Multidimensional Perspectives on Language Vitality and Linguistic Landscapes in Indonesia

NURENZIA YANNUAR *
English Department
Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia
nurenzia.yannuar.fs@um.ac.id

YUSNITA FEBRIANTI
Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia

IKA NURHAYANI
Universitas Brawijaya, Indonesia

NAZARUDIN NAZARUDIN
Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia

YAZID BASTHOMI
Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Indonesia is a multilingual country with over 700 local languages; however, 70 per cent of these languages are at risk of endangerment. The government regulation supports the use of Indonesian in public spaces, which contributes to the decline of local language vitality. By looking at the linguistic landscape of Malang and Kupang, this study aims to capture local language vitality in western and eastern Indonesia. The main data of the study includes 2510 photographs of public signs in both cities. Walk-in interviews with the passersby and focus group discussions with local communities were also conducted to investigate their perception of selected signs. Results of the study on language vitality show that despite the dominance of Indonesian and English, local languages still appear in public spaces. Local communities are familiar with multilingual signage and can interpret the different linguistic codes according to the spatial distribution and placement of the signs. However, it is also found that multilingual signs have multidimensional layers and can provide contextual insights into the country: Indonesian dominates public signage under the national language policy, while English is primarily employed for its economic and global appeal. Local languages—such as Javanese, Kupang Malay, and Uab Meto/Dawan—surface mainly in governmental, identity, and social-movement contexts, showing that language visibility is closely tied to sociopolitical and economic factors. This article has offered a new perspective on the connection between linguistic landscape studies, language vitality, and socio-economic realities.

Keywords: multilingualism; linguistic vitality; linguistic landscapes; local language

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia is home to more than 700 local languages, making it one of the most multilingual countries in the world (Pepinsky et al., 2024). Using the Expanded Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale by Lewis and Simons (2010), the Ethnologue estimates that approximately seventy per cent of the languages in Indonesia are endangered, indicating that children are no longer accustomed to acquiring and using them (Eberhard et al., 2024). Language endangerment often takes place as communities switch from minority languages to more dominant and economically advantageous languages (Austin & Sallabank, 2013). While it is true that fewer

speakers might increase the risk of endangerment, the most defining reason is when parents stop transmitting their language to their children (Klamer, 2019). Languages with many speakers are not immune to language endangerment as well; research findings have shown how the Javanese language, with approximately 80 million speakers, is threatened by the spread of Indonesian as the national language (Pepinsky et al., 2024; Ravindranath & Cohn, 2014; Vander Klok, 2019).

The dominance of Indonesian or Bahasa Indonesia in every sector is attributed to the government statute, Law no. 24/2009, which stipulates that "Indonesian is the language of scientific papers and publication (Article 35); geographic names (Article 36); information about domestic and foreign goods circulation within the country (37); public signs (38); mass media (39); and, of course, education" (Zentz, 2015, p. 340). One of the derivatives of this policy is the guideline of language use promoted by the Agency for Language Development and Cultivation (*Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa*), namely *Trigatra Bangun Bahasa*, which includes three principles: prioritise the Indonesian language, preserve regional languages, and master foreign languages. According to these principles, Indonesian must be placed on the upper part of any public signs, conveying the most important text. Regional and foreign languages, on the other hand, cannot appear on their own and must be underlined as it is placed next to the Indonesian text (Sunendar et al., 2024). While promoting the use of Indonesian in public spaces, the policy also contributes to the decline of local language use (Sakhiyya & Martin-Anatias, 2023).

Language shift towards Indonesian has been the focus of a number of studies (Abtahian et al., 2016; Anderbeck, 2015; Klamer, 2019; Manns, 2014; Pepinsky et al., 2024, 2024; Zentz, 2015). Strategies to manage and maintain minority local languages are discussed in Arka (2013). Additionally, in order to support language preservation, documentation of local languages has been carried out (Balukh, 2021; Fricke, 2020). Complementing previous studies on the risk assessment, maintenance strategies, and language documentation of local languages in Indonesia, this study fills the gap by using Linguistic Landscape (Ben-Rafael et al., 2010; Landry & Bourhis, 1997) as a conceptual framework to explore linguistic vitality.

Linguistic landscape (henceforth LL) focuses on the use of languages in public signs, such as road signs, billboards, street names, commercial shop signs, and government building signs, both verbal and non-verbal (Shohamy & Gorter, 2009), and examines how these languages and symbols are used to create a visible representation of cultural and linguistic identities in public spaces (Ben-Rafael et al., 2010; Landry & Bourhis, 1997). Following Shohamy and Gorter (2009), public signs are divided into governmental signs, also referred to as top-down signs, and bottom-up signs. Top-down signage typically embodies language policies enforced by governmental authorities, whereas bottom-up signs are individually produced, so they are more likely to represent the multilingual dynamics of a region. In this light, LL becomes an arena for language contestation because it reflects the statuses and roles of official and local languages in a region (Pütz & Mundt, 2018). The presence and prominence of languages in public signage provide insights into their vitality, as LL reflects the social, political, and historical contexts in which languages are used, influenced, and shaped by the community (Shohamy & Waksman, 2009). In their seminal work, Landry and Bourhis (1997) have established a connection between linguistic landscapes and ethnolinguistic vitality, demonstrating the sociopsychological impact of LL on bilingual development and language maintenance by looking at speakers' perceptions of their in-group language vitality. In the current situation of rapidly changing urban environments, new languages may emerge in public spaces. This temporal notion poses properties that LL can identify, assess, or monitor language vitality by offering real-time data pertinent to whether languages are thriving or otherwise fading within specific communities or regions.

The topic of how LL may reflect the vitality of minority languages has been examined in different contexts. Kallen (2009) presented how the Irish LL can be a place to study the interplay between language policy, tourism, and ethnolinguistic vitality. In Galway, there is a notable increase in signage that features the Irish language in areas frequented by tourists. In southern Mexico, Hernández et al. (2017) demonstrated that a semiotic landscape, that is, the interaction of written language with visual images, spatial practices, and cultural dimensions in public space, can encourage the language revitalisation of the Ixcatec language. Despite the positive results, Begum and Sinha's (2019) study on the LL of Bihta, Bihar, in India, revealed the dominance of Hindi and English, threatening the vitality of the local mother tongues. These studies largely focus on the presence of minority languages in the LL, while overlooking how community members, including sign makers and the audience, interpret the signs.

Similarly, several studies have investigated the revitalisation and vitality of local languages in Indonesia using LL as a framework. For example, in Bali, the provincial government supported the maintenance and revitalisation of Balinese by implementing a policy that regulates the use of local language in public signs (Mulyawan, 2021). A study in Kupang showed that Dawan, Sabu, Rote, and Kupang Malay are rarely found in the LL of the city, proposing that more efforts are needed to revitalise them (Benu et al., 2023). Further, Javanese was rarely found in Mojosari (Rohmah & Wijayanti, 2023) and Malang (Yannuar & Tabiati, 2016), as the LL of both cities is dominated by Indonesian and English. Although these previous studies have examined patterns of language presence and have suggested the maintenance of local languages, they focus primarily on linguistic distribution and policy statements. More studies that show how broader socio-political or economic factors shape language vitality are still needed. In addition, existing LL studies have provided an overview of the use of languages in different Indonesian cities and regions, but they rarely interviewed makers of the signs and the passersby, which would be useful for investigating the 'authorship' of the signs (Malinowski, 2009) and understanding the perception of local communities towards language in public spaces.

Given the identified gaps, the present study therefore examines the dynamics of multidimensionality and language vitality through LL in a multilingual urban area, revealing the sociopolitical, economic, and ethnolinguistic dimensions that might have motivated the use of these languages. These dimensions enable us to focus more on explaining how languages appear and function in LL rather than only describing where they appear. Sociopolitical factors, such as language policy and top-down signs, influence the prominence of certain languages (Shohamy & Gorter, 2009). Further, economic factors such as business and tourism influence language choice and prominence in commercial signage (Heller, 2003, 2010). Meanwhile, ethnolinguistic dimensions, including local identity and intergroup relations, can be used for understanding grassroots multilingual practices (Landry & Bourhis, 1997). In this paper, the integration of these perspectives produces a more comprehensive understanding of multidimensionality and language vitality in multilingual urban contexts.

The study specifically aims to: 1) investigate the languages found on public signs, including the types and combinations of languages displayed; 2) explore the community perceptions of the languages used; 3) analyse how the presence of multiple languages on signs reflects the community's multilingualism; and 4) consider what these linguistic choices reveal about language vitality in the area.

DISPARITY OF POWER AND STATUS IN MULTILINGUALISM

In Indonesia, some languages are considered more prestigious than others (Arka, 2013). In this section, we discuss the history and status of Indonesian languages in the study.

