



Linguistic Landscape Analysis at Cimory Dairyland: A Study of Sign Types and Functions Based on Landry and Bourhis' Framework

Annisa Fitria Nurjannah,¹✉ Rizky Tazkiyatul Ummami²

^{1,2} Universitas Pamulang, Indonesia

¹ Email: annisafitiannisa@gmail.com

Abstract

Linguistic landscape studies in tourism areas are important because public signs not only facilitate visitor navigation and access to facilities but also reflect how tourist destinations manage language use to accommodate diverse visitors and construct their identity. This study aimed to analyze the linguistic landscape at Cimory Dairyland based on the theory proposed by Landry and Bourhis (1997). The study focused on two research problems: the types of linguistic landscape found at Cimory Dairyland and the functions of linguistic landscape displayed on public signs. This study employed a qualitative method. Data were collected through observation and photographic documentation of 22 signs displayed in various areas of Cimory Dairyland. The findings showed two types of linguistic landscape, namely top-down and bottom-up signs. Top-down signs were dominant, with 21 signs, while only one bottom-up sign was found. The findings also showed two functions of linguistic landscape, namely informational and symbolic functions. The informational function was dominant, with 21 signs, as most signs provided information and directions for visitors. Meanwhile, one sign served a symbolic function by representing cultural identity. These findings indicate that the linguistic landscape at Cimory Dairyland was predominantly used to provide practical information to visitors.

Keywords: Functions of Linguistic Landscape, Linguistic Landscape, Type of Signs..

INTRODUCTION

Language plays an important role in human life as a means of communication and social interaction. According to Kinzler (2021), language is not only a tool for conveying messages but also serves as a social cue that reflects identity, social relationships, and group membership. The use of multiple languages has become increasingly common as people from different linguistic backgrounds interact. Mekt (2023) explained that multilingualism refers to the use or coexistence of more than one language by individuals or within a society. The use of multiple languages can also be observed in written texts displayed in public spaces, such as cities, shops, schools, government offices, public transportation, campuses, markets, and shopping centers (Shohamy & Gorter, 2009). These signs are used to convey information and messages to the public.

Therefore, the visibility of languages on public signs has become an important focus in linguistic landscape studies. Landry and Bourhis (1997) defined linguistic landscape as the visibility and salience of languages displayed on public signs. They also classified linguistic landscape signs into two types, namely top-down and bottom-up signs. Top-down signs are produced by government institutions or public authorities, while bottom-up signs are created by private sectors, businesses, or individuals. In addition to these types, Landry and Bourhis (1997) identified two main functions of linguistic landscape, namely informational and symbolic functions. Informational functions provide information, directions, warnings, or regulations, while symbolic functions represent identity, culture, prestige, and social values. However, subsequent scholars have expanded upon this foundational framework. Ben-Rafael et al. (2006) complicated the top-down/bottom-up distinction by demonstrating that the boundary between these categories can be blurred, particularly in spaces where public and private interests intersect. Similarly, Scollon and Scollon (2003) introduced the concept of geosemiotics, which emphasizes how signs are situated in physical space and how their meaning is shaped by their material placement and social context. More recent linguistic landscape scholars have further refined these categories by examining how semiotic resources (including images, colors, and fonts) interact with language to construct meaning in public spaces (Jaworski & Thurlow, 2010; Gorter, 2006). These developments suggest that while Landry and Bourhis' (1997) framework remains valuable, a more nuanced approach to analyzing linguistic landscape is warranted.

Linguistic landscape can be observed in various public spaces, including tourist destinations. Tourism areas contain various public signs, information boards, warnings, facility names, and commercial signs that help visitors obtain information and access facilities. Since tourist destinations may be visited by people from different linguistic backgrounds, the use of different languages on public signs can be observed. One of the tourist destinations in Indonesia is Cimory Dairyland, which combines recreational and educational activities. As a tourism area, Cimory Dairyland contains various public signs displayed in different languages, making it an appropriate setting for investigating linguistic landscape.

