Landscape. As shown, most of the signs were created by local commercial actors with 305 signs in total. A total of 267 commercial local signs used the English language and only 3 signs used Samoan. E+S signs accounted for 35 local signs meaning the English language is predominant whether it is used individually or alongside the Samoan language.
Significantly, official signs (68) exceed the number of commercial national signs (41) which is in contrast with the data collected from Upolu where there are more commercial national signs than official signs. Official signs also use the English language more prominently in Savai’i than in Upolu.

Community actors and individuals have a greater influence in Savai’i than in Upolu. The signs by the community were either in Samoan or in Samoan + English. For instance, Figure 18 is an illustration of a Samoan only sign by the community with the wording, O IESU LE TALI, which is translated into English to mean ‘Jesus is the answer’. Another example is the community sign in Figure 19 which is in Samoan and in English. The individual signs on the other hand, used English on 13 out of 16 of individual signs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Official</th>
<th>Commercial National</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English + Samoan</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>436</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Languages that are used by the actors in the Linguistic Landscape of Savai’i (N = signs)
Chapter 5: Discussion
The Linguistic Landscape of Sāmoa was examined through the two survey areas, Apia and Salelologa, to explore the languages that are present in the two areas and to reveal the actors who inserted the signs in the LL. Yet, the findings of the study revealed more than just the languages that were found. The power of language policies, attitudes of the public, influence of the actors, the relationship between Sāmoa and foreign countries, and history of Sāmoa were also found imbedded in the languages used on signs in Sāmoa. The findings of the study show that there are numerous factors involved in the construction of the linguistic landscape, and that these factors are possibly interconnected. As is typical of LL studies, the examination of languages in a public sphere often reveals new and different information about the languages that exist in the LL, and it shows how languages on signage challenges language policies (Shohamy & Gorter, 2008). The following section discusses the findings of the current study, i.e. the languages present in the LL of Sāmoa, the dominance of the English language, underuse of the Samoan language, the actors who created the signs, and the analysis of the Samoan language on signs.
Language Use in Sāmoa

The analysis of the LL of Sāmoa through the two survey areas, Apia and Salelologa, illustrated the dominance of the English language on official and non-official signs. The high visibility of English in the two areas suggests three points. First of all, it could be said that English is viewed as a highly prestigious language in Sāmoa. The high status of English can be traced back to early contact with Europeans and during colonialism. As noted by Kruse-Va’ai (2011), “…the possession of an ability to speak and write in English has often been perceived as a mark of distinction in Samoan society”. As a result, the use of English overwhelms the use of the official language, Samoan, on signage in Sāmoa due to the attitudes and perceptions of the actors who created the signs and the audience of the signs. Secondly, the dominance of English in both the capital city of Apia and the more rural town of Salelologa could be due to the population’s ability to read and write in not only Samoan but also in English. Sāmoa has a high literacy rate; the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2019) shows the literacy rate of Sāmoa at 99.1% as of 2018. Lastly, the dominance of English could also be due to the encouraged use of English as a medium of instruction in the education system of Sāmoa over the years, as noted in the language policies of Sāmoa. As can be seen, the LL holds possible explanations for the dominance of languages and how it reflects the attitudes of the community in which the signs are found.

In addition to the prevalence of the English language in the Samoan LL is the high number of signs that use English and Samoan collaboratively on signs. The study found that the number of E+S signs exceeds the number of signs that are in Samoan only. The preferred use of English either on its own or alongside the Samoan language, again, likely shows the language attitudes of the people and their preferred use of English. It is possible that the use of the English language clarifies the meaning of a Samoan sign or vice versa for bilingual speakers, i.e. when there is a lexical gap in the Samoan language, an English word is used to bridge the gap, e.g. the word ‘fax’ (see figure 40). Also, the high number of E+S signs compared to Samoan only signs could be indicative of a bilingual speaking community, i.e. speakers of both Samoan and English. To summarize, the findings of the study suggests that English is evidently the most dominant language in Sāmoa.

In relation to policies, it can be said that the dominance of the English language could be due to how it is addressed in the language policies of Sāmoa. As mentioned in the literature review, the English language is not an official language in the Constitution of Sāmoa, however, it is acknowledged in Sāmoa’s national policies and education policies.
Perhaps the acknowledgement of English in language policies plays an important role in maintaining the prestigious status of English in Sāmoa. It is also possible that the way English is taught and used in education influences how it is perceived outside of the classroom. Either way, the dominance of English suggests that there is a possible weakness in how the language policies address the status of the languages used and spoken in Sāmoa.

One of the most notable findings of the study is the underuse of the official language, Samoan, compared to the unofficial language, English. The Sāmoa Language Constitution Act 2014, as previously stated in the literature review, explicitly recognises the Samoan language as the official language of Sāmoa, however, the study found that it is underutilized in the LL of Sāmoa. It is possible that the underuse of Samoan in the LL is due to the perceptions of its speakers, for instance, they perceive that English rather than Samoan represents modernisation and globalisation in the LL and therefore prefer the use of English in the LL which is evident in how English is used predominantly on signs within the commercial sphere. Therefore, it could be said that the language attitudes of the public, as displayed through the language they choose to use on signs, plays an important role in explaining how languages are either underused or overused in the public arena.

Apart from Samoan and English, the study found that there are ‘other’ foreign languages in the LL of Sāmoa. Chinese, French, Italian, Spanish, Malaysian, Māori, Fijian, Tongan, and Cook Island Māori were all found on signage in Apia. This can possibly index that the aforementioned languages are spoken in Sāmoa, however, the analysis of the signs show that the languages lean more towards a symbolic meaning. As mentioned by Scollon and Scollon (2003, p.133), “When a sign makes its meaning by representing something else which is not present or which is ideal or metaphorical, we call that symbolization”. An example is given in Figure 20 where the use of French and Italian on a coffeeshop’s menu likely symbolizes a foreign taste in coffee. It is also possible that the foreign languages found in the LL symbolizes globalisation, for instance, in Figure 13, the Air New Zealand welcome sign uses Samoan, English, Maori, Fijian, Tongan, Chinese, and Cook Island Maori which is symbolic of globalisation because it targets a global audience rather than a Samoan audience only. Therefore, it may be symbolization rather than indexicality that explains the salience of foreign languages in Sāmoa.
The study of the LL of Sāmoa found that foreign languages were only found in Apia and not in Salelologa. As a reminder, Apia is the capital city of Sāmoa and Salelologa is a rural town of Sāmoa. The presence of these languages in Apia suggests two points. Firstly, it is possible that the status of Apia as the capital city where trades are made, and its position as the major port of global commercial interactions allow for the presence of foreign languages. Secondly, it seems likely that the historic significance of Apia contributes to the existence of foreign languages in Sāmoa. As mentioned by Stolberg (2013), Apia was known as the “seat of the colonial government and the main trading centre” around the time of colonialism. Apia was the capital for foreign businesses such as Deutsche Handels and Plantagen Gesellschaft (a German firm), Morris Hedstrom Limited Cocoa Shed, and Burns and Philp (South Sea) Co Ltd, to name but a few. The link between the history of Apia and the existence of foreign languages can be illustrated using the image of Vaea Street taken in May 2019 (refer to Figure 7), and the old image of the same street taken circa 1916 (Figure 21). Figure 7 shows that the building located on the left was once named Burns and Philp (South Sea) Co Ltd building before it was bought by the Chan Mow family, Chinese by descent, and became Chan Mow Co Ltd in the 1950s, as was shown in Figure 7. The main point that can be made from the comparison of Figure 21 and Figure 7 is that, over the past few decades, as Sāmoa transitioned from being a German colony to being a New Zealand territory, and to later on being independent, foreign languages were entering and exiting the LL of Apia. This reminds
us that any LL is a dynamic construct and suggests that the history of Apia as a major port for business and as a trading centre, possibly contributes to the presence of foreign languages in Sāmoa.

