



## Linguistic Landscapes

Jhonn Rochelle Charisse Carr

LAST MODIFIED: 30 OCTOBER 2019

DOI: 10.1093/OBO/9780199772810-0251

---

### Introduction

Linguistic landscape studies is the investigation of displayed language in a particular space, generally through the analysis of advertisements, billboards, and other signs. A common definition used in the field is the one posited in the canonical 1997 article “Linguistic Landscape and Ethnolinguistic Vitality: An Empirical Study” (*Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 16(1): 23–49) by Rodrigue Landry and Richard Y. Bourhis: “The language of public road signs, advertising billboards, street names, place names, commercial shop signs, and public signs on government buildings combines to form the linguistic landscape of a given territory, region, or urban agglomeration” (p. 25). (See Landry and Bourhis 1997, cited under Origins of the Field.) The study of the linguistic landscape (LL) is a fairly new area of investigation, with the establishment of its first international conference in 2008 and first international journal in 2015. An especially interdisciplinary field, it incorporates work from camps such as anthropology, linguistics, political science, education, geography, and urban planning. While the majority of research focuses on particular geographical places, the area of study has expanded to include the linguistic landscape of the Internet. This article highlights diverse works from male and female scholars, researchers of color, and scholarship on minority languages by scholars from all over the globe. Key texts include research presented in various forms including books, articles, conferences, conference presentations, and dissertations. The first half of the article is organized by contribution type. It begins with Key Works and then turns to Edited Collections. It then moves on to journals that commonly feature linguistic landscape work or special issues and then some of the latest dissertations that have been published. Finally, the article turns to conferences dedicated to the subject and important conference papers that have been discussed recently among scholars in the field. The second half of the article is organized topically in the following order: Origins of the Field, Innovative Methodologies, Applications and Approaches in the Field (including subsections Multilingualism, Global English, Minority Languages, Anthropology, Language Policy and Planning, and Education). In the subsection Anthropology, three central themes are considered: Language Attitudes and Ideologies, Identity, and Ethnography. Finally, the article reviews important works from a newer subcamp: The Linguistic Landscape of the Internet.

---

### Key Works

This section discusses several key works in the field of linguistic landscape studies. Scollon and Scollon 2003 is one of the crucial works that has had a large influence on the direction of scholarship, even though it predates the naming of the field and the canonical article Landry and Bourhis 1997 (cited under Origins of the Field) is not cited in it. Scollon and Scollon 2003 provides a clear presentation of methodology to study geosemiotics and complements this with an array of examples of public signs in multiple countries including Austria, China, Hong Kong, and Italy. Ultimately, it shows how physical and social context play a large role in our understanding of signage as a social semiotic. Kelly-Holmes 2005 focuses on the internationalization of advertising, in contrast with brand indexation of more local and national identities. It contains examples of advertisements from several countries that incorporate multiple languages as well as a chapter dedicated to English and its ever-growing presence in marketing in non-English speaking countries. The short manuscript Backhaus 2007 is comprised of original research conducted in Tokyo. Its introduction would be of great interest to new scholars, as it contains a thorough review of literature from the early period of linguistic landscape research. The book also provides an excellent example of a mixed methods approach that includes both quantitative and qualitative analyses of urban signage. Bhatia 2007 is a revised edition that was originally published in 2000. New to this edition are thirty interviews conducted with business executives from large-scale companies throughout India. One of the important contributions of this manuscript is its focus on rural ads, since the majority of scholarship focuses on urban signage. Blackwood and Tufi 2015 examines the linguistic landscape of ten coastal cities in France and Italy. Apart from national and regional languages and dialects, it also describes cases of English, Slovenian, Catalan, Castilian, Occitan, and Arabic in urban signage. In

addition, it notably provides in-depth backgrounds related to each city's history and sociolinguistic situation. Pennycook and Otsuji 2015 also recognizes the importance of historical and sociolinguistic context in a study of the linguistic landscape in Sydney and Tokyo. It presents the concept of metrolinguism, which takes into account the constant interchange going on between individuals, space, and their historical backgrounds. Other key works include Blommaert 2013 and Lou 2016, cited under Ethnography and Martin 2006, cited under Global English.

**Backhaus, Peter. 2007. *Linguistic landscapes: A comparative study of urban multilingualism in Tokyo*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.**

Backhaus presents an excellent review of linguistic landscape scholarship and operationalization of terminology for the moment and then offers a mixed methods analysis of 2,444 images of signs in twenty-eight areas in Tokyo. He addresses concepts including code preferences, top-down versus bottom-up signage, and availability of translation or transliteration, in addition to linguistic idiosyncrasies and layering of signs.

**Bhatia, Tej K. 2007. *Advertising and marketing in rural India: Language, marketing communication, and consumerism*. Tokyo: Macmillan.**

This book was first published in 2000 with the Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa at the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies. Bhatia analyzes signage for language and script choice, as well as the purpose of the advertisement and the size of text. He investigates languages and combinations of languages used in signs (e.g., Hindi, English, Sanskrit, Urdu) from the author's perspective.

**Blackwood, Robert J., and Stefania Tufi. 2015. *The linguistic landscape of the Mediterranean: French and Italian coastal cities*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.**

Blackwood and Tufi present an extensive study on the linguistic landscape of ten cities located on the coast of Italy and France such as Nice, Marseilles, Genoa, Trieste, Palermo, and Naples. In addition to French and Italian, they discover differing degrees of a variety of languages including Slovenian, Catalan, Castilian, Occitan, and Arabic. They also describe their comparative analysis of English in the two countries.

**Kelly-Holmes, Helen. 2005. *Advertising as multilingual communication*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.**

Kelly-Holmes shows how advertising uses multiple languages and cultures to index an international identity as opposed to a traditional local or national identity. The first chapter describes the characteristics of advertisements using different languages. The second and third chapters deal with the symbolic function of multilingual signs, while the third and fourth chapters analyze their communicative function. The last chapter reviews the advantages and challenges of employing different languages. The book also examines the fetishization of language.

**Pennycook, Alastair, and Emi Otsuji. 2015. *Metrolinguism: Language in the city*. New York: Routledge.**

Pennycook and Otsuji showcase the role of history, architecture, and the city, in addition to residents and migrants and their languages in a comparative study of the linguistic landscape of Sydney and Tokyo. The authors examine the mundane use of language for communication in different urban realms including in restaurants and cafés, on the street and in shops, and at places of work. The results are contextualized within the fields of pedagogy and language policy.

**Scollon, Ron, and Suzie W. Scollon. 2003. *Discourses in place: Language in the material world*. London: Routledge.**

In one of the most heavily cited linguistic landscape works, Scollon and Scollon argue for the importance of physical and social context in understanding signs. Throughout ten chapters, they include several examples from Austria, China, Hong Kong, Italy, and North America, along with activities and a glossary of key terms.

---

## Edited Collections

The vast majority of publications related to linguistic landscapes have been journal articles. Very few books have been dedicated to linguistic landscape studies. This section discusses some of the edited volumes on language use in the public space. For other edited volumes on the topic, see Gorter 2006, cited under Multilingualism and Gorter, et al. 2012, cited under Minority Languages. Some of the books discussed in this section originated from conference presentations at Linguistic Landscapes International Workshops (see Linguistic Landscapes International Workshop cited under Conferences and Conference Papers). For example, Shohamy and Gorter 2009 is a collection of works stemming from presentations at the first conference in 2008, whereas Shohamy, et al. 2010 is from the second in 2009. This first volume contains works that discuss theories and methodologies for the analysis of the linguistic landscape, the manner in which it interacts with language policy and identity, and how the field was expanding at the time. The following year, Shohamy, et al. 2010 was published. This collection has an urban focus, centering on major cities throughout the world. Two other books have come from the 2010 and 2012 workshops, carried out in Strasbourg, France, and Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, respectively. They are cited in other sections of this bibliography; see Hélot, et al. 2012, cited under Multilingualism and Blackwood, et al. 2016, cited under Identity. Other works related to later conferences are currently in progress. Itagi and Singh 2002 is an early work that contains proceedings from a seminar. This volume contains chapters related to the linguistic landscape of different areas of India such as Jharkhand, Uttaranchal, and Chhattisgarh. Jaworski and Thurlow 2010 is another key edited edition in the field. Chapters in the book review the physical and online linguistic landscape from interdisciplinary perspectives, taking into consideration the role of individuals and authorship and the way signage can interact with other elements such as images, space, and architecture. More recently, Laitinen and Zabrodskaja 2015 presents several case studies in Europe in order to offer methodological approaches, and Rubdy and Said 2015 reports works that show how the linguistic landscape can be a site of contention, both as a point of conflict itself and as a means of conveying ideas. The above-mentioned edited volumes have served as important handbooks in this new, growing field.

