

RECONSIDERING LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS: A REVIEW

Sepri Kurniadi

Politeknik Aceh Selatan

Nyak Mutia Ismail

Universitas Serambi Mekkah

nyamutiaismail@serambimekkah.ac.id

Abstrak

Studi tentang linguistik lanskap telah mendapatkan perhatian yang signifikan dalam beberapa tahun terakhir sebagai sarana untuk memahami dinamika sosiolinguistik dalam suatu ruang tertentu. Artikel ini menyajikan evaluasi kritis terhadap metodologi dan kerangka kerja yang digunakan dalam menganalisis linguistik lanskap. Dengan mengeksplorasi dan meninjau pendekatan yang ada, artikel ini bertujuan untuk berkontribusi pada wacana yang sedang berlangsung di lapangan, menawarkan gagasan yang memungkinkan untuk mengusulkan perspektif alternatif. Penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa perkembangan analisis lanskap linguistik juga menyoroti pentingnya aspek spasial representasi bahasa. Konfigurasi, tata letak, dan penyebaran komponen bahasa di ruang publik menyampaikan konotasi sosial budaya yang substansial. Mereka berperan dalam membentuk karakteristik unik suatu tempat, kisah-kisah yang mendefinisikan kota, dan cara bahasa terhubung dengan ruang fisik. Terkait kelemahan, pengumpulan data dalam analisis lanskap linguistik menghadapi kendala metodologis, khususnya terkait dengan cakupan yang luas dan sifat manifestasi linguistik yang beragam. Mengumpulkan data yang ekstensif dan inklusif dari banyak wilayah publik memerlukan pengorganisasian yang hati-hati, sumber daya yang memadai, dan akses yang tepat, yang dapat menimbulkan kesulitan praktis. Selain itu, tugas mengembangkan pendekatan yang seragam untuk mengumpulkan, menganalisis, dan menafsirkan data dalam berbagai studi lanskap linguistik masih merupakan upaya yang sulit, sehingga memengaruhi kemampuan untuk membandingkan dan mengandalkan hasil.

Kata Kunci: linguistik lanskap, dinamika, pragmatik, dan ruang publik.

Abstract

The study of linguistic landscapes has garnered significant attention in recent years as a means of understanding the sociolinguistic dynamics within a given space. This article presents a critical evaluation of the methodologies and frameworks employed in analyzing linguistic landscapes. By exploring and reviewing existing approaches, the article aims to contribute to the ongoing discourse in the field, offering insights that challenge prevailing notions and propose alternative perspectives. The work demonstrates that the development of linguistic landscape analysis has also highlighted the importance of the spatial aspect of language representation. The configuration, layout, and dissemination of language components in public areas convey substantial socio-cultural connotations. They have a role in shaping the unique characteristics of places, the stories that define cities, and the way language is connected to physical space. Data gathering in linguistic landscape analysis encounters methodological obstacles, particularly with regards to the extensive scope and varied nature of linguistic manifestations. Gathering extensive and inclusive data from many public areas necessitates careful organization, sufficient resources, and appropriate access, which may cause practical difficulties. Furthermore, the task of developing uniform approaches for gathering, analyzing, and interpreting data in various linguistic landscape studies continues to be a difficult endeavor, affecting the ability to compare and rely on the results.

Keywords: linguistic landscapes, dynamics, pragmatics, and public spaces.

1. INTRODUCTION

Linguistic landscape analysis traditionally focuses on the visible language elements present in public spaces, such as signs, billboards, and street names, aiming to uncover the sociolinguistic complexities embedded within these visual representations (Blackwood & Amos, 2023). However, this article posits a reevaluation of these conventional methodologies, emphasizing the need for a more nuanced and multifaceted approach to interpreting linguistic landscapes. It argues that a broader consideration encompassing not only the visible textual elements but also their contextual, social, and historical underpinnings is crucial for a comprehensive understanding. This review sets out to critically assess the limitations and biases inherent in existing linguistic landscape analysis methodologies. It scrutinizes the predominant paradigms and frameworks, examining their efficacy in capturing the intricate interplay between language, culture, power dynamics, and identity within the public sphere as these all are importantly connected (Andriyanti, 2019).

By questioning established norms, the article seeks to pave the way for a more inclusive and holistic approach that encompasses diverse perspectives and factors influencing linguistic landscapes. Furthermore, this review aims to shed light on emerging trends and innovations within linguistic landscape analysis. It seeks to highlight the evolution of the field, exploring new theoretical frameworks, methodological advancements, and interdisciplinary approaches that contribute to a richer understanding of the intricate tapestry of languages present in public spaces. By synthesizing these developments, the article seeks to offer a roadmap for future research directions, encouraging scholars to explore untapped avenues and adopt innovative methodologies.