First, the standard form of Indonesian (Bahasa Indonesia) is the most prestigious language; it demonstrates national citizenship, identity, and social and political integration within the broader community (May, 2016; Poedjosoedarmo, 2006). Indonesian was based on the Riau dialect of Malay, chosen as the language of unity during the 1928 Youth Pledge for its long-standing role as a lingua franca across the Indonesian archipelago (Sneddon, 2003). Following independence, the language was modernised with vocabulary expansion and morphosyntactic changes to reflect modern societal values (Alisjahbana, 2019). Indonesian was used as a symbol of the new nation; consequently, minority languages were undervalued in the process of nation-building (Tupas, 2015). Only 5% of the population spoke Indonesian in the 1930s (Ricklefs et al., 2010), but a more recent study shows the dominance of Indonesian among adolescents (Sari et al., 2019).

With language varieties ranging from formal to colloquial registers, the usage of Indonesian reflects a diglossic situation (Abtahian et al., 2016). The standard form of Indonesian serves as the high (formal) variety, while colloquial Indonesian—encompassing informal spoken forms—is predominantly used in casual, interpersonal settings (Cohn & Ravindranath, 2014; Ewing, 2005). Colloquial Indonesian is characterised by a set of lexical, morphological, syntactic, and discourse markers (Ewing, 2005).

English is also considered prestigious in Indonesia, often viewed as the language of upward mobility and a symbol of modernity (Lauder, 2008). Indonesia is part of Kachru's (1990) Expanding Circle of World Englishes, where English is a foreign language. However, people often associate English with higher education and a cosmopolitan image, which can lead to greater global opportunities (Martin-Anatias, 2018; Yannuar, 2022).

Regarded as having lower prestige, regional lingua francas such as Kupang Malay also exist. It is a creole spoken in West Timor, Indonesia, particularly in and around the city of Kupang. It is used by approximately 220,000 native speakers, with thousands more using it as a second language. The creole historically emerged when Malay was used as a lingua franca in the trade of sandalwood from Timor between the 7th and 14th centuries (Jacob & Grimes, 2006, 2011). Nowadays, Kupang Malay has the same function among speakers of local languages such as Dawan, Helong, Rote, or Alor who reside in Kupang. Many children born in the area acquire Kupang Malay, and the language is becoming the primary language for the younger generation (Jacob & Grimes, 2006, 2011).

Further, local or vernacular languages are at the lowest level with little to no upward social mobility status (Arka, 2013). Vernacular languages are often perceived as obstacles to effective communication within the broader society, potentially limiting the social mobility of their speakers (May, 2016). They do not reflect global or modern identities (Febrianti & Yannuar, 2022; Nurani, 2015; Yannuar, 2022). This includes Javanese, Dawan/Uab Meto, Helong, and Rote. Javanese, however, can be categorised as a non-minority local language as it has a large number of speakers.

Javanese is a local language with the largest number of speakers, with 69 million native speakers worldwide (Simons & Fennig, 2018). Most of these speakers live on Java, Indonesia's most populated island, which is inhabited by about 60% of the nation's population (Ananta et al., 2015; Suryadinata et al., 2003). Despite being a non-minority local language, the Javanese language vitality is also threatened (Ravindranath & Cohn, 2014; Vander Klok, 2019). Standard

Javanese is at risk due to Indonesian dominance, while smaller Javanese dialects are more vulnerable to endangerment. Urban areas might display lower Javanese language vitality (Anderson, 1990; Errington, 1998; Vander Klok, 2019); however, Setiawan's (2012) study in East Java also shows the pressure on Javanese language vitality in rural areas. A more positive view is shown in Sari et al. (2019), where Javanese speakers demonstrate the highest fluency in their ethnic language compared to speakers of other ethnicities. Additionally, Javanese speakers tend to use their ethnic language more frequently than speakers of other ethnic groups. In Malang, a creative reinterpretation of Javanese was created through segment reversal; for example, *apik* (Javanese 'good') is reversed into *kipa* (Yannuar, 2018). By attaching new values to Javanese, Walikan can revitalise the language among young speakers (Yannuar, 2022).

Next, we look at the situation regarding the minority local languages in the area. Dawan belongs to the Austronesian language family and is spoken in West Timor by approximately 700,000 speakers (Benu, 2021). The native speakers are the Atoin Meto people, who refer to the language as Uab Meto. There are three main dialects of the language: Mollo, Amanuban, and Amanatun (Olbata, 2017). Edwards (2021) proposes four different groupings of Meto: (1) Ro'is Amarasi, (2) Kotos Amarasi, Amabi and Kusa-Manea, (3) Amanuban and Amanatun, (4) all other varieties. Dawan is the most dominant vernacular in the LL of Kupang, featured in the form of writings on churches and on graffiti in public transportation. Some notable examples include *Uis Neno Nokan Kit* ("God be with us"), *Tetus* ("blessing"), and *Oehonis* ("divine water") (Benu et al., 2023).

Helong is an Austronesian language spoken in Timor, Indonesia, with an estimated 14,000 to 17,000 speakers. It is classified into three main dialects: Helong Pulau, Helong Bolok, and Helong Funai (Balle, 2017). Despite its historical significance, the language is considered endangered (Adelaar, 2010).

Finally, Rote is spoken on the island of Rote, Indonesia, comprising twelve distinct varieties, including (1) Dela and Oenale, (2) Dengka, (3) Tii, (4) Lole, (5) Ba'a, (6) Termanu and Keka, (7) Korbafo, (8) Bokai, (9) Bilbaa, (10) Rikou, (11) Landu, and (12) Oepao (Edwards, 2021). The Rote language cluster demonstrates the traits of a language/dialect chain, in which speakers from nearby domains can typically understand one another, but speakers from farther-flung domains find it difficult or impossible to communicate. According to Fox (2016), the island of Rote is divided into 19 distinct domains, each corresponding to a different linguistic variety.

METHODOLOGY

We use the ethnographic Linguistic Landscape framework by Szabó and Troyer (2017) in order to describe the linguistic vitality of local languages in two different cities in Indonesia. In this way, linguistic landscapes are interpreted beyond their static displays of language, but as socially embedded and interactive constructs that are shaped by people's experiences, movements, and identities. This paper focuses on how languages are displayed in public spaces and how they can project the sociolinguistic patterns, power relations, identity, and multilingualism in the area. By also referring to Kress and van Leeuwen (2006), we touch on the multimodal aspects of the signs.

Data in the study were collected from Malang and Kupang. The former represents the western part of Indonesia, while the latter represents the eastern part of Indonesia. Western Indonesia and Eastern Indonesia have been described as having different socio-economic and infrastructure disparities (Booth, 2004). Moreover, Malang and Kupang are both melting pots. As

relatively big cities, they attract students and migrants from the surrounding cities who bring diverse linguistic backgrounds. These migrants then learn the local language in their new environments. Finally, examining both cities allows for more comparative insights into urban communities across Indonesia, rather than isolating the study to a single city.

Malang is located in a mountainous area, covering around 111,000 km², inhabited by around 850,000 people. In contrast, Kupang is located in a coastal area, covering around 180,000 km² with 450,000 people. Specific selection of Malang and Kupang as the main research sites is based upon the cities' representative quality as typical Indonesian urban situations, whereby business, education, and other public places are not located in specially designated areas. Instead, the cities are characterised by the provision of these public spaces in the overall urban location. In both cities, we collected photographs of public signs by walking around different areas, including the main streets, shopping centres, schools, campuses, and residential areas, in order to get a balanced representation of top-down and bottom-up signs. The distribution of signs based on the location can be seen in Appendices 1 and 2. Since Malang is the place where we reside, we were able to take pictures all around Malang from June to October 2024. In Kupang, we spent five days taking pictures in October 2024. Different durations in data collection, however, yield a similar amount of data that is suitable for comparative purposes.

In addition, we occasionally conducted short walk-interviews with the passersby to elicit their perceptions of the language used in the public signs. Two FGDs (Focus Group Discussion) with local communities in Malang and Kupang were conducted, involving 10 and 9 participants respectively. Participants in the FGDs were local people aged between 19 and 57 years old, mostly university students and lecturers. The FGDs were aimed at exploring the perceptions and attitudes of local community members towards a number of selected signs that we have collected. The participants' data can be found in Appendix C. Qualitative data from the FGDs and walk-in interviews were analysed using a thematic coding approach. Coded segments were organised manually in spreadsheets to track theme frequency and supporting quotations.

