CORRELATION BETWEEN LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE AWARENESS WITH VOCABULARY KNOWLEDGE OF SMAN 2 PADANG`S STUDENTS

Shania Amanda[1], Yendra[2], Melvina[3]

[1,2,3]Universitas PGRI Sumatera Barat, Indonesia
shaniaamanda1409@gmail.com[1], melvina.stkippgrisumbar@gmail.com[3]

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui ada atau tidaknya korelasi antara kesadaran linguistik lanskap siswa dengan pengetahuan kosakata bahasa Inggris di SMAN 2 Padang. Sampel yang digunakan sebanyak 10% dari 400 siswa kelas 11, yaitu hanya 40 siswa. Teknik pengumpulan data menggunakan angket dan tes, kemudian dianalisis menggunakan rumus korelasi product moment pada SPSS versi 23. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa koefisien kesadaran linguistik lanskap siswa dengan pengetahuan kosakata bahasa Inggris sebesar 0,257 dengan taraf korelasi yang rendah. Selanjutnya hasil Anova menunjukkan bahwa model regresi yang menguji pengaruh "Linguistic Landscape Awareness" terhadap "Vocabulary Knowledge" hampir mencapai batas signifikansi dengan nilai F sebesar 2.679 dan p-value sebesar 0,0110, namun belum cukup kuat untuk menguji pengaruh "Linguistic Landscape Awareness" terhadap "Vocabulary Knowledge" Secara keseluruhan, hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan indikasi adanya hubungan antara "Kesadaran Lanskap Linguistik" dan "Pengetahuan Kosakata", namun lemah. Berdasarkan data dan hasil analisis, belum cukup bukti untuk menolak HO.

Kata Kunci: Kesadaran, Lanskap Linguistik, Pengetahuan Kosakata.

ABSTRACT

This research aims to determine whether or not there is a correlation between students' landscape linguistic awareness and English vocabulary knowledge at SMAN 2 Padang. The sample used was 10% of 400 grade 11 students, namely only 40 students. Data collection techniques used questionnaires and tests, then analyzed using the product moment correlation formula in SPSS version 23. The research results showed that the coefficient of students' landscape linguistic awareness with knowledge of English vocabulary was 0.257 with a low correlation level. Furthermore, the Anova results show that the regression model that tests the influence of "Linguistic Landscape Awareness"

on "Vocabulary Knowledge" almost reaches the significance limit with an F value of 2,679 and a p-value of 0.0110, but is not strong enough to test the influence of "Linguistic Landscape Awareness" towards "Vocabulary Knowledge" Overall, the results of this study show indications of a relationship between "Linguistic Landscape Awareness" and "Vocabulary Knowledge", however weak. Based on the data and analysis results, there is not enough evidence to reject HO.

Keywords: *Awareness, Linguistic Landscape, Vocabulary Knowledge.*

A.   INTRODUCTION

According to (Landry & Bourhis, 1997) Linguistic landscape is very useful for enhancing vocabulary in English language learning. For example, through the linguistic landscape, students can understand how signs convey meaning. Therefore, this approach offers students a more inclusive, comprehensive, and enjoyable learning experience. Engaging with diverse linguistic expressions in public spaces encourages students to explore language in context, making their learning more practical and relevant. Linguistic awareness, also known as metalinguistic awareness, refers to a person's ability to think about and understand language in both spoken and written forms. It involves recognizing language patterns and being able to correct mistakes in speech or writing. People with linguistic awareness can focus on the structure and functions of language, like figuring out unclear sentences or editing texts. Unlike strict rule-based explanations, linguistic awareness doesn't always rely on explaining language rules explicitly.Notices are written messages found in public places, used for giving warnings, orders, or instructions. Analyzing the language used in notices is crucial because they directly influence people's behavior. In both Indonesian and English, notices typically use direct language to convey commands or explanations, often accompanied by nonverbal cues. These messages are straightforward and aim to communicate intentions clearly.

Understanding the linguistic landscape, which encompasses all visible languages in public spaces, is vital for language awareness. It involves recognizing and understanding how language is used in various contexts. By studying linguistic landscapes, we can gain insights into social, cultural, and historical dynamics. This understanding helps increase language awareness by allowing us to grasp linguistic and visual language characteristics.