2. THEORETICAL SUMMARY

The evolution of linguistic landscape

The field of linguistic landscape analysis has witnessed a remarkable evolution over the past few decades, experiencing a shift from its initial focus on the mere documentation of visible language elements in public spaces to a more multidisciplinary and nuanced examination of the socio-cultural dynamics intertwined with these linguistic representations (Muriungi & Mudogo, 2021). Originating in the early 1990s, the concept primarily centered on the study of signage, examining the languages used on street signs, advertisements, storefronts, and other visible textual features in urban environments. Scholars have laid the groundwork by exploring the presence of multiple languages and their societal implications in public spaces (Duizenberg, 2020).

As the field progressed, its scope expanded beyond a descriptive analysis of languages visible in public spaces. Researchers began acknowledging the intricate connections between language, identity, power, and culture embedded within these linguistic landscapes. This evolution led to a shift in focus from a purely descriptive approach to a more interpretative and analytical one. Scholars delved deeper into the socio-political contexts influencing language use, recognizing linguistic landscapes as reflections of power relations, social hierarchies, and cultural identities within a given society. The field's evolution was marked by a growing interest in the theoretical frameworks and methodological approaches employed in linguistic landscape analysis (Riadi & Warti, 2021). Initially dominated by qualitative methodologies relying on observation and documentation, researchers increasingly integrated quantitative and mixed-method approaches to complement their analyses. This amalgamation of methodologies aimed to capture both the quantitative aspects, such as the prevalence of certain languages, and the qualitative nuances, such as the sociocultural meanings attached to these linguistic representations (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Moreover, the interdisciplinary nature of linguistic landscape studies became more apparent as scholars from diverse fields, including linguistics, sociology, anthropology, geography, and urban studies, contributed their perspectives. This interdisciplinary collaboration enriched the field by incorporating diverse theoretical lenses and methodologies, fostering a more comprehensive understanding of linguistic landscapes as complex social phenomena.

Furthermore, the evolution of technology played a pivotal role in advancing linguistic landscape analysis. Digital tools and geographic information systems enabled researchers to map and analyze linguistic data more efficiently, facilitating a deeper exploration of spatial patterns, language distribution, and the interaction between physical spaces and linguistic representations (Riadi & Warti, 2021). This technological integration expanded the possibilities for data collection, analysis, and visualization within the field. Simultaneously, scholars began advocating for a critical reassessment of the methodologies and conceptual frameworks used in linguistic landscape analysis. They highlighted the need to address biases, challenges of representation, and the limitations of existing approaches. This critical turn prompted researchers to reconsider the ways in which they interpret and analyze linguistic landscapes, emphasizing the importance of context, agency, and the multiplicity of meanings embedded in these visual representations (Zahara & Wijana, 2022). In recent years, the evolution of linguistic landscape studies has also involved a growing

emphasis on the global dimensions of language display. Researchers have started exploring transnational linguistic flows, diasporic communities' linguistic representations, and the impact of globalization on linguistic landscapes (Halim & Sukanto, 2023). This expansion of focus beyond localized contexts reflects an understanding of linguistic landscapes as interconnected, influenced by global trends, migration, and cultural exchange.

Paradigms

Below is provided an exploration of the predominant paradigms within the field of linguistic landscape. First, it is descriptive paradigm. The descriptive paradigm represents the foundational approach in linguistic landscape analysis. Initially, scholars focused on cataloging and documenting visible linguistic elements in public spaces, such as signs, billboards, and advertisements. This paradigm aimed to identify and classify the languages present, quantify their occurrences, and map their distribution within specific geographical locations. This contribute to the initial understanding of linguistic landscapes as visual representations of multilingualism in urban environments (Anderbeck, 2015). Later, as the field progressed, scholars shifted from a purely descriptive stance to a more sociolinguistic paradigm. This approach expanded the analysis beyond mere enumeration of languages and delved into the sociocultural, political, and identity-related aspects embedded within linguistic landscapes. Researchers began examining the social dynamics influencing language use in public spaces, exploring how linguistic representations reflect power structures, social hierarchies, and identity politics within a given society. This paradigm emphasizes the relationship between language, culture, identity, and the negotiation of space, revealing linguistic landscapes as mirrors of societal complexities (Nosiani et al., 2019).