**Itagi, Narasimha H., and Shailendra K. Singh. 2002. *Linguistic landscaping in India with particular reference to the new states: Proceedings of a seminar*. Mysore, India: Central Institute of Indian Languages and Mahatma Gandhi International Hindi Univ.**

This edited collection was published early on in the inception of the field. It contains chapters regarding studies of the linguistic landscape conducted in Jharkhand, Uttaranchal, and Chhattisgarh, India. Main themes include identity, history, globalization, diglossia, and education.

**Jaworski, Adam, and Crispin Thurlow, eds. 2010. *Semiotic landscapes: Language, image, space*. London: Continuum.**

Jaworski and Thurlow bring together a diverse, interdisciplinary volume that unites work conducted in places such as Dublin, Jamaica, Tel Aviv–Jaffa, and online linguistic landscapes. Rather than divide the book into sections, the editors structure it as thirteen stand-alone chapters. One of these chapters, Piller 2010, is discussed in the section Identity. The editors' focus on meaning-making amplifies the field of linguistic landscapes to one of semiotic landscapes.

**Laitinen, Mikko, and Anastassia Zabrodskaja, eds. 2015. *Dimensions of sociolinguistic landscapes in Europe: Materials and methodological solutions*. Language Competence and Language Awareness in Europe 7. Frankfurt, Germany: Peter Lang.**

This methodological volume contains ten chapters divided up into three parts: Mobility, Globalization and Signs in Space, Semiotic Landscapes and Signs in Virtual Space, and Exploring Linguistic Landscapes in the Former Eastern Bloc. A variety of languages such as Italian, German, Czech, and English are studied in several European regions including Slovakia, Russia, Transnistria, and Norway.

**Rubdy, Rani, and Selim B. Said, eds. 2015. *Conflict, exclusion and dissent in the linguistic landscape*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.**

The essays in this edited collection focus on problems in relation to and ideologically expressed via urban signage given different economic, political, and social contexts. It contains fourteen chapters separated into two sections: Conflict and Exclusion and Dissent and Protest. Geographically, it spans a variety of countries including India, Ireland, China, Japan, and the United States.

**Shohamy, Elana G., Eliezer Ben-Rafael, and Monica Barni, eds. 2010. *Linguistic landscape in the city*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.**

This edited collection stems from conferences presentations at the second Linguistic Landscapes International Workshop in 2009. It focuses on the urban signage of global metropolises in Japan, Ireland, Ukraine, Washington, DC, Tennessee, France, and Israel. The book contains five parts: Multilingualisms, Top-Down, Power and Reactions, Benefits of LL, Perceptions of Passers-By, and Multiculturalism in LL.

**Shohamy, Elana, and Durk Gorter, eds. 2009. *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery*. New York: Routledge.**

This heavily cited volume is the result of the first Linguistic Landscapes International Workshop in 2008. Its twenty chapters are divided up into five sections: Theoretical Perspectives, Methodological Issues, Language Policy Issues, Identity and Awareness, and Extensions and the Way Forward. Admirably, the book has a central color plate with several color images, something very important for a book on what some consider a subfield of visual studies.

---

## Journals

To date, there is only a single journal dedicated to the study of language in the public space: *Linguistic Landscape: An International Journal*. Prior to the institution of this journal in 2015, some journals published individual linguistic landscape studies (e.g., *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *Language in Society*, and *World Englishes*), while others had dedicated special issues. Publication in academic journals, more so than in edited volumes or books, continues to be the largest outlet to disseminate linguistic landscape research.

***International Journal of Bilingualism*. 1997–.**

Interdisciplinary journal with a focus on bilingual and multilingual speakers. First volume in 1997. Special issue dedicated to linguistic landscapes in 2014: *Languages in Motion: Multilingualism and Mobility in the Linguistic Landscape*. Three of the articles are included in this bibliography: see Lanza and Woldemariam 2014 in Identity, Pietikäinen 2014 in Ethnography, and Moriarty 2014 in Language Attitudes and Ideologies.

***International Journal of Multilingualism*. 2004–.**

Interdisciplinary journal centering on second language acquisition and multilingualism. First volume in 2004. Special issue dedicated to linguistic landscapes in 2006: *The Study of the Linguistic Landscape as a new Approach to Multilingualism*.

***International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 1974–.**

Five issues per year are topical, whereas one annual issue is open to individual articles regarding the sociology of language. Occasionally highlights minority languages and languages with small groups of speakers. First volume in 1974. Special issue dedicated to linguistic landscapes in 2014: *Signs in Context: Multilingual and Multimodal Texts in Semiotic Space*.

***Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. 1980–.**

This sociological journal focuses on language and culture in Latin America. Covers topics including gender, immigration, and social movements and inequalities. First volume in 1980.

**Journal of Sociolinguistics. 1997–.**

This flagship journal publishes work dedicated to analyzing the connection between language and society. First volume in 1997.

**Language in Society. 1972–.**

This well-established, international journal publishes work regarding the situation of language within social life. First volume in 1972.

**Linguistic Landscape: An International Journal. 2015–.**

The only journal dedicated solely to the study of linguistic landscapes. Also hosts thematic issues from time to time. Includes book reviews and forums for discussion. First volume in 2015.

**Linguistics and Education. 1988–.**

This international, interdisciplinary journal explores language and all levels of learning. First volume in 1988. Special issue dedicated to linguistic landscapes and education in 2018: *Studying the Visual and Material Dimensions of Education and Learning*.

**Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana. 2003–.**

This international linguistic journal is published primarily in Spanish and contains three components: a thematic section, a general section, and reviews. First volume in 2003. Special issue dedicated to linguistic landscapes in Spanish in 2013: *Paisajes lingüísticos en el mundo hispánico*.

**Social Semiotics. 1991–.**

This journal studies meaning making and how semiotic resources interact with power structures. First volume in 1991. Special issue dedicated to linguistic landscapes in 2015: *Typographic Landscaping: Creativity, Ideology, Movement*.

**World Englishes. 1981–.**

Articles in this international journal focus on the uses of English in different linguistic, international, and public spheres. Also includes book reviews and a comments section to foster dialogue. First volume in 1981.

---

**Recent Dissertations**

In recent years, and especially in the last three years, dissertation studies have begun to employ mixed methods in linguistic landscape research. Alomoush 2015, Al-Naimat 2015, Carr 2017, Maldonado 2015, and Stoltmann 2016 use quantitative and qualitative analyses, examining both signs and interviews with residents. Most likely due to the ease with which images are now captured and stored (e.g., on cellular telephones), the size of quantitative corpora has increased. This is especially noted in three of the dissertations mentioned. Alomoush 2015 analyzes 8,037 signs, while Carr 2017 examines 4,664 signs. Lyons 2017, on the other hand, looks at a corpus of 16,756 Instagram posts. However, only Carr 2017 and Lyons 2017 use quantitative analyses that employ inferential statistics to go beyond descriptive statistics. One prominent area of interest in recent dissertations is that of language policy. Whereas Stoltmann 2016 investigates the effect of policies dating back to 1990, Maldonado 2015 examines how the implementation of de jure and de facto language policies can vary. The following works focus on the linguistic landscapes of various parts of the world: the United States (Carr 2017, Guzmán Valerio 2018, Lyons 2017) and the unincorporated territory of Puerto Rico (Maldonado 2015), Germany (Stoltmann 2016), and Jordan (Al-Naimat 2015, Alomoush 2015). Together, they represent cutting edge research regarding global and local languages used in public and private

spaces, the scripts in which these languages are transcribed, and the collective identities and attitudes of community members, instructors, and passers-by.

**Al-Naimat, Ghazi. 2015. Brand names in the linguistic landscape of Aqaba, Jordan. PhD diss., Univ. of Liverpool.**

This dissertation, under embargo until 2019, investigates brand names, scripts, and languages used in the linguistic landscape of Aqaba, Jordan. Analyzing a corpus of 1,810 signs and interviews with forty-two residents, the author concludes that global brands tend to use Roman scripts to convey messages of prestige, success, and progress, among others, whereas brands using Arabic scripts convey ideas regarding the local community and religious and social practices, among others.

**Alomoush, Omar. 2015. Multilingualism in the linguistic landscape of urban Jordan. PhD diss., Univ. of Liverpool.**

Alomoush explores the use of minority languages in the linguistic landscape and attitudes regarding this use. Through an examination of 8,037 signs and interviews with thirty-two participants, he concludes that minority languages are not frequently seen in signage. Instead, Modern Standard Arabic dominates due to Arab nationalism, along with English which dominates due to globalization. Because it is tied to informal realms, Jordanian Arabic is rarely used in top-down signs.

**Carr, Jhonni Rochelle Charisse. 2017. Signs of our times: Language contact and attitudes in the linguistic landscape of Southeast Los Angeles. PhD diss., Univ. of California, Los Angeles.**

Carr uses interdisciplinary methods to explore the urban signage of three Los Angeles Latinx communities, arguing that the presence—or absence—of Spanish can affect individuals' sense of belonging and solidarity with their community. She further presents a method through which the linguistic population can be reflected in local signage. Data come from a corpus containing images of over forty-five hundred signs and twenty-four semi-directed interviews with Latinx community members.

