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Since 1999, migrants and refugees from across the Middle East and Northeastern Africa have squatted in makeshift camps in and around the strategic port city of Calais, France, hoping for the opportunity to stow away on a ferry or lorry to England. The inhabitants of these camps seek to engage the world in a dialogue, and although they speak a variety of languages, the voices the refugees and migrants in *The Jungle* of Calais raise through their protest placards and graffiti are more homogeneous. Like in many other protests, the languages of these messages are universal; they are French and English, the languages of their location, their desired destination, and of the world that they hope is watching. The data for this study are from still images freely available through Getty Images Embed Service. Using the techniques of linguistic landscapes, this paper analyzes the linguistic material of *The Jungle*. Like other recent works on the linguistic landscapes of protest, this analysis challenges the idea that territory is a fixed place or space (Kasanga, 2014), asserting rather that the migrants/refugees are co-creating a collective space that exists more through their raised voices, and less in the physical space they temporarily inhabit.
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Section 1: Introduction

As of writing, in March of 2016, the migrant and refugee camps in Calais, France, known collectively as *The Jungle* are in transition, again. Bulldozers raze the blue-tarped lean-tos while austere, white shipping containers line up, stacked 2 high behind an imposing wire fence, awaiting inhabitants like waylaid freight. Gone, too, are the many handwritten signs that dotted the landscape, erased for now, only to be rewritten more loudly with each injustice. The migrants have been coming to this port city for almost 20 years, first, fleeing the Taliban in Afghanistan, more recently, running from the civil wars in Syria and Sudan. Many of the refugees want to go onward to England. Others prefer asylum in France. All are a long way from home and adapting and contributing to the landscape of *The Jungle* until such time as they can be processed by the system, find a smuggler, brave the rail line through the Channel Tunnel, or vanish into the ether, as some displaced people do.

(Huguen, 2015a)

Figure 1.1: Refugees welcome
Landscape is a space that, according to Lefebvre (1991), “works in a highly complex way, [that] has something of a dialog about it, in that it implies a tacit agreement, [and] imposes reciprocity, a communality of use” (p. 56). It is a contested place, The Jungle landscape. In this case, the landscape is built upon a toxic waste dump on the outskirts of Calais (Breibart, 2016). Its heterogeneous residents do not share a common culture, religion, or language. This research delves into that heterogeneity, and through a linguistic landscape (LL) analysis of the publicly visible textual material produced by the refugees, shows that linguistic heterogeneity is not the choice among The Jungle’s inhabitants to disseminate their message, instead using or perhaps even preferring the global languages of English and French. Like with other international landscapes of protest, the signs are often in English, and it is unsurprising to find that the linguistic landscape of The Jungle reflects this tradition.

Mass-scale protests draw media attention. This study capitalizes on the thorough documentation of the changing space of The Jungle in its many incarnations. In doing their job, not only are international photojournalists capturing the story of The Jungle, they are sometimes inadvertently capturing valuable linguistic landscape stories that are ancillary to the photographers’ foci. Linguistic material abounds. Whether it’s the shop name on a carrier bag, a menu painted on the side of a makeshift restaurant, or the manufacturer of a bulldozer or graffiti, the linguistic landscape of The Jungle is rich with details that may or may not have been the intended subjects of the photographs, instead they were part of the backdrop, the landscape. For example, in Figure 1.2 below, did Court (2016) intend to capture the man with flowers on the bicycle, the restaurant menu, or both?
Figure 1.2: What is the intended subject?

Traditional LL studies would systematically record all of the visual text in an environment and code each token based on whatever criteria were necessary to address the research question, typically one about power in a multilingual environment, or about the manifestation of and alignment with language policies. Often, in LL data collection and processing, all of the tokens might be coded, to allow for alternative and future research questions. These traditional methods focus heavily on the cataloging and coding of official or semi-official signs and their physical characteristics (e.g., Pavlenko, 2009, 2010; Sloboda, 2009). While interesting, this approach is admittedly quite static. It fails to consider the dynamic sociolinguistic factors at play. This work attempts to embrace the traditions of the LL past, while exploiting the existing documentation available from the Getty News Agency's
online image database, and pushing the boundaries of LL theory and methodology, to include a protest space that is far more longstanding than the *Occupy Movement* camps of 2011-12 across the United States (Hanauer, 2015; Chun, 2014), for example, and more heterogeneous than other European protests that have received recent LL attention, like the 1 March immigrant protests across Italy (Barni & Bagna, 2016). The data are inherently qualitative, in that, embedded within the linguistic material, are the migrants' messages. This study pursues a simultaneously quantitative and qualitative analysis of the LL of *The Jungle* through the news images.

This thesis focuses primarily on the languages the migrants and refugees in *The Jungle* use for their non-informational messages, the protest signs that convey messages ranging from a simple “UK” (United Kingdom) painted above the entrance to a tent, to “We.r.not animals to live in the forests” written on a piece of cardboard, as we see in Figure 1.3.

![Image of protest signs at The Jungle](image-url)  
(Charlet, 2015b)  
Figure 1.3: “We.r.not animals"
The aim of this analysis is to explore the dialogic nature of these messages and to consider the idea that the messages are intended for a global audience, in contrast with the informational signs in the camp, presumably intended for the practical use of the local camp audience. The authors of these signs have linguistic agency and make choices motivated by their circumstances. They co-create a linguistic landscape that transforms their place into a space (Lefebvre, 1991). The space is *The Jungle*, an unpredictable habitat, from which the migrants and refugees cry out to the world through their signs.

In this text, I first present a brief overview of *The Jungle*, its location, history, some of its characteristics, its demography, and its current status. I then move on to review the literature around linguistic landscapes, and of the landscapes of protest, in particular. After that, I describe the methods I chose to employ for this analysis, including a comprehensive description of the data selection/collection and methodological procedures I followed. The results of the research follows the methods section, and a thorough discussion to follow that, which includes the current findings, as well as implications for future research in this still nascent area of protest landscapes and the use of online linguistic landscape materials.

Section 2: The Jungle

*The Jungle*, despite its collective-sounding name, is not one place, rather it is any number of ramshackle migrant camps that have sprung up, in and around the northern French city of Calais, since the government-ordered destruction of the Red Cross *Sangatte* refugee camp there in 2002. Most of *The Jungle* camps emerged organically, strategically
located near the road where lorries slow to get into the Channel Tunnel to England, hidden in the woods on the outskirts of town, or near the busy port, where ferries depart. See Figure 2.1 for an aerial photograph of some of Calais' Jungle camps. Migrants and refugees, men women and children, from Afghanistan, Senegal, and many conflict-zones in between, have been camping until they achieve asylum in France or until they succeed in stowing away on a vehicle bound for The United Kingdom. According to the most recent (2015) United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) report, one quarter of the migrants and refugees in Europe are from Afghanistan, Syria, and Eritrea, and an equal percentage are unaccompanied minors. Most of them have fled political and/or economic turmoil in their home countries.

