



An Intersemiotic Analysis of the Public Space: Cultural Representation of the Arab Diaspora Community in Tourism Area Puncak Bogor Indonesia

Encep Rustandi ^{1*}, R. Dian Dia-an Muniroh ², Yanty Wirza ³, Nur Fitriyani ⁴

^{1,2,3} Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia

⁴ Universitas Kebangsaan Republik Indonesia, Indonesia

Correspondence: E-mail: encep.rustandi04@upi.edu

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Submitted/Received 07 Jan 2025

First Revised 06 Oct 2025

Accepted 28 Oct 2025

Publication Date 31 Oct 2025

Keywords:

Arab Diaspora

Cultural Representation

Intersemiotics

Linguistic Landscape

Tourism

ABSTRACT

Prevailing Linguistic Landscape (LL) scholarship has insufficiently addressed the complex processes by which cultural meanings are constructed intersemiotically. This study addresses this gap by analyzing cultural representations and intersemiotic relations in the Arab diaspora landscape of Puncak Bogor. Using a qualitative case study, it applies an integrated framework Jakobson et al. to a corpus of public signs. Findings reveal 'Arabness' is strategically constructed via nomenclature and calligraphy, employing intersemiotic relations (repetition, hyponymy) to authenticate cultural identity and ensure commercial clarity simultaneously. Theoretically, this study offers a replicable intersemiotic model for LL. It also enriches Arabic Language Studies by demonstrating that in non-Arabophone diaspora spaces, Arabic functions as symbolic cultural capital and a transnational identity marker, transcending a purely linguistic role.

1. INTRODUCTION

Linguistic Landscape (LL) studies have become a crucial analytical tool for understanding how language in public spaces visualizes social identity, political power, and ethnolinguistic vitality (Landry & Bourhis, 1997). Public space is never neutral; it is understood as a *symbolic construction* (Ben-Rafael et al., 2006), a dynamic *arena* (Gorter, 2012) in which various actors, from states to individuals, compete and negotiate for visibility and legitimacy. The significance of this issue, however, goes beyond written texts. Meaning in public spaces is inherently multimodal (Jewitt, 2011; O'Halloran, 2008). Scollon & Scollon (2003) fundamentally assert that landscape is an *intersemiotic text*, where linguistic signs (words, script) interact in a complex manner with other semiotic resources such as visual images (Tufte, 1990), color (Piller, 2011), typography (Papen, 2012), and architecture to produce a complete meaning (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006).

This context becomes particularly significant in analyses of diasporic landscapes (Grinberg, 2022) and transnational tourism (Jaworski & Thurlow, 2010; Stavans & O'Brien, 2018). The Puncak tourist area in Bogor offers an ideal case study. As a historical destination for diasporic communities and Middle Eastern tourists, its landscape is *layered* (Goryachev & Zavyalova, 2021), marked by the high visibility of Arabic script coexisting with the national (Indonesian) and local (Sundanese) languages. This semiotic interaction actively produces and represents "Arab-ness." Theoretical tensions arise, as you noted, when LL analyses tend to stop at sociolinguistic inventories, thus ignoring the intersemiotic mechanisms that actually construct these cultural meanings.

Language Orientation (LO) research has developed rapidly through three main phases (Chen, 2025). The first phase was dominated by foundational works focusing on ethnolinguistic vitality (Landry & Bourhis, 1997), language policy (Spolsky, 2004), and the sociolinguistic functions of language. These early studies popularized the crucial dichotomy between top-down (official/governmental) and bottom-up (non-official/commercial) signals (Ben-Rafael et al., 2006). The second phase saw a shift toward functionalism and global context. Many studies examined the symbolic versus informational functions of language. For example, a study in Tokyo (Backhaus, 2006) showed that English use was more symbolic (modernity), while a study in Yemen (Al-Athwary, 2017) found Arabic dominant for informational functions and English for symbolic prestige functions. Reviews such as Shohami & Gorter (2009) established LL as a field that studies the functions of language in the public sphere. The third phase, or "critical turn", views LL as a site of discourse, power, and agency (Pennycook, 2010; Blommaert, 2013).

Research now asks not only *what language* but also *who* places the signs and *why* (Hult, 2014; Zhang & Zhang, 2024). Language (LL) is seen as an arena for policy conflict (Han & Wu, 2020) and identity struggles. Case studies of the Nepali community in India, for example, demonstrate how LL is used as a tool for political resistance and identity claims (Bhujel et al., 2023). In the context of tourism, commercial agencies (market agencies) have taken center stage, where LL is used to construct a "destination image" (Blesic et al., 2013) targeting

specific cultural demographics, such as Arab tourists in Australia (Al-Hamarneh & Al-Sarhan, 2018). Particular studies on Arabic sociolinguistics (Bassiouny, 2020) have also provided a foundation for understanding Arabic language identity, although they often focus on the context of diglossia within the Arab world.

