

Contesting Language Ideologies in the Linguistic Schoolscape in an Indonesian Multilingual School: A Case Study

*¹Dwi Lestianingsih, ¹Joko Nurkamto, ¹Sumardi

¹Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia

***Correspondence:**

dwilestia123@gmail.com

Submission History:

Submitted: October 24, 2023

Revised: November 8, 2023

Accepted: November 13, 2023



This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License.

Abstract

This research investigates language ideologies in Indonesian multilingual schools, examining how these ideologies influence student language perceptions, use, and institutional policies. The study centers on analyzing signage in a multilingual school, revealing a preference for Indonesian, English, and Chinese. This preference reflects ideologies of globalization, ethnic identity, and nationality, influencing language choices in the curriculum and shaping attitudes towards each language. A notable finding is the absence of Javanese language signage despite the school's location in a Javanese-speaking region. This points to a potential prioritization of global languages over local ones, raising questions about the preservation and promotion of local languages and cultural identities in education. The study suggests that such prioritization may stem from a desire to prepare students for a globalized world but at the risk of overlooking indigenous linguistic and cultural heritage. The findings highlight the complex dynamics of language policy in educational settings, especially in multilingual countries. They underscore the need for a more inclusive approach to language education that balances global demands with the preservation of local languages and cultures. This research contributes to understanding the broader implications of language ideologies in education and the challenges of maintaining cultural identity in the face of globalization.

Keywords: Linguistic landscape, linguistic school scape, language ideology, multilingual

INTRODUCTION

Schools are vital spaces where diverse language ideologies are both taught and challenged. These ideologies are evident in the linguistic schoolscape, defined by [Brown \(2012\)](#) as the amalgamation of the physical school space, interwoven with written and spoken texts and the interconnected processes therein. This interaction between text and place in schools not only shapes and sustains language ideologies but can also drive linguistic changes. Distinguished from linguistic landscapes of public spaces, linguistic

schoolscapes focus on visible written signs within educational settings. According to [Schmidt \(2013\)](#), public schools are heavily regulated, complex environments where various demands, including those of space and time, converge. These settings provide a rich context for examining the evolution of language use and the underlying influences shaping it, illustrating the dynamic interplay of language policy in everyday educational practices.

This study delves into the linguistic ecosystem of the school, shedding light on different aspects of school life and revealing the visual manifestations of language ideologies, often part of the hidden curriculum. [Shohamy \(2005\)](#), [Brown \(2012\)](#), and [Aronin and Laoire \(2012\)](#) have underscored the significance of linguistic ideologies in educational settings. [Brown \(2012\)](#) explains the concealed curriculum as the set of values and expectations not explicitly stated in the formal curriculum but reflecting the educational philosophy of institutions. Outside the classroom, the linguistic landscape includes materials like signs, posters, and announcement boards, typically crafted by those in authority, illustrating a top-down communication approach. In contrast, within classrooms, the landscape is formed by learners and teachers through materials like signs, graffiti, and posters, constituting a bottom-up phenomenon, as described by [Chimirala \(2018\)](#). This contrast highlights the diverse ways language ideologies are presented and reinforced in different school environments.

The concept of linguistic landscape relates to the visibility of languages on objects within the public domain of a specific area. [Landry and Bourhis \(1997\)](#) introduced this term, which has since been adapted to educational contexts as "schoolscape" by scholars like [Brown \(2012\)](#), [Szabó \(2015\)](#), and [Laihonen and Tódor \(2015\)](#). [Brown \(2012\)](#) suggests that schoolscape offers a unique mix of adhering to and potentially altering prevailing language ideologies. Adopting a broad perspective of linguistic landscaping as a societal engagement tool ([Ben-Rafael et al., 2006](#)), the educational environment is interpreted as a space where written materials, pictures, and inscriptions are visually, auditorily, and spatially prioritized. [Trumper-Hecht \(2010\)](#) analyzed the symbolic and informative roles of linguistic landscapes. The symbolic aspect involves how language and texts symbolize cultural identities and social representations in a specific geographical area.