Several previous studies have examined linguistic landscape in different public settings. Khoiruddin (2025) investigated the functions and language patterns of linguistic landscape signs in Sengkaling UMM Recreation Park and Balekambang Beach. While the study provided valuable insights into language patterns in tourism contexts, it did not classify the signs into top-down and bottom-up types, thereby overlooking an important analytical distinction that reveals power relations in the production of public signs. Ayuningsih (2021) examined the types of linguistic landscape signs and visitors' language attitudes in Panakkukang Mall and Fort Rotterdam, Makassar. This study demonstrated the utility of Landry and Bourhis' (1997) typology but did not examine the informational and symbolic functions, which are equally important for understanding how signs serve both practical and identity-related purposes. Similarly, Ilmia (2022) examined the linguistic landscape of airports in East Java by focusing on monolingual, bilingual, and multilingual signs, without discussing the types and functions of linguistic landscape signs. While the language-choice analysis was informative, the absence of functional analysis limited the study's ability to explain how signs operate in the airport context.

Beyond these studies, there is a growing body of linguistic landscape research in Indonesian tourism contexts. Susanto et al. (2020) examined the linguistic landscape in Yogyakarta tourism areas, focusing on how local languages (Javanese) are represented alongside Indonesian and English. Saifudin et al. (2021) investigated multilingual signage in Bali tourist areas, demonstrating how the three languages (Balinese, Indonesian, and English) are deployed to construct tourism identity. These studies indicate that linguistic landscape in Indonesian tourist destinations is not merely a matter of providing information but is also a site of identity construction and language policy. However, these studies have primarily focused on language patterns or visitor attitudes, with less attention to the systematic classification of signs according to their types and functions based on a comprehensive theoretical framework.

Therefore, the present study addresses this gap by examining both the types and functions of linguistic landscape signs found at Cimory Dairyland based on the framework proposed by Landry and Bourhis (1997). This study is significant for several reasons. First, by systematically classifying signs according to both type (top-down/bottom-up) and function (informational/symbolic), the study offers a more comprehensive analysis than previous research that has focused on only one dimension. Second, the findings have practical implications for tourism management, as understanding the distribution of sign types and functions can inform decisions about signage design, placement, and language choice to better serve visitors. Third, the study contributes to linguistic landscape theory by testing and applying Landry and Bourhis' (1997) framework in the understudied context of Indonesian tourism, thereby providing insights into how the framework functions in a developing country context.

Based on the discussion above, this study is entitled "Linguistic Landscape Analysis in Cimory Dairyland." The study aims to address the following research questions:

1. What types of linguistic landscape signs (top-down or bottom-up) are found at Cimory Dairyland?
2. What functions (informational or symbolic) are served by the linguistic landscape signs at Cimory Dairyland?

METHODS

This study used a qualitative approach to analyze the types and functions of linguistic landscape signs found at Cimory Dairyland. According to Creswell and Poth (2018), qualitative research is an approach used to explore and understand the meaning that individuals or groups assign to a social or human problem through the analysis of textual or visual data. This approach was considered appropriate for the present study because the data consisted of written signs that required description and interpretation rather than numerical measurement. The analysis was based on the framework proposed by Landry and Bourhis (1997), which classified linguistic landscape signs into top-down and bottom-up types and identified their informational and symbolic functions. While more recent scholarship has complicated this dichotomy (Ben-Rafael et al., 2006), the framework remains a useful starting point for systematic analysis.

The collected data were analyzed in several stages. First, the signs were classified into two types of linguistic landscape, namely top-down and bottom-up. Top-down signs were identified as those produced by the management as the official authority of the tourist area, while bottom-up signs were identified as those created by private businesses or individuals operating within the area. In cases where the classification was ambiguous, the sign was discussed with another researcher to achieve consensus (inter-coder reliability). Each sign was then examined to determine its function, either informational or symbolic. The informational function was identified when a sign provided information, directions, or regulations, while the symbolic function was identified when a sign represented social or cultural meanings, such as identity or status. After the classification, each sign was described and interpreted based on the framework of Landry and Bourhis (1997). The frequency of each type and function was then determined to identify the dominant patterns of linguistic landscape at Cimory Dairyland. Additionally, the specific languages appearing on each sign were documented to provide a comprehensive analysis of the linguistic features of the landscape.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Findings

The findings of this study were based on 22 linguistic landscape signs collected at Cimory Dairyland. The signs were classified on two types of linguistic landscape, namely top-down and bottom-up, and two functions, namely informational and symbolic, based on the framework proposed by Landry and Bourhis (1997). The classification showed

that top-down signs were more dominant than bottom-up signs, while the informational function was more dominant than the symbolic function.

