Is There a Place for Global Citizenship Education in the Exploration of Linguistic Landscapes? An Analysis of Educational Practices in Five European Countries

Mónica Lourenço, Joana Duarte, Francisco P. Silva, and Bruna Batista

Abstract Prior research has shown that linguistic landscapes (LL) can promote language awareness and critical thinking, foster text-to-world connections, and develop intercultural awareness and understanding. Still, few studies have specifically explored the potential of LL in contributing to global citizenship education (GCE), an educational perspective that aims to prepare students to fully embrace the opportunities and challenges of a globalised world, and to assume active roles, both locally and globally. The study reported in this chapter draws on data gathered in an ongoing international project that brings together researchers, teacher educators, language (and other subject) teachers, and students from five European countries. The study investigates whether, to what extent, and how the LL multimodal modules designed and carried out by the teachers in the different partner cities of the project address domains of learning, include competences and topics, and are developed according to methodological approaches aligned with GCE. To do this, a qualitative methodology was adopted and an analytical tool for content analysis was created drawing on key GCE literature. Based on the findings, a set of recommendations are proposed, illustrated by example activities that may inspire teachers to address GCE in a more comprehensive and meaningful way while exploring LL.

M. Lourenço (✉) · F. P. Silva · B. Batista
Department of Education and Psychology, CIDTFF, University of Aveiro, Aveiro, Portugal
e-mail: monicalourenco@ua.pt

F. P. Silva
e-mail: parranca.silva@ua.pt

B. Batista
e-mail: brunabatista@ua.p

J. Duarte
Faculty of Arts, Minorities and Multilingualism, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands
e-mail: j.duarte@rug.de

Research Institute of Child Development and Education, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

1 Introduction

The field of linguistic landscapes (LL) has emerged relatively recently but has experienced a rapid expansion in the past two decades among researchers working on sociolinguistics, literacy and multilingualism (van Mensel et al., 2017). LL refer to the "visibility and salience of languages on public and commercial signs in a given territory or region" (Landry & Bourhis, 1997, p. 23). According to Gorter (2018b, p. 42), "LL attempts to understand the motives, uses, ideologies, language varieties and contestations of multiple forms of 'languages' as they are displayed in public spaces." From the very start, LL studies have focused on issues related to globalisation, as LL effectively put on display the tensions that occur between local and global flows, acting as a linguistic mirror of the dynamics of our globalised society (Gorter, 2013; Hélot et al., 2012). While much of the earlier research has been conducted in the domains of sociolinguistics and literacy studies, recent work has been linked to education (Gorter, 2018a). Research has shown that LL can foster text-to-world connections (Li & Marshall, 2018), provide in-depth learning about cultural and historical meaning (Shohamy & Waksman, 2009), promote language awareness and critical thinking (Clemente et al., 2012; Dagenais et al., 2009), and develop intercultural awareness and understanding (Gorter & Cenoz, 2015a). Still, few studies have specifically explored the potential of LL in contributing to global citizenship education (GCE), an educational perspective that aims to help students to fully embrace the opportunities and challenges of a globalised, interdependent and multicultural world, and to assume active roles, both locally and globally (Dill, 2018; Torres, 2018).

The study reported in this chapter draws on data gathered in the LoCALL project, an Erasmus + project that brings together researchers, teacher educators, language (and other subject) teachers, and students from five European countries. The study investigates whether, to what extent, and how the modules designed and staged by the teachers in the different partner cities/regions of the project address domains of learning, include competences and topics, and are developed according to methodological approaches aligned with GCE. To do this, a qualitative methodology was adopted and an analytical tool for content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) was created drawing on three types of literature on GCE: documents from international organisations (UNESCO, Council of Europe), documents from NGOs (Oxfam) and academic research papers.

The chapter is organised in the following way. It begins with an overview of key literature and recent research on the two central topics of this study—linguistic landscapes and global citizenship education—with a focus on the links between the two. Then, it describes the study, namely the context and corpus of analysis, and the

methodological design, including the analytical tool. This is followed by a presentation of the results according to each category of analysis. The chapter ends with a conclusion where the main findings and limitations of the study are discussed and recommendations, illustrated by example activities, are proposed aiming to inspire teachers to address GCE in a more comprehensive, meaningful and systematic manner while exploring LL.

2 Linguistic Landscapes in Educational Research

Shohamy and Gorter's (2009) conceptualisation of Linguistic Landscapes (LL) goes beyond Landry and Bourhis' (1997) initial definition of LL as the mere description of the various ways in which multilingualism is visualised, expressed and disseminated in the public space, as "it [= LL] contextualizes the public space within issues of identity and language policy of nations, political and social conflicts. It posits that LL is a broader concept than documentation of signs; it incorporates multimodal theories to include also sounds, images, and graffiti" (Shohamy & Gorter, 2009, p. 4). This approach shows the broad understanding of what constitutes the subject of investigation in LL research, as well as its efforts to achieve a deeper understanding of the issues investigated by focusing on the relationship between an analytical framework and the contextualisation of topics (Ziegler et al., 2018). Recently, there has even been a call for extending LL research to encompass the body as a corporeal landscape with a focus on 'skinscapes' (Peck & Stroud, 2015), 'sensescapes' (Prada, 2021; also the same author in this volume) or on sounds in the landscape, i.e., 'soundscapes' (Scarvaglieri et al., 2013). LL in research in applied linguistics and education is a relatively new field (Bolton et al., 2020). There are two common lenses towards analysing LL in education (Brinkmann et al., 2022):

- Learning *in* the LL (Malinowski et al., 2020), which brings together the classroom and the public spaces through an ethnographic focus, in which teachers and students observe, document and analyse languages in their representation in public spaces. Learning in the LL can occur incidentally (Cenoz & Gorter, 2008; Tjandra, 2021) or/and through planned noticing strategies (e.g., fostering language awareness).
- Learning *through* the LL, which happens when students' attention towards previously chosen elements is fostered during the analysis of existing LL. Learning through LL in the classroom means bringing the public space into the classroom and re-contextualising it as a classroom document.