Conversely, the informative aspect relates to the practical use of language and texts for conveying information, directions, and services within a region. [Trumper-Hecht \(2010\)](#) proposed a three-dimensional framework for understanding these functions: spatial practice, conceived space, and experienced space. Spatial practice denotes the physical manifestation of language distribution. Conceived space relates to the political dimension, reflecting policymakers' ideologies and their impact on the linguistic environment. Experienced space focuses on the experiential aspect, exploring language users' attitudes. This theoretical framework aids in understanding how social organizations navigate symbolic dynamics in multilingual contexts, balancing both the symbolic and informative functions of language in public spaces.

[Trumper-Hecht \(2010\)](#) defines the political dimension of linguistic landscapes as reflecting and reinforcing power dynamics and social hierarchies through public language use and representation, encompassing aspects like language policy, rights, maintenance, and transition. This dimension, often termed the conceptual realm, is shaped by government entities, elected officials, and policy experts. Concurrently, [Shohamy \(2005\)](#) observes that language policy is evident in various domains, such as public signage,

government operations, and educational instruction. Moreover, [Spolsky and Shohamy \(2000\)](#) describe language policy as deliberate actions by authoritative figures to influence others' language usage. Additionally, [Trumper-Hecht's \(2010\)](#) physical dimension emphasizes the visual elements of linguistic landscapes, including the location, size, font, and color of signs and their impact on urban aesthetics. Complementing this, [Lefebvre's \(1991\)](#) concept of experienced space focuses on individuals' perceptions and interpretations of their linguistic environments. This multifaceted approach is applied in this study to examine the physical, political, and experiential aspects of linguistic schools in an Indonesian private multilingual school.

Furthermore, [Szabó \(2015\)](#) points out that schools are influenced not only by legal frameworks but also by the visual practices of educational institutions. Inscriptions and cultural symbols on school buildings act as navigational tools through various cultural and linguistic ideologies. This research into school signage offers valuable insights into educational dynamics and contributes significantly to education research. Finally, the study addresses the complex interactions among native, official, and foreign languages in schools serving both minority and majority language communities. As [Bartha et al. \(2013\)](#) discuss, the coexistence of these languages in minority contexts opens up a myriad of research possibilities.

Analyzing signs or visual texts in schools, or linguistic landscapes ([Landry & Bourhis, 1997](#)) and linguistic schools ([Brown, 2012](#)), can reveal the ideology behind a school's language policy. Studies in various countries have explored this theme. For instance, in India, school signage is primarily in Bengali and English, with limited representation in Santali, despite a significant number of students from Mundari backgrounds ([Bisai & Singh, 2022](#)). In Singapore, a multilingual nation, English dominates school signage ([Tang, 2018](#)). Conversely, South African schools exhibit diverse linguistic landscapes reflecting varied ideologies ([Kretzer & Kashula, 2017](#)), while Finnish schools show a balance between Finnish and Swedish ([Pakarinen & Bjorklund, 2018](#)).

Furthermore, research on linguistic schools in Asia, particularly in Indonesia, remains scarce. This gap presents an opportunity for new studies to understand language ideologies in Indonesian multilingual schools. The current study responds to this need by investigating which language ideology predominates in such settings. It poses three key research questions: Firstly, it examines the languages visibly present in the school environment. Secondly, it seeks to identify the dominant and less dominant language ideologies. Finally, the study aims to understand how individuals interpret the messages conveyed by their surrounding linguistic schools.

METHOD

This study was conducted in Madiun, a small town in East Java, Indonesia. Covering an area of 33.23 km², Madiun had a population of approximately 4.29 million as of the 2020 census. In this region, Javanese and Indonesian are the predominant languages used in offices, newspapers, public places, and educational settings. The research focused on multilingual schools, specifically one that is distinguished for teaching three languages: Indonesian, English, and Chinese.

Participants included teachers, administrative staff, and parents of students. The study selected 8th-grade English teachers with at least five years of teaching experience.

This choice aimed to gain insights into their teaching methods and strategies, particularly for English language education. An administrative staff member with four years of experience at the school was also interviewed to understand the school's organizational structure and its role in the educational environment. Additionally, parents who regularly dropped off and picked up their children at school were included to provide insights into their involvement in the school community and their perspectives on their children's education. The research focused on a multilingual school with a substantial number of students of Chinese ethnicity. In line with the methodology proposed by [Trumper-Hecht \(2010\)](#), the study conducted a comprehensive descriptive analysis of the linguistic landscape, utilizing a three-pronged approach. This method was apt for the research as it encompassed an analysis of all sign categories within the school, including information about the authors and the audience of these signs.

