

Linguistic Landscape for Teaching Spatial and Safety-Related Vocabularies to Primary School Students: Integration between Community Service and Teaching

Lanskap Linguistik untuk Pengajaran Kosakata Bahasa Inggris Terkait Ruang dan Keamanan bagi Pembelajar Bahasa Inggris Tingkat Sekolah Dasar: Integrasi Pengabdian pada Masyarakat dan Pengajaran

Anna Marietta da Silva*¹, Ignatio Diantama Arinugraha¹, Li Xinyi¹, Theodorus Sule¹, Yanuar Yohana Widarti¹

¹Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma Jaya
Jl. Jenderal Sudirman No.51, Jakarta 12930

*Email: anna.silva@atmajaya.ac.id

(Diterima 05-10-2025; Disetujui 09-02-2026)

ABSTRACT

This community service project (CSP) was conducted in Mita Learning Centre (MLC), a non-profitable learning center in Duren Sawit, East Jakarta. MLC always needs voluntary teachers because it never recruits professionals, but those teachers are not always available on a regular basis, and that motivated this CSP back in 2019. The goal of the 2024 CSP is to introduce an English language learning opportunity in the environment through the adaptation of linguistic landscape in the teaching of English vocabulary in a two-session English tutorial program. This program was integrated to a course called Approaches to English Language Learning in Atma Jaya's Master's Program in Applied English Linguistics. The master students (MSTs) who become the English tutors had to design a syllabus based on theories on teaching English vocabulary through linguistic landscape to young learners. After the syllabus was presented in the class, and given feedback from the lecturer, the MSTs conducted the teaching sessions, and then a reflection upon the teaching experiences. Then, the syllabus, the teaching sessions, and the reflection must be reported in the mid and final term-papers. The small survey after the tutorials showed that the pupils in MLC understood the vocabularies taught, enjoyed the learning activities and expected to join the same program in the future.

Keywords: linguistic landscape, teaching English vocabulary, young English beginners, community service

ABSTRAK

Kegiatan Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat (PkM) ini diadakan di Bimbingan Belajar Mita (Bimbel Mita) sebuah bimbingan belajar non-profit di Duren Sawit, Jakarta Timur. Karena tidak pernah merekrut guru profesional, Bimbel Mita selalu membutuhkan guru-guru yang dapat mengajar dengan sukarela. Guru-guru yang ada tidak selalu dapat datang dengan teratur karena tidak memiliki ikatan kerja profesional dengan Bimbel Mita. Kondisi ini memotivasi dimulainya PkM ini pada tahun 2019. Pada tahun 2024 ini tujuan PkM adalah memperkenalkan kesempatan belajar Bahasa Inggris dari lingkungan sekitar melalui penggunaan adaptasi dari Lanskap Linguistik di dalam pembelajaran kosakata Bahasa Inggris. Program PkM ini diintegrasikan dengan mata kuliah Approaches to English Language Learning di Program Studi Magister Linguistik Terapan Bahasa Inggris, Atma Jaya. Mahasiswa yang menjadi pengajar harus menyiapkan silabus pengajaran berdasarkan teori tentang pengajaran kosakata untuk anak melalui lanskap linguistik. Setelah silabus dipresentasikan di kelas dan mendapatkan balikan dari dosen, para mahasiswa melaksanakan kegiatan pengajaran berdasarkan silabus tersebut, dan juga refleksi atas pengalaman mengajar mereka. Semua kegiatan harus dilaporkan dalam makalah ujian tengah dan akhir semester. Survei kepada para siswa di Bimbel Mita dilaksanakan setelah pengajaran usai, dan hasil survei menunjukkan bahwa para siswa memahami kosakata yang diajarkan, menyukai cara pengajaran yang diberikan, dan berharap program ini dapat terus berjalan.

Kata kunci: lanskap linguistik, pengajaran kosakata Bahasa Inggris, pembelajar Bahasa Inggris pemula, pengabdian pada masyarakat

INTRODUCTION

Teaching vocabulary in English as a second language to young learners has its own dimensions. Zein (2017) points out several necessary aspects in teaching English to young learners, including language and learner dimensions. The former deals with spelling, pronunciation, vocabulary, phonemic awareness, and oral reading fluency, among other aspects. The latter covers preparing lesson plans

and learning materials that are appropriate and attractive. Understanding the young learners' characteristics bases the plan for teaching them and making them engaged with the language learned. Thus, incorporating authentic materials that are adjusted to their context in combination with fun activities finds its justification.