Figure 21: An image of Vaea St, circa 1916

The most prominently used foreign language in Sāmoa is Chinese. Chinese characters were salient on three signs (e.g. Figure 22), and Chinese Pinyin was used on five signs as follow: Chan Mow Co Ltd (on two signs), John Fong Ltd, Ah Liki Wholesale, Pat Ah Him Co Ltd. This is an important finding in the understanding of Chinese influence on the commercial activities of Sāmoa. The use of Chinese and Chinese Pinyin demonstrates two things. Firstly, it is possible that Chinese is used to cater to the minority group of Chinese in Sāmoa, and Chinese Pinyin is used in place of Chinese characters to cater to the dominantly Non-Chinese audience (the Samoan population) to read the name of the shop and understand the purposes of the business. Secondly, it is possible that the ‘Pinyinisation’ of Chinese surnames symbolises the history of Chinese settlement in Sāmoa. As mentioned in the literature review, Chinese migration into Sāmoa can be explained in four waves. The aforesaid signs possibly symbolize the Chinese migrants who arrived in the first wave (Chinese people who intermarried with Samoan and identified themselves as Samoan) and the second wave (those who arrived as indentured labourers) of Chinese migration to Sāmoa.
The significance of the quantitative data collected from Salelologa is the absence of ‘Other’ languages. The signs found in Salelologa were either in English only, Samoan Only, or English + Samoan. Perhaps it reflects Apia as the capital city catering to a majority of the country’s global trades whilst Salelologa town provides necessary services to those residing in Savai’i. In the case of the Chinese language, which is prominent in Apia, its absence in Salelologa could be due to the banning of Chinese businesses on customary lands that are under the protection and guidance of the village council in Salelologa, as mentioned in the literature review. However, while the Chinese language is absent in this LL, this does not mean that Chinese businesses are absent in Salelologa; the banning of Chinese businesses does not cover government owned lands in Salelologa.

In the case of English, tourists are a potential audience for the signs in Salelologa. As mentioned in the introductory section of the current study, Sāmoa’s economy relies on agricultural products and tourism therefore it is possible that the use of English on signs in Salelologa targets tourists, for example Salafai Backpacker’s Inn (Figure 23), Stevenson’s Sandy Beach Resort (Figure 24), Scuba Dive courses and trips (Figure 24), and Lusia’s Lagoon Chalets (Figure 25), all of which are located in close proximity to each other.
Figure 23: Backpacker’s Inn in Savai’i

Figure 24: Scuba Diving courses and trips & Stevenson’s Resort
Figure 25: Lusia’s Lagoon Chalets

**Actors in the LL of Sāmoa**

One of the possible ways of answering the research question: *What factors contribute to the presence of these languages* is by looking at the actors who influence the construction of the Linguistic Landscape of Sāmoa. Table 6 gives the results of the signs inserted and created by each category of actors, i.e. official, commercial national, commercial local, community, and individual, in Apia and Salelologa. The Table highlights differences and similarities on each actors’ contribution to both town areas. This is significant to the current study because it provides important insights on language use throughout the whole country of Sāmoa and not limited to the capital city of Apia or the island of Upolu alone.

The abundant majority of the signs were created and inserted by commercial actors (refer to Table 6). A total of 692 signs were inserted by local commercial actors, 55.9% were found in Upolu and 44.1% were found in Savai’i. Commercial signs inserted 139 signs with 70.5% found in Upolu and 29.5% found in Savai’i. A similar result was obtained in Macalister’s (2012) study in Timor Leste where commercial actors inserted 188 signs out of the 222 signs analysed. The findings of the current study suggest that regardless of the location of the two towns, and regardless of the fact that Salelologa is a smaller town that caters mostly to the residents residing in Savai’i, commercial actors continue to play a pivotal role in the display of signage and the use of language within each area. As mentioned by Gorter and Edelman
(2010) in their study on the Linguistic Landscape and the Market, “global and local market forces are important factors affecting the use of languages in commercial domains.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upolu</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savai’i</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6: Actors in the Linguistic Landscape of Upolu and Savai’i (N = signs)*

One of the possible reasons for the overwhelming contribution of commercial local actors in the LL of Sāmoa is due to the number of signs a single local business generates. Highlighted in red (Figure 26) are fifteen signs on a storefront in Upolu. Figure 27 is another example of a local business contributing more than seventeen signs to the LL. Each sign is counted individually instead of all fifteen (and more) signs equalling to one token, as proposed by Cenoz and Gorter (2006). Whether or not the shopfront consisted of ten signs that are alike, all the signs that contained written text were included in the analysis because the existence of each sign in the LL contributes to the overall presence of languages in the LL. As stated by Backhaus (2006), defining a sign as “any piece of written text within a spatially definable frame” is a physical rather than semantic definition of a sign.

*Figure 26: Storefront in Upolu*
The study found that official actors did not contribute as many signs as commercial actors. Only 116 signs were inserted by official actors, with 58.6% of these being present in Salelologa, Savai’i. This shows that official actors have a greater influence in Salelologa than in Upolu. What is significant about the official actors is their preferred use of the English language over the Samoan language which indicates a potential weakness in the processes and procedures that an official actor supposedly goes through, for example, the Sāmoa Language Commission Act which is in place to promote and monitor the use of the Samoan language throughout Sāmoa, including public spaces. A similar result was found in Macalister’s (2012) study of the LL of Timor Leste, where he found that actors towards the in vivo end of the spectrum often drew on English rather than Portuguese for new terms such as ‘ice cream’, despite the language policies stating that Portuguese should be used for the creation of new terms.

The community contributed more signs in Upolu, and individual signs were more prominent in Salelologa. Although there are not many signs inserted by the community and individuals in comparison to official and commercial actors, there contribution to the LL can draw possible conclusions on the language use and language preference of the public.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Official</th>
<th>Com. National</th>
<th>Com. Local</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English + Samoan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan + Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English + Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English + Samoan + Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Language use by actors in Sāmoa (n=signs)

In terms of language use the official actors, commercial actors, the community, and individual citizens prefer the use of the English language rather than the official language – Samoan. As shown in Table 7, an overwhelming total of 800 signs used English only in Sāmoa. The English language is evidently present on 135 more signs under the E+S, E+0, and E+S+O categories. Altogether, English is salient on 94.7% of signs in the Linguistic Landscape of Sāmoa. Significantly, most of the English signs are commercial local signs. At this point it is safe to reaffirm that English is not an official language in Sāmoa yet the findings of the data shows that actors use English to possibly cater to a community that prefers the English language. It is possible that local actors use the English language to refer to the “material culture...visible and tangible objects” (Macalister, 2006) of the products sold in Sāmoa, for example signs that display products such as beer, furniture, and food. Another possible reason for the use of English is to identify oneself by their English name or surname, or in some cases identify themselves as part Samoan – part European, for instance, Misty’s Red Shop, Collins Medical Clinic, Hazelman and Associates and Georgies Pizza. Otherwise, the preferred use of the English language by actors gives an idea of the preferred language of the audience of the signs in the LL of Sāmoa.
**Code Preference**

The next section will discuss what Backhaus (2007) refers to as the “visual hierarchies of languages”, referred to by Scollon and Scollon (2003) as “code preference”. In cases where two or more languages are used on a sign, the position of the languages is considered.