In order to explore the role of the LL in second language acquisition research, Cenoz and Gorter (2008), looked into five different perspectives that might intervene in that relationship: LL as input; LL and pragmatic competence; LL and literacy skills; LL and multicompetence; and LL and affective and symbolic factors. Research on LL within the scope of education has so far highlighted the broad understanding of what

LL can contribute to in educational settings and focused on identifying contributions at different levels:

1. in terms of defining the general framework, themes and topics that LL in education investigate;
2. in fostering specific knowledge of a particular subject (e.g., language education);
3. in relation to the learning goals related to so-called 'soft skills' and general values.

In relation to *(1) the general framework, themes and topics of LL educational research*, most initiatives developed so far place LL research within the larger framework of globalisation, diversity and social justice, by zooming on inequity in the public space (Gorter & Cenoz, 2020) or on hierarchies as expressed in the unequal representation of communities in a given societal context (Gorter, 2013; Hélot et al., 2012). The aim is often to change participants' views on language and community representation and to engage in critical thinking in relation to existing hierarchies. In the context of teacher education, for example, Hancock (2012) concluded that the very act of investigating LL can potentially affect teacher students' world views and the school environment in which they will teach.

Regarding *(2) the specific knowledge of particular subject areas*, LL research has found evidence for the positive impact of using LL in language education, specifically in relation to the affective and cognitive dimensions of James and Garrett's (1992) dimensions of language awareness. As such, working with LL has been linked to fostering students' openness towards languages (Dagenais et al., 2009) and enhancing language learning through the exploration of language learning strategies and awareness (Cenoz & Gorter, 2008; Hernández-Martín & Skrandies, 2020; Roos & Nicholas, 2019; Sayer, 2020; Tjandra, 2021). In addition, Nilsen et al. (2017) found that LL research in education could foster critical language learning in a study that looked at the perceptions and understandings that both teachers and students have about linguistic diversity. Other studies looked at how LL foster second or foreign language acquisition (Cenoz & Gorter, 2008), the development of translingual and transcultural competence, translanguaging practices and plurilingual methodologies (Gorter & Cenoz, 2015b). Finally, Rowland (2013) also identified pragmatic competence and language learning, multimodal literacy skills, and sensitivity to connotational aspects of language as skills that can be developed when exploring LL in educational settings.

In relation to *(3) overarching soft skills and values*, LL have been found to enhance students' intercultural competence and critical thinking through the development of attitudes and knowledge related to the understanding and engagement in particular linguistic and cultural scenarios (Clemente et al., 2012). This was reiterated by Rowland (2013) who described a gain in critical literacy skills, through a deeper understanding of the power of language. LL have also been linked to the development of participatory skills. Pennycook (1999) described LL as a pedagogy for engagement and an engagement device that can turn students into activists and engaged individuals in their communities. In an empirical study with primary school-aged children, Clemente (2017) discovered that LL may function as a tool to make students more aware about their role and responsibilities in building (or writing) cities that are more

inclusive and sustainable. These studies suggest that LL can in fact be linked to a global citizenship education approach.

3   Global Citizenship Education: A 21st Century Priority

Global citizenship education (GCE) has become a catchphrase in the past decades, partly as a response to the times of rapid and unprecedented change we have been living through since the turn of the millennium. The call for a global citizenship is grounded in the assumption that today people live in a global context and interact at a planetary level. In a world that is increasingly interdependent, GCE promotes a sense of belonging to a global community emphasising a shared common humanity among people. This community extends beyond the human sphere, embracing also the biosphere and natural environment. This reflects the importance of reformulating the concept of citizenship in a broader context of a 'homeland-earth' (Morin & Kern, 1999) where human beings are collectively responsible for helping reduce inequalities, overcoming differences and prejudice, fighting for human rights and social justice, and healing their 'common home' (Pope Francis, 2015).

Although GCE has been the focus of international, regional and national conferences and fora since the 1990s, momentum around this educational perspective increased in 2012 with the publication of the *Global Education First Initiative.* The document, launched by United Nations' (UN) Secretary General Ban Ki-moon, set fostering global citizenship among the top educational priorities of the twenty-first century, next to access to education and quality education, identifying key actions that may help countries and governments meet these priorities (UN, 2012). Among those specifically addressing GCE are:

- To develop the values, knowledge and skills necessary for peace, tolerance, and respect for diversity;
- To cultivate a sense of community and active participation in giving back to society;
- To ensure schools are free of all forms of discrimination, including gender inequality, bullying, violence, xenophobia, and exploitation.

Another major impetus for GCE came with the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) at the UN Sustainable Development Summit in 2015. SDG Target 4.7 focuses specifically on the transformative potential of GCE in building peaceful and sustainable societies, highlighting the need to ensure that by 2030

> all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, *global citizenship* and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture's contribution to sustainable development (UN, 2015, authors' emphasis).

In addition to world leaders, academics all over the world have also been devoting their attention to GCE. According to the third edition of the *Global Education Digest*

(ANGEL, 2020), which provides a reasoned bibliography of academic and research materials relevant to the field of GCE, the number of publications on the theme has increased dramatically since 2015. Similar results are given when we make a search on Scopus, the largest article database worldwide. We can identify nearly 1000 journal articles written about this topic in the past 10 years, revealing a significant growing trajectory since 2010.