Table 1

Types and Functions of Linguistic Landscape Signs at Cimory Dairyland

Types	Functions	Frequency
Top-Down	Informational	21
Bottom-Up	Symbolic	1
Total		22

Based on the findings, 21 of the 22 signs were categorized as top-down, while only one sign was categorized as bottom-up. This finding showed that top-down signs were the dominant type of linguistic landscape at Cimory Dairyland. The top-down signs were mainly provided and controlled by the management as the official authority of the tourist area. These signs included directional signs, regulations, and facility descriptions that were placed in strategic locations to provide information and guide visitors.

In terms of function, 21 signs served an informational function, whereas only one sign served a symbolic function. The informational signs provided visitors with directions and information about facilities and services, including rides, restrooms, and smoking areas. The symbolic function was represented by the Holland Costume Rental sign, which represented Dutch cultural identity and supported the tourism theme of Cimory Dairyland. Therefore, the findings indicated that the linguistic landscape at Cimory Dairyland primarily served to provide information and guidance to visitors, while symbolic elements appeared only to a limited extent.

Based on the findings presented in Table 1, a more detailed analysis was conducted to examine the linguistic landscape signs found at Cimory Dairyland. The analysis focused on the types of signs, namely top-down and bottom-up, and their functions, namely informational and symbolic. The following figures present selected examples of the signs and their analysis.



Figure 1. *Sign Indicating Facilities*

The sign above is classified as a top-down sign because it was created by the management as the official authority. It displays two directions using arrows pointing left and right. The left-pointing arrow indicates the “ATV” facility, while the right-pointing arrow indicates “De Windmills,” “Mini Playground,” and “Smoking Area.” In terms of functions, the sign serves an informational function by providing clear directions to visitors. The different arrows help visitors identify the appropriate path and locate the facilities more easily. Thus, the sign provides information while supporting visitors’ movement within the tourist area.



Figure 2. *A Sign of CFC as a franchise food outlet*

The sign above is classified as a bottom-up sign because it represents the commercial brand CFC, which operates as a franchise. Although located within the Cimory Dairyland area, the sign was created by a private business rather than the management, reflecting commercial interests. The sign displays the CFC logo in red and white, making it clearly visible against the dark background. In terms of functions, the sign serves an informational function by informing visitors about the availability of a food outlet. The logo and brand name make the information easy to recognize, while the clear visual design attracts attention, strengthens brand recognition, and helps visitors identify available dining options.

2. Discussion

The findings of this study reveal significant patterns in the linguistic landscape at Cimory Dairyland that warrant critical examination. This discussion interprets the findings, compares them with previous studies, engages with theoretical implications, addresses power relations embedded in the linguistic landscape, and offers practical recommendations for tourism management.

The findings showed that the linguistic landscape at Cimory Dairyland consisted of 21 top-down signs (95.5%) and only one bottom-up sign (4.5%), based on the theoretical framework proposed by Landry and Bourhis (1997). The overwhelming dominance of top-down signs indicated that the communication and information system in the tourist area was mainly managed and regulated by the official authority. The management provided official signs in strategic locations, such as entrances, intersections, and high-traffic areas, to deliver information, regulate visitor movement, and guide visitors to facilities and attractions, including restaurants, toilets, musholla, parking areas, and other facilities. In contrast, the only bottom-up sign was the California Fried Chicken (CFC) commercial sign, which was created by a private franchisee rather than the management. Its presence reflected commercial interests and supported visitors' needs for dining services within the tourist area.

This near-total dominance of top-down signs (95.5%) is particularly significant for several reasons. First, it reflects a highly controlled tourism space where visitor experience is carefully managed through official signage. Unlike urban public spaces where multiple actors contribute to the linguistic landscape, Cimory Dairyland operates as a single-authority destination where the management exercises near-total control over the visual and linguistic environment. This concentration of control raises questions about visitor agency and the extent to which visitors are free to navigate and interpret the space independently. As Ben-Rafael et al. (2006) observed, the production of public signs reflects power relations in society, and in this case, the management's dominance in sign production reinforces its position as the primary definer of the visitor experience.