In this study, linguistic schoolsapes were documented using photography to record the school's spatial practice or physical component, focusing on elements like the gate name, information boards, announcement boards, rooms' names, and other visible signs. Each sign was captured in a single image. Additionally, the study explored the political or conceptual space by examining institutional regulatory frameworks related to language use. This involved consulting relevant departments for insights into communication policies and regulations about the placement of signs.

Furthermore, to assess the lived space dimension, semi-structured interviews were conducted with students, teachers, and parents to understand their attitudes toward the institution's official languages. The study involved six participants, including teachers, school staff, students, and parents, with each interview lasting approximately 30 minutes. These interviews, designed to be semi-structured, aimed to capture users' perceptions and evaluations of the significance and hierarchy of languages used. Lastly, thematic analysis was applied to the data collected from the semi-structured interviews. This approach, as described by [Braun and Clarke \(2006\)](#), facilitated the identification, organization, and interpretation of systematic patterns within the data. The identified patterns were then coded and categorized into themes, such as the dominant language used in the school, offering a comprehensive understanding of the linguistic dynamics within the educational environment.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Languages represented in the linguistic schoolsapes

A total of 163 photographs were obtained by capturing images of all the signs present within the school premises. The acquired images are classified into two categories, namely bilingual and multilingual. Each category is then further subcategorized based on the type of signage, either top-down or bottom-up. The present investigation delves into the linguistic schoolsapes, which can offer valuable insights into the disparities between the official language policy, as manifested in authoritative signage such as announcements, school signs, or room names, and its effects on individuals, as evidenced by grassroots indicators such as student works on display or wall magazines. Upon initial examination of the data, it is apparent that most of the signs depicted, precisely 72.4%, are monolingual, while the remaining 27.6% are multilingual, as demonstrated in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1. Monolingual signage at the school

Languages	Top Down		Bottom Up		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
English	10	55.6%	8	44.4%	18	15.3%
Chinese	6	15.6%	32	84.4%	38	32.2%
Indonesian	47	75.8%	15	24.2%	62	52.5%

A total of 118 images were acquired from monolingual signage. The monolingual signage displays a trilingual composition consisting of English, Chinese, and Indonesian languages. The data presented in the table reveals that the predominant language used in the top-down signages is Indonesian, with a total of 47 images (72.8%). English follows with 10 images (55.6%), while Chinese ranks last with only 15.6% of the total images. In addition, it was observed that Chinese characters were predominantly utilized in bottom-up signage, with a total of 32 images (84.4%). In contrast, the Indonesian language was only employed in a minimum of 15 images (24.2%). Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that the Indonesian language is more prevalent than English and Chinese in all the depicted images. This finding is consistent with the findings that [Brown \(2012\)](#) discovered in her research, which showed that Estonian, the official language, is more dominant than the minority language. This result also aligns with the findings that [Brown \(2012\)](#) discovered in her research. However, the results of this study indicate that Indonesian, the official language of the country, is still used the most in schools that teach more than one language. This school does not recognize the use of regional languages and instead emphasizes the study of three languages: Indonesian, Chinese, and English.

Table 2. Bilingual and Multilingual signage at the school

Languages	Top Down		Bottom Up		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Indonesian and Chinese	14	87.5%	2	12.5%	16	35.6%
Indonesian and English	13	92.9%	1	7.1%	14	31.1%
Chinese, English, Indonesian	15	100%	-	-	15	33.3%

Table 2 shows that there are 45 signages for multilingual. There are three categories, namely Indonesian and Chinese, Indonesian and English, and finally, a combination of 3 languages (Chinese, English, and Indonesian). The results show that using two languages (Indonesian and Chinese) and three languages (Chinese, English, and Indonesian) was almost in balance, with 16 pictures (35.6%) and 15 pictures (33.3%). However, the top-down signage was dominated by using three languages (Chinese, English, and Indonesian). Meanwhile, three languages (Chinese, English, and Indonesian) were not used on the bottom-up signage. This finding contradicts the study conducted by [Bisai and Singh \(2022\)](#). It shows the dominance of majority languages over minority languages in the schoolscape in Indian multilingual schools. Whereas in the findings of this study, the use of multilingual signs in signage is generally balanced. This is in line with the vision and mission of the school, which one of its missions is to improve the understanding and use of Indonesian, English, and Chinese properly and correctly.