Yet, despite increasing attention to GCE, the concept is still unknown or perplexing to most of the world's teachers and teacher educators (Hopkins, 2020). This may be attributed to the contested nature of the concept itself (see, for instance, Andreotti & Souza, 2012; Bowden, 2003; Davies, 2006), and to its openness to multiple interpretations and operationalisations. Oxley and Morris (2013), Pais and Costa (2017) and, more recently, Pashby et al. (2020) have found that, coupled with the different designations used to define a 'global citizenship' (e.g., 'planetary citizenship', 'world citizenship', or 'cosmopolitan citizenship'), there are multiple ideological constellations overlapping and even contradicting one another within the field of GCE. Starting with Andreotti's (2006), 'soft' versus 'critical' dichotomy, GCE has been pushed and pulled in a continuum ranging from the neoliberal discourse, which privileges a market rationale focused on self-investment and enhanced profits, to the critical democracy discourse, highlighting the importance of ethical values, social responsibility and active citizenship.

For this study we take as reference the work of Santamaría-Cárdaba and Lourenço (2021), who define GCE as a transformative educational perspective whose purpose is to educate citizens to be autonomous and think critically so that they can understand the existing social inequalities and act in a committed way seeking to transform society into a more just one. According to UNESCO (2015), this entails the development of three conceptual dimensions—cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioural—which correspond to the three domains that are required to create a well-rounded learning experience. Based on these dimensions, key learning outcomes are identified, which describe the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes that learners can acquire and demonstrate as a result of GCE, as well as key learner attributes. These are: informed and critically literate, socially connected and respectful of diversity, and ethically responsible and engaged.

Oxfam (2015) offers a similar perspective on GCE, defining the 'global citizen' as someone who is aware of the wider world and has a sense of their own role as a world citizen; respects and values diversity; has an understanding of how the world works; is passionately committed to social justice; participates in the community at local and global levels; works with others to make the world a more equitable and sustainable place; and takes responsibility for their actions. This organisation goes on to define the key elements for developing active and responsible global citizenship, proposing a tripartite approach that includes the knowledge and understanding, skills, values and attitudes that learners need both to participate fully in a globalised society, and to secure a more just, inclusive and sustainable world than the one they have inherited. These include, for instance, knowledge and understanding of social justice, equity, and diversity; critical thinking, and ability to challenge injustice and inequality; respect for diversity and belief that people can make a difference.

In order to help teachers address these issues, several international organisations (see, for instance, UNESCO, 2014, 2015; Council of Europe, 2012, 2019), have produced a series of guides and booklets that provide guidance on how to translate GCE principles into practice, featuring examples of 'good' practices. Emphasis is placed on participatory and transformative learning practices that are learner-centred, encourage dialogue, promote critical thinking and creativity, are empowering and solution-oriented, develop resilience and 'action competence'. Among these approaches feature *issues-based learning*, which engages students with global issues; *dialogue-based learning*, which promotes oral interactions between participants, improving their communication and reflection skills; *collaborative learning*, which promotes positive interdependence between participants' efforts to learn; *problem-based learning*, which uses collaborative group work to engage learners with problem exploration, and *service-learning*, which actively engages learners in a range of global issues within their schools and local communities. In line with these pedagogical approaches, best practices in global citizenship education include *debates*, as a means of raising awareness of contemporary global issues and developing communication and argumentation skills; *blog*s on a topic of global or local relevance to practise writing; *role-playing or simulation games* to promote students' oral skills and empathy, and favour the discovery of other perspectives and worldviews; *visual diagrams*, such as issues tress, as a way of structuring an enquiry to encourage learners to explore the causes, effects (or symptoms) and solutions of a given issue; *sports activitie*s, stimulating interpersonal relations and promoting cohesion and mutual respect; or voluntary *community service*, which fosters social responsibility and commitment. Another instrument often cited as an important source of reflection about global issues are *real photographs*. As reported by Oxfam (2015, p. 13): "Photographs can be hugely influential in shaping our ideas about ourselves, other people and the wider world. However, the pictures we see do not always tell the whole story." It is important, therefore, to get learners questioning photographs (or artefacts), as well as their own assumptions about them. This is also one of the main tools and approaches used in LL research and pedagogy (Clemente, 2017), providing yet another evidence of the links between LL and GCE.

4   Methodological Design

In line with this background, the purpose of this study is to understand whether, to what extent, and how the modules conceived and implemented by teachers in the five different partner cities/regions of the LoCALL project address domains of learning, include competences and topics, and are developed according to methodological approaches aligned with GCE. To address this aim, a qualitative study was carried out supported by a content analysis of the multimodal modules. This methodological procedure for data analysis, given its heuristic function, is justified and distinguished from other procedures as it allows researchers to systematically and objectively analyse textual data and to infer about the analysed content aiming to respond to the

proposed research objectives and questions (Schreier, 2012). In this study, we built upon predefined categories of analysis providing content description and inferences based on a *directed* or *deductive approach* (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Schreier, 2012). This approach permits the validation or conceptual expansion of the area the study focuses on, in this case GCE and LL, based on a structured process. This process started with the collection of suitable data, i.e., the corpus of analysis, which consisted of the LL modules available at the time the study was being developed. This was followed by the definition of the coding categories, drawing on key literature, and the construction of the categorisation matrix or analytical tool, whereby all the data were reviewed for content and coded for correspondence to or exemplification of the identified categories. All researchers/authors of this chapter were involved in the process of data analysis, and multiple instances for peer debriefing were carried out in order to validate both the analytical tool and data coding.

