CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter is the final part of this research, with a purpose to conclude the findings and could provide some suggestions associated with the studies that have been observed through the researcher that are geared toward general readers, and in particular for the next researchers who will study the same field.

5.1. Conclusion

This present study analyzes the linguistic landscape in urban space located in two main objects; the city of Gorontalo and the district of Gorontalo areas. This study underlines three research questions; first, to discover what language represents the LL in Gorontalo, second, to find out the LL categories are used in Gorontalo's linguistic landscape, and the third is to examine what are the functions of the languages used in the linguistic landscape in Gorontalo. The result discovered as follows:

The first and second research question of this research focuses on discovering what language types (*mono, biling, multi*) and LL categories are used in Gorontalo's linguistic landscape. Briefly, the researcher managed to collect data on linguistic landscapes that meet the requirements according to the qualifications determined; totaling 502 signs, which are divided into 298 monolingual signs, 190 bilingual signs, and 14 multilingual signs. From the three types of signs, fifteen languages were found. Therefore, based on the fifteen different languages found in this public sign, Indonesian is the most dominant language used then followed by English as the second most language widely use, and sadly, the local language of Gorontalo becomes the least language used in public signs.

This finding proves that the use of Indonesian in the linguistic landscape in the Gorontalo area is still widely used compared to foreign languages, especially the use of English. However, this study also proves that English has also begun to develop in its use in public places in the Gorontalo area, unfortunately, the use of the Gorontalo local language itself is starting to decrease and only a few are used in public signs.

Further, based on the same theoretical concept of the public sign category that was found, answering the second research question that from the total of 502 signs, dominated by the bottom-up sign category with 355 signs, while the top-down sign only got 147 signs. Based on these findings, it can be concluded that most of the public signs present in the Gorontalo area are non-official signs or have an unofficial position.

On the other hand, the third research question focuses on examining the functions of the languages used in the linguistic landscape in Gorontalo. The researcher found that there are three functions of using the linguistic landscape in Gorontalo based on the theoretical concept of Gorter (2006): (language as the marker of language revitalization, language as the marker of globalization, and language as an identity marker).

The three functions found are interrelated in their emergence. An indigenous language that carries the identity of a particular community or region has a high probability of being lost and not being used anymore due to globalization in the language field. In this case, it is illustrated by the use of the Gorontalo language from the linguistic landscape side, which is rarely used, resulting in the language being forgotten so that future generations from the region are unable to use the local language itself. In addition, the development of the use of foreign languages, in this

case, English, which brings the impression of modernity and keeping up with the times has made this language more and more used in public signs. Even at the time of arrival, if the use of a foreign language is not controlled appropriately, its use may erode the official language of a country itself. Therefore, one of the steps taken by the community and the government, whether consciously or not, is the existence of a language revitalization process in the use of local languages and official languages on signs in public places.

More than that, the three functions of the linguistic landscape found can also represent the state and development of the linguistic landscape in the Gorontalo region; both in terms of the spread of language in signs, the function of its use, and the cause and effect of the use of language diversity within the scope of the linguistic landscape in Gorontalo.

In conclusion, it turns out that the use of the type of linguistic landscape in Indonesia, especially in the Gorontalo area, is still widely used in the form of monolingual signs and is dominated by the Indonesian language itself. On the other hand, the use of LL in bilingual form is dominated by a combination of Indonesian and English. This is relevant to the findings of previous studies conducted in several places in Indonesia by previous researchers.

5.2. Suggestion

Several things have not been the focus of this research because of some other reasons, where the researcher expects that future researchers can examine these in order to accomplish this research on the Linguistic landscape side. These things include; the form of using LL in street names and how the process of the formation of a street

name is, and also about how to find the cause of errors in interpreting language in the linguistic landscape.

Other than that, this research was conducted in two parts of a large area in the Gorontalo area, but there are still several other parts of the area that have not been reached by the researcher because of some reason. So that there are still some parts of the area that cannot be reached, including the Bonebolango district, Bualemo district, and Pohuwato district. The researcher hopes that other researchers in the future, especially those from the Gorontalo region, can continue this research at an even greater level of coverage, as in some of the areas previously mentioned, so that it can reach the entire territory of the Gorontalo province itself.