Second, the near-absence of bottom-up signs suggests limited commercial diversity within the area. While this may reflect a deliberate policy of maintaining aesthetic consistency or controlling commercial activities, it also reduces the variety of visitor experiences. In contrast, Ayuningsih (2021) found that bottom-up signs were more dominant at Panakkukang Mall because numerous independently operated commercial tenants displayed their own shop names, advertisements, and business signs. The difference between these settings highlights how the nature of the space (shopping mall vs. managed tourist destination) fundamentally shapes the linguistic

landscape. While malls are characterized by commercial diversity and multiple actors, managed tourist destinations are characterized by centralized control and communication systems. However, one might question whether this level of control enhances or diminishes the visitor experience. A more diverse linguistic landscape could create a more dynamic and engaging environment, whereas excessive control may result in a sterile or overly predictable experience.

The findings also showed that the informational function was the most dominant, with 21 signs (95.5%), while only one sign (4.5%) served a symbolic function. The dominance of the informational function indicated that most signs were intended to provide essential information and guidance, such as directions to toilets, amusement rides, area maps, and traffic information. This reflected the management's priority in ensuring visitor convenience and helping visitors navigate the area safely and efficiently. Meanwhile, the Holland Costume Rental sign represented the symbolic function because, besides indicating a costume rental service, it reflected Dutch cultural identity and reinforced the tourism theme of Cimory Dairyland.

The near-absence of symbolic signage is particularly noteworthy given Cimory Dairyland's stated tourism theme incorporating Dutch cultural elements. While the Holland Costume Rental sign serves a symbolic function, its presence is isolated rather than integrated into the broader signage system. This raises important questions about the extent to which the tourism theme is genuinely embedded in the visitor experience. If the Dutch cultural identity is intended to distinguish Cimory Dairyland from other tourist destinations, one would expect more signs reflecting this theme—perhaps through the use of Dutch language, traditional Dutch imagery, or cultural references. The limited symbolic representation suggests that the theme may be primarily marketed through the site's architecture and activities rather than through its linguistic landscape. This represents a missed opportunity for the management to strengthen the destination's unique identity through integrated symbolic signage.

Although the present study did not systematically analyze language choices, the photographic data revealed that signs predominantly used Indonesian and English. Indonesian appeared on all signs, reflecting the national language policy and the primarily domestic visitor base, while English appeared on most signs to accommodate international visitors. This bilingual pattern is consistent with findings from other Indonesian tourism contexts (Susanto et al., 2020; Saifudin et al., 2021). The presence of English, even in a domestic tourism context, reflects the globalized nature of tourism and the expectation that tourist destinations should be accessible to international visitors.

However, the absence of Dutch language on any signs is striking given the Dutch cultural theme. This suggests that the symbolic function of representing Dutch identity is conveyed through visual and material elements rather than through language, perhaps because Dutch is not widely spoken or recognized by the target visitors. This raises questions about the authenticity of the cultural representation and whether visitors recognize or appreciate the Dutch theme. Future research could investigate visitor perceptions of the Dutch cultural elements and whether they contribute to a meaningful cultural experience or merely serve as aesthetic decoration.

A critical analysis of the findings reveals several underlying dynamics that warrant attention. First, the dominance of top-down signs reflects a top-down approach to communication that positions visitors as passive recipients of information rather than active participants in the space. As Scollon and Scollon (2003) argued, signs are not neutral carriers of information but are embedded in social and power relations. The management's control over sign production positions visitors as subjects to be guided and regulated rather than as agents who can independently explore and interpret the space. This top-down orientation may limit visitors' sense of exploration and discovery, as their movement and activities are largely guided by official signage. Future research could investigate whether visitors perceive this as helpful organization or excessive control, and whether it affects their overall satisfaction with the visit.