One example of the authentic materials that can engage young learners to learn vocabulary is linguistic landscape (da Silva, 2018; da Silva, 2023; Hancock, 2022; Nursaputri & Aisyah, 2024). Linguistic landscape has been defined as "the use of language in its written form in the public sphere" (Gorter 2006 as cited in Gorter & Cenoz, 2023, p.5). Because of its authenticity, linguistic landscape has been used to teach basic literacy (Chern & Dooley, 2014) and to learn the reasons for of English usage (Roos & Nicholas, 2019). Inspired by the above previous studies, we decided to use linguistic landscape as our pedagogical resource in our community service project (henceforth, CSP) that took place in *Mita Learning Centre* (henceforth, MLC).

MLC is a non-profit learning center organized by those who are concerned with education for children from the low-income families in Duren Sawit, East Jakarta. Because MLC is non-profitable, they do not recruit professional teachers, and always in need of voluntary teachers to teach students English and Mathematics subjects. The voluntary teachers are commonly retired teachers, high school employees, and university students residing around MLC.

This CSP was a continuation of previous CSPs held in MLC since 2019; all of the CSPs focused on the teaching of English basic vocabulary to grades 3 to 6 (da Silva, 2020; da Silva, Pradipta, Yuliana, Maria, & Paradita, 2021; da Silva, Junita, Pasaribu, Tavian & Manurung, 2024). In the first CSP, the first author taught vocabulary through short pictorial English texts and vocabulary games to grade 4 students. They learned basic vocabulary in relation to house, animals, fruits, vegetables, colors, animals, and professions. The parts of speech taught included nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs relevant to the above themes (da Silva, 2020). In the second CSP, the master student-teachers guided by the first author (henceforth, MSTs) taught basic literacy in English through themes such as colors, shapes, food (fruits, vegetables, and tastes), public places, and jobs (da Silva et al., 2021). They implemented the weak version of multimodality in teaching (Grapin, 2019). Thus, they provided anagrams, hands-on activities, real objects, arts, and craft tools, and a variety of games which were relevant with the themes learned. In the third and fourth CSPs, the MSTs still adopted the weak version of multimodality (Grapin, 2019) that was manifested in a variety of teaching techniques such as games, songs, films, diagrams, realia, and flashcards to teach high frequency vocabulary that students can find at home and their surroundings (da Silva et al., 2024). The teaching activities lasted for two subsequent sessions, each of which consisted of 120 minutes. In addition to the teaching sessions, the MSTs reflected upon their teaching approaches and methods and reported their reflection in a reflective paper.

None of the CSPs above, however, centered on used Linguistic Landscape to introduce the English vocabularies to the young learners. There have been a few studies that reported the use of Linguistic Landscape in English language classes at primary level. For example, Padmadewi et al. (2023) integrated Linguistic Landscape into a project for grades 4 to 6 students, and Widyawati et al. (2024) had an experimental study to test the effectiveness of Linguistic Landscape to enrich grade 5 students. Therefore, this 2024 CSP intends to fill in the lack of CSPs on using Linguistic Landscape to teach English vocabulary at the primary level. The objective of the 2024 CSP was to enable students understand vocabularies pertaining to positions, directions, and safety signs through Linguistic Landscape to help raise their awareness that English can be learned through their environment. Later, this model of CSP was adapted for the CSP in 2025 (da Silva, Winstin, Ikhtiar, Maharani, & Subari, 2025), but there are significant differences between the two CSPs. While the 2024 CSP adopted signs in Linguistic Landscape such as street maps, and signs connected to health and safety, the 2025 CSP adjusted signs food packages available in minimarkets or supermarkets, and hospital signs. It is important to note that all CSPs conducted under the leadership of the first author in MLC are not the same, because the team members have taught distinctive teaching content and used different teaching and learning materials. To put it another way, each CSP in MLC is unique and distinguishable.