In addition, the researcher hopes that readers, whether it is the society in general or the related government parties who have read this research, can try to revive the local language of Gorontalo, either by refitting the language in terms of the linguistic landscape or with other ways. So that the local Gorontalo language can still survive and be used by the general public in the Gorontalo area and may even develop in its use to go international.

REFERENCES

Alfaifi, A. (2015). Linguistic Landscape: The Use of English in Khamis Mushait Saudi Arabia. *Linguistic Landscape Khamis Mushait*.

Angouri, J. (2010). *Combining methods in linguistic research*. In Litosseliti, L (Eds). Research methods in linguistics. (pp. 29-45). London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Ardhana, A. (2019). The Bilingualism in Road Sign, From the Perspective of the Linguistic Landscape. *Thesis*.

Ardhian, D., & Fajar, Y. (2017). Linguistic Landscape in Malang City, East Java. *Linguistic Landscape in Malang City, East Java*.

Aribowo, EK, & Nugroho, AJS (2018). *Ancangan Analisis Bahasa di Ruang Publik: Studi Lanskap Linguistik Kota Surakarta dalam Mempertahankan Tiga Identitas.*, osf.io, https://osf.io/preprints/inarxiv/qa5p8/

Backhaus, P. (2007). *Linguistic landscape a comparative study of urban multilingualism in Tokyo.* Antigonish: St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, Nova Scotia, Canada.

Ben-Rafael, E., E. Shohamy & M. Barni 2010. Introduction: An approach to an 'ordered disorder'. In E. Shohamy, E. Ben-Rafael & M. Barni (eds.) 2010. Linguistic Landscape in the City. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Ben-Rafael, E., Shohamy, E., Amara, M. H., & Trumper-Hecht, N. (2006). *Linguistic landscape as a symbolic construction of public space*: The case of Israel. International Journal of Multilingualism, 31, 7-30.

Bila, M., & Vankova, I. (2019). Tourists notices in the spotlight of linguistics

    landscape and translation study. *Russian Journal of linguistics*.

Block, D. (2007). *The rise of identity in second language acquisition research*: Post

    Firth and Wagner (1997). Modern Language Journal, 91(5), 863-

    876.doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00674x

Bowen, G. A. (2009) Document *Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method*.

    Qualitative Research Journal, 9, 27-40. http://dx.doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027

Cenos, J., & Gorter, D. (2008). The linguistic landscape is an additional source of

    input in second language acquisition. *The Linguistic Landscape*.

Clyne, M. (1994.) Inter-cultural communication at work. Cambridge: Cambridge

    University Press.

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University

    Press. Eggington, W. (1987). Written academic discourse in Korean:

    Implications for effective communication. In U. Connor and R. Kaplan (Eds),

    Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text (pp. 172–189). Reading, MA:

    Addison-Wesley.

Fakhiroh, Z. (2019). *Linguistic Landscapes of Bangil*: Sign Identification of Urban

    Space in Kampung Arab.

Fakhiroh, Z., & Rohmah, Z. (2019). Linguistic Landscape Of Sidoarjo City. *Zakiyatul*

    Fakhiroh & Zuliati Rohmah, Linguistic Landscape.

Firdausiyah, H. (2019). *A Linguistic Landscape Study in Pondok Pesantren Putri*

    Mambaus Sholihin Gresik.

Gorter, D. (2006). *Linguistic landscape*: A new roach to multilingualism. Somerset,

    Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Harrison, K. D. (2007). A world of many (fewer) voices. In K. D. Harrison (Ed.),

    When languages die: The extinction of the world's languages and the erosion

    of human knowledge. Cary, NC: Oxford University Press.

Holmes, H. K. (2019). Multilingualism and Technology: A Review of Developments

    in Digital Communication from Monolingualism to Idiolingualism. *Annual*

    Review of Applied Linguistics.