4.1 Context of the Study

This study was developed within the Erasmus + project LoCALL, an acronym which stands for 'Local linguistic landscapes for global language education in the school context'. LoCALL's main goal is to promote global language education in the school context through the use of LL and multilingual pedagogies, in order to build a bridge between pupils' (and teachers') lived experiences with multilingualism inside and outside school.

LoCALL's aims are realised through the sequential but interrelated conception of four intellectual outputs (IO): (i) *(multimodal) modules* for teaching and learning though LL, aimed at teachers and teacher trainers and developed in a collaboration between the researchers and the school teachers or student teachers in the different partner cities; (ii) *tutorials* based on 'how to' questions related with pedagogical or methodological issues, and *podcasts* describing experiences of teachers and students with LL; (iii) *a mobile App* to explore and learn about LL, using a multiple-choice question game; and (iv) *guidelines* for (language) teachers and curriculum developers. Our analysis focuses precisely on the first of these outputs, as further explained below.

4.2 Corpus of Analysis

Data collected for this study consisted of a total of 12 multimodal LL modules developed by the teachers and the researchers involved in the LoCALL project and available on the website www.locallproject.eu by 15 July 2021. Table 1 provides an overview of the modules including the original title and the English translation, the age of the pupils, the context(s) of implementation, the languages explored in the activities, and the disciplines/subjects involved.

Table 1 Corpus of analysis

Title in English (Original title)	Age group	Context	Languages	Disciplines/subjects
1. Exploring LL in the EFL classroom ("Explorar a PL na aula de língua inglesa")	6–9	Formal—classroom	Portuguese English French Gaelic	Arts Foreign Languages
2. Jungle of Languages ("Sprachdschungel")	10–16	Formal—classroom	French German Low German (*Plattdeutsch*) English Portuguese Turkish	Foreign Languages
3. Languages and Society ("Sprache und Gesellschaft")	10–16	Formal—classroom	German English Bulgarian Polish Romanian & others	Foreign Languages History Social Sciences
4. Language Detective ("Taaldetektive")	12–16	Formal—classroom Informal—outdoors	Dutch English Frisian & others	Foreign Languages Geography History
5. LL at home ("Paisaje lingüístico en casa")	10–11	Informal—home Formal—digital	Spanish English Catalan & others	Arts Foreign Languages ICT
6. LL in our city ("Paisaje lingüístico de nuestra ciudad")	10–11	Formal—digital Informal—outdoors	Spanish English Catalan & others	Arts Foreign Languages ICT
7. Digital landscapes—Memes	12–16	Formal—digital	Dutch English Frisian & others	Arts Foreign Languages History
8. Digital landscapes—Poems	12–16	Formal—digital	Dutch Frisian & others	Arts Foreign Languages History
9. Sensorial Maps ("Mapas sensoriais")	6–16	Informal—outdoors (with family)	Spanish & others	n/a

Table 1 (continued)

Title in English (Original title)	Age group	Context	Languages	Disciplines/subjects
10. Wordcloud ("Nube de palabras")	10–11	Formal—digital	Spanish English Catalan & others	Arts Foreign Languages ICT
11. LL pop-up map ("Carte pop-up de PL")	6–14	Formal—classroom	French & others	Arts Foreign Languages Geography History Social Sciences
12. Family migration history ("Histoire migratoire familiale")	13–14	Informal—home	French & others (e.g., heritage languages)	Geography History Foreign Languages

As we can see, the majority of the modules were developed for pupils in the 10–11 and in the 12–16 age groups. Still, three modules also target younger pupils aged between 6 and 10 years old. Regarding the contexts in which the modules were developed, these were either formal or informal. Formal contexts were related to the classroom setting and activities could be carried out either face to face or online. The latter was a common strategy used by teachers during COVID19 school lockdown. Informal contexts included out-of-school activities carried out at home or outdoors, mainly in the city/village where the pupils lived. Some of these activities could also also be guided or teacher-led, but they were less structured and more flexible than the activities taking place inside the classroom. In a formal context, we can find ten modules, five of which were developed for an in person and in classroom context, and the remaining five took an online format. The informal context, in turn, appears in five of the modules that constitute the corpus of analysis. From these, three activities took place outdoors and two at home. It should be noted that some modules included activities that could be developed in different contexts, for instance in formal (inside the classroom) and informal (in the city) settings. Regarding the languages explored during the activities, at least fourteen different languages were present. Most of them were official state languages with a majority status in the target countries/regions (e.g., Catalan, Dutch, French, German, Portuguese or Spanish); others were minority languages (e.g., Frisian and Gaelic) or dialects (e.g., Low German); some languages were part of the school curriculum, while others are frequently absent from the classroom setting (e.g., heritage or migrant languages). In what concerns the main disciplines or subjects involved, we can see that most modules provide an opportunity for interdisciplinary links connecting foreign languages and other subjects such as arts, history and geography. Apart from these subjects, other disciplines and areas are mentioned such as social sciences and ICT.

4.3 Instrument and Procedures for Data Analysis

In order to conduct the content analysis of the LL modules, an analytical tool was developed comprising four major categories: *domains of learning*, *competences*, *topics* and *approaches*, which are considered useful when analysing GCE pedagogical activities (see, for instance, Lourenço & Simões, 2021). The definition of subcategories emerged and evolved through the analysis of data alongside the interrogation of related literature in the field of GCE and LL. Agreement on the tool was reached after a preliminary analysis of the modules and following a peer-debriefing process between the researchers/authors. Each category and subcategory are explained in detail below.

