The Linguistic Landscape (LL) approach – the documentation and analysis of language and other signs in public spaces – has over the past 10-15 years experienced an enormous spread across different branches of linguistics and related disciplines. Publications have mushroomed and conferences with a diverse range of foci have been dedicated to LL studies. Today, LL-related topics are discussed in relation to numerous methodologies, theoretical contexts and practical applications (see e.g. Gorter 2018a for a recent overview). One important practical trend has been the application of the LL-method to educational contexts. On the one hand, “eduscapes”, i.e. languages and semiotics found in schools, universities and other educational contexts, have been analysed in order to understand values assigned to languages in education and discourses among teachers, students, parents, educational authorities and others. On the other hand, LL research and data has been used for teaching purposes in language classes, but also in subjects such as history or art (cf. Gorter 2018b for an overview of LL in educational contexts).

Even though the approach rapidly spread to many parts of the world, in German-speaking contexts LL research has been conducted after some delay. During the past few years, however, this gap has slowly been narrowed. Some important studies have been carried out both in Germany and in regions where German is a minority language or a language of education and (former) lingua franca. Seminal studies and publications include a project on multilingualism in Hamburg (Redder et al. 2013) and, recently, the large-scale “Metropolenzeichen” project on the Ruhr area in the west of Germany.
Other studies focused e.g. on German in Belgium (Van Mensel & Darquennes 2012) or on the district of Prenzlauer Berg in Berlin (Papen 2012). Among the first collections of LL-studies in German-speaking contexts was also a 2017 volume on the relationship between “traditional” LL research and the “Spot German” approach, i.e. the search for the German language and symbols related to German-speaking countries, in particular with regard to their application in educational contexts (Marten & Saagpakk 2017). These contexts were once again taken up in 2018 by a special issue of the journal *Der Deutschunterricht* (Ehrhardt & Marten 2018) and a symposium at the annual conference of the German Association of Applied Linguistics (GAL) at the University of Duisburg-Essen, which had the explicit aim of uniting existing LL-studies in German-speaking contexts.

It is in this context of both LL-studies which involve the German language and the application of the LL-approach to education, that the volume edited by Camilla Badstübner-Kizik and Věra Janíková follows an international trend in linguistic and educational debates. The chapters are, except for one in English, written in German – therefore, this review aims to spread information about on-going discussions and innovative approaches particularly to a non-German reading audience. The 11 contributions focus on LL-projects in education and unite an abundance of didactic and methodological ideas. The authors are lecturers and researchers from Austria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Germany, the Netherlands and Poland who work not only in schools, but also at universities and in adult education.

In the introduction, the editors provide a solid overview of previous LL-studies in pedagogical contexts as well as the usual summary of approaches and chapters united in the book. They define their aim as “contributing to a conceptualisation of the Linguistic Landscape as a school-external learning space in foreign and second language classes”. The first main chapter is, in this sense, exemplary: Sabine Jentges and Paul Sars’s (Nijmegen) report of a project across the Dutch-German border. In this context of closely related cultures and languages, the LL can reveal hidden differences between two neighbouring regions. The authors show how a conceptualisation and an analysis of space can contribute to searching for deeper meanings and explanations in the sense of the “cultural iceberg” model suggested by Gibson (1994). Place names, street signs and public notices reveal information about the living environment of children of all ages. In
this way, the project is not only a valuable example of cross-border school exchanges, but may also be followed in any kind of youth activities.

In a similar vein, the second chapter by Gabriele Bell and Susanna Pfeiffer-Seelig (Hanover) reports on an excursion by German students to Edinburgh, focusing on important places of literature. The authors provide examples of how societal discourses are reflected in public space, and how they are constructed at different places related to literary works. Edinburgh was chosen because of its richness in literary examples, many of which have also been used in city marketing and for developing guided tours and other tourism-related products. Besides the theoretical ideas underlying the examination of Edinburgh, the chapter is of particular interest because it provides a “recipe” of how to plan such an excursion, which may easily be adapted to other places. This “manual” is, not least, suitable for convincing students and others of the relevance of LL-awareness in different professional contexts.

Maris Saagpak (Tallinn), in the third chapter on the use of LL-methods in schools, contextualises the rich history of the capital of Estonia. She shows how an analysis of the “palimpsest” structure of the city may help to understand the history of Baltic Germans and other historical layers, but also how history is commodified in contemporary Estonia. In this context, Saagpakk emphasises how the LL-method may help students to develop a new understanding of their own home town – e.g. through a quiz and activities pointing to the historical presence of Germans and other ethnic groups in the tradition of lieux de mèmoire studies. At the same time, the chapter discusses examples of how to apply the “Spot German” approach to language learning and to developing digital literacy among students, e.g. when developing a web site.