Language ideologies represented in the linguistic schoolscapes

The language ideologies reflected in linguistic schoolscapes can represent the beliefs, attitudes, and values associated with various languages. These ideologies influence

how languages are perceived, valued, and utilized in educational contexts. Here are some prevalent language ideologies that can be found in linguistic schoolsapes:



Figure 1. The picture of monolingual signage in English

The message "close the door nicely" can be classified as a directive or request to ensure the door is shut gently or conservatively, thereby serving its intended function. The statement conveys the desire of the speaker to have the door closed in a gentle and noiseless manner, without any abrupt or disruptive impact. The act of gently closing a door can hold significant symbolic connotations. This phenomenon may signify the necessity for confidentiality, establishing limits, or upholding a perception of structure and arrangement. The image has the potential to be construed in two distinct ways: as a pragmatic entreaty and as a symbolic gesture that prompts reflection on the broader connotations and ramifications of shutting a door.

The vision of the school is to produce high-achieving students fluent in three languages (Indonesian, English, and Chinese) who can compete at the national and international levels based on their faith and piety, as well as environmental science and technology; the school aims to produce students who excel in academics and who can compete at the national and international levels. Image 1 demonstrates the use of English in signage. This is evidence that day-to-day practice aligns with the school's vision. This signifies the school's philosophy, emphasizing using English in ordinary life by providing English-language signage. English is a global language, as is common knowledge. The expectation is that this will be the provision for students to communicate and interact in English.

[Trumper-Hecht \(2010\)](#) identified the conceived space, highlighting the political aspects of language because it represents the policymakers' supported ideologies and opinions. Globalization has become a significant phenomenon in a world that is becoming more interconnected through technology and communication. The inculcation of globalization ideology can be reflected in English-language signage in various locations, such as the English-language sign in picture 1. This can be interpreted as the school's policymakers attempting to convey that one of the English languages is one of the enforced language ideologies at the school. English was chosen because it is widely recognized as a global language. It is a prominent language of international communication, commerce, education, and diplomacy.



Figure 2. The picture of monolingual signage in Chinese

Figure 2 shows examples of some signs that use Chinese. With the branding of this school, namely a three-language school, the use of Chinese language signage is often found. Figure 2 depicts a child bowing politely to someone by saying 老师 : lǎoshī = teacher 早上好 : zǎoshang hǎo = good morning. This signage is placed at the school's front door in the hope that students who read this sign can do the good exemplified by the image by greeting each other to the teacher. In a practical sense, this message is a polite greeting because it says "good morning" and calls the person a teacher. It is a polite and common way to start a talk or show respect for a teacher. Symbolically, the message also means something. It is a cultural and social sign of education and teachers' importance. By calling someone "lǎoshī" (which means "teacher"), the student shows that they respect their wisdom, knowledge, and direction. It is a sign of thanks and respect for how hard the teacher works and what they bring to the learning process.

This is followed by Figure 2, which is written in large font and faces the school's main door, which means 学好三语 , 走向世界: learn three languages well and go to the world. Functionally, the message "learn three languages well and go to the world" is an instruction or suggestion to become proficient in three languages and then travel or explore different parts of the world. It emphasizes the importance of language learning to broaden one's horizons and navigate diverse cultural contexts. Symbolically, the message carries several implications. Firstly, learning three languages well signifies a dedication to communication and understanding. It suggests an openness to embracing different cultures, perspectives, and ways of life. By acquiring language skills, one can bridge gaps and connect with people from various backgrounds, fostering mutual understanding and empathy. Secondly, "go to the world" symbolizes a desire for exploration, adventure, and personal growth. It encourages individuals to venture beyond their comfort zones, expand their knowledge, and experience the richness and diversity of the world. It implies a thirst for new experiences, connections, and self-discovery.

A linguistic schoolscape, according to [Brown \(2005\)](#), [Dressler \(2015\)](#), [Bisai and Singh \(2022\)](#), and [Pakarinen and Bjorklund \(2018\)](#), can disclose the ideologies and language practices implemented in these schools. According to the signage in pictures 2 and 3, one of the prevailing ideologies at this school is the ideology of ethnic identity. This

school, a three-language institution (Indonesian, English, and Chinese), is identified by Chinese-language signage. This is also corroborated by the fact that this school was a gift from a Chinese descendant in the past. The preponderance of students is currently of Chinese descent, with signage in Chinese indicating their ethnic identity. Instilling ethnic identity ideology through school signs can strengthen students' sense of pride, recognition, and understanding of their ethnic identity. Schools may use signs that include words, expressions, or greetings in the language of the ethnicity represented by students in the school. For example, a welcome sign at a school entrance could include a greeting in an ethnic language that demonstrates inclusivity and recognition of students' diverse cultural backgrounds.



