

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW ON LITERATURE

#### B.1 Theoretical Framework

##### B.1.1 Linguistic landscape

The basic concept of linguistic landscape is the study of signs in certain areas. According to Bourhis and Landry (1997) linguistic landscape is “The language of public road signs, advertising billboards, street names, place names, commercial shop signs, and public signs on government buildings combines to form the linguistic landscape of a given territory, region, or urban agglomeration.” Or, in brief, linguistic landscape “refers to the visibility and salience of languages on public and commercial signs” (Landry & Bourhis 1997: 23). This definition is well-known and followed by many researchers in linguistic landscape study.

Concerning the term of linguistic landscape, it is often abbreviated as LL. Another scholar, Gorter (2006), has a different perspective about the term of linguistic landscape. He proposes to use the term ‘multilingual cityscape’ instead of ‘linguistic landscape’, as the word ‘landscape’ relates to the countryside whereas collections of signs with texts are encountered predominantly in urban areas. ‘Cityscape’ is indeed more precise than ‘landscape’, but ‘multilingual cityscape’ excludes the possibility of monolingualism in advance (Edelman: 2010).

However, the concept of linguistic landscape is probably much wider than what given by Landry and Bourhis though their definition of linguistic landscape is accepted by many researchers as a standard. In this case, Ben-Rafael et, al (2006) give another concept of linguistic landscape. They define the linguistic landscape as "any sign or announcement located outside or inside a public institution or a private business in a given geographical location" (Edelman: 2010). So the area inside a building can be considered as the corpus of the research.

The constituent of this study is signs since it becomes the object of it. Backhaus (2006, in Edelman: 2010) defines what constitutes a sign.

A sign was considered to be any piece of written text within a spatially definable frame. The underlying definition is rather broad, including anything from handwritten stickers to huge commercial billboards. Also, such items as 'push' and 'pull' stickers at entrance doors, lettered foot mats or botanic explanation plates on trees were considered to be signs. Each sign was counted as one item, irrespective of its size.

However, not all signs are considered as the data of this research. Since the data were taken in metro stations and a railway station, there may be same signs although they are displayed in different location. As a result, the data are signs which have different style and the signs with the same style are categorized as one signs. Gorter and Canoz (2006) also classify the signs with the same message from the company as one unit.

### B.1.2 Linguistic Situation in Purwokerto

The language choice is a complex problem in multilingual society in Indonesia, in which there are some languages used in daily as a mean for social interaction. Each individual should consider the language or language style in certain interaction. However, Indonesian language grows as the national language since 1945 and becomes the lingua franca which connects millions of people who speak different local language (Cohn & Ravindranath: 2014). Javanese people, for example, speak Javanese language as the local language with other Javanese people in daily life but they speak the Indonesian language to communicate with non-Javanese.

So, they at least have two languages that are used in their social interaction, those are Javanese language as the vernacular and Indonesian language as the national language (Rokhman: 2005). However, the Javanese language that Purwokerto people speak has different specialties from the standard one. Javanese in Purwokerto is *Banyumasan* or called *ngapak* is Javanese language which has different dialect and grammatical from the standard Javanese which used in Yogyakarta and Solo (Mar'ah and Hartati: 2015). Koentjaraningrat in Hadiati (2017) also stated that *Banyumasan* which is spoken along serayu river is non-standard Javanese. The fact is that Javanese becomes the dominant language which used as the spoken language. Indonesian language may be used too as the spoken language but its dominance is not as strong as Javanese.

### **B.1.3 Linguistic Situation in Sofia**

Bulgaria is located in eastern Europe and the language is Bulgarian which is an Indo-European language which becomes a part of Slavic language. The family of Bulgarian language is Russian, Macedonian, Polish and Czech. The data from BBC in 2014 show that there are several languages used in Bulgaria. Bulgarian language as the official language has the largest number of speakers with approximate 8.7 million speakers or about 85% of the total population. The data also show that there are 2.5% who speak Macedonian, but it is considered as a dialect of Bulgarian, not as a different language. The other languages are Romani and Turkish. However, both languages are minority languages with the number of speakers are only 9% of the total population.

As it is part of Slavic languages, Bulgarian is written in Cyrillic script. According to Transconsult Bulgaria, the basis of the Cyrillic alphabet is the Glagolitic which had been developed in the 9th century. In the 11th-12th century, it was officially renamed to Bulgarian language. After Bulgaria has joined the European Union in 2007, the Cyrillic became the third official alphabet of the European Union countries.