Scollon and Scollon’s code preference is used to analyse and discuss the position of two or more languages on a sign, and to show the preferred code used by the actors who created the signs. In their book, Scollon and Scollon used order and font to express which of the codes is preferred, and how much space is taken up by the text. For the purposes of this study, Scollon and Scollon’s analysis is used to discuss the preferred language on signs in the following language categories: English and Samoan (E + S), Samoan + Other languages (S + O), English and Other languages (E+O), and English, Samoan and Other languages (E + S + O).

The analysis of ‘code preference’ is restricted to signs that contain two or more languages, i.e. signs that transliterate or translate each other, or signs that use two languages independently on signs. Similar to Backhaus’s study on multilingualism in Tokyo where the analysis was confined to signs that had partial or full translations or transliteration of each other, however, the current study on Sāmoa also includes multi-code signs that do not necessarily translate or transliterate each other. For instance, on the commercial signs in Figures 28 and 29, there are no transliterations or translations between the Samoan and English languages, but the Samoan language is in prominent position in both signs. This suggests that a code preference analysis is still possible with or without translation or transliteration.

![Figure 28: a sign in Upolu without translations or transliterations](image)
Out of 136 signs that contain two or more languages, 119 signs were possible for determining code preference. The 17 signs excluded from the analysis are due to a few reasons: code-switching between the two codes using the same font and size (e.g. Figure 30), and because a Samoan surname is used alongside the English description of the shop using the same font and font size (e.g. Figure 31). However, not all signs containing a Samoan surname were excluded for example, Naumati Creations (Figure 32) and Atoa Law Firm (Figure 33) are counted because it is clear that the Samoan code is in prominent position, i.e. taking up more space on the sign and using a larger font size than the English words.
Thus far, the findings of the study show that the English language is dominant on official signs and non-official signs. Government officials, commercial actors, and the community all use English more than Samoan on signs. However, according to the analysis of the 119 signs...
determined for code preference, the Samoan language is more salient and prominent than English and Other languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Language</th>
<th>E + S (N=107)</th>
<th>E + O (N=6)</th>
<th>S + O (N=1)</th>
<th>S+E+O (N=5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Code Preference in a Samoan LL

The quantitative results in Table 8 shows that the Samoan language is in prominent position on 68.2% of signs in the E+S category which is 73 out of 107 E + S signs. This shows that although English is predominant on Sāmoa’s signage, the examination of multi-code signs suggests the preference of the Samoan code. For example, the preferred code on Jane’s Travel Agent sign in Figure 34 is Samoan. The Samoan text is not located at the top left, top centre, or centre of the sign, however, the large font size, the uppercase lettering of the phrase ‘OFISA MALAGA’, and the large space the text occupies determines its visual preference over the English dominant sign.

Figure 34: Jane’s Pasifika Travel Services Ltd
It is also possible that the preferred use of the Samoan language on an E+S sign is based on what Scollon and Scollon refer to as geopolitical indexing, that is, to index the place in the world where the sign is located, therefore the preferred used of the Samoan language on signs containing two or more signs indexes Sāmoa. An example is given in Figure 35 where the Samoan language is noticeably the preferred code to indicate an evacuation route in the case of a tsunami. Firstly, notice the term ‘SUNAMI’. It is the Samoan translation of the English transliteration ‘TSUNAMI’. Tsunami is considered an English word for this study due to its Romanization (つなみ is the Japanese (Hiragana) word for tsunami). The term ‘sunami’ uses a font size bigger than ‘tsunami’. It is the same case with the Samoan text ‘AUALA SULUFA’I’ which is placed above its English translation, ‘EVACUATION ROUTE’.

![Figure 35: Tsunami evacuation sign](image)

A total of 31.8% of E + S signs used English as the preferred code. Notice in Figure 36 the English code and Samoan code are using the same font and mean the same thing in two different languages. However, the larger font size for the word ‘ENTRY’ and its position on top of the sign and above its Samoan translation, ‘ULUFALE’, indicates a preference of the English code.
Symbols and Icons; Indexicality and Symbolism

In the present study, indexes and icons were intentionally excluded from the counting of signs in Sāmoa because the study focused on the written language of signs; referred to as symbols. This does not however, exclude the importance of discussing indexicality through the use of icons, symbols, and indexes in the LL. As mentioned by Scollon and Scollon (2003, p.3), “whether a sign is an icon, symbol or an index, there is a major aspect of its meaning that is produced only through the placement of that sign in the real world”. An icon is a sign that “resembles an object” and an index “can point to or be attached to the object”. Scollon and Scollon stated that “in a sense it might be more accurate to say that there are two types of signs, icons and symbols, and that all signs achieve their meaning through properties of indexicality” (p.28). In the case of Sāmoa, icons and symbols will be discussed to indicate either the indexical meaning of a sign or a symbolic meaning of a sign.

The study found various signs containing icons that had a direct link to the written text (symbol) of the signs. This indicates that the signs possibly have an indexical meaning because the icon resembles the symbol. An example is given in Figure 12 where the icon used on the sign is an ‘ink pen’ which resembles the name of the business, ‘The Ink Patch’. A similar example is given in Figure 37 (sign B) where the icon of the business operating phone complements the symbol that is written in English. The sign indexes that the telecommunication business, Digicel, offers services catering to the tele-communication needs of any business. As can be seen, the LL can be viewed as a canvas where icons are used alongside symbols to give an indexical meaning of the sign.

On the other hand, it could be argued that not all signs using icons alongside symbols have an indexical meaning. It is possible that some icons, when used alongside symbols have a symbolic meaning in the LL. For example, in Figure 37 (sign A), the icon consists of a ‘tanoa’ (traditional Samoan ava bowl), ‘fue’ and ‘to’oto’o’ (used for oratory exchange), and the Southern Star. The sign serves its purpose by delivering a message about insurance to its audience, but the icon used symbolises where the sign is placed, i.e. the Sāmoa Life Assurance Corporation is located in Sāmoa. The tanoa, fue, and to’oto’o icon was also found on other signs (see Figure 10 and Figure 19), which also symbolises Sāmoa.
Another interesting example of a sign that contains an icon and a symbol was shown in Figure 35. It could be argued that the sign has both an indexical meaning and a symbolic meaning. On the sign, there is an arrow which compliments the running figure through indexicality to show the reader the direction of the evacuation route. Also, on the sign is an iconic, running figure wearing a *lavalava* (Samoan sarong). The use of a *lavalava* on the figure symbolises the placement of the sign in the world, indicating that ‘this tsunami evacuation sign is located in Sāmoa’. The findings of the study argue that perhaps the use of icons alongside symbols can have an indexical meaning and a symbolic meaning.
Motu Analysis: Translation vs Transliteration
The discussion on the use of two or more languages on a sign shows the predominance and preference of the English language over the Samoan language, but the extent to which the languages translate or transliterate each other will be discussed further using the Motu Analysis. Spolsky and Cooper took a similar approach to rule out the simple problem of mistaking one language [and writing system] for another. For instance, the ‘HA MALAKH RD’ sign is written in three different writing systems – Arabic, Hebrew, and English, and in each language, the phrase is not translated but rather transliterated (Spolsky & Cooper, 1991, p.6, 75). Drawing from this study, and others (Reh, 2004; Backhaus, 2007), this sub-section will analyse transliteration and translation on bilingual signs in Sāmoa using the ‘motu analysis’ which resembles three out of four of Backhaus’s (2007) part writing types: polyphonic, homophonic, and mixed signs. As a reminder, the motu types are ‘atumotu’ (signs that do not translate or transliterate each other), ‘nu’u’ (signs containing complete translations and transliterations), and ‘itumalo’ (signs with partial translation or transliteration).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motu Types</th>
<th>Language Categories: N = signs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S + E</td>
<td>E + O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atumotu</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu’u</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itumalo</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Transliteration and Translation. S+E, E+O, S+O, S+E+O

