JJMLL

WC or Toilet: Should We Consider Proairetic Decoding and Signgeist in Writing Toilet Signage for Indonesian Islamic Kindergartens?

SF. Luthfie Arguby Purnomo *, Khasan Ubaidillah, Abdulloh Hadziq, SF. Lukfianka Sanjaya Purnama, Lilik Untari, Muhammad Nashiruddin
State Islamic University of Raden Mas Said Surakarta, Indonesia

Abstract

Toilet writing in the schoolscape context of Indonesian Islamic kindergartens is unique in nature since the schools have to negotiate between the ideology and identity they bear. The negotiation revolves around whether the toilet writing should accommodate Arabic praying and toileting procedures in Bahasa Indonesia to enhance the *geist* or the learning purpose of a sign or not. Departing from this issue, we attempt to formulate a typology of toilet writing which addresses and adheres to proairetic decoding reading and signgeist by examining twenty kindergartens in Indonesia. These two elements are crucial for any signs involving children as the sign recepients with the first referring to an easy reading and the second to learning environment. Employing linguistic analysis of linguistic landscapes by Huebner, children as social actors in linguistic landscapes by Dagenais, Moore, Sabatier, Lamarre, and Armand, semiotics of toilet signs by Iio, language and message content by Reh, sign*geist* by Dressler and schoolscape by Gorter, we formulate three types of toilet writing. They are ungeist, monogeist, and polygeist. These types serve one of the two functions of toilet writing namely decorative and iterative functions. The first function refers to the alignment between toilet writing with the school branding while the second to learning environment the schools attempt to build.

Keywords: Schoolscape, Toilet Writing, Linguistic Landscape, Indonesian Islamic Kindergarten.

1. Introduction

Since playing is learning for children, kindergartens, as implied by Dudek (2013), have to maximize all the spaces the schools have to support the imagination and learning of the students. Benefiting from the spaces is the concern of schoolscape, which focuses on how linguistic elements are in tandem with educational setting (Gorter 2018). This schoolscape is exercised through the creation of painting environment, as implied by Meiboudi, Karimzadegan, and Khalilnejad (2011) and print environment, as suggested by Dowhower & Kimberly (1998).

Schoolscape constructed and expressed in painting environment context, e.g. mural and in print environment context, e.g. posters and signs, triggers a specific challenge in the context of kindergartens and that challenge is called proairetic decoding. Nikolajeva (2010) borrows Barthesian term of *proairesis*

to argue that in children context any reading should be composed and constructed in nonbiased and reading level wise fashion. This what is read is what is meant and what it depicts is what it says is what proairetic decoding is all about. Constructing a toilet sign, for instance, ones have to textually consider whether to write it toilet, WC (water closet), *kamar mandi* (lit. bathroom) or *kamar kecil* (lavatory). The first and second save spaces than the third and fourth but they tend to be foreignized. On the other hand, the third and the fourth, which is more domesticative, than the first and the second consume more spaces. In Islamic Indonesian kindergarten context, the challenge does not stop there. The necessity to incorporate Islamic values in any aspects of the school requires the schools to address Islamic teaching through any means. In the toilet context, the schools are urged to add Islamic prayer or *dua* in Arabic and *sharia* instruction on how to perform a toileting.

In schoolscape context, this case of toilet discloses a negotiation. The negotation occurs on whether the *dua* is written on the same medium as the toilet sign, whether the *dua* is written separately and located on a different place, or whether the *dua* is ignored or not. The choices will lead to the ideology perception by the readers and ideology projection by the kindergartens. This ideology dissemination complicates these signage matters since the writing of *dua* in toilet is differently perceived. Due to the fact that the kindergartens bear themselves Islamic images and disseminate Islamic values, addressing this ideological matter is a concern in designing the schoolscape – the signage in the case of toilet. In Islamic kindergartens with international branding, the toilet signage construction poses a complication on a different level – the schools have to negotiate between Bahasa Indonesia, Arabic, and English as the branding or differentiating feature the kindergartens have from the other kindergartens. These concerns are what proairetic decoding should address. Departing from these concerns, we attempt to answer the following questions:

1. What considerations are taken in the writing of toilet signage in the schoolscape of kindergaten context?
2. What typology of toilet signage writing in the schoolscape of kindergaten context can be formulated?
3. What functions of toilet signage writing in the schoolscape of kindergaten context can be formulated?

In this study, we argue that proairetic decoding in schoolscape context especially toilet signage not only circumnavigates around constructing the text itself but also the typography of the text, the typology of the text, the mediality of the text, and the demography of the text. The first refers to the writing style of the text, the second to the text types, the third to the media where the text is written, and the last to the place where the text is located. To support these claims, we employed linguistic analysis of linguistic landscapes by Huebner (2009), children as social actors in linguistic landscapes by Dagenais, Moore, Sabatier, Lamarre, and Armand (2009), semiotics of toilet signs by Iio (2019), language and message content by Reh (2004), *signgeist* by Dressler (2015) and schoolscape by Gorter (2018). The first theory was implemented to reveal how the lingual aspects as found from painting and print environment were constructed, the second to address the nature of reception by children, the third to address how the lingual elements are expressed in regard to the visuals and the media, the fourth to address the categorization of toilet signs, the fifth to address how the language of toilet signage is negotiated, and the last to address

how the three theories are intertwined. These theories were carried out in this research by adhering to the principles of linguistic landscape research as laid out by Barni & Bagna (2009) with analytical techniques from Spradley (2016).