Figure 3. The picture of signage in Indonesian

The Indonesian signage in Figure 3 states “Budayakan Malu” / “Shame culture” in Indonesian. It is followed by 14 positive messages that inspire, motivate, and encourage good behavior. These messages are presented in a list of good behaviors. For instance, it is not arriving late, not getting into fights, telling the truth, etc. Functionally, this sign serves as a reminder or instruction to instill a sense of humiliation or embarrassment when engaging in undesirable behavior. It implies that individuals should consider the potential adverse effects of their actions, remarks, and behaviors on others. It promotes self-control and introspection prior to engaging in inappropriate or objectionable behavior. The phrase can represent the promotion of moral behavior. It implies that individuals should adhere to moral principles and societal norms, avoiding actions that could bring disgrace or dishonor upon themselves or others. It encourages the development of a strong sense of personal integrity and ethics in the Indonesian nation, which has the official language, Indonesian. This is in line with the study of [Bartha et al. \(2013\)](#). The relationships between the mother tongue, the official language, and foreign languages must be studied in minority- and majority-language medium institutions. This emphasizes the conduct.

The use of Indonesian in the schoolscape, as an example in Picture 4, shows an ideology of nationality in the importance of studying the relationship between mother tongue, official language, and foreign language in the context of educational institutions. It is essential to understand the influence and interaction between the various languages used in education, both in institutions that use minority and majority languages.

People's perspectives on the languages in the linguistic schoolsapes

The perspectives on linguistic schoolscape are subject to significant variation, contingent upon individuals' diverse backgrounds, cultural orientations, and social perspectives. The national or official language is often regarded as a representation of national identity by specific individuals. The authors contend that education should prioritize promoting and enhancing the official language within the public sphere and the education system. Numerous individuals acknowledge the advantages of acquiring and proficiently mastering multiple languages. It is widely held that multilingual skills can enhance cognitive abilities, facilitate access to international employment prospects, and foster a more comprehensive appreciation of diverse cultures. In the subsequent sections, several noteworthy findings will be presented in this study.



Figure 4. The picture of signage in Chinese

One aspect of using Chinese in a linguistic schoolscape is the provision of formal Chinese lessons at school. This allows students to learn the language in a structured and systematic way. Chinese language lessons can help students develop skills in speaking, reading, writing, and understanding the language. Using Chinese in a linguistic schoolscape can also reflect educational policies encouraging multilingualism. In this context, Chinese is integrated into the curriculum as one of several languages offered to students. This allows students to become more linguistically skilled and communicate in multiple languages.

Figure 4 is a Chinese sign often found in the school. That means 请节约用点用水: please be economical in using electricity and water. The school has claimed that using signs that speak Chinese can be their input and habituation to use Chinese in their daily practice. One of the Grade 5 teachers responded to one of the Chinese signs by stating:

"Yes, I cannot speak Chinese fluently, but I know what it means; it means we must save on electricity and water. So, the teachers here are introduced to this Chinese language sign so that we can take part in educating students."

The previous comment suggests that incorporating Chinese signs is a strategic measure undertaken by the school to actualize its vision of equipping students with proficiency in three languages, including Chinese. Additionally, this signage functions as the emblem of the educational institution, which boasts a trilingual school identity. Even

though not all teachers and staff members have fluency in Chinese, the school is trying to promote socialization related to Chinese language signage. This ensures that the message is not merely a compliment or display but is effectively communicated. However, in practice, some students do not understand the meaning of the sign, as stated by one of the grade 6 students:

"I do not know what the full meaning is. I know that the last word is 水: Shuǐ means water. I do not know if the front one is because it has not been taught."