The results of the bilingual signs overall when distributed into the categorical variables is illustrated in Table 9. The majority of the signs used the Samoan and the English language independently on the signs. The messages that the two languages conveyed on the signs were mostly unrelated, for instance, while the Samoan language is used as a greeting on a notice, ‘TALOFA LAVA’, the notice itself will use the English language to specify the public notice. This indicates that actors often have different purposes for the languages used on signs, i.e. one language may serve the purpose of being the main header of a sign, and the other may give the full details of the intentions of the sign. To discuss the different motu types further, examples will be given for each motu type to elaboration and clarification. The discussion will give details of how the Samoan and English signs, and English and Foreign language signs are positioned and used on a sign.
**Atumotu signs**

Atumotu signs contain two languages that do not translate or transliterate each other but are used independently on a sign. In other words, these signs code-mix the two languages on the signs in a way that one does not translate or transliterate the other. A total of 99 signs were categorized as *Atumotu* signs: 91 signs were E+S, 6 were E+O, 1 was S+O, and 1 S+E+O. Perhaps the large number of atumotu signs in the E+S category is indicative of a bilingual community that can speak both English and Samoan fluently, using code-switching on a sign to further clarify the meaning and purpose of the sign. It could also indicate normality in drawing from the two separate linguistic repertoires to bridge a gap caused by the absence of a linguistic lexical item in another language. A few examples are illustrated below:

1. Supermarket, fast food, food catering and Sunday *tona'i*
2. We cater for birthday parties, weddings, funerals, reunions, *saofa'i*
3. Sāmoa National Provident Fund. *Lumana'i Manuia*

From the examples given, *tona'i* refers to a traditional Samoan Sunday feast, *saofa'i* is the traditional bestowing of a chief title, *lumana'i manuia* means future, and *o a'u a lea* is a common slang that means ‘this is so me’. The first two examples show how the Samoan language is easily incorporated in an English dominant sentence, catering to lexical gaps. The example in 3 and 4 uses the Samoan language and English language, not in the same phrase or sentence, but separately. Neither example contains transliteration or translation.

Another obvious contributor to the number of E+S *atumotu* signs are the names of shops. A total of 22 (E+S) signs used a Samoan name with an English word or phrase to form the name of the shop. For example, *Tagi'ilima* Taxi Stand, *So'oula* Rentals, *Reti* Consultants, and *Aumua* Law Firm. This was common in the Samoan LL and is a possible indication of an actor (lawyer, consultant, etc) who is possibly claiming their Samoan identity by adding the Samoan surname to the sign.
**Nu’u signs**

A sign is categorised under the *nu’u* category if it contains two languages that translate or transliterate each other completely. *Nu’u* signs can be referred to as ‘purely bilingual’ signs given that they have equal translation or transliteration of each other. Altogether, only 6 signs were categorised as *nu’u* signs: 5 signs under E+S, and 1 under S+E+O. The limited number of *nu’u* signs in the E+S category compared to *atumotu* signs under the same category shows that the possible audience of *nu’u* signs are either non-English speakers or non-Samoan speakers. However, *nu’u* signs and *atumotu* signs can compare in a sense that they both provide clarity for the audiences. For example, the words ‘enter’, ‘entry’, and ‘entrance’ when used on a sign to direct people inside a gate (eg. Figure 37 – code pref.) means ‘ulufale’ in Samoan. It is possible, although not common, to mistake the meaning of the terms used. If the words are used in a different context, the translation can mean something else, for example, ‘Enter your name here’. The word ‘enter’ is used here to mean ‘write’ or ‘type’ if using a computer; in Samoan it is referred to as *tusi* (write) or *ta* (type). Another example is ‘forced entry’. Obviously, it does not mean the same thing as a car park ‘Entry’ and in Samoan it will therefore be translated differently. In this case, the context in which the word is used determines the translation.

On the other hand, *nu’u* signs could also be targeting a minority group in the LL who cannot read or understand English, for instance, the shop name ‘CITY STAR’ is transliterated into the Chinese language in Figure 38. Interestingly, the English code is in prominent position on the sign which could possibly mean the main audience are English speakers, however, the inclusion of a Chinese transliteration means that there are two audiences of the signs, English speakers and Chinese speakers.

![Figure 38: English and Chinese sign](image-url)
Itumalo signs

The itumalo signs are the second most common type of bilingual signs in Sāmoa. These signs have a partial translation or transliteration of the two languages used on the signs. Although they are similar to atumotu signs in terms of code-mixing between two languages, the translation or transliteration of at least one word on the sign determines it to be an itumalo sign. The results show that 31 bilingual signs were categorised as itumalo: 24 were S+E signs, 4 were E+O signs, and 3 were S+E+O signs. An example of an itumalo sign is given in Figure 39 where the description of the sign is partially translated; ‘money transfer’ is tupe fa’amomoli in Samoan, and tupe lafo mai fafo means ‘money sent from overseas’. The findings suggest that the intended audience of the E+O itumalo signs are bilingual speakers of the Samoan and English languages.