There is a persistent fragmentation between sociolinguistic LL studies (which examine language and its functions) and semiotic analysis. Although the "multimodal turn" has been recognized, and there have been calls for analyses of *intersemiotic textures* (Liu & O'Halloran, 2009) and *multimodal discourse analysis* (O'Halloran, 2008), most LL research still prioritizes text. There remains a *lack of systematic methodological synthesis* between sociolinguistic LL (e.g., Ben-Rafael et al., 2006) and the analytical apparatus of social semiotics.

Empirical Gap: As mentioned, research on *complex diasporic identities* is lacking. Specifically, while studies on Arab LL exist (Al-Athwary, 2017; Bassiouny, 2020) and tourism LL also exist (Al-Hamarneh & Al-Sarhan, 2018; Thurlow & Jaworski, 2012), there is a clear gap in studies focusing on the Arab diasporic landscape in the non-Arab, tourism-dominated context of Southeast Asia. Puncak is a unique, unexplored empirical case. **Conceptual Gap:** This gap relates to agency. The focus in Puncak is not on top-down state policies, but instead on bottom-up commercial agency (Ben-Rafael et al., 2006). The gap lies in a lack of understanding of how these commercial agencies use *intersemiotic bundles* (e.g., Arabic script + specific iconography such as domes/camels + specific color palettes) to actively produce, commodify, and potentially stereotype cultural representations of *Arabness*. This shifts from viewing LL as a reflection of reality to LL as a site of discourse production (Blommaert, 2013).

The methodological contribution of this research is the proposal of a conceptual framework that systematically synthesizes two often separate fields. This framework bridges the sociolinguistic principles of LL from vitality (Landry & Bourhis, 1997), the arena model (Ben-Rafael et al., 2006), with the detailed analytical apparatus of social semiotics, visual grammar, and intersemiotic texture (Liu & O'Halloran, 2009). **Empirical Contribution:** This study presents the first in-depth intersemiotic study of the Arab diaspora landscape in Indonesia. It fills a significant empirical gap by providing analysis on a unique case that sits at the intersection of commercial, tourism, and diaspora landscapes (Goryachev & Zavyalova, 2021; Grinberg, 2022). **Theoretical Contribution:** This study contributes to the *critical turn* and *agency turn* (Hult, 2014; Zhang & Zhang, 2024) in LL studies. By focusing on bottom-up agency, research shows how linguistic landscapes not only reflect identities, but actively produce, commodify, and negotiate cultural representations (and stereotypes) in the transnational tourism economy (Blommaert, 2013; Thurlow & Jaworski, 2012).

Based on this gap, this study aims to provide a deeper understanding of the relationship between language, meaning, and culture in the context of Puncak public spaces through intersemiotic analysis. This study explores how cultural representations of the Arab diaspora community are reflected and constructed through the combined use of language and visual symbols. This study also explores how cultural representation is reflected through the use of language and visual symbols. This study aims to provide a deeper understanding of the

relationship between language, meaning, and culture in the context of public space: (1) Cultural representation in public spaces in the Puncak Bogor area, (2) The relationship of meaning on signs with an intersemiotic approach.

2. METHODS

This study employs a qualitative research design grounded in a linguistic landscape approach. This framework facilitates the systematic analysis of written language in public spaces to understand the sociocultural dynamics, identity representations, and multicultural interactions present in the Puncak Bogor tourist area. The approach is inherently descriptive and interpretive, focusing on the meaning constructed by public signage. Theoretically, this design integrates three complementary frameworks:

1. Linguistic Landscape Analysis is the primary approach to mapping sign visibility.
2. The Intersemiotic Framework is a conceptual foundation for understanding the "translation" of meaning (meaning relations) between sign systems.
3. Social Semiotics is an analytical tool for uncovering how cultural meaning is constructed contextually and visually.

Data Sources and Collection

The primary data consists of a corpus of visual documentation (*photographs*) of public signs. Data collection was concentrated in the high-traffic tourist and commercial corridor of the Puncak Bogor area, specifically along Km 83-84 in Tugu Utara, Cisarua, Bogor Regency, West Java. A purposeful sampling strategy was used to document signs in strategic, high-visibility locations, including restaurants, hotels, retail shops, and tourist attractions. The dataset includes a diverse range of sign types, such as advertisements, building names, informational signs, opening hours, and warning or prohibition notices.

Analytical Framework

The analysis is built on a social semiotic framework, which examines how meaning is constructed through the interplay of various modes, including text, image, and layout (Nakakuwa, 2019). The initial classification of textual relationships on the signs adopts Roman Jakobson's categories of translation (as cited in Brower, 1959):

1. Intralingual: Rephrasing or interpretation within one language.
2. Interlingual: Translation from one language to another (Arabic to Indonesian).
3. Intersemiotic: Translation or transfer of meaning between different sign systems (from verbal text to a visual image).

This study places a primary emphasis on intersemiotic analysis to explore how meaning is transferred, repeated, or complemented between the verbal text and the visual elements (such as images, typography, and color) on a sign. This tool is essential for analyzing cultural representations and the semantic dynamics of multimodal signs.