In our study, we used three categories of signs based on the makers. Top-down signs were made by governmental institutions such as municipalities, police departments, and the provincial coordination office. Bottom-up signs are those created by universities, schools, restaurants, shops, supermarket chains, and local hospitals. Finally, a semi-top-down category is added for signs that include government institution signs that were sponsored by local businesses.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

We collected and analysed a total of 1,542 signs in Malang. The general distribution, including language usage frequencies and percentages as well as the types of public signs—top-down, semi-top-down, and bottom-up signs—is shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1. Overview of the linguistic landscape in Malang

Types of language combinations	Top-down (%)	Semi Top-down (%)	Bottom-up (%)	Total (%)
Indonesian (monolingual)	34 (50.7)	5 (41.67)	545 (37.25)	584 (37.87)
English (monolingual)	1 (1.4)	0 (0.00)	168 (11.48)	169 (10.96)
Javanese (monolingual)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	19 (1.30)	19 (1.23)

Indonesian, English (bilingual)	22 (32.84)	0 (0.00)	459 (31.37)	481 (31.19)
Indonesian, Javanese (bilingual)	5 (7.46)	0 (0.00)	60 (4.10)	65 (4,22)
Indonesian, Arabic (bilingual)	1 (1.49)	0 (0.00)	31 (2.12)	32 (2.08)
Indonesian, English, Javanese (multilingual)	1 (1.49)	1(0,00)	34 (2.32)	36 (2.33)
Indonesian, English, Sanskrit (multilingual)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	4 (0.27)	4 (0.26)
Indonesian, English, Japanese (multilingual)	0 (0.00)	6 (50.00)	0 (0.00)	6 (0,39)
Indonesian, English, Arabic (multilingual)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	14 (0.96)	14 (0.91)
Others (mono-, bi- multilingual)	3 (4.48)	0 (0.00)	129 (8.82)	132 (8.56)
Total	**67 (4.35)**	**12 (0.78)**	**1463 (94.88)**	**1542 (100)**

Further, we collected 968 public signs in Kupang; the distribution of the signs is presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2. Overview of the linguistic landscape in Kupang

Types of language combinations	Top-down (%)	Semi Top-down (%)	Bottom-up (%)	Total (%)
Indonesian (monolingual)	67 (44.67)	1 (50.00)	263 (32.23)	333 (34.19)
English (monolingual)	14 (9.33)	0	106 (12.99)	121 (12.40)
Dawan (monolingual)	1 (0.67)	0	3 (0.37)	4 (0.41)
Indonesian, English (bilingual)	40 (26.67)	1 (50.00)	229 (28.06)	269 (27.89)
Indonesian, Kupang Malay (bilingual)	6 (4.00)	0	27 (3.31)	33 (3.41)
Indonesian, Javanese (bilingual)	0 (0.00)	0	13 (1.59)	13 (1.34)
Indonesian, English, Kupang Malay (multilingual)	2 (1.33)	0	42 (5.15)	44 (4.55)
Others, including Helong, Rote, Sumba, Hebrew (mono-bi- multilingual)	20 (13.33)	0	133 (16.30)	151 (15.81)
Total	**150 (15.50)**	**2 (0.21)**	**816 (84.30)**	**968 (100)**

In both cities, the most dominant type of signs based on the creators is bottom-up signs, 95.57% in Malang and 84.30% in Kupang. This indicates that the majority of signs analysed in the study reflect local community authorship, highlighting the significance of their linguistic choices in assessing the linguistic vitality of the language in the area. On the other hand, top-down signs have a smaller proportion in both cities, followed by semi-top-down signs.

In terms of choice of linguistic codes, Indonesian (IN) is the most prominent language across all types of signage, 37.87% of the total signs in Malang, and 34.40% in Kupang. The strong presence of Indonesian reflects the government's regulation of the use of Indonesian in the public domain (Zentz, 2015). Tables 1 and 2 show that the majority of top-down signs are monolingual Indonesian, 50.07% in Malang and 46.00% in Kupang. In the second rank is EN (English), which has a stronger presence monolingually in Kupang (12.50%) than in Malang (10. 96%). It also

appears in bilingual and multilingual signage alongside Indonesian and other languages. English is used predominantly in bottom-up signs, underscoring its appeal among the makers of the signs.

The LL of both cities presents local languages differently. Monolingual Javanese signs are only 1.23% of the bottom-up signs. Although Javanese also appears in multilingual signs alongside Indonesian and English, its presence still suggests the limited use of the non-minority local language. In Kupang, local languages like Dawan (0.41%) and Kupang Malay (3.41%- in bilingual signs alongside Kupang Malay) also have a modest presence, although the latter is more visible due to its role as a regional lingua franca. Interestingly, Kupang displays a wider variety of local languages, including Helong, Rote, and Sumba, reflecting the region's linguistic diversity.

Tables 1 and 2 reflect the multilingual situation in Indonesia. In Malang, the most prominent combinations are Indonesian-English (31.19%) and Indonesian-Javanese (4.22%). In Kupang, it is Indonesian-English (27.79%) and Indonesian-English-Kupang Malay (4.55%). This combination indicates the attempts of the makers to showcase their local and national identities while embracing their interests in globality.

In addition to categorising the signs based on the types of makers, we also categorise them based on more detailed areas of the signs and how the linguistic codes are combined, including a smaller number of languages found in the LL, such as Helong, Rote, and international languages such as Japanese, Italian, and Dutch. This is shown in Appendix A (Malang) and Appendix B (Kupang).

Given the prevalence of the monolingual signs, we provide more information on the specific location where they occur and are concentrated in both cities. Table 3 shows top-down monolingual signs in Malang.

TABLE 3. Mapping the top-down monolingual signs in Malang

Places	Languages		Total of places
	Indonesian	English	
Banner	1		1
Government information on the street	12		12
Government building	3		3
Government properties	3	1	4
Market	1		1
Park	3		3
Street direction/name	11		11
Total	**34**	**1**	**35**

In Malang, the largest clusters of top-down monolingual signs are government information on the street (12) and street direction/names (11). Both of them represent core public information functions. Other sites, such as parks, government buildings, and government properties, are related to the public administration function of these signs. We found one English sign on a government property, and it is likely intended for foreign visitors or branding. Table 3 shows top-down monolingual signs in Kupang.

TABLE 4. Mapping the top-down monolingual signs in Kupang

Places	Dawan	Languages English	Indonesian	Total of places
Airport		9	24	33
Banners in the street			3	3
Beach		1	6	7
Monument	1	1	11	13
Park		1	4	5
Posters			1	1
Government building		2	18	20
Total	**1**	**14**	**67**	**82**

In Kupang, Indonesians appear in every type of place. This shows its function as the primary language of public signage. English occurs most frequently at the airport (24), on monuments (1), in parks (4), and on government buildings (18), indicating a strong association with tourism, mobility, and official communication with outsiders. Dawan, a local language, appears only once on a monument, indicating its minority status.

UNITY IN DIVERSITY IN THE LL

Indonesian in top-down signs appears predominantly, confirming the success of the language use regulation in public domains, Law no. 24/2009 and the *Trigatra Bangun Bahasa* principles. The results are also similar to previous studies conducted in Malang (Ayyub & Rohmah, 2024; Yannuar & Tabiati, 2016). A recent study on the border of Indonesia and Timor Leste also shows that Indonesian is used in all signage of government institutions, including schools, offices, and banks (Sudarmanto et al., 2023). In this section, we focus on how Indonesian is also prevalent in bottom-up signs.

FIGURE 1. Indonesian graffiti expressing a protest in Malang

Figure 1 is graffiti we collected in 2023 that shows the first key discourse to respond to the national Kanjuruhan stadium tragedy in Malang, *#usuttuntas*. *'Usut tuntas, tembak gas, air mata ke rumah duka'* ('Investigate thoroughly, shoot gas, tears at the funeral home') was written in

Indonesian, next to a smaller text in English, 'Rest in pride.' Sakhiyya et al. (2024) describe how the Kanjuruhan Stadium tragedy in Malang has motivated local communities to use LL and public signs to spark protests against authorities. Key discourses, including hashtag *#usuttuntas* (to investigate thoroughly), tear gas vs. mothers' tears, and humanity above football, were predominant as they searched for justice.

The graffiti in Figure 1 illustrates how Indonesian is used to convey local advocacy, while English might be used as an attempt to include global audiences (Sakhiyya et al., 2024). In addition, the phrase 'Rest in pride' originated from the Black and LGBTQ+ communities, who have used it as a variation of 'rest in peace' in order to show respect for victims of systemic issues. In this sense, 'rest in pride' is a plea for cross-border solidarity, which aims to link the tragedy in Malang with global movements against injustice and violence.