Another influential paradigm within linguistic landscape analysis is the semiotic approach. This perspective views linguistic landscapes as semiotic systems where visible linguistic elements function as signs conveying meaning beyond their literal interpretation. Scholars employing this paradigm analyze the symbolic and discursive dimensions of language displayed in public spaces. They explore how linguistic choices, font styles, colors, and spatial arrangements contribute to conveying socio-cultural messages, ideologies, and power dynamics (Michira & Iribemwangi, 2014). This paradigm underscores the importance of interpreting linguistic landscapes as symbolic representations requiring semiotic analysis. Then, in recent years, a critical turn within linguistic landscape studies has gained prominence. This critical paradigm advocates for a reflexive and critical examination of the methodologies, power structures, biases, and ideologies underlying the analysis of linguistic

landscapes (Miruka, 2018). Scholars employing this approach question established norms, challenge representations, and seek to uncover hidden hierarchies and inequalities embedded within linguistic representations in public spaces. They emphasize the need to consider multiple perspectives, marginalized voices, and the socio-political contexts shaping linguistic landscapes, aiming to deconstruct power imbalances and promote social justice within the field.

Next, it is poststructuralist/postcolonial paradigm. The poststructuralist/postcolonial paradigm in linguistic landscape analysis draws from critical theory, postcolonial studies, and poststructuralist approaches (Blommaert, 2013). This perspective scrutinizes language representations in public spaces through the lens of power, discourse, and colonial histories. It explores how linguistic landscapes reflect and perpetuate hegemonic structures, colonial legacies, and the dominance of certain languages over others. Scholars adopting this paradigm analyze how language choices in public spaces reinforce or challenge colonial hierarchies, cultural hegemony, and linguistic imperialism, contributing to a more profound understanding of linguistic power dynamics (Muriungi & Mudogo, 2021). And last, In response to the complexities inherent in linguistic landscapes, a transdisciplinary paradigm has emerged, emphasizing the integration of diverse theoretical perspectives, methodologies, and disciplinary insights. This paradigm encourages collaboration among scholars from various fields such as linguistics, anthropology, sociology, geography, and urban studies. It promotes a holistic approach that acknowledges the multifaceted nature of linguistic landscapes, incorporating diverse methodologies and theoretical frameworks to comprehensively understand the sociocultural, spatial, and semiotic dimensions of language in public spaces.

3. THE REVIEW

Efficacy of Linguistic landscape analysis

The linguistic landscape serves as a window into the complexities of societal dynamics, offering valuable insights into the multifaceted interplay between language, culture, power dynamics, and identity within the public sphere. By analyzing visible language elements in public spaces, such as signs, billboards, advertisements, and street names, linguistic landscape studies unravel the intricate relationships between these elements and the socio-cultural fabric of a given society (Dagenais et al., 2008).

Language, as a fundamental aspect of culture, plays a pivotal role in shaping and expressing identities within a community. Linguistic landscape analysis provides a means to decipher how language choices and

representations in public spaces reflect cultural identities and expressions. The coexistence, dominance, or suppression of certain languages in specific contexts convey sociocultural hierarchies, historical narratives, and the negotiation of identities within diverse communities. It unveils the ways in which language functions as a vehicle for cultural transmission, social inclusion or exclusion, and the assertion of group identities in the public domain (Hu, 2022). Moreover, linguistic landscapes offer insights into power dynamics manifested through language use in public spaces. The presence or absence of particular languages, linguistic varieties, or scripts can reveal asymmetrical power relations and societal hierarchies. Dominant languages often occupy prominent spaces, signifying their authoritative status and reinforcing power structures. Conversely, marginalized or minority languages may be relegated to peripheral or less visible locations, reflecting unequal power dynamics and struggles for linguistic recognition. This analysis highlights how linguistic landscape acts as a reflection of power imbalances and the distribution of societal influence within a given space.

The evolution of linguistic landscape analysis has also brought attention to the spatial dimension of language representation. The spatial arrangement, design, and distribution of linguistic elements in public spaces carry significant socio-cultural meanings. They contribute to the creation of place identities, urban narratives, and the spatialization of language. Examining the spatial aspects of linguistic landscapes helps uncover the symbolic and territorial dimensions of language, showcasing how linguistic representations interact with the physical environment to construct and define spaces imbued with cultural significance (Angyab, 2023). Besides, linguistic landscape studies facilitate a nuanced understanding of the intersectionality between language and identity. They reveal how individuals and communities negotiate their identities through language choices and representations in public spaces. Language serves as a marker of social identity, ethnicity, religion, and belonging, allowing for the expression and negotiation of multiple identities within a diverse society. Linguistic landscape analysis captures these intricate intersections, showcasing the fluid and multifaceted nature of identity construction within the public sphere. Additionally, linguistic landscape research contributes to broader discussions on social cohesion, cultural diversity, and inclusive urban environments. Understanding linguistic diversity in public spaces fosters dialogue on the importance of linguistic rights, cultural heritage preservation, and the promotion of multilingualism within societies. It highlights the significance of acknowledging and valuing linguistic

diversity as a means of fostering social cohesion and creating inclusive spaces that embrace cultural pluralism.