Category A. Domains of learning is related to the areas that the learning experience with LL is expected to affect. It includes three subcategories—cognitive, socio-emotional and behavioural—which are considered the three conceptual dimensions of GCE by UNESCO (2015). The *cognitive dimension* focuses on developing the knowledge and thinking skills that are necessary for learners to better understand the world and its complexities. In the context of this study, it is regarded as being specifically linked to foreign language learning and to the development of critical thinking and language awareness, but it might also include other content knowledge associated with the history, geography and culture of a given place. The *socio-emotional dimension* includes the feelings, emotions, attitudes and social skills that enable learners to live peacefully with others. It considers, in particular, the development of attitudes of respect towards linguistic and cultural diversity and the recognition and valorisation of plurilingual repertoires. Finally, the *behavioural dimension* is linked to the conduct, performance and engagement of learners, and to their ability to act towards linguistic equity and to participate in the creation of more inclusive communities.

Category B. Competences includes the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes that learners are expected to develop when participating in activities that are rooted in the exploration of LL. These include *language-related knowledge and skills* linked to language awareness, decoding, transfer and analytical skills, (multimodal) literacy skills, translanguaging, plurilingual competence, or pragmatic competence; *other content knowledge and skills* linked to text-to-world connections established, for instance, within the subjects of history and geography, or skills involving the use of technology; *soft skills* (also known as 'twenty-first century skills' or 'transversal skills'), including critical thinking, creativity or collaboration; *attitudes and values,* namely respect for diversity, awareness and valorisation of one's own identity and culture, intercultural awareness and understanding, empathy and commitment to social justice and equity.

Category C. Topics comprises the knowledge areas that can be foregrounded in LL activities, especially when using a GCE lens. These include *identity*, namely self-awareness and self-esteem; *diversity* (linguistic, cultural, ethnic, religious, socioeconomic, political, and disability); *globalisation*, linked to multilingualism and multiculturalism, on the one hand, and to the hegemonic status of the English language, on the other hand; *language attitudes* reflecting language ideologies and stereotypes towards languages and their speakers; *language (in)equity* associated with the unequal representation of communities in a given societal context; *language policy* that might render some languages invisible; *language families* (Germanic, Indo-European, Romance, …) *and language types* (migrant, minority, official, regional, or endangered languages); *migration* and migrant communities (un-/mis-) represented in the community; *participation/activism* for social and linguistic justice; and *sustainable development* in ensuring inclusive, just and peaceful communities.

Finally, *Category D. Approaches* highlights the main teaching and learning methodologies to support the development of competences associated with GCE and most-commonly used when working with LL. *Dialogue-based learning*, which recognizes the unique life experiences each learner brings to the learning interaction, seems to provide a useful basis to exchange ideas about LL and about learners' linguistic and cultural 'lifeworlds'. This can be used alongside *reflective learning*, which helps students think deeply about their own experiences, namely via individual written assignments. Another possibility is *problem-based learning*, which engages learners with the exploration of a real problem, helping them pinpoint causes and present possible solutions. This approach might be useful in promoting their reasoning and participatory skills, which are fundamental attributes of a global citizen. Problems or problematic situations can be the centre of a broader class or school project. Therefore, through *project-based learning*, learners can gain knowledge and skills by working for an extended period of time on an authentic, engaging, and complex question, problem, or challenge. All of these approaches can be used together with *collaborative learning*, which promotes positive interdependence between learners and action competence.

Figure 1 provides a visual description of the analytical tool, which highlights the links that might be established between the different categories and subcategories, but which are not meant to be mutually exclusive.

For data analysis, each researcher was responsible for one of the categories described above (A to D) and for three of the modules that make up the corpus of analysis (1–12). Thus, through a crosschecked analysis, it was possible for researchers to initially analyse three modules globally, considering all categories. At a later stage, this analysis was validated by the other team members, responsible for each category of analysis.

A. DOMAINS	B. COMPETENCES	C. TOPICS	D. APPROACHES
COGNITIVE	Language-related knowledge Other content knowledge	Language families and language types Globalisation	Problem-based learning Reflective learning
SOCIO-EMOTIONAL	Attitudes/Values	Identity Diversity Language attitudes Language (in)equity Migration	Dialogue-based learning
BEHAVIOURAL	Language-related skills Other content skills Soft skills	Language policy Participation/activism Sustainable development	Project-based learning Collaborative learning

Fig. 1 Overview of the analytical tool

5 Results and Discussion

The results of this categorisation are presented in Table 2, a double-entry table, where we can find the 12 modules distributed by the columns and the categories and subcategories of analysis divided by the rows. The centrality of a specific subcategory inside a module was marked by using the (+) sign. A detailed account of the results is given in the following sections.

5.1 Domains of Learning

As mentioned before, to define the domains of learning we used the categorization proposed by UNESCO (2015) which indicates the cognitive domain, the socio-emotional domain and the behavioural domain as the three dimensions of GCE. In line with prior research on the presence of GCE in the curriculum (Santamaría-Cárdaba & Lourenço, 2021), the cognitive domain is the most representative, being present in 10 out of the 12 modules analysed. The cognitive domain concerns the knowledge and the knowledge construction and mobilisation skills that pupils need to develop with a view to understanding the world in all of its complexity. In the case of the modules analysed, more attention seems to have been given to the acquisition of knowledge than to its construction or mobilisation. An example of a module centered on the cognitive domain is module 10, where, after an initial collection of LL-items at home and in the city, pupils had the opportunity to select one of the languages found and to learn words in those languages displaying them in a word cloud.