FIGURE 2. Motivating words in Kupang

In Kupang, graffiti created by a certain artist is prominently displayed around the city. The graffiti is mostly words of motivation written in Indonesian. Figure 2 displays the motivational phrase '*hidup ini adalah kesempatan'* ('this life is an opportunity'). This indicates that Indonesian is a medium to convey intimate messages, not just to deliver formal messages from the authorities. The graffiti artist's choice to use Indonesian instead of the regional or local languages might reflect their confidence that the language is universally understood by the audience. This shows that Indonesian has successfully been accepted as the country's national lingua franca after its conception as the language of unity during the 1928 Youth Pledge (Sneddon, 2003). Among the youth, colloquial Indonesian is shown to be used as the primary language for interethnic communication (Djenar et al., 2018). Ilma and Rohmah's (2024) interview data also confirm the dominant use of Indonesian in the interaction of urban speakers for broader communication. In this sense, Figure 2 illustrates how Indonesian is used in the LL as the language of unity amongst the diverse linguistic communities in Kupang.

Regarding the themes of the graffiti, both Malang and Kupang display multifaceted urban expression. Comparatively, the graffiti in Malang shows a more collective sociopolitical discourse, such as protest, activism, and marketing. Kupang graffiti, on the other hand, centres on personal motivation and individual reflection (Appendix D).

Monolingual English signs are found mostly in the commercial area. Despite being monolingual, the form and structure of the English used are often spiced with local language characteristics. In Figure 3, a monolingual stylised English is shown in the Central Market area.

FIGURE 3. Sign displaying Indonesian-flavoured English

The text *"Centra Moda Textile. Exclusive fabric product*" which appears in Figure 3, is a variety of English that is influenced by Indonesian linguistic structures and thought patterns. Despite sounding like English, the term '*Centra Moda'* likely originates from a combination of Latin and Romance, influenced by Italian or Spanish. '*Centra'* is derived from '*centre'* or '*centra'*, suggesting a focal point or hub. The word *'moda'* is a borrowing from Italian or Spanish, meaning fashion or style. In context, '*Centra Moda'* could be interpreted as the centre of fashion. Underneath the brand name is the tagline of the shop, '*Exclusive fabric product'*, which is atypical in standard English. A more common English phrase would be *'exclusive fabrics'* or '*special fabrics*,' bringing the emphasis directly to '*fabrics'* without adding the less precise term '*product'*. This construction appears to be a direct translation from the Indonesian phrase *'produk kain eksklusif'*. In this way, the LL of Malang has shown how English, as a global language, is reshaped to align with local linguistic and cultural contexts.

Yannuar (2022) also shows examples of non-standard English in the LL of Malang, such as '*Keep original'* (instead of 'Stay original') and '*No one can hold us'* (instead of 'No one can stop us'). The 'creative' use of English in Indonesia can be seen as a reflection of Indonesia being in Kachru's (1990) Expanding Circle. As such, many words and phrases are often reshaped in non-standard ways since they adopt local linguistic or cultural norms (Kirkpatrick, 2010; Lowenberg, 1991). What appears to be monolingual English apparently is rich with cultural nuances.

FIGURE 4. Intriguing brand name in English

The '*Panties Pizza*' restaurant sign in Malang exemplifies how LL may be a place of cultural negotiation, combining local, global, and religious themes. As seen in Figure 4, the brand logo is a picture of half a pizza attached to a pair of red pants. Next to it is the brand name, Panties Pizza, and a small halal logo written in Arabic. Below the name is the tagline, *'I love panties, like I love you.'* As highlighted in the FGD, the English word 'panties' carries connotations of intimacy and modesty, which were traditionally taboo topics in many cultures, including Indonesia. Participants noted that while the imagery of panties might have been provocative or offensive in the past, it is now perceived more humorously or neutrally by some (Excerpts 1-2).

(1) *"I remember a few years ago that picture was shocking, but now people just laugh or ignore it."*

(Malang FGD)

(2) *"It's more humorous than offensive these days. We get used to seeing it."*

(Malang FGD)

The presence of the word *'halal'* next to *'panties'* is seen as a cultural juxtaposition that could be interpreted in various ways. For some, it might signal adherence to Islamic dietary standards, while others may find the combination inappropriate due to the conflicting symbolic associations. As the sign was located in one of the main streets in Malang, it was very visible to the people of Malang as well as visitors to the city. One FGD participant shared that once she accompanied a visitor from the United States who found the logo intriguing and wanted to photograph it, she thought the sign signalled inappropriateness in a Western context. In this sense, LL can provoke a variety of responses depending on cultural frames of reference (Backhaus, 2007). As also described by Scollon and Scollon (2003), social and cultural contexts contribute to the creation of meaning in LL. Despite the use of English, the message is difficult to comprehend for an international audience.

The prominence of English in the LL of commercial areas in Malang and Kupang demonstrates that English is considered an economically beneficial language, reflecting the notion of language commodification (Heller, 2003, 2010). This pattern can be observed in different sociocultural contexts. In Pakistan, shop owners purposefully use English in their signs to attract wealthier customer segments, as the language is tied to modernity (Manan et al., 2016). Similarly, the use of English in a museum in China also represents modern taste and global status (Xiao & Pang, 2024). Such cases highlight the symbolic function of English as a marker of globalisation (Jaworski, 2015). In the context of Malang and Kupang, where English is rarely a language for everyday communication, the language functions more as a commercial and decorative resource in the LL.

FIGURE 5. British English in Kupang

In a campus area in Kupang, English is found to be used in the naming of facilities on campus. Figure 5 is a large red-letter sign reading 'ICT Centre'. ICT stands for 'Information and Communication Technology' and the writing employs British English spelling. In contrast, a neighbouring building is labelled 'Student Centre', noticeably using American English spelling. Some participants in a focus group discussion (FGD) in Kupang acknowledged that they were unaware of the spelling variation. Campus officials who joined the FGD acknowledged a lack of regulation in the use of English for naming campus units. This observation highlights the wide acceptance of global varieties of English in Kupang, whether American or British.

On another note, the mix of spellings is also connected to the status of English in Indonesia as a foreign language. As part of Kachru's (1990) Expanding Circle, there are no rigid norms on the variety of English being used in the media, classrooms, or public spaces. The lack of standardisation leads to mixed influences, mostly from British and American, resulting in spelling inconsistencies, among others (Lauder, 2008).

REFLECTION OF LOCALITIES IN THE LANDSCAPE

As previously mentioned, Javanese is considered threatened (in terms of vitality) despite its large number of speakers (Ravindranath & Cohn, 2014; Vander Klok, 2019).

FIGURE 6. Local delicacies in Javanese

One example of the continued relevance of Javanese is seen in Figure 4 as a small restaurant name in Malang: *'Rawon isor uwit'* (Rawon under the tree). In Malang, people embrace the local culinary dish, *rawon*, sometimes as a cultural marker. The dish is typically East Javanese and cannot be found in other Indonesian regions. The use of Javanese in this context connects individuals with their local identity, while also helping to strengthen a sense of belonging to the community.

FIGURE 7. Walikan is a creative reinterpretation of the Javanese

Further, in the discussion on Javanese and its connection to food, an advertisement that uses Javanese to encourage donations (*sedekah* in Islamic tradition) is shown in Figure 7. The donations are intended to provide food for those in need and are encouraged in the religion. The ad features the word *nakam*, a walikan or reversal of the Indonesian word *makan* (to eat). Walikan is particularly intriguing as it incorporates vocabulary from various languages, including Javanese and Indonesian, while maintaining East Javanese as the matrix language (Yannuar, 2018). In this instance, although *nakam* originates from Indonesian, Walikan has transformed it into a creative reinterpretation of Javanese. The big and bold word in the ad shows a strong locality of the message, making use of a positive politeness strategy (Brown et al., 1987).

FIGURE 8. Multilingual Javanese and English

Javanese can also coexist with English, as illustrated in Figure 8 with the sign "*Omah Gitar, Music and Sport*". The phrase combines the Javanese word *omah* (house) with the English word *guitar.* This fusion exemplifies a blend of local and global linguistic elements.

In the LL of Kupang, Kupang Malay is the most dominant language.

FIGURE 9. Kupang Malay in a cigarette advertisement

One striking example of Kupang Malay is found in a cigarette advertisement prominently displayed in the city, on the corner of one of the most important bridges in the city. The advertisement features the phrase *'Mari Kitong nikmati Surya Pung Cahaya'* (Let us enjoy the light of Surya). The term *kitong* is a local variant of the inclusive pronoun 'we.' *Pung* in Kupang Malay means *punya* (to have). Interestingly, the Indonesian word *cahaya* (light) is cleverly aligned with the product name Surya (which also means the sun in Indonesian). During an FGD in Kupang, participants commended the choice to use the term *kitong*. They mentioned that similar pronouns such as *katong, basong, and betong* exist, but even locals have difficulty differentiating them. The inclusion of the inclusive pronoun *kitong* in the sign reflects a strategic use of belonging and locality to resonate with the target audience. This choice also acknowledges Kupang Malay as the lingua franca in the region (Benu et al., 2023).