Figure 2.1: An aerial photograph of The Jungle camps

Currently, close to 6000 people are sleeping rough in Calais (Calais, 2016), a small fraction of the estimated 320,000 “population of concern” in France, alone, as of June 2015 (UNHCR, 2015). Calais is a strategic if largely unfriendly choice, poised as it is, across the
English Channel from the promised land of the United Kingdom. The UK is one of a handful of preferred destinations for these migrants and refugees because of its strong economy and liberal social services. The Channel crossing represents the last hurdle in what has been a perilous journey for the thousands who have attempted it in the past 20 years, originally Afghans fleeing the Taliban, now a broader spectrum of people, taking flight from the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIS/ISIL), al-Qaeda, the U.S. invasions and occupations in Afghanistan and Iraq that began post-911, religious persecution, the war in Syria, economic hardship, civil war in Darfur, et cetera. These are the migrants we see shoehorned standing into smugglers’ dinghies in the Mediterranean, whose drowned toddlers wash up on its European shores, with host and through-migration countries, and the world, overwhelmed and scrambling. Now some refugees of The Jungle hope to make one last crossing. Those who are unable to stow away surreptitiously, will resort to paying a(nother) smuggler to get to the UK, potentially working for years to repay the debt to the traffickers.

The British and French governments signed the Le Touquet treaty in 2003, effectively moving the English border across the Channel to French soil, requiring that all travelers between the two countries clear immigration in the country of departure, rather than at their destination (Calais, 2016). This created a logjam of refugees and migrants, who, according to the British government’s monetarily expensive plan, are caught and processed in France, rather than the UK (Calais, 2016). These ‘juxtaposed controls,’ as they are officially called, deny thousands of travelers passage from Calais to the UK -- 10,766 denied between 2003 and 2007 - - with those numbers swelling as the migrant/refugee crisis in Calais intensified in recent
years (UK Parliament, 2008). In figure 2.2, a refugee colorfully depicts his or her dreams of passage through the Channel Tunnel to England.

(Figure 2.2: A refugee's representation of the Channel Tunnel

(Yaghodzadeh, 2016a)

Figure 2.3: A UK asylum interview and preparation class flyer

(Court, 2016a)
Not all of the migrants and refugees in *The Jungle* seek passage to the UK. Many intend to stay in France, although the path to asylum is fraught with pitfalls, particularly for those asylum-seekers who do not speak French. The migrants and refugees are a vulnerable population that has already endured considerable trauma. The ambivalence of the people of Calais and much of France toward the migrants can be seen in anti-immigrant protests and private business that pay guards to stand at shop entrances and deny entrance to people of color, regardless of their citizenship (Calais, 2016). The constant fear of police raids/reprisals, exacerbates the situation. According to all accounts, the refugees are out of the loop and slow to trust aid and governmental agencies, meaning that they miss opportunities at their disposal, either from fear, ignorance, or simply from misunderstandings. Well-meaning aid agencies and organizations attempt to provide meals, showers, clothing, etc., to the migrants, while other groups hostile to the influx of foreigners have vandalized, destroyed, and obstructed these efforts (UNHCR, 2015). Compounding the situation is the heterogeneity of the migrant/refugee population. In the United States, we have large populations of Spanish-speaking migrants, meaning that Spanish language services can expect to communicate expediently with those groups, despite potential illiteracy or mistrust. In a situation like Calais, with genetically unrelated languages ranging from Eritrean to Pashto to Arabic represented, little or no cultural homogeneity, a wide range of ages and education levels, and the constant dislocation and relocation of its migrant population, communication becomes a significant challenge. It is this communication that is of particular interest for me. Not so much the day-to-day communication of relief agencies to the refugees, for example, or the
informational signs the refugees create to label the infirmary or showers, rather the voices the heterogeneous group of migrants co-create to communicate with the world through their many protest signs, as they define their place, and redefine that place as a *space* with collective and *dialogic* messages.

The media have done their part to disseminate these messages, much like bees do double duty by pollinating flowers while they troll for nectar. While reporting the latest news on the desperate and seemingly intractable plight of *The Jungle*'s tenacious inhabitants, the media also spread images of the refugees' poignant wor(l)ds. The migrants seize these opportunities to be ‘heard.’ This is an uncomfortable symbiosis, at times. Of course, I have an awareness that while I am also part of sounding the clarion call, in choosing this thesis topic, I am also exploiting the misery of migrants for my own purposes. I certainly will not be arrogant to think that the refugees need me, but they certainly require the media to get the word out. But imagine that you have fled your home, travelled a desperate, perilous, expensive journey, and are now huddled under a tattered blue tarp in an icy French mud puddle, with a reporter sticking a camera in your face. You might not be particularly gracious. One migrant’s handwritten sign reads, “To Journalists: Photograph €10* *(or free if you take someone to England in your car) (or if you're from the Daily Mail just fuck off)” (n.a., 2015). Yes, the refugees need the media to disseminate their messages, but the symbiosis is not without its obvious tensions and asymmetries.

*The Jungle* is but one of a once spontaneous, now entrenched conglomeration of migrants in this century's European refugee crisis, its blue-tarped lean-tos razed, its dark-
The color and noise have drained from the once lively encampments, the protest signs erased by another round of bulldozers, dumpsters, and fire. How will the dialogue continue from behind the fences? As of writing, a number of Iranian refugees in Calais have sewn their mouths shut and are hunger striking to protest the police destruction of *The Jungle* camps.
One of their signs reads, in English: “Will you listen now?” (Breibart, 2016). The irony is not lost on this linguist.

The following section, Section 3, presents the field of linguistic landscapes and explores some of its relevant literature. Additionally, I further discuss the ideas of space that is part of the struggle of silenced groups like the inhabitants of The Jungle, who rely on their visual dialogue with the powerful outside world to elicit responses.