Additionally, being aware of the linguistic landscape enhances language consciousness, which involves sensitivity to language's nature and role in society. By paying attention to the linguistic landscape, we can observe the prevalence of different languages in public spaces, such as billboards along roads, which serve as a form of public language display. In education, the linguistic landscape is relevant for motivating language learning through public signage and messages (Abdullah & Wulung, 2023). In the school environment, linguistic landscape encompasses everything from bulletin boards, room signs, posters, books, to interactions between students and teachers. In the context of English language learning in schools, paying attention to the linguistic landscape can have a significant impact, especially regarding students' vocabulary mastery. Firstly, the school's linguistic landscape provides consistent exposure opportunities to English language around students. For instance, bulletin boards, motivational posters, and learning materials often use English, giving students the chance to see and interact with vocabulary in a school context. Secondly, the school's linguistic landscape also presents vocabulary in relevant contexts to daily school life. Students can encounter vocabulary related to classroom instructions, academic terms, and other learning topics, aiding them in understanding the meaning and usage of these words within the school environment. Lastly, the school's linguistic landscape can enhance students' motivation and engagement in English language learning. Observing English being widely used in school, both in learning activities and beyond the classroom, can instill a sense of urgency and relevance in learning new vocabulary. By considering the school's linguistic landscape, teachers can create more meaningful and effective learning experiences for students in developing their mastery of English vocabulary in the school environment.

Excerpted from (Gorter & Cenoz, 2007) in their article stated that it is important to improve the linguistic landscape in the field of education because the linguistic landscape is widely used in schools or in the public, therefore mastery of vocabulary is very important in understanding the language of the linguistic landscape, therefore vocabulary is the most important thing, everyone's mastery of vocabulary is different, but increasing one's vocabulary depends on their own curiosity (Nurweni & Read, 1999). According to (Tarigan, 2011) states that a person's language ability depends on the quality of

vocabulary he has, with this it can be concluded that vocabulary is important in a language both orally and in writing.

Based on the Pre-Observation at SMA N 2, the researcher found that the school has many interesting linguistic landscapes to be researched. In this study, the researcher only focuses on the correlation between students' awareness and vocabulary towards English, in the use of English, which is the main attraction for the researcher to examine students' vocabulary towards the linguistic landscape at school. In education, language stands as an important domain in the development of students' communication skills. One aspect that is increasingly emphasized in language education is the awareness of language landscape and its influence on students' vocabulary acquisition. Previous studies have highlighted the significant relationship between language landscape awareness and students' vocabulary acquisition. Research by Martinez (2019) indicates that students with a strong awareness of the language landscape tend to have a better understanding of the variations in vocabulary usage across different social and cultural contexts. This finding suggests that an understanding of the language landscape can influence students' comprehension of word meanings and their ability to apply vocabulary in various communicative situations. Furthermore, research by Park (2020) underscores the importance of language landscape awareness in motivating students to learn new vocabulary. Students who recognize the significance of vocabulary in communicating with diverse audiences are more inclined to actively expand their vocabulary. Thus, understanding the language landscape not only affects students' comprehension of vocabulary but also influences their motivation to learn the language.

In the context of language education in schools, understanding the complex relationship between language landscape awareness and vocabulary has significant implications. Language teachers need to recognize the importance of integrating language landscape awareness concepts into vocabulary instruction, emphasizing the contextual understanding of words and their usage in different communicative situations (Brown, 2018). Consequently, language education can become more relevant and effective in preparing students to communicate in multilingual and multicultural societies.

In this background section, the significant relationship between language landscape awareness and vocabulary acquisition in student learning is explained, drawing upon

recent literature findings and their implications for language education in schools. Awareness of language landscape (language landscape awareness) is indeed crucial for students, and sometimes, focusing solely on vocabulary knowledge may overlook this essential aspect. Here are several reasons why awareness of language landscape is important for students: Understanding Context, Enhanced Communication Skills, Appreciation of Linguistic Diversity, Gateway to Cultural Learning, and Improved Literacy Skills. Therefore, awareness of language landscape is important as it helps students develop a deeper understanding of language and culture, as well as enhances their communication and literacy skills overall. While focusing solely on vocabulary knowledge may provide a solid foundation, it may not encompass all crucial aspects of language use in diverse contexts.