It is sometimes found that students are less educated about this Chinese language sign; for example, one of these students admits that he does not know the meaning as a whole, but he only knows the last word. He stated that his ignorance was because he had not been taught in class. However, several other things can also influence this; for example, the placement of this sign also has an effect. Because this sign is located at the end of the room, maybe this student ignored this sign. As the model described by [Trumper-Hect \(2010\)](#), one is lived space, which describes the reader's attitude toward the signage. Here, the attitude found varies from one of the findings above. The abundance of this signage in Chinese is supported because of the ideology contained in it as the political dimension by [Trumper-Hect \(2010\)](#).



Figure 5. The picture of signage in English

In the findings in picture 5. reveals that the school wrote this sign so students are careful when climbing stairs. Students are also expected to understand the signs and always be careful on stairs. One school staff stated:

"It means be careful, right? It is placed on the stairs with the aim of the children to be careful when climbing the stairs."

One of the school staff believes that the sign in English can be understood and placed in its place, so he believes that the message in the sign can be adequately conveyed to people who cross the stairs, both students, teachers, and other people. In line with the school staff, other findings were also obtained from one of the 9th-grade students, whose class was on the 2nd floor, so he went up the stairs every day:

"Be careful means to be careful; the goal is as long as we do not run around when climbing the stairs so we do not fall."

The sign in English is also well conveyed to students who cross it. Students know what it means, understand, and finally carry out the sign message as a form of embodiment of mastery of the English language. The perspective of using English on signage at this

school shows that the school is a multilingual school that teaches three languages, one of which is English. This is in line with the findings of [Cenoz and Gorter \(2006\)](#) that signage in public areas can describe and teach multilingualism. Furthermore, English represents globalization and sophistication. English has evolved into a global language of communication widely used in various fields, including business, technology, science, and entertainment. In the era of globalization, its capacity to facilitate cross-cultural and cross-national communication has made it an essential instrument.



Figure 6. The picture of signage in Indonesia

The Indonesian language is extensively employed on the signage within the premises of this educational institution, with one language variant being particularly prevalent. Figure 6 depicts top-down signage in the Indonesian language. The school created this signage to target its student body, faculty, and staff. The signage unambiguously requests individuals within the school vicinity to don masks. Consistent with the observations made by a particular educator, it was stated that employing the Indonesian language on the bulletin board is a customary practice for our institution as a national school. This statement serves as a reminder of our national identity as Indonesian citizens, even though many students in this educational institution are of Chinese origin. The utilization of signage in Indonesia has the potential to serve as a mechanism for reinforcing our national identity as responsible citizens of Indonesia, even though the majority of students in this school are of Chinese heritage. The utilization of signage in the Indonesian language remains imperative as a means of preserving national identity among Indonesian nationals. The students expressed their ease and familiarity with the signage in the Indonesian language.

Furthermore, the Javanese language can be regarded as a regional ideology and a local language in various contexts, particularly in regions where it holds linguistic dominance, such as the location of this educational institution. However, a noteworthy discovery in this study is the conspicuous absence of the Javanese language within the linguistic landscape of the educational setting. The Javanese language is not represented on the signage displayed at the school. It can be asserted that Javanese is the linguistic minority within the educational institution. Minority languages may not receive official recognition or be utilized as languages of instruction, resulting in their limited presence within the linguistic and educational landscape. The absence of the Javanese language as a dedicated subject in the current educational curriculum is the underlying reason for this

situation. The educational system may lack emphasis or sufficient backing for instructing regional languages such as Javanese in certain regions. This is in line with the findings of Brown (2012), where the linguistic schoolscape in the Estonian school displays a bit of their regional language, namely Võro, even though Võro is the regional language that is used every day. Likewise, in this study, students use Javanese to communicate with their friends, but Javanese is not found on any signage at this school.

CONCLUSION

This research provides a comprehensive analysis of the language displays in a multilingual school in Madiun, Indonesia, revealing a predominant use of Indonesian, English, and Chinese in schoolsapes. The study finds that Indonesian, as the national and official language, is prominently featured, reflecting its significant role in the Indonesian linguistic landscape. The substantial presence of Chinese highlights the school's multilingual character, while English, though less prevalent, is still a key part of the linguistic environment. The absence of Javanese, despite its widespread use in the local community, is a notable finding. This suggests a potential oversight in representing local linguistic identities within the school's linguistic landscape. The research also uncovers that multilingual signage is almost evenly distributed, with Indonesian-Chinese combinations being the most common, followed by trilingual displays involving Indonesian, English, and Chinese.

