

**CAPTURING THE LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE OF TWO  
ISLAMIC UNIVERSITIES IN EAST JAVA: UIN SUNAN  
AMPEL SURABAYA AND UIN MAULANA MALIK IBRAHIM  
MALANG**

**THESIS**



**BY:**

**LAILLY WIJIATI RAHMATUL ULLA**

**REG. NUMBER: A73215105**

**ENGLISH DEPARTMENT  
FACULTY OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES  
STATE OF ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY SUNAN AMPEL  
SURABAYA**

**2019**

## DECLARATION

I am the undersigned below :

Name : Lailly Wijati Rahmatul Ulla  
Reg. Number : A73215105  
Department : English Department  
Faculty : Arts and Humanities

truly state that the thesis I wrote is my original work and not a plagiarism / fabrication in part of in whole.

If in the future it is proven that this thesis results from plagiarism / fabrication, either in part of in full, then I am willing to accept sanctions for such actions in accordance with the applicable provisions.

Surabaya, September 12<sup>th</sup> 2019

Who make the statement



Lailly Wijati Rahmatul Ulla

## APPROVAL SHEET

CAPTURING THE LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE OF TWO ISLAMIC  
UNIVERSITIES IN EAST JAVA: UIN SUNAN AMPEL SURABAYA AND  
UIN MAULANA MALIK IBRAHIM MALANG

by

Lailly Wijati Rahmatul Ulla

Reg.Number: A73215105

Approved to be examined by the Board of Examiners, English Department,  
Faculty of Arts and Humanities, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya

Surabaya, July 23<sup>rd</sup> 2019

Thesis Advisor



Prof. Dr. Hj. Zuliati Rohmah, M. Pd.  
NIP. 197303032000032001

Acknowledged by:

The Head of English Department



Dr. Wahyu Kusumajanti, M. Hum.  
NIP. 197002051999032002

This thesis has been approved and accepted by the Board of Examiners, English Department, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, State Islamic University Sunan Ampel Surabaya, on September 26<sup>th</sup>, 2019

**The Board of Examiners are:**

**Examiner I**



**Prof. Dr. Hj. Zuliati Rohmah, M. Pd.**

**NIP. 197303032000032001**

**Examiner II**



**Dr. Mohammad Kurjum, M. Ag.**

**NIP. 196909251994031002**

**Examiner III**



**Dr. A. Dzul Milal, M. Pd.**

**NIP. 196005152000031002**

**Examiner IV**



**Murni Fidivanti, M. A.**

**NIP. 198305302011012011**

**Acknowledge by:**

**The Dean of Faculty of Arts and Humanities  
UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya**



**Dr. H. Agus Aditoni, M.Ag.**

**NIP. 196210021992031001**



**KEMENTERIAN AGAMA**  
**UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI SUNAN AMPEL SURABAYA**  
**PERPUSTAKAAN**

Jl. Jend. A. Yani 117 Surabaya 60237 Telp. 031-8431972 Fax.031-8413300  
E-Mail: [perpus@uinsby.ac.id](mailto:perpus@uinsby.ac.id)

---

LEMBAR PERNYATAAN PERSETUJUAN PUBLIKASI  
KARYA ILMIAH UNTUK KEPENTINGAN AKADEMIS

Sebagai sivitas akademika UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, yang bertanda tangan di bawah ini, saya:

Nama : LAILLY WIJIATI RAHMATUL ULLA  
NIM : A73215105  
Fakultas/Jurusan : SASTRA INGGRIS/ ADAB DAN HUMANIORA  
E-mail address : laillyulla97@gmail.com

Demi pengembangan ilmu pengetahuan, menyetujui untuk memberikan kepada Perpustakaan UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, Hak Bebas Royalti Non-Eksklusif atas karya ilmiah :

Sekripsi     Tesis     Desertasi     Lain-lain (.....)

yang berjudul :

CAPTURING LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE OF TWO ISLAMIC UNIVERSITIES IN

EAST JAVA : UIN SUNAN AMPEL SURABAYA AND UIN MALIK IBRAHIM MALANG

---

beserta perangkat yang diperlukan (bila ada). Dengan Hak Bebas Royalti Non-Eksklusif ini Perpustakaan UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya berhak menyimpan, mengalih-media/format-kan, mengelolanya dalam bentuk pangkalan data (database), mendistribusikannya, dan menampilkan/mempublikasikannya di Internet atau media lain secara *fulltext* untuk kepentingan akademis tanpa perlu meminta ijin dari saya selama tetap mencantumkan nama saya sebagai penulis/pencipta dan atau penerbit yang bersangkutan.

Saya bersedia untuk menanggung secara pribadi, tanpa melibatkan pihak Perpustakaan UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, segala bentuk tuntutan hukum yang timbul atas pelanggaran Hak Cipta dalam karya ilmiah saya ini.

Demikian pernyataan ini yang saya buat dengan sebenarnya.