Toilet signage in kindergarten in this study is employed as a tool to prove that proairetic decoding should be addressed and revisited to adjust the messages with the recipients which are primarily kindergarten students. The toilet signage, covering printed and painted signs, is limited on the signage appearing on the Indonesian Islamic kindergartens. The textual, visual, proxemic, and operative elements of the toilet signage are analyzed to reveal whether the signage addresses and adheres to proairetic decoding or not. Textual elements of the signage cover any verbal elements printed or painted on the boards, placates, or stickers. Visual elements refer to pictograms covering images, colors, and how they are presented in regard to the textual elements. Proxemic elements concern on where the signage is located. Operative elements deal with the functions of the signage. The analysis over these four elements of toilet signage is expected to indicate that proairetic decoding might be revisited to reveal what concerns and considerations taken in designing the signage.

2. Literature Review

The functions of public signage in both conventional and digital formats, as implied by Gupta (2008) and Ogi, Kito, and Ukegawa (2017), have transformed not only serving as a guide but also a source of alternative learning. Depending on the venues where the signage is planted, the learning might be unique to the place in terms of the content and the method of delivering the content. Signage as seen from zoo (Görlitz and Schmidt 2008), schoolscapes (Biró 2016), and signage for the visually impaired (Foong and Razali 2011) are the examples of the learning functions of the signage. These studies signify the importance of signage for an alternative learning medium. To comprehend schoolscape, one has to learn its umbrella – linguistic landscape (LL), which primarily concerns with how verbal and pictorial expressions are delivered through public-sphered signage in sociolinguistic ecology (Spolsky 2009). This definition by Spolsky implies that written expressions on the signs are the axis of communication of those whom the signage addresses with particular public spheres as the speech community. The writings on toilet signage, for example, are differently constructed depending on the public spheres where the signage is located. In a religious place like mosque, additional writing in the form of prayer might accompany the signage. In some Indonesian gas stations, the additional writing might take the form of toilet fee, which informs how much toilet users have to pay for different toileting activities. In some Indonesian hotels with flush toilet, the additional writing might be a notice or warning not to squat on the toilet. These differences, as stated by Iio (2019), emerge due to the toilet culture of the locations.

In the context of schoolscape, where the sociolinguistic ecology circumnavigates around teachers, administration staffs, and students with additional participations from parents or guardians, the verbalization and pictorialization of toilet signage has fundamentally to accomodate this ecology. Since the axis of communication in schools is the student, the ecology should center around what the students need and how they interact with the signage. What they need and how they interact mull over around

learning and thus, the signage in school environment, as implied by Dressler (2015), should be a signgeist – the spirit of promoting learning through the signage. Since toilet and toileting in school context, as implied by Pruneri (2020), have a moral education, anything related to toilet and toileting including the signage should be constructed based on the objective of transmitting moral education. The necessity of this learning inducement which signage including toilet signage should address compels the sign makers – the teachers – to adjust what is written on the signage not only with the participant oriented sociolinguistic ecology but also the identity, the ideology, or the branding of the school. When the sign makers incorporate identity and ideology in constructing signage, as implied by Dagenais, Moore, Sabatier, Lamarre, and Armand (2009) and Sloboda (2009), they have to negotiate the language use, the physical shape, and the location where the signage is positioned.

Regarding the location of the signage, studies by Krompák, Grima, and Farrugia (2020) indicate that four locations which could be used as a learning schoolscape namely architectural features, dedicated corners in classrooms, boards, and wall displays. The studies do not specifically mention about toilet and its signage as a possible means of learning. Toilets, as implied by Shang and Xie (2020), as a part of schoolscape tends to be neglected if repurposed for a means of learning. In the context of toilet signage, though different in construction like the placates or the boards, fundamentally toilet signs are categorized into human-shaped, portions, and words (Iio 2019). These sign categories, in regard to negotiation between identity and ideology, reflect that these three categories are used and utilized to communicate the identity and ideology of the sign markers and the sign receivers under language-based sign rule principles. The first sign rule is to write signs in the language that the sign makers know, the second to write signs in the language of the intended readers, and third to write signs in language with which the sign markers want to be identified (Spolsky & Cooper 1991). When these rules are applied to address identity and ideology negotiation, the impacts over negotiation might vary. Applying the first rule, the negotiation might tend to be subjective but indicating that the sign makers have more authority over the sign recipients. On the other hand, the second and third rule tend to be objective with the second showing less authority than the third.

In the context of sign markers and sign recipients who use more than a language like what is commonly found from Indonesian Islamic kindergartens, the relationship in signage context is not just involving the sign makers and the sign recipients but also the relationship between language in use and message content of the signage. Reh (2004) classifies this relationship into duplicating multilingual writing, fragmentary multilingualism, overlapping multilingual writing, and complementary multilingual writing. The first relationship, with the toilet signage of Indonesian Islamic kindergartens as the example, occurs when the schools want to say 'toilet' in both Bahasa Indonesia and Arabic on the same sign. The second occurs when 'toilet' and its additional information is written in either Bahasa Indonesia or Arabic with opposing language being given in a different domain or context. The third occurs when 'toilet' is written in either Bahasa Indonesia or Arabic but additional information like prayers and how to do a proper toileting are written on the opposing language. The fourth occurs when 'toilet', toileting prayers, or toileting instructions are written in both Bahasa Indonesia and Arabic.