Data Analysis Procedures

The data analysis followed a systematic, multi-stage process:

1. Documentation and Corpus Building: All photographs were compiled into a digital corpus for systematic Review.
2. Classification: Signs were categorized based on their content (informational and commercial) and their primary linguistic relationship using Jakobson's framework (intralingual, interlingual, intersemiotic).
3. Linguistic and Semiotic Analysis: Each sign was analyzed to identify its micro- and macro-linguistic units (lexical choices, script) and cultural values. The analysis focused on the linguistic and contextual meaning of the text.
4. Intersemiotic Interpretation: The relationship between the textual elements and other semiotic modes (images, layout) was analyzed to determine how they interact to construct a unified message and cultural representation.

Triangulation and Validation

To enhance the validity of the interpretations, methodological triangulation was employed. Findings from the visual (semiotic) analysis of the signs were compared with data gathered from semi-structured interviews. Participants included local business owners (as producers of the signs) and visitors (*as consumers/interpreters of the signs*). These interviews aimed to understand their perceptions of Arabic language use in the public space, its communicative purpose, and its perceived impact on local identity, thereby providing context and validating the researchers' analysis.

Ethical Considerations

This study adhered to ethical guidelines for research in public spaces. All photographs documented signage displayed publicly, with no expectation of privacy. Participants in the interviews were informed of the study's objectives, assured of their anonymity and the confidentiality of their responses, and provided informed consent before participation.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Results

Cultural representation in public spaces in the Puncak Bogor area

Based on the results of field observations, from 166 signs at three points, several symbols were found that represent Middle Eastern culture, be it accommodation, culinary, retail, travel agents, and money exchange service providers. Based on the results of observations in the field, from 166 signs at three points, several symbols were found that represent Middle Eastern culture, be it accommodation, culinary, retail, travel agents, and money exchange service providers.

Table 1. Symbols of Middle Eastern Culture

Sign Symbol	Local Community (%)	Arab Diaspora Community (%)
Music	0.60	0.60
Sisha		2.90
Aud		0.60
Calligraphy		6.02

Architecture		1.81
Arab Nomenclature	1.81	8.43
Food		1.81
Agarwood	0.60	1.81
Local Business	0.60	
Clothing		0.60
Dental	0.60	
Coffee		1.20
Salon	1.2	

Based on the data above, it is known that the symbolic use of Middle Eastern names, either using Arabic letters or Latin letters, is around 10%. Followed by calligraphy symbolism at around 6%, and agarwood as a typical Middle Eastern fragrance commodity. Dominance of Arabic Cultural Elements, Arabic Nomenclature is most dominant in immigrants (8.43%), indicating a strong possibility that the Community still maintains or brings Arabic names to new areas. Calligraphy (6.02%) and Shisha (2.90%) also stand out. This data can be associated with the expression of cultural identity and a distinctive lifestyle. Architecture, food, clothing, and coffee all appear only on the immigrant side, indicating that the visual and consumer aspects of culture are more maintained by this group.

Impact on local community culture: Lower and thinly spread. This data could mean that Arabic culture is not deeply ingrained in local society, or is only present in symbolic form. Some unique local elements: Salon (1.2%), Local Business (0.6%), Dental (0.6%). These could be local adaptations that absorb a little Arabic element, but not in a direct form. The Same Element in Both Groups is Music (0.60% each indicating that Arabic music is a meeting point or bridge between cultures.

The Relationship of Language Meaning in the Linguistic Landscape at Puncak Bogor

Meaning relations emerge from the interaction of languages used in public spaces, both in terms of lexical meaning and contextual meaning. This relation forms an understanding of the multicultural dynamics that occur in Puncak Bogor. In the landscape linguistics of tourist areas such as Puncak Bogor, language meaning relations can be analyzed through several semantic categories, such as Synonymy, Meronymy, Polysemy, and Hyponymy. All will be analyzed based on the sequence.

a. Intersemiotic Synonyms

The concept of Intersemiotic repetition is the repetition of meaning or information between two different semiotic systems, such as between text and images, sound, or other visual elements. The goal is to strengthen the message and improve audience understanding. Intersemiotic synonyms occur when the meaning of one semiotic element is expressed differently through another semiotic system, but still maintains the equality of meaning.

Word analysis was carried out using the Analytical tool for intersemiotic sense relations categories used to analyze the relationship of meaning between various emotic modes, such as written text, images, sound, and video. Intersemiotic synonyms occur when the meaning of one semiotic element is expressed differently through another semiotic system, but still maintains the equality of meaning.

