CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Linguistic Landscape

Ben-Rafael et al. (2006 in Backhaus, 2007) define the 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 are several functions of linguistic landscapes. The first is to spread message of topographic information. The language used in linguistic landscape can give any description of particular area, such as geographical region, or any sections reserved for a specific function, such as the business area of town, district or a division of territory, or localities, such as cities, towns, or estates. The second is to give directions, such as street names, places names, and road signs. The third is to give a warning which is a statement that indicates a possible danger, problem, or unpleasant situations to many people in public places. The fourth is to prohibit or forbid people to do something by law in a certain place in public. The fifth is to express greetings or farewell which is a written expression as an instance of welcoming or saluting on a meeting and good wishes on parting. The last is to attract people's attention to a certain business or product, which is to make people know the nature of business done in a certain

place and what product is being offered to them (Backhaus, 2007 in Oktavia, 2015).

Based on their content, linguistic landscape texts are divided into four groups – business names, advertising, slogans, and non-commercial information (Karapalo, 2011). Business names refer to a name of shop, store, restaurant, bar, enterprise, business, service, etc. Advertising refers to advertising products or events usually consist of more than one word like a large commercial billboard, banner, or poster. Slogans refer to motto or business brand and contain texts located below a business name or right next to it and also consist of more than a word. Last, non-commercial information is all the other texts that have no direct commercial content.

2.1.1 English in Linguistic Landscape

There is a fact that English is now the most popular language used in many countries where English is a foreign language for advertising, business, and commercial names after the local language (Paakkinen, 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. Sayer (2009) differed the way people use English in public signs into a distinction between 'iconic' and 'innovative' uses. The iconic uses reproduced English in corporate logos and slogans, such as 'Domino's: The Pizza Delivery Experts'. The innovative uses were novel forms of language (non-standard

English) or linguistic innovation of English grammar and vocabulary, such as "H@RDSOFT COMPUTERS", "4ever", and "MrKlyn Laundry" (Oktavia, 2015). In addition, Karapalo (2011) also differed the way people use English grammar in public signs into a distinction between grammatically complete sentence and grammatically less complete sentence. The Example of grammatically complete sentence is "we can also arrange meetings" as an advert in a window of a restaurant, while the example of grammatically less complete sentence is "bad boy rebel wearing a bomber jacket" since there is no to be "is" before "wearing".

2.2 Translingualism

2.2.1 Background of Translingualism

Multilingualism is common in everyday life, as is dialect mixing within languages, though not always recognized or granted legitimacy (Horner et al., 2011b). Language use in our classrooms, our communities, the nation, and the world has always been multilingual rather than monolingual. Around the globe, most people speak more than one language. Indeed, they speak more than one variation of these languages. In addition, these languages and variations are constantly changing as they intermingle (Horner et al., 2011a). There is a fact in what have been called "native" varieties or what Canagarajah (2006) calls the Metropolitan Englishes (ME) – spoken by the communities that traditionally claimed ownership over the language in England, the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand – that among themselves, they have strikingly different varieties of their own standardized English (Shelton, 2007).

English has become the global lingua franca and been exported to all of the world (Shelton, 2007). The growing majority of English speakers worldwide – including substantial numbers within the United States – know other languages, and, through interaction, the Englishes they use vary and multiply. All speakers of English speak many variations of English, every one of them accented, and all of them subject to change as they intermingle with other varieties of English and other languages (Horner et al., 2011a). In addition, non-native speakers of English now outnumber native speakers worldwide (Ray, 2013). According to Crystal's conservative estimate (1997 in Canagarajah, 2006), multilingual users of the language will be about 30 million more than the "native" speakers. Graddol (1999 in Canagarajah, 2006) is stating the obvious when he proclaims, "[I]n future [English] will be a language used mainly in multilingual contexts as a second language and for communication between nonnative speakers." It can be concluded that the global spread of English has led to the production of multiple versions of English that themselves remain in flux as they encounter other "languages" (Brutt-Griffler, 2002 in Horner et al., 2011b).