WC or Toilet: Should We Consider Proairetic Decoding and Signgeist in Writing
Toilet Signage for Indonesian Islamic Kindergartens?

In the context of kindergartens in which the sign message recipients are primarily children, Reh's language and message content for signage becomes more complicated since they have to address proairetic decoding. As pointed out on the introduction section, this Barthesian decoding as proposed by Nikolajeva (2010) revolves around how a verbal expression is nonbiasedly digested by the children – a reading and a meaning digestion in one go. The concerns over proairetic decoding, taking Indonesian Islamic kindergartens as the example, revolve not only over what to read but also proairesis over when to read and why to read. In toilet signage context at kindergartens, what to read has to address the textual elements written on the sign, the visual elements required to accompany the textual elements, the signs that are used, the ways to put the signs, and if the language is more than one, the relationship between language and content should be adhered to. This what to read is linked to when to read. When to read deals with the time the toilet signage is read by the sign recipients and how long it might take to read the the signage. The relationship between these two points out that the sign makers have to consider the length of the writing, the shape and size of the signs, and the reading focus the signs expect from the sign recipients. This relationship between what to read and when to read has to address the why to read the signage, which revolves around signgeist – signs for learning purposes, to signify the meaning the signage attempts to convey.

3. Research Method

This descriptive qualitative research is a case study-based research. The mapping based linguistic landscape research by Barni and Bagna (2009) was applied in micro level context of Indonesian Islamic kindergartens with the focus on toilet signage. The mapping of toilet signage encompasses verbal or textual, visual, proxemic, and operative elements of the toilet signage – the data of the research. The following table might help comprehend what the data were:

Table 1: Data Forms

Data Forms	Descriptions
Textual Data	What is verbally written on the toilet sign e.g. toilet, *kamar kecil*, *kamar mandi*, etc
Visual Data	The visuals which represent or accompany the verbal texts e.g. the picture of a kid entering a toilet
Proxemic Data	The position and distance of the verbal texts and the visuals e.g. the word toilet on the right side and the icon of a male kid on the left
Operative Data	Signgeist – learning purpose as seen from whether the toilet signage employs a multilingualism e.g. Arabic prayers and English toileting instructions

The data were taken from 24 Indonesian Islamic kindergartens. The selected kindergartens are varied. They are classified into kindergartens run by Islamic organizations, kindergartens run by local mosque communities, and kindergartens run by Islamic boarding schools. Reliability and validity of the data were implemented by applying the theory from Sandelowski (1993) which emphasizes on the clarity over the processes of thought in the analysis and the interpretation of the data. Departing from this theory, the collected data were analyzed in Spradleyan fashion. As laid down by Spradley (2016), four analysis steps comprising of domain, taxonomy, componential, and finding cultural theme were taken. In domain

analysis, the theories of linguistic analysis for linguistic landscape by Huebner (2009) and toilet signage categorization by Iio (2019) was applied to indicate which data were categorized into human-shaped, portions, and words. In taxonomy analysis, departing from this categorization, language and message content by Reh (2004) and children as social actors in linguistic landscapes by Dagenais, Moore, Sabatier, Lamarre, and Armand (2009) were applied to reveal how language in use and message content were constructed. The result of this implementation was expected to indicate how textual, visual, operative, and proxemic elements are negotiated. The result of the negotiation is classified in componential analysis by leaning over the theory of schoolscape by Gorter (2018) to formulate a typology of toilet signage which conforms to the proairetic decoding in regard to textual, visual, operative, and proxemic elements of the signage and *signgeist*. In the last step, finding cultural theme, the affiliations of the Indonesian Islamic kindergartens are linked with the result of the componential analysis to reveal whether proairetic decoding is ideologically influenced by the affiliations or not when toilet signage was constructed.

4. Findings

In order to ensure a smooth proairetic reading, the findings are presented in four sub sections namely findings on textual, visual, proxemic, and operative elements of the toilet signs, toilet signage categories, the relationship between language in use and message content of the toilet signage, and proairetic decoding revisiting. In the first sub section, the numbers of textual, visual, proxemic, and operative data are presented to indicate which elements dominate the most. The second sub section reveals what category of toilet signage in kindergartens the data indicate. The third sub section presents the findings on whether the data fall into duplicating multilingual writing, fragmentary multilingualism, overlapping multilingual writing, or complementary multilingual writing. Each finding sub section is addressed in proairetic decoding and signgeist context to indicate whether proairetic decoding and signgeist are addressed or not in constructing the signage. From the three finding types, a proairetic decoding and signgeist based typology of toilet writing in the schoolscape context of Indonesian Islamic kindergartens is constructed on the fourth sub section.

4.1 Findings on Textual, Visual, Proxemic, and Operative Elements of the Toilet Signage

The findings indicate that Indonesian Islamic kindergartens tend to lean over the hybrid of text and visual to construct the toilet signage with the word *toilet* as the lexicon to textualize or verbalize the signage. In the context of proairetic decoding, the use of textual and visual element combination supports the process of decoding since the children are pictorially assisted by the visuals in case, they have difficulties in decoding the textual writings. The preference over *toilet* is a unique finding in a sense that it consumes more space than WC. In the context of Indonesian toilets this might result from common understanding that the word WC is a place only to defecate while the word *toilet* might serve various bathroom activities from taking a bath, defecating, and ablution. The following table might help illustrate the findings in a more comprehensive fashion:

WC or Toilet: Should We Consider Proairetic Decoding and Signgeist in Writing
Toilet Signage for Indonesian Islamic Kindergartens?

