
**STUDENTS' LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE AWARENESS BASED ON
LANGUAGE ELEMENTS AT MTS N 6 PADANG**

Sindi Novaria¹, Yendra², Melvina³

^{1,2,3}Universitas PGRI Sumatera Barat, Indonesia

sindinovaria66@gmail.com¹, melvina.stkippggrisumbar@gmail.com²,
yendrastkip@gmail.com³

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui sejauh mana kesadaran siswa terhadap keberadaan dan arti dari beberapa elemen Linguistics Landscape pada lingkungan sekolah mereka, seperti pada papan nama, poster, dan beberapa tempat lainnya. Penelitian telah dilakukan di MTS N 6 Padang sebagai objek penelitian dan seluruh siswa MTS N 6 Padang merupakan populasi penelitian dengan pengambilan sampel sebanyak 62 responden yang merupakan 10%-15% dari total populasi. Pada penelitian ini, peneliti menggunakan kuesioner sebagai instrument penelitian dan random sampling sebagai teknik pengambilan sampel. Pada tahap awal, peneliti telah melakukan uji validitas terhadap instrument yang akan digunakan menggunakan SPSS Versi 30. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan rata-rata persentase sebanyak **60,26%** dengan kategori level kesadaran Sedang. Selain itu, untuk hasil setiap elemen Linguistic Landscape memperoleh 61% untuk elemen Word, 59% untuk elemen Frasa, 69% untuk elemen Kalusa, dan 50% untuk elemen Kalimat. Berdasarkan hasil analisis data tersebut ketiga dari empat elemen telah memperoleh atensi yang cukup baik dari siswa MTS N 6 Padang, namun pada elemen Kalimat menunjukkan hanya setengah responden yang telah sadar akan keberadaan dan arti dari elemen kalimat sebagai Linguistic Landscape di sekolah mereka.

Kata Kunci: Level Kesadaran, Lanskap Linguistik.

ABSTRACT

This research aims to determine the extent of students' awareness of the existence and meaning of Linguistics' Landscape elements in their school environment, such as on signboards, posters, and several other places. The research has been conducted at MTS N 6 Padang as the object of research and all MTS N 6 Padang students are the research population with a sampling of 62 respondents which is 10%-15% of the total population. In this study, researchers used a questionnaire as a research instrument and random

sampling as a sampling technique. The results showed an average percentage of 60.26% with a moderate level of awareness category. In addition, the results of each Linguistic Landscape element obtained 61% for Word elements, 59% for Phrase elements, 69% for Clause elements, and 50% for Sentence elements. Based on the results of the data analysis, three of the four elements have received quite good attention from MTS N 6 Padang students, but the Sentence element shows that only half of the respondents are aware of the existence and meaning of the sentence element as a Linguistic Landscape in their school.

Keywords: *Level of Awareness, Linguistic Landscape.*

A. INTRODUCTION

Linguistic landscape is a linguistic study that aims to connect space, place and time (Cohen Abady, 2019). In common, Linguistic landscapes are spread all over and exceptionally simple to discover. A few cases of Linguistic landscapes can be found in schools or other buildings which are utilized as objects of inspiration for individuals who perusing, In this way, the etymological scene gets to be something that's exceptionally prevalent since it contains a few sentences that make an individual dazed by the several meanings displayed within the etymological scene additionally the etymological scene is an question that's continuously displayed in different shapes.

Linguistic landscapes can increase individuals' linguistic awareness. Daily interactions with multilingual signs in public spaces can make people more aware of the linguistic diversity around them, Gorter and Cenoz (2008). Awareness could be a person's understanding of oneself, the encompassing environment, sentiments, considerations and continuous encounters. Awareness includes a more touchy perception of current encounters, counting mindfulness of sentiments, considerations, body, and environment. Awareness can too allude to social mindfulness, specifically an understanding of connections and intuitive with other individuals as well as an awareness of the social setting around us. Therefore, awareness and linguistic landscape are interrelated. When learning a language, it is necessary or important for students to know the structure of the language. Language structure is the way language elements such as words, phrases, clauses and sentences. are arranged to form grammatical and meaningful

sentences called syntax (David Crystal, 1997). School as one place to gain and study knowledge, of course studying requires calm and an enthusiastic spirit, for this reason the selection of supporting materials in various schools is very necessary for student awareness, such as linguistic landscapes. The choice of language in texts in public spaces varies greatly and is generally dominated by the use of English. The use of English also functions as a sign that English is an international language which is used as a communication material to connect one language with another. It is not surprising that the linguistic landscape is dominated by the use of English.