Figure 39: Pacific Way Money Transfer

As mentioned earlier, itumalo signs are often mistaken for atumotu signs. The mistake is made when a sign is analysed according to the language that is dominantly used rather than analysing the individual words used. In Figure 40, the description of the sign is partially transliterated, ‘medical clinic’ – ofisa foma’i, and partly translated, ‘dispensary’ – fale talavai. The sign, however, also contains the words Salafai and ‘fax’; both words have no noticeable translation or transliteration on the sign. It can be said that Salafai cannot be translated or transliterated because it is a name of a place in Sāmoa. In the same vein, the word ‘Fax’ cannot be translated or transliterated because it is probably a borrowing word in Samoan.
One of the main conclusions drawn from the motu analysis is that the majority of the multicode (bilingual or multilingual) signs possibly targets different bilingual speakers in the Samoan society. Firstly, **atumotu** signs target speakers who are fluent in both English and Samoan and are able to understand the descriptions on signs without translation or transliteration. Secondly, it can be said that **nu’u** signs are designed to clarify information for non-English speakers and/or non-Samoan speakers. Lastly, **itumalo** signs have a similar audience to **atumotu** signs. Either way, the main audience of the majority of the bilingual and multilingual signs are possibly the bilingual speakers who reside in Sāmoa. However, English continues to overwhelm the presence of the Samoan language, Other languages, and all the languages put together.
**Analysis of signs using the Samoan Language**

In the previous sub section, Scollon and Scollon’s code preference analysis was used to analyse signs containing two or more languages; the results showed that Samoan is possibly the preferred code on multi-code signs (see Table 8). At the same time, it is obvious from the findings of the study that Samoan is underused, and English is dominant. With the English language overwhelming the use of the Samoan language on signage in Sāmoa, one may assume that Sāmoa is slowly but surely shifting its language use from Samoan to English. This is an assumption that researchers can potentially look into from different lens when further studying the Samoan language. The present study however, intentionally studied the Samoan language from a ‘linguistic landscape perspective’, i.e. through signage (only). The study recognises that this discussion is limited in terms of making generalisations about the Samoan language, but it represents what is seen on public signage on a Samoan Linguistic Landscape. The following discussion will be based on a thorough analysis of the Samoan language (only) on signs. A list of all the Samoan texts found in the LL of Sāmoa which will be discussion below, can be found in Appendix 1.

One of the most noticeable findings of the study is the inconsistent use, and in some cases absence, of diacritic marks on both official and non-official signs containing Samoan texts. This finding is in accordance with the study by Tualaulelei et.al (2015) who mentioned the inconsistent use of diacritic marks in the Samoan Bible. It can be argued that the inconsistent use and absence of diacritics in the LL of Sāmoa may have been caused by early language policies, a socio-political factor. The intentional exclusion of the diacritic marks from the education policy of Sāmoa in the early years of independence possibly impacted the use of diacritics on signs in the LL. Although the problem was addressed in later policies such as the MESC Strategic Policies and Plan (July 2006 – June 2015), the current study revealed that actors use diacritics inconsistently or not at all. The absence of diacritic marks on both official and non-official signs does not necessarily mean that the actors are unaware of mispronunciation or misunderstanding by its Samoan audience. Perhaps the actors of the signs assume that readers of the Samoan text can understand the word(s) according to the context in which it is used. A few examples are the words **tāua** and **susū**. The former means ‘important’ and the latter is used alongside the word **mai** to mean ‘to come with’. Without the macron over the [a] and [u], the homographic counterparts of the mentioned words are **taua** (war) and **susu** (milk). Both terms are used without the macron (-) on a Western Union Money Transfer sign (Figure 41) and reads:
O le mea lea e taua ai lou susu mai ma sou pepe faamaonia o loo iai sou ata.

(This is why it is important that you bring some form of identification, with your picture on it, when you come)

Clearly, the sign is not about waging war or anything war-related, and it is not about milk. Perhaps the actors are aware of this and decided to omit the diacritics because the context in which the words are used is given. The example given also omits the use of the glottal stop (‘). Had the sign used all diacritic marks, the text would be written as follow:

‘O le mea lea ‘e tāua ai lou susū mai ma sou pepe fa’amaonia ‘o lo’o iai sou ata.

Figure 41: Western Union Money Transfer

A full list of Samoan words found in the LL of Sāmoa that have homographic counterparts is illustrated below in Table 10. The Samoan words in the first column do not use diacritics, and the third column is the same word using the diacritic marks, the macron (˘) and the glottal stop (‘). As can be seen, The Table clearly illustrates how the meaning of a Samoan word is changed when the diacritic marks are added or removed. As mentioned previously, the actors who inserted the signs are probably aware that with or without the use of diacritics, the audience of the signs can differentiate the meaning of a word according to the context in which it is used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samoan word (no diacritics)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Samoan word (with diacritics)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ma‘i</td>
<td>towards; from</td>
<td>la‘u</td>
<td>yours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma‘i</td>
<td>sick; sickness</td>
<td>ma‘i</td>
<td>mine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>māe’a</td>
<td>rope</td>
<td>la‘u</td>
<td>mine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tāūa</td>
<td>war</td>
<td>māe’a</td>
<td>it is [finished]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suśū</td>
<td>milk; breast</td>
<td>tāūa</td>
<td>important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’āiga</td>
<td>important</td>
<td>suśū</td>
<td>wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’ata</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>suśū</td>
<td>wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’a’iga</td>
<td>to [tell]</td>
<td>’ata</td>
<td>smile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’īa’iga</td>
<td>family</td>
<td>’a’iga</td>
<td>family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>falē</td>
<td>dwell within</td>
<td>sa’u</td>
<td>[one of] my (Tualualelei et al, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo‘u</td>
<td>my</td>
<td>sa’u</td>
<td>[one of] my (Tualualelei et al, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’au</td>
<td>teaming</td>
<td>sa’u</td>
<td>[one of] my (Tualualelei et al, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>falō</td>
<td>exterior</td>
<td>sa’u</td>
<td>[one of] my (Tualualelei et al, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tu‘i</td>
<td>punch</td>
<td>sa’u</td>
<td>[one of] my (Tualualelei et al, 2015)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Samoan words with homographic counterparts

Another example of the inconsistent use of diacritics is shown on the official sign on Figure 42. The glottal stop is used in the word fa’alapopotopota but is not used in other words that follow which are pronounced with glottal stops: so‘o, mana‘oga, ‘o. The use of the macron is also omitted in the following: fa’alāpotopotopota, Sāmoa. Perhaps it is because the mentioned words do not have homographic equals (i.e. the word does not contain another meaning with or without the diacritics), therefore actors omit the diacritics. As mentioned in the literature review, this was also found in a review of the Samoan translation of the bible by Tualualelei et al (2015). Symbolically, maybe the absence or inconsistent use of diacritics constructs a Samoan community that has had a high literacy rate since before the colonial era possibly enabling them to differentiate between Samoan words with homographic equals. To conclude, it is possible that the inconsistent use of diacritics on Samoan words with homographic counterparts is due to the exclusion of diacritics in the early language policy of
Sāmoa. As a result, speakers of Samoan have learnt to differentiate the meaning of words without diacritics according to the context that it is used in.