This multilingualism taps not only linguistic ability within single languages but also the ability to move translingually (and transculturally), across as well as within abstracted languages and cultures (Horner et al., 2011b). We need to practice understanding each other whether we use the same lexicon or not. By "yielding" or reaching out to others linguistically, we as members of society can learn to negotiate meaning (Shelton, 2007). This situation makes us move towards *translingualism* or *translingual* approach.

2.2.2 Translingualism

Translingualism proclaims that writers can, do, and must negotiate standardized rules in light of the contexts of specific instances of writing, and asks of writing not whether its language is standard, but what the writers are doing with language and why (Horner et al., 2011a). We now realize that writing involves more than words. Writing is multimodal, with multiple semiotic features (space, visuals), ecological resources (objects, people, texts), and modalities (oral, visual, and aural) contributing to its production and interpretation. Translingual involves a way of relating to semiotic resources beyond autonomous/ static languages. In other words, translingual also encourages us to think of communication as involving semiotic features beyond words–to accommodate multimodal and multisensory factors (Canagarajah, 2013a).

Also, translingual approach takes the variety, fluidity, intermingling, and changeability of languages as statistically demonstrable norms around the globe. This approach thus calls for *more,* not less, conscious and critical attention to how writers deploy diction, syntax, and style, as well as form, register, and media. In short, a translingual approach argues for honoring the power of all language users to shape language to specific ends; recognizing the linguistic heterogeneity of all users of language both within the United States and globally; and directly confronting English monolingualist expectations by researching and teaching how writers can work with and against, not simply within, those expectations. By addressing how language norms are actually heterogeneous, fluid, and negotiable,

a translingual approach directly counters demands that writers must conform to fixed, uniform standards (Horner et al., 2011a).

A translingual approach to composition is concerned with how to treat language (including varieties of Englishes, discourses, media, or modalities) as performative: not something we have but something we do; users of language as actively forming and transforming the very conventions we use and social-historical contexts of use; communicative practices as not neutral or innocent but informed by and informing economic, geopolitical, social-historical, cultural relations of asymmetrical power; decisions on language use as shaping as well as shaped by the contexts of utterance and the social positionings of the writers, and thus having material consequences on the life and world we live in; difference as the norm of all utterances, conceived of as acts of translation inter and intra languages, media, modality during seeming iterations of dominant conventions as well as deviations from the norm; deliberation over how to tinker with authorized contexts, perspectives, and conventions of meaning making as needed and desired by all users of language, those socially designated as mainstream or minority, native or first, second, foreign speakers, published or student writers; and all communicative practices as mesopolitical acts, actively negotiating and constituting complex relations of power at the dynamic intersection of the social-historical (macro) and the personal (micro) levels (Lu & Horner, 2016).

2.2.3 Translingual Practice: Code-Meshing

A set of practices of this approach is called *translanguaging* (Matsuda, 2014 in Schreiber, 2015). Translanguaging can be defined as a speaker using all of his or her linguistic resources "to make meaning, transmit information, and perform identities," such that individual "languages" appear as part of a single integrated system (Creese & Blackledge, 2010 in Schreiber, 2015). Canagarajah has proposed the term *code-meshing* as "the realization of translanguaging in texts", extending the concept of translanguaging to include the use of registers and dialects within languages, as well as nonlinguistic resources like symbols (Schreiber, 2015). Besides translanguaging and code-meshing, other scholars also have other terms to represent their insights into cross-language relations in the global contact zones e.g. Jørgensen's (2008) *poly-lingual languaging*, Blommaert's (2008) *hetero-graphy*, Pennycook's (2010) *metrolinguistics*, The Council of Europe's (2000) *plurilingualism*, etc. (Canagarajah, 2013b). And, in his recent book, Canagarajah (2013b) adopts the umbrella term *translingual practice* to cover those terms.

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). In Canagarajah's article (2006) that identifies textual and pedagogical spaces for World Englishes in academic writing, it presents code-meshing as a strategy for merging local varieties with Standard Written English in a move toward gradually pluralizing academic writing and developing multilingual competence for

transnational relationships (Canagarajah, 2006). 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) also add 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 (Young, 2010).