Section 3: Literature Review

While the idea of a linguistic landscape (LL) is not entirely new, it is a construct that is still being defined and negotiated among linguists. Its inception is traditionally linked to the 1997 article in The Journal of Language and Social Psychology, by Landry and Bourhis, who took the LL to mean “the visibility and salience of languages on public and commercial signs in a given territory or region” (p. 23). Landry and Bourhis' (1997, p. 25) landscape of “public road signs, advertising, billboards, street names, place names, commercial shop signs, and public signs” 20 years on, seems limited and limiting for the full potential of sociolinguistic exploration; the signage, like spoken language, is not at all a static entity. Because the sociolinguistic reality of contemporary society demands a sophisticated and nuanced approach, the construct of LL has broadened to include “verbal texts, images, objects, placement in time and space[,] as well as human beings” (Shohamy and Waksman, 2009, p. 314). By extending the construct of LLs beyond the written language of edifices and robust signage, it is possible to include multimodal elements such as street art, graffiti, clothing on
passersby, video presentation screens, and protest signs, as well as to consider the liminal spaces between public and private, real and cyber, sacred and secular, informational and political (Rudby, 2015, p. 5), and to ask other interesting questions around the power asymmetries of gender or class, for example, or what it might mean to be an insider versus an outsider.

‘Linguistic landscapes’ is the conventional and widely used term to designate the study of these visual language contexts, but other scholars have proposed compelling alternatives, many of which reflect either the (sub)field of the author(s), such as Kress and van Leeuwen's (1996) visual grammar, or the foci of the research, such as Gorter’s (2013) ‘multilingual cityscapes,’ or Huebner's (2006) ‘environmental print.’ Worth a serious mention is Scollon and Scollon's (2003) ‘geosemiotics,’ in/through which they “offer a detailed classification of discourse in urban places as (1) signs produced by official organs (municipal regulatory and infrastructural discourses); (2) commercial discourses (for example, shop signs); and (3) transgressive discourses (that is, signs that violate the conventional semiotics expected, for example, graffiti)” (Rudby, 2015, p. 6). Jaworski and Thurlow (2010) use the term ‘semiotic landscapes’ to highlight and broaden the potential areas to analyze, away from physical signs and toward “symbolic practices” (Rudby, 2015, p. 6); the semiotic landscape of Jaworski and Thurlow (2010) includes the space and its use as a resource, providing an emphasis on “the way written discourse interacts with other discursive modalities: visual images, non-verbal communication, architecture, and the built environment” (p. 2). This paper will continue the tradition of using the term ‘linguistic landscapes,’ while drawing from
the theoretical (frame)works of others, such as Jaworski and Thurlow (2010), in particular, who choose a different label. The ‘linguistic landscape’ label, while chafing to some, is not so very limiting as to restrict a full exploration of *The Jungle*, in the context of this thesis.

Whatever we decide to call linguistic landscapes, in the end, “its goal is to examine the meaning of language and texts in place and space” (Seals, 2015, p. 225). It is this transformation of space into *place* through the construction of a shared linguistic identity, or of distinct identities that share the space and interact, that give space its cultural meaning.

Lefebvre (1991) imagines space not as a physical vessel that contains, rather as an abstract construction of linguistic and social practices. Going back 20 years before Landry and Bourhis, Tuan (1977) distinguished abstract space from concrete place; “what often begins as undifferentiated space becomes place as we get to know it better and endow it with value” (p. 6). According to Lefebvre (1991), place is the discursive construction of space.

Landry and Bourhis (1997) separated LL’s two main functions into informational and symbolic. Accordingly, they suggest that a place’s ‘ informational’ languages are those that represent the demographics of the speakers, and/or that represent the language policies of the environment. The informational function is largely in-group, meant to communicate within and among the community. The function becomes ‘symbolic’ when it expresses the power asymmetries, prestige, and status of language use. Many LL studies focused on these two functions, quantitatively documenting and measuring the size, color, font, placement, etc. of visual linguistic material, addressing the hierarchy of language, often *languages*, in a multilingual landscape that have something to demonstrate about the power flow
between/among languages (and, by extension, their communities), such as in East Jerusalem (Ben-Rafael, et al., 2006) and in Tokyo (Backhaus, 2007). Huebner (2006) studied the creation, organization, and display of signs in 15 neighborhoods in Bangkok, Thailand. Of particular interest to Huebner (2006) were the hierarchies of the languages on the signs, how official the signs were, types of writing, etc., to try to surmise the sanctioned and tacit rules of language use in these signs. Included with the quantitative analysis, could be traditional qualitative sociological research that might include questionnaires to glean attitudes about the linguistic material, or interviews with sign authors to explore agency. Recently LL inquiry has expanded to include the manifestation of ideological debates in the LL (e.g., Moriarty, 2014) (as well as the ideological debates that motivate the creations of new LLs), and the construction of emerging, complex individual and group, real and imagined identities (e.g., Kasanga, 2014). Malinowski (2009) considers the roles politics and authorship play in meaning-making in Korean-American businesses and “argues that the semiotics of a linguistic landscape are a multimodal performance that is dually authored by the creator and the reader, taking into account the sociopolitical experiences of both” (Seals, 2015, p 226). There are almost as many LL analyses as there are opportunities, if one considers that printed text is everywhere in most societies, not just on city streets, but in our homes (Aronin and Ó Laoire, 2013), schools (Hanauer, 2010), public restrooms (Nwoye, 1993), restaurants (Kasanga, 2012), places of worship, and even on our currency (Hawkins, 2010; Sebba, 2013). Pushing at the edge of these alternative landscapes of the everyday, are the transitional and ephemeral material of protests that are far more politically and ideologically motivated (see Hanauer, 2012, 2015; Messekher,
These landscapes could include banners and handheld signs at a rally, face paint at a demonstration, t-shirts with political messages worn in protest, all of which could be mobile. This type of landscape is intended to be dialogic, to engage its audience and elicit a verbal, mental, or emotional response (Seals, 2015, p. 226). Protests, by their very nature, exist to generate a reaction from viewers. Many protests are documented and their messages continue to call for action from our Facebook timelines and Twitter feeds. It is possible that the next protest landscape for analysis will be the internet (see Jones, 2010b; Ivkovic and Lotherington, 2009, esp. Wee, 2015).