**Guzmán Valerio, Luis. 2018. Perspectives from the streets and the classrooms in the same 'hood: Linguistic landscapes of Sunset Park, Brooklyn. PhD diss., City Univ. of New York.**

In his dissertation, Guzmán Valerio compares the use of languages in 2,723 images of signs in the Sunset Park neighborhood of Brooklyn with that of 213 images of signs in a local public school. He concludes that, while the majority of signage in both the community and school are in English, Spanish and a combination of English and Spanish are used as a means of political resistance.

**Lyons, Kate. 2017. From street to screen: Linguistic productions of place in San Francisco's Mission District. PhD diss., Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.**

In her 2017 dissertation, Lyons examines San Francisco's Mission District through the filter of Instagram. She explores the ways in which individuals interact with and enact the Mission, concluding that what the Mission represents is constantly changing. The author uses generalized linear regression models and generalized additive models to reveal data such as the most popular words, hashtags, and emojis in 16,756 Instagram posts.

**Maldonado, Mirta. 2015. Implementational spaces for language practice and education policy: A case study of linguistic landscape in Puerto Rico. PhD diss., Univ. of Texas at San Antonio.**

This dissertation compares signage of the city and schools in Guaynabo City, Puerto Rico, in order to reveal its identity as an English-speaking community. The quantitative corpus constitutes 510 signs with 128 signs total coming from forty-nine different schools. The qualitative corpus includes thirty-six interviews with residents from urban (n=26) and rural (n=10) areas lasting between ten and fifteen minutes and twelve interviews with teachers lasting approximately sixty minutes.

**Stoltmann, Kai. 2016. Ausprägung und wahrnehmung der linguistic landscapes von kiel und rostock. PhD diss., Univ. of Kiel.**

Translation: Characteristics and perception of the Linguistic Landscapes of Kiel and Rostock. Stoltmann analyzes the urban space of two German cities that were originally on either side of the Iron Curtain, the barrier dividing eastern and western Europe. With a corpus of over thirty-five hundred images and eighty interviews, the author compares the use and perception of languages of each city and how migration policies influenced them. This dissertation, written in German, would interest scholars of language policies, historical memory, and migration.

---

## **Conferences and Conference Papers**

There are few conferences dedicated solely to the study of linguistic landscapes. The most known one is the Linguistic Landscapes International Workshop, which has taken place since 2008. Several edited collections have stemmed from this conference. The first workshop took place in Tel Aviv in 2008. From here, Shohamy and Gorter 2009 (cited under Edited Collections) was born. Then the following year in 2009, the second workshop occurred in Siena and Shohamy, et al. 2010 arose (cited under Edited Collections). The third workshop occurred in 2010 in Strasbourg, France; Hélot, et al. 2012 (cited under Multilingualism) is a book from several of the presentations. In 2012, the fourth workshop took place in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, and Blackwood, et al. 2016 (cited under Identity) was published. Other edited volumes resulting from more recent workshops are currently being assembled. More recently, additional conferences have been dedicated to the topic. Multilingual Manchester takes place in the United Kingdom, while the International Conference on Linguistic Landscaping (ICLL) was initiated in 2017 in India. However, most conferences on language and linguistics now host panels and individual papers on linguistic landscapes. Examples include the American Association for Applied Linguistics, which had its first conference in 1978, the Georgetown University Round Table, which had its first meeting in 1949, Sociolinguistics Symposium, which first took place in 1976. Some innovative conference presentations have been given at conferences on Spanish linguistics, including the Conference on Spanish in the United States (Carr 2017), the Hispanic Linguistics Symposium (Restrepo Ramos 2017), and the International Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics (see also Carr 2016 in Language Attitudes and Ideologies). These presentations have showcased cutting-edge research in the field.

### **American Association for Applied Linguistics.**

The American Association for Applied Linguistics hosts an annual conference that usually takes place in March and lasts four days. The first conference was in 1978. In 2017, the annual conference contained a panel entitled “Spanish in the Linguistic Landscape of the United States” and at least ten other individual conference presentations pertaining to the linguistic landscape. Linguistic landscape presentations are becoming more and more common.

**Carr, Jhonni Rochelle Charisse. 2017. Perceptions and realities of Spanish in the urban signage of Los Angeles. Presentation at the 26th Conference on Spanish in the United States (SIUS)/11th Conference on Spanish in Contact with Other Languages, Brigham Young Univ., Provo, Utah.**

In this presentation, Carr uses mixed methods to document the languages of the linguistic landscape using a corpus of over forty-five hundred signs and compares this with the perception of these languages’ appearance as discussed in interviews with twenty-four Latinx residents. She demonstrates that the production and perception of Spanish in L.A. signage does not always coincide. In certain areas, residents perceive Spanish as the dominant language when it is in fact English.

### **Georgetown University Round Table.**

Presentations are commonly related to the linguistic landscape at the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics. In 2015, a panel was dedicated to the linguistic landscape (i.e., “The Linguistic Landscape as a Pedagogical Space for Second Language Learning”) along with four other presentations. This annual conference has been around since 1949. Proceedings are published by Georgetown University Press.

### **International Conference on Linguistic Landscaping (ICLL).**

The International Conference on Linguistic Landscaping hosted its first conference in 2017 in Shillong, India. The scope was not limited to local environments, but also encouraged international perspectives. A second meeting has not yet been announced.

### **Linguistic Landscapes International Workshop.**

The annual Linguistic Landscapes International Workshop gathers major scholars in the field. It was first hosted in 2008 in Tel Aviv. Select conference presentations have been published in edited volumes. See Shohamy and Gorter 2009 and Shohamy, et al. 2010, cited under Edited Collections, Hélot, et al. 2012, cited under Multilingualism, and Blackwood, et al. 2016, cited under Identity. Other collections are currently in progress.

### **Restrepo Ramos, Falcon. 2017. Spanish in contact with islander creole. Presentation at the 2017 Hispanic Linguistics Symposium, Texas Tech Univ., Lubbock, Texas.**

Restrepo Ramos investigates Spanish and an English-based creole known as Islander on the archipelago of San Andres, Colombia, to shed light on the local situation of language contact. He demonstrates its complexity by sharing information gathered from ethnographic observations, sociolinguistic interviews, a picture story narration task, and an information gap activity.

### **Multilingual Manchester.**

More recently, in the United Kingdom, Multilingual Manchester has hosted symposia related to the linguistic landscape. In addition to organizing conferences, Multilingual Manchester generates reports and manages the first linguistic landscape app, LinguaSnapp. The project involves undergraduate students in different stages of research including fieldwork and publications.

### **Sociolinguistics Symposium**

This biannual conference attracts scholars from around the globe investigating signage and other aspects of the field of sociolinguistics. At the 2018 conference, for example, there were at least fourteen presentations on the linguistic landscape. Meetings were initially held in the United Kingdom from the conference's inception in 1976, until 2002, when the first meeting in continental Europe took place in Belgium. In 2018, the conference met for the first time outside of Europe in New Zealand.

---

## **Origins of the Field**

Some say the birth of linguistic landscape studies was in Israel, since two of the three first reported linguistic landscape studies took place there: Rosenbaum et al. 1977 and Spolsky and Cooper 1991. However, the field really took off with a study conducted in Canada: Landry and Bourhis 1997. Rosenbaum et al. 1977 was the first study to analyze the language of signs. It examines the spread of English in fifty signs, determining the languages (e.g., English, Hebrew) and scripts used (e.g., Roman, Hebrew). This study contributed an important distinction to the field: whether signs were private (i.e., coming from private offices, shops and restaurants) or public (i.e., coming from government offices and institutions). It found that Roman script occurred more in private signs than in public signs, revealing a gap between the official language policy (i.e., Hebrew-only) and the degree of public, linguistic tolerance in signage of languages other than Hebrew, especially of English. Another early study was Spolsky and Cooper 1991 which analyzed the multilingualism of Jerusalem. Using one hundred signs, the authors established three criteria for which to classify signs. First, they examined the sign's function. For instance, they looked at whether the sign's purpose was to advertise (e.g., Tamales for sale), label a street or a building (e.g., Sunset Boulevard), or if it was a transgressive sign (e.g., graffiti). The second criterion had to do with the type of materials that were used to fashion signs (e.g., wood, metal, paper, glass). Finally, from a linguistic standpoint, they looked at the number of languages in signs, as well as the specific languages present. Landry and Bourhis 1997 is the canonical linguistic landscape article that gave name to the field. In a study of 2,010 Canadian Francophone students, it concludes that public signage contributes to the perception of the value and status of a language within a multilingual society. The study shows how we can use the linguistic landscape as a sign of ethnolinguistic vitality, as one of the ways we can



evaluate a minority language's chance of survival. Finally, two main functions of the linguistic landscape are identified: an informative function and a symbolic function; displayed language can convey both a literal and a symbolic message. Another important, early study was Scollon and Scollon 2003, cited under Key Works. Prior to the establishment of the nomenclature "linguistic landscape," these authors used the term "geosemiotics." Nowadays, some scholars use the term "semiotic landscapes" interchangeably with "linguistic landscapes." Finally, early work also took place in India. See Bhatia 2007 (cited under Key Works), Itagi and Singh 2002 (cited under Edited Collections), and International Conference on Linguistic Landscaping (cited under Conferences and Conference Papers).