Apart from the noticeable inconsistency in the use of diacritic marks, the analysis of the Samoan language used in the LL also found the different ways in which foreign concepts are integrated into the Sāmoa language. The findings of the study found two processes involved in incorporating foreign concepts into the Samoan lexicon. (Refer to Table 11). The first process is the loaning of foreign words. The study found 30 loanwords, the majority of which are borrowed from the English language. This probably means that speakers of Samoan would often borrow foreign words to bridge a lexical gap on signage within the commercial domain, for instance, the word *aīsa* (ice), *keke* (cake), and *pepa* (paper). As shown by the examples given, the borrowed terms are ‘Samoanised’ to take the Samoan orthography. The second process used for incorporating foreign concepts in the Samoan language is through the ‘semantic extension’ of an existing Samoan word. As a reminder, semantic extensions are formed when an existing word in a language is given a new meaning to cater to a newly introduced concept. Table 11 shows that a total of 51 Samoan words in the LL are semantic extensions, for instance, *ofu fa’aiopoipo* means ‘wedding dress’ in Samoan. It could be said that the use of ‘Samoanised’ borrowings and the extension of an existing word in the Samoan orthography to cater to a new concept is an indication of ‘hybridity’. As can be seen on Table 11, there are elements of the Samoan language and English language intertwined in the borrowing of words, and in the extension of a meaning of an existing Samoan word.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loanwords</th>
<th>Semantic extensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 42: Sāmoa Life Assurance Corporation
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Aisa [ice]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Aperila [April]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Araisa [rice]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Fa’alenaturu [-natural]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Falaoamata [flour]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Faraile [Friday]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Iesu [Jesus]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Inisiua [insurance]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Keke [cake]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Kerisiano [Christian]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Laisene [license]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Loia [lawyer]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Mami [mumps]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Miliona [million]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Minute [minute]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Misela [measles]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Numera [Number]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Ofisa [office]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Palota [ballot]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Pepa [paper]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Pepe [baby]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Pine [pin]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Pisinisi [business]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Rupela [rubella]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Rupi [ruby]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Sipuni [spoon]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Suka [sugar]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Sunami [tsunami]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Telefoni [telephone]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Tesema [December]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Apainu [drink in a can]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Aso fa’apitoa [wedding day]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Aso fanau [birthday]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Auala sulufa’i [evacuation route]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Auaunaga tau suavai [water services]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Avetaavale [driver]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Elei toniga [print uniform]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Fa’ama’i pipisi [contagious diseases]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Fa’alapotopotoga faaputugatupe... [National Provident Fund]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Fa’alapotopotoga o Inisiua [Insurance corporation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Fa’alavelave faafuase’i [emergency]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Fale pu’e ata [Photo Shop]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Fale talavai [pharmacy]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Fale tusi [stationary shop/library]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Fesuia’iga o tupe [exchange money]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Fogafale luga [top floor]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Itula faigaluega [working hours/opening hours]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Malupuiupiuia [safe]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Matagaluega o le soifua maloloina [Ministry of Health]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Matagaluega o Tina... [Ministry of women...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Mea pu’e ata [digital camera]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Moavao [lawn mower]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Ofu fa’aipoipo [wedding dress]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Ofutino [shirt]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Oloa sii atoa [bulk products]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Loanword/Semantic Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Ositaulaga sili [the greatest sacrifice]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Povi masima [raw salted beef]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Pulega tau suavai [Water authority]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Pusa apa [a box of canned mackerel]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Pusa pisupo [a box of canned corn beef]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Pusa saimini [box of noodles]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Pusa susu [box of milk cartons]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Pusa vai [box of water bottles]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Salafai sasa’e [east]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Ta’aiga ie [material?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Tui puipui [vaccination]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Tupe faamomoli [transfer money overseas]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Tupe lafo mai fafo [remittances]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Tusifolau [passport]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Tusitupe [cheque book]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Uila vilivae [bike]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Vaega loto’ifale [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Faalapotopotoga Kerisiano [Youth for Christ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Mea pu’e ata [camera]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Foma’i [medical doctor]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Vili [call]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Suavai lafoa’i [waste water]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Fa’atauina atu [to sell]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Se’evae [shoes]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Ata [photo/smile]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Uga [plastic]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 11: Loanwords and Semantic extensions in the Samoan LL*
Interestingly, Table 11 shows that the number of semantic extensions exceed the number of loanwords in the LL of Sāmoa. Perhaps this is an indication of a hybridised society with a strong maintenance of the Samoan language despite the dominance of the English language. It is also possible that Samoans often draw from the Samoan lexicon rather than borrowing a foreign term when encountering a newly introduced concept. Overall, this suggests that Samoan speakers have been using, and continue to use, existing linguistic resources to deal with new concepts despite the overuse of English in the public arena.

![Figure 43: Measles Vaccination (Upolu)](image)

Thus far, the analysis has revealed all the loanwords and semantic extensions of the Samoan language used on signage in the LL of Sāmoa. The discussion of how the Samoan and English intertwine on signs through the process of ‘borrowing’ and process of ‘semantic extensions’ will be discussed further. This will show the different borrowing techniques used on signs, for example, transliteration, and to also show how the meaning of the sign is delivered through the interweaving of Samoan and English.

In Figure 43, the written text on the sign contains loan translations, transliteration, and a semantic extension. The sign is categorised as a bilingual sign because of the hashtag (#VACCINESWORK) located at the bottom of the sign, and the names of the organisations, ‘Ministry of Health’ and ‘World Health Organisation’, located at the top of the sign. The sign, however, is dominantly Samoan. The Samoan text reads:
(The number of people who have died from the measles virus has decreased)

The words *fa’aitiitia* (decrease or decreased), *tagata* (people), *maliliu* (died or passed away), *fa’ama’i* (disease/illness), *tui* (to jab), and *puipui* (protect) are Samoan words. The loanwords *numera* (number) and *misela* (measles) are transliterations of the English language. The collaboration of the linguistic elements of English and Samoan is a possible example of hybridity:

Hybrid = Samoan + Transliterate + Samoan + Samoan + Samoan + Transliterate + Semantic Extension

Particularly, the semantic extension which in this case is also a collocation, is formed from terms that already exist in the Samoan lexicon, for instance, the word *tui* has multiple meanings: stab, jab, prick, fork, and injection. The latter definition of *tui* is combined with *puipui* to form and introduce the foreign concept - vaccination. As can be seen, an existing word in Samoan is extended to incorporate an imported meaning. In light of this, the collocation is a possible example of a hybrid:

Hybrid = *Tui* (injection) + *Puipui* (protect) = vaccination (foreign concept)

A similar case of the collaborative use of English transliterations and Samoan translations is given in Figure 44. The transliterated version of the MMR vaccine is given as ‘Misela, Mami ma le Rupela’ (Measles, mumps, and Rubella). The foreign concept (MMR) is indigenized and is written using the Samoan orthography. Another example of transliteration in this sign is the word ‘Aperila’ meaning the month of ‘April’. Other words contained in the sign are Samoan words. Other than the ones already discussed previously, the Samoan words in the sign are: *toe* (again), *amata* (again), *fa’atinoina* (embodying), *puipuiga* (protection), *pipisi* (contagious).
Apart from the collaborative use of Samoan words, loanwords, and English transliterations, the analysis also found that code-switching between English and Samoan is common in the LL. Notice on Figure 44, the column located on the right corner code-switches between Samoan and English to deliver the meaning of the written text:

- **Tupua Tamasese Meaole** (Samoan) + Hospital (English) + Moto’otua (Samoan)
- **Leulumoega** (Samoan) + Rural District Hospital (English)
- **Poutasi** (Samoan) + Rural District Hospital (English)