Table 2. Distribution of Intersemiotic Repetition and Synonym Data

Sense Relations	Category	N	%
Intersemiotic Repetition	Perfect match	21	12.65
	Inflexion	0	0.00
	Derivation	31	18.67
	Homospatiality	21	12.65
Intersemiotic Synonymy	Similarity	5	3.01
	Exposition	14	8.43
	Translation	20	12.05

Based on the search results of 166 data, the most common forms of Derivation and translation are. Arabic texts are directly matched with Indonesian around 12%. The total intersemiotic is 23% and repetition 42%. The aspect of the suitability of semiotic symbols represented by cultural representation is around 12% which describes the Middle Eastern cultural nuances. Then the presentation of derived words, such as the words *matham* and *mathaam* as plural forms, is commonly used. There are several findings of Dominant Repetition and Derivation (42%), including Derivation (18.67%), which is the dominant form, showing the adaptation or transformation of words from one basic form to a derived form, such as the use of the words *matham* and *mathaam* (perhaps referring to the variation of the word "restaurant" in Arabic). This situation reflects linguistic creativity in the public space that not only copies but also adapts Arabic morphologically. Then, Direct Translation is Quite Significant (12.05%), including Translation between Arabic and Indonesian, which is done directly, indicating the intention to make information accessible across communities. This condition shows a form of active interaction between cultures, not just passive symbolic expression.

Homospatiality and Perfect Match (12.65%) include these two categories, indicating repetition of meaning in the same space, for example, between visual text and written text in this context, most likely occurs on a signboard or visual sign where the visual icon is reinforced with an identical verbal label. The last is Intersemiotic Synonymy and Exposition, which includes Exposition (8.43%), meaning text or visuals are used to explain or support other modes. For example, text explaining Arabic calligraphy icons or certain architectural styles. Similarity (3.01%) is relatively small,

but substantial as an indication of the use of visual metaphors or analogies between modes (example: ornaments resembling Arabic letters).

b. Intersemiotic hyponym

Intersemiotic hyponym refers to words or phrases that have the same form but different meanings across sign or semiotic systems. In the context of intersemiotics, this means how the same word or phrase can have different meanings depending on how or where it is used. In the linguistic landscape, hyponymy relations arise when a more specific term is used in a broader category of meaning. Then, an Intersemiotic hyponym is a relationship in which a semiotic element from one system becomes a special part of the meaning of another semiotic element.

Intersemiotic hyponym cases are not only words or phrases that refer to more specific words. The reverse relationship refers to hypernym relations. Based on the results of field searches, there are several intersemiotic phenomena, both language and symbols. The details are as follows:

Table 3. Distribution of Hyponym Data

Sense Relations	Category	N	%
Intersemiotic Hyponymy	Visual more general	10	6.02
	Verbal more general	14	8.43

Hyponym in the linguistic landscape concept refers to whether the visual image is more general or verbal, whether it is a more general signboard. Based on the search, 10 signs illustrate that the visual is more general, and around 14 presentation signs represent that the verbal is more general. The purpose of using this symbol mode, apart from creativity, is that the use of this hypernym intersemiotic mode is carried out by instigators or business actors as a clarification, so that tourists avoid confusion when understanding advertisements presented in public spaces. Several things need to be studied, namely, Visual is More General (6.02%), which indicates a broad or global meaning, but the interpretation can vary. Then the visual meaning is open, allowing for more flexible interpretation, but it can cause ambiguity. In addition, Verbal is More General (8.43%). In this case, the text conveys a general category, while the image provides specifications (hyponym). Shows that text is often used to simplify or explain the context, especially for foreign or cross-cultural tourists.

c. Intersemiotic meronymy

Intersemiotic meronymy is a concept that describes the relationship between various sign or symbol systems (such as text, images, sounds, etc.) in creating or conveying overall meaning. This statement means that various semiotic elements complement each other and work together to form a coherent or complex message, where semiotic elements from one system become a general category that includes

other semiotic elements from different systems. Arabic is used together with Indonesian and English; meronymic relations are seen in the functions of each language. Arabic is often the part that represents religious or symbolic aspects, while Indonesian or English completes the informative function. A signboard with the main text in Arabic has a translation in Indonesian at the bottom. The Arabic text becomes a cultural symbol, while the Indonesian text functions as a complement to information for the local Community.

Table 4. Distribution of Intersemiotic Meronymy Data

Sense Relations	Category	N	%
Intersemiotic Meronymy	Visual showing the whole	12	7.23
	Verbal referring to the whole	18	10.84

Based on the table above, there are 12 signs containing meronymy elements where the visuals reflect the whole, and 18 signs reflecting the verbal writing reflect the whole. In intersemiotic studies, Arabic text often interacts with other visual elements, such as images of mosque domes or Middle Eastern geometric ornaments. This relationship is meronymic, where the Arabic text becomes a part that complements the visual elements to create a complete message. Example: The nameplate (al-Makhbaz al-Arabiy) is presented with Arabic text with the addition of symbols of bread and chefs in Middle Eastern costumes. In addition, types of Middle Eastern bread are presented, namely khubuz syaamiy, khubuz tamiis, and others. Arabic text is the central part, while ornaments are complements that support the overall meaning.

3.2. Discussion

Cultural Representation in Public Spaces at Puncak Bogor

The linguistic landscape of Puncak Bogor reflects an active process of semiotic and cultural negotiation shaped by transnational mobility, tourism economy, and religious identity. The multilingual appearance of Arabic, English, and Indonesian functions not only as communicative diversity but as a semiotic mechanism for cultural positioning (Hall, 1997; Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006). Arabic emerges as a marker of religious prestige and symbolic capital that connects Puncak to Middle Eastern visitors. At the same time, English serves as a lingua franca of global accessibility, and Indonesian retains local authenticity and social grounding.