**Landry, Rodrigue, and Richard Y. Bourhis. 1997. Linguistic landscape and ethnolinguistic vitality: An empirical study. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 16.1: 23–49.**

This is the canonical linguistic landscape article that gave name to the field. The authors conclude that one of the ways we can evaluate a minority language's chance of survival is by using the linguistic landscape. This publication is also well-known for the distinction between the linguistic landscape's two main types of functions: informative and symbolic; displayed language can share both a literal and a symbolic message.

**Rosenbaum, Yehudit, Elizabeth Nadel, Robert L. Cooper, and Joshua A. Fishman. 1977. English on Keren Kayemet Street. In *The spread of English: The sociology of English as an additional language*. Edited by Joshua A. Fishman, Roberts L. Cooper, and Andrew W. Conrad, 179–196. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.**

This book chapter was the first documented study to analyze the language of signs. The authors analyzed script choice and the spread of English on a single street using fifty images of signs from shops, restaurants, and private and government offices. Through interviews, they also discovered that English was used in Israeli signage as a way of indexing modernity, internationalism, and technology.

**Spolsky, Bernard, and Robert L. Cooper. 1991. *The languages of Jerusalem*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.**

Spolsky and Cooper dedicate part of this book to the analysis of the multilingualism of Jerusalem through its linguistic landscape. They classified one hundred signs using three types of criteria: functional, material, and linguistic natures. That is, they answered questions such as: What is the purpose of this sign? What material is the sign made of? What language(s) are used in the sign?

---

## Innovative Methodologies

The classification of the language of signage or its code preference has been a popular method from the very beginning of the field. However, one challenge to this endeavor is the presence of company names, logos, and brands such as Levi's, Vans, or Tommy Hilfiger. Tufi and Blackwood 2010 outlines how this classification is a problem using the example of the brand name "Diesel" which could be considered Italian, English, German, French or even a form of international language (p. 199). The authors then present their own process for determining the code preference of trademarks. Franco-Rodríguez 2009 takes note of another issue, which the author later remedied. Classifying entire signs can be problematic because many times there are different sections of signs that each serve their own purposes. The author proposed a unique way to categorize signs that parallels Landry and Bourhis 1997 (cited under Origins of the Field) which discusses the informative and symbolic functions of signs. Finally, a more recent study, Szabó and Troyer 2017, tackles the observer-observed dichotomy, instead showcasing the interaction between researcher and participant as a way of co-constructing ideas of the linguistic landscape and space. It presents a multimodal methodology for ethnographic research. Together, these three studies represent some of the innovative directions in which the field is going.

**Franco-Rodríguez, José M. 2009. Interpreting the linguistic traits of linguistic landscapes as ethnolinguistic vitality: Methodological approach. *Revista Electrónica de Lingüística Aplicada* 8: 1–15.**

Franco-Rodríguez proposes two possible sections of a sign, or linguistic landscape text: the main section and the informative section. He describes how the informative section has an informational function and therefore gets across a communicative message. This, in turn,

relates to the status of ethnolinguistic vitality of the language used. He also includes an in-depth linguistic analysis of linguistic landscape texts.

**Szabó, T., and R. Troyer. 2017. Inclusive ethnographies: Beyond the binaries of observer and observed in linguistic landscape studies. *Linguistic Landscape: An International Journal* 3.3: 306–326.**

Szabó and Troyer review current literature related to walking-based methods and present a new methodology for ethnographic linguistic landscape research. Unlike typical one-sided interviews in which solely the researcher gathers information, using the proposed methodology, their interactions “become woven into the history of the landscape and . . . alter the participant’s future understanding of the place and possibly their agentive role in its modification” (p. 323).

**Tufi, Stefania, and Robert J. Blackwood. 2010. Trademarks in the linguistic landscape: Methodological and theoretical challenges in qualifying brand names in the public space. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 7.3: 197–210.**

This article argues for the inclusion of difficult-to-categorize logos, brand names, and trademarks (e.g., McDonalds, Coca Cola, L’Oréal) in linguistic landscape research, putting forth a framework to do so. Tufi and Blackwood argue for analyzing trademarks in a different way than other language: (1) code them as trademarks, (2) identify the language of representation, and (3) identify the country of representation.

---

## Applications and Approaches in the Field

Since the publication of the canonical article Landry and Bourhis 1997 (cited under Origins of the Field), there has been a surge in scholarship regarding the linguistic landscape. Now, with the institution of its own conference, journal, and scholars, it is arguably its own field. However, since it is by nature interdisciplinary, the camp incorporates theories and methodologies from outside disciplines. Its very name, “linguistic landscape,” references two other domains: linguistics and geography. Indeed, the field has strong roots (conceivably its deepest roots) in linguistics. It is also deep-seated in anthropology, political science, education, and the intersection or overlap of these disciplines. The following subsections examine how different scholars have approached the study of public signage with focuses on multilingualism, minority languages, and the presence of English, in addition to theories and methodologies stemming from anthropology, political science, and education.

### Multilingualism

The field of linguistic landscape studies began with quantitative approaches documenting language use and predominance in public signage. This section reflects these approaches, describing two important edited volumes, a book chapter, and four journal articles centering on multilingualism in the linguistic landscape. Gorter 2006 was originally published as an individual article in a special issue of the *International Journal of Multilingualism* (cited under Journals). Major scholars in the field completed the works in this volume, investigating multilingual situations in the signage of large cities in Israel, Japan, the Netherlands, Spain, and Thailand. Hélot, et al. 2012 arises from presentations given at the third Linguistic Landscapes International Workshop (cited under Conferences and Conference Papers) which took place in 2010. In this edited volume, authors examine multilingualism in the context of art, religion, education, literacy, policy, and migration in countries such as Europe, Israel, Ethiopia, Gambia, the United States, and Canada. The final section of this collection is most relevant to the study of multilingualism. Shohamy 2012 provides a literature review of the field as related to multilingualism. This piece situates the camp in terms of vocabulary, theories, methods, and interdisciplinary study. Reh 2004 examines multilingualism in the linguistic landscape of the Lira Municipality in Uganda. The author describes the relationship between multiple languages on signs, citing four possibilities: duplicating, fragmentary, overlapping, and complementary. While the majority of linguistic landscape scholarship examines signs individually, Gorter and Cenoz 2015 offers an approach to analyze the overall situation of languages in the urban signage using the notion of translanguaging. While early studies used smaller corpuses, the invention of digital cameras have facilitated the collection of larger corpuses. With these larger data sets came the possibility of conducting statistical analyses. Examples of such approaches in this section are the following: Barker and Giles 2004, in which a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) test is used; Magnini, et al. 2011, which used *t* tests; and Soukup 2016, in which linear mixed effects models are used. While this approach did not flourish until more recently, Landry and Bourhis 1997 (cited under Origins of the Field) did use statistical procedures (i.e., factor analyses and regression analyses) to analyze their data. Carr 2017

(cited under Recent Dissertations) is an additional example of a study employing inferential statistics, this time in order to predict the arrangement of Spanish and English in signs.

**Barker, Valerie, and Howard Giles. 2004. English-only policies: Perceived support and social limitation. *Language & Communication* 24.1: 77–95.**

Barker and Giles examine the intersection of language policies, immigration, and English-only policies. They examine data collected via telephone surveys in Santa Barbara, California, to demonstrate the relationship between the presence of Spanish in the linguistic landscape and support for the English-only movement.

**Gorter, Durk. 2006, ed. *Linguistic landscape: A new approach to multilingualism*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.**

This was one of the early edited volumes to come out regarding linguistic landscapes. In this short book, the urban signage of large cities in the countries of Israel, Japan, the Netherlands, Spain, and Thailand is analyzed by leading scholars in the field. The book's contents were originally published as a special issue of the *International Journal of Multilingualism* (cited under Journals).

**Gorter, Durk, and Jasone Cenoz. 2015. Translanguaging and linguistic landscapes. *Linguistic Landscape: An International Journal* 1.1–2: 54–74.**

As opposed to analyzing individual signs, in this article Gorter and Cenoz offer an innovative approach, employing the concept of translanguaging to examine multiple signs and the co-existence of languages (e.g., Basque, English, and Spanish) in the linguistic landscape of Donostia-San Sebastián.