*Tupua Tamasese Meaole* is the name of the former Head of State of Sāmoa. *Leulumoega* and *Poutasi* are names of villages in Sāmoa. If the Samoan terms were used individually without the insertion of ‘Hospital’ or ‘Rural District Hospital’, the reader would be confused as to its connection to MMR vaccinations. This is possibly another indication of ‘hybridity’ in the linguistic landscape of Sāmoa, as shown through the languages used. In this case, it can be said that code-switching between Samoan and English on signs helps the audience make sense of the purposes of the sign. Other examples of code-switching can be found in Appendix 1.
To further examine the existence of semantic extensions and how they are incorporated on signs in the LL, examples will be drawn from Figures 40, 45 and 46. As can be seen, the phrase ‘Fale Tala Vai’ is a semantic extension that is translated into English as ‘Pharmacy’. The sign uses three words *fale* (house), *tala* (news) and *vai* (water); all three words are existing words in the Samoan language. The words are then combined to form the collocation ‘Fale Talavai’. The study found that in Figure 40 and Figure 45, the semantic extension is spelt *Fale Tala Vai* (three words). However, according to the Simplified Dictionary of Modern Samoan (Allardice & Holding, 2000), the Samoan spelling is ‘Fale Talavai’ (three words). Because there is no direct translation for ‘pharmacy’ in the Samoan language, and because it is a new concept, the collocation ‘Fale Talavai’ is used to fill the semantic gap. In summary, the analysis showed that semantic extensions can be two or more Samoan words put together and given a new meaning in order to cater to a new concept.
Other than the extended meaning of existing words to cater to new concepts, the study also found that some signs contained Samoan transliterations with extended meanings. For example, the Samoan transliteration of the word ‘ofisa’ is used on various signs in the LL of Sāmoa to refer to different types of businesses. The term ‘ofisa’ is a Samoan transliteration of the English word ‘office’. In Figure 47, ‘Ofisa mo Pisini Laiti’ is referring to the ‘Small Business Enterprise Centre’. In Figure 48, the collocation ‘Ofisa Malaga’ refers to a ‘Travel Agent’. In Figure 49, the collocation ‘Ofisa Loia’ refers to a ‘Law Firm’. In the examples stated, the word ofisa is not used literally to refer to an ‘office’ but is referring to the nature of the business which probably means that the meaning of the term is extended. In the same vein as other examples previously mentioned, this example likely contains elements of hybridity through the extended meaning of a transliterated word to cater to new concepts.

Figure 47: Small Business Enterprise Centre (Savai’i)

Figure 48: Travel Agent (Upolu)
The discussion concludes that the English language is predominantly used on signs within the urban domains of Sāmoa. The majority of official signs and non-official signs are in English Only rather than in Samoan, which is the official language of Samoa. The possible factors contributing to English predominance on signs in the LL are: the attitudes, perceptions, and practises of actors who inserted the signs in the LL, the population’s high literacy rate, and the use of English as a medium of instruction in the education system of Samoa. Also, the English language is used alongside the Samoan language on more signs than there are Samoan Only signs. Perhaps the use of the two languages on a sign is to cater to bilingual speakers or to cater to a possible lexical gap in the Samoan language or vice versa. In brief, the English language is evidently the predominant language in Sāmoa.

The findings of the analysis of the Samoan language used in the LL of Sāmoa suggests that the Samoan language is a ‘hybridised’ language. The analysis found that loanwords
from the English language are ‘Samoanised’ to use the Samoan orthography. This shows that speakers probably prefer to borrow foreign terms using the Samoan language rather than borrowing the foreign term in its original form. The analysis also found that Samoan language speakers often extend the meaning of existing words to cater for a foreign concept rather than loaning the concept. This indicates that the Samoan language and the English language impact and influence each other in the LL, but perhaps not to the extent where one language replaces the other. This is in accordance with Kruse-Vaai’s (2011) claim that ‘hybridity’ rather than ‘dualism’ is perhaps a more fitting term to describe the language situation in Sāmoa due to the interactions between English and Samoan. Overall, the dominance of the English language in the LL probably has no effect on the maintenance of the Samoan language.
Chapter 6: Conclusion
This study has attempted to examine the linguistic landscape of Sāmoa. It has revealed the languages that are present in the LL of Sāmoa, indicated the dominant language in the Samoan LL, and has pointed out various underlying factors that are at play in the display and use of languages in the LL. The most significant finding of the study is the overwhelming number of English signs in the LL of Sāmoa despite its unofficial status in the language policies of Sāmoa. English is explicitly acknowledged but not made official in language policies, but according to the current study, it is perceived as preferable than Samoan (official language), thus revealing its high status and prestige in Sāmoa. The preferred use on English on signs is also evident through the continuous use of English as a descriptive language to describe the purposes of shops, businesses, and organisations. It is also evident in the high number of E+S signs compared to the number of Samoan only signs. The use of English in the commercial domain symbolises Sāmoa’s journey towards globalisation which is apparent on signs that contain English and other foreign languages. It is also symbolic of Sāmoa’s move towards modernisation, to fit with the current changes and trends.

Apart from English and Sāmoan, the study found other foreign languages were in the Samoan LL, i.e. Chinese, French, Italian, Spanish, Malaysian, Māori, Fijian, Tongan, and Cook Island Māori. The study proposes that the foreign languages are symbolic of foreign tastes, and symbolic of globalisation. Among the foreign languages present, the most obvious is Chinese. The study revealed that the presence of Chinese could be due to the history of Chinese migration into Sāmoa over the past few years. The study also found that signs using Chinese characters possibly cater to a Chinese minority group in Sāmoa, and Chinese Pinyin caters to the dominantly non-Chinese audience. Overall, this shows that foreign languages are salient and not silent in the LL of Sāmoa, thus indicating that the public space is where global interactions take place as well as a place where other cultures are represented via the languages used.

The study found that all actors: official actors, commercial actors, the community and individuals have contributed to the construction of the LL. Yet, the most significant are
the commercial actors due to the high number of commercial signs they contribute in the LL. This suggests that commercial actors play a key role in the construction of the LL. An examination of the language use of the actors revealed that the English language is preferred by the actors. It is possible that the preferred use of English by the actors cater to an audience of first language speakers of English or second language speakers of English; either way, the audience of the signs supposedly use English as an everyday language. This emphasises the language attitudes of the actors who created the signs and their proposed audience. The study also showed that English dominance on signage in Sāmoa stretches to more rural towns such as Salelologa. This proposes that English is not restricted to the capital city of Apia only, but is also widely used by the population living in rural parts of Sāmoa. The study shows that perhaps English is embraced throughout Sāmoa, in the capital city and in rural town areas; it is not concentrated in one area and less used in another.

Although the LL of Sāmoa is predominantly English, the examination of the use of the Samoan language in the LL reveals that the extent to which the English language has entered the Samoan language possibly has no effect on the maintenance of the Samoan language. The study discovered Samoan loanwords, the extension of existing Samoan words to cater to newly introduced foreign concepts, and various cases of code-switching between Samoan and English. The intertwining of the two languages suggests that the Samoan language is a hybridised language and supports the claim by Kruse-Vaai (2011) that ‘hybridity’ rather than ‘dualism’ is a more fitting term to describe the language situation of Sāmoa. The number of semantic extensions exceed the number of loanwords which shows that Samoan speakers often incorporate new meanings to existing words in order to cater to foreign concepts. In other cases, Samoan is used as a marker of identity for some businesses, i.e. to showcase their identity. The analysis of the Samoan language used in the LL perhaps shows a strong maintenance of the Samoan language, however, it is still underused in the LL.