Surabaya, 10 Oktober 2019

Penulis



( Lailly Wijiati Rahmatul Ulla )  
*nama terang dan tanda tangan*

















C., Lamarre, P., & Armand, F.; 2014) and universities (Haynes, 2012). Cenoz and Gorter (2008) have pointed the role of linguistic landscape as language input device of second language acquisition to pupil. They find out potential usage of linguistic landscape through the functions of English language on commercial signs. Since then, several studies start their focus on pedagogical applications of linguistic landscape.

With the increasing interest in public places signage, the research about linguistic landscape is also easily found in many part of the world. Some regions where the researches have conducted linguistic study are, for instances, in Asia (Wang, 2015; Backhaus, 2006; Rowland, 2013; Curtin, 2014, Lawrence, 2012), Europe (Calvet, 1990; Shohamy, 2010; Trumper, 2009; Lanza, 2009; Leung, 2012; Poveda, 2012), and Southeast Asia (Tan, 2014; Tang, 2016; Huebner, 2016; Siricharoen, 2016; Shang, 2017; Coluzzi, 2017).

In Indonesia, there have been also some researches of linguistic landscape studies conducted by some researchers. Unfortunately, the main focuses of the previous researches are dominated by the context of tourism and cityscape only. The study of LL that investigates educational area is still considered to be very rare in Indonesia.

Places such as school, boarding school, and university should also be investigated. Education places have a big role in enhancing students' language awareness and perception toward globalization. Siricharoen (2016) states that raising language awareness can be done by letting the students to be exposed to authentic contexts in foreign language and make them conscious of linguistic

strategies of their landscape. Therefore, by this study, the researcher wants to follow Siricharoen's suggestion in conducting linguistic landscape in education settings.

In Indonesia, the number of the official published research of LL in educational setting in Indonesia is only two titles that can be found at the moments. They are conducted by Auliasari (2019) and Firdausiyah (2019).

The recent study of LL conducted in education settings have been done by Auliasari (2019). The researcher investigates the LL of private and state school of Surabaya by applying the theory of Spolsky and Cooper. The study analyzes the linguistic landscape according to the language used in the sign and the function of the sign. The instrument observation and interview are used in the research. The results of the research show that the kinds of the languages that is used in the school, the types of LL categorization sign and the function of the LL in the school. However, the researcher is only focused on the physical and the political dimension of LL.

The other study of LL held in educational area has been done by Firdausiyah (2019). The study takes place in Pondok Pesantren Putri Mambaus Sholihin Gresik. The research explores three research questions about how the languages are displayed, what are the categories of the sign and how the signs are constructed. The research concludes that the displayed languages in the sites are English, Indonesia, and Javanese. There are six kinds of signs in the area and the function of the sign is not only as pedagogical tool but also to remind the students, to build language environment and to create aesthetic values. Nevertheless, the

clear distinction of the sign maker either top-down or bottom-up from the sign is vague.

The present study tries to fill in the gaps of the previous LL research in educational settings area by taking different site. Therefore, to enrich the perspective of LL in educational context in Indonesia the researcher chooses different angle in exploring the LL related to education area. The chosen site of the study will be university.

Universities have a big role as institutes settings which applying the functioning society that should be valued (Haynes, 2012). Universities are educational institutions that have both educational and occupational perspectives, they are where knowledge is invented, exchange and disseminated, and are workplaces for staff and students. University setting is an important area due to its influence roles on society (Yavari, 2012) and employment (Shohany and Abu Ghazaleh Mahajneh, 2012). Furthermore, the research of linguistic landscape conducted in Indonesia by focusing educational sites or pedagogy potential is still relatively rare.

The present study take an analysis in research construction that has not been investigated by other linguistic landscape researchers in Indonesia. First, the researcher will use comparative design to explore the language environment of two Islamic campus in Indonesia asrepresentatives. Second, the theory that will be used is three-dimensional theory which means the policy, the signage, as well as the sign-reader's feedback will be investigated. Comparing two sites of university

and analyzing three aspects of linguistic landscape in one research is never done by Indonesian previous linguistic landscape researchers in Indonesia.

Comparing two universities' linguistic landscape has been done by Sonia Yavari in her thesis entitled *Linguistic Landscape and Language Policies: A Comparative Study of Linköping University and ETH Zurich*. She chooses the mentioned universities because both of them are the house of many international students; it is likely that the national languages are not the only languages found in the linguistic landscape. Therefore, the multilingualism and students background is rich by diversity. From the study, it is found out that at both universities, the dominant language is the national language (Swedish at LiU and German at ZTH), and English has the second position. Yavari concludes that defining a unified policy from both campus from different country, Switzerland and Germany, even its university is not possible. However, the study is only investigated around the relationship between linguistic landscape (LL) and language policy in both campuses.