**Hélot, Christine, Monica Barni, Rudi Janssens, and Carla Bagna, eds. 2012. *Linguistic landscapes, multilingualism and social change*. Vol. 16. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.**

This edited volume is the result of presentations from the third Linguistic Landscapes International Workshop (cited under Conferences and Conference Papers) which took place in 2010. It contains nineteen chapters divided into five parts: Linguistic Landscape and Language Policy, Linguistic Landscapes as Language of Dissent, Linguistic Landscapes and Linguaging, “Reading” the Linguistic Landscape in Different Contexts, Linguistic Landscape and the Mapping of Multilingualism.

**Magnini, Vincent P., Todd Miller, and BeomCheol (Peter) Kim. 2011. The psychological effects of foreign-language restaurant signs on potential diners. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research* 35.1: 24–44.**

Magnini, Miller, and Kim use an innovative methodology to examine how the linguistic landscape can influence restaurant customers. In an experiment with 105 students, approximately half participated in a virtual tour of a Mexican restaurant with English advertising, while the other half saw the same restaurant but with Spanish signage. Those that saw English signage considered the restaurant more “down-to-earth” and contemporary than those that were presented with Spanish signage.

**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.**

This article is well known for its taxonomies regarding the multilingual landscape and translations therein. The author describes four types of configurations of signs with multiple languages: duplicating, fragmentary, overlapping, and complementary. Data come from Lira Town, Uganda.

**Shohamy, Elana. 2012. Linguistic landscapes and multilingualism. In *The Routledge handbook of multilingualism*. Edited by Marilyn Martin-Jones, Adrian Blackledge, and Angela Creese, 538–551. New York: Routledge.**

This article provides a comprehensive overview of the field of linguistic landscape studies and how it relates to multilingualism. It discusses how the field is developing related to terminology, theories, methodologies, and areas of study. Topics include the intersection of the linguistic landscape with semiotics, language policy, education, anthropology, and sociology.

**Soukup, Barbara. 2016. English in the linguistic landscape of Vienna, Austria (ELLViA): Outline, rationale, and methodology of a large-scale empirical project on language choice on public signs from the perspective of sign-readers. *Vienna English Working Papers* 25: 1–24.**

In this methodological proposal, Soukup describes three modules to “investigate meaning-making in the LL from the sign-readers’ perspective” (p. 8). The first module analyzes language choice in 17,214 signs, while the second looks at how the Viennese public perceives language variation by using a lexical decision task and measuring the participants’ reaction times. Finally, questionnaires and focus groups are used to study how social meanings of displayed languages are understood.

## Global English

The study of English in multilingual linguistic landscapes has been a popular subfield of study from early on. Some works have analyzed the functions English plays in urban signage. For example, Piller 2003 finds that English indexes modernity and progress in German advertisements, whereas other languages are used to index ethnocultural stereotypes. In another study, this time in Mexico, Baumgardner 2006 also finds the use of English to index modernity, along with its association with technology. Martin 2006 examines the presence of English in French advertising via a corpus of seven thousand ads, showing that English is commonly blended with the French language in order to create a hybrid identity that draws on both local and global identities. A foundational study to the field, Ben-Rafael, et al. 2006 is a language inventory in different areas of Israel, looking at the use and predominance of English, Arabic, and Hebrew in local signage. The authors show that Israel’s linguistic landscape (LL) was contested between groups that spoke those languages, and that it was not a reflection of the different local, ethnolinguistic communities, but rather an outcome of a negotiation process between them. The authors posit that the configuration of the LL is a symbolic construction of the public space. Their study demonstrates that prestige, power, and other factors can play a larger role than demographic influence in determining the language of public signage. More recently, Lee 2014 drew attention to the fact that the presence of non-standard English use in non-English-speaking contexts is frequently misinterpreted as grammatical mistakes rather than as deliberate intentions. Lee effectively argues for global Englishes to be considered not necessarily as imprecise L2 speech, but rather as instances of linguistic creativity or new types of usage that employ different strategies than those by L1 speakers.

**Baumgardner, Robert J. 2006. The appeal of English in Mexican commerce. *World Englishes* 25.2: 251–266.**

Baumgardner investigates English use in Mexican commerce as seen in business and product names, newspapers, and magazines. He further analyzes interviews with Mexican businessmen to examine language attitudes toward English, finding that use of the language is prominent in the business community due to its associations of technological authority and modernity.

**Ben-Rafael, Eliezer, Elana Shohamy, Muhammad Hasan Amara, and Nira Trumper-Hecht. 2006. Linguistic landscape as symbolic construction of the public space: The case of Israel. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 3.1: 7–30.**

In this pioneering article, the authors examine the use and predominance of Hebrew, Arabic, and English in signage in Israel. They showed that the languages spoken in the local areas were not equally represented in signage and that instead Hebrew was the dominant language. This led the authors to argue that the configuration of the linguistic landscape is a symbolic construction of the public space.

**Lee, Jerry W. 2014. Transnational linguistic landscapes and the transgression of metadiscursive regimes of language. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* 11.1: 50–74.**

Lee uses examples from linguistic landscapes in South Korea and the Koreatowns of Los Angeles and New York to urge readers to consider alternative interpretations of perceived incorrect English usage in non-English-speaking contexts. That is, global Englishes should

not be considered imprecise L2 speech, but rather new types of usage that employ different strategies than those of L1 speakers.

**Martin, Elizabeth. 2006. *Marketing identities through language: English and global imagery in French advertising*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.**

In her book, Martin showcases the function English has in global marketing campaigns directed at the French. Even though mixing languages in media is regulated through legislation, companies continue including English. In an impressive corpus of seven thousand advertisements, the author investigates concepts such as identity and resistance to global English, in addition to language mixing and translation.

**Piller, Ingrid. 2003. Advertising as a site of language contact. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 23: 170–183.**

While Piller does not reference the specific phenomenon of the linguistic landscape in this article, she establishes a part of this field (i.e., advertisements) as a legitimate arena for the study of language contact. The author also shows how multilingualism is used in different forms in ads to index identities: English is used to index modernity and progress, whereas other languages are used to index ethnocultural stereotypes.

## Minority Languages

As multilingualism has been a strong area of study in the field of linguistic landscapes, so has the examination of minority languages in situations of contact. This section contains an article (Cenoz and Gorter 2006), an edited collection (Gorter, et al. 2012), and a book chapter (Troyer, et al. 2015). While two of the works focus on the linguistic landscape of European regions, Troyer, et al. 2015 investigates the small town of Independence, Oregon. Cenoz and Gorter 2006 shows that the implementation of local language policies can have a difference in the frequency with which a language is displayed in signage. Troyer, et al. 2015 demonstrates that attitudes and socioeconomic differences can lead for an ethnic minority to have a desire to not stand out and to instead pass unperceived in a society, even if this means using their heritage language less. Gorter, et al. 2012 provides a comprehensive guide to research conducted on the linguistic landscape and minority languages. The eighteen chapters contain studies related to the intersection of these topics and language ideologies, language policies, the distribution of languages, and innovative theoretical and methodological approaches. Together, the three works mentioned in this section underscore the importance of linguistic diversity and discuss how the presence of minority languages in the linguistic landscape is strongly tied to group identity and ethnolinguistic vitality.

**Cenoz, Jasone, and Durk Gorter. 2006. Linguistic landscape and minority languages. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 3.1: 67–80.**

This article compares the linguistic landscape of two European cities in light of regional language policies. Basque enjoys a stronger promotion in Donostia-San Sebastian than Frisian does in Ljouwert-Leeuwarden and is consequently seen more frequently in signage. Interestingly, this is despite the fact that oral Frisian proficiency levels are higher than those of Basque.

**Gorter, Durk, Heiko F. Marten, and Luk Van Mensel, eds. 2012. *Minority languages in the linguistic landscape*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.**

This edited volume addresses the linguistic landscape and minority languages, considering the latter not from a numerical perspective, but rather an imbalance in power relations. There are four parts: Language Ideologies and Linguistic Landscape, Linguistic Landscape and Language Policy, The Distributive Approach to Linguistic Landscape, and Fresh Perspectives on Linguistic Landscape. Color images can be found on a companion website. Case studies include those in Europe, Israel, and Brunei.

**Troyer, Robert A., Carmen Cáceda, and Patricia Giménez Eguívar. 2015. Unseen Spanish in small-town America: A minority language in the linguistic landscape. In *Conflict, exclusion and dissent in the linguistic landscape*. Edited by Rani Ruby and Selim**

**Ben Said, 52–76. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.**

Troyer, Cáceda, and Giménez Eguibar examine the linguistic landscape of a small Oregonian town that has a Spanish-speaking population of 35 percent. They find that Spanish is used in 11 percent of signage, mostly stemming from Mexican restaurants and businesses, as well as convenience stores. The authors attribute the lack of Spanish in signage to the group's lower socioeconomic status and negative attitudes regarding the ethnic minority as discussed in interviews they conducted.