METHODS

Like the previous CSP since 2021, the 2024 CSP in MLC was also integrated to the course of Approaches to English Language Learning (henceforth, AELL) in Master's Program of Applied English Linguistics, which is taught by the first author. This implies that the CSP was part of the

course learning experiences and assessment. Hence, the MSTs should minimally conduct two teaching sessions (including the preparation of syllabus design and teaching materials), and reflection of the use of Linguistic Landscape in the CSP. The former was the prerequisite of the latter, which was reported in term papers. The first author, with her connection to MLC, was responsible for creating and managing the 2024 CS, and the MSTs (the 2024 cohort)-the co-authors, were responsible planning, conducting, and reflecting upon the teaching sessions. The entire CSP followed the following 3 stages: (1) preparation, (2) implementation, and (3) post implementation.

Preparation

This stage was initiated by the first author as the CSP team leader. She made a proposal to the university’s institute for research and community empowerment for the CSP after receiving the invitation from MLC in June 2024. After the proposal was accepted, she designed a project-based AELL course into which the CSP was integrated in August 2024. The AELL course started in September 2024, and the CSP was held during November 2024. The CSP is a tutorial English program conducted by the first author and MSTs. In the first meeting of the course the first author gave an overview of the course and the CSP, together with the assessments, grading system, scoring rubric of the course, learning sources and other relevant issues for the introductory course.

Themes (concepts) of the course are discussed in 14 meetings. The themes that are discussed from the first until the 6th weeks are as follows: (1) introduction to English language teaching and learning, (2) the Natural Approach, (3) teaching English vocabulary to young learners, (4) linguistic landscape as a pedagogical source, (5) multimodal teaching, (6) reflective teaching. In the seventh meeting, the MSTs should present their CSP preparation, which should include the syllabus and lesson plan – the templates for the two assignments were provided by the first author (see Tables 1 and 2). However, the MSTs were given freedom not to use the templates if the content of the syllabus and lesson plan is the same as that of the templates. Other topics, i.e., (7) the role of L1 in L2 learning, (8) the Sociocultural perspective on L2 learning, (9) the Sociolinguistic perspective on L2 learning, (10) translanguaging and ELT, and (11) language learning strategies were discussed after the midterm exam. Every meeting of the course consisted of two sessions; the first sessions were used to present and discuss the topic of the day; the second sessions were for discussing the CSP’s preparation.

Table 1. Template of the syllabus

Item	Description	References (supporting readings/teaching materials)	Links (to the references/teaching materials)
General objective			
Objective of each session			
Theme			
Vocabulary taught			
Linguistic landscape project adopted/adapted			
Assessment (exercises/short quiz/home assignment)			

Table 2. Template of the lesson plan

Opening activities & allocated time	Main activities & allocated time	Closing activities & allocated time	Materials (links to the materials)

The MSTs must also do their preparation. There were four MSTs involved in the CSP and they were divided into two pairs. Their preparation included (1) doing intensive reading in order to understand the concepts of teaching English vocabulary to young learners, multimodality, authenticity, reflection, and linguistic landscape as pedagogical resource, (2) presenting a reflective presentation of the above concept, (3) choosing the language focus and previous linguistic landscape project to

be adapted into their syllabus, (4) designing a syllabus and lesson plans, (5) preparing teaching and reinforcement materials as well as presenting them in order to obtain peer and teacher's feedback, and (6) writing all of the preparation in the mid-term paper (see Figure 2). The mid-term paper is a progressive reflective paper, which is part of the final term paper. Basically, the midterm paper reports the MSTs' preparation for the CSP (see Figure 1).

Title (not more than 15 words, and should at least reflect the teaching plan)
1. Background This section (around 500 words) should consist of a clear explanation about the importance of teaching English vocabulary to young learners and the rationale for using Linguistic Landscape to teach English vocabulary to young learners. Relevant supporting sources should be used. Citation style should conform with APA 7 th
2. Expected target/result This part (around 300 words) should provide a clear explanation of the target participants and the expected result of your community service project. Use relevant sources to support your explanation and all information about MITA that you have received.
3. Method This section (around 700 words) will consist of a sequential description about the preparation for the project, the task of each group member, and the teaching syllabus proposed. Use relevant sources to support your explanation.
4. References This part will show a list of all the sources that have been cited or quoted in the above 3 sections. Citations and references should adhere to APA7 th

Figure 1. Midterm paper template

Implementation

The teaching sessions were conducted for two times, on 10th and 17th November 2024 from 10 to 12 am. Each session lasted for one hundred and twenty minutes. Each group were present in every session, together with the first author. The MSTs taught MLC students of grades 4 and 5 using the syllabus and lesson plans that they have prepared. The first MSTs group, whose members were second and the fifth authors, decided to teach vocabularies related to place and directions. Inspired by a linguistic landscape study using Google maps for tertiary students by Kweldju (2018), they used Google map, site map (see Figure 2) and games to engage students with the target vocabularies. Figure 3 presents an example of the syllabus, written by the first group. The MSTs second group (the third and the fourth authors) selected health and safety as their themes and chose relevant public signs at various places such as schools, hospitals, restaurants, and malls to teach imperatives (see Figure 4). The group adapted several previous studies such as that of Sayer (2010) and Roos and Nicholas (2019).