B.   RESEARCH METHODS

This study using quantitative correlation research methods. The quantitative correlation method is a method whose data can be analysed using statistical analysis. this quantitative correlation research method is a survey method with a type of correlational research. The research method is basically a scientific way to get data with specific purposes and uses. Based on this, there are four keywords that need to be considered, namely scientific methods, data, goals and uses (Sugiyono, 2013) where this correlational quantitative method is a study whose data is presented in the form of numbers which are used as a tool to find a broader picture. This research aims to better understand the influence of the linguistic landscape on students. Participants For this research a sample is required. In this study, the researcher used person product memon as an analysis in the search for data to see how much the linguistic landscape correlates with student vocabulary.

The correlation here is not cause and effect but a correlation that relates from one to another (Variable X and Variable Y) Where this explains that the greater the value of X, the greater the value of Y. To obtain data, researchers need participants for this research. The author chose participants for the research at SMA N 2 Padang. The author used random sampling for data collection. Random sampling is a sampling technique where each member of the population has an equal chance of being selected as a sample.

Random sampling can be done using a random number table, random number generator, or lottery technique (Fraenkel et al. 2012). This study involves 400 students in grade 11 at SMA N 2 Padang, of which only 10% will be participants from the total population. The researcher used random sampling technique to take this sample. If the subject is less than 100, all should be taken, while if the subject is large, it can be taken between 10% - 15% or 20% - 25% (Arikunto, 2006). In this study, the instruments used to collect data and measure research variables are referred to as research instruments. According to Yusup (2018), this instrument functions as a tool that helps researchers in applying data collection methods systematically and more effectively.

C.   RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, to obtain data, the researcher used questionnaires awareness (variable X) and tests vocabulary (variable Y) as research instruments. The researcher presents the data analysis that reveals the linguistic landscape found in the school environment. The researcher found 25 data of English-based linguistic landscape in the school environment of SMA 2 Padang. The data includes various types of texts, such as banners, notice boards and promotional materials, which show the use of English in the school environment.

Tabel 1. Lanskap Linguistik

4. Linguistic Lanscape	5. Word / Sentence
6. LL 1	7. Easier with all mutual assistance in the same small laptop,same weight borne.
8. LL 2	9. Spirit in the struggle no determination extent of burning, but the spirit in the struggle and intentions,praying,deeds
10. LL 3	11. Abstinence
12. LL 4	13. Be Faithful
14. LL 5	15. Experience is the root of wisdom
16. LL 6	17. Cool

18. LL 7	Do not ask what the school is given to you, ask what we can provide to schools 19.
20. LL 8	21. Each day is a gift
22. LL 9	23. Championship
24. LL 10	25. I come to get knowledge for my bright future
26. LL 11	27. Today should be better than yesterday
28. LL 12	29. Over Here
30. LL 13	31. Thow kindness around like confetti
32. LL 14	33. Library Information
34. LL 15	35. OPERATION
36. LL 16	37. PULL
38. LL 17	39. Library Story.
40. LL 18	41. Good Things Take Time
42. LL 19	43. We have the talent is a gift from for our, what can we generate from such talent is our gift from god for
44. LL 20	45. Behavior of living clean, honest, Discipline marks of people are not arrogant clever and morality.
46. LL 21	47. Save Our Planet it`s in our hands
48. LL 22	49. Technology is future
50. LL 23	51. Push
52. LL 24	53. Keep Environment clean
54. LL 25	55. No smooking Area

The first instrument was a linguistic landscape awareness questionnaire (X) based on the theory (Gagne, 1965) with 25 questions. Each question number was given 1 picture of the linguistic landscape of English at school. Each question number also contained 4 question items related to the concept of linguistic landscape awareness, namely question item (a) related to attention, question item (b) related to Receiving information, and question items (c & d) Reiterating Information. The questionnaire regarding linguistic landscape awareness utilizes a Guttman scale that only provides two answer options, namely yes - no. The questionnaire also contains 4 question items that are related to the concept of linguistic landscape awareness. The questionnaire also contains 4 question items related to the concept of linguistic landscape awareness.