The visibility of protests, and their documentation which counteracts their inherent ephemerality, motivates participants to stake a claim on their space from the bottom up (Pennycook, 2009; Scollon and Scollon, 2003). Mass-scale protests in 2011, such as the Occupy movement across the United States, and Tahrir Square in Cairo, “disrupted the ritual social cleansing of the linguistic landscape” to make “subversive discourses more salient” (Seals, 2015, p. 226; see Aboelezz (2014) for a LL analysis of the protests in Tahrir Square; see also Chun (2014) for a look at Occupy Wall Street rallies in Los Angeles). Rojo (2014) studies the student Indignados movement protest in Madrid’s Puerta del Sol square. Rubdy (2015) combines elements of Pennycook’s work on graffiti with the recent protest studies to perform a multimodal analysis of graffiti commemorating the Mumbai terror attacks of 2008. Again, key to these new approaches is the space, itself, as a discursive text to be ‘read,’ ‘heard,’ and engaged with.
These co-created spaces, these linguistic landscapes, emerge from a tradition of protest, from dialogic texts that came before them, and anticipate the discourses and reactions that might follow. Dialogism, both in its most neutral sense, and as a political act, is the conversation that occurs when texts have an audience. Bakhtin (1992) contrasts *dialogism* with *heteroglossia* and *polyphony*. *Heteroglossia* situates texts within their canons, acknowledging and drawing from the words and ideas that preceded them. This means that all language is *polyphonic*, comprised of a collection of all the voices and ideas from all the source texts that influenced it. Texts are inherently and fully *dialogic* once they have an audience who responds to the history of the linguistic material (textual and/or visual) and participates with the text in a kind of dialogue, prompted by the discursive role the audience is socialized to play in and with the text (Cf. Kress and van Leeuwen, 1996). A protest space, its linguistic material, is a co-creation of individual people whose text draws upon the canon, is *polyphonous*, and ultimately *dialogic* in that its primary purpose is to engage its audience in some form of predictable response: outrage, action, assistance, support, discomfort, or even disdain. The language of protest is uniquely subversive, yet does not necessarily deviate from the discursive norms that sanction dialogism. Dialogic messages of protest are not the expected norms of the regulated society. The messages are those of resistance. Their purpose is to engage. Meaningful engagement fights back, but it might not fight against the sanitized landscape of the dominant discourses (Leeman and Modan, 2010; Seals, 2011, 2012, 2015). If the protests are inaccessible or impenetrable for the audience, dialogue is impossible. The Getty Images show us that these refugees are participating in their own linguistic erasure, leveling
their language use to speak to an audience, and choosing English and French over their L1s, even when labeling their environment (see Irvine & Gal, 2000 and Pavlenko, 2009 for a discussion of ‘erasure’). In the data, we see numerous examples of this leveling, both loud and quiet in *The Jungle*, such as in Figure 3.1, below, where homes are engulfed in flames set by French authorities to raze part of the camp.

(Huguen, 2016g)

Figure 3.1: A shelter with the sign ‘lieu de vie <3’ (‘place of residence’) burns in *The Jungle*

Regardless of how many times the police bulldoze the camps, burn the shelters, expunge its linguistic landscape, and revert the space to it back to unthreatening silence, the LL of protests, like we see in *The Jungle*, are quite deliberately salient, parsable, easily regenerated on a fresh scrap of cardboard or bedding, and impossible to squelch. Even the recent act of sewing one’s lips shut at *The Jungle*, to demand dialogue, writes volumes that cannot be razed, sanitized, or ignored.
The longer protests continue, the more attention they might garner from the media, disrupting the cleansing process and promoting conversations about, in this case, the plight of migrants and refugees. The thousands of inhabitants of The Jungle camps take advantage of the high visibility of their situation to communicate with the world, much as have the Palestinians and people sympathetic to the Palestinian situation have done with messages and graffiti on the imposing concrete separation wall at Abu Dis (Hanauer, 2011), and the more ephemeral National Immigration Reform March in Washington, D.C.’s National Mall on March 21, 2010, where approximately 200,000 people from around the country met to protest the United States’ immigration policies (Seals, 2011). The discourses of these landscapes of protest stimulate dialogue with society, doing so by finding a unified voice that delimits the space, and anticipating a reaction from the audience (Bakhtin, 1992; Seals, 2015).

Two recent edited volumes focus exclusively on contested linguistic landscapes and innovative uses of LL methodologies. These groundbreaking compilations take LL into new territory. Conflict, Exclusion and Dissent in the Linguistic Landscape, edited by Rudbi and Ben Said, and published by Palgrave Macmillan in 2015, wrestles with power, identity, and the social order in local communities and in global capitalism. These landscapes are sites of contest, as people strive for justice, visibility, and survival. The landscapes explored in Conflict, Exclusion and Dissent in the Linguistic Landscape are not neutral. They can be highly political, both in the sense of high-profile societal issues like the Tunisian Revolution in late 2010-early 2011 that resulted in the flight of President Zine El Abidine Ben Ali to sympathetic Saudi Arabia after 28 days of civil unrest (Shiri, 2015), as well as issues that
typically fly beneath society's radar, like how a Singaporean university student might be intimidsted by an imposing building on campus, and adapt her academic linguistic self to reflect the all-Englishness of its juggernaut-like textual space (Tupas, 2015). Well-known scholars sit cheek-to-jowl with novitiates in this book, each contribution abuzz with fresh energy around the potential of LL research. The two parts of this book present LLs of conflict and exclusion or of dissent and protest. While all are compelling, it was the latter group of contributions that informed this thesis, in particular, that of Seals (see also Seals 2011). The newer edited volume, *Negotiating and Contesting Identities in Linguistic Landscapes*, published in 2016 by Bloomsbury, collects the papers together from a LL conference in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia in November of 2012 that attempted to draw attention to and bring scholarship to light from Africa, alongside other global LL contexts. Blackwood, Lanza, and Woldemariam edited the book into five parts that represent the full spectrum that this new wave of LL scholarship embodies, including how bodies engage a place through transitioning a rent hike protest into a full-fledged occupation in South Africa (Stroud, 2016) and how the absence of one visual language in two multilingual cities in southern Ethiopia represents an unspoken language policy of exclusion (Mendisu *et al.*, 2016). Barni and Bagna (2016) appear in this volume, and it is their diachronic and multimodal analysis of the LL of the March 1st annual immigrant protests across Italy that exposes the linguistic choices that protesters make when they want their messages to reach a broad audience, a linguistic strategy that seemed to surprise the authors, and contradict their expectations about immigrant protests, but also revealed the potential homogenization of the message (and its presentation) from the
rally organizers from year to year. None of the works represented in these two revolutionary volumes, nor anywhere else among the canon of LL research, addresses the linguistic landscape of a migrant/refugee camp.