English is a foreign language in Bulgaria. However, as a process of modernization of Bulgaria, the authority aims to modernize the public facilities, it includes making understandable public signs for those who do not speak Bulgarian. One of the steps has been done is the use of English in Sofia's metro stations (Krusteva: 2017). She also stated that the linguistic landscape around the

metro stations is a bilingual area where both Bulgarian and English are used on the signs.

#### **B.1.4 English as a Global Language on Signs**

English has grown as an important language in the world. It is undeniable that English has a main role in the globalization process. It is widespread in the entire world even it is used in a non-English speaking country. A report from Babel.com confirms that 1.5 billion of the Earth's population speaks English, which means 20% of the population uses English as a mean of communication. However, the number of people who speak English as the first language is only 360 million people. It indicates that English has grown as one of the languages with the largest speaker in the world.

According to Crystal (2003), a language achieves its status as a global language when it develops a special role that is recognized in every country. In this case, English has been recognized or even used by non-English native speaker whether it is as the second language or as a foreign language. Crystal states that English becomes a global language since it is heard on television spoken by politicians from all over the world, it is displayed on signs and advertisements in a lot of countries or even it is written in a menu in a restaurant.

Due to globalization and modernization, English is gaining its importance in the linguistic landscape. As stated by Backhaus (2006) about his study in Tokyo that English presence in the visual scenery of the street is increasing since it has

prestige. As a result, English becomes part of everyday Japanese life. Huebner (2006) also mentioned the same thing about the English language in his study in Bangkok. English has influenced the development of Thai language system which displayed on signs. Thus, English does not only influence the world's spoken language but also the written language.

#### **B.1.5 Bottom-up & Top-down**

The terms top-down and bottom-up are used to distinguish the signs written by the authority and what written by the citizens. However, there are other terms, 'in vitro' and 'in vivo', which proposed by Calvet (1990), which have the same definition with top-down and bottom-up, respectively (Backhaus: 2006).

Top-down signs are official signs provided by the government. It also stated by Gorter and Cenoz (2007) that "Top-down signs are 'government' signs". The signs are public or as the facilities such as road signs, building names which belongs to governmental institution, street names. Meanwhile, bottom-up signs are non-governmental signs which belong to individual social actors or certain company (Ben-Rafael et. al: 2006). The sign is private and the characters are varied based on the owner of the company. So Top-down and bottom-up are the other terms of official and non-official which used to differentiate the category of the signs (Backhaus: 2007) The examples of bottom-up signs are names of shops, signs on businesses, private offices and personal announcements.

<i>Category</i>	<i>Type of item</i>
Top-down	Public institutions: religious, governmental, municipal, cultural and educational, medical
	Public signs on general interest
	Public announcements
	Signs of street names
Bottom-up	Shop signs: clothing, food jewelry
	Private business signs: offices, factories, agencies
	Private announcements: 'wanted' ads, sale or rentals of flat or cars

Masanung in Hendrastuti (2015) also explains that public sites are any places used for public purposes such as parks, markets, streets, public transportation facilities, and museums. However, there are some public facilities organized by the government in these selected areas, so they belong to official signs or top-down.

#### **B.1.6 Monolingual and bilingual sign**

According to Backhaus (2006), one of the important considerations of data collection is to distinguish between monolingual and multilingual signs. Whereas, the types of the sign are divided into two; those are monolingual sign, and bilingual sign. A monolingual sign is a sign which displays one language only; it can be Bulgarian only, English only or Indonesian. Meanwhile, in a bilingual

sign, there are two languages displayed. The possible displayed languages on a bilingual sign in this research are Indonesian – English and Bulgarian – English. On the other side, translation might be included in bilingual sign, so Reh (2004, in Backhaus: 2006) distinguished four types of multilingual information arrangement, those are; (1) duplicating, (2) fragmentary, (3) overlapping and (4) complimentary.

#### **B.1.7 Language and Script in Order of Appearance**

Language and script in order of appearance deals with the positioning of the language and the script displayed on the sign. Edelman (2010) states that language in order of appearance is based on Scollon and Scollon's (2003) code preference system. Their code is mostly applied to official sign since the sign displays the language in a certain pattern and style.