In this study, 40 respondents from SMA 2 Padang were assessed in three cognitive aspects: attention, recall and repetition. The total scores obtained were 722 for attention, 933 for Receiving information, and 1708 for, Reiterating Information. making a total of 3363 (Appendix 4). The results showed that most students scored relatively high in terms of knowledge. Many respondents scored very well, with scores close to 95, while others scored lower, reflecting the variation in cognitive ability among students. This data provides a comprehensive picture of how cognitive ability is distributed in the school environment.

This section presents the results related to the first step to answer the research question, whether Linguistic Landscape awareness affects vocabulary knowledge of SMA 2 Padang. In this first step, descriptive statistics were conducted to determine the level of Linguistic Landscape awareness of SMA 2 Padang students. The results were obtained from the calculation of descriptive statistics based on the questionnaire scores of 40 students. Table 4 below presents the results of the descriptive statistics calculation of the Linguistic Landscape awareness questionnaire scores.

Table 2 Descriptive Landcape Linguistick Student SMA N 2 Padang

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Linguistic_Lanscape	40	12.00	99.00	84.0750	17.36248

Source : SPSS 21 (Primary Data Processed)

Table 2 shows that the range of scores obtained by 40 students (N) is a minimum of 12 and a maximum score of 99, with an average score of 84.07 points and a standard deviation of 17.36. In detail, the frequency and percentage of scores obtained by 40 students in the score range of 12 to 99 are shown in Table 5 as follows:

Table 3. Frequency of Linguistic Landscape of SMA 2 Padang student

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	12.00	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
	39.00	1	2.5	2.5	5.0
	40.00	1	2.5	2.5	7.5
	75.00	2	5.0	5.0	12.5
	78.00	1	2.5	2.5	15.0
	79.00	3	7.5	7.5	22.5
	80.00	3	7.5	7.5	30.0
	81.00	1	2.5	2.5	32.5
	82.00	1	2.5	2.5	35.0
	83.00	1	2.5	2.5	37.5
	86.00	1	2.5	2.5	40.0
	87.00	1	2.5	2.5	42.5
	89.00	2	5.0	5.0	47.5
	90.00	3	7.5	7.5	55.0
	91.00	3	7.5	7.5	62.5
	92.00	3	7.5	7.5	70.0
	93.00	4	10.0	10.0	80.0
	96.00	3	7.5	7.5	87.5
	97.00	1	2.5	2.5	90.0
	98.00	2	5.0	5.0	95.0
	99.00	2	5.0	5.0	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Source : SPSS 21 (Primary Data Processed)

From Table , it can be explained that out of a total of 40 students (100%), 1 student scored 12 (2.5%), 1 student scored 39 (2.5%), 1 student scored 40 (2.5%), 2 students scored 75 (5%), 1 student scored 78 (2.5%), 3 students scored 78 (7.5%), 3 students scored 80 (7.5%), 1 student scored 81 (2.5%), 1 student scored 82 (2. 5%), 1 student got score 83 (2.5%), 1 student got score 86 (2.5%), 1 student got score 87 (2.5%), 2 students got score 89 (5%), 3 students got score 90 (7.5%), 3 students got score 91 (7. 5%), 3 students scored 92 (7.5%), 4 students scored 93 (10%), 3 students scored 96 (7.5%) 1 student scored 97 (7.5%), 2 students scored 98 (5%) 2 students scored 99 (5%).

Students Vocabulary Knowledge

In addition, the second instrument used was a vocabulary knowledge test (Y) based on the theory of Maulia, 2020) with a total of 25 questions. Each question number contains 4 interrelated items about vocabulary knowledge. Item (a) contains questions about word meaning, item (b) contains questions about synonyms and, item (c) contains questions about antonyms and item (d) contains questions about grammar.