Visual and linguistic modes in signage cooperate to form what Kress and van Leeuwen (2006) term multimodal orchestration, the integration of language, image, and color to produce meaning. Green color schemes, mosque silhouettes, and Arabic calligraphy

collectively function as visual-semiotic markers that index Islamic identity and touristic familiarity. Rather than static decoration, these multimodal compositions constitute acts of cultural communication, generating hybrid meanings that resonate across cultural audiences.

Assimilation and isolation coexist within this semiotic system: selected Arabic cultural symbols (e.g., music, agarwood, and coffee) are assimilated into local life, while architectural and culinary elements remain exclusive to Arab identity. This statement illustrates a form of controlled hybridity, where cultural representation becomes a dynamic site of negotiation between local adaptation and transnational influence (Bassiouny, 2020; Spolsky, 2020).

The Relationship of Language Meaning in the Linguistic Landscape of Puncak Bogor

a. Intersemiotic Synonymy: Cultural Adaptation and Horizontal Negotiation

The predominance of intersemiotic synonymy (62%) shows how linguistic and visual repetition create semiotic equivalence rather than redundancy. Morphological adaptations such as *matham* and *mathaam* display intersemiotic translation (Jakobson, 1959), enabling visitors to recognize meaning through familiar linguistic cues. These transliterations symbolize not imitation but cultural adaptation, a deliberate negotiation of meaning that aligns with visitors' identity and linguistic expectations.



Figure 1. Culinary Field Signboard

Based on field research related to culinary signs that have a meaning relationship in the culinary field, including "mat'am-mataaim" with the equivalent of restaurant and café. Use of signs. Meaning: This synonym variation aims to accommodate multicultural understanding and build tourist trust, especially from the Middle East.



Figure 2. Intersemiotic synonym exposition

The sign is presented to introduce ideas or services offered by a salon with a communication mode through Exposition, and each service is symbolized by the service provided. Synonym relations are translated with symbols. The most frequent intersemiotic synonym phenomenon is translation, which is around 20 signs that exhibit this pattern. Be it bilingual Arabic-Indonesian, Indonesian-Arabic, and Indonesian-English, or even multilingual. This translation is not limited to translation between languages, but also includes translation from one form of communication to another form of communication using different media or modes.

Multimodal perspective The use of intersemiotic analysis tools reveals that public space does not only contain text, but also the coexistence of various semiotic modes such as visual, written, and sound symbols. In the context of a tourist area or multilingual Community, the coherence between these modes is crucial in forming meaning. Cultural Identity Discourse The symbolic representation of Arabic culture through linguistic equivalents, derivations, and visuals shows that this Community is not only physically present, but also forms a visual and linguistic identity in public space.

Homospatiality (Rothenberg, 1979), seen in the pairing of Arabic calligraphy with images of food or Shisha, signifies horizontal semiotic negotiation, where verbal and visual systems coexist in the same communicative space. This strategy reflects Galante's (2016) perspective on identity alignment, where shared semiotic codes foster intercultural resonance. Thus, synonymy serves as a communicative bridge between linguistic systems, reinforcing symbolic cohesion within a multicultural context. *Analytical implication:* Intersemiotic synonymy manifests cultural alignment through multimodal equivalence, creating shared interpretive spaces that accommodate transnational audiences while retaining local authenticity.

b. Intersemiotic Hyponymy: Hierarchical Clarification and Pedagogical Function

The 24 identified cases of intersemiotic hyponymy illustrate hierarchical meaning relations between general verbal expressions and specific visual illustrations. Phrases such as "Middle Eastern souvenirs" or "Arab restaurant" (hypernyms) are visually contextualized by dates, perfumes, or Arabic ornaments (hyponyms). This combination

exemplifies Jewitt's (2011) notion of multimodal literacy, where visual elements concretize linguistic abstraction to guide understanding among multilingual audiences.



Figure 2. Intersemiotic synonym exposition

The Golden Relax signboard, the signboard of the Asshiyaahat travel agent, and the assafar journey are symbolized by the letter G with a picture of an airplane on it. The hyponyms are in the form of offers of hijaj fanaadiq or hotel tours and reservations, muwaasholaat or accommodation. In addition, an example of a case in the culinary field of a mataam restaurant or restaurant is presented with al-aqlu atthaib athaazaj or delicious food services and breakfast time sessions (further), lunch (ghadaa'), and dinner ('isyaa). Hyponyms are used to attract the attention of certain groups through specific meanings, but remain within an inclusive framework that reflects multiculturalism.

The use of hyponymy thus performs a pedagogical function, educating non-Arab audiences while maintaining cultural specificity for Arab visitors. It reflects vertical negotiation, positioning broad linguistic categories within visual specificity that aids accessibility. The dual use of verbal generality and visual precision strengthens comprehension and fosters inclusivity across cultural boundaries (Forceville, 2006; O'Halloran, 2008). *Analytical implication:* Intersemiotic hyponymy operates as an interpretive hierarchy bridging abstract linguistic meaning and concrete visual representation, enhancing communicative efficiency and cross-cultural literacy.