The current study suggests further research into the extent of the preference of the English language, and the underuse of the Samoan language. The current study is limited in expanding the discussion of the aforementioned because of the exclusion of interviews. Interviews with the public, business owners, and official media officers would
have opened a wider window of explanation on the language attitudes of the public and
the strength of language policies in Sāmoa. Also, interviews with existing minority groups
and descendants of those from minority groups such as the Chinese, would have helped
in linking the history of Sāmoa to the current picture of the commercial sphere of Sāmoa.
With the inclusion of interviews, the current study can be repeated to reveal more
significant results about the LL of Sāmoa. In the case of the Samoan language, a further
examination of loanwords and semantic extensions by studying what time in history the
loanword used or semantic extension used was introduced into Sāmoa, can reveal
similarities and difference in how previous generations of Samoan speakers and the
current generation of Samoan speakers incorporate English words or concepts in the
Samoan language. It can potentially reveal whether generations of Samoan speakers vary
in how they choose to borrow a term or add a new meaning to an existing term to cater
to a foreign concept.

Finally, this study has contributed to the field of Applied Linguistics through the study of
the LL of Samoa. The study is the first LL research to be conducted in Sāmoa. It has
opened the door for other researchers to conduct further studies in Sāmoa through a
linguistic landscape lens. The use of the ‘motu analysis’ to analyse the Samoan language is
a contribution this study has made to the study of Pacific Languages. It suggests that for
the study of Pacific Languages, it is best to avoid using western references to make sense
of the Pacific world. It also suggests that it is possible to see the world from a Pacific point
of view. Overall, the study contributes to the field of linguistic landscape by expanding the
study of languages on signs to the shores of Sāmoa.
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Appendix 1

Key: loanwords are in bold letters, translation of loanwords are in [square brackets], underlined words are semantic extensions, English words and foreign words are in (brackets)

1) (café) Laterano
2) (Da hot) falai
3) (Enter) Ulufale
4) (Not for the) mosi
5) (Sāmoa Life) le Inslua [insurance] mo tagatanuu o Sāmoa
6) (SSAB) Lotemau
7) (supermarket, fast food, food catering and Sunday) tonai
8) (We cater for birthday parties, weddings, funerals, reunions), saofai
9) 5mph faamolemole
10) Afio mai
11) Atoa (Law Firm)


13) Aumua (Law Firm)
14) Avamua
15) Ekalesia Aiga Paia
16) Fa’alapotopotoga o Inisiua [insurance] tau soifua a Sāmoa. Mo so’o se mana’oga tau Inisiua [insurance] o le soifua.


18) Fa’atau nei loa sau pepa [paper] malaga I le <virgin Australia>.

19) Faalapopotoga faaputugatupe mo le lumana’i manuia o tagata Sāmoa.

20) Faasilasilaga – ua matua’i fa’asaina le ulaula I le itu lenei o le fale.

21) Fale tusi.


24) Itula faigaluega. Aso Gafua. Aso Faralle [Friday].

25) Lapata’iga. O lenei fale o loo puipuia ma pu’eina e mea pu’e ata.

26) Le (Well), iliafi, pusa’aisa [-ice] uila vilivae, moavao, ogaumu.

27) Le Inisiua [insurance] mo tagatanu’u o Sāmoa.

28) Le supagas [super-] Le aute <gas>.

29) Le Vai.

30) Lumana’i Manuia.

31) Maali (company).

32) Manaomia le nonu matua lelei. $10.00 I le paelo.

33) Manumalo. E lelei le Alii.

34) Matagaluega o Tina ma Tamaitai Atinae o nuu ma aga fesootai.

35) Maua (BBQ).


37) Mo lou soifua maloloina. Fale tala vai.

38) Mo so’o se faalavelave.

39) Mo soo se faalavelave faafuasei valaa valaa le 911.

40) Mo Tagatanu’u.

41) Naumati (creations).

42) Nuanua o le alofa. Telefoni [telephone].

43) O a’u a lea.
44) O atinae e faatauina ai tagata e l ai manaoga faapitoa, I le faatauaina o o latou tomai ma agavaa
45) O Iesu le Alii ma le ositaulaga sili
46) O le faalapotopotoga Kerisiano [Christian] mo tina ma tamaitai mai ekalesia esese
47) O Le [Jesus] o le tali
48) Ofisa [office] foma’i
49) Ofisa [office] ma le atina’e o pisinisi [business] laiti
50) Ofisa [office] Malaga
51) Ofisa [office] mo pisinisi [business] laiti
52) Ofisa lola [Lawyer’s office]
53) Palama <print>
54) Pine [pin] faamanatu
55) Povi masima
56) Pulega o le suavai. Suavai mo le ola. O le taimua I Auaunaga tau suavai ma le suavai lafoai I Sāmoa
57) Puletasi. Ofutino. Ofu faaipoipo. Elei toniga
58) Pusa apa, pusa pisupo, taaiga ie, ipu, tui, sipuni [spoon], Apainu, pusa vai ma isi oloa sii atoa, taga aralsa [rice], taga suka [sugar], taga falaoamata [flour], pusa susu, taga (t/roll), pusa saimini, seevae.
59) Rupi
60) Sai <motors>
61) Salafai sasa’e
62) Seki a Savai’i. Seki<works>
63) Seki<fest>
64) Siva
65) Sunami [tsunami] Auala sulufa’i
66) Talofa (airways)
67) Talofa (and welcome)
68) Tatou tutu faatasi e lagolago ma unaia le faatinoina o tui puipui a le fanau. O le tui e taofia ma faaititia ai avanoa e maua ai l fa’ama’i. Afai e siitia le aofa’i o le fanau e
fai tui puipui, o le a si’itia foi le numerar [number] o tagata e puipuia mai fa’ama’i pipisi e aofia ai pepe ma fanau laiti. Puipui tagata matutua e ono aafia I faama’i. Puipui tagata ua faaitiitia malosiaga ma puipuiga faalenatura [natural] o le tino.

69) Taufusi (market)
70) Tausisi I le itu agavale
71) Tautua mo ou faalavelave
72) Toa (gas)
73) Toe amata le fa’atinoina o tui puipui o le Misela, Mami, ma le Rupela (MMR) [Measles, Mumps, Rubella] Puipuiga o fa’ama’i pipisi. Fai tui puipui o fanau.  
74) Tofo lelei
75) Tupe faamomoli & fesuia’iga o tupe
76) Tupe lafo mai fafo
77) Tuuina atu o avanoa mo se taeo manuia
78) Ua faaitiitia le numerar [number] o tagata e maliliu I le fa’ama’i o le misela [measles] ona o tui puipui
79) Vaega Lotoifale
80) Vave iloa. Vave vaai se fomai. Vave vili mai
82) Tatou tutu fa’atasi e lagolago ma unaia le fa’atinoina o tui puipui a le fanau. O tui puipui e taofia ma fa’aiititia ai avanoa e maua ai i fa’ama’i. Afai e si’itia le aofa’i o le fanau e fai tui puipui, o le a si’itia foi le numerar o tagata e puipuia mai fa’ama’i pipisi e aofia ai pepe ma fanau laiti. Puipui taga matutua e ono a’afia I fa’ama’i. Puipui tagata ua fa’aiititia malosiaga ma puipuiga fa’alenatura o le tino. Fa’ailoa I se foma’i ua mae’a tui puipui o lau fanau.

Ia silafia le mea moni. O tui puipui ua uma ona laisene. Ua uma ona su’esu’e ma ua mautinoa lona lelei mo le fa’aaogaina. E tulituliloa ma mata’ituina le fa’aaogaina o tui puipui ina ia mautinoa e saogalemu ma lelei