Table 2: the Display of Toilet Signage in Indonesian Islamic Kindergartens

Signage	Textual Elements			Visual Elements		Proxemic Elements			Operative Elements	
	Req	Pro	Ind	Rep	Dec	SBS	BU	FBF	Tel	Bui
Text	x	2	9	x	x	x	x	x	6	1
Visual	x	x	x	1	x	x	x	x	1	x
Text and Visual	1	6	1	7	x	4	3	1	x	7

Req: Requesting	Rep: Representative	SBS: Side by Side	Tel: Telling
Pro: Proceduring	Dec: Decorative	BU: Bottom Up	Bui: Building
Ind: Indicating		FBF: Frame by Frame	

As seen from the table, the textual elements of the toilet signage are structured in requesting, proceduring, and indicating. Requesting means that the textual messages are not only words which indicate toilet but also additional information in requestive fashion like *masuk kamar mandi/wudhu mohon menggunakan sandal kamar mandi yang telah disediakan* (please, use bathroom sandals when entering the bathroom/ablution). Proceduring points out that the additional information is constructed in a procedural fashion to accompany lavatory referring words like *toilet*, *kamar mandi*, and WC e.g. procedures on how to wash hands after toileting. Indicating means that the toilet only employs an indicator that the place is a toilet without any additional information.

The findings show that textual signage tends to be constructed through indicative markers while a hybrid of textual and visual elements tend to employ proceduring markers. In proairetic decoding perspectives, the decision to only use of indicative markers without any additional information implies that the sign makers treat toilet as toilet without any consideration over signgeist – signage for learning. This further implies that any learning involving toileting might only be delivered in a classroom fashion and that to place additional information might hinder the process of toileting itself. On the other hand, the use of proceduring strengthens the implication that sign makers attempt to design the toilet signage in a signgeist paradigm. This attempt to signgeist-ing the toilet signage raises a problem on the efficiency of designing signage based on signgeist knowing that children need to hurry themselves in toileting and might spare a little time to learn what the signage attempts to teach.

This problem of efficiency seems to be responded through the use of visuals as a company for the textual elements. The findings indicate that the visual elements are all constructed under the principles of representation – what the texts say is what the visuals depict. This representative marker of the visuals points out that the toilet signage is designed in a signgeist fashion to support the learning process of toileting-based activities. Supported by side by side and bottom up proxemic positioning of the visual and textual elements, the signage is proairetically decoded to serve the signgeist. That the findings indicate the dominance of building from telling in the relationship between textual and visual elements further point out that the toilet signage functions not only as telling that it is a toilet but also as a signgeist.

4.2 Findings on Toilet Sign Categories

Toilet signage, as proposed by Iio (2019), is categorized into human-shaped, portions, and words with the first referring to human visualization, the second to human body parts, and the third to words conveying that the place is a toilet. In Indonesian Islamic kindergarten context,

Table 3: Toilet Sign Categories in Indonesian Islamic Kindergartens

	Human-Shaped	Portions	Words	None
(accompanied by) Procedure of toileting	6	x	x	x
(accompanied by) None	1	x	12	5

The findings indicate that the *geist* – the spirit of learning – tends to be constructed in human-shaped toilet signage – visible from the use of extra information plate which addresses the procedures of toileting for the children. The problem of having procedure of toileting as a geist in proairetic decoding context is that it tends to ignore the fact that the children tend to be in hurry in using the toilets. Moreover, the children tend to already learn the toileting procedure whether in the classroom or in home and thereby the extra information addition tends to serve only for decorative purposes – implying the unnecessity for proairetic decoding consideration.

The findings also indicate that the absence of portion use for toilet signage signifies the *geist* itself in Indonesian Islamic kindergarten context. Portions are toilet signage which depict or visualize a representation of human genitalia. In kindergarten context, this visualization might trigger religious norms related issues. Thus, the *geist* of the toilet signage in religious context is preserved by deciding not to construct the toilet signage in portions. In kindergarten context, portion visualization might hinder the proairetic decoding process by the children since portions tend to abstract the genitalia and that might require more explanations on what the visuals attempt to say to the children.

On the other hand, the dominant use of words without being accompanied by any additional learning-based information points out that the absence of *geist* ushers a proairetic decoding in terms of using the toilet – the children have no hindrance in rushing themselves to the toilet. That there are three kindergartens which prefer textualizing or verbalizing lavatory as *kamar mandi*, seven preferring *toilet*, one preferring WC, two preferring hybrid, and seven preferring textless signs further signifies the proairesis of directing the children to the bathroom activities related place. In lexical context, that *toilet* is more preferable than WC, which consumes less space, is culturally related to the general dichotomic stereotype in Indonesia that WC refers to a place only to defecate not to urinate or to take a bath. *Kamar Mandi* is lexically more complex than *toilet* due to its compound status. Moreover, *kamar mandi*, just like the case of WC, tends to culturally refer to a single bathroom activity – bathing. These concerns over cultural stereotypes of a lavatory indicate that the sign makers attempt to deliver unbiased decoding over the selected words. These concerns further point out that proairetic decoding might culturally occur due to cultural concerns.