Intersemiotic Meronymy: Integration and Cultural Cohesion

Meronymy (18.7%) reflects the part-whole relationship between linguistic and visual systems that together generate cohesive cultural narratives. Arabic language components often signify symbolic parts (religiosity and identity), while English and Indonesian represent the communicative whole (functionality and inclusiveness). This data corresponds with O'Halloran's (2008) framework of intersemiotic complementarity,

wherein meaning arises from the cooperation of different semiotic modes.

Through this complementarity, the public signage of Puncak forms a semiotic ecology (Spolsky, 2020) that integrates religious symbolism with practical communication. Rather than competing for attention, each semiotic element contributes to a unified identity performance. This synthesis demonstrates how the linguistic landscape acts as a multimodal cultural system, merging symbolic depth and communicative accessibility. *Analytical implication:* Intersemiotic meronymy embodies integrative negotiation uniting symbolic and functional modes into cohesive communicative forms that articulate shared yet diverse cultural values.

Intersemiotic Meronymy as Cultural Integration and Communicative Function. This finding shows that the multilingual linguistic landscape not only conveys informative messages but also functions as a representation of cultural identity. Arabic acts as a symbolic element that emphasizes religious/cultural nuances, while Indonesian/English fills functional-informative needs for local/global audiences. Meronymy as a Semiotic Strategy can be seen in meronymic relations, such as Part (Arabic text) and whole (visual/verbal text), which complement each other to form a complete message. This practice reduces ambiguity and accommodates the diversity of visitors in tourist areas. In addition, field data shows Multimodal Dynamics.

The combination of text and visuals: Strengthens branding and cultural authenticity, and facilitates message accessibility without eliminating cultural values.



Figure 4. Intersemiotic Meronymy

Meronymy helps to identify how parts (text, images, visual elements) work together to form a larger meaning in public space. In this context, these meronymic relations strengthen the function of Arabic as a symbol of identity and an effective marketing tool. This analysis shows that language elements in landscape linguistics cannot be separated from the social and cultural contexts that surround them.

The relation of language meaning in the Puncak Bogor tourist area reflects cultural interaction and linguistic accommodation in the context of multiculturalism. Synonymy and hyponymy are used as strategies to attract tourists by considering differences in understanding meaning. Polysemy reflects the flexibility of language in responding to market needs and tourist culture. Meronymy as a symbol of identity. This analysis shows that the linguistic landscape is not only a communication tool but also a cultural symbol that accommodates differences in meaning based on visitor backgrounds. Thus, language

in the Puncak Bogor public space is a reflection of cultural diversity as well as a strategy for negotiating identity in a multicultural area.

c. Analytical Cohesion and Theoretical Implication

Synthesizing these findings, the Puncak Bogor linguistic landscape demonstrates a triadic semiotic negotiation model, where meaning emerges from the interaction among synonymy, hyponymy, and meronymy. These categories form complementary dimensions of multimodal communication

Table 5. dimensions of multimodal communication

Intersemiotic Type	Function	Semiotic Role	Cultural Implication
Synonymy	Equivalence	Horizontal negotiation	Cultural alignment and adaptation
Hyponymy	Clarification	Vertical negotiation	Pedagogical communication and inclusivity
Meronymy	Integration	Integrative negotiation	Cohesive identity and multimodal unity

d. Theoretical Contribution

This study contributes to linguistic landscape research by showing that public signage operates as a multimodal semiotic dialogue, a communicative arena where linguistic, visual, and cultural codes continuously negotiate meaning. The findings reinforce the claim that linguistic landscapes function not as passive representations of multilingualism but as active arenas of identity construction (Shohami & Gorter, 2009; Landry & Bourhis, 1997).

Through the triadic model, the study expands the application of Roman Jakobson's (1959) intersemiotic relations and Kress and van Leeuwen's (2006) visual grammar into a tourism-based ethnolinguistic context. It demonstrates how meaning-making in public space reflects broader sociocultural processes: adaptation, pedagogy, and integration. Hence, the linguistic landscape of Puncak Bogor emerges as a living semiotic ecosystem, where cultural representation, identity, and communication converge dynamically across languages and modalities.

4. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the linguistic landscape of Puncak operates as a complex intersemiotic text. Within it, Arab diasporic identities are actively constructed—producing commercial yet authenticated representations of Arab culture through specific semiotic strategies, including synonymy, hyponymy, and meronymy. Theoretically, this research contributes to Linguistic Landscape (LL) studies by offering a systematic intersemiotic analysis model that transcends sociolinguistic inventories, integrating the frameworks of

Jakobson, Scollon & Scollon, and Kress & van Leeuwen. Significantly, this study enriches Arabic Studies by analyzing its role in a non-Arabophone diaspora context. It demonstrates Arabic's function as cultural capital for commodification, a transnational identity marker, and a symbolic *lingua franca* in the global tourism economy. In this domain, its semiotic value often supersedes its linguistic value for non-speaking audiences.