Also in relation to the cognitive domain, we found that in eight out of the 10 modules where this category was identified, this was associated with another learning domain (either socio-emotional or behavioural). Still, in most of these modules knowledge acquisition and/or the development of thinking skills associated with a

Table 2 Categorisation of the data

		Modules											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Domains of Learning	Cognitive	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓+		✓
	Socio-emotional	✓		✓			✓	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓	✓+
	Behavioural				✓					✓+		✓	
Competences	Language-related knowledge/skills	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓	✓+		✓+
	Other content knowledge/skills	✓			✓					✓			✓+
	Soft skills	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓-	✓+	✓
	Attitudes/Values	✓			✓				✓+	✓+			✓+
Topics	Identity							✓+	✓+				✓+
	Diversity	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓	✓	✓			✓+	✓+	✓+	✓+
	Globalisation												✓
	Language attitudes				✓			✓	✓				
	Language (in)equity												
	Language policy												
	Language families and language types	✓+											
	Migration	✓	✓	✓+	✓			✓-	✓	✓	✓		✓+
	Participation/ activism	✓								✓+		✓	✓+
	Sustainable development												

(continued)

Table 2 (continued)

Approaches	Modules											
---	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Dialogue-based learning	✓+		✓+	✓+			✓	✓				✓+
Collaborative learning									✓+			
Problem-based learning	✓				✓+	✓+				✓+		
Project-based learning	✓+		✓+	✓+			✓+	✓+	✓+		✓+	✓+
Reflective learning	✓+	✓	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓+		✓+		✓+

Frequency: (+) central

specific topic were central to the activities (e.g., modules 1, 2 and 3). It is also worth mentioning that there was no module covering all of the three learning domains.

Second to the cognitive domain, the socio-emotional domain was also identified in a considerable number of modules (eight out of 12), being central to four modules and often in association with the cognitive domain. An example is module 8, where the pupils had the opportunity to create a poem on a topic that was most significant to them after resorting to an online search to find out how to write a poem, reading examples of poems in different languages, as well as getting to know some of the characteristics of poetic writing, such as the use of rhymes or metaphors. Another example where the socio-emotional dimension was particularly emphasised is module 12. In this module, pupils were invited to interview their relatives about the languages present at home and in their family history, having later to present their findings to their peers in the classroom. This allowed students to develop attitudes and values of respect for and valorisation of the linguistic and cultural diversity that characterises the global world of the twenty-first century.

Although the learning domains of GCE are meant to be approached in an interrelated way, since they are interdependent (UNESCO, 2015), the behavioural domain assumes particular importance from a GCE perspective as it corresponds to the realisation of what is expected from a global citizen, i.e., an active and participatory engagement with a view to building more inclusive and sustainable communities also from a linguistic point of view. Yet, this domain was identified in only three out of the 12 modules analysed, being central to only one of the modules (module 9). In this module pupils walk around their neighborhood to collect photographic records of the LL and sound recordings of the languages they hear in order to create a path on Google My Maps. This activity allows pupils and visitors to experience the linguistic and cultural diversity of a place, thus contributing to building a more inclusive community.

5.2   Competences

Concerning competences, and as it would be expected from activities involving LL, language-related knowledge and skills are central in 11 out of 12 modules. Knowledge acquisition related to languages and cultures and to the concept of LL is evident in seven out of 12 modules. In module 4, for example, pupils watch a video about LL and their types and about where to find them, while in module 2, pupils read a text titled "Jungle of languages" and then fill in a worksheet that invites them to write down their own definition of LL. Language learning is only mentioned explicitly as an outcome in module 10. In this module, pupils are asked to make a word cloud with three words they would like to learn in the language(s) that intrigue(s) them the most, and to record themselves speaking those words.

Regarding language-related skills, all modules target one or more basic language skills, with emphasis being placed on productive skills (speaking and writing). In modules 7 and 8, which revolve around online linguistic landscapes, pupils discuss

writing techniques and then create either multilingual memes or poems that they are to present in class. Other examples of activities that promote the development of speaking or writing skills through LL include writing a summary about information collected through photographs (module 4), voicing one's opinion about the presence/absence of specific languages in the LL (modules 1, 4), interviewing people in the street (module 9) or interviewing family members (module 12).

Common to all modules are activities that promote pupils' language awareness and invite them to recognise different languages, identify similarities and differences between them, and find translations or equivalent words using prior knowledge and transfer skills. This usually involves the analysis of photographs taken by the pupils themselves (modules 4, 6) or suggested by the teachers (modules 2, 3), but it can also include artefacts or other objects (food packages, books, CDs, magnets, posters, etc.) pupils collect in their homes (modules 1, 5). These activities are usually followed by a reflective dialogue, which triggers the development of pupils' pragmatic competence by inviting them to discuss the functions of the texts and the communicative intentions behind them (modules 3, 4).

In what concerns soft skills, these stand out in 10 out of 12 modules, although they are only central in four. In this case, there seems to be a predominance of creativity as an outcome of arts-based activities, such as collages (modules 5, 6, 12), drawings or constructions of an imagined or real LL (modules 1, 11), or multimedia activities (module 9). Critical thinking is also mentioned as an outcome of the activities developed by the pupils in five modules. A clear example is the central activity in module 3, titled "Languages and Society", where pupils are asked to analyse a multilingual poster and to uncover the reasons for the discrepancies they find between the languages chosen in the poster and the ones that belong to the most representative migrant groups in Germany.

The acquisition of other content knowledge is only evident in four modules, although most of them make a reference to the possibility of establishing links with disciplines other than (foreign) languages. Content related to history and geography, mainly in association with migration, is visible in two modules (3 and 12); module 4 opens the room to maths by asking pupils to count the number of photos they took, the number of languages they found and to indicate percentages; finally, module 1 addresses the theme of food and drinks linked to the gastronomic traditions of a given place and in association with the LL of restaurant names and multilingual menus. In terms of other skills, ICT-related skills stand out in five modules, particularly the ones that propose activities to be carried out in digital format. In this case, pupils are not only required to use their computers or smartphones, but to use specific software, such as Google My Maps, and social media, such as WhatsApp (module 9).