FIGURE 10. A blend of Kupang Malay and English

Another commercial cigarette campaign presents an intriguing linguistic choice, this time through graffiti in front of a park on the beachside of Kupang that creatively blends English and Kupang Malay. The phrase *'Balapeace'* originates from '*Batong Lagi Peace'*, which translates to *'Batong Lagi Damai'* or 'We are at peace.' The term 'peace' in the slogan is aimed at attracting broader audiences, particularly younger generations who are more familiar with English. By merging Kupang Malay and English, the campaign effectively communicates a sense of inclusivity and modernity, as English is seen as the language of modernity and upward mobility (Martin-Anatias, 2018). The positioning of the audience, which is a public park frequented by younger generations, is consistent with the intention of the makers of the sign.

FIGURE 11. Announcement of government programs in top-down signage

Another important role of public signage is the delivery of government programs via top-down signs, observed in both Malang and Kupang, illustrated in Figure 11. As a central government program, a provincial election was about to be conducted at the same time in different provinces in Indonesia. The election commission of each region has cleverly used a combination of local and Indonesian languages to promote the election. Furthermore, pictures of regional icons were displayed on the signs. *Sepe*, a local name for Flamboyant flowers and *Kain Tenun* (traditionally woven fabric) were used as the symbols of the election ad in Kupang. FGD participants in Kupang further noticed how Flamboyant might also be used to indicate the time when the flowers bloom, which coincides with the election date. The local government of Malang, on the other hand, used pictures of Topeng Malang's pride as a symbol. This is complemented with the use of a hashtag '*Gaknyoblosgakmboisjess'*, a local variety of Javanese that means 'it's uncool not to vote'. In Kress and van Leeuwen's (2006) visual grammar framework, the regional icons can be seen as cultural metonyms, as they have the ability to carry complex identities and merge them into visual icons. The inclusion of the icons shows that public space is a semiotic landscape, where imagery and language can blend to create belonging and express identity (Jaworski & Thurlow, 2010).

FIGURE 12. Gepe gepe (cramped) on a public minivan

Figure 12 displays a popular Kupang Malay word on an *angkot* (public minivan). The reduplicated form, *gepe-gepe*, refers to being cramped among other passengers inside one of these vehicles. FGD participants in Kupang shared that the word captured their personal experience when riding the public transport. Historically, *angkot* played a significant role in Kupang's transportation and urban culture, with practices like the *angkot disco,* which was popular in the 1990s and 2000s. During that time, *angkot* drivers would play loud music as they took their vans around the city at night, creating a similar experience as being at a discotheque for the passengers. Seeing the word *gepe-gepe* on an angkot nowadays brings back nostalgia for a more communal social life before online taxis in Kupang. As mentioned in Peck et al. (2019), LL can activate sensory memories and memories of the past. Landscapes of the past can reappear in the present, as shown in the study of Bock and Stroud (2019) on old landscapes of apartheid in South Africa in contemporary times. In the case of the *angkot* in Kupang, however, the word *gepe-gepe* brought back happy memories.

MULTILINGUALISM AND LANGUAGE VITALITY FROM THE COMMUNITY'S VIEWPOINT

Vital to our claim on how the public perceives multidimensionality is the perspective from the passersby as the viewers/readers of public signage. FGDs and interviews with passersby and local communities were carried out for this purpose. Findings from interviews and FGDs in both cities show that the use of different languages in the public signage reflects the multilingualism in the communities and how language vitality is preserved in both cities.

Despite appearing as multilingual signs, they are generally perceived positively in the FGD. Participants acknowledged the overwhelming use of English in public signage. As people in Malang and Kupang were exposed to English in different signs and media, they were used to guessing certain unintelligible words from the context. In a walk-in interview in Malang, a participant admitted that they did not fully understand all the English words in Figure 13; they only interpreted that the shop must be selling 'the food of the young people nowadays' or 'those that are of Western'. This particular discussion informs us that despite its prestigious status and extensive use in public space, English proficiency in Indonesia is still lacking (Renandya et al., 2018).

FIGURE 13. Fruit sensation, food for the young

Our FGD participants endorsed the use of local languages in public signage. They acknowledged that the use of local languages in the LL of the observed cities has revealed the increased awareness of language differences, as shown in Excerpts (3-4):

(3) "*It is refreshing to see local language on public signs. I think it makes people more aware that different languages are part of our everyday life.*"

(Kupang FGD)

(4) *"Why not? It shows that the city values its own culture and identity."*

(Malang FGD)

This is not without challenges, however. For example, some non-native Malang residents were mostly aware of the use of Javanese in the signage but may struggle to understand the unfamiliar Javanese scripts (see Figure 14). Also, while they can identify Javanese in general, specific variants of spoken Javanese may not be familiar to them. This situation represents one of the challenges to promoting local languages in the superdiverse country, as it may exclude speakers of other languages (Sneddon, 2003; Zein, 2020).

FIGURE 14. Symbolic use of Javanese script

In Kupang, local languages like Uab Meto/Dawan, Kupang Malay, and Rote are equally acceptable as a part of public signage in a local church, as shown in Figure 15. FGD participants in Kupang admitted that due to the diversity of local languages in the area, they sometimes only focused on languages that are familiar in their repertoire. The texts in Figure 15 welcome Christians to the place of worship using local wisdom bearing similar philosophy, namely '*Uis neno Nokan Kit'* (Uab Meto/Dawan for 'God bless us'), '*Sodamolek'* (Rote for 'Joy'), '*Helama Tona Le'* (Sabu for 'Highest kindness') and '*Boablingin'* (Helong for 'Greetings').

FIGURE 15. Variety of local languages in a church in Kupang

On the other hand, a concern was raised about the use of local language in signage, as a part of shop signs and advertisements, for instance. A few FGD participants in Kupang admitted that this may lead to misunderstandings, as the language may be exclusive to the natives only (Excerpt 5).

(5) *"Sometimes if the sign is only in our language, outsiders might not understand. It can feel exclusive to natives."*

(Kupang FGD)

(6) *"What if they mistake it for something else?"*

(Kupang FGD)

In this case, the national language, i.e. Indonesian, is suggested for better understanding. In this way, Indonesian is seen as more accommodating to wider audiences, highlighting the success of the country's language planning (May, 2016; Poedjosoedarmo, 2006).

CONCLUSION

This research has investigated the LL of two major cities in the multilingual country of Indonesia, focusing on how different languages are featured on the public signs. Findings show that the LL displays an intersection of monolingual and multilingual signs. Indonesian emerged as the dominant language, followed by English and local languages. The dominance of Bahasa Indonesia in the public space supports findings of previous studies on language shift in Indonesia. The current study supports the notion that the language policy of the country has given power to a single language, potentially driving the country closer to monolingualism, at least in the public space.

In addition to the prevalence of Indonesian in the public signage, globalisation has made English more visible in the LL of Indonesia. English has generally positive perceptions from the public. People appreciate the use of local languages and are accustomed to seeing English even when they do not understand the message completely. The most popular motive for the use of English is economic factors. English reflects upward mobility. Specific to our aim of observing language vitality, we found that local languages such as Javanese or Kupang Malay and Uab Meto/Dawan in signage are often used to represent governmental policies, social movements, or expressions of group identity. The vitality of these local languages in public spaces needs more support. Our data shows that there is a preference for non-minority local languages, with minority languages remaining underrepresented, thus indicating the connection of language use, visibility, and sociopolitical factors.

Because multilingual signs involving the national, local, and foreign languages often appear together, the dynamics of multidimensionality and language vitality in multilingual urban areas across Indonesia (beyond the present study's loci of Malang and Kupang) may potentially manifest more broadly. Further studies are therefore needed to corroborate and extend the results of the present research.

In addition, the multidimensionality may require future LL research in Indonesia to engage with two competing approaches: prescriptive and descriptive. From a prescriptive perspective, future LL research could specifically observe the ideal realisation of *Trigatra Bangun Bahasa*—the national principle of "prioritising Indonesian, preserving regional languages, and mastering foreign languages"—as promoted by the Agency for Language Development and Cultivation (*Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa*).

On the other hand, future LL research should provide more empirical evidence that can inform and refine these prescriptive goals. Robust descriptive findings are essential to support language policies that safeguard Indonesia's unity across its vast archipelago and protect its multilingual and multicultural character.

Finally, when interpreting the results and planning future studies, it is important to consider the limitations of this research. Future research would benefit from longer fieldwork periods to allow comparable exploration of both cities, inclusion of larger urban centres across different islands in Indonesia, and engagement with a broader pool of walk-in interview participants to capture a wider range of perspectives.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Abtahian, M. R., Cohn, A. C., & Pepinsky, T. (2016). Modeling social factors in language shift. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *2016*(242), 132-170.