Figure 2. An example of a site map

Syllabus:	
I.	Objective of the course: Students can create a floor plan of MLC and write some sentences using prepositions of place.
II.	Objective of each meeting:
	A. Show the positions of places on Google Maps based on the location in accordance to other places.
	B. Show directions by giving descriptive sentences using prepositions of place.
III.	Linguistic landscape application:
	A. Google Maps
IV.	Classroom procedure (including activities & tasks) : introduction, content & closure

Figure 3. Syllabus of the first group

<p>“Do not smoke”, “Do not litter”, “Do not play with fire”, “No swimming”, “No striding”, “No leaning”, “No playing and jumping”, “Mind the gap”, “Do not feed the animals”. “Wash your hands before eating”, “Drink water regularly”, “Brush your teeth everyday”, “Get enough sleep”, Take regular breaks from screen time”, “Cover your mouth when coughing”, “Eat fruits and vegetable everyday”, and “Keep your surroundings clean”</p>

Figure 4. A collection of imperatives on public signs selected by the second group

Post-implementation

After each of the teaching sessions, the two groups had to write their reflection about their teaching experiences, particularly the use of linguistic landscape to teach the vocabulary to MLC students. They were given a guideline in writing their reflection (see Figure 5), in which they could start from overviewing their teaching plans, and the real teaching activities from the beginning until the end of each session. They could point out some lessons learned from the class, as well as some happenings that attracted their attention, or interrupted them in any ways. In other words, they could start from reporting what they did in the class, and from that point they could mark and highlight some specific aspects in relation to the journal theme. They were also suggested to make photos of their partner during the teaching session. The photos were expected to be able to help them recall their teaching and write the reflective journal. The journal can be written individually by each member, and then combined, or collaboratively from the beginning. The teaching sessions, the reflection and its explanation, as well as the group’s task division (see Table 3) should be reported in the final term-paper (see Figure 6). It is important to note that the final term paper would not be the same as the midterm paper (see Figure 1); while the former reported the actual teaching sessions and its reflection, the latter reported the teaching plan. All tasks should be submitted to the course’s Teams and would be given written feedback by the first author.

REFLECTION – WRITE THIS IN YOUR JOURNAL

What I did and felt today – write what you did when teaching your students at *Bimbel Mita* – have a sequential and clear organization*

1. Reflective question(s) I can use to help me select the focus of my reflection* :
 - *What have I learned from the teaching session today?*
 - *What are interesting/unique/unexpected/new/worthy/(other adjectives) from the teaching session today?*
2. Based on #1 and 2 above, I would like to reflect in relation upon...because
3. Based on #1, 2, 3, and 4 above, *what changes (e.g., of thought, attitude, and/or plan) do I make? or what could I have done better next time?*
4. Include 1-3 photos of your teaching sessions (you can also use the photos to help explain #1, 2, 3, or 4 above-if you do) – please compress your photos

Figure 5. Reflective journal guideline

Table 3. Task division between group members

Task	Description	Person in Charge	Date (Done by)
Topic Discussion	Discussing the theme of the paper, method, and LL format.	2 nd & 5 th authors	Oct 4th 2024
Gathering the readings		2 nd author	
Syllabus Draft 1	Building teaching learning activities based on the theme chosen.	5 th author	Oct 10th 2024
Paper First Draft	Writing the paper based on the methods in the syllabus.	5 th author	Oct 14th 2024
Paper Second Draft	Developing the first draft based on the comments given.	5 th author	Oct 20th 2024
Reflective Journal	Choosing the framework, meeting one	5 th author	December 1st 2024
	Meeting two	2 nd author	December 1st 2024
Paper Final Draft	Editing the format of the draft, discussion section, writing reflection section (meeting one) into the draft	5 th author	January 4th 2025
	Writing reflection section (meeting two). Writing conclusion section.	2 nd author	January 4th 2025