Surprisingly, only three modules explicitly mention the development of pupils' attitudes and values in their learning goals statements. In this case, the focus is related mainly with fostering respect for and valorisation of cultural and linguistic diversity, in general, and of pupils' plurilingual repertoires understood as part of their own identity, in particular. This is evident, for instance, in module 12, where pupils are asked to interview their relatives to unveil their family's migration history. The results of this activity, which was presented in the form of a collage with text and

illustrations, led pupils to become more respectful of their own cultural and linguistic heritage and helped teachers to become aware of their pupils' life stories viewing them as resources for learning rather than as problems to be overcome.

Although not explicitly mentioned in the learning goals, modules 1, 4 and 9 suggest yet another important outcome of the exploration of LL—the development of a committed and engaged attitude towards creating more inclusive and equal communities. In activity 1, pupils are asked to draw their imagined LL in a sheet of paper. Drawings, which are included as results of the intervention, show a large variety of (real and invented) languages, different scripts, as well as different and happy people living in harmony with others and nature, suggesting that pupils want their LL to be more multilingual, diverse and sustainable. In a similar way, in activity 4, pupils have to imagine that they are giving advice to their local government regarding changes they would like to see in their LL. Pupils were eager to argue strongly about the inclusion of more Frisian in the LL of Leeuwarden, the capital city of Friesland, showing that they understand that languages are identity markers and, therefore, should be protected. Finally, in module 9, families are invited to collect the 'visualscapes' and the 'soundscapes' of their neighbourhood and to build a sensory map that can be displayed in the school library or in the city museum. These activities suggest that there is room for LL to promote pupil's language activism, which involves an engaged pursuit of the preservation and promotion of linguistic diversity.

5.3 Topics

In terms of the topics, the majority of the modules (10 out of 12) focuses on issues related to diversity; in seven of these activities, diversity was coded as a central topic taking a broad definition of the concept. For example, module 1 is dedicated to exploring linguistic and cultural diversity in the primary school English classroom, by conducting language biographies and working around the topic of "food and drinks" from an LL perspective and within arts education. Module 2, directed at lower secondary education, specifically addresses language diversity, as the students read and reflect upon the text "Jungle of languages", focusing on language richness, language diversity, language awareness, culture and urban features.

Next, the topic of migration was present in six out of the 12 modules and it was central in two of them. In module 3, the issue of migration to larger urban areas in Europe is the main topic. The teacher is to discuss a multilingual poster in order to find out the origin of the poster, the languages featured in it, the translations of these languages and the reasons for the languages chosen bringing together the issues of migration in society and language. The languages in the banner are featured as they stand for the largest migrant communities in the city of Hamburg and can easily be replaced with other languages for other settings. In module 12 the History and Geography teachers encourage the students to question their own family history in order to find out whether they had a migratory background. The students present the results of their discussions through collages' with text and illustrations. So migration

is perceived as a reality of urban European areas that can be analysed through their crystallisation in terms of visible language diversity in the LL. But pupils are also encouraged to relate the topic of migration to themselves and their own family history.

Several other topics are featured in four of the modules, namely language attitudes, participation/activism and language families and types. Language attitudes are not central in any of the activities but are one aspect alongside other aspects in four modules. In module 4, pupils are encouraged to take on the role of a 'language detective' and investigate the LL in their own neighbourhood or setting. They work in groups, make photographs and analyse them in a quasi-scientific way, by quantifying languages in signs, identifying different types of signs (monolingual, bilingual, multilingual) and identifying the functions of the languages in the signs. On the basis of their analyses, they must then take on the role of a language policy advisor and provide recommendations for a re-shaping of the LL of the analysed area. In the example provided in the module, the non-Frisian speaking pupils, after analysing the LL of their officially bilingual region with Dutch and Frisian co-existing, came to the conclusion that the regional language Frisian was under-represented in the LL, although it should play a much more prominent role as a marker of regional identity but also as a commodification agent in commercial activities for tourists and visitors. The pupils started the module with a somewhat negative attitude towards Frisian, and by engaging in an analysis of the LL, came to develop a positive attitude towards the language in the context of the regional LL.

The topic of participation/activism is central in one of the four modules in which it is featured. In module 9 pupils go on two tours to collect the sound and visual landscapes of the neighborhood where their school is located, in order to build a multimedia device on the sensory landscapes of the neighbourhood. The sound tours consist of interviews with people from the neighbourhood: neighbours, tourists, people who come to work, etc. The visual tours intend to make a photographic collection of landscape elements of the neighbourhood that appeal to different languages and/or cultures. The topic of participation/activism thus derives from the degree of involvement of the pupils as co-researchers in the construction of the sensorial maps of the module.

The topic of language families and types was coded as central in two of the four modules in which it was identified. For example in module 12 a broad definition of language families and types is taken in which the pupils investigate the migration history of their ancestors, including the languages, whereas in module 1, focused on LL around the topic of "food and drinks", language families are explored by working with the central vocabulary of the topic in the different languages and grouping it according to language families.

Identity is central in all three of the modules in which it was coded. Modules 7 and 8, for example, are focused on investigating and producing digital landscapes in the form of multilingual memes (module 7) and multilingual poems (module 8). On the basis of an analysis of existing memes and poems online and in several languages, pupils reflect on how these forms of digital LL can contribute to fostering happiness and well-being. Then they produce their own memes or poems, using several languages, and revealing parts of their identities as multilingual writers.