This research investigates students' awareness of the use of English in the city of Padang. This research was conducted at a specific location, namely MTS N 6 Padang. Researchers chose this school because there is a large English language linguistic landscape at the school. Therefore, researcher are interested in investigating students' awareness of the use of English in the linguistic landscape in Padang City and examining the meaning of the use of English in signs.



Previous research that is relevant to this researcher is research entitled Linguistic Landscape of Medan City: Onomastics, Semiotics and Spatial Studies (Sahril et al., 2019). Linguistic phenomena in Medan City are described in this research. The research results show that in Medan City, the dominance of foreign languages has shifted to Indonesian. Further research that is relevant to this research is research entitled "Use of Indonesian in the Linguistic Landscape at Yogyakarta International Airport" (2019) which is related to this research. The comes about appear that the multilingual or bilingual marvel at Yogyakarta Universal Air terminal is ruled by phonetic signs. The relationship between top-down and bottom-up dialect is talked about encourage in this inquire about. Indonesian is the most subject of this research. The final inquire about that's important to

this inquire about is inquire about entitled "The effect of linguistic landscape on students' vocabulary" (Liza Maulia, 2023). This research aims to determine the effect of linguistic landscape on students' vocabulary. The results of this research are not intended for all linguistic landscapes in public places because the LL test in this study was only carried out in one school.

B. RESEARCH METHODS

This research uses quantitative descriptive statistical research methods. The descriptive statistical quantitative research method is an approach used to describe and summarize data in a form that can be understood numerically. The main goal is to provide a clear picture of the characteristics or distribution of an observed variable or phenomenon. Descriptive statistics consists of methods for organizing, summarizing, and presenting information from a data set in a clear and effective way, Gravetter & Wallnau (2013). The researcher chose to use this method with the aim of providing an overview of the variables used, such as minimum value, maximum value, average and standard deviation in this research. This research was purpose to know student's level of awareness to several elements of Linguistics Landscape, those are Word, Phrase, Clause, and Sentence. Participants of this research are students of MTS N 6 Padang This research involves 40 students in grade X, XI, and XII at MTS N 6 Padang, of which only 10-15%% will be participants from the total population. The researcher was used random sampling technique as the sampling technique, and used SPSS Version 30 to do the validity test Random sampling is a sampling technique where each member of the population has an equal chance of being selected as a sample.

To collect the data, the researchers was used questionnaire as the instrumentation. the questionnaire was used closed-ended questionnaire with 16 questions and each questions divided into 4 more questions. It means total of questions on the instrument is 64 items. The questions was about word, phrase, clause and sentence as linguistics landscape elements. The researcher was began with collecting the data by used questionnaire, conduct to know level of student's awareness to several elements of Linguistics Landscape in their school environment. Then, the data was gathered, analyzed to know level of student's awareness. It was analyzed by calculating the percentage of

student’s awareness. Score analysis used to know the point of choice within the questions. Then it describe in descriptive statistic. Calculating the percentage of answers in the questionnaire purpose to know percentage of the students’ answers in the questionnaire. The result of statistical analysis shows dominance answer of the questionnaire. This percentage descriptive is process by frequency divided by the number of respondents and multiplied by 100%. The data qualitative from questionnaire change into quantitative with used Likert Scale with the interpret result of classification as on the table below.

Table 1. category level of student’s awareness

Score Percentage	Category of Student’s level awareness
81% ≤ 100%	Very High
61% ≤ 80%	High
41% ≤ 60%	Sufficient
21% ≤ 40%	Low
0% ≤ 20%	Very Low

Adopted from Arikunto (1996) in (Santiyadnya, 2020)

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The main objective of this research is to extent student’s level of awareness to several elements of Linguistics Landscape on their school environment. The finding of questionnaire based on the data analyzed about student’s level of awareness was gotten the percentage on the table.

To know determine student’s category of level awareness, the researcher was make a class of interval. Which right answer or answering ye for question number a and b got 1 (one) score and if they have wrong or no answer the score is 0 (zero), and the largest score if they have right answer total score is 64.