These findings yield practical implications for policymakers regarding the governance of multicultural visual spaces, as well as pedagogical implications concerning how this semiotic visibility shapes the linguistic attitudes of local communities. The limitations of this study are acknowledged in its focus on an *etic* analysis (researcher interpretation) within a narrow geographic corridor. Future research must, therefore, prioritize an *emic* perspective, ethnographically exploring the perceptions, acceptance, or even resistance of the local (Sundanese) community in confronting this semiotic landscape. Ultimately, this study affirms that a contemporary understanding of the Arabic language is inseparable from an analysis of its visual and semiotic life in the global public space.

5. REFERENCES

- Al-Athwary, A. H. A. (2017). English and Arabic inscriptions in the linguistic landscape of Yemen: A multilingual writing approach. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 6(4), 149–157. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.6n.4p.149>
- Al-Hamarneh, A., & Al-Sarhan, F. (2018). Creating the destination image of the Gold Coast (Australia) for Arab tourists. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 16(1), 17–31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14766825.2016.1206131>
- Alves, A. (2012). *Semantic enrichment of places: Understanding the meaning of public places from natural language texts* [Disertasi doctoral, Universidade Nova de Lisboa]. Repositório UNL.
- Backhaus, P. (2006). Multilingualism in Tokyo: A look into the linguistic landscape. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 3(1), 52–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710608668383>
- Bassiouny, R. (2020). *Arabic sociolinguistics* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Ben-Rafael, E., Shohamy, E., Amara, M. H., & 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/10.1080/14790710608668382>
- Bhujel, A., Sharma, S., & Subba, C. (2023). Contesting identity in the linguistic landscape: A case of the Nepali/Gorkha community in Darjeeling and Kalimpong. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 27(1), 4–25. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12574>
- Blesic, I., Pivac, T., Stamenkovic, I., & Besermenji, S. (2013). The role of destination quality in the creation of destination attractiveness: The case of the Republic of Macedonia. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja*, 26(4), 105–118. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2013.11517631>

- Blommaert, J. (2013). *Ethnography, superdiversity and linguistic landscapes: Chronicles of complexity*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Chen, Q. (2025). The shifting knowledge frontiers: a bibliometric analysis of linguistic landscape research trends and scholarly influence. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 22(2), 273–294. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2023.2274435>
- Csernicskó, I. (2016). A dinamikus változó nyelvi tájkép: Kárpátalja példája. *Acta Beregsasiensi*, 4(3), 91–105.
- Forceville, C. (2006). *Pictorial metaphor in advertising*. London: Routledge.
- Galante, A. (2016). Linguistic and cultural diversity in language education through plurilingualism: Linking the theory into practice. In R. Latiner Raby & E. J. Valeau (Eds.), *Handbook of comparative studies on community colleges and global counterparts*. New York: Springer.
- Gorter, D. (2012). *Linguistic landscapes in a changing world: New perspectives on signs in space*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Goryachev, A., & Zavyalova, N. (2021). Layered linguistic landscape: Russian, Tatar and English in Kazan. *Language Policy*, 20(3), 427–450. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-020-09575-5>
- Grinberg, D. (2022). Homeland prisms: Diaspora museums as sites of internal negotiation of national identity. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, 29(6), 794–812. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.2020.1793774>
- Han, Y., & Wu, X. (2020). Language policy, linguistic landscape and residents' perception in Guangzhou, China: dissents and conflicts. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 21(2), 173–193. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2019.1625983>
- Hult, F. M. (2014). Covert discourse analysis in linguistic landscape research. In M. D. L. A. E. A. (Ed.), *Linguistic landscapes, multilingualism and social change*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jakobson, R. (1959). On linguistic aspects of translation. In R. A. Brower (Ed.), *On translation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Jaworski, A., & Thurlow, C. (Eds.). (2010). *Semiotic landscapes: Language, image, space*. London: Continuum.
- Jewitt, C. (2011). *The Routledge handbook of multimodal analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Khan, W. A. (2020). Your language, your identity: The impact of cultural identity in teaching English as a foreign language. *International Journal of English Linguistics, Literature and Skills*, 5(4), 1–5. <http://dx.doi.org/10.46827/ejel.v5i4.3249>
- Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2006). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- 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>
- Leech, G. N. (1990). *Semantics: The study of meaning* (2nd ed.). Harmondsworth: Penguin

Books.