Second, the sole symbolic sign representing Dutch cultural identity raises questions about the politics of representation in Indonesian tourism. The invocation of Dutch colonial heritage in a postcolonial context is complex and potentially problematic. While the management may intend the theme to evoke European charm or pastoral aesthetics, the historical associations of Dutch colonialism in Indonesia cannot be ignored. Indonesia's colonial history under Dutch rule from the 17th to the mid-20th century involved exploitation, oppression, and cultural domination. The celebration of Dutch cultural elements in a tourist destination without acknowledging this historical context is a form of selective memory that may be troubling to some visitors. Moreover, the absence of any signs representing local Indonesian cultural identity (aside from the Indonesian language itself) is noteworthy. This suggests that the site's identity is constructed primarily through foreign cultural elements while local cultural heritage remains unrepresented in the linguistic landscape. This pattern merits critical examination, as it may reflect broader dynamics in Indonesian tourism where foreign cultural elements are privileged over local ones, potentially reinforcing colonial hierarchies of cultural value.

Third, the linguistic landscape at Cimory Dairyland can be understood as part of what Jaworski and Thurlow (2010) term "semiotic landscapes," where meaning is constructed through the interplay of language, images, colors, fonts, and materiality. While the present study focused primarily on language and function, the visual design of signs—such as colors, fonts, logos, and materials—also plays a crucial role in conveying meaning. For example, the use of certain colors may evoke particular emotions or associations, while the materiality of signs (wood, metal, plastic) may convey durability, naturalness, or modernity. Future research should adopt multimodal approaches to analyze these semiotic resources and their contributions to the overall meaning of the linguistic landscape.

The findings of this study both support and complicate Landry and Bourhis' (1997) theoretical framework. The classification of signs into top-down/bottom-up types and informational/symbolic functions proved useful for systematic analysis, confirming the framework's continued relevance. The clear categorization of signs in this study demonstrates the framework's applicability to Indonesian tourism contexts and its utility for researchers seeking to understand linguistic landscape patterns.

However, the findings also reveal limitations of the framework that align with critiques from subsequent scholars. As Ben-Rafael et al. (2006) noted, the boundary between top-down and bottom-up signs is not always clear-cut. In the present study, the CFC sign was classified as bottom-up because it was created by a private franchisee. However, one could argue that because the franchise operates within a managed tourist area with permission from the management, the sign exists in a hybrid space between top-down control and bottom-up commercial expression. This blurring of boundaries suggests that a binary classification may be overly simplistic for some contexts, and future research might benefit from a more nuanced understanding of sign production that recognizes the complex interplay between public and private actors.

Similarly, the distinction between informational and symbolic functions proved somewhat simplistic. While most signs were clearly informational, some signs might serve both functions simultaneously. For example, signs providing directions to the "Holland Costume Rental" could be seen as having both informational and symbolic functions because the name itself carries cultural meaning. This suggests that future research might benefit from frameworks that recognize the multifunctionality of linguistic landscape signs. The present study's application of the framework also highlights the need to consider the role of semiotic resources beyond language—such as colors, fonts, images, and materials—in constructing meaning in public spaces (Jaworski & Thurlow, 2010).

Furthermore, the findings suggest that the framework could be extended to include additional categories or dimensions. For example, the absence of signs representing local cultural identity suggests the need for categories that address cultural representation and authenticity. The high proportion of informational signs suggests the need for more fine-grained distinctions within informational functions, such as navigational, regulatory, and promotional information. Future research could develop more nuanced frameworks that account for these dimensions.

This study shares similarities with the findings of Ayuningsih (2021), who found that bottom-up signs were more dominant at Panakkukang Mall because numerous independently operated commercial tenants displayed their own shop names, advertisements, and business signs. In contrast, the dominance of top-down signs at Cimory Dairyland was related to its management by a single official authority responsible for providing information, regulating visitor movement, and managing tourism facilities. This comparison highlights how the nature of the public space (shopping mall vs. managed tourist destination) fundamentally shapes the linguistic landscape. While malls are characterized by commercial diversity and multiple actors, managed tourist destinations are characterized by centralized control and communication systems. This suggests that the typology of spaces (private vs. public, commercial vs. institutional, managed vs. organic) is an important factor in understanding linguistic landscape patterns.