Code-meshing or translanguaging is more than code switching, which considers that the two languages are separate systems (or codes) and are "switched" for communicative purposes (Velasco & Garcia, 2014). We also must distinguish *code-meshing* from *code mixing*, which refers to the inclusion of single lexical items ("borrowings") that have become naturalized in the borrowing language. Code-meshing, however, can include mixtures of larger structural and rhetorical units and may still symbolize something "marked" in the dominant language of the text (Canagarajah, 2006). Here the examples of code-meshing found in Young's (2010) article.

1) Iowa Republican Senator Chuck Grassley sent two tweets to President Obama in June 2009 (Werner). His messages blend together common texting abbreviations, standard English grammar and an African American rhetorical technique:

> First Tweet: "Pres Obama you got nerve while u sightseeing in Paris totell us 'time to deliver'on healthcare.Westill onskedul/even workinWKEND."
> Second Tweet: "Pres Obama while u sightseeing in Paris u said 'time to delivr on healthcare' When you are a 'hammer' u think evrything is NAIL I'm no NAIL."

2) Professor Kermit Campbell uses multiple dialects to compose *Gettin' Our Groove On* (2005), a study of college writing instruction. In it he say:

> Middle class aspirations and an academic career have rubbed off on me, fo sho, but all hell or Texas gotta freeze over befo you see me copping out on a genuine respect and love for my native tongue. […] That's from the heart, you know. But I don't expect a lot of folks to feel me.

3) ChrisAnn Cleland, a real estateagent from Virginia, express disappointment about President Obama's economic plan in an interview with the *Washington Post* (Rich):

> "Nothing's changed for the common guy," she said. "I feel like I've been punked."

4) Referencing Cleland's remark, the title of *New York Times* columnist Frank Rich's Op-ed article asks: "Is Obama Punking Us?" Rich writes in the last paragraph of his article:

> "The larger fear is that Obama might be just another corporatist, punking voters much as the Republicans do when they claim to be all for the common guy."

The contraction "nothing's," the colloquial phrase "common guy," and the vernacular expression "punked," are neither unusual nor sensational (Young, 2010). For more understanding of this translingual practice, discussion is provided in the next previous studies section right after communicative function section.

2.3 Communicative Function

Language is a tool for persons to communicate; to looking for and give information and knowledge to the others. According to Leech (1981), there are five communicative functions; informational, expressive, directive, aesthetic, and

phatic function. Each function is oriented on factors; subject-matter, speaker or writer, listener or reader, channel of communication, and message. Informational function is oriented on the message and aims to give (new) information. Expressive function aims to express speaker's or writer's feelings and attitudes. Directive function aims to influence the behaviour or attitudes of others, to convince, and to persuade them (usually with commands and requests). Aesthetic function aims to use the language in creative way (by using rhymes, similes, metaphors, etc.). Phatic function aims to keep communication lines open, keep social relationship in good repair, and/or establish/maintain contact between the addresser and the addressee.

2.4 Previous Studies

2.4.1 Young (2004)

Young (2004) found the 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). In the paper, his student wrote:

> Your average *nigga* in the ghetto is given *5 words* at birth.
> Your average *nigga* is living in a hostile world that will *chew you up* and spit you out still whole.

The word *nigga* is a Black English Vernacular (BEV) word that refers to nigger. The phrase *5 words* actually refers to "*I don't give a fuck!"* which is a BEV slang. So "*5 words* at birth" constitutes the ghetto newborn's lifelong defense plan that is guaranteed to "get him or her through every problem they face." While in the second sentence, "*chew you up*" is also BEV slang refers to being eaten up which

means being punished, usually for disobeying a command. Young (2004) stated that this meshing code happened because his "black" student did not master the standard language.

2.4.2 Milu (2013 in Sugiharto, 2015 and Oktavia, 2015)

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*. Sheng is a language variety that has been in use, especially among the urban youth in Kenya for over decades now. Whereas many of the surface morphemes of Sheng look like Kiswahili morphemes (Ogechi, 2005). Based on her study, Milu (2013 in Oktavia 2015) stated that translingualism happens at two different levels; translingualism at the lexical level and translingualism at the morpho-syntactical level.