## Anthropology

Linguistic landscapes have also been studied from anthropological perspectives. A more recent focus in the field is on the reactions and sentiments evoked by the presence and absence of particular written languages in the public space. Key works by scholars that have analyzed these topics are included in *Language Attitudes and Ideologies*. The study of identities—personal, collective, regional, and national—is a related area of interest in the field. Some scholars are interested in the impact of displayed language on these identities in addition to the manipulation of displayed language with the goal of indexing particular identities. Significant publications are cited in *Identity*. One technique for understanding language attitudes and ideologies as well as different identities is that of ethnographic methods. Important studies using this methodology in studies regarding the linguistic landscape are reviewed in *Ethnography*.

## Language Attitudes and Ideologies

Some studies have focused on how the linguistic landscape can be an effective tool in getting at language attitudes and ideologies. One example of this can be found in Garvin 2010, where the author conducted walking tours to ascertain locals' reactions to minority languages in the Memphis linguistic landscape. This area had been undergoing much change due to a recent, heavy flow of transnational migration. During the walking tour, Garvin had informants report their understandings and visual perceptions of multilingual signage. She argues that the linguistic landscape (LL) triggers emotional responses, and that reactions to signage are never neutral. Instead, the LL elicits emotional and psychological statements of belonging and identity in time and place. This contribution has greatly added to the field in inspiring more interaction with and analysis of the point of view of sign-onlookers and passers-by. Carr 2016 also contains interviews that were conducted on the go, but this time in a single Hollywood metro car that contained multilingual signage. The author analyzed interviews with Anglo and Latinx participants regarding feelings toward signage in Spanish. In addition to varying degrees of English-only attitudes, her informants mentioned their appreciation of the use of Spanish in the linguistic landscape and in the public sphere in general. The poor quality of translation, however, was widely commented upon. Latinx participants referenced sentiments of cultural and linguistic disrespect. These results lead Carr to argue for the impact local signage can have on different groups, especially minority groups. In a study in Dingle, Ireland, Moriarty 2014 discovered conflicting linguistic ideologies. Interviews revealed a local attitude in favor of multilingual, in addition to a more national attitude that associated a single language with each nation. Relatedly, Hornsby and Vigers 2012 demonstrates that the linguistic landscape can contribute to negative attitudes regarding minority languages, even when the goal in status planning is to promote them. Finally, Dailey, et al. 2005 considers the role of the linguistic landscape in Anglo and Latinx judgements of Anglo- and Hispanic-accented speakers. In their study of 190 participants, the authors found that Anglo raters did not seem to be affected by the presence or absence of Spanish, whereas Latinx raters evaluated Anglo-accented speakers more positively when the English language occurred more frequently in signage, and more negatively when Spanish was more common in signage. These studies represent an important direction in the field of linguistic landscape studies: one toward language attitudes and ideologies.

**Carr, Jhonni Rochelle Charisse. 2016. *En la Línea Roja: Language attitudes regarding the linguistic landscape of a Hollywood metro cabin*. Presentation at the 8th International Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics, Río Piedras, Puerto Rico.**

This study examines language attitudes through the lens of linguistic landscapes. Interviews were conducted with ten Anglo and Latinx participants regarding the use of Spanish and English in the signage of a single metro car on the red line in Hollywood. Responses reflected varying degrees of English-only attitudes, an appreciation of the use of Spanish in local signage, and also sentiments of resentment and feelings of cultural and linguistic disrespect.

**Dailey, René M., Howard Giles, and Laura L. Jansma. 2005. Language attitudes in an Anglo-Hispanic context: The role of the linguistic landscape. *Language & Communication* 25.1: 27–38.**

In this study, 190 Anglo and Latino informants listened to a radio announcement and assessed Anglo- and Hispanic-accented speakers. Hispanics were found to be considerably influenced by their LL: the more Spanish appeared in the signage of their area, the poorer Anglo-accented individuals were rated. Conversely, the more English was present in the LL, the higher Anglo-accented individuals were rated. Anglo raters' judgments were not affected by the linguistic landscape.

**Garvin, Rebecca T. 2010. Responses to the linguistic landscape in Memphis, Tennessee: An urban space in transition. In *Linguistic landscape in the city*. Edited by Elana G. Shohamy, Eliezer Ben-Rafael, and Monica Barni, 252–271. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.**

Garvin is known as the pioneer for participatory interviews regarding the linguistic landscape, a technique that has grown in popularity in the field. In this attitudinal study, she used “postmodern walking tour interviews” to capture locals' reactions to migrant and minority language discourses in the Memphis linguistic landscape. She argues that the LL triggers emotional responses, and that reactions to signage are never neutral. Instead, the LL elicits emotional and psychological statements of belonging and identity in time and place.

**Hornsby, Michael, and Dick Vigers. 2012. Minority semiotic landscapes: An ideological minefield? In *Minority languages in the linguistic landscape*. Edited by Durk Gorter, Heiko F. Marten, and Luke Van Mensel, 57–73. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.**

Hornsby and Vigers examine language ideologies and the linguistic landscape by analyzing responses from semi-structured interviews regarding ten photographs of the linguistic landscape in Scotland and in Wales. They conclude that even though status planning has been successful in promoting the minority language, it could also be responsible for contributing to negative attitudes toward the language.

**Moriarty, Máiréad. 2014. Contesting language ideologies in the linguistic landscape of an Irish tourist town. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 18.5: 464–477.**

In this study, Moriarty investigates the linguistic landscape of Dingle, Ireland, and ideologies toward the Irish language. She discovers two competing ideologies: a local one that promotes the use of different languages (i.e., ideology of multilingualism) and a state one that is in line with the “one nation, one language” ideology. Data comes from interviews with tourists, signage, and ethnographic field notes.

## Identity

As language is so inextricably tied to identity, so is the linguistic landscape. Several works have investigated how social, national, and group identities are intertwined with displayed, public language. Piller 2010, for example, shows how the sex industry in Switzerland uses the linguistic landscape to portray their identity as one that is clean and upper scale. Lanza and Woldemariam 2014 also looks at group identity, but from a national point of view. The authors find that businesses in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, frequently use English and clone the design of English-speaking businesses as a way to portray their orientation to modernity. Taylor-Leech 2012 takes a historical approach to compare how Timor-Leste's colonial past has an effect on the linguistic landscape of its capital city, Dili. The article investigates how the appearance of English, Tetum, Portuguese, and Indonesian in signage obeys or disobeys language policies and reveals social and national identities. More recently, the first comprehensive volume on the linguistic landscape and identities was published. In Blackwood, et al. 2016, nearly half of the case studies in the book come from African countries (e.g., cities in Egypt, Tunisia, South Africa, and Ethiopia) due to the fact that the chapters stem from presentations at the fourth Linguistic Landscapes International Workshop, held in Ethiopia 2012. The other half of studies come from countries outside of the African continent (e.g., Moldova, Belarus, France, South Korea, and the United States). This diverse volume in terms of theory, methods, areas of study, and items of study is sure to be of interest to a wide range of scholars.

**Blackwood, Robert J., Elizabeth Lanza, and Hirut Woldemariam, eds. 2016. *Negotiating and contesting identities in linguistic landscapes*. London: Bloomsbury.**

This book stems from the fourth Linguistic Landscapes International Workshop in 2012. It contains several black and white images and has five sections: Political and Economic Dimensions of Identity Constructions in the Linguistic Landscape, Protest and Contestation of Identities in the Linguistic Landscape, Negotiating Regional and National Identities, Negotiating Collective Identities, and Identity Constructions from a Comparative Perspective.

**Lanza, Elizabeth, and Hirut Woldemariam. 2014. Indexing modernity: English and branding in the linguistic landscape of Addis Ababa. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 18.5: 491–506.**

Lanza and Woldemariam examine the effects of globalization and an increase of English in the linguistic landscape of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, using data from ethnographic interviews with business owners and managers and images of the linguistic landscape. By cloning international brands and using locally prestigious English, regional companies project a national identity that is modern.

**Piller, Ingrid. 2010. Sex in the city: On making space and identity in travel spaces. In *Semiotic landscapes: Language, image, space*. Edited by Adam Jaworski and Crispin Thurlow, 123–136. London: Continuum.**

Piller combines data from the urban linguistic landscape with the landscape of the Internet (i.e., websites and blogs) in order to study the group identity of the Basel, Switzerland, sex industry. The sex industry is positioned as clean and classy by highlighting prostitutes' conversational skills, advertising them as multilingual and educated, which contrasts with earlier portrayals of the sex industry which did not emphasize conversational ability.

**Taylor-Leech, Kerry J. 2012. Language choice as an index of identity: Linguistic landscape in Dili, Timor-Leste. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 9.1: 15–34.**

Taylor-Leech investigates language as a marker of identity in the linguistic landscape of the capital city of the new nation of Timor-Leste in light of the country's colonial past. The author uses data from official and non-official signage to discuss social and national identities and also evaluate if local language policies are obeyed or violated.