The study reveals three main ideologies in the school's linguistic landscape: globalization, ethnic identity, and nationality. The use of English signage reflects a globalizing ideology aimed at encouraging English proficiency. The incorporation of ethnic identity through signage fosters a sense of pride and understanding among students about their heritage. Finally, the expression of national identity solidifies the school's commitment to Indonesian nationalism. This investigation into schoolsapes has significant implications for educational policies and practices. It highlights the need for an inclusive approach that acknowledges the diversity of languages within educational settings. The study underscores the impact of visual elements on the educational experience, prompting a reevaluation of their use in schools. Furthermore, the findings offer insights into the practices and norms of linguistic schoolsapes in a multilingual context, particularly in a school offering Indonesian, English, and Chinese. However, the research is limited to a single institution in Indonesia, suggesting a need for future studies to encompass a broader range of multilingual schools across Indonesia for more comprehensive insights. This expansion would enhance our understanding of linguistic landscapes in diverse educational contexts and inform more inclusive and representative language policies.

REFERENCES

- Aronin, L., & Ó Laoire, M. (2013). The material culture of multilingualism: Moving beyond the linguistic landscape. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 10(3), 225–235. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2012.679734>
- Bartha, C., Laihonen, P., & Szabó, T. P. (2013). Nyelvi tájkép kisebbségben és többségben: egy új kutatási területről (Minority and majority linguistic landscape: A new field of research). *Pro Minoritate*, 23(3), 13-28.

- Ben-Rafael, E., Shohamy, E., Amara, M., & Trumper-Hecht, N. (2006). Linguistic landscape as symbolic construction of the public space: The case of Israel. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 3(1), 7–30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710608668383>
- Bisai, S., & Singh, S. (2022). Language visibility in multilingual schools: An empirical study of schoolscapes from India. *Linguistics and Education*, 69, 101046. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2022.101046>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Brown, K. D. (2005). Estonian schoolscapes and the marginalization of regional identity in education. *European Education*, 37(3), 78–89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10564934.2005.11042390>
- Brown, K. D. (2012). The Linguistic landscape of educational spaces: language revitalization and schools in Southeastern Estonia. In *Palgrave Macmillan UK eBooks* (pp. 281–298). https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230360235_16
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2006). Linguistic landscape and minority languages. *Linguistic Landscape*, 67–80. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853599170-005>
- Chimiralá, U. (2018). Appropriating to the schoolscape: A study of reference of Linguistic Landscape in dyad text construction. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3356227>
- Dressler, R. (2015). Signgeist: Promoting bilingualism through the linguistic landscape of school signage. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 12(1), 128–145. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2014.912282>
- Kretzer, M. M., & Kaschula, R. H. (2019). Language policy and linguistic landscapes at schools in South Africa. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 18(1), 105–127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2019.1666849>
- Laihonen, P., & Tódor, E.-M. (2015). The changing schoolscape in a Szekler village in Romania: Signs of diversity in rehungarization. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 20(3), 362–379. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1051943>
- Landry, R., & Bourhis, R. Y. (1997). Linguistic Landscape and ethnolinguistic vitality. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 16(1), 23–49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927x970161002>
- Lefebvre. (1991). *The production of space*. Blackwell.
- Pakarinen, S., & Björklund, S. (2018). Multiple language signage in linguistic landscapes and students' language practices: A case study from a language immersion setting. *Linguistics and Education*, 44, 4–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2017.10.005>
- Schmidt, S. J. (2013). Claiming our turf: Students' civic negotiation of the public space of school. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 41(4), 535–551. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2013.840717>
- Shohamy, E. (2005). *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203387962>
- Spolsky, B., & Shohamy, E. (2000). Language practice, language ideology, and language policy. In *John Benjamins Publishing Company eBooks* (p. 1). <https://doi.org/10.1075/z.96.02spo>

- Szabó, T. P. (2015). The management of diversity in schoolsapes. *Apples: Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 9(1), 23–51. <https://doi.org/10.17011/apples/2015090102>
- Tang, H. K. (2018). Linguistic landscaping in Singapore: Multilingualism or the dominance of English and its dual identity in the local linguistic ecology? *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 17(2), 152–173. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2018.1467422>
- Trumper-Hecht, N. (2010). 13. Linguistic landscape in mixed cities in Israel from the perspective of 'walkers': The case of Arabic. *Linguistic Landscape in the City*, 235–251. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847692993-015>