- Liu, Y., & O'Halloran, K. L. (2009). Intersemiotic texture: Analyzing cohesive devices between language and images. *Social Semiotics*, 19(4), 367–388. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10350330903361059>
- Maitland, R., & Smith, A. (2009). Tourism and the aesthetics of the built environment. In J. Tribe (Ed.), *Philosophical issues in tourism*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Maruani, T., & Amit-Cohen, I. (2010). Patterns of development and conservation in agricultural lands: The case of the Tel Aviv metropolitan region 1990–2000. *Land Use Policy*, 27(2), 671–679. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2009.09.001>
- Mauliddian, K., Nurhayani, I., & Hamamah, H. (2022). Penanda publik bahasa Kawi di Kota Probolinggo: Kajian lanskap linguistik. *Ranah: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa*, 11(1), 130–143. <https://doi.org/10.26499/rnh.v11i1.2716>
- Milem, S. M. (2018). Signs in the city: A case study of the linguistic landscape of Brussels. *Dutch Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(1), 59–83. <https://doi.org/10.1075/dujal.17013.mil>
- Nakakuwa, T. (2019). *Exploring intersemiotic complementarity in three Namibian Physical Science teachers' classroom practice* [Tesis master, University of Namibia].
- Nurhayati, S., & Agung, N. (2019). Fenomena kunjungan wisatawan timur tengah dan kondisi kependudukan di Puncak Bogor. *Populasi*, 4(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.37306/kkb.v4i1.16>
- O'Halloran, K. L. (2008). Systemic functional-multimodal discourse analysis (SF-MDA): Constructing ideational meaning using language and visual imagery. *Visual Communication*, 7(4), 443–475. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470357208096210>
- O'Halloran, K. L., & Smith, B. A. (2011). *Multimodal studies: Exploring issues and domains*. London: Routledge.
- Ou, L. (2023). A study of the three dimensions of linguistic landscape: A case study of Five Star Commercial Pedestrian Street in Liuzhou, China. *Academic Journal of Humanities & Social Sciences*, 6(3), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.25236/AJHSS.2023.060301>
- Palang, H., Spek, T., & Stenseke, M. (2011). Digging in the past: New conceptual models in landscape history and their relevance in peri-urban landscapes. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 100(4), 344–346. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2011.01.012>
- Palmer, F. R. (1997). *Semantics* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Papen, U. (2012). Commercial logotypes in the linguistic landscape: A multimodal analysis of shop signs in Paris. *Semiotica*, 2012(190), 181–221. <https://doi.org/10.1515/sem-2012-0036>
- Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice*. London: Routledge.
- Pertiwi, A., & Mulyono, M. (2021). Penggunaan Bahasa di Ruang Publik Kota Jombang Sebagai Kota Santri (Kajian Linguistik Lanskap). *Bapala*, 8(03), 20–27.
- Piller, I. (2011). *Intercultural communication: A critical introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Rosenbaum, J., & Rivette, J. (1977). *Rivette: Texts and interviews*. London: British Film Institute.

- Saeed, J. I. (2011). *Semantics* (3rd ed.). Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sahril, S., Harahap, S. Z., & Hermanto, A. B. (2019). Lanskap linguistik Kota Medan: Kajian onomastika, semiotika, dan spasial. *MEDAN MAKNA: Jurnal Ilmu Kebahasaan Dan Kesastraan*, 17(2), 195–207. <https://doi.org/10.26499/mm.v17i2.2141>
- Sari, T. Y., Kurnia, H., Khasanah, I. L., & Ningtyas, D. N. (2022). Membangun identitas lokal dalam era globalisasi untuk melestarikan budaya dan tradisi yang terancam punah. *Academy of Social Science and Global Citizenship Journal*, 2(2), 76–84. <https://doi.org/10.47200/aossagcj.v2i2.1842>
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. B. K. (2010). *Discourses in place: Language in the material world*. London: Routledge.
- Setyowati, Y. (2016). Tindakan komunikatif masyarakat “kampung preman” dalam proses pemberdayaan. *Jurnal ASPIKOM*, 3(1), 16–30. <https://doi.org/10.24329/aspikom.v3i1.96>
- Shohami, E., & Gorter, D. (Eds.). (2009). *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery*. London: Routledge.
- Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spolsky, B. (2020). Linguistic landscape: The semiotics of public signage. *Linguistic Landscape: An International Journal*, 6(1), 2–15. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ll.00015.spo>
- Spolsky, B., & Cooper, R. L. (1991). *The languages of Jerusalem*. Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press.
- Stavans, A., & O'Brien, R. (2018). Linguistic landscape of tourism: A study of multilingualism in food and drink signs in a tourist area of Tel Aviv. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 15(4), 385–403. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2017.1360061>
- Suaedi, S. (2015). Analisis situasi pariwisata kawasan Puncak. *Jurnal Kepariwisata*, 2(2), 1–27.
- Thurlow, C., & Jaworski, A. (2012). Elite mobility: The semiotics of Alps-gazing and destination branding in airline in-flight magazines. *Social Semiotics*, 22(4), 437–460. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10350330.2012.704285>
- Tufte, E. R. (1990). *Envisioning information*. Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press.
- Van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Introducing social semiotics*. London: Routledge.
- Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2015). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Wise, H. (1995). [Review of the book *L'Argot*, by L.-J. Calvet]. *Journal of French Language Studies*, 5(2), 234–236. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959269500002817>
- Zhang, M., & Zhang, T. (2024). Agency and structure in the linguistic landscape of the communities in Beijing, China: a discursive frame and geosemiotic analysis. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03463-2>