Analyzing by using three-dimensional space design in Kyushu University's linguistic landscape has been conducted by Jing-Jing Wang in 2015 report entitled *Linguistic Landscape on Campus in Japan—A Case Study of Signs in Kyushu University*. He investigates Ito campus of Kyushu University from its language policy, language sign, and language perception by students. The investigation to analyzed the campus language policy is done by compelling document or formal written book that governs language policy in campus. The language sign was divided through the types of the multilingualism to



monolingualism of the public board, and the perception is collected by questionnaire. Japan eventhough does not have regulation or law written in governing language in public, the government –starts from entertainment to education side, has pushed a great effort to potray internationalization in Japan landscape. It is found out that on Ito campus of Kyushu University, bilingual Japanese-English signs compose the majority of the formation of campus signs, with Japanesse language used as the dominant language. The results from the questionnaire is known that in academic life, students value bilingual ability a lot; in the daily life, students maintain multilingual contact to a certain degree.

However, Wang only focuses on public sign (top-down) as the reference for Trumper-Hecht's theory in physical dimension and neglects the private sign (bottom-up). Szabo et al (2012) in Yavari (2012) states that even though a distinction is usually made between top-down and bottom-up signs, both play their part together in making the overall image of LL. Therefore, to evaluate the manifestation of certain policy, bottom-up signage should not be ignored since the sign also plays particular part in linguistic landscape phenomena.

The present study aims at filling in the gaps by previous researches in Indonesia by investigating the aspects of linguistic landscape in educational site particularly in university area. The theory of three-dimensional study would also be differentiated from Wang's (2015) study. Since Wang has neglected the bottom-up sign in the previous research, the present research will try to potray the landscape of top-down and bottom-up signage as well. As Szabo et al (2012) has said that even though a distinction is made between top-down and bottom-up









linguistic landscapes (Backhaus, 2007; Rafael et al, 2006; Laundry and Bourhis, 1997), other researchers have focused on people's relationships with linguistic landscapes, examining issues related to the creation of signs, the perception of signs, and the experience of being in a particular landscape (Wang, 2015).

Exploring linguistic landscape in educational setting is as important as exploring linguistic landscape in certain town. Since the language-sign can convey many complicated things from a hidden agenda to a language awareness, the results can also significantly contribute to an evaluation of certain area in the aspect of multilingualism and globalization. As Haynes (2012) has stated on his thesis, that the linguistic landscape study should be conducted wholly in order to know the language environment deeply.

## **2.2 SIGN MAKER**

Identifying the sign maker is one of important aspect in LL. By identifying the sign-maker researcher will be able to indirectly reveal many things between different sign-makers (Huebner, 2009). Apparently, there are many terms used to differentiate the sign maker based on previous researchers but mostly they are distinguished between two categories, "private & public" (Shohamy, Ben-Rafael & Barni, 2010), "top-down & bottom-up" (Ben-Rafael, Shohamy, Trumper Hect, 2006), "official & non-official" (Backhaus, 2006), or "private & public" (Landry and Bourhis, 1997). In this thesis, the author will use the categorization LL sign maker by Ben-Rafael that is top-down and bottom-up.







landscape to the visual aspect of space that may change in different social context accordingly with the features of that society (Trumper-Hecht, 2010). The study brings linguistic landscape research into the field of multilingual campuses to see the stimulation of globalization (Wang, 2015).

Trumper-Hecht (2010) develops three dimension of space proffered by Lefebvre in *The Production of Space* (1991) and explains that the spatial-practice can be seen as: political dimension, physical dimension, and experiential dimension. This theory covers the entire aspect of what and who is involved in language environment in certain settings.

### **2.3.1 PHYSICAL DIMENSION**

Spatial-practice or be seen as physical dimension of language space is the one sign the demonstrates the actual distribution of languages used on signs (Trumper-Hecht, 2010). The physical sign in linguistic landscape is divided as public sign (top-down) and private sign (bottom-up) (Rafael, 2006).

Shohamy states that top-down and bottom-up are differentiated by the used languages in the public places (2006). Top-down signages links with the authorities of languages preference, bottom-up signs shows whether the preference is accepted and implemented by general population (Puzey, 2012). Ben Rafael (2009) puts the distinction between top-down and bottom-up in clear way, that they are differentiated by the actor who makes it. Top-down signs serve official policies meanwhile bottom-up signs are designed much more freely (Rafael, 2009).

### **2.3.2 POLITICAL DIMENSION**

Political dimension or be called as conceived space by Trumper-Hecht's (2010) theory means the policy that reflects views and ideologies held by different policy makers whose policies mold the linguistic landscape. The policy that will be examined through is the policy in creating the public sign. Even though the language policy plays the big role in creating tool to promote the foreign and national language, the researcher will separate the policy in general language management and the process of creating public sign.

### **2.3.3 EXPERENTIAL DIMENSION**

The lived-space theory or often be called as experiential dimension explained by Trumper-Hecht as the dimension that presents the attitudes of inhabitants (2010). This means that experiential dimension is any feedback from the sign-reader to the signage, it could be attitude or perception. Here, the research focuses on the feedback in form of attitude.

