

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Ben-Rafael et al. (2006 in Backhaus, 2007) define linguistic landscape as referring to any sign or announcement located outside or inside a public institution or a private business in a given geographical location. That any sign or announcement can be public road signs, advertising billboards, street names, place names, commercial shop signs, and public signs on government buildings (Landry & Bourhis, 1997 in Backhaus, 2007). There is a fact that English is now the most popular used language for advertising, business, and commercial names after the local language in many countries where English is a foreign language (Paakinen, 2008 in Karapalo 2011). According to Athwary (2014, in Oktavia 2015), the reason for using English in local advertisements and commercial signs are to attract the customers' attention to the services products, and in relation to globalization, modernity, and reputation.

The way people use English in public signs is iconic and innovative (Sayer, 2009), and includes grammatically complete sentence and grammatically less complete sentence (Karapalo, 2011), such as “H@RDSOFT COMPUTERS”, “4ever”, and “MrKlyn Laundry” (Oktavia, 2015). Jiang et al. (2010 in Oktavia, 2015) see this advertisement writing phenomenon as a problem. They stated that today's advertisements, which are part of linguistic landscapes, tend to use

language and style that fall far from the ideal standard language because there is no definitive agreement of language rules for advertisements. On the other hand, other scholars see this advertisement writing phenomenon as language varieties or translingual practice called code-meshing (Milson-Whyte, 2013 in Oktavia, 2015; Young, 2010; Canagarajah, 2006; Lu, 2004 in Fraiberg 2010; etc.).

Code-meshing is a set of practices of blending dialects, international languages, local idioms, chat-room lingo, and the rhetorical styles of various ethnic and cultural groups in both formal and informal speech acts (Young, 2010). Lu (2004, in Fraiberg 2010) also defines code-meshing as a strategy for writers to mesh their own native language with the dominant discourse. Young (2010) adds that this mode of communication is just as frequently used by politicians and professors as it is by journalists and advertisers. It allow writers and speakers to bridge multiple codes and modes of expression. Code-meshing use the way people already speak and write and help them to be more rhetorically effective. Code-meshing has already been everywhere (Young, 2010), including linguistic landscape.

There are several previous studies related to translingual practice via meshing codes. The first is from Young (2004) that found an example of code-meshing in his student's academic writing which was a mix between Black English popular street slang and academic discourse (Standard English). He stated that this meshing code happened because his "black" student did not master the standard language. The second is from Milu (2013 in Sugiharto, 2015) that analyzed Kenyan hip-hop to showcase the common translingual practice in

Kenyan context, which is called *Sheng*. She stated that translingualism happens at two different levels; lexical level and morpho-syntactical level. She showed that hip-hop artists meshed two or more languages creatively, and concluded that the deliberate code-meshing showcases the Kenyan artists' freedom and agency in constructing their identity through language use. The third is from Milson-Whyte (2013 in Oktavia, 2015) that studied translingual practice via code-meshing through a property sign. She stated that the sign writer blended both English which was the standard language and Jamaican Creole expletive word.

The fourth previous study, which is the most related study to this current study, is from Oktavia (2015) that explored translingual phenomenon/practice via code-meshing in Jakarta's linguistic landscape. This explorative study examined code-meshing from exploration, analysis, and interpretation based on the available translingual approach and translingual practice theory, and only focuses at the lexical level of the data. The form data of the study were pictures taken from Blok-M Mall (South Jakarta) so all of the linguistic landscape data were only about commercial shop signs. She concluded that Jakarta's linguistic landscapes (which are only commercial shop signs) makers use English as another resource beside Indonesian language in conveying their purposes and messages to public and their customers, and use the English words from the English resource in diverse way by meshing it with words from Indonesian languages in order to enrich their message or information.

Since Jakarta is the special capital region in Indonesia which has become metropolitan city that indicates code-meshing phenomena possibly occur in its

linguistic landscape and since the data of the latest previous-related study only focused on commercial shop signs, the purpose of this current study is to explore code-meshing phenomena in (East) Jakarta's linguistic landscape (not only on commercial signs). East Jakarta is chosen as the field of the data source because although it is in the suburbs, its Human Development Index (HDI) is the most developing score, 1.33, from 78.74 in 2009 to 80.07 in 2013 (Badan Pusat Statistik: jakarta.bps.go.id) that indicates its people are more literate and educated. East Jakarta is in the second place for the highest of Jakarta's HDI 2013, only 0.40 below the first place, South Jakarta, with the average score 78.31 of whole Jakarta. It also indicates that East Jakarta's people not only just know English, but they understand and (ever) use it, at least Basic English in the schools, colleges, or work. In addition, this study focuses only at the lexical level of the data. The result of this explorative study can, off course, enrich the previous-related studies, give contribution to sociolinguistics, and for the researcher himself, it can give a new knowledge, understanding, and experiences.

1.2 Research Question

In accordance with the background mentioned above, this study was conducted to answer the following question:

- How is lexical level code-meshing in East Jakarta's linguistic landscape?
 - o What process has each lexical level code-meshing in East Jakarta's linguistic landscape undergone?

- What is communicative function of each code-meshing in East Jakarta's linguistic landscape?

1.3 Purpose of the Study

This study aims to explore code-meshing at lexical level in East Jakarta's linguistic landscape. To reach the purpose, the process of each lexical level code-meshing and its communicative function were identified.

1.4 Scope of the study

This study is focused only at code-meshing in English or between English and Indonesian language at lexical level in East Jakarta's linguistic landscape.

1.5 Benefits of the Study

The result of this explorative study is expected to:

- Enrich the previous-related study since this study is filling the gap and can give more understanding of code-meshing in linguistic landscape.
- Contribute to sociolinguistics since code-meshing is still a "new" term, although not new phenomenon, at least in English Department, Universitas Negeri Jakarta.
- Give, for the researcher himself, a new knowledge and understanding of code-meshing, its real-world practices and the way people code-mesh, also give remarkable yet fun experience in conducting this explorative sociolinguistics study.