In this study, 40 respondents from SMA 2 Padang had their vocabulary knowledge assessed. The total score obtained for vocabulary knowledge was 2195 (Appendix 5). The results showed variations in vocabulary scores among students, with the highest score reaching 84 and the lowest. Most students scored moderately, with some students achieving scores close to 60 or above. While some students had good scores, others had lower scores, reflecting differences in their vocabulary knowledge ability. This section presents the results related to the first step to answer the research question, whether vocabulary knowledge affects the vocabulary knowledge of SMA 2 Padang students. In this first step, descriptive statistics were conducted to determine the level of vocabulary knowledge of SMA 2 Padang students. The results were obtained from the calculation of descriptive statistics based on the questionnaire scores of 40 students. Table 4 below presents the results of the descriptive statistics of the Linguistic Landscape awareness questionnaire scores.

Table 4. Descriptive Vocabulary Knowledge of SMA N 2 Padang students

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Vocabulary_Knowledge	40	19.00	84.00	54.8750	15.60438

Source : SPSS 21 (Primary Data Processed)

Table shows that the range of scores obtained by 40 students (N) is a minimum of 19 and a maximum score of 84, with an average score of 54.87 points and a standard deviation of 15.60. In detail, the frequency and percentage of scores obtained by 40 students in the score range of 19 to 84.

Can be explained that out of a total of 40 students (100%), 1 student scored 19 (2.5%), 1 student scored 24 (2.5%), 1 student scored 28 (2.5%), 1 student scored 29 (2.5%), 1 student scored 33 (2.5%), 1 student scored 36 (2.5%), 1 student scored 41 (2.5%), 1 student scored 41 (2.5%), 1 student scored 42 (2.5%), 1 student scored 43 (2.5%), 1 student scored 44 (2.5%), 1 student scored 45 (2.5%), 1 student scored 48 (2.5%), 2 students scored 49 (5%), 1 student scored 50 (2.5%), 1 student scored 51 (2.5%), 2 students scored 52 (5%), 1 student scored 56 (2.5%), 1 student scored 57 (2.5%), 3 students scored 59 (7.5%), 1 student scored 60 (2.5%), 1 student scored 61 (2.5%) 1 student scored 62 (2.5%), 1 student scored 63 (2.5%), 2 students scored 64 (5%), 1 student scored 66 (2.5%), 1 student scored 69 (2.5%), 1 student scored 70 (2.5%), 1 student scored 71 (2.5%), 1 student scored 72 (2.5%), 1 student scored 74 (2.5%) 2 students scored 76 (5%), 1 student scored 77 (2.5%), 1 student scored 84 (2.5%),

Based on the descriptive data, researchers analyzed data from questionnaires and test results. The results of each instrument were tabulated into Microsoft Excel, the tabulation table is attached in Appendix 3. In scoring, each correct answer received a score of 1 and each wrong answer received a score of 0. After the scores of 40 students were tabulated into Microsoft Excel, obtained the students' language span awareness score as variable X and students' vocabulary knowledge as variable y, the researcher

added up the scores of each student. Based on the table attached in the appendix, the results of the questionnaire scores measuring students' linguistic landscape awareness show significant variations. Some students obtained the highest score, 99, indicating a very good level of awareness. On the other hand, there are also students who obtained the lowest score of 12, indicating a relatively low level of awareness. This variation provides a clear picture of the differences in students' understanding and attention to the linguistic elements around them. This data provides an important indication of the extent to which students realize and pay attention to the linguistic landscape.

Based on the analysis results presented, the findings regarding the relationship between "Linguistic Landscape Awareness" and "Vocabulary Knowledge" can be attributed to the theory proposed by Zhu and Fhu (2024). According to their theory, the influence of the linguistic environment on vocabulary development is multifaceted, involving complex interactions between social, cultural and pedagogical contexts. In this study, although a slight positive relationship was found between "Linguistic Landscape" and "Vocabulary Knowledge" with a correlation coefficient of 0.257, the p value greater than 0.10 indicates that this relationship is not statistically significant

In the findings found by Gorter (2021) explains that students gain knowledge about the outside world through interaction with the environment to develop their cognitive structure. The results of the study concluded that language displayed in public spaces is an important source of language learning and teaching and can also be used to increase language awareness and is in line with current research.

The Anova results show that the regression model, with an F value of 2.679 and a p value of 0.110, almost reaches the significance threshold. The model shows a potential but inconsistent effect. Based on the data and analysis results, there is not enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis. Although there is an indication that "Linguistic Landscape Ability" may influence "Vocabulary Knowledge", the influence is not statistically significant enough.