Allport (1935) in Garret (2010) claims that attitude is the most indispensable concept in social psychology. Thurstone (1931) in Garret (2010) defines an attitude as affect for or against a psychological object. It deals with the condition of what people think, feel and like to do toward a person or an object in certain situations. Since 1996, the work on attitudes has become the core concept of sociolinguistics. It is marked by Labov's research about language changes by the prestige and the stigma or "language attitude" afforded by speech community. Language attitudes are distinguished from other forms of attitudes due to the fact that they are precisely about attitude toward language. Richard (1992) defines

language attitude as the attitude which speakers of different languages or language varieties have toward each others' language or to their own language. Language attitude people's belief in a language and language object, which make people react in a certain way; positive attitude or negative attitude.

A positive attitude is defined as the attitude of enthusiasm for the use of language (Garin & Mathiot, 1986 in Chaer & Agustina, 2004). Moreover, Garvin and & Mathiot (1968) also states that positive attitude toward particular languages are said to work as language loyalty, language pride, and awareness of language norms. Language loyalty triggers and encourages the society to maintain the existence of their language. Language pride influences the community to develop the language and to use it as their identity and unity of society. Awareness of language norms motivate the society to use the language appropriately and correctly.

Conversely, negative attitude toward a language can be defined as a rejection, indignity, and unawareness toward the language. Related to the characterisitc proposed by Garvin and Mathiot (1968), negative attitude is characterized as the absence of language loyalty, language pride as well as awareness of language norms.



signs that have written form only. The researcher captured any sign in the universities both public-signage (the signs which are created by official staff of the campus, such as; building name, road sign, etc) and private-signage (the signs which are created by the students of the campus, such as; event flyer, poetry hung in magazine wall, etc) by mobile phone camera. Therefore, the data were stored in .jpg formats.

The second data were qualitative data. Therefore, the data were served in form of words. The researcher looked for some informations in regard to universities' regulation that has the authority to manage the public signage. The researcher did interview to some people that has authority in creating public sign in both universities.

The third data were taken from the questionnaires filled by the respondents. The data answered the third research question which is about students' language-in-sign attitude. The data were served in numeric data and charts since the data were considered to be quantitative. There are two kinds of questionnaires.

The source of data that was taken for this research were some buildings and area in UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim and UIN Sunan Ampel. According to Haynes (2012) the selected building for linguistic landscape appropriately taken from buildings with different purpose. In addition, Yavari (2012) conducted the research by selecting the campus area that has bigger number of students in scale. In the present research, the researcher combined both method from Yavari (2012) and Haynes (2012). The researcher selected the campus area of UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim and UIN Sunan Ampel for the undergraduate students. Then, the

data source were shrunken into some buildings only as Haynes (2012) has suggested to purposefully pick buildings with different purposes. Therefore, the present research purposefully picked the following department buildings; Arts and Humanities Faculty, Tarbiyah Faculty, Sharia and Law Faculty, Science and Technology Faculty, and Economic Faculty.

The reason arts humanities, tarbiyah, sharia, science, and economics faculty are chosen by the researcher to shrink the different buildings between UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim and UIN Sunan Ampel. The chosen faculties listed above are the faculty buildings which both universities have in common. The students of mentioned department are more pushed to be able to adapt and to involve in such multi-race and multi-culture setting.

### **3.3 RESEARCH INSTRUMENT**

In conducting the research, there were three instruments used to answer different research questions. The first instrument was observation. The researcher observed the public and private signage in the campus and take photograph as data. As Hult (2009) states that linguistic landscape study is based on taking photographs from the relevant source. Observation was needed to know whether the language-maker's policy is accepted by the whole population, or there will be another notion of language-policy by different actors.

The second instrument was interview. The researcher did semi-structured interview to several Islamic university authorities in order to know the universities' policy of language. When doing the structured-interview, the researcher also did audio-recording as main instrument and field-note as secondary instrument. To





































It is quite clear that among the three languages, Indonesia (88.9%) language still sets on the most frequent language to be seen in public sign in many faculties building. The second language that appears most in public sign is English (4.8%). In addition, the comparison number of the photographed sign is quite far 240:13. Meanwhile, Arabic placed in the third position with the very least signage to be found in monolingual Arabic sign (0.7%).

It shows that in every faculty, the monolingual sign mostly used is Indonesia. This phenomenon could be happening because of the lack of language policy does not set in the area. Therefore, the language-in-use found is also merely using Indonesia because the aim of public signage for the students, lecturer, and staff is only based on clarity rather than expanding the globalizing the campus landscape.

When entering a language Department, one may expect to see many guidance, instruction, newsletter, or etc to be written in English/Arabic, particularly in UINSA where *ilahiyyat* and human/natural sciences are taught. The globalized environment is expected to be sensed by students whose university aims to have a position in the international academic community. However, seen by the small landscape of Arts and Humanities Department, where the English Department and Arabic Department take place, the instructions are still mostly written in monolingual form, mainly in Indonesia language.

#### **4.1.1.1.2 Bottom-Up Sign in UINSA**

In the following paragraphs, the quantitative findings from bottom-up signage analysis will be examined. The creation of signage within a certain space







followed by Indonesia-Arabic combination (0.84%) and have zero sign in English-Arabic combination (0%).