4.3 Findings on Languages and Message Contents

Findings on languages refer to what languages are used by the toilet signage and its additional information signs while message contents refer to whether the information conveyed by the toilet signage only an indicative marker or along with the other toilet and toilet usage information. The findings indicate that the kindergartens employ Bahasa Indonesia and Arabic. Bahasa Indonesia is employed for both indicative and instructive markers while Arabic is only for an instructive marker – praying. The details are as follows:

Table 4: Languages and Message Contents

	Dup		Fra		Ove		Com	
	Ind	Ins	Ind	Ins	Ind	Ins	Ind	Ins
Toilet	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Toileting Prayers	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	5
Toileting Instructions	x	x	x	15	x	x	x	x

Dup: Duplicating	Fra: Fragmentary	Ove: Overlapping	Com: Complementary

Ind: Indicative Marker   Ins: Instructive Marker

As seen from Table 4, that fragmentary message content dominates the toileting instructions in Bahasa Indonesia indicates the the *geist* or the spirit of learning is focused on how to procedurally do toileting activities or toilet training. Prayers in Arabic are positioned as additional information. This condition implies that the prayers tend to be more efficiently delivered in different domain or context – classroom domain or teaching-learning context. In the perspectives of proairetic decoding, this emphasis over toilet training points out a synchronization between the decoding of toilet function and the bodily activities which might follow. Thus, it implies that the use of prayers is intended for iterative functions which emphasize on situating and habituating the children in memorizing the toileting prayers. These iterative functions are articulated by concerning over textual, visual, proxemic, and operative elements of the signage. The following example might help clarify the statement:

Figure 1: Iterative function through textual, visual, proxemic, and operative considerations

Figure 1 points out that the message contents in the form of prayers are complementary supported by textual element in Arabic and its Indonesian translation, visual element in the form of cartoon, proxemic element in the form of side by side positioning and centric axis on the wall which separate teacher and student toilets, and operative element in the form of building Islamic character through praying. In

signgeist perspectives, the sign as seen from the prayer points out that toileting prayers might become the focus of toileting instead of the procedures on how to do toileting itself.

That there lies three different perspectives of signgeist – focusing on toileting procedures, focusing on toileting prayers, and focusing on both – indicates that the sign makers might have different considerations over the *geist* in relation to the paradigm, vision and mission, and branding of the school. In the context of proairetic decoding in regard to the language use, the focuses imply that everyday language – Bahasa Indonesia – due to its familiarity is proairetically implemented in a manual like fashion. The manual comprises of manual in using the toilet and manual in transliterating and translating the Arabic prayers. These manual like fashions signify the proairesis attempts of the sign makers in easing the children using the toilet.

4.4 Typology of Proairetic Decoding and Signgeist based Toilet Writing

Departing from the findings on textual, visual, proxemic, and operative elements of the toilet signage toilet sign categories, and languages and message contents, the typology of proairetic decoding and signgeist based toilet writing was constructed. There are three types of toilet writings namely ungeist, monogeist, and polygeist. The differences among the three are as follows:

Table 5: Toilet Writing Typology

	Learning Topics	Proairesis	Language Use	Toilet Sign Category
Ungeist	None	Tends to emphasize over indication or direction	Mono	Words/Human Shapes
Monogeist	Singular	Tends to emphasize over toileting procedure	Mono/Bilingual	Words/Human Shapes
Polygeist	Plural	Tends to emphasize over toileting procedure and manners	Tends to be bilingual	Words/Human Shapes

As seen from Table 5, ungeist toilet writing focuses solely on directing the children by stating that the place where urinating and defecating activities is called 'toilet' through word/human shaped signs. The language used in ungeist toilet writing tends to be monolingual since the proairesis of indicating or directing should be maintained. Different from ungeist, which spotlights the nature of sign as a sign, monogeist and polygeist have learning topics to accompany the sign function as an indicative and directive marker. Monogeist emphasizes the learning topic over toileting procedures – how to use the toilets – while polygeist emphasizes over procedures and manners. The emphasis over manners in polygeist toilet writing in Indonesian Islamic kindergarten context is expressed through the use of Arabic language.

Figure 2: Prayers in Arabic

The polygeist sign depicts prayers in Arabic. They consist of prayers before and after entering the toilet. The implementation of visuals and Indonesian translation of the Arabic indicates that the sign maker attempts to elicit a clear and nonbiased comprehension over the manners of using the toilet.

The problems with monogeist and polygeist revolve around the proairetic aspects of the signs. Since the function of a sign mainly as an indicative and directive marker, the questions whether the learning topics truly deliver the messages or only functioned as a decorative marker arise. When decorative marker is the function of the signs, in Indonesian Islamic kindergarten context, it implies that a driving force toward the emergence of the marker is of existent. The driving forces could be the necessity for the schools to evoke a holistic learning environment or to align the schools with the branding the schools have. The driving forces could also derive from iterative functions the schools attempt to implement. Through iterative functions, students are expected to understand what to do in the toilet in a more comprehensive manner. Thus, a guideline is of necessity to reveal whether toilet writing types tend to function decoratively or iteratively.

