CHAPTER II

RIVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter, the researcher explains about the meaning of sociolinguistic, Linguistics Landscape or LL, and multilingual including the definitions and previous researches.

2.1 Sociolinguistic

Linguistics is divided into eight branches, one of them is sociolinguistics. According to Jendra (2010: 9-10) sociolinguistics is a branch of linguistics that makes language the object of study. Sociolinguistics is a field that analyzes language as part of social diversity. This study explores the function and variety of languages, contact between languages, one's attitude towards language use and users, language changes, and language planning. In the initial definition of this research, some linguists used the term sociology of language, while others called it sociolinguistics. In this case, the term sociolinguistics is more often used to refer to language studies related to society, whereas, the sociology of language is mainly used in community studies related to language. Thus, in the sociology of language, the object of research is society, whereas in sociolinguistics, the focus of research is language. Though, the emphasis seems different and reasonable, but in practice the discussion still overlaps. The sociolinguistic popularity of the subject is far greater in both studies

and literature. In the next definition the subject uses sociolinguistics as a field name. Social and cultural phenomena in sociolinguistics are part of linguistics (Trudgill, 1983).

2.1.1 Linguistic Landscape

In this part, researcher will give some explanations about Linguistic Landscape or LL, including the definition, functions, and types.

2.1.1.1 Definition

Issues related to the idea of linguistic landscape in the field of language planning first appeared in Belgium (Verdoot, 1979) and in Québec (Corbeil, 1980). The most frequent quoted definition of LL (Linguistic Landscape) is:

> Languages used in public signs, street names, billboards, commercial shop signs, place names, and general signs in government buildings, joined and formed linguistic landscape for a particular region or urban agglomeration. Linguistic landscape of a region can have two basic functions, namely information functions and symbolic functions (Landry & Bourhis, 1997: 25).

This refers to language seen in certain areas, more precisely, languages that can be found in indoor markets, cities, schools, campuses, shops, government offices and large corporations, mobile buses, beaches, etc (Shohamy & Gorter, 2009). In addition, it is noteworthy that most analysis in the original Bourhis and Landry articles used and adopted public sign instead of landscape linguistics compared to personal sign which together formed the overall linguistic landscape, which led to a misunderstanding of public sign.

Actually, the term has been expanded into many places with different research objectives. In the end the investigation of the term LL turned to a discussion of what was included in the linguistic landscape and how the data was compiled. Recently, several researchers have criticized the limitations of the LL definition which is generally quoted from Landry & Bourhis and expanded it by including various literacy items such as icons, logos, and images, apart from languages written and displayed in public places (Itagi & Singh, 2002; Beckhaus, 2007; Shohamy & Gorter, 2009). Therefore, in their research on LL definitions changed to the definition of the form of LL research based on data collection. For this research, the researcher focuses on the representation of languages found on the entire Ponorogo universities.

Traditionally the sign has been divided into two types, private vs. government (Landry & Bourhis, 1997), top-down vs. bottom-up (Ben-Rafael, Shohamy, Amara & Trumper-Hecht, 2006), commercial vs. noncommercial (Backhaus, 2006), or private vs. public (Bourhis, 1992; Maurais & Monneir, 1996; Landry & Bourhis, 1997) that have the same definition and scope: signs issued by public authorities (government, cities or public bodies), and individuals, associations or companies who act independently within the official rules (Shohamy. at all, 2010). However, the explicit classification ignores various linguistic features of landscape. Huebner (2009: 74) criticizes the difference between top-down vs. bottom-up which fails to capture ideas and how they influence the linguistic form of

landscape. In his explanation it was mentioned that several major differences in the design of signs from both the government and multinational companies; local business and written notice; and graffiti is totally different. Therefore, to clarify the division of linguistic landscape it requires further analysis of the shale and type of the sign.

2.1.1.2 The Functions of Linguistic Landscape

The linguistic landscape in a region can provide two basic functions: informational function and symbolic function.

2.1.1.2.1 The Informational Function

The most basic information function of linguistic landscape is as a special marker of a geographical area inhabited by a particular language community (Bourhis, 1992). Linguistic landscape can also be used to describe territorial boundaries between groups of languages that are interconnected and coexist in a region. The use of language that is consistent in linguistic landscape will clarify the boundaries of the area between groups of languages that coexist in a region. Good language boundaries can stabilize competition between language groups by clearly describing administrative areas where group members can use and receive them in their language either from the public or private sector. Thus linguistic landscape serves to provide information to members in and/or outside the group about the linguistic characteristics, territorial boundaries, and language boundaries in the area they have entered (Landry & Bourhis, 1997).