<p>Title (not more than 15 words, and should at least reflect the teaching plan)</p>
<p>1. Background This section (around 500 words) should consist of a clear explanation about the importance of teaching English vocabulary to young learners and the rationale for using Linguistic Landscape to teach English vocabulary to young learners. Relevant supporting sources should be used. Citation style should conform with APA 7th.</p>
<p>2. Expected target/result This part (around 300 words) should provide a clear explanation of the target participants and the expected result of your community service project. Use relevant sources to support your explanation and all information about MITA that you have received.</p>
<p>3. Method This section (around 700 words) will consist of a sequential description about the preparation for the project, the task of each group member, and the teaching syllabus proposed. Use relevant sources to support your explanation.</p>
<p>4. Discussion This section (around 800 words) should explain how the teaching sessions were conducted, including but not limited to what went well, any challenges/problems that occurred (and how to deal with them), and the reflection upon the entire teaching sessions (one model/cycle of reflection should be adopted – see Reflective teaching lecture slides in Teams).</p>
<p>5. Conclusion This part (around 200 words) will show the most important items of the teaching sessions, and any potential impact created.</p>
<p>6. References This part consists of a list of all the sources that have been cited or quoted in the above 3 sections. Citations and references should adhere to APA7th.</p>

Figure 6. Final term-paper template

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

This section is divided into two subsections. In the first sub-section, the authors explain and describe how the teaching sessions were conducted by the two MSTs groups. In the second sub-section, the authors reported their reflection on the teaching and learning activities in MLC, particularly on the use of linguistic landscape to teach vocabulary to the students.

The teaching sessions

The first MSTs group reported that their pupils did not know much about vocabularies related to places, including the prepositions of place. However, they were eager to learn. In the first meeting, they focused on prepositions of place (see Figure 7). They started from a game for warming up, which was followed by checking students' knowledge about the prepositions of place, where they used translation of English to Indonesian language. This stage was followed by the MSTs' presentation about prepositions of place (in which they used Google map and other maps of places) (see Figure 8). Lastly, they gave students written exercises about prepositions of place to check their understanding. In the second meeting (see Figure 9), the language focus was verbs for showing direction. In the beginning of the lesson, they had other games. They used games that were relevant to the above focus (see for example, Figure 10). Then, they continued with teaching the verbs and giving exercises (see Figure 10) to reinforce students' understanding. At the end of the meeting, they had an interactive quiz like to check students' understanding of the day's topic. They divided students in groups of 2 or 3 because students preferred to work in groups rather than individually.

Meeting 1 (90')

Focus: Prepositions of place & Vocabulary

1. Introduction 2'
2. Warm Up: Game Find Me (Where's Waldo?-like version) 13'
3. Getting Started: Ask questions (*in, on, at, behind* & other preps.) 10'
4. Teacher Presentation 15'
5. Vocabulary repetition 5'
6. Exercise (fill in the blanks with pictures) 15'
7. Break 15'
8. Review: Where am I? 30'

Figure 7. The first group's lesson plan for the first teaching session



Figure 8. The first group's maps as shown on the television

Meeting 2 (90')

Focus: Showing Direction

1. Game Positions!! 15'
2. One Direction Game 15'
3. Direction Presentation 15'
4. Practice: Get Out of Here! 20'
5. Exercise 20' (showing directions with pictures of the map)
6. Review: Where Am I? 15'
7. Students' feedback – small survey 15'

Figure 9. The first group's lesson plan for the second teaching session



Figure 10. An example of the worksheet used by the first group

The second MSTs group used safety signs and what they mean and their functions to teach the English imperatives (the language focus). They used the television available in MLC, flash cards, and realia to explain the signs (Figure 11). They taught how to say those signs and provided worksheets to enhance students' comprehension of the meanings of the imperatives, and how they must be written (see Figure 12). Then, they combined the worksheets with the games, for example, the relay whispering games, where the students who were divided into groups had to whisper a series of sentences explaining the signs. The goal was to make students familiar with the signs and the meanings. At the end of the lesson, they had a short evaluation of the students' comprehension of the target vocabulary of the day.