It shows that combining two languages in UINSA bottom-up signage is not quite popular. Despite the combination of Indonesia-English sign takes the highest number within bilingual signs (4.23%), the comparison signs between bilingual sign and monolingual sign are quite significant (112 signs to 6 signs). Therefore, in bottom-up signage, the monolingual signs still become the dominant sign produced by the lower authorities of campus.

Among the total number of bottom-up signage, the monolingual signs produced by the students are strongly dominant. The five faculties (Arts and Humanities, Education Faculty, Sharia, Science and Technology, and Islamic Economics) gathered 118 total numbers of bottom-up signs and 112 out of 118 depict the appearance of monolingual signs. In addition, the table also shows the popularity in using language within monolingual signs either in Indonesia, Arabic or English. Indonesia as monolingual signs are still dominating the list with 84 signs (71.1%), followed by English with 23 signs (19.4%) and the least is Arabic with 5 signs (4.23%).

To see Bahasa Indonesia still takes the dominant position in top-down and bottom-up signage is understandable since many parties consider the aims of the sign to reach clarity. Indonesia is mainly used in official and unofficial signs on the campus as the mother language. The usage of Bahasa Indonesia language will deliver the intention of the message more precisely rather than in another language.



Referring to the chart, the appearance of monolingual signs among five buildings is still dominating. The percentages of monolingual signs are varying from the least (62%) in Arts and Humanities Faculty to the most (95.20%) in Shariah Faculty. Meanwhile, the presence of bilingual signs is quite impressive within the taken five buildings considering the high percentage in Arts and Humanities the bilingual signs reached (31.00%). Meanwhile, in Tarbiyah Faculty they are (26.80%), followed by Islamic Economics in (9%) percentage, Science Technology in (4%) percentage, and Sharia Faculty with the least appearance of bilingual signs in (2.40%) percentage.

It is interesting to note that Arts and Humanities Faculty in UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang has the least percentage of monolingual signs (69%) and the highest chart in bilingual signs (31%) but has no multilingual signs at all among the five faculties. Meanwhile, in other faculties, the multilingual signs are still able to find even though the percentage of signs are quite low.

Even though the percentage is showing in a maximum score of one hundred percent, the raw data taken from a photograph of each Faculty is varying in number. Arts and Humanities have 58 data, the Education Department has 26 data, Sharia has 42 data, Islamic Economy has 65 data, and Science Technology has 335 data. The difference can happen because the width of the faculty area is different from one to another. Science and Technology Faculty and Arts and Humanity Faculty have the whole building as their own Faculty. Meanwhile, Economics, Sharia, and Tarbiyah share the same single building.

















The process of creating public sign shows the empirical language policy within the campus. To get further knowledge about the public sign creating process, the researcher interviewed the chief of General Subdivision in UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang who manages the process of creating the public sign.

In UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, the multilingual signs are quite easy to be found. Judging by the whole faculties building, they are all written in multilingual sign. However, the advancement of these public signs management is started when the title of a *world-class university* is desired. The head of the university has directly made a policy to raise the language environment on campus starts from upgrading the public signage. This regulation also can be found in university documents related to aiming the *world-class university* policies. Therefore, UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim has the formal written policy in regulating the language used in public signs.

In the process of creating the public sign, the General Subdivision team is responsible to manage the whole process in creating the public sign. Since the command has been received by the chief of General Subdivision, the whole public signs production on the campus is centered to General Subdivision. General Subdivision team will create and decide the sign, later the sign will be distributed to each Faculty.

Even though the regulation of language used in public sign in UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim is centered to General Subdivision's guardpost, the faculties still have the privilege to develop the signage in their area. For example,

adding additional information related to departments' policy, events, etc. are still acceptable.

To sum up, the process of creating a public sign in UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim is centered to General Subdivision's management. In the process of distributing the sign, the General Subdivision will create, manage, and design the sign. Later, the created sign will be distributed to other faculties. However, the faculties still have the privilege to create a further sign to announce further notice related to the department's events, lecturing class, and etc.

Briefly speaking, both UIN Sunan Ampel and UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim put effort in training their students' language competence. It is shown that both universities have the same policy in necessitating their students to follow the intensive language training and requiring language proficiency test as graduate qualifications. However, the systems applied in both campuses are different UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim is rather strict to their students language training schedule. Furthermore, they have specific language day where the students and the staff are obligated to speak in the agreed language. On Tuesday and Wednesday the students and the staffs must try to speak in English meanwhile on Thursday and Friday is Arabic. Furthermore, UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim also has other foreign language recently added in the university class that is Mandarin.

The other difference part is the process of creating public sign. Both campus have different method in managing their public signs. In UIN Sunan Ampel, the environment of campus is handled by the General Subdivision. Meanwhile in smaller scope, the faculty staffs are freely given the rights to control





The first question asked in the questionnaire was whether the respondents put attention to any public signs shown in UINSA. According to the interval score of Likert Scale, 60%-79.9% is considered as 'important'. Therefore, based on the context from Q1 it shows that mostly the students 'aware' the presence of language signs.