## **Ethnography**

This section contains books, book chapters, and a journal article that investigate the linguistic landscape using ethnographic methodologies. Blommaert 2013 shares the author's insider perspective of his own neighborhood located in Antwerp, Belgium. Blommaert incorporates ethnographic and superdiversity theories and methodologies to demonstrate how we can gain insight into the complex histories of a place through a reading of its signs. Relatedly, Lou 2016 also shows how an analysis of the linguistic landscape can give us a glimpse into the history of communities. The author examines the signage of Washington, DC's Chinatown, presenting an analysis of the linguistic landscape from the perspective of individuals that visit and those that live in an area, in addition to the local organizers and urban planners. She uses ethnographic data stemming from interviews conducted with visitors and residents, as well as observations of community meetings and local policy. Furthermore, two of the entries in this section are book chapters. Juffermans and Coppoolse 2012 discusses the strategies used by individuals of differing literacy competencies in understanding the linguistic landscape of the West African country of Gambia. Its data comes from twenty ethnographic interviews conducted with villagers of varying literacy backgrounds. Next, Malinowski 2009 uses a multimodal analysis of signage in order to give us an overall picture of the sociolinguistic situation in an area of Oakland, California. It analyzes data from the linguistic landscape, ethnographic interviews with Korean American business owners, walking tours, participant observation, and mapping activities in order to examine how and why sign authors select a particular language to use in signage. Ultimately, it shows that they do not always have full control of how onlookers read and understand signs. Finally, Pietikäinen 2014 examines the local signage of an indigenous Sámi village in Scandinavia. Pietikäinen addresses the linguistic landscape's temporal and spatial dimensions by making use of Bakhtin's notion of the chronotope. Moreover, Szabó and Troyer 2017 is a relevant entry related to ethnographic methods in the linguistic landscape (cited under Innovative Methodologies).

**Blommaert, Jan. 2013. *Ethnography, superdiversity and linguistic landscapes*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.**

Blommaert combines an ethnographic approach with one of superdiversity to reveal how we can gain an understanding of the multiple histories of a place by reading the linguistic landscape. The chapters include "Introduction: New Sociolinguistic Landscapes"; "Historical Bodies and Historical Space"; "Semiotic and Spatial Scope"; "Signs, Practices, People"; "Change and Transformation"; "The Vatican of the Diaspora"; and "Conclusion: The Order of Superdiversity."



**Juffermans, Kasper, and Jannet Coppoolse. 2012. How literate, low-literate and non-literate readers read the linguistic landscape in a Gambian village. In *Linguistic landscapes, multilingualism and social change*. Edited by Christine Hélot, Monica Barni, Rudi Janssens, and Carla Bagna, 233–248. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.**

Juffermans and Coppoolse explore how individuals of differing literacy competencies understand the linguistic landscape. Relying on ethnographic interviews with twenty villagers of varying backgrounds, the authors uncover the interpretive strategies used in the interpretation of signage in the West African country of Gambia.

**Lou, Jackie J. 2016. *The linguistic landscape of Chinatown: A sociolinguistic ethnography*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.**

Lou presents a fascinating analysis of the linguistic landscape of Washington, DC's Chinatown from the perspective of residents and visitors, in addition to the local organizers and urban planners. The six chapters are "Conceptualizing Linguistic Landscape: Language, Space and Place"; "Approaching Chinatown: Background and Methodology"; "Chinatown as Heterotopia: Urban Revitalization Through Linguistic Landscape"; "Situating Linguistic Landscape in Time"; "Situating Linguistic Landscape in Space"; and "Conclusion and Reflection."

**Malinowski, David. 2009. Authorship in the linguistic landscape: A multimodal-performative view. In *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery*. Edited by Elana G. Shohamy and Durk Gorter, 107–125. New York: Routledge.**

Malinowski investigates sign authors and their motivations for language choice in Oakland signage through a multimodal analysis of signage. His data come from ethnographic interviews with Korean American business owners, in addition to walking tours, participant observation, mapping activities, and an analysis of signage. He incorporates theories of multimodal semiosis and performativity in language to reveal that authors don't always have full control of how signage is read.

**Pietikäinen, Sari. 2014. Spatial interaction in Sámiland: Regulative and transitory chronotopes in the dynamic multilingual landscape of an indigenous Sámi village. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 18.5: 478–490.**

Pietikäinen takes us to Scandinavia to investigate signage in an indigenous Sámi village. She incorporates Bakhtin's idea of the chronotope in order to study the linguistic landscape's temporal and spatial dimensions.

## Language Policy and Planning

Some claim that linguistic landscape studies originated under the umbrella of political science with studies regarding language policies (see Shohamy and Gorter 2009, cited under Edited Collections). The fields of linguistic landscape studies and language policy and planning are directly related in that language policies are frequently aimed, not only at spoken language, but also toward written and posted language. For instance, Quebec has a language policy that forbids the predominance of English and other languages in signs. The law dictates that French must always be markedly predominant. Linguistic landscape researchers have studied the different language policies toward written, public language to see if and how they are obeyed and in what areas. For example, see Landry and Bourhis 1997 (cited under Origins of the Field). Another example can be seen in this section in a study regarding language conflict in Kyiv, Ukraine. Here, Pavlenko 2012 discusses how a new policy making Ukrainian the official state language generated a situation of diglossia. The official monolingual language policy is obeyed more generally in formal contexts such as government-funded signage; in this context, mostly Ukrainian is used. However, in informal circumstances, individual choice is reflected more in unofficial signage like shop signs and graffiti, where both Ukrainian and Russian are used. Barni and Bagna 2010, on the other hand, shows how immigration can have an effect on the languages displayed in an area, but also argues that this is but one of the important factors that affect linguistic diversity. Chun 2014 tackles the topic of transgressive signage, as witnessed in the 2011 Occupy Movements, arguing that this category should be opened up to include not only illegal signage such as graffiti, but also signs that go against the status quo such as protest signage. Furthermore, language attitudes can be revealed through studying language policies. For instance, Lanza and Woldemariam 2009 addresses issues of the linguistic landscape and language ideologies regarding a changing language policy. It studies the linguistic landscape (LL) in the regional capital of Mekele in Ethiopia, where three languages are in use: Tigrinya, the official regional language; Amharic, the national working language, and English. The challenge in analyzing the LL of an area in the light of language ideology is to understand the interplay between the language user's

choices as a result of his/her conditioned view of the world through habitus or as a result of a rational actor's calculations as Tigrinya, Amharic, and English compete in the public space. The display of certain languages and the lack of others provide a clear ideological message as to the value, relevance, and priority of the languages.

**Barni, Monica, and Carla Bagna. 2010. Linguistic landscape and language vitality. In *Linguistic landscape in the city*. Edited by Elana G. Shohamy, Eliezer Ben-Rafael, and Monica Barni, 3–18. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.**

Barni and Bagna provide evidence that a language's presence in signage doesn't always coincide with its vitality. They also conclude that linguistic policy can have an effect on a language's vitality, especially when it is a minority language. In Italy, laws were passed with the alleged goal of keeping Italian citizens safe. However, local politicians have used these laws to limit linguistic and cultural diversity.

**Chun, Christian W. 2014. Mobilities of a linguistic landscape at Los Angeles City Hall Park. *Journal of Language and Politics* 13.4: 653–674.**

The ethnographic data for this article come from Chun's participation in the 2011 Occupy Movements. Here he makes a strong case for amplifying the category of transgressive signage to include protest signs, which, unlike graffiti and illegal postings, are more transgressive in content rather than in material form. He further analyzes the physical and digital journey of three signs and their paths to YouTube, a blog, and a political cartoon.

**Lanza, Elizabeth, and Hirut Woldemariam. 2009. Language ideology and linguistic landscape: Language policy and globalization in a regional capital of Ethiopia. In *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery*. Edited by Elana Shohamy and Durk Gorter, 189–205. New York: Routledge**

In this chapter, Lanza and Woldemariam analyze a changing language policy and related ideologies in Mekele, Ethiopia, regarding the use of three languages: Tigrinya, Amharic, and English. Amharic was the official language in Ethiopia until 1991, when it was decided that local governments could independently determine the language of instruction. The authors observe regional Tigrinya as the dominant language in their corpus of 376 signs.

**Pavlenko, Aneta. 2012. Transgression as the norm: Russian in linguistic landscape of Kyiv, Ukraine. In *Minority languages in the linguistic landscape*. Edited by Durk Gorter, Heiko F. Marten, and Luke Van Mensel, 36–56. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.**

In a study regarding language conflict in Kyiv, Ukraine, Pavlenko discusses how a new policy making Ukrainian the official state language generated a situation of diglossia. The official monolingual language policy is obeyed more generally in formal contexts such as government-funded signage. However, in informal circumstances, individual choice is reflected more in unofficial signage like shop signs and graffiti, where both Ukrainian and Russian are used.