Figure 11. The second group's teaching public signs through TV, flashcard & realia



Figure 12. The second group's worksheet that has been filled in by one student & flashcard sample

The reflection

Both groups noted that they had to make some adjustments with their lesson plans due to the students' English language ability. The first group initially created a lesson plan in which students would mostly work individually. However, based on their short observation and quick survey to the students (who preferred group rather than individual task) in the first meeting, they decided that most of the tasks would be carried out in pairs or groups of three persons. In addition, they also reduced the number of students' activities in the lesson plan so that they would be able to concentrate more on students' understanding of the vocabulary. They viewed that a review activity at the end of the lesson is very important and it could be done through games. The second group at first designed a syllabus that required communication only in English language. Nevertheless, they decided to adopt translanguaging in their class as promoted by Cenoz and Gorter (2020) so that they could move from one idiolect (English) to another (Indonesian) in explaining the public signs to facilitate students' comprehension of the materials. Furthermore, in their initial teaching plan, they would also taught health-related signs. Yet, after looking at the students' ability and available amount of time, they decided to withdraw the topic, and focus on the safety signs in both meetings.

Another lesson learned from the 2024 CSP was the importance on multimodality (Jewitt, Bezemer & O'Halloran, 2016) in all the teaching sessions. The MSTs found that multimodal teaching can raise the students' enthusiasm as they could learn vocabulary through activities that does not entail reading

and pronouncing the ‘words’ per se. The MSTs applied their knowledge about teaching English to young children, so they had prepared a variety of learning items such as games, worksheets with pictures, real objects, and visuals such as Google maps to attract students’ attention. The use of multimodes could also facilitate students’ engagement with the target vocabularies. For example, they could learn the English words and sentences that indicate the meanings of the public signs that consist of images (without any words). The knowledge would be useful when they encounter the signs in main public roads or streets.

Discussion

Studies have shown that teaching vocabulary to young language learners is a delicate matter. These young pupils are energetic, and love to learn new things. However, because they are still in the stage of development, they may not always have long span of memory and attention (ELT in Ireland, 2015). When teaching vocabulary to young pupils, teachers need to be sure that the learning materials are attractive for the pupils so that they are interested to learn them. Then, teachers must do a lot of repetitions and personalize the learning (adjusting the materials to the items students know and familiar with) so that they remember the vocabulary they learn and are engaged to the learning (having interest in the learning and wanting to know more about what’s being learned).

Therefore, the focus of the vocabulary teaching for young learners should be the high frequency words Hestetræet’s (2019) to help them understand simple reading text or simple conversation. The MLC students need to be introduced to concrete words which should be appropriate to their cognitive development. In addition, the words must be meaningful to them, for example, objects they can easily find at home, school or environment. Public signs in the linguistic landscape around the young learners can provide opportunities for learning concrete vocabularies. Public signs include all signs that are available in public spaces, from posters to advertisements to restaurant menu to packages in mini markets (Nursaputri & Aisyah, 2024; Sayer, 2010; Roos & Nicholas, 2019). In particular, as Sayer (2010) suggested, the application of linguistic landscape for teaching English can be adjusted to the learners’ contexts and ages. For example, for young students, the signs can be obtained from their houses, namely from the electronic devices, clothes, and bags. Those are sources for language learning incidentally and intentionally.

The MLC students seemed to enjoy learning vocabulary through linguistic landscape. They explored the features of Google maps and had fun doing the activities. This shows an example of incorporating real-life experience (using Google maps to find addresses) to the class (Kweldju, 2018; Li, Tang, Wang, & Liu, 2012). The students may think that they did not learn the language because they do not only focus on form, but on meaning (Renandya, 2023) through applications that are indeed useful in their daily lives. Besides that, the students may have another insight on the English learning sources, namely through public signs around them. Although the learning in the 2024 CSP was done in the classroom, the students are expected to recall what they have learned in the class when they walk down the streets or go to various public places where they can actually find a lot of signs that use English words. This, according to Roos and Nicholas (2019, p. 107), can provide students with “. . . out-of-school contact with the language.”

Regarding how vocabulary should be taught or learned, Renandya (2023) suggested to use both explicit and implicit methods. The former may indicate that teachers directly introduce new vocabularies in isolation – introduce the words and their meanings in English (with a variety of techniques, for instance, flash cards, realia, games, movements). The latter can mean that teachers indirectly introduce new words through a variety of techniques like the above, but they let the learners deduce the meanings. Teaching vocabulary to young learners, in this context, the MLC students, also entails a lot of repetitions and hands-on practice as well as teaching aids such as images and real objects. For example, in the first group’s second teaching session, not all students remembered most of the words they had learned in the first session. Therefore, the first group had to help them recall the vocabulary and checked their understanding again.