However, the present study was similar to Khoiruddin (2025), who found that the informational function was dominant in tourism destinations because public signs primarily provided information and guidance for visitors. Similarly, the signs at Cimory Dairyland provided directions, area maps, traffic information, and other essential information. The consistent finding across studies suggests that the informational function is a universal feature of tourist destinations, where visitor convenience and navigation are primary concerns. Yet the present study's finding of only one symbolic sign contrasts with studies in other tourism contexts where symbolic signage plays a more prominent role in constructing destination identity. This difference may reflect the specific characteristics of Cimory Dairyland as a relatively new destination still developing its identity, or it may reflect a deliberate management decision to prioritize practicality over theming in signage.

The findings also shared similarities with Ilmia (2022), as both studies showed that linguistic landscapes reflected the characteristics of their respective settings and employed the theoretical framework of Landry and Bourhis (1997). While Ilmia (2022) showed how linguistic patterns represented the characteristics of an airport, the present

study demonstrated how the dominance of top-down signs and informational functions reflected Cimory Dairyland as a managed tourist destination. This comparison reinforces the value of the framework for analyzing institutional spaces, while also highlighting the importance of context in understanding linguistic landscape patterns.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, the linguistic landscape at Cimory Dairyland was dominated by top-down signs, with 21 signs, while only one bottom-up sign was identified. This indicated that most signs were provided by the management to deliver official information and regulate visitors' activities, while commercial signage played a limited role. In terms of function, the informational function was dominant, appearing in 21 signs, as these signs provided directions and information about facilities and services. In contrast, only one sign served a symbolic function, namely the Holland Costume Rental sign, which represented Dutch cultural identity and supported the tourism theme of Cimory Dairyland. The findings also demonstrated that Landry and Bourhis' (1997) theory was appropriate for analyzing the types and functions of the linguistic landscape in this research setting.

Several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the sample size of 22 signs is relatively small and may not fully represent the entire linguistic landscape of Cimory Dairyland, particularly considering that the site contains numerous signs across various areas. Second, the analysis was conducted by a single researcher, which may introduce interpretive bias despite efforts to achieve consensus on ambiguous classifications. Third, the study was limited to a single tourist destination, which restricts the generalizability of the findings to other tourism contexts. Fourth, the study did not incorporate visitor perspectives on how they interact with and interpret the linguistic landscape, which would have provided a more comprehensive understanding of the signs' effectiveness.

The findings offer several practical implications for tourism management. The dominance of top-down signs suggests that the management has successfully established a controlled communication system to guide visitors. However, the near-absence of bottom-up signs indicates limited commercial diversity within the area, which may affect the visitor experience by reducing the variety of dining and shopping options. Tourism managers should consider whether this reflects a deliberate policy or an opportunity for enhancement. Additionally, the limited symbolic representation, with only one sign reflecting Dutch cultural identity, suggests that the theme is not fully integrated into the linguistic landscape. Management could consider incorporating

more signs that reflect the cultural theme, potentially enhancing visitor engagement and reinforcing the destination's unique identity. For language policy, the findings suggest that while informational signs effectively use Indonesian and English to serve diverse visitors, there is room for more deliberate use of additional languages to cater to international visitors or to promote local languages.

REFERENCES

- Ayuningsih, R. (2021). *Linguistic landscape in public places in Makassar and visitors' language attitudes* [Undergraduate thesis, Alauddin State Islamic University of Makassar].
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Ilmia, F. H. (2022). *Linguistic landscape of airports in East Java* [Undergraduate thesis, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya].
- Khoiruddin, M. A. (2025). *Linguistic landscape study on the tourism place in Malang Regency* [Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang].
- Kinzler, K. D. (2021). Language as a social cue. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 72, 241–264. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010418-103034>
- Landry, R., & Bourhis, R. Y. (1997). Linguistic landscape and ethnolinguistic vitality: An empirical study. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 16(1), 23–49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X970161002>
- Mekt, G. (2023). Aspects of multilingualism. *Journal of Language, Literature, Social, and Cultural Studies*, 1(2), 95–103.
- Shohamy, E., & Gorter, D. (Eds.). (2009). *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery*. Routledge.