There are two kinds of code applied, preferred code and marginal code, which called as secondary code by Edelman, mean the text on top of the sign uses larger font and the text in the bottom of sign displayed in smaller font (Weber and Horner: 2012). The preferred code is located on the left and the marginal code is the right side if it is aligned horizontally. It is aligned vertically, the preferred code is placed above the secondary code. meanwhile, if the preferred code is in the middle while the secondary is placed on the margins, so it is not taken into account in the coding.

### **B.1.8 Translation in Bilingual sign**

Translation in the signs possibly occurs in linguistic landscape, particularly in bilingual or multilingual signs. To make the readers understand the signs which delivered by foreign language, translation is one of the best ways to deliver the information accurately. Backhaus (2006) also discussed translation which used as one of an arrangement of the information. In his research, he employs Reh's (2004) four types of multilingual information arrangement: (1) duplicating, (2) fragmentary, (3) overlapping, and (4) complimentary. The explanation of Reh's (2004) four terms are as follows:

1. Duplicating: the same text is written in more than one language. The purpose of which is to make the target who is monolingual understand the text.
2. Fragmentary: the information is written in one language but there are some certain words which are translated into another language. By doing so, the reader will focus on the translated word or it will help the reader to understand the point of the text.
3. Overlapping: in this case, there are two text which written in different languages either they contain similar and/or one of which gives additional information.
4. Complementary: the text is displayed in multiple languages. The readers have to master all of the language used in the text to understand the

information. However, it will make a problem for a monolingual person to access the information clearly and completely.

Another researcher, Philibane (2014), uses translation studies as an approach in his research in the linguistic landscape. It is mentioned in his research that translation recognized by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1995) and Veniti (2004) is divided into two groups: (1) direct translation technique and oblique technique. However, there are more translation strategies under those two main strategies. Literal or direct translation, calque as well as borrowing are three translation strategies which belonged to direct translation technique. Meanwhile, there four technique which exist under oblique technique: modulation, transposition, equivalence, and adaptation (Philibane: 2014).

## **B.2 Review of Related Researches**

There are several researches related to this research. They are researches which have similarities in some aspects such as topic, discussion, place, etc.

The first research was done by Krusteva (2017) entitled "Exploring Linguistic Landscape in the Sofia Subway: Public Signs and Language Policy". Her research discusses the changes in the linguistic landscape of Sofia's subway, including the use of English translation of the text and names and how it is written in Cyrillic script. The data of this research are not only signs around the subway but also the audio recording from the Sofia subway.

The researcher focusses on how Bulgarian language is translated into English and how it is written in Latin script. The finding shows that there are

some inaccurate translation in English and mistakes in writing English words. The researcher also finds out that the Sofia subway is a bilingual area with regards to the signs and voice recording produced by the metropolitan. She explains that the authority does not pay attention to the language policy which leads to incorrect translation. However, the use of bilingual language on signs in the Sofia subway shows the desire to make Sofia to become more international.

The second related research is done by Reyes (2014) entitled "Language of 'order': English in the Linguistic Landscape in the two Major Train Station in the Philippines. His research examines top-down and bottom-up signs using Ben Rafael et al.'s (2006) notion.

The data of his research are 76 signs found in the two stations. The finding shows that the main languages displayed on the signs are English and Filipino. In the case of monolingual signs, English is more dominant than Filipino. English is also more dominant on bilingual signs than Filipino and has more preferential writing such as capitalizing, circling, underlining.

The third research was done by Agustina Tri Widiastuti entitled "linguistic landscape: multilingualism and the minority in town". It is adequate interesting since one of the objects of the research is located in the same city, it is Jendral Sudirman Street. The difference is her research focusses on linguistic landscape in a main street in two towns, Cilacap and Purwokerto. It is comparing the linguistic landscape in those two towns.

The result shows that the linguistic landscape in Cilacap is dominated by Indonesian, both bottom-up and top-down signs with the total amount of 61.16% and 75.28% respectively. Indonesian is also dominant in Purwokerto where it is displayed on 51.66% of bottom-up signs and 87.2% of top-down signs. However, English is quite an important language to be displayed on the signs which can attract people to visit the cities and considered a prestigious language. Meanwhile, the local language becomes the minority language used on signs in Cilacap and Purwokerto, it is only 2.05% and 2.4% respectively.