Table 6: Decorative and Iterative Functions of Toilet Writing

Functions	Geist/Learning	Languages	Proairesis	Schoolscape
Decorative	The procedures and manners of toileting are not a part of the curriculum	The procedures and manners are not taught and made as a conversation language in the school	The other signs in the school are treated the same as toilet signs with procedures and manners as the focus	Schoolscape is considered on the basis of school branding
Iterative	The procedures and manners of toileting are a part of the curriculum	The languages used in the procedures and manners are taught and made as a conversation language in the school	The other signs in the school are differently treated based on the principles of textual, visual, operative, and proxemic proairesis	Schoolscape is considered on the basis of learning environment

As seen from Table 6, decorative and iterative functions are primarily differentiated by the objectives the schools have in designing the toilet writing in schoolscape context. Branding related objectives tend to lead to decorative functions while learning environment related objectives tend to lead to iterative functions. In relation to languages, decorative functions tend to ignore text simplification and text display while iterative functions rely on text simplification and display to ensure that the messages are delivered to the children. The following example might help comprehend the statement:

Figure 3: Decorative Functions of a Text

As seen from Figure 3, the picture on the left informs the children about how to wash hands with soap and water while the picture on the right informs them the Standard Operating Procedure. The picture on the left tends to be iterative since the portions of the visuals consume more spaces than the texts. The top bottom position of the visuals and texts also suggest that the how to hand wash text tends to lean over the visuals to texts. Proairetically the use of visuals as the primary concern indicates that the sign makers attempt to direct the children to apply what is being depicted. On the other hand, the picture on the right tends to be decorative since the language is formally textualized through the use of terminologies and standard writing of an announcement. The fact that the text is an SOP points out that it serves as an indicative marker that the school has implemented what is written on the SOP. The use of child cartoon on the SOP further indicates the decorativeness of the text function since the cartoon and the formal language used on the text indicates a discrepancy.

5. Discussion

The findings indicate that textual, visual, operative, and proxemic elements of signage were negotiated to address the issues of proairetic decoding and *signgeist* with decorative and iterative functions as the concerns. As stated on the literature review section, Dagenais, Moore, Sabatier, Lamarre, and Armand (2009) and Sloboda (2009) imply that language use, physical shape of the signage, and the location where the signage is positioned are negotiated when identity and ideology become the concerns in constructing a sign. In the context of Islamic Indonesian kindergaten context, the identity and the ideology mainly revolve around the status of being an Islamic school. This status compels the schools to brand or align themselves with Islamic teaching. In the context of toilet writing is also the concern of the branding and alignment where Arabic prayers are considered in constructing its signage.

The types of kindergartens might also influence the negotiation of the toilet signage writing. Inclusive kindergartens tend to adopt text-based toilet signage in indicatives to ease the students comprehend what the signage says. This student-wise toilet signage writing points out the roles of pedagogy in the signage design. This condition further indicates that creating a learning environment, as implied by Roos and Nicholas (2019), is possible through the use of signage under the umbrella of linguistic landscapes. However, when it comes to a shared toilet like kindergartens run by local mosque communities, the pedagogical aspects of the signage might be off. In this type of kindergarten, the schools

are in the same complex as the mosque and commonly the toilets are of shared toilets between the congregation, the students, and the teachers. Due to this shared-toilet type, the signage tends to adopt a simple indicative writing. In linguistic context, the learning might not be explicitly delivered but students might learn how to accept others in the context of toilet sharing.

In toilet signage context, proairetic decoding, due to its textual nature (Nikolajeva 2010), tends to be implemented by primarily leaning over the textual element of the signage. Accompanying textual elements in preference is visual element since this element in signage context acts as an explainer to what the text says. Thus, if toilet writings are designed with *signgeist* as the concern, as seen from the use of procedures on the signage, visual elements might take over textual elements as the primary concern due to their proairesis. Though textual and visual elements are considered more among the four elements, their existence depends on the operative and proxemic elements of the signage. The last two elements determine the process of message deciphering displayed and depicted by the textual and visual elements. Due to this issue, we can say that spatial constraints of the signage and the lingual and nonlingual expressions of the signage tend to influence one and another with identity and ideology as the driving forces.

The aforementioned driving forces still have to address the fact that kindergartens are the context of the toilet signage design. Since kindergartens are the context, the signage makers have to consider the elements of playfulness – ludic elements. These playful elements might be derivable from what Purnomo, Untari, Purnama, Asiyah, Umam, Sartika, Anggraini, dan Indersari (2021) call as ludic adaptation – adjusting a general text for younger recepients. The makers have to consider also gaming elements to ensure the immersive level of the sign recepients. In the context of language, ludic linguistics with a concern on immersive level, as suggested by Purnomo, Nababan, Santosa, and Kristina (2017), might be taken as a consideration.

The toilet writing, if the sign makers prefer the messages over their media or containers, might face the problem of verbosity. Purnomo, Untari, Purnama, Asiyah, Muttaqien, Umam, Sartika, Pujiyanti, and Nurjanah (2020) implies that verbosity has potentials to occur in children related texts due to the necessity of being explicit and clear. In the toilet signage of Indonesian Islamic kindergarten context, this verbosity might likely occur due to the necessity to adopt information of how to do toileting in Bahasa Indonesia and toileting prayers in Arabic language. This multilingual generated verbosity further implies that negotations also occur on the intra element of the textual elements. This intra element negotiation also takes place in the visual elements in terms of the pictures, their types, their poses, and their sizes, in the proxemic elements in regard to where the pictures and texts should be positioned and how they are positioned, and in operative elements in regard to what should be considered in designing decorative and iterative functions of the signage.