Backwashes

One of the primary weaknesses of linguistic landscape analysis lies in its tendency to offer a simplified and surface-level understanding of complex socio-cultural dynamics. While it documents and analyzes visible linguistic elements in public spaces, such as signs and advertisements, it often overlooks the deeper contextual nuances, historical complexities, and the multiplicity of meanings associated with these representations. This approach can result in a superficial interpretation that fails to capture the intricate layers of socio-political, cultural, and historical influences shaping linguistic landscapes (Kadwa & Alshenqeeti, 2020).

Another point is the static representation of dynamic societies. Linguistic landscape studies often present a snapshot of language use in a particular moment and location. However, societies are dynamic, and language representation evolves over time in response to social, political, and cultural changes (Date et al., 2011). The static nature of linguistic landscape analysis may lead to an incomplete understanding, as it does not account for temporal shifts, linguistic transformations, or the fluidity of language use in public spaces. Consequently, this static representation may fail to capture the ongoing processes that shape linguistic landscapes.

The latter weakness of linguistic landscape analysis is its predominant focus on urban environments, which can result in a neglect of rural or less densely populated areas. The emphasis on urban spaces might overlook the linguistic diversity and representations existing in rural, suburban, or peripheral regions (Zhu & Fu, 2024). This limited scope might undermine the comprehensive understanding of linguistic diversity, as it does not account for the variations in language use and representation across different geographical contexts.

Linguistic landscape analysis primarily revolves around visible textual elements, such as signs, billboards, and inscriptions. However, it often overlooks oral forms of language, including conversations, speeches, or oral traditions, which also contribute significantly to the sociolinguistic dynamics within a community. Additionally, non-visual aspects, such as linguistic practices in digital spaces or audio-based communication, are often disregarded in traditional linguistic landscape studies, limiting the comprehensive exploration of language representation. While linguistic landscape analysis acknowledges the presence and distribution of languages in public spaces, it might neglect the socioeconomic factors and power dynamics influencing these representations (Shohamy et al., 2010). The analysis often focuses on the visibility and prevalence of languages

without critically examining the underlying power structures, economic disparities, or institutional influences shaping language use and representation in public spheres. This oversight might lead to a superficial understanding of how societal power dynamics influence language visibility and representation. Linguistic landscape analysis is susceptible to biases and interpretative challenges. Researchers' subjectivity and preconceived notions might influence the interpretation of linguistic elements in public spaces. The meanings attributed to languages, scripts, or symbols could vary based on researchers' cultural backgrounds, perspectives, or disciplinary biases, leading to interpretations that may not resonate with the community whose linguistic landscape is being analyzed. Additionally, linguistic landscapes often contain ambiguous or multilayered meanings, posing challenges in accurately deciphering and interpreting their significance.

There are ethical considerations regarding the representation of communities within linguistic landscape analysis. The portrayal of linguistic diversity might inadvertently reinforce stereotypes or overlook the complexities of identity within a community. Additionally, there might be issues of consent and privacy when capturing and analyzing linguistic elements in public spaces. The representation of certain languages or groups within a linguistic landscape might unintentionally marginalize or stereotype communities, raising ethical concerns in research practices (Čalovková, 2017). Linguistic landscape analysis faces methodological challenges in data collection, especially concerning the vastness and diversity of linguistic representations. Collecting comprehensive and representative data from diverse public spaces requires meticulous planning, resources, and access, which might pose logistical challenges. Moreover, establishing standardized methodologies for data collection, analysis, and interpretation across different linguistic landscape studies remains a challenge, impacting the comparability and reliability of findings.

4.CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the evolution of the linguistic landscape field illustrates its transformation from a descriptive study of visible languages in public spaces to a multidimensional and interdisciplinary inquiry into the complex interplay of language, culture, identity, power, and space. This evolution, marked by theoretical advancements, methodological diversification, technological integration, and critical introspection, has contributed to a more nuanced and comprehensive understanding of linguistic landscapes as dynamic socio-cultural constructs.