With Danuta Wiśniewska’s (Poznań) chapter, the only chapter written in English, the book moves from school towards higher education. The author highlights a largely neglected aspect of LL-studies: the role of the recipients. For her study, she asked students to interpret a collection of multimodal advertisements, including several signs related to political campaigns, in the Polish city of Poznań. Wiśniewska was particularly interested in understanding to which visual appearances and to which verbal elements the participants reacted, and which factors were considered in interpreting the signs. The results of the study show that the participants focused on a few aspects of each sign only, rather than interpreting whole advertisements. The study also displays a frequent interaction between emotional and rational reactions to the signs and reveals that
typographic features are much easier to interpret than images. Věra Janíková’s (Brno) chapter is related to this topic with its discussion of language awareness and its four dimensions according to Gnutzmann (2010): affective, social, political and cognitive. In the context of Brno, the second largest city of the Czech Republic, the author describes the potential of connecting LL-studies to these dimensions. With topics such as the multicultural history of the city or the role of English in contemporary Brno, this chapter is of particular value for readers who actively engage in planning their own classroom projects. In this, the chapter connects to Simone Schiedermair’s (Jena) text, which focuses on teaching German as a foreign and second language. Her chapter provides a valuable overview of LL-approaches used in language teaching at university level. Of particular interest in this context is the diversity of topics chosen by students for approaching the LL, e.g. recent migration to Germany, products and places focusing on Asian languages, or gentrification processes in major German cities.

In one of the most innovative chapters of the volume, Zbyněk Fišer (Brno) connects LL-studies to marketing activities. The author shows how the potential of LL-studies reaches far beyond classical educational purposes in language teaching or cultural contexts. One focus of the chapter lies in art spaces, word art and provocative use of language and symbols, not least in advertising. Rooted in intercultural marketing, the chapter analyses instances of intertextuality and how students – in this case Czech and Slovak students who study English or German as well as non-Czech students who study Czech – need to learn to “translate” cultural symbols. This chapter, once again, concludes with a clear “recipe” of how to implement the topic in class: steps such as developing text sensibilisation and analysis are followed by examples of writing strategies and the application of stylistic devices in creative writing processes for marketing purposes.

In the next chapter, Camilla Badstübner-Kizik (Poznań) discusses the potential of analysing the historical LL as it is displayed in films. Most notably, she introduces the term “Secondary Linguistic Landscapes” for such cases and, using remains of signs pointing to the German past in former German territories which have since 1945 been part of Poland, reflects in which way such secondary landscapes correspond to historical memories. At the same time, the chapter discusses how visions of the past are created – both in pictures and films produced at earlier times, which display a specific version of the LL at the time of shooting the film or taking the picture, and in newer films which
reconstruct a previous era. In this sense, the chapter is also an important contribution to debates about how to use historical pictures for developing contemporary media competence.

With Grzegorz Lisek’s (Greifswald) chapter, the book reaches its final section, focusing on educational contexts beyond school and university. In an interesting excursion into the didactics of Polish as a Foreign Language, the author analyses the potential of LL-signs in textbooks for adult learners of Polish. Sandra Ballweg (Bielefeld) reports on an experiment with Syrian refugees in Germany. She conducted in-depth interviews in which the respondents were asked to comment on pictures, language and multimodal signs. At the time of the interviews, the respondents had lived in Germany for a few months; they had some basic knowledge of German language and society, and were interviewed in order to understand which receptive processes are used by people with little experience in a specific culture. Ballweg found that very different strategies were used. For instance, one way of understanding signs was to look at the visual images of a picture in detail while trying to make sense of individual words, but not entire texts; in other cases, the respondents moved back and forth between the visual images and the texts in a picture. The chapter is less relevant for the didactic context of the book, but highly innovative for text reception theory and as such one of the most inspiring of the volume. Finally, Thomas Fritz and Dilek Taşdemir (Vienna) analyse patterns and structures of multilingualism on markets in Vienna. They use the approach of “metrolingualism” (Pennycook 2012), i.e. processes of extreme mixing of codes in which borders between languages fade, and add ethnographic observations to their research. This last chapter is also less didactically relevant, but inspiring to read because of its rich collection of data connected to an exemplary analysis.

The book concludes with some summarizing remarks by Silke Pasewalck (Tartu/Oldenburg) who postulates that the abundance of approaches and methodologies collected in the book may serve as the beginning of a “didactics of Linguistic Landscapes”. These could incorporate four major perspectives: 1. the expectation that the application of LL-projects in educational contexts will increase in the future, mostly as individual projects and often with the aid of new technologies; 2. LL is seen as a useful tool for developing critical literacy and media competence; 3. stylistic and text linguistic implications may be helpful in LL studies which focus on advertising; and 4. the truly interdisciplinary nature of LL studies is bound to increase awareness of “beiläufiges
Lernen”, i.e. learning processes as a by-product of other activities, not only in formal contexts, but also in everyday life.

There is little to add to these conclusions. In total, the volume is a pleasure to read and a rich source of ideas, in particular for teachers and lecturers at schools and in higher education, but also for a more general audience interested in LL-developments and the use of the LL-approach for e.g. language marketing. In this sense, the volume entirely fulfils its self-declared aim and makes a valuable contribution to the field. Among the common denominators of the chapters is the analysis of different layers found in the LL – historical, semiotic and cultural – and its application in educational contexts. The chapters show how a sensibilisation of students may take place through LL-work in different fields – not just for language learning, but also in e.g. history, literature studies, geography or art. In addition to developing analytical skills among students, several of the chapters explicitly call for creativity.

As was pointed out above, some of the chapters may easily be used by teachers or lecturers as a “recipe” for developing their own projects. As such, the volume shows the potential of LL-studies with regard to several key aspects of modern didactics – they provide opportunities not only for interesting and informative, but also for innovative, involving and inclusive learning. Not least, it should be noted that the studies collected in the volume deserve to receive attention also from an audience with less access to reading academic texts written in German.
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