Verbosity might also occur due to the complexities of the *geist* the toilet writings attempt to deliver. Polygeist signage might be the type where those complexities take place since this type of toilet writing attempts to accommodate multiple learning through the signage. This attempt might violate the proairesis of the toilet writing which ushers difficulties in digesting all of the displayed information. In regard to this

proairesis violation, verbosity fundamentally violates the textual elements of the signage and thus space consumption becomes the issue. When signage with verbosity is attached on toilet walls, the proairesis is even more eroded since the urge to performing toileting activities takes more priority for the students than digesting what the signage says.

6. Conclusion

In kindergarten's teaching and learning context, toilet signage as a linguistic landscape might function as a learning environment. The results of this research which comprise the considerations, the types, and the functions of toilet signage might be used as a guideline in designing toilet signage in kindergarten context. In kindergarten context, these considerations are in tandem with the playful nature of the kindergarten students. This playful nature prompts the toilet signage markers to create attention grabbing texts and visuals from which an alternative learning environment is constructed. The construction of this alternative learning environment is based on the iteration paradigm where continual and constant process of learning in class or out of the class are the key to mnemonically absorb the materials being presented through the signage.

The learning alternative toilet signage offers has to be in tandem with the other means of linguistic landscapes e.g. walls and boards to generate a learning environment. To achieve a comprehensive learning through linguistic landscape driven learning environment, the materials used for learning should be inseparable from the curriculum taught in the schools. The considerations over the curriculum will transform the decorative functions of a toilet signage into those of iterative functions. Thereby, in designing a learning intended toilet signage, the presence of *geist* which is identical to intelectually and zeal in learning is of necessity. Further research might address this issue of *geist* not only from its typology, as discussed in this study, but also what it takes to have a *geist*, how *geist* might be aligned with the in-class learning and teaching, and why *geist* holds a significant role in supporting the core learning and teaching process in kindergartens.

The results of this study further signify the distinctiveness of linguistic landscape in kindergarten schoolscape context from which a neologism might be constructed – it might be called kinderscape. Further research might investigate kinderscape to reveal its distinctive features which might differentiate it from the other schoolscapes. Kinderscape could address the issues of ludic learning engagement by the students of kindergartens, the issues of learning environment denaturation, and the issues of signage-wise in designing a learning environment.

WC or Toilet: Should We Consider Proairetic Decoding and Signgeist in Writing
Toilet Signage for Indonesian Islamic Kindergartens?

تحليل لكتابة لافتات المرحاض في روضة الأطفال الإسلاميّة الإندونيسيّة

إسئف لطفي أركوبي فورنومو، حسن عبيد الله، عبد الله حاذق، إسئف لطفينكا سنجايا فورنما، ليليك أونتاري، محمد نصر الدين

قسم الآداب الإنجليزيّة، كلية الثقافات واللغات، جامعة رادين ماس سعيد الإسلاميّة الحكوميّة، إندونيسيا

الملخص

تعدّ كتابة المرحاض في سياق مدرسة روضة الأطفال الإسلاميّة الإندونيسيّة فريدة من نوعها؛ لأن هذه المدرسة يجب أن تتفاوض بين أيديولوجيتها وهويتها. دارت المفاوضات حول هل كتابة المرحاض يجب أن تستوعب الدعاء باللغة العربيّة وإجراءات استخدام المرحاض باللغة الإندونيسيّة لتعزيز أهداف التعلم للعلامة أم لا؟. بناء على هذه المسألة، حاولنا تصنيف كتابات المرحاض من خلال قراءة فك التشفير الاستباقي والإشارة في عشرين روضة أطفال في إندونيسيا. هذان العنصران ضروريان لأي علامة تتضمن الأطفال كمستقبلي العلامة، حيث يشير الأول إلى سهولة القراءة والثاني إلى بيئة التعلم. باستخدام التحليل اللغوي للمشهد اللغوي عند هويبنر، والأطفال كممثلين اجتماعيين في المشهد اللغوي بواسطة دحانيس والآخرين وسيميائيّة إشارة المرحاض بواسطة ليو ومحتوى اللغة والرسالة بواسطة ريه، والإشارة بواسطة درسلير والواقع المدرسي بواسطة جزرتير، ونتيجة لهذا قمنا بصياغة ثلاثة أنواع من كتابة المرحاض. هذه الأنواع هي غير المفهومة، والمفهومة الفهم الواحد، ومتعددة الفهم. وهذه الوظائف تستخدم للكتابة على المرحاض، الزخرفيّة أو التعبيريّة. تشير الوظيفة الأولى إلى الانسجام بين كتابة المرحاض والعلامة التجاريّة للمدرسة، في حين تشير الوظيفة الثانية إلى بيئة التعلم التي تحاول المدرسة بناءها.

الكلمات المفتاحيّة: منظر مدرسي، كتابة المرحاض، لغويات المناظر الطبيعيّة، روضة الأطفال الإسلاميّة الإندونيسيّة.

References

Barni, Monica, and Carla Bagna. 2009. A Mapping Technique and the Linguistic Landscape. In *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery*, 1st ed., 126–40. New York: Routledge.

Biró, Enikő. 2016. Learning Schoolscapes in a Minority Setting. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica* 8 (2): 109-121.

Dagenais, Diane, Danièle Moore, Cécile Sabatier, Patricia Lamarre, and Françoise Armand. 2009. Linguistic Landscape and Language Awareness. In *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery*, 1st ed., 253–69. New York: Routledge.