Adelaar, K. A. (2010). Language documentation in the West Austronesian World and Vanuatu: An overview. In M. Florey (Ed.), *Endangered languages of Austronesia* (pp. 12–44). Oxford Univ. Press.

Alisjahbana, S. T. (2019). Language planning for modernization: The case of Indonesian and Malaysian. J. A. Fishman (Ed.). De Gruyter Mouton.

Ananta, A., Nurvidya Arifin, E., & Sairi Hasbullah, M. (2015). *Demography of Indonesia's ethnicity*. ISEAS Publishing.

Anderbeck, K. (2015). Portraits of language vitality in the languages of Indonesia. In I. W. Arka, N. L. N. Seri Malini, & I. A. M. Puspani (Eds.), *Language documentation and cultural practices in the Austronesian world: Papers from 12-ICAL*, Volume 4 (pp. 19–47). Asia-Pacific Linguistics, College of Asia and the Pacific, The Australian National University.

Anderson, B. R. O. (1990). *Language and power: Exploring political cultures in Indonesia.* Cornell University Press.

Arka, I. W. (2013). Language management and minority language maintenance in (eastern) Indonesia: Strategic issues. *Language Documentation & Conservation*, *7*, 74–105.

Austin, P. K., & Sallabank, J. (2013). Endangered languages: An introduction. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 34*(4), 313–316.

Ayyub, S., & and Rohmah, Z. (2024). The linguistic landscape of Kotabaru Malang Train Station: Language representation in public space. *Cogent Arts & Humanities, 11*(1), 2389633.

Backhaus, P. (2007). *Linguistic landscapes: A comparative study of urban multilingualism in Tokyo*. Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Balle, M. (2017). Phonological sketch of Helong, an Austronesian language of Timor. *Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society, 10*(1), 91–103.

Balukh, J. (2021). A Grammar of Dhao; An endangered Austronesian language in Eastern Indonesia. *Wacana, 22*(2), 522–533.

Begum, N., & Sinha, S. (2019). Mother tongue marginalisation: An empirical study on language visibility and vitality in public space of an Indian satellite town. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *18*(1), 41–58.

Ben-Rafael, E., Shohamy, E., & Barni, M. (2010). Introduction: An approach to an 'ordered disorder.' In E. G. Shohamy, E. Ben-Rafael, & M. Barni (Eds.), *Linguistic landscape in the city*. Multilingual Matters.

Benu, N. N. (2021, September 10). *Dawan language in public space (A linguistic landscape study in Kota Kupang and Soe)* [Paper presentation] International Seminar on Austronesian Languages and Literature IX, Denpasar, Indonesia.

Benu, N. N., Artawa, I. K., Satyawati, M. S., & Purnawati, K. W. (2023). Local language vitality in Kupang city, Indonesia: A linguistic landscape approach. *Cogent Arts & Humanities, 10*(1), 2153973.

Bock, Z., & Stroud, C. (2019). Zombie landscapes: Apartheid traces in the discourses of young South Africans. In *Making sense of people and place in linguistic landscapes* (pp. 11–28). Bloomsbury Academic.

Booth, A. (2004). Africa in Asia? The development challenges facing Eastern Indonesia and East Timor. *Oxford Development Studies*, *32*(1), 19–35.

Brown, P., Levinson, S. C., & Gumperz, J. J. (1987). *Politeness: some universals in language usage* (Reissue edition). Cambridge University Press.

Cohn, A. C., & Ravindranath, M. (2014). Local languages in Indonesia: Language maintenance or language shift? *Linguistik Indonesia, 32*(2), 131–148.

Djenar, D. N., Ewing, M., & Manns, H. (2018). *Style and intersubjectivity in youth interaction*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Eberhard, D. M., Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (2024). Ethnologue: Languages of the world. Twenty-seventh edition. Retrieved October 12, 2024.

Edwards, O. (2021). *Rote-Meto comparative dictionary* (1st ed.). ANU Press.

Errington, J. J. (1998). *Shifting languages interaction and identity in Javanese Indonesia*. Cambridge University Press.

Ewing, M. C. (2005). Colloquial Indonesian. In K. A. Adelaar & N. Himmelmann (Eds.), *Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar* (pp. 227-258). Taylor & Francis.

Febrianti, Y., & Yannuar, N. (2022). The youth linguistic index: Narrative persuasion and sense of belonging in a movie trailer. In C. Groff, A. Hollington, E. Hurst-Harosh, N. Nassenstein, J. Nortier, H. Pasch, & N. Yannuar (Eds.), *Global perspectives on youth language practices* (pp. 293–314). De Gruyter.

Fox, J. J. (2016). *Master poets, ritual masters: The art of oral composition among the Rotenese of Eastern Indonesia.* ANU Press.

Fricke, H. (2020). Traces of language contact: The Flores-Lembata languages in eastern Indonesia. *Wacana, 21*(1), 156–167.

Heller, M. (2003). Globalisation, the new economy, and the commodification of language and identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 7*(4), 473–492.

Heller, M. (2010). The Commodification of Language. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *39*(1), 101–114.

Hernández, L. C., E. López-Gopar, M., & M. Sughrua, W. (2017). From Linguistic Landscape to Semiotic Landscape: Indigenous Language Revitalization and Literacy. *Studie Z Aplikované Lingvistiky*, *2*, 7–21.

Ilma, A., & Rohmah, Z. (2024). Balancing faith and identity: Language policies and practices in Indonesian Muslim families. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1–16.

Jacob, J., & Grimes, B. D. (2006, January 17). *Developing a role for Kupang Malay: The contemporary politics of an eastern Indonesian creole* [Paper presentation] Tenth international conference on Austronesian Linguistics (10-ICAL), Puerto Princesa City, Palawan, Philippines.

Jacob, J., & Grimes, C. E. (2011). Aspect and directionality in Kupang Malay serial verb constructions: Calquing on the grammars of substrate languages. In C. Lefebvre (Ed.), *Creoles, their substrates, and language typology* (pp. 337-366). John Benjamins Pub.

Jaworski, A. (2015). Globalese: A new visual-linguistic register. *Social Semiotics, 25*(2), 217–235.

Jaworski, A., & Thurlow, C. (Eds.). (2010). *Semiotic landscapes: Language, image, space.* Continuum Bloomsbury Publishing.

Kachru, B. B. (1990). World Englishes and applied linguistics. *World Englishes, 9*(1), 3–20.

Kallen, J. (2009). Tourism and representation in the Irish linguistic landscape. In E. Shohamy & D. Gorter (Eds.), *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery* (1st ed, pp. 270–284). Routledge.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *English as a lingua franca in ASEAN: A multilingual model*. University Press.

Klamer, M. (2019). Language endangerment and vitality in Indonesia. In A. C. Cohn, T. Conners, & Yanti (Eds.), *Indonesian Languages and Linguistics: State of the Field*.

Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2006). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design* (2nd ed). Routledge.

Landry, R., & Bourhis, R. Y. (1997). Linguistic landscape and ethnolinguistic vitality: An empirical study. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *16*(1), 23–49.

Lauder, A. (2008). The status and function of English in Indonesia: A review of key factors. *Makara Human Behavior Studies in Asia*, *12*(1), 9.

Lewis, M. P., & Simons, G. F. (2010). Assesssing endangerment: Expanding Fishman's GIDS. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique*, *55*, 103–120.

Lowenberg, P. H. (1991). English as an additional language in Indonesia. *World Englishes, 10*(2), 127–138.

Malinowski, D. (2009). Authorship in the linguistic landscape: A multimodal-performative view. In E. Shohamy & D. Gorter (Eds.), *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery* (1st ed), (pp. 107–125). Routledge.

Manan, S. A., David, M. K., Dumanig, F. P., & Channa, L. A. (2016). The glocalisation of English in the Pakistan linguistic landscape. *World Englishes*, *36*(4), 645–665.

Manns, H. (2014). Scripting radio language amidst language shift in Indonesia. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, *24*(1), 21–38.

Martin-Anatias, N. (2018). Bahasa gado-gado: English in Indonesian popular texts. *World Englishes*, *37*(2), 340–355.

May, S. (2016). Language education, pluralism, and citizenship. In T. McCarty & S. May (Eds.), *Language Policy and Political Issues in Education* (pp. 1–16). Springer International Publishing.

Mulyawan, I. W. (2021). Maintaining and revitalising Balinese language in public space: A controversial language planning regulation. *Indonesia and the Malay World*, *49*(145), 481–495.

Nurani, L. M. (2015). *Changing language loyalty and identity: An ethnographic inquiry of societal transformation among the Javanese people in Yogyakarta, Indonesia* [Doctoral Dissertation, Arizona State University]. Arizona State University Repository.