Table 21. Number of Each Category

Category	Class of Interval	Total Respondents
Very High	$> X \leq 44,60$	13
High	$42,20 < X \leq 44,60$	8
Sufficient	$37,38 < X \leq 42,20$	19

Low	$32,57 < X \leq 37,38$	17
Very Low	$X < 32,57$	5
TOTAL		62

From the table above, it can see if respondents got $X > 44.60$, the categories is Very High. In this research, there are 12 (twelve) respondents who have very high level of awareness. If the respondents got $42.20 < X \leq 44.60$, the categories is High. In this research there are 13 (thirteen) respondents who have high level of awareness. If the respondents got $37.38 < X \leq 42.20$, the categories is Sufficient. In this research there are 14 (fourteen) respondents who have sufficient level of awareness. If the respondents got $32.57 < X \leq 37.38$, the categories is Low. In this research there are 17 (seventeen) respondents who have low level of awareness. If the respondents got $X < 32.57$, the categories is Very Low. In this research there are 6 (six) respondents who have very low level of awareness. From that all student's categories, have found the average of students' score and the average of the category level of students' awareness as on table below.

Average (%)	Catgeory
60%	Sufficient

From the table, the average of percentage is 60%. Which is it means it got Sufficient level of category of students' awareness. Also, this research there are several language landscapes that are already aware by the students on their school. With four indicators of Language Landscape shows that most of the students MTS N 6 Padang aware to the words, phrases and clauses. Also most of them already know the meaning of language landscape of words, phrases, and clauses on their school. Therefore, the sentence have low level of awareness, it just got 50% students who was aware, which is it means that the students not really aware about sentence as the language landscape on their school and also they are not known yet meaning of that sentences.

To find out the result, the researcher was gotten from the data that have been gathered by the questionnaire. Here is the result of four indicators on the table below.

Nama Siswa	Pernyataan/Pertanyaan															
	Kata				Frasa				Klausa				Kalimat			
	1	5	9	13	2	6	10	14	3	7	11	15	4	8	12	16

TOTAL	615	590	687	501
	0,61	0,59	0,69	0,50
%	61	59	69	50
KATEGORI	<i>Sedang</i>	<i>Sedang</i>	<i>Tinggi</i>	<i>Rendah</i>

As the finding, the analyst found that most of them as of now awareness to their etymological scene, particularly almost the words, expressions, and clauses. It can be seen from the rate of level awareness gotten from the questionnaire. Which is most of the respondents deliver react “yes” to the questions of words, expressions, and clauses. Also, most of them already know the meaning to “words”, “phrases”, and “clauses”. It means that most of have a good awareness to the linguistics landscape refer to Word, Phrase, and Clause.

Completely different result, the profit of “sentence” is as it were got half score from most extreme score level of awareness. Half of them moreover don't know however approximately the meaning of the sentences that exist on their school. It is demonstrate that the understudies have Low Awareness to the sentences as the Linguistics Landscape on their school.

So, from the clarify, it found that students' level of awareness is on category Sufficient with 60% and nearly of them have awareness to a few components of Linguistics Landscape, that's word, state, and clause. Whereas one of Linguistics Landscape component, that's sentence, it is as it were got 50% of understudies who has Awareness and more 50% isn't Awareness however.

D. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Conclusion

Based on the information analyzed, nearly of phonetics scene was awareness by the understudies the presences. It is Word and State, which is get Sufficient level with 61% for each other, Clause get tall level with 69%, and Sentence get low level with as it were 50% understudies who has awareness to this component of linguistics landscape. The by and large score of the students' level awareness demonstrate that the understudies had sufficient level category of awareness. This implies that the understudies have sufficient awareness to the elements of linguistics landscape on their school environment. Great

awareness to language landscape has a few points of interest that can offer assistance understudies to extend the capacity and capability of their language. Great language awareness can moreover increment student's language procurement, language learning and encourage advanced remote language ponder by giving understudies information almost the likeness and contrasts of their language.

Suggestion

As we known before, linguistics landscape is very important for the students student's language acquisition, language learning and facilitate modern foreign language study by giving students knowledge about the similarity and differences of their language. It can be better if the school can add another linguistics landscape in their environment and update their banner, nameplates, posters or other writing text on their school that more interesting. They also can make the wall information with bilingual (English and Indonesia).

REFERENCES

- Alwi, H., Dardjowidjojo, S., Lapoliwa, H., & Moeliono, A. M. (2003). *Tata bahasa baku bahasa Indonesia* (3rd ed.). Balai Pustaka.
- Arikunto, S. (2006). *Prosedur penelitian: Suatu pendekatan praktik*. Rineka Cipta.
- Backhaus, P. (2007). *Linguistic landscapes: A comparative study of urban multilingualism in Tokyo*. *Multilingual Matters*.
- Bloomfield, L. (1926). A set of postulates for the science of language. *Language*, 2(3), 153-164.
- Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Blommaert, J. (2013). *Ethnography, superdiversity and linguistic landscapes: Chronicles of complexity*. *Multilingual Matters*.
- Bourke, J. M. (2002). Learning experiences promoting vocabulary development. *TESOL in Context*, 12(1), 17-21.
- Cohen Abady, R. (2019). *Linguistic landscape: An introduction*. In R. Cohen Abady (Ed.), *Linguistic landscape* (pp. 1-15). Publisher not specified.