This present work takes its cues from the early quantitative LL analyses of static landscapes, the more recent studies of protest scapes, in particular the two aforementioned edited volumes and other works by some of their contributors, the theories of place and space of Tuan (1974) and Lefebvre (1991), ‘reading’ visual texts (Kress and van Leeuwen, 1996), and approaching protest (linguistic) landscapes (Seals, 2011; 2015), to examine the dialogue that the migrants and refugees in The Jungle are co-creating. The following methods section presents how I set about ‘reading’ the publically visible linguistic landscape of The Jungle, and how, from my home base in Lexington, Kentucky, I measured almost 10 years of its visual semiotic voice for evidence of dialogue.

Section 4: Methods

However tempting it might be to approach linguistic landscapes with a Google Images search for “Calais migrant camp,” or “Calais refugee signs,” or even to watch a few videos on bbc.com about the most recent developments in The Jungle, this would be irresponsible linguistic research because it is neither systematic nor comprehensive enough. However, one simply cannot see everything that the migrants and refugees, the French government, or the citizens of Calais generate and display, nor can one see the text on each passing semi-trailer, fluttering candy wrapper, or donated t-shirt (the most surprising example of which comes
from Parkinson’s (2009) video on the camp, *Video Rush: The Jungle Refugee Camp, Calais, France*, in which a young Afghan man is sporting a jarringly irreverent tee that says “This t-shirt would look great on your bedroom floor”).

Methodology has been somewhat problematic in linguistic landscapes as a field, since its inception (Barni & Bagna, 2015). Data from *The Jungle*, itself ephemeral, cannot be conceptualized the same way we might document the signage in a row of shops in Jerusalem (Ben-Rafael et al., 2006) or even the Russian-language help wanted sign in an Italian shop, post-1991 (Pavlenko, 2015). Data from *The Jungle* are multifarious and often fragmented; signs are hastily scribbled on whatever scrap of cardboard is left to spare after constructing one’s shelter, protest slogans spray painted onto bedsheets, all documented, or not, according to the whims of the media enterprise. A Getty photographer might choose to document a lush landscape of sunset-tinted mammatus clouds, a fetid litter-strewn puddle, or a particularly poignant, clumsily-spelled sign appealing to The United Kingdom’s Prime Minister, David Cameron, for a tête-a- tête, rather than the banal sign at the outhouse or barber shop.
Regardless of the lacunae, the news photographs still contain the linguistic material that refugees would see, both inside and outside of shelters, on passing lorries, and other incidental landscapes like brand names on clothing or packaging, or on the seemingly ubiquitous hand-painted messages. See Figures 4.2 and 4.3 for examples.
Figure 4.3: An example of a non-dialogic text in *The Jungle*

This work assembles and analyzes images of text – which I consider to be ‘linguistic landscape material’ – from *The Jungle* refugee and migrant camp in Calais, France, taken by international photojournalists whose work is available without royalty charges from Getty news agency’s online image database, called Getty Embed. There are over 1 million images in this database, over 75,000 tagged with ‘Calais,’ and over 5,000 tagged with ‘Calais immigrant.’ I chose the search string ‘Calais jungle’ for the analysis because it yielded the most images of the camps and the fewest that were irrelevant. The analysis takes a diachronic view, as much as possible, paralleling the timeline of the current camps, not from their inception in 1999 to the present, but from 2006, when the database begins. Every effort was made for this data collection to be comprehensive, but it was only so to the extent necessary to address the research question, at hand.
I considered other avenues for data before choosing the Getty database. Each had its own advantages and challenges. Initially, I considered approaching veteran photojournalist Phillippe Huguen for access to his images of the camps. He has photographed them for over 15 years and his work has its strong artistic merits and pathos, while being quite comprehensive of the (linguistic) landscape of *The Jungle*, itself. I had hoped that he would have additional images in his collection that documented the visual texts of the camps. Perhaps for his own safety and privacy, his contact information was not forthcoming. When I reached out to news agencies such as Reuters and Agence France-Presse directly about using images for research, I was politely told that I would have to pay for rights to the images, even for scholarly research. Unsurprisingly, a Google Image search on *The Jungle* reveals a treasure-trove of rich visual linguistic data, but it is all from different, uncorroborated sources, and its use of questionable permission. Social media, including the very active Facebook page for the *Calais Migrant Solidarity Movement*, also has images of the camps, as do creative commons sites like Flickr, but these sources can be quite agenda-driven and unpredictable in their sources and scope. Videos of/from the camps were another option, but, again, a site like YouTube would present daunting obstacles to manually collecting the linguistic material. An on-the-ground field report might be the gold standard of linguistic research, but that option was unavailable, given the setting of the study, and of the other obligations of its author, which occasioned an interesting twist to the research question, the feasibility of using online materials.

I tagged each of the tokens in the 2,706 images in the Getty database labeled with ‘Calais jungle.’ Each of these 2,706 images was subjected to a manual assessment in order to
classify and categorize them for data analysis. As it is really the content and the actual languages (e.g., French) of the messages that I am interested in, those without text were first identified, and duplicates identified and marked. Often the linguistic material is partially obscured or incomplete, yet the entire text can be recreated, or at least the intent of the message, which became part of the coding exercise. There were often layers of text, some in the foreground, some behind, on walls, on sweatshirts, on bicycles, on cardboard, on windows, on portable toilets, etc. These were challenging to explore and parse. See Figure 4.4 for an example.

![One of the many richly layered texts in The Jungle LL](image)

(Court, 2016c)

Figure 4.4: One of the many richly layered texts in *The Jungle* LL

In the end, I arrived at six discrete criteria for analysis, the interplay of which is represented in the following flowchart, where yesses were assigned a one, and nos a zero, all the way through to the final question of multilinguality. (Figure 4.5):
These categories/criteria are not necessarily as comprehensive as some linguistic landscape analyses. To address the research question at hand, they do not need to be as specific and thorough as with Huebner's SPEAKING mnemonic that covers setting/scene, participants, ends, act sequences, key, instrumentalities, norms, and genre (2009, adapted from Hymes (1974)). For example, something that fell away from my original research objective was an analysis of the ephemerality of *The Jungle*'s LL, which is a popular area of emphasis in LL research, meaning how robust might the actual physical sign and its paint/ink be, which proved to be too challenging and subjective a thing to analyze from news photographs. As the flowchart illustrates, the research aims focus on the construction of and around ‘speaker’ agency, namely the textual representation of dialogue with the world, or a perceived or desired dialogue. Answers to questions 3 (“Was the linguistic material user-generated?”), 4 (“Is the message dialogic?”), and 5 (“Is the some/all of the text in French and/or English?”) formed the foundation of the statistical analysis that I present in the following section of this report, Section 5: Results

I entered each of the 1053 linguistic tokens from the 2706 images into a spreadsheet. The first column has a clickable link to the Getty Embed database, which brings up the image, a short description of the scene, and basic information including the date and name of the photographer (which is digitally watermarked). I made note of the date in a second column, which is sortable so I can more easily approach a diachronic analysis. The third through sixth columns, representing uniqueness, user-generation, dialogue, French/English, and multilinguality, have ones (yes) or zeros (no), depending on the value of each data point. I can
sort the data according to agency, purpose, multilinguality, et cetera. The final column is not a binary choice, rather it is where I took note of the language or languages of each token. When I encountered a linguistic token that had already been accounted for, such as the word ‘POLICE’ on a uniform, it did not get counted every time it appeared. It was only counted once, because it was impossible to tell one officer from another in riot gear. These tokens were ubiquitous, but not user-generated, and do not affect the outcome of my analysis.