Meanwhile, in the Q2, the question is heavily weighted on the students' ideas about the importance of adding multilingualism signage. The results of the response (80%) show the strong agreement of the respondents in regard to multilingualism signage. In the next following question of the questionnaire, the researcher asked specifically about the student's perception toward particular foreign languages commonly used in Islamic Universities area. Therefore, the Q3 and Q4 asked their agreement in adding English and Arabic to the campus signage. The charts show a decent agreement toward both languages.

When asking the students' attitude toward the English language added in public signage (Q3) the respondent's responses in (76%) agreement, meanwhile toward the Arabic language (71%). As the results show, the students put great willingness in seeing multilingualism signage on the campus. The strongly agree responses can be seen in the last question (Q5) in asking the importance of setting the public signage in the multilingual sign.

In conclusion, it is clear to imply that the students of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya have a high awareness of the importance of multilingual signage to put in the campus. From all provided questions, the responses gathered are mostly agreed to strongly agree related to the idea of putting foreign languages in public



signage. Particularly when the question is specified into English and Arabic language, the dominant responses have a positive attitude toward the language. However, the students do not only aware of multilingualism demand but also the importance to conserve Indonesia as the mother language despite the necessity to learn a foreign language on the campus.

At the end of the questionnaire section, the researcher added an open-ended question to ask whether the respondent has further comments in regard to the public signage on the campus. However, the section is freely decided to be filled or not. There are variant responses getting from the students in expressing their thoughts. Most of them are supporting the multilingual signs to welcome the globalization environment. But there is also one of the responses expressing the concerns related to preserving Indonesia language dignity;

*‘The existence of foreign language in public places is quite important, especially in UINSA, a campus where the international students or guests are welcomed. But, maintaining the Indonesian language in public places is important as well. Therefore, cultural and nationalism value will not disappear due to the existence of foreign language usage.’*

#### **4.1.3.2 UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim**

In this part, the research tries to portray the students’ attitude as sign reader toward language used in top-down signage in UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim.



The third question is asking the students perception toward English to be used as public signage. The bar demonstrates 73% of students agree to use English in campus signage. Having 73% in agree terms depicts the positive attitude of the students toward English signage.

Next, the fourth question is raising the question about students' perception toward the Arabic language put on public signage. The chart shows that more than 50% of the students agree to use Arabic in public signage. It implies the students have a positive attitude toward public signage using the Arabic language.

The fifth question is requesting the students' opinion about campus signage whose more than one language. The result confirms the students' positive attitude about the multilingual sign. The percentage shows the highest number 77% among other questions responses.

Last, the open-ended question was given in the last paragraph of the questionnaire. The question asks whether the students have a further opinion about multilingual signs. However, the question is free decided to be filled or not by the respondents. From the gathered responses, the students are showing support in improving the number and the variant of existent multilingual signs by adding other translation and placing them in more specific area. The students are also showing eagerness in learning the language through written environment.

To sum up, both of the campuses public signs are receiving positive responses from the students. The overall responses in percentage appear above than 60% which implies an agree response toward the question given. The students are aware the importance and the benefits in multilingual public signs,



note that both universities have similar order of language preference. UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim and UIN Sunan Ampel have Bahasa Indonesia as the most used language in signage, English is placed at the second place and the last rank is placed Arabic. Therefore, according to the data, the dominant language choice that is chosen by the campus is pointed to Bahasa Indonesia.

Moreover, this result goes along with Miller (2000)'s statement said that the language and identity are inseparable. Bahasa Indonesia comes up as the most used language in sign proves that both universities desire to show the identity as Indonesian rather than shows other identities through foreign language. This result is also relevant to the previous research by Gorter (2013), that LL preserves to have multitude information including language choices, powerful and powerless ideology and etc from a merely visual sign appears within the territory. Thus, by investigating the UIN Sunan Ampel's and UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim's dominants language-use in top-down signs, one can evoke the language preference of the campus authorities

The next first point that we need to discuss is the bottom-up sign version of both campuses. The results of the research show that the bottom-up signs of both universities show similarities in prioritizing Bahasa Indonesia in the signage. Thus, Bahasa Indonesia comes up as the most dominant language. Seeing by the percentage, it shows that UIN Sunan Ampel has 71.1% percentage of Bahasa Indonesia signage and UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim has 51.1%. The order of the language appeared in bottom-up sign is also similar to the top-down sign. In the

previous signage, it shows that top-down signage has Bahasa Indonesia as the first, English as the second and Arabic as the third most appear language in signage.

However, the bottom-up sign also has the language rank order that is English as the second and Arabic as the third. It shows that official and unofficial signs have no discrepancy toward the most dominant language used. The higher authorities and the lower authorities of both campuses show correspondence on their own sign products. Despite both campuses have the potential of becoming a rich multilingualism community, it shows that both universities are still far beyond from facing a multilingualism situation as what Landry and Bourhis (1997) has explained. Landry and Bourhis (1997) stated that the discrepancies situation of linguistic landscape top-down and bottom-up sign can occur in multilingual environments in which the competition of presenting most dominant languages happened.