The findings in this study related to 'Linguistic Landscape Awareness' and 'Vocabulary Knowledge in Padang City High School found statistically insignificant results, but had a positive relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable...'. This is supported by previous research by Maulia (2023) which

states that there is a significant relationship between Linguistic Landscape Awareness' and 'Vocabulary Knowledge. Linguistic landscape is a study that discusses the relationship of interaction between language and space, semiotics and mobility, and the self-image of a place. The focus of study in landscape linguistics is the form of written language in public spaces that involve aspects of multilingualism in a place. Multilingualism is the ability to speak more than one language spoken by someone both orally and in writing that is used as a sign in public spaces. As a specific language practice, the linguistic landscape can reflect the relative position and power relations of various languages in the region, as well as reshape people's language awareness, thus providing support to the government to adjust language policies.

The growing importance of English and other languages in the linguistic landscape suggests that the study of linguistic landscapes is helpful in the analysis of multilingual phenomena. Other studies, such as the one conducted by Goster Durk`s (2021)found that one of the main reasons why English occupies the top spot is its growing proportion in the linguistic landscape is that the use of English signs can activate values (e.g., modernism). The English language used in many signs is symbolic, indicating global values. According to Constructivist learning theory, people can strengthen their original cognitive structures through assimilation, in which the subject's initiative plays a large role. Indeed, one important source of initiative is interest, which is subjective and is the driving force of students' English learning while the language environment is an objective condition. Compared with adults, students are more likely to do things under the impetus of interest rather than a strong desire for success or pressure. Only when English learning follows the principle of interest can English knowledge be more easily accepted by students. Linguistic landscape is a useful tool to increase the fun of learning English. When teachers want to develop students' listening and speaking skills, they can use the linguistic landscape to create a context in which students can practise English knowledge. Under these circumstances, teachers can add an element of entertainment to English learning.

D. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Conclusion

Based on the results of the data analysis, it can be concluded that although there is a slight positive relationship between "Linguistic Landscape Awareness" and "Vocabulary Knowledge", this relationship is not statistically significant. The results of the Pearson correlation analysis showed a correlation coefficient of 0.257 with a p-value of 0.110, which means that the indication of a relationship between the two variables is not strong enough to be considered significant.

Furthermore, the Anova results showed that the regression model testing the effect of "Linguistic Landscape Awareness" on "Vocabulary Knowledge" almost reached the limit of significance with an F value of 2.679 and a p value of 0.110, but was not strong enough to prove a statistically significant effect. Overall, the results of this study showed an indication of a relationship between "Linguistic Landscape Awareness" and "Vocabulary Knowledge", but the evidence was not strong enough to conclude a statistically significant relationship.

Suggestion

Based on the conclusion of the study, the researcher of this thesis has some suggestions, namely that schools add landscape linguistics into the school environment. For future research, it is suggested that the sample used is larger and more diverse in order to increase the accuracy of the research results. Future research should also consider additional variables that may affect the relationship between "Linguistic Landscape Awareness" and "Vocabulary Knowledge", such as social and cultural aspects that may not have been fully covered in this study.For students, it is suggested that they actively seek and utilize opportunities to engage in diverse linguistic landscape environments and participate in creating written works for display in the school environment, as this can help deepen their understanding and use of vocabulary. Taking these suggestions into account, it is hoped that future research can provide a deeper understanding of the relationship between linguistic environmental awareness and vocabulary development, as well as its applicability in educational contexts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abdullah, C. U., & Wulung, S. R. P. (2023). Lanskap Linguistik Daya Tarik Wisata: Aspek

Multilingualisme di Kawasan Pariwisata Nasional Lembang dan Tangkubanparahu. Khasanah Ilmu - Jurnal Pariwisata Dan Budaya, 14(1), 43–49. https://doi.org/10.31294/khi.v14i1.14350

Arikunto Suharsimi. (2013). Prosedur penelitian suatu pendekatan praktik. In Jakarta: Rineka Cipta (p. 172). http://r2kn.litbang.kemkes.go.id:8080/handle/123456789/62880

Beck, I., Mckeown, M., & Kucan, L. (2013). Bringinf words to life. In Guilford Press.