Dowhower, Sarah L., and Geiger Beagle Kimberly. 1998. The Print Environment in Kindergartens: A Study of Conventional and Holistic Teachers and Their Classrooms in Three Settings. *Literacy Research and Instruction* 37 (3): 161–90.

Dressler, Roswita. 2015. Sign Geist: Promoting Bilingualism through the Linguistic Landscape of School Signage. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 12 (1): 128–45.

Dudek, Mark. 2013. *Kindergarten Architecture.* Taylor & Francis. http://www.myilibr ary.com?id=536143.

Huebner, Thom. 2009. A Framework for the Linguistic Analysis of Linguistic Landscapes. In *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery*, 1st ed., 70–87. New York: Routledge.

Iio, Jun. 2019. "The Semiotics of Toilet Signs." In *Human-Computer Interaction. Design Practice in Contemporary Societies*, edited by Masaaki Kurosu, 11568:285–94. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-22636-7_20.

Foong, Oi-Mean, and Nurul Safwanah Bt Mohd Razali. 2011. "Signage recognition framework for visually impaired people." In *Proc. Int. Conf. on Computer Communication and Management*, pp. 488-492.

Görlitz, Gudrun, and Anja Schmidt. 2008. Digital signage: informal learning in animal parks and zoos. In *E-Learn: World Conference on E-Learning in Corporate, Government, Healthcare, and Higher Education*, pp. 841-846. Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE).

Gorter, Durk. 2018. Linguistic Landscapes and Trends in the Study of Schoolscapes. *Linguistics and Education* 44: 80–85. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2017.10.001.

Gupta, Ila. 2008. Public Signage System to Combat Problems of Illiteracy and Multilingualism. *Journal of Internasional Social Research* 1 (4).

Krompák, Edina, Antoinette Camilleri Grima, and Marie Therese Farrugia. 2020. A Visual Study of Learning Spaces in Primary Schools and Classrooms in Switzerland and Malta: The Relevance of Schoolscape Studies for Teacher Education. *Malta Review of Education Research* 14 (1): 23-50

Meiboudi, Hossein, Hasan Karimzadegan, and Sayyid Mohammad Reza Khalilnejad. 2011. Enhancing Children's Environmental Awareness in Kindergarten of Mashhad City Using Mural Painting. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 28: 1020–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.187.

Ogi, Tetsuro, Kenichiro Ito, and Seiichiro Ukegawa. 2017. Multilingual Information Service Based on Combination of Smartphone and Digital Signage. In *International Conference on Network-Based Information Systems*, pp. 644-653. Springer, Cham.

Pruneri, Fabio. 2020. Civilisation and the Italian School Toilet: Insights for the Cultural History of Education. *Paedagogica Historia*, 1–6.

Purnomo, SF Luthfie Arguby, Lilik Untari, SF Lukfianka Sanjaya Purnama, Nur Asiyah, Robith Khoiril Umam, Yustin Sartika, Novianni Anggraini, and Elen Inderasari. 2021. Ludic Adaptation: Can We Babyfy, Chibify, Bambify, or Cherubify a Literary Text for Younger Audiences?. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies* 21 (1).

Purnomo, SF Luthfie Arguby, Lilik Untari, SF Lukfianka Sanjaya Purnama, Nur Asiyah, Muhammad Zainal Muttaqien, Robith Khoiril Umam, Yustin Sartika, Umi Pujiyanti, and Hidayatul Nurjanah. 2020. King Size or all Size: Proposing a Typology of Amplification Translation Technique for Children Picturebook Translation. *Studies in English Language and Education* 7 (2): 558-575.

Purnomo, SF Luthfie Arguby, Mangatur Nababan, Riyadi Santosa, and Diah Kristina. 2017. Ludic Linguistics: A Revisited Taxonomy of Fictional Constructed Language Design Approach for Video Games. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies* 17 (4).

Reh, Mechthild. 2004. Multilingual Writing: A Reader-Oriented Typology—with Examples from Lira Municipality (Uganda). *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 2004 (170): 1–41.

Roos, Jana, and Howard Nicholas. 2019. Using Young Learners' Language Environments for EFL Learning: Ways of Working with Linguistic Landscapes. *AILA Review* 32 (1): 91-111.

Sandelowski, Margarete. 1993. Rigor or Rigor Mortis: The Problem of Rigor in Qualitative Research. *Advances in nursing science* 16 (2): 1-8.

Shang, Guowen, and Fen Xie. 2020. Is "poor" English in Linguistic Landscape Useful for EFL Teaching and Learning? Perspectives of EFL Teachers in China. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 30 (1): 35-49.

Shohamy, Elana Goldberg, and D. Gorter, eds. 2009. *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery*. 1st ed. New York: Routledge.

Sloboda, Marián. 2009. "State Ideology and Linguistic Landscape: A Comparative Analysis of (Post)Communist

Belarus, Czech Republic and Slovakia." In *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery*, 1st ed., 173–88. New York: Routledge.

Spolsky, Bernard. 2009. Prolegomena to a Sociolinguistic Theory of Public Signage. In *Linguistic Landscape:Expanding the Scenery*, 1st ed., 25–39. New York: Routledge.

Spolsky, Bernard, and Robert Leon Cooper. 1991. *The Languages of Jerusalem*. Oxford Studies in Language Contact. Oxford : New York: Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press.