The field of linguistic landscape analysis encompasses diverse paradigms, each offering unique

insights into the multifaceted nature of language representations in public spaces. These paradigms, from descriptive and sociolinguistic approaches to critical, semiotic, poststructuralist/postcolonial, and transdisciplinary perspectives, collectively contribute to a nuanced understanding of linguistic landscapes as complex socio-cultural constructs shaped by power relations, identities, ideologies, and spatial dynamics.

REFERENCES

- Anderbeck, K. (2015). Portraits of language vitality in the languages of Indonesia. *Language Documentation and Cultural Practices in the Austronesian World: Papers from 12-ICAL, Volume 4* (April), 19–57. https://openresearch-repository.anu.edu.au/bitstream/1885/13514/1/Papers_ICAL_Volume_4.pdf#page=23
- Andriyanti, E. (2019). Linguistic landscape at Yogyakarta's senior high schools in multilingual context: Patterns and representation. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(1), 85–97. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v9i1.13841>
- Angyab, K. J. M. (2023). *GSJ© 2023 www.globalscientificjournal.com*. 11(7), 1209–1224.
- Blackwood, R., & Amos, W. (2023). Linguistic landscapes. *The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics: Volume Two, Second Edition*, 2(November), 337–348. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003082637_27
- Blommaert, J. (2013). Ethnography, Superdiversity and Linguistic Landscapes. In *Ethnography, Superdiversity and Linguistic Landscapes* (Issue September). <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783090419>
- Čalovková, S. (2017). Linguistic Landscape. *The Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea*, 25(1), 85–117. <https://doi.org/10.14353/sjk.2017.25.1.04>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Mixed Methods Procedures. In *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*.
- Dagenais, D., Moore, D., Sabatier, C., Lamarre, P., & Armand, F. (2008). Linguistic Landscape and Language Awareness. *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery*, 253–269. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203930960-25>
- Date, J., Proof, F., & Path, F. (2011). Knowledge about Language and Linguistic Landscape. *SpringerReference*, 6, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1007/springerreference_60069
- Duizenberg, M. R. (2020). Linguistics landscape: A cross culture perspective. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 4(1), 15–28. <https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v4n1.17>
- Halim, S. W., & Sukamto, K. E. (2023). The (In)Visibility of Torajan Language: A Study on Linguistic

- Landscape in South Sulawesi, Indonesia. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 10(3), 1585–1607. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v10i3.27931>
- Hu, J. (2022). A Review of the Perspectives of Linguistic Landscape Research. *OALib*, 09(07), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1109057>
- Kadwa, M. S., & Alshenqeeti, H. (2020). International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation (IJLLT) The Impact of Students' Proficiency in English on Science Courses in a Foundation Year Program. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation (IJLLT)*, 3(11), 55–67. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt>
- Michira, J. N., & Iribemwangi, P. I. (2014). Kiswahili as an Official Language in Kenya : Its Past , Present and Future Roles and Challenges. *Reyono Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 3(1), 42–52.
- Miruka, F. A. (2018). *A Pragmatic Analysis of Selected Personal and Place Names in John Habwe ' s Novel , Maisha Kitendawili*. 6(1), 15–18. <https://doi.org/10.5923/j.linguistics.20180601.03>
- Muriungi, S. W., & Mudogo, B. A. (2021). Linguistic Landscape in a Multilingual Context: a Case of Kenyan Universities. *LLT Journal: Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 24(2), 450–460. <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v24i2.3673>
- Nosiani, N., Asiyah, S., & Mustikawati, D. A. (2019). Linguistic Landscape on Campus in Ponorogo (a Case Study of Signs in Ponorogo Universities). *Edupedia*, 3(2), 130. <https://doi.org/10.24269/ed.v3i2.299>
- Riadi, A., & Warti, F. W. (2021). Linguistic Landscape: A Language Learning Media in An Underdeveloped Region. *Indonesian TESOL Journal*, 3(1), 46–67. <https://doi.org/10.24256/itj.v3i1.1782>
- Shohamy, E., Ben-Rafael, E., & Barni, M. (2010). *Lingustic Landscape in the City*. Multilingual Matters.
- Zahara, I., & Wijana, D. P. (2022). The Function of English Usage on Linguistic Landscape of Padang: A Case Study on Khatib Sulaiman Street. *Lingua Didaktika: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Pembelajaran Bahasa*, 16(1), 26. <https://doi.org/10.24036/ld.v16i1.115206>
- Zhu, Y., & Fu, X. (2024). *Research on Strategies for Integrating Linguistic Landscape into International Chinese Language Education* (Issue Icmets). Atlantis Press SARL. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-128-9_45