Additionally, many of the linguistically rich signs appeared in more than one image. I counted each token only once. Some languages and messages were challenging to parse. For example, there are at least 4 languages among camp inhabitants that use the Arabic script. I was able to discriminate Arabic from Farsi, Pashto, and Dari, but not always among those three Indo-Iranian languages. It is possible that Urdu is also in the Arabic-script mix, as I have seen one example of Devanagari, which suggests that there are migrants and refugees from further East than Afghanistan. These tokens often got the label of ‘Afghan/Farsi’ or ‘Arabic script’ in my spreadsheet. See more discussion about the potential for this in Section 6: Discussion.

I am not in Calais, France. Instead, I adopted the perspective/vantage point of the Getty news photographers, as if it had been I taking the photographs (or, more importantly, as if I were one of the residents viewing the material from the same perspectives as the photographer). This raises two obvious methodological issues. One, perhaps the Jungle resident-cum-viewer is not literate, or not literate in the language in question. Would the linguistic material be at all salient to her? Unsurprisingly, given the nature of a migrant and refugee camp, I was unable to find literacy statistics about this population (see more about
this in Section 6: Discussion). And two, news photographers have specific agendas that are markedly different from those who are eking out an uncomfortable existence, thousands of kilometers from home, in a wretched Calaisienne mud puddle. Why document some things and not others in this terrible, unfortunate, hardscrabble, organic, simultaneously necessary and unnecessary camp? The press photographers make choices and attend to what they attend, just like the rest of us. Yet, they still succeed in documenting abundant linguistic material in the camps. Regardless of any potential shortcomings, the data still have an interesting and important story to tell that is inherently both quantitative and qualitative, like the best of recent LL research, such as we find in Rudby (2015), Blackwood et al. (2016), and especially Bagna and Barni’s (2015) multimodal longitudinal study of the annual 1 March immigrant protests in Italy, in which they personally took 500 images at rallies, sampled YouTube videos of the demonstrations, and coded extralinguistic indexes, such as color.

Discerning the message in each visual text was a subjective thing, of course. The more it looked like graffiti, the more inclined I was to label anything I could not translate as dialogic/political. Context clues are very helpful, although not always available. To determine the ‘politicalness’ of the message in the image, I asked myself if the text has a purpose that is not purely informational. For example, if the linguistic material simply labeled a place as a library or a mosque (see Figure 4.3), then it was not considered political. On the other hand, as in Figure 4.6, if a tarp is spray painted with the words and symbols “France ↔ England,” I would consider that a political message. See Appendixes A & B for a complete outline of the
coding criteria I used, as well as the spreadsheets of my own coding results. I include these to open up the opportunity for inter-rating.

From these 572 individual *unique* tokens, derived from the 1053 total tokens, I created tables to illustrate the results of the research. The data in the tables clearly reveal the distribution of the French and English languages in the political and informational texts, as well as the multilinguality of the signs. I present the tables in the following section.

Section 5: Results

The aim of this study was to explore the dialogic nature of the migrant and refugee visual linguistic landscape of *The Jungle* camps over the past 10 years, the hypothesis being that the refugees choose the international languages of English and French for their protest languages to raise awareness to their plight via the lenses of photojournalists. I expected to
find that the migrants use more English and French for their linguistic material that is oriented to an outside audience in their dialogic signage, and that they use more of their first languages (L1s) for non-dialogic labeling and informational signs in their habitats. I also expected to find that this trend would be consistent across the 10 year span represented in the data set, even though the demographics shifted from predominantly Afghan refugees early, to a highly heterogeneous population today. The data collected from the Getty online embeddable images database were coded to address these questions, and the analysis of the 572 tokens that contained unique text, reveals that international languages of the LL of protest of *The Jungle* predominate. What the data do not support, and this is something that will be discussed in Section 6, is the use of migrant L1s in labeling their environment. Table 5.1, below, shows the breakdown of the 248 user-generated out of 572 total unique sign tokens that are in the Getty database.

Table 5.1: The dialogic and non-dialogic texts in international versus local languages in the LL of *The Jungle*, 2009-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>dialogic</th>
<th>NOT dialogic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French and/or English</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO French or English</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By a factor of 10, the migrants are using French and/or English more than non-/less-international languages, such as Arabic or Eritrean, for their visual protest materials. What they are not doing, is using languages other than French and English, their L1s, for the
informational signage in their environment. If we further separate the data to expose the multilinguality of the texts in the LL, we can see this even more clearly:

Table 5.2: Multilinguality and dialogue in the LL of The Jungle, 2009-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>dialogic monolingual</th>
<th>dialogic multilingual</th>
<th>NON-dialogic monolingual</th>
<th>NON-dialogic multilingual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French and/or English</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT French and/or English</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I found no examples of either dialogic multilingual materials or of non-dialogic multilingual materials which incorporate exclusively L1s of the camp population (no French or English), which suggests, among other things, that the migrants are not accommodating one another in their L1s in their shared place. It is in their co-created space, that some sort of accommodation begins to emerge not in L1s, but in English and/or French, or often in a mixture of L1s and French and/or English. This, and other factors that could explain this lack of L1 labeling, will be further considered in Section 6.
(Huguen, 2009)

Figure 5.1: Afghan at *The Jungle*, 2009

(Huguen, 2016i)

Figure 5.2: An Iranian Kurd at *The Jungle*, 2016
After months of looking for a usable database from which to gather material for this analysis, and more months looking at images from the camps, I was still surprised to find so few tokens of non-international language use in *The Jungle*, although, upon reflection, I do not remember seeing any non-dialogic signs from the camps in L1s. I have heard interviews with the refugees which required subtitles from their L1s into French and English. Still, and perhaps because I have heard these interviews, I would have expected closer parity between the dialogic and non-dialogic ratios, with the habitats being labeled in L1s. Instead, I found something that is quite different, which we can see clearly in the following bar graph, Figure 5.3, which illustrates the data from Table 5.1:

![Figure 5.3: Use of English/French in the dialogic LL of *The Jungle*](image)

The lighter grey bar on the right indicates the non-dialogic use of languages other than English and/or French in the user-generated LL of *The Jungle*, such as informational labels, like what
we see in Figure 5.4, below, while the other light grey bar on the left side of the chart shows
the use of neither English nor French in the dialogic, user generated visual materials, like what
we see in Figure 5.5, below.