Nonetheless, despite having both sign producers have no discrepancy in the language choice order in their physical signs, the amount of English and Arabic appearances in UIN Sunan Ampel and UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim need to be further noticed. The comparison of the signs presented between Indonesia and English is 3:1 in UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim meanwhile in UINSA is 22:1. English is placed in the second place as the most appeared language and Arabic is placed the last. Arabic's presence in signalways appears lower than English. Kayam (2012) explains that LL also became the tool to see how certain language and community are put in state such as in inclusion or exclusion, in alienation or welcome, claim or loss in particular territory. By seeing English and Arabic have

low visual percentage implies that foreign language information in UINSA and UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim is rather exclusive because ones who have least fluency of Bahasa Indonesia cannot expect to be able to obtain information and/or services in English or Arabic language.

The second point worth to mention is the political perspective of linguistic landscape. In the present research it shows that generally UINSA and UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim have similar goal expected to be aimed by their students in mastering the foreign languages: English and Arabic. Both universities policy demand the students to pass certain language proficiency test. However, UINSA and UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim have different policies to manage the language environment. UINSA has no explicit rule in managing the language presentation in the public sign. Meanwhile, UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim has received the instruction to prepare the community environment to welcome the multilingual society symbolized through the appearances of public signs. Therefore, different language policy comes out different language environment.

When we look up into the result of the total number multilingual signs, UIN Sunan Ampel rather has less multilingual sign than UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim. From the chosen buildings to be observed, UINSA has only 1 multilingual sign but UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim has 10 signs. This fact goes along with the matter of language policy management. As the matter of fact, UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim has more complex and prepared language environment policy rather than UINSA. To sum up, the present study result goes along with the theory stated by Landry and Bourhis (1997) related to the power of language

policy maker has in addressing language either to promote or to maintain them. The results of the study is also relevant to Shohamy (2006)'s statement that LL is the evidence of language policy. LL in both areas is significantly shows how the language policy in universities is treated.

The last point to be addressed from the objective of the research is portraying the attitudes of sign-reader in both universities. Out of five likert scale questions delivered to the respondents, all of the answer show rather positive response to receive Bahasa Indonesia, English and Arabic to be presented in the campus public official signage. When the students are being asked about their thoughts to multilingual sign, the data shows a high agreement response percentage (77%-81%).

It shows that despite the lack percentage of multilingual sign in the universities area, the students seems to be enthusiast in having their campus public signs developed in various language signages. Garvin and Mathiot (1968) stated that a positive attitude toward a language is also defined in the attitude of showing enthusiasm for the language use. As it can be implied, the students of both campuses are anticipating the development of the public sign appearance mostly in its language-use.

The students are not only showing positive attitudes to multilingual signage, but also showing their awareness in the importance maintaining the mother language, Bahasa Indonesia. The sixth research question was asking about the students further thoughts about multilingual sign, the responses shows positive attitudes such as expecting the public signs to be more developed and



emphasizing the importance to conserve Bahasa Indonesia despite the demand to adapt in international and multicultural society.

Since the three dimensional study is conducted to see the solid frame of language environment in both universities, the research is also investigated to see the campus readiness and preparations to multilingualism society. Both UIN Sunan Ampel and UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim share the similar goal to achieve World Class University title. However, after the research is conducted the result shows that most likely UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim has further preparations than UINSA. It is an interesting fact to know that initially both universities were originated from the same institution under East Java Religion Department. Originally, the building in Malang was belong to UINSA as its Tarbiyah Faculty. However, in 1997 the Tarbiyah Faculty of Malang changed its status to (STAIN) along with other 33 Islamic Institutions (STAIN) in Indonesia. Since the process, Tarbiyah Faculty of Malang became an independent institution.

It is interesting point to note that based on history, both universities have the similar time range to prepare the insights of providing international atmosphere to the students. However, UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim rather has more developed progress than UIN Sunan Ampel. One of possibilities to create such differences is that UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim has earlier thought to change its institution status from STAIN to University title. In 2004, after being built as a Tarbiyah Faculty of Malang then to STAIN Malang, the institution success to change its name to University of Islamic State Malang. Meanwhile the decision of Sharia Faculty Surabaya to change its institution to University of Islamic State

'Sunan Ampel' Surabaya was occurred in 2013. Therefore, it is possible that such different language environment may happen because of the different decision that was taken by the campus authority.

It is worth to mention that the possible core differences of both education institutes is occurred due to the language policy management. Landry and Bourhis (1997) also mentioned that the language policy makers have bigger chance to make effort in promoting certain language maintenance so that it can be fully addressed in the society. Both universities should be preparing the readiness to international community by improving the campus policies, including language policy. As the present research have addressed the way of the students' attitude in expecting richer language used in the practical life, it implies that students supports the campus to grow more international atmosphere within universities.