Hult, F.M. (2009). Language Ecology and Linguistic Landscape Analysis, in E.

    Shohamy,&D. Gorter, (Eds.). *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery*.

    (pp.88-104).London: Routledge.

Ibrahim, Riskawati (2016). Interferensi Morfologi Bahasa Melayu Manado Terhadap

    Penggunaan Bahasa Gorontalo. Universitas Negeri Gorontalo

Julia A. Wolfson, Ph.D., MPP, Stephen P. Teret, JD, MPH, Deborah Azrael, Ph.D.,

    and Matthew Miller, MD, ScD, MPH (2017). *US Public Opinion on Carrying*

    Firearms in Public Places. June 2017, Vol 107, No. 6. AJPHRESEARCH.

Knupfer, N. N. & McLellan, H. (2001). The Handbook of Research for Educational

    Communications and Technology. Bloomington: AECT. Pdf.

Koskinen, K. (2012). Linguistic Landscape as a Translational Space. *Language,*

    Space, and Power: Urban Entanglements.

Kumar, R. (2011). Research methodology. *A step-by-step guide for beginners.* SAGE

    Publications Ltd.

Landry, R., & Bourhis, R. Y. (1997). *Linguistic landscape and ethnolinguistic vitality*:

    An empirical study. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 16(1), 24-49.

Loth R.C, (2016). The linguistic landscape as a construct of the public space: *a case*

    *study of post-apartheid rural South Africa.*Unit for Language Facilitation and

    Empowerment, UFS.

Marko Ristić, at al. 2017. *Epidemiological Importance Of Green Areas And Public*

    Places Contaminated With Canine Feces In Urban Environmental Conditions.

    Acta Medica Medianae 2017, Vol.56(3).

McKay, S. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford

    University Press.

Mensel, L. V., Vandenbroucke, M., & Blackwood, R. (2016). Linguistic Landscapes.

    Linguistic Landscapes.

Napu, N. (2019). *Linguistic Landscape in Gorontalo*: Insights From Translation

    Perspective. Paper presented at International Students Conference 2019.

Napu, Novriyanto. (2016). *Translation in tourism: understanding the quality of*

    translation across multiple perspectives. Ph.D. thesis, University of South

    Australia

Puzey, Guy. (2007). Planning the Linguistic Landscape: *A Comparative Survey of the*

    Use of Minority Languages in the Road Signage of Norway, Scotland, and

    Italy. The University of Edinburgh.

Shohamy, E., & Gorter, D. (2009). *Linguistic Landscape.* New York: Routledge 270

    Madison Ave.

Siricharoen, A. (2016). Multilingualism in the Linguistic Landscape of the Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand. *Multilingualism in the Linguistic Landscape*.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2001). The globalization of (educational) language rights. International Review of Education, 47(3-4), 201-219.

Su, Guangzi. (2012). Public places: the *retail-oriented public realm in Beijing.* Ph.D. thesis, University of Nottingham.

Tan, KH, Farashaiyan, A, Sahragard, R, & Faryabi, F (2020). Implications of English as an International Language for Language Pedagogy. *International Journal*, ERIC, https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1234483

Tang, H.K. (2016). *Linguistic Landscaping in Singapore: The Local Linguistic Ecology and the Roles of English.* Centre for Languages and Literature.

Piller, I. (2001). *Identity Construction in Multilingual Advertising*, Language in Society,30,153-186.

Varna, Georgiana M. (2011). *Assessing the publicness of public places*: towards a new model. The University of Glasgow.

Wray, A., & Bloomer, A. (2006). Projects in Linguistics.

Wulan Sari, A. D. (2019). *A Linguistic Landscape Study of Signage in Museum Angkut Batu East Java*.

Zsifkovits, M. & Pham, T. S. (2017). *Modelling And Parameterizing Pedestrian Behaviour In Public Places: A Review.* 16 (2017) 4, 630-643. Institute for

Theoretical Computer Science, Mathematics and Operations Research,

Universität der Bundeswehr Munich.