The fourth related research was done by Nataliya Aristova entitled “English Translation in the Urban Linguistic Landscape as a Marker of an Emerging Global City: the Case of Kazan, Russia”. The data of the research were eight spires of business activity and company names.

The result shows that due to the introduction of English into linguistic landscape in Kazan and the mindset of the inhabitants, diverse and at times inconsistent linguistic landscape involving Russian, Tatar and English reflect the transition from a strictly bilingual linguistic environment to more global multilingual one. Though it is still an ongoing process, English translation and English vocabulary influence the national identities of the local population of Kazan in creating global urban environments.

The fifth related research was done by Elena B. Grishaeva and the title is “Linguistic Landscape of the City of Krasnoyarsk”. The data of the research were taken from centered public spaces downtown, business areas and spots of

entertainment in the city of Krasnoyarsk. The researcher also gave questions to twenty students of the institute of economics, management and environmental studies of the Siberian Federal University.

The result of the research shows that Krasnoyarsk is a monolingual city where the area is dominated by the Russian population. However, due to the marketing revolution, the linguistic landscape of Krasnoyarsk is far being trivial. Ironically, English is on the front stage of the linguistic portraying and decorating the residential and commercial facades. It shows that the immunity to foreign languages, particularly English, does not save the city of Krasnoyarsk of the worldwide geopolitical trends.

The sixth research was done by Backhaus (2006) entitled "Multilingualism in Tokyo: A look into the linguistic Landscape". The research focused on multilingualism in Tokyo. The research gave special attention to the distinction between official and non-official multilingual signs in which it demonstrated that the two types of the signs exhibit some essentially different characteristics concerning the languages contained and their arrangement on a sign.

The counted signs that collected by Backhaus (2006) were 2321 signs. Almost three-quarters of the signs are non-official signs; 1731 signs or 74.6%, whereas the official signs are only 590 signs or 25.4% of the total number of the signs. From 590 official signs, the English language has the highest number displayed on it with 587 signs (99.5%). Japanese as the state language is in the

second place with 574 signs (97.3%) while the other languages which displayed on official signs are Chinese and Korean.

Meanwhile, for non-official signs, again, it dominated by English and Japanese with 1679 signs (97%) and 1100 signs (63.5%), respectively. The other languages displayed on non-official signs are Thai, Italian, Persian, Tagalog, German, Arabic, and Russian.

The result of the research shows that official agents have started providing for signs in English and, to a certain degree, Chinese and Korean beside Japanese as the language of power. The number of the use of foreign languages also adequate high since the use of which on non-official signs is mainly motivated by a desire to create an overseas atmosphere, even if there is no direct link to the world outside Japan.

The seventh related research was done by Zakiyatul Fakhroh and Zuliati Rohmah (2018) entitled "linguistic landscape of Sidoarjo city". Their research discusses the visible language on top-down and bottom-up signs in Sidoarjo. The result shows that the Indonesian language dominates the signs of the city. There are also found foreign languages such as English, Arabic and other Asian languages. However, the English language becomes the prominent one among others. Ironically, the local language, Javanese is displayed in very limited signs.

The eighth related research was done by Svehana S. Takhtarova et. Al (2015) entitled " The Role of English in Shaping The Linguistic Landscape of Paris, Berlin and Kazan". The research shows that globalization gives a significant effect

on the linguistic landscape in which the use of English is increasing. It is reflected from the use of the English word as the name of shop and cafes. The English translation and language mixing on signs also indicate that the English language has an important role in the linguistic landscape of the cities.

The ninth related research was done by Nurenza Yannuar and Sri Endah Tabiati (2016) entitled "Public Signs in the City of Malang: A Study of the Linguistic Landscape of Indonesia. The selected areas of the research cover the old parts of the city, including the big market of Malang and the center of the city, and the new parts of the city, it covers Soekarno-Hatta street and Veteran street. The result shows that most signs in the old parts of the city display the Indonesian language, while the English language is dominant in the new parts of the city. However, the dominance of both languages gives a negative effect on the local language since Javanese has no space in the linguistic landscape of Malang.

Those related researches were done in European cities and Asian cities. The selection of related researches was chosen to provide an overview of the linguistic landscape in different cities. Some of them also compare cities, only the cities are located in the same area or the same country. This research compares the linguistic landscape in two different cities in two different countries. This research tries to reveal the differences and the similarities of European city and Asian city using linguistic landscape as the perspective.