- Haynes, P. (2012). *Welsh language policy: A study of the linguistic landscape at Cardiff university*. Master thesis. Birmingham: University of Birmingham
- Hoogervorst, T.G. (2009). *Urban dynamics: An impression of Surabaya's sociolinguistic setting*. Netherland: Institute of Southeast Asian and Caribbean Studies
- Huebner, T. (2009). A framework for the linguistic analysis of linguistic landscapes. In E. Shohamy & D. Gorter (Eds.), *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery* (1<sup>st</sup>ed.)(pp. 70-87). London, UK: Routledge.
- Hult, F. M. (2009). Language ecology and linguistic landscape analysis. In E. Shohamy & D. Gorter (Eds.), *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery* (1<sup>st</sup>ed.)(pp. 88-104). London, UK: Routledge.
- Hult, F.M. (2014). Drive-thru linguistic landscaping: Constructing a linguistically dominant place in a bilingual space. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 18(5), 507-523. DOI: 10.1177/1367006913484206
- Jaworski, A. & Thurlow, C. (Eds.)(2010). *Semiotic landscapes: Language, image & space*. London and New York: Continuum.
- Kallen, J. (2009). Tourism and representation in the Irish linguistic landscape. In E. Shohamy & D. Gorter (Eds.), *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery* (1<sup>st</sup>ed.)(pp. 270-283). London, UK: Routledge.
- Lanza, E., & Woldemariam, H. (2009). Language ideology and linguistic landscape: Language policy and globalization in a regional capital of Ethiopia. In E. Shohamy & D. Gorter (Eds.), *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery* (1<sup>st</sup>ed.)(pp. 189-205). London, UK: Routledge.
- Lawrance, C.B. (2012). *The Korean English linguistics landscape*. *World Englishes* 31 (1): pp. 70-92. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-971X.2011.01741.x
- Leung, G.Y. & Wu, M. (2012). Linguistic landscape and heritage language literacy education: A case study of linguistic rescaling in Philadelphia Chinatown. *Written Language and Literacy*, 15(1), 114-140. DOI: 10.1075/wll.15.1.06leu.
- Mahararas, P.D. (2016). *The language attitudes of male Surabayanese youth toward llinguistic landscapes written in Indonesian, Javanese, and English*. Undergraduate Thesis. Surabaya: Airlangga University

- Moriarty M. (2012) Language ideological debates in the linguistic landscape of an Irish Tourist Town. In Gorter D., Marten H.F., Van Mensel L. (eds) *Minority Languages in the Linguistic Landscape* (pp.74-88). London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Prayitno, R. (2007). *Linguistic landscape and the use of English in Surabaya clothing stores*. Undergraduate Thesis. Surabaya: Widya Mandala Chatolic University
- Pennycook, A. (2009). Linguistic landscapes and the transgressive semiotics of graffiti. In E. Shohamy & D. Gorter (Eds.), *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery*, (1<sup>st</sup>ed.) (pp. 302-312). London, UK: Routledge.
- Puzey G. (2012). Two-way traffic: How linguistic landscapes reflect and influence the politics of language. In Gorter D., Marten H.F., Van Mensel L. (eds) *Minority languages in the linguistic landscape*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan
- Poveda, D. (2012). Literacy artifacts and the semiotic landscape of a Spanish secondary school. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 47(1), 61-88. DOI: 10.1002/RRQ.010
- Reh, M. (2005). Multilingual writing: A reader-oriented typology — with examples from Lira Municipality (Uganda). *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2004(170), 1-41. DOI: 10.1515/ijsl.2004.2004.170.1
- Rowland, L. (2013). The pedagogical benefits of a linguistic landscape project in Japan. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(4), 494-505. DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2012.708319
- Sayer, P. (2010). Using the linguistic landscape as a pedagogical resource. *ELT Journal*, 64(2), 143–54. DOI: 10.1093/elt/ccp051
- Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agenda and new approaches*. London: Routledge
- Shohamy, E., Ben-Rafael, E., & Barni, M. (Eds.)(2010). *Linguistic landscape in the city*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Shohamy, E., & Waksman, S. (2009). Linguistic landscape as an ecological arena: Modalities, meanings, negotiations, education. In E. Shohamy & D. Gorter (Eds.), *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery* (pp. 313-331). London, UK: Routledge.



- Gilinger E.S., Sloboda M., Šimičić L., Vigers D. (2012). Discourse coalitions for and against minority languages on signs: Linguistic landscape as a social issue. In Gorter D., Marten H.F., Van Mensel L. (eds) *Minority languages in the linguistic landscape*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan
- Trumper-Hecht, N. (2009). Constructing national identity in mixed cities in Israel: Arabic on signs in the public space of Upper Nazareth. In E. Shohamy & D. Gorter (Eds.), *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery* (pp. 238-252). London, UK: Routledge.
- Yavari, Sonia. (2012). *Linguistic landscape and language policies: A comparative study of Linköping university and ETH Zurich*. Master Thesis. Linköping: Linköping University
- Wang, Jing J. (2015). Linguistics landscape on campus in Japan—a case study of signs in yushu university. *Intercultural Communication Studies* 54(1), 123-144.