At the lexical level, there is a mixture of two or more languages to form a word through manipulation of forms and meanings to invent new words. There are two processes at this level; lexification and lexicalization (Ogechi, 2005). Lexification refers to the source and/or processes of creating the words, while lexicalization deals with encoding of meaning to words. For example, the sheng phrase "-pata *doo poa*" is lexified by two languages. The source language of *pata* and *poa* is Kiswahili. While *-pata* literally translates to 'get' in Kiswahili, it means 'earn' in Sheng. As for *doo*, it is sourced from English *dough* whose informal meaning is money. Sheng takes on this informal meaning. Finally, while the adjective *poa* refers to cool in Kiswahili, the process of lexicalization in Sheng

changes its sense to *good*. This signals semantic borrowing from English where *cool* informally means impressive or when used with an amount of money, *cool* emphasises how large the money is. So the Sheng phrase "*-pata doo poa*" which means 'earn good money' has undergone both the lexification and lexicalization processes (Ogechi, 2005). Thus, lexicalization process is changing the sense of the words while lexification process is not so. Ogechi (2005) defines lexicalization as the manner in which Sheng vocabulary has over time been unstable (changed) either in form (emergence of new surface morphemes) or meaning (same surface morpheme assuming a new sense), while lexification is a system of language change in which one language replaces much of its entire lexicon (all the words and phrases used in language) with another language including the basic vocabulary without drastic change to its grammar (Oktavia, 2015).

The morpho-syntactical level is a mixture of various linguistic units – affixes, words, phrases, and clauses – from two different grammatical systems and subsystems within the same sentence and same speech situation. For example, the word *illest* in the lyric "that we the *illest kwa hii crowd ya wasanii*" from a hiphop song called hiphop halisi by Ukoo Flani and Nazizi is a word taken from African American Language (AAL) which has different linguistic system, lexicon, grammar, and phonological patterns of usage (Milu, 2013 in Oktavia 2015).

Milu (2013 in Sugiharto, 2015) 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.

2.4.3 Milson-Whyte (2013 in Oktavia, 2015)

Milson-Whyte (2013 in Oktavia, 2015) studied translingual practice via code-meshing through a property sign. The sign writer blended both English which was the standard language and Jamaican Creole expletive word. In this study, she firstly studied the details provided in this property sign in order to know the nature of the message in this property sign. She found out that the message was to overcome a problem which was to forbid animals from grazing in the sign writer's area by directing a prohibition sign to the owner of the animals. Secondly, she analyzed the Standard English that appears in this property sign and found out that those Standard English words had a different resonance in the specific context. Thirdly, she analyzed the Jamaican Creole expletive word *rasscolth* and found out the function and the sense, that was to emphasize the seriousness of prohibition because this expletive word has the sense of "absolutely no trespassing", and also found out the reason why the sign writer use a Jamaican expletive word with the standard English, that was Jamaican expletive word is used for cursing, so it showed the seriousness of prohibition. She also found out that the way Jamaican expletive word spelled in this property sign showed either the sign maker or the animal owner (the reader) is Rastafarian; she defined this as indexes identity.

2.4.4 Oktavia (2015)

Oktavia (2015) 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 data of the study were pictures taken from Blok-M Mall so all of the linguistic landscape data were only about commercial shop signs. In the data analysis, she used Ogechi's theory of lexification and lexicalization to identify the process of the data. Code-meshing in linguistic landscape found in her study are "Jual Pulsa *Electrik*", "Roti Bakar *Strowberry*", "*Intel*" (Indomie [a popular brand of instant noodle] – telur [egg]), "*Interned*" (Indomie – telur – corned), "*Indo. Complet*" (Indomie komplit [complete]), "Kaos Trendy *Metal*" (metal in here means a music genre [heavy metal]), "Obral *Riject* Pabrik Tidak Luntur", and "Pesan *Delevery*". 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.