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2008). The linguistic landscape as an additional source of input in second language acquisition. IRAL - International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 46(3), 267–287. https://doi.org/10.1515/IRAL.2008.012

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2017). Language Awareness and Multilingualism. In Language Awareness and Multilingualism. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02325-0

Cresswell, J. W. (2012). Educational Research: Planning. Conducting And Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research.

Garrett, P., & Cots, J. M. (2017). The Routledge Handbook of Language Awareness. The Routledge Handbook of Language Awareness, 1–536. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315676494

Gorter, D. (2006). Introduction: The study of the linguistic landscape as a new approach to multilingualism. Linguistic Landscape: A New Approach to Multilingualism, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853599170-001

Gorter, D., & Cenoz, J. (2007). Knowledge about Language and Linguistic Landscape. Encyclopedia of Language and Education, 2090–2102. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_160

Jessner, U. (2016). Language Awareness and Multilingualism. Language Awareness and Multilingualism. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02325-0

Landry, R., & Bourhis, R. Y. (1997a). Linguistic landscape and ethnolinguistic vitality: An empirical study. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 16(1), 23–49. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X9701610

Li, W., Fu, X., He, Q., & Luo, J. (2020). The Influence of Linguistic Landscape on English Learning: A Case Study of Shenzhen City. English Literature and Language Review, 6(67), 119–132. https://doi.org/10.32861/ellr.67.119.132

Maulia, L. (2020). SISWA The Effect Of Landscape Linguistics On Students ' Vocabulary.

Moriarty, M. (2014). Languages in motion: Multilingualism and mobility in the linguistic landscape. International Journal of Bilingualism, 18(5), 457–463. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006913484208

Nation, I. S. P. (2001). Learning vocabulary in another language. Learning Vocabulary in Another Language, 1–624. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0889-4906(02)00014-5

Nurweni, A., & Read, J. (1999). The English Vocabulary Knowledge of Indonesian University Students. In English for Specific Purposes (Vol. 18, Issue 2).

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2010). Dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics. In Proceedings of the 21st Asian Pacific Weed Science Society (APWSS) Conference, 2-6 October 2007, Colombo, Sri Lanka. http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=lah&AN=20163298076&site=ehost-live%0Ahttp://www.cabi.org/cabdirect/showpdf.aspx?PAN=http://www.cabi.org/cabdirect/showpdf.aspx?PAN=20163298076%0Aemail: javaidleghari@hotmail.com

Rowland, L. (2013). The pedagogical benefits of a linguistic landscape project in Japan. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 16(4), 494–505. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2012.708319

Rustan, M., Anshari, A., & Nensilianti, N. (2023). Fungsi Bahasa Lanskap Linguistik Pulau Kambuno Kabupaten Sinjai (Perspektif Landry Dan Bourhis 1997). Neologia: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia, 4(2), 174. https://doi.org/10.59562/neologia.v4i2.51775

Sayer, P. (2009). Using the linguistic landscape as a pedagogical resource. ELT Journal, 64(2), 143–154. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccp051

Schmitt, N., & McCarthy, M. (1997). Vocabulary : Description , Acquisition and Pedagogy Edited by. In cambridge university press.

Shohamy, E. (2008). Language policy and language assessment: The relationship. Current Issues in Language Planning, 9(3), 363–373. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664200802139604

Shohamy, E., & Gorter, D. (2018). The study of the linguistic landscape as a new approach to multilingualism. Analytical Biochemistry, 11(1), 1–5. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-319-59379-1%0Ahttp://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-420070-8.00002-7%0Ahttp://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ab.2015.03.024%0Ahttps://doi.org/10.1080/07352689.2018.1441103%0Ahttp://www.chile.bmw-motorrad.cl/sync/showroom/lam/es/

Sisilda, R. (2022). THE USE OF ENGLISH LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE IN PALANGKA RAYA CITY. Gramatika STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat, 8(1). https://doi.org/10.22202/jg.2022.v8i1.5375

Stegu, M., Preston, D. R., Wilton, A., & Finkbeiner, C. (2018). Panel discussion: language awareness vs. folk linguistics vs. applied linguistics. Language Awareness, 27(1–2), 186–196. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2018.1434921