- Cohen Abady, F. (2019). The Psychology of Modern Antisemitism: Theory, Research, and Methodology. In *Comprehending and Confronting Antisemitism*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110618594-024>
- Creswell, J. W. (2015). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2008). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* (6th ed.). Blackwell Publishing.
- Dourish, P., & Bellotti, V. (1992). Awareness and coordination in shared workspaces. In *Proceedings of the 1992 ACM conference on Computer-supported cooperative work* (pp. 107-114). ACM.
- Fisher, R. A. (1925). *Statistical methods for research workers*. Oliver and Boyd.
- Gafoor, K. A. (2012). Considerations in the measurement of awareness. Online Submission.
- Gagné, R. M. (1985). *The conditions of learning and theory of instruction* (4th ed.). Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Gorter, D. (2006). Linguistic landscape: A new approach to multilingualism. *Multilingual Matters*.
- Gorter, D. (2013). Linguistic landscapes in a multilingual world. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 33, 190-212.
- Gorter, D. (2017). Linguistic landscapes and trends in the study of schoolsapes. *Linguistics and Education*, 44, 80-85.
- Gorter, D. (2018). Methods and techniques for linguistic landscape research: About definitions, core issues and technological innovations. In M. Pütz & N. Mundt (Eds.), *Expanding the linguistic landscape: Linguistic diversity, multimodality and the use of space as a semiotic resource* (pp. 38-57). *Multilingual Matters*.
- Gorter, D., & Cenoz, J. (2007). Knowledge about language and linguistic landscape. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2nd ed., Vol. 6, pp. 343-355). Springer.

- Gorter, D., & Cenoz, J. (2008). Knowledge about language and linguistic landscape. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2nd ed., Vol. 6, pp. 2090-2102). Springer.
- Graddol, D. (1997). *The future of English? A guide to forecasting the popularity of the English language in the 21st century*. British Council.
- Gravetter, F. J., & Wallnau, L. B. (2013). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences* (9th ed.). Wadsworth.
- Gutwin, C., & Greenberg, S. (2000). The mechanics of collaboration: Developing low cost usability evaluation methods for shared workspaces. In *Proceedings IEEE 9th International Workshops on Enabling Technologies: Infrastructure for Collaborative Enterprises (WET ICE 2000)* (pp. 98-103). IEEE.
- Jespersen, O. (1924). *The philosophy of grammar*. Allen & Unwin.
- Kridalaksana, H. (2008). *Kamus linguistik* (4th ed.). Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Landry, R., & Bourhis, R. Y. (1997). Linguistic landscape and ethnolinguistic vitality: An empirical study. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 16(1), 23-49.
- Lou, J. J. (2016). *The linguistic landscape of Chinatown: A sociolinguistic ethnography*. Multilingual Matters.
- Lyons, J. (1968). *Introduction to theoretical linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Matthews, P. H. (1981). *Syntax*. Cambridge University Press.
- Maulia, L. (2023). *The effect of linguistic landscape on students' vocabulary*. Publisher not specified.
- Ramlan, M. (2005). *Ilmu bahasa Indonesia: Sintaksis*. CV Karyono.
- Rensink, R. A. (2015). A function-centered taxonomy of visual attention. In P. Coates & S. Coleman (Eds.), *Phenomenal qualities: Sense, perception, and consciousness* (pp. 347-375). Oxford University Press.
- Sahril, Nasution, S. H., & Sibarani, R. (2019). *Linguistic landscape of Medan City: Onomastics, semiotics and spatial studies*. Publisher not specified.
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2003). *Discourses in place: Language in the material world*. Routledge.
- Shohamy, E. (2015). LL research as expanding language and language policy. *Linguistic Landscape*, 1(1-2), 152-171.

- Shohamy, E., & Heath, S. B. (2015). Linguistic landscape as a tool for interpreting language vitality: Arabic as a 'threatened language' in Israel. In B. Spolsky, O. Inbar-Lourie, & M. Tannenbaum (Eds.), *Challenges for language education and policy: Making space for people* (pp. 181-196). 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* (pp. 313-331). Routledge.
- Sugiyono. (2014). *Metode penelitian pendidikan pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
- Suryabrata, S. (2008). *Metodologi penelitian*. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Yendra. (2020). *Mengenal ilmu bahasa (linguistik)*. Yogyakarta. Deepublish