Olbata, Y. (2017, October 6). *Language varieties analysis of dialect differences in Bahasa Dawan* [Paper presentation] Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Applied Linguistics (CONAPLIN 9). Ninth International Conference on Applied Linguistics (CONAPLIN 9), Bandung, Indonesia.

Peck, A., Stroud, C., & Williams, Q. (2019). *Making sense of people and place in linguistic landscapes*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Pepinsky, T. B., Abtahian, M. R., & Cohn, A. C. (2024). Urbanization, ethnic diversity, and language shift in Indonesia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 45(*7), 2503–2521.

Poedjosoedarmo, G. (2006). The effect of Bahasa Indonesia as a lingua franca on the Javanese system of speech levels and their functions. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *2006*(177), 111-121.

Pütz, M., & Mundt, N. (Eds.). (2018). *Expanding the linguistic landscape*. Multilingual Matters,

Ravindranath, M., & Cohn, A. C. (2014). Can a language with millions of speakers be endangered? *Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society (JSEALS)*, *7*, 64–75.

Renandya, W. A., Hamied, F. A., & Joko, N. (2018). English language proficiency in Indonesia: Issues and prospects. *The Journal of AsiaTEFL, 15*(3), 618–629.

Ricklefs, M. C., Lockhart, B., Lau, A., Reyes, P., & Aung-Thwin, M. (Eds.). (2010). *A new history of Southeast Asia*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Rohmah, Z., & Wijayanti, E. W. N. (2023). Linguistic landscape of Mojosari: Language policy, language vitality and commodification of language. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, *10*(2), 1-22.

Sakhiyya, Z., & Martin-Anatias, N. (2023). Reviving the language at risk: A social semiotic analysis of the linguistic landscape of three cities in Indonesia. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *20*(2), 290–307.

Sakhiyya, Z., Yannuar, N., & Anjaniputra, A. G. (2024). Football fandom, social justice and solidarity: The linguistic landscape of fans' protests on the Kanjuruhan tragedy in Indonesia. *International Journal of Multilingualism,* 1–18.

Sari, B. T., Van De Vijver, F. J. R., Chasiotis, A., & Bender, M. (2019). Contextualized bilingualism among adolescents from four different ethnic groups in Indonesia. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *23*(6), 1469–1482.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2003). *Discourses in place: Language in the material world.* Routledge.

Setiawan, S. (2012). *Children's language in a bilingual community in East Java* [Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Western Australia]. The University of Western Australia profiles and Research repository.

Shohamy, E., & Gorter, D. (Eds.). (2009). *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery* (1st ed). Routledge.

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* (1st ed, pp. 313–331). Routledge.

Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (2018). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world, 21st edition.* Ethnologue: Languages of the World, Twenty-First Edition. Retrieved October 12, 2024, from https://www.ethnologue.com/country/ID

Sneddon, J. N. (2003). *Indonesian language: Its history and role in modern society*. University of New South Wales press.

Sudarmanto, B. A., Wahyuni, T., Aji, E. N. W., Murdowo, D. A., Hendrastuti, R., Artawa, K., & Benu, N. N. (2023). The languages on the border of Indonesia and Timor Leste: A linguistic landscape study. *Cogent Arts & Humanities, 10*(2), 2273145.

Sunendar, D., Hardini, T. I., & Racmadhany, A. (2024). The "Trigatra Bahasa": How much do digital native students understand about it? *International Journal of Education, 17*(2), Article 2.

Suryadinata, L., Ananta, A., & Arifin, E. N. (2003). *Indonesia's population: Ethnicity and religion in a changing political landscape*. Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

Szabó, T. P., & Troyer, R. A. (2017). Inclusive ethnographies: Beyond the binaries of observer and observed in linguistic landscape studies. *Linguistic Landscape. An International Journal*, *3*(3), 306–326.

Tupas, R. (2015). Inequalities of multilingualism: Challenges to mother tongue-based multilingual education. *Language and Education, 29*(2), 112–124.

Vander Klok, J. (2019). The Javanese language at risk? Perspectives from an East Java village. *Language Documentation, 13*, 300–345.

Xiao, R., & Pang, C. (2024). The commodification of English language in Chinese tourism: A case study of the Palace Museum. *3L The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, *30*(1), 142–157.

Yannuar, N. (2018). Wòlak-waliké jaman: Exploring contemporary Walikan in public space. *Wacana, 19*(1), 100–121.

Yannuar, N. (2022). "Keep original" translanguaging and identity construction among East Javanese football supporters. In S. H. Mirvahedi, *Linguistic Landscapes in South-East Asia* (1st ed., pp. 185–207). Routledge.

Yannuar, N., & Tabiati, S. E. (2016). Public signs in the city of Malang: A study on the linguistic landscape of Indonesia. *The Changing Face of Language Pedagogy: Exploring Linguistics and Literature*, 119–134.

Zein, S. (2020). *Language policy in superdiverse Indonesia*. Routledge.

Zentz, L. (2015). "Love" the local, "use" the national, "study" the foreign: Shifting Javanese language ecologies in (post-)modernity, postcoloniality, and globalization. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 24*(3), 339–359.

APPENDIX A

Malang

Language	Kecamatan Klojen			Kecamatan Sukun			Kecamatan Lowokwaru			Kecamatan Kedungkandang			Kecamatan Blimbing		
Monolingual	IN	267	35,22%	IN	132	49,81%	IN	165	38,64%	IN	34	39,08%	EN	2	40,00%
	EN	94	12,40%	EN	20	7,55%	EN	50	11,71%	EN	8	9,20%	IN	1	20,00%
	Indeterminable	12	1,58%	JAV	3	1,13%	ES	3	0,70%	Walikan	1	1,15%			
	JAV	15	1,98%	IT	1	0,38%	AR	1	0,23%						
	SUN	2	0,26%				HAW	1	0,23%						
	NL	1	0,13%				JAV	1	0,23%						
	IT	1	0,13%												
	KO	1	0,13%												
	SA	1	0,13%												
	JA	3	0,40%												
	AR	4	0,53%												
	YUE	1	0,13%												
	Walikan	4	0,53%												
Bilingual	IN, EN	219	28,89%	IN, EN	75	28,30%	IN, EN	147	34,43%	IN, EN	26	29,89%	EN, IT	2	40,00%
	IN, JAV	26	3,43%	IN, JAV	14	5,28%	IN, JAV	14	3,28%	IN, JAV	6	6,90%			
	IN, AR	19	2,51%	IN, Walikan	5	1,89%	IN, AR	6	1,41%	EN, JAV	1	1,15%			
	EN, ZH	5	0,66%	IN, AR	4	1,51%	EN, ZH	3	0,70%	IN, Walikan	1	1,15%			
	EN, NL	4	0,53%	EN, ZH	1	0,38%	EN, JA	3	0,70%	IN, AR	1	1,15%			
	EN, FR	3	0,40%	EN, NL	1	0,38%	EN, NL	2	0,47%	IN, JA	1	1,15%			
	EN, JAV	3	0,40%	EN, FR	1	0,38%	English, Icelandic	1	0,23%	IN, EN	1	1,15%			
	EN, KO	3	0,40%	IN, LA	1	0,38%	EN, IT	1	0,23%						
	IN, NL	3	0,40%	EN, JAV	1	0,38%	EN, ES	1	0,23%						
	JAV, Walikan	3	0,40%				EN, SV	2	0,47%						
	EN, IT	2	0,26%				English, Greek	1	0,23%						
	EN, JA	2	0,26%				IN, ZH	1	0,23%						
	EN, MS	2	0,26%				IN, NL	1	0,23%						
	EN, SA	2	0,26%				IN, JA	1	0,23%						
	EN, SV	2	0,26%				IN, SUN	1	0,23%						
	EN, Walikan	2	0,26%				EN, LA	1	0,23%						
	IN, SA	2	0,26%				IN, Walikan	1	0,23%						
	IN, ZH	1	0,13%												
	IN, FR	1	0,13%												
	IN, JA	1	0,13%												
Multilingual	IN, EN, JAV	22	2,90%	IN, EN, JAV	4	1,51%	IN, EN, AR	6	1,41%	IN, EN, JAV	3	3,45%			
	IN, EN, SA	4	0,53%	IN, EN, JAV, FR	1	0,38%	IN, EN, DE	1	0,23%	IN, EN, AR	2	2,30%			
	IN, EN, JA	3	0,40%	IN, EN, SA	1	0,38%	IN, EN, JA	3	0,70%	IN, EN, AR, JA, ZH	1	1,15%			
	IN, EN, AR	2	0,26%				IN, EN, JAV	5	1,17%	IN, EN, JA	1	1,15%			
	IN, EN, ZH	2	0,26%				IN, EN, SA	1	0,23%						
	IN, EN, FR	2	0,26%				IN, EN, Walikan	1	0,23%						
	IN, EN, KO	2	0,26%				IN, JAV, AR	1	0,23%						
	IN, EN, VI	2	0,26%				IN, JAV, Walikan	1	0,23%						
	En, JAV, Walikan	1	0,13%												
	IN, EN, NL	1	0,13%												
	IN, EN, DE	1	0,13%												
	IN, EN, EL	1	0,13%												
	IN, EN, JAV, AR, NL	1	0,13%												
	IN, EN, JAV, ZH	1	0,13%												
	IN, EN, JAV, VI, MS, ZH	1	0,13%												
	IN, JAV, Walikan	1	0,13%												
Total		758	100,00%		265	100,00%		427	100,00%		87	100,00%		5	100,00%