2.1.1.2.2 The Symbolic Function

It makes sense if the presence or absence of a language on public signs has an effect on each member of a language group in either a bilingual or multilingual setting (Bourhis, 1992). Having a language that is used in most private and government signs gives a relatively high contribution to the feeling and status of language groups to other languages in the sociolinguistic environment. With the inclusion of group languages on public signs can provide services in symbolic functions which include the complete function of information from the linguistic landscape effectively (Quebec, 1996). The most prominent symbolic function of the linguistic landscape is its arrangement, where language has become the most important dimension for the identity of an ethnicity (Sachdev & Bourhis, 1990). In such settings, the presence of language contributes directly to the positive identity of an ethnolinguistics group (Landry & Bourhis, 1997).

2.1.1.3 Types of Sign

According to Landry & Bourhis (1997), Ben-Rafael at all (2006), Backhaus (2006), and Bourhis (1992); Maurais & Monneir (1996); Landry & Bourhis (1997) there are 4 sign types. They are:

2.1.1.3.1 Private Signs vs. Government Signs

Private signs include commercial signs on storefronts and business institutions (e.g., rental stores and banks), advertisements displayed on public transportation and private vehicles as well as commercial

advertisements on billboards. Government signs refer to public signs used by national, regional or city governments, such as road signs, place names, street names, government buildings, hospitals, schools, universities, city halls, metro stations, and city parks. The linguistic landscape under jurisdiction has the most systematic impact on government signs through its language policy. Conversely, the language on the private sign is not controlled by the state. This occurs because private signs are seen as part of the freedom of individual opinion, while government signs are rarely considered as constituent parts of individual freedom of speech (Bourhis, 1992, 1994; Bourhis & Landry, nd; Woehrling, 1993).

2.1.1.3.2 Top-down vs. Bottom-up

According to Ben-Rafael, Shohamy, Amara & Trumper-Hecht (2006) LL items issued by national and public bureaucratic institutions, such as signs on public sites, public announcements, and street names are included in the top-down. On the other hand, items issued by store owners or social companies such as shop names, company marks, and personal announcements are included in bottom-up.

Top-down and bottom-up are divided into several fields of activities. Therefore, bottom-up is broken down into clothing and leisure, food, household appliances, private offices. While 'top-down' items are divided according to the type of institution, such as religion, government, interests, culture, education, and public health. But in practice, the categorization is

often ignored for the sake of statistical analysis because of the limited number of items obtained in different categories (Ben-Rafael, Shohamy, Amara & Trumper-Hecht, 2006).

2.1.1.3.3 Commercial vs. Non-commercial

An important variable in previous research into the linguistic landscape is the distinction between official and nonofficial signs (Backhaus, 2006). Calvet (1990, 1994) mentions there are two types of signs ‘in vitro' and 'in vivo' as components of the linguistic landscape. Both terms make a whole difference.

Calvet applied these differences to his research in Dakar, he observed that the city gave a multilingual impression of ‘in vivo’ aspects. Although not all spoken languages are represented, French, Arabic, and Wolof appear regularly in nonofficial signs. The image of the city in vitro gives a different picture. All official signatures contain only the official French language, the rejecting concession to the other languages of Dakar (Backhaus, 2006).

2.1.1.3.4 Private vs. Public

Public signs can be unilingual, bilingual, or multilingual, reflecting the diversity of a language group in the region. The dominance of a language on public signs in a particular region reflects relatively the strength and status of competing for language groups (Bourhis, 1992). In situations like this, people find most public signs written in dominant language groups, while

public signs in minor languages are rarely encountered (Landry & Bourhis, 1997). In some cases, dominant languages can be found outside of public signs, while minor languages can coexist with dominant language on signs in private buildings and countries (Landry & Bourhis, 1997). Or, people will find public signs written in two languages by clearly displaying the dominant language rather than the minor language. This is a case where the use of the dominant language in an area is the language of the majority group that inhabits the region in question (Maurais & Monnier, 1996); but languages used in public signs sometimes use minor languages that can impose language on other language groups even if the group forms the majority of the population.