## Education

As an interdisciplinary camp, linguistic landscape studies has several implications as well as applications. Multiple scholar-instructors have implemented linguistic landscape (LL) investigations as part of their curriculums for teaching a particular language, culture or even political-themed course. LL studies is consistently receiving more attention in the field of language education. For instance, Dagenais, et al. 2008 argues that incorporating language awareness in the classroom, in addition to adding new or reinforcing present knowledge regarding the language, helps promote the learning of other issues such as “the evolution of languages, relationships between languages, as well as a critical stance on the relative status of language” (p. 141). One way the authors propose to do this was to include linguistic landscape projects in classes. The linguistic landscape can even have an effect on its observers' usage of particular languages. Cenoz and Gorter 2008 analyzes the role of the LL in second language acquisition, focusing on acquiring pragmatic competence, multimodal literacy skills, and multicompetence. It determines that the LL provides an excellent source of input and learning context for second language learners, and that it can also help open students' eyes to the linguistic diversity in particular areas, promoting language awareness, which Dagenais, et al. 2008 expresses is pedagogically critical to the language classroom. Shohamy and Waksman 2009 discusses how, in addition to

functioning as input for the second language learner, the linguistic landscape can operate as an educational tool for linguistic and political activism. An additional example of utilizing the linguistic landscape for pedagogical purposes can be found in Sayer 2010. The author shows how he used the LL for teaching English as a foreign language to students in Oaxaca, Mexico. Sayer describes a small-scale research project that he carried out to look into the English language's social functions in the LL. Sayer found different uses of English according to social identities and context and proposes that students can take on the role of "language investigator" and conduct projects similar to this one. Finally, Malinowski 2015 gives a review of the literature on utilizing the linguistic landscape in the classroom, adding to the discussion the concept of thirdness. He argues that rather than considering a single perspective such as perceived space or what students observe when visiting and photographing sites, that they also consider lived space by interacting with local residents and vendors, in addition to conceived space by comparing multiple perspectives with how the local area is presented in different forms of media as well. In general, Malinowski 2015 shows how triangulation paints a more detailed picture of the realities of the linguistic landscape which can enhance student learning.

**Cenoz, Jasone, and Durk Gorter. 2008. The linguistic landscape as an additional source of input in second language acquisition. *IRAL - International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 46.3: 257–276.**

Cenoz and Gorter show how the linguistic landscape can be a helpful tool in students' acquisition of pragmatic competence, multimodal literacy skills, and multicompetence. As a source of input and learning context for second language learners, the linguistic landscape also helps to open students' eyes to the linguistic diversity of particular areas, promoting language awareness.

**Dagenais, Diane, Nathalie Walsh, Françoise Armand, and Erica Marillet. 2008. Collaboration and co-construction of knowledge during language awareness activities in Canadian elementary school. *Language Awareness* 17.2: 139–155.**

Dagenais, Walsh, Armand, and Marillet argue that incorporating language awareness in the classroom, in addition to adding new or reinforcing present knowledge regarding the language, helps promote the learning of other issues such as "the evolution of languages, relationships between languages, as well as a critical stance on the relative status of language" (p. 141). One way they proposed to do this was to include linguistic landscape projects in classes.

**Malinowski, David. 2015. Opening spaces of learning in the linguistic landscape. *Linguistic Landscape: An International Journal* 1.1–2: 95–113.**

Malinowski provides a valuable overview of methods for using the linguistic landscape in the language classroom for linguistic, cultural, and political pedagogical purposes. He maintains that the concept of thirdness is productive in using the linguistic landscape as an educational tool, encouraging instructors to consider incorporating perceived space, lived space, and conceived space.

**Sayer, Peter. 2010. Using the linguistic landscape as a pedagogical resource. *ELT Journal* 64.2: 143–154.**

Sayer presents a project in which he identifies six uses of English according to social identities and contexts: English as advanced and sophisticated, fashionable, cool, sexy, loving, and for expressing subversive identities. He proposes that students can take on the role of "language investigator" and conduct projects similar to this one, which connects them with the outside world via the linguistic landscape.

**Shohamy, Elana, and Shoshi Waksman. 2009. Linguistic landscape as an ecological arena: Modalities, meanings, negotiations, education. In *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery*. Edited by Elana Shohamy and Durk Gorter, 313–331. New York: Routledge.**

Shohamy and Waksman discuss how, in addition to functioning as input for second language learners, the linguistic landscape can operate as an educational tool for linguistic and political activism. They also argue to expand the scope of linguistic landscapes, essentially eliminating the "linguistic" portion of "linguistic landscape," to incorporate items such as sounds, images, objects and even people in the public space.

## The Linguistic Landscape of the Internet

As Shohamy and Gorter 2009 (cited under Edited Collections) suggests in its title, the field of linguistic landscape studies is expanding in several ways. In addition to methodological and theoretical expansions, the geographical reach of studies has extended to several parts of the world. Furthermore, beyond physical spaces, research has spread to computer-generated spaces. In one of the first publications connecting the linguistic landscape with advertising and language use on the Internet, Ivković and Lotherington 2009 calls this domain the “virtual linguistic landscape.” Troyer 2012 later critiques this terminology, arguing that the use of the word “virtual” implies a false “virtual–real” dichotomy” (p. 95) and that virtual spaces are also real spaces. Troyer instead uses the term “linguistic netscape.” While some of these articles focus on particular languages (Gottlieb 2010 on Japanese, Troyer 2012 on Thai, and Wee 2015 on English), Ivković and Lotherington 2009 and Thorne and Ivković 2015 look at multilingualism and the virtual interaction of a myriad of languages. For example, Ivković and Lotherington 2009 gives a broad overview of multilingualism in the virtual realm considering Youtube, Wikipedia, government websites, and even video games; in its corpus over ten languages are used.

**Gottlieb, Nanette. 2010. Playing with language in e-Japan: Old wine in new bottles. *Japanese Studies* 30.3: 393–407.**

Because the Japanese writing system uses three scripts and frequently incorporates Arabic numerals and the Roman alphabet, it enjoys great flexibility in expression. Gottlieb argues that this allows for language play, which can reinforce in-group solidarity and function as subcultural identity markers. Rather than considering this language play a new phenomenon, the author maintains that it has existed and is now being used in different capacities such as the Internet.

**Ivković, Dejan, and Heather Lotherington. 2009. Multilingualism in cyberspace: Conceptualising the virtual linguistic landscape. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 6.1: 17–36.**

This article provides an overview of the notions of virtual linguistic landscape and linguistic cyberecology, drawing parallels between multilingualism in the real world and the digital world. The author also discusses the informational and symbolic functions (Landry and Bourhis 1997, cited under Origins of the Field) of the virtual linguistic landscape.

**Jones, Rodney H. 2010. Cyberspace and physical space: Attention structures in computer mediated communication. In *Semiotic landscapes: Language, image, space*. Edited by Adam Jaworski and Crispin Thurlow, 151–167. London: Continuum.**

In this chapter, Jones discusses the importance of attention in our construction of sites of engagement which can be the physical space where individuals use their computers, the virtual space that computer interfaces create, and the screen space where communication can be viewed. That is, we can ignore or filter out particular texts or images in space, while giving our attention to others.

**Thorne, Steven L., and Dejan Ivković. 2015. Multilingual Eurovision meets plurilingual YouTube: Linguascaping discursive ontologies. In *Dialogue in multilingual and multimodal communities*. Edited by Dale A. Koike and Carl S. Blyth, 167–192. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.**

Here, Thorne and Ivković analyze comments made on YouTube in different languages regarding Eurovision song entries from 2007 to 2010. They argue that this type of virtual interaction can be considered linguascaping, or a linguistic exchange in which language ideologies are transmitted and contested.

**Troyer, Robert A. 2012. English in the Thai linguistic netscape. *World Englishes* 31.1: 93–112.**

Troyer finds a preference for English over other languages in online Thai newspaper advertisements, arguing that the use of English connects products and services with notions of modernity, globalization, and wealth. The use of Thai, on the other hand, creates more familiar connections with readers. The author also shows how English influences Thai on orthographic, lexical, and syntactic levels.

**Wee, Lee. 2015. Mobilizing affect in the linguistic cyberlandscape: The r-word campaign. In *Conflict, exclusion and dissent in the linguistic landscape*. Edited by Rani Rubdy and Selim Ben Said, 185–203. London: Palgrave Macmillan.**

In this chapter, Wee reviews the employment of affect in language debates, taking as a case in point the online discussion centered around the removal of the word “retarded” from mainstream vocabulary. He argues that the campaign was especially successful due to the employment of affect. This work would be of particular interest to scholars working with the concepts of verbal hygiene and political correctness.

[back to top](#)

Copyright © 2019. All rights reserved.