The CSP also shows that multimodality plays an important role as it consists of the use of visual, sound, movement, text, and technology (Choi & Yi, 2015). Research has found that multimodal instruction in teaching vocabulary has improved students’ vocabulary knowledge (see for example, Cárcamo, Cartes, Velásquez, & Larenas, 2016). Moreover, research has also found that employing multimodality, English teachers can help their students to understand both the content and language that the teachers have taught (Choi & Yi, 2015). Language is a complex matter, and it needs more than texts to understand the meanings and engage with the learning. With a comprehension that is

facilitated through multimodal learning, students can sense self-accomplishment, which in turn can raise their self-confidence towards the learning.

Concerning the use of translanguaging to teach English vocabulary to MLC students, research has proved that translanguaging has been able to increase students' participation in the English class as has been demonstrated in Daniel, Jiménez, Pray, and Pacheco's (2019) study. Nation (2022) also suggested that teacher's translation to students' first language can help students learn new words in English comfortably and deliberately. Therefore, he also recommended the use of bilingual dictionaries in the classroom. A brief survey to MLC students at the end of the sessions showed that most students were able to understand the vocabularies taught to them. The students also favored the way the MSTs taught English in the class. In addition, they felt that it was fun to learn English with the MSTs and expected that they would teach them again in the future.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Overall, the teaching sessions have emphasized the importance of authentic materials and sensitivity towards the young learners' characteristics and context into the teaching of vocabulary. The integration of Google Maps into the teaching program has demonstrated the potential of linguistic landscape application in teaching language focus such as prepositions of place and vocabulary related to place names. By leveraging tools like Google maps, teachers can create dynamic language learning experiences and prepare students for the real-world skills of reading real-time map. This method can make students more engaged with the vocabulary learning because the application provides interaction with visual objects and is heavily used nowadays. The use of collaborative work and games in the class as preferred by the students could also reduce their anxiety to learning the target vocabulary.

The next CSP can integrate other signs in virtual linguistic landscape, for example, educational websites for children, the online shops, and social media accounts in which English is used that are relevant for children. Educating children on the meanings of signs in the virtual linguistic landscape would enable them to learn not only English language components such as vocabulary, but also explicit and implicit meanings, as well as denotative and connotative meanings of language. That is part of today's literacy that children need to possess, which does not only cover basic literacy, but also digital literacy, in its simplest form. Thus, the CSP could also involve students from other departments such as from Information and Technology or Communication.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to express their gratitude to the Institute for Research and Community Empowerment of Atma Jaya Catholic University of Indonesia who have funded the CSP, and the anonymous reviewers of this paper.

REFERENCES

- Cárcamo, M. M. A., Cartes, R. A. C., Velásquez, N. E. E., & Larenas, C. H. D. (2016). The impact of multimodal instruction on the acquisition of vocabulary. *Trabalhos em Linguística Aplicada*, 55(1), 129-154. <https://doi.org/10.1590/010318134842170942>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020). Teaching English through pedagogical translanguaging. *World Englishes*, 39(2), 300-311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12462>
- Choi, J., & Yi, Y. (2015). Teachers' integration of multimodality into classroom practices for English language learners. *TESOL Journal*, 7(2), 304-327. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.204>
- Chern, C. L., & Dooley, K. (2014). Learning English by walking down the street. *ELT Journal*, 68(2), 113-123. Doi: 10.1093/elt/cct067
- Daniel, S. Jiménez, R. Pray, L. & Pacheco, M. (2019). Scaffolding to make translanguaging a classroom norm. *TESOL Journal* 10(1): e00361. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.361>
- da Silva, A. M. (2018). Linguistic landscape: an authentic material to teach English to high school students. *Madani: Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, 4(2), 70-76. <https://doi.org/10.53834/mdn.v4i2.508>