Private signs include commercial signs on storefronts and business institutions (e.g., rental stores and banks), advertisements displayed on public transportation and private vehicles as well as commercial advertisements on billboards. Conversely, the language on the private sign is not controlled by the state. This occurs because private signs are seen as part of the freedom of individual opinion.

2.2 Previous Researches

There are other researches discuss a range of topics, by no means exhaustive, that represent their interest and that will be expand in further volumes of linguistic landscape.

In his research of LL explorations and methodological challenges: Analyzing France's regional languages (2015: 38-53). Blackwood has been exploring written varieties of public space in French regional languages (RLs) for years. In his research, he reflected on the development of the LL research methodology by critically considering the shortcomings on his own work. He also tried to contribute to a wider debate, all through the prism of French RL both on city walls, cities, and villages throughout France.

Gorter and Cenoz (2015: 54-74) considered the increasing number of languages found on the streets following the globalization process of the spread of English, some of global brand names and both of migrant and minority languages. Local and global dimensions join dynamically and complexly influenced by rules and regulations by a designer of signs of creativity, technology, and their interactions with linguistic landscape readers. They want to get a deeper understanding of multilingualism by outlining the concept of translanguaging and reflecting on a combination of linguistic resources.

Jaworski (2015: 79-94) spoke of language objects in the urban landscape, which contemporary did not serve any utilitarian purpose. The case specifications considered are the word of LOVE by Robert Inddiana and decoration of love letters from Marks & Spencer. It is suggested that the language object is able to perform its function by focusing on the form and giving examples of linguistic performances with a complex of appropriation and contextualization as its focus.

Malinowski (2015: 95-113) focused on students and places of learning in LL; the language in the public space is the object of teaching contextualized pragmatic speech acts. This research assesses LL studies might be suitable as a study of pedagogic languages and considers relationships that have a productive potential between theory, method, and practice as a geosemiotic landscape.

Pavlenko and Mullen (2015: 114-132) re-read some of the past works, including their own works, which aimed: (a) to challenge the claim that urban proliferation represented a completely contemporary global trend; (b) as a consideration of the problem of re-reading the signs to be practiced by the reader; and (c) to establish a previous opinion that LL must be investigated as a diachronic phenomenon and embedded in the social-politic process. This research considers multilingual empires to highlight the importance of diachronic LL investigations.

According to Peck and Stroud (2015: 133-150) to expand LL studies which include the body as a physical landscape, or move discursive locality, they articulate this point by suppressing the mobility and materiality of semiotics which is interpreted as performative. By taking an illustration of tattoo culture in Cape Town, they developed the idea of 'human beings as subjects of self-entrepreneurship and writers who are in the world'. In particular, they focus on how the body of future selves is attached.

Shohamy (2006: 53-82) showed how to broadly issue LL definitions and combine them with several contextual factors to achieve deeper

meaning from languages in space. She focused on LL as a mechanism used to make and oppose unfair language policies. Through a number of researches, she showed how LL was made a powerful tool by the government and society in the city and the environment to negotiate the language just and fair policies. Thus, LL has a role in conceptualizing language policy by including several factors that exist in the public space and community involvement in this policy.

Woldemariam and Lanza (2015) described how LL is used as a strategy among diaspora communities not only to maintain a transnational identity but also be used to build a unique identity in society. They examined LL Ethiopian diaspora in Washington DC, which is called 'Little Ethiopia' and constructing an imaginary community built on the basis of old homeland myths, as well as unique and new African identities. Henceforth, this research offers a theoretical perspective on transnationalism, diaspora, and identity.

In compiling this research, the researcher uses the notion of Landry & Bourhis as a reference. From a number of studies that have been carried out to date, the LL concept presented by Landry & Bourhis is used as a reference in LL research throughout the world. As it is known the term of linguistic landscape was first put forward by Landry and Bourhis (1997). However, the study of languages on general boards used as objects of research has a very long history.

According to Landry & Bourhis (1997) statement, in the language planning field that issues related to the notion of linguistic landscape first emerged. Language planners in Belgium (Verdoot, 1979) and in Quebec (Corbeil, 1980) were among the first to recognize the importance of marking the boundaries of linguistic territories through the regulation of language use on public signs including billboard, street signs, and commercial signs (Leclerc, 1989), as well as in place names.