(Huguen, 2016b)
Figure 5.4: Migrants cook bread in a makeshift bakery

(Charlet, 2016f)
Figure 5.5: A rare example of a dialogic non-international message in *The jungle*
I found only 64 examples of English and/or French being used in labels or informational signs that the migrants had themselves created. The above example, in Figure 5.6, is typical of the types of non-dialogic tokens that are in the dataset.

While these findings are significant, it must be acknowledged that the photojournalists who took these photos, and chose particular photos to sell to Getty, and Getty, itself, all have their audience in mind. This audience is international. It is possible that there are LL tokens that went undocumented or unreported in this dataset because they did not ‘speak’ to the international audience in their own language(s). An on-the-ground LL field report might be able to be more systematic about capturing all of the LL material, but it would fail to be as longitudinal. The results represented here deserve scrutiny for the reasons I have mentioned here, which I will discuss further in the following section. That being said, as Bagni and Barna (2016) and others report, it is now expected, in our increasingly connected world,
that protest scapes will be dominated by international languages, such as English and French (or in the case of Bagni and Barna’s example, Italian), because those who make the materials are attempting to co-create a space that speaks to the outside and to rallies against being silenced.

Section 6: Discussion

Initially inspired by a colleague’s linguistic landscape analysis using Google Maps, of two towns in Bulgaria (see Lee, 2015), I set out to explore the LL materials in a more contested place. I wanted to see if it were possible to use an online database to perform this exploration, and if this exploration could illuminate any number of things about the landscapes that marginalized people co-create to raise their ‘voices’ to an audible level. This type of research brings together a number of areas that are of particular interest to me – power asymmetry, language contact, graffiti, protest, World Englishes – and introduces some ideas and techniques that I hope will be of interest to the nascent fields of linguistic landscapes and geosemiotics. While this study did support the initial hypothesis, that refugees in The Jungle are using English and/or French to attempt to generate dialogue, there are data and techniques that could be brought to bear on this work, ways in which the investigation could be strengthened, expanded, and pursued in the future.

Data about shifting and vulnerable populations are difficult to glean. Information about literacy rates, first languages, age, gender, education level, etc., would have been extremely interesting and relevant to include in this kind of sociolinguistic research.
Unfortunately, even on the ground, this information would be like mercury, elusive and perhaps even dangerous, at least for the people being surveyed, and maybe even for the researchers, as there is considerable anti-migrant sentiment in places like Calais, and a conspicuous police presence. See Figure 6.1 for an example of one of the many dangers of living/researching in a contested space like The Jungle.

![Image](https://placekitten.com/300/300)

(Court, 2016d)

Figure 6.1: Migrant runs through tear gas in The Jungle

There are any number of extra-linguistic materials in The Jungle that would be interesting to include in this kind of study, things like flags, graffiti, tapestries, artwork, and cairns. Some might suggest that this veers away from linguistics and into rhetorical or visual analysis territory. A diachronic study of how the refugees communicate through their other, non-textual visual materials might add further insight into their intentions with their dialogue, would reveal more of their agency, and would attest to the co-creation of their
temporar(il)y shared space. Is there cohesion? Incongruity? Does one color predominate? I cannot say that I see anything that would suggest this kind of extra-linguistic visual message, save for the blue of the ubiquitous tarpaulin that seems to be the international symbol for shelter in a 'storm.'

The linguistic material posed some problems. Some was difficult to parse. Some was truncated by the photographic 'frame.' Some of it was written in Arabic script, meaning it could be Arabic, Pashto, Dari, Farsi, or Urdu. I was able to differentiate Arabic from the others, and often Farsi from its eastern cousins, but a more nuanced analysis is waiting to be done with these data.

Like Bagni and Barna (2016), this kind of analysis could include and benefit from online video resources, like YouTube footage from drone flyovers and protest rallies. This was beyond the scope of this research, but future work could include a well-chosen set of these examples to offer a more comprehensive and dynamic view of the LL of The Jungle. Also, by extension, these video sources would include oral linguistic material which could partner with the visual LL to enhance the linguistic interpretation and analysis. Were I able to hear the refugees in Calais, would they have spoken in English, as their signs read? The videos I have watched from The Jungle have had either subtitles or a translator, suggesting to me that the language choices might be more complicated once oral language is considered.

Of course, this kind of research need not be limited to The Jungle or to migrant and refugee camps. Its applications extend to any contested place, such as taking a fresh look at
some established sites of conflict, like Israel/Palestine, or perhaps Beirut, with its influx of Syrian refugees who are restricted from integrating with the already heterogeneous Lebanese and visitor populations by a cordon of military checkpoints, effectively creating a refugee camp within Beirut (Bourdain and Vitale, 2015). These methods could also work well in a short-lived protest rally, like we might see in the United States at election time. Because we now inhabit a highly documented and connected world, it is possible to perform this kind of research and analysis from almost anywhere, investigating LLs that might be too far away or dangerous to visit in person.

One final area that would be of particular interest, is the evidence of language contact within a LL, such as we find in The Jungle. In Figure 6.2, we see the text “Welcome in France...” This could be a contact-induced product or just a non-target second language form.