Total	1542

APPENDIX B

Language	Kelapa Lima	Kota Raja	Kota Lama	Maulafa	Oebobo
Monolingual	IN 158 40,31%	IN 33 29,73%	IN 25 34,25%	IN 32 24,24%	IN 84 32,31%
	EN 50 12,76%	EN 4 3,60%	EN 8 10,96%	EN 25 18,94%	EN 34 13,08%
	Indeterminable 4 1,02%	Dawan 1 0,90%	Dutch 1 1,37%	Dawan 1 0,76%	Indeterminable 5 1,92%
	Dawan 2 0,51%		Helong 1 1,37%		Dawan 1 0,38%
	JAV 1 0,26%		Indeterminable 1 1,37%		HE 1 0,38%
	Kupang Malay 1 0,26%		IT 1 1,37%		Kupang Malay 1 0,38%
	Sumba 1 0,26%		Kupang Malay 1 1,37%		PT 1 0,38%
Bilingual	IN, EN 96 24,49%	IN, EN 38 34,23%	IN, EN 17 23,29%	IN, EN 50 37,88%	IN, EN 68 26,15%
	IN, Kupang Malay 17 4,34%	IN, Kupang Malay 2 1,80%	Indonesian, Kupang Malay 6 8,22%	IN, HE 3 2,27%	IN, AR 11 4,23%
	IN, HE 8 2,04%	EN, ZH 1 0,90%	IN, AR 1 1,37%	IN, Kupang Malay 2 1,52%	IN, Kupang Malay 6 2,31%
	IN, JAV 7 1,79%	EN, Japanese 1 0,90%	IN, HE 1 1,37%	EN, Kupang Malay 1 0,76%	IN, HE 3 1,15%
	EN, Kupang Malay 3 0,77%	EN, JAV 1 0,90%	IN, JAV 1 1,37%	EN, Sumba 1 0,76%	IN, JAV 3 1,15%
	IN, AR 3 0,77%	EN, KO 1 0,90%	EN, JA 1 1,37%	IN, AR 1 0,76%	EN, KO 2 0,77%
	IN, Betawi 2 0,51%	EN, Kupang Malay 1 0,90%	IN, Manado 1 1,37%	IN, Dawan 1 0,76%	IN, Manado 2 0,77%
	IN, Dawan 2 0,51%	EN, TH 1 0,90%		IN, JAV 1 0,76%	IN, AR 1 0,38%
	IN, Minangkabau 2 0,51%	IN, AR 1 0,90%		IN, LA 1 0,76%	EN, IT 1 0,38%
	IN, AR 1 0,26%	IN, Balinese 2 1,80%		IN, Rote 1 0,76%	EN, JA 1 0,38%
	EN, Dawan 1 0,26%	IN, HE 1 0,90%			IN, Betawi 1 0,38%
	EN, HE 1 0,26%	IN, JAV 1 0,90%			IN, Dawan 1 0,38%
	IN, Helong 1 0,26%	IN, Manado 1 0,90%			IN, NL 1 0,38%
	IN, IT 1 0,26%	IN, Palembang Malay 1 0,90%			IN, LA 1 0,38%
	IN, Makassar 1 0,26%				IN, Makassar 1 0,38%
	IN, Sanskrit 1 0,26%				IN, Rote 1 0,38%
					IN, SA 1 0,38%
					JAV, AR 1 0,38%
Multilingual	IN, EN, Kupang Malay 13 3,32%	IN, EN, Kupang Malay 5 4,50%	IN, EN, Kupang Malay 4 5,48%	IN, EN, AR 3 2,27%	IN, EN, Kupang Malay 6 2,31%
	IN, EN, JAV 3 0,77%	IN, EN, JAV 2 1,80%	IN, EN, Dawan 1 1,37%	IN, EN, Kupang Malay 3 2,27%	IN, EN, ZH 3 1,15%
	IN, EN, JAV 2 0,51%	IN, EN, AR 1 0,90%	IN, EN, AR 1 1,37%	IN, EN, ZH 1 0,76%	IN, EN, HE 3 1,15%
	IN, Dawan, Rote, Sabu, Alor, Helong, Sumba 1 0,26%	IN, EN, ZH 1 0,90%	IN, Kupang Malay, Rote 1 1,37%	IN, EN, JA 1 0,76%	IN, EN, JAV 3 1,15%
	IN, EN, ZH 1 0,26%	IN, EN, JA 1 0,90%		IN, EN, Manado, Rote 1 0,76%	IN, EN, Rote 3 1,15%
	IN, EN, HE 1 0,26%	IN, EN, JA 1 0,90%		IN, EN, Rote 1 0,76%	IN, EN, AR 1 0,38%
	IN, EN, Kupang Malay, Sabu 1 0,26%	IN, EN, KO, JA, ZH 1 0,90%		IN, JAV, Rote 1 0,76%	IN, EN, NL, JA 1 0,38%
	IN, EN, Makassar 1 0,26%	IN, EN, Minangkabau 1 0,90%		IN, Rote, Manado 1 0,76%	IN, EN, Ende 1 0,38%
	IN, EN, Manado 1 0,26%	IN, EN, Palembang Malay 1 0,90%			IN, EN, IT 1 0,38%
	IN, EN, Minangkabau 1 0,26%	IN, EN, Sundanese 1 0,90%			IN, EN, KO 1 0,38%
	IN, Kupang Malay, EL 1 0,26%	IN, JA, Thai 1 0,90%			IN, EN, Minangkabau 1 0,38%
	IN, Kupang Malay, SA, LA 1 0,26%	IN, JAV, AR 1 0,90%			IN, EN, ES 1 0,38%
	IN, Sabu, Rote 1 0,26%	IN, JAV, Sundanese 1 0,90%			IN, EN, Sumba 1 0,38%
		IN, EN, KO 1 0,90%			IN, Kupang Malay, JAV 1 0,38%
		IN, EN, HE 1 0,90%			
	392 100,00%	111 100,00%	73 100,00%	132 100,00%	260 100,00%
Total	968				

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEWEE DEMOGRAPHICS IN KUPANG

KUPANG			
Interviewee	**Age**	**Gender**	**Identity/Occupation**
1	unknown	F	Street food seller
2	43	F	Shop owner
3	45	F	Government staff
4	18	F	University student
5	21	M	University student
6	21	F	University student
7	unknown	F	Government staff
8	unknown	F	University student
9	unknown	M	Street seller
10	unknown	F	Street seller

FGD PARTICIPANTS DEMOGRAPHICS IN KUPANG

FGD			
Participant	**Age**	**Gender**	**Identity/Occupation**
1	26	M	University student
2	37	F	University student
3	19	F	University student
4	21	M	University student
5	31	F	University lecturer
6	21	M	University student
7	45	M	University lecturer
8	46	M	University lecturer
9	50	M	University lecturer

INTERVIEWEE DEMOGRAPHICS IN MALANG

MALANG			
Interviewee	**Age**	**Gender**	**Identity/Occupation**
1	50	F	Teacher
2	unknown	F	University student
3	21	F	University student
4	20	F	University student
5	42	M	Private employee
6	25	F	Private employee
7	60	F	Local community member
8	unknown	M	Brawijaya Museum Manager

FGD PARTICIPANTS DEMOGRAPHICS IN MALANG

FGD			
Participant	**Age**	**Gender**	**Identity/Occupation**
1	21	F	University student
2	19	M	University student
3	21	F	University student
4	22	M	University student
5	23	F	University student
6	57	F	University staff
7	29	F	University lecturer
8	27	F	University lecturer
9	35	F	University lecturer
10	20	M	University student

APPENDIX D

Graffiti Themes in Malang and Kupang			
MALANG	Amounts	**KUPANG**	Amounts
education	15	education	1
identity	18	environmental	3
motivation	3	humor	2
Nationalism	5	identity	14
promotion/ marketing	42	love	1
protest/activist	60	motivation	39
public	1	nationalism	2
religion	1	promotion	5
Ultras	3	protest/activist	5
Unidentified	8	public	1
		religion	2
		taboo	1
		unidentified	7
		warning	1
Total	156	Total	84
Grand Total	240		