- da Silva, A. M. (2020). The teaching of English vocabulary through pictorial reading texts and games to a group of primary school students in East Jakarta. *Riau Journal of Empowerment*, 3(1), 1-15. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30998/jurnalpkm.v4i2.6245>
- da Silva, A. M., Pradipta, A., Yuliana, V., Maria, M. S., & Paradita, G. (2021). Giving free English lessons and vocabulary modules: Learning beyond the classroom walls through a community service program. *Jurnal PkM (Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat)*, 4(2), 109-116. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30998/jurnalpkm.v4i2.6245>
- da Silva, A. M. (2023). Linguistic landscape projects as English teaching and learning resources: A review. *Scope: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 7(2), 143-149. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30998/scope.v7i2.15970>
- da Silva, A., Junita, J., Pasaribu, J. B. T., Tavian, Y., & Manurung, A. R. (2024). Being reflective student tutors through community service programs. *J-Dinamika: Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat*, 9(3), 471-476. <https://doi.org/10.25047/j-dinamika.v9i3.5448>
- da Silva, A. M., Winstin, E., Ikhitar, T. P. W., Maharani, C. Y. & Subari, G. Y. L. (2025). *Pengajaran kosa kata Bahasa Inggris bagi murid sekolah dasar melalui lanskap linguistik*. [Manuscript submitted for publication]. Master's Program in Applied English Linguistics, Atma Jaya Catholic University of Indonesia.
- ELT Ireland. [Youtube]. (2015, April 28). *Teaching vocabulary to young learners through brain-based teaching strategies by Setenay Çelik* [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pzIv02E9vU8>
- Gorter, D., & Cenoz, J. (2023). *A panorama of linguistic landscape studies*. Bristol, Jackson: Multilingual Matters.
- Grapin, S. (2019). Multimodality in the new content standards era: Implications for English learners. *Tesol Quarterly*, 53(1), 30-55. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.443>
- Hancock, A. (2022). Chinese students' engagement with linguistic landscapes during a summer school in Scotland. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 25(10), 3568–3579. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2022.2066970>
- Hestetræet, T. I. (2019). Vocabulary teaching for young learners. In S. Garton & F. Coupland (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of teaching English to young learners* (pp. 220-233). New York: Routledge.
- Jewitt, C., Bezemer, J., & O'Halloran, K. (2016). *Introducing multimodality*. New York: Routledge.
- Kweldju, S. (2018). Autonomously riding Google Maps to travel to English speaking countries: Linguistic landscape. *Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching*, 2(1), 5-13.
- Li, H., Tang, J., Wang, Y., & Liu, B. (2012). Looking into the world on Google Maps with view direction estimated photos. *Neurocomputing*, 95, 72–77. 10.1016/j.neucom.2011.06.040
- Nation, P. (2022). Translanguaging and vocabulary learning. *Teaching English as a Second Language Electronic Journal (TESL-EJ)*, 26(3). <https://doi.org/10.55593/ej.26103a24>
- Nursaputri, E. R., & Aisyah, S. (2024). Linguistic landscape analysis on meal advertisement and its potential as authentic materials in ELT. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching & Learning, Linguistics & Literature*, 12(2). 10.2456/ideas. v12i2.5712
- Padmadewi, N. N., Suarcaya, P., Artini, L. P., Munir, A., Friska, J., Husein, R., & Paragae, I. G. A. P. N. S. (2023). Incorporating linguistic landscape into teaching: A project-based learning for language practices at primary school. *International Journal of Elementary Education*, 7(3), 467-477. <https://doi.org/10.23887/ijee.v7i3.58792>
- Renandya, W. [Youtube]. (2023, February 18). *Teaching English to young learners*. [Video file] Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Oy-ILi2rNE&t=152s>
- Roos, J., & Nicholas, H. (2019). Using young learners' language environments for EFL learning: Ways of working with linguistic landscapes. *AILA Review*, 32(1), 91-111. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.00022.roo>
- Sayer, P. (2010). Using the linguistic landscape as a pedagogical resource. *ELT Journal*, 64(2), 143-154. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccp051>

- Widyawati, N. K. P. A., Padmadewi, N. N., & Artini, L. P. (2024). The effect of linguistic landscape in project-based learning on students' vocabulary mastery: A Pre-Experimental Study. *Tamaddun*, 23(1), 32-42. 10.33096/tamaddun.v23il.587
- Zein, S. (2017). The pedagogy of teaching English to young learners: Implications for teacher education. *Indonesian JELT: Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 12(1), 61-77. <https://doi.org/10.25170/ijelt.v12i1.1469>