Figure 6.2: Perhaps a language contact ‘error’
The findings of this study partially support the initial hypothesis, but fail to show that the migrants use their home languages to label their camps. I would have expected my tables to look more like Table 6.1, instead of what we saw in Table 5.1, in the previous section:

Table 6.1: The expected general distribution of international vs. local languages in dialogic and non-dialogic texts, 2009-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>dialogic</th>
<th>NOT dialogic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French and/or English</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO French or English</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lack of L1 use in the non-dialogic signs might be because of the way the LL of *The Jungle* was represented in the Getty database and indeed the migrants choose to use English and/or French for their dialogic language(s). It could just as easily mean that the photographers and/or Getty editors chose these images because they contained French and/or English, while other non-English/French tokens languish on the computers of photojournalists around the world. Instinct says it is a combination of the two, with leanings toward the former. I acknowledge that this is an inherent methodological problem with my approach, one that would have to be acknowledged by any researcher pursuing a similar tack. One of the original attractive features of the Getty database was that it appeared to have 10 years of images to study, but the distribution of these images proved to be highly uneven, beginning only in 2009 with one photoshoot of Afghans protesting, and the chronology began to loop around itself, jump from 2014 to 2016 or 2011 to 2006, after consistently following a predictable reverse chronological path for the first 1000, or so images. This distribution parallels the rise in
population and scrutiny of *The Jungle*, with only a handful of Afghans in sleeping bags in 2009, to over 6000 refugees living in shipping containers today. It makes sense that this kind of landscape would experience an ebb and flow, and its documentation would be correspondingly unpredictable. As a result, there are not enough data from these gaps to report, in a significant way, that the protest scape has consistently been ‘international’ in its objective, from the inception of the camps. Anecdotal observation, like we see in Figure 5.1 in the previous section, suggests that were there more longitudinal data, that the original hypothesis would be further corroborated diachronically.

Some other very interesting things emerge from the analysis of the numbers. Because I kept track of the languages and their messages as I coded the data, I am able to see with a simple manipulation of the spreadsheets, the interplay among the languages, according to classic LL techniques. For example, I can see which languages dominate or are more salient (see APPENDIX A for the complete dataset and its language distribution), by being the topmost and/or largest language, as in Figure 5.2, where English is on top and in block letters, saying ‘STOP POLICE!’ and where the Farsi text is smaller and on the bottom of the sign – حقوق بشر کجاست؟ – which translates to ‘Where are the human rights?’ Of course, the findings are what they are because the photographers made choices. The choices of the refugees are limited, as well, by things like literacy. Perhaps there are few tokens labeled with Eritrean because there are few literate Eritreans in the camps. It could be that the inhabitants default to French and English for labels because these are lingua francas, or there is some sort of accommodation going on. The images do reveal a kind of ghettoization, or self-selecting of
communities, even across extra-cultural lines, such as sex and age, where I would expect to see one language dominate in each of these ‘neighborhoods,’ were I on the ground. Again, these are ephemeral things, not captured in the data. A camp neologism emerged for a time – “fundągether” (fun together) – shown in Figures 6.3 and 6.4, which suggests a certain spirit of camaraderie and awareness of the collective space.

(Charlet, 2016b)

Figure 6.3: Camp neologism ‘fundągether’
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Section 7: Conclusion

There is no doubt that the migrants and refugees in *The Jungle* want to be heard. This study showed that they are using French and English most loudly for their visual messages of protest, but that they do not, by and large, default to their first languages, such as Eritrean, to label things and places in their habitat, as we see with the church in Figure 7.1, below.
The migrants and refugees in *The Jungle* likely have an awareness that the conversation they are hoping to have with the world is communicated most effectively in the international languages of English and French, and through this co-constructed message, they are creating a space that they share, despite their differences. With numbers swelling near 5-digit figures, the media are paying attention to the inhabitants of the camps, and documenting their linguistic landscape, playing their role in the dialogue. As linguists, an analysis of this type is something that can find its place among the increasing numbers of us who see an obligation to involve ourselves in the intersection of language and activism, choosing to find ways to demonstrate that the structure of language is inherently powerful, such as the recent work in Creoles of Fabiola Henri, Michel DeGraff, et al., or that threatened/marginalized languages find power
through preservation, such as with the indigenous languages of The Americas and Australia.

Language, and by extension linguistics is seldom, if ever, neutral.
APPENDIX A: Spreadsheet

There is a separate electronic spreadsheet document filed with the online research repository uknowledge.uky.edu at the University of Kentucky that links to all of the images used for this analysis, as well as the coding results. Below is a screen shot of what the spreadsheet looks like, with its coding criteria at the top.

Figure A.1: spreadsheet
APPENDIX B: Coding Criteria

The first of each image pair is an example where I did not deem the category to be represented. These I coded with a zero. Examples like the second image would receive a one, in each category, as I progressed through the criteria in the flowchart (text? → unique? → user-generated? → dialogic? → French and/or English? → multilingual?).

Text?

(Charlet, 2016d)

Figure B.1: No text

(Huguen, 2015c)

Figure B.2: Text
Unique?

The first time I encountered the ‘Médecins sans frontières’ vest I would label it ‘unique.’ Subsequent tokens would receive a zero. The same goes for the red wagon. Its first image would get a one, following tokens would be zero. I saw many examples of the word ‘POLICE.’ The first time I saw it on the back of a uniform, it would be a one. The same for on an armband, a hat, the front of a shirt, etc. Any subsequent examples would not be considered unique.

(Huguen, 2015d)

Figure B.3: Not unique

(Huguen, 2015e)

Figure B.4: Unique
User-generated?

The camp abounds with non-user-generated text, like this butane canister or the two images, above, in Figures B.3 and B.4. Brand names, labels, trucks, street signs, etc., are all examples of tokens that would be zero in the spreadsheet. On the other hand, examples like ‘Let’s go England, GB’ I considered to be user-generated.

(Andalou Agency, 2016)

Figure B.5: Not user-generated

(Huguen, 2015b)

Figure B.6: User-generated
Dialogic?

Does the message invite a reaction? If so, I labeled it as dialogic. If, like this first aid sign (written in Arabic alongside the English) below, the message is purely informational, the token received a zero in the spreadsheet.

‘First Aid’ in Arabic

(Andalou Agency, 2015)

Figure B.7: Non-dialogic

(Huguen, 2016e)

Figure B.8: Dialogic
French/English?

If there were any English, French, or English- and/or French-like text in the image, it received a one in the spreadsheet, even if there was accompanying non-English or French text, as well. If, like in the first image below, there is only Arabic, it would get a zero in the spreadsheet, and be labeled as Arabic in the languages column, along with a translation of any message I could decipher, which, in this case, is ‘hajji within.’

(Huguen, 2016c)

Figure B.9: Neither French nor English

(De Viguerie, 2015a)

Figure B.10: French and/or English
Multilingual?

Is there more than one language in the image? Sometimes the languages would be French and English, other times, Arabic, French, and English, or Pashto and English. Tokens like the second would be considered multilingual, while the first image would not be considered as such because there is only French represented.

(Lo Presti, 2015)

Figure B.11: Not multilingual

(de Viguerie, 2015b)

Figure B.12: Multilingual
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