Finally, four of the topics in our analytical tool were not found in any of the 12 modules: globalisation, language inequity, language policy and sustainable development. This can be due to the fact that the topic of globalisation has mainly been operationalised in the topics of migration and diversity, whereas language inequity and language policy were marginally addressed in activities around language families and types. The lack of focus on sustainable development would indeed point towards a need to review the modules in order to address issues around the sustainable development goals more explicitly.

5.4   Approaches

Of the five subcategories that make up the approaches, we can see that there is a greater incidence of activities that use reflective learning. We verified, however, that the analysed modules do not always clearly contemplate the issues on which reflection is promoted. This subcategory integrates reflective questions about migration (modules 3 and 12), LL in different contexts, from the home (modules 5, 10 and 12) to the local context (modules 1, 4, 6, 9 and 10). There is also work focused on personal emotions (modules 7, 8 and 10) or those of a particular group (modules 7 and 8), as well as reflection on the presence or absence of local languages in the LL of the city (modules 1, 4, 6, 9 and 10).

The second most representative subcategory is related to activities focused on project-based learning. Seven out of the 12 modules use approaches that promote learning through projects. The strategies revolve around pupils collecting and recording LL as language detectives (module 4) in different places, from the street, school, supermarket or other places in the community. The creation of poems (module 8), memes (module 7), collages (modules 4, 5, 6 and 12) or pop-ups (module 11) based on or that include elements of the LL are also frequently mentioned, not only in terms of visual LL, but also in terms of sound landscapes (module 9). In this subcategory we can also find activities focused on the creation of linguistic biographies (module 1) and the exploration of the LL at the food level in the city (module 1).

With regards to an approach based on dialogue, out of the 12 activities that make up the corpus, six use this approach, although not always in isolation. Dialogue arises from the promotion of debates, discussions or conversations (modules 1, 3, 4, 7, 8 and 12) related to the concept of 'educating cities' (module 1) whose goal is to improve the quality of life of their inhabitants on the basis of their active involvement (International Association of Educating Cities, 2020). The creation, in groups, of an imaginary city (modules 1 and 11) that integrates and responds to the individual and collective needs of each person, requires that students discuss among themselves and make decisions that allow them to reach mutual agreements. Activities that invoke the families related to migration (modules 3 and 12), or the creation and presentation of poems about personal and collective emotions (module 8) also appear as some of the examples that make up the corpus of analysis and that reflect an approach based on dialogue.

Problem-based learning, in turn, appears in five modules and focuses on the dynamics that are closely related to the aforementioned informal contexts—the home (modules 5, 10 and 12) or the community (modules 1, 4, 6, 9 and 10). In this case, pupils are confronted with a question or dilemma they are expected to find an answer to by conducting research at home or in the city. For instance, in module 5 pupils are expected to answer the question: "How many languages live in your house?" and then search for artefacts (packages, books, pamphlets) that display different languages, showcasing them in a collage or making a video sharing their discoveries.

Collaborative learning only stood out in one of the modules (module 9), as the creation of the proposed project would tend to require the collaboration of several people. It seems to us that this collaboration may have been based on individual contributions that were fundamental to the project's success, as there was a need to create scripts with questions for an interview, as well as to build sound and photographic maps with route delimitation to be carried out by the participants (pupils and their families).

6 Conclusion and Recommendations

Our study aimed at analysing 12 multimodal modules for LL-based language education developed within the LoCALL project, by proposing and applying an analytical tool that addressed domains of learning, competences, topics, and methodological approaches aligned with GCE. In terms of the domains of learning, our analysis showed that the vast majority of the LoCALL-modules are focused on the development of cognitive skills, namely related to the acquisition of knowledge about different languages and cultures. This is followed by modules focussed on different aspects of the socio-emotional domain, mostly related to language attitudes or values/emotions when engaging with different languages. Modules focusing on the behavioural domain were scarce and this domain was often not intertwined with the other domains. Focus on behaviour meant mobilising pupils for action in relation to investigating or protecting different languages. These results are in line with general studies on citizenship education, and GCE in particular, which have also identified the predominance of the cognitive domain and the general under-representation of aims related to behavioural aspects (Joris & Agirdag, 2019; Santamaría-Cárdaba & Lourenço, 2021).

In relation to the competences featured in the modules, and as expected, language-related knowledge and skills were central, as all of them target one or more basic language skills, with emphasis being placed on productive skills. In addition, many of the modules also aimed at fostering language awareness by identifying similarities and differences between languages and finding translations across languages. In terms of soft skills, we found a predominance of creativity as an outcome of arts-based activities, multimedia skills, and a focus on critical thinking. These results resonate Shohamy and Gorter's (2009) broad conceptualisation of LL as going beyond the mere description of languages and language use in public signage to also focus on

issues of identity, awareness and language policy. They attest to the broad under-
standing of the competences addressed in our LL research, as a result of the rela-
tionship between the analytical framework of LL and the contextualisation of topics
(Ziegler et al., 2018).

Regarding the topics addressed in the modules, we found a clear focus on the
issues of diversity, migration, language attitudes, participation and activism, which
are typical topics within GCE. As expected, an emphasis on the analysis of language
and cultural diversity in modern European societies was present in many of the
modules. Also deconstructing existing language hierarchies or addressing pupils'
own language attitudes was important. Surprisingly no module focused on the topics
of globalisation, language inequity, language policy nor on sustainable development.
The choice of topics, however, goes beyond mere language-related issues to reflecting
also aspects of diversity and migration, for example. This can be seen as a form of
transformative pedagogy which is in line with Santamaría-Cárdaba and Lourenço's
(2021) definition of GCE as a means to educate citizens for autonomous and critical
thinking so that they can understand the existing social inequalities and act in a
committed way to transform societies into more just communities.

Finally, in terms of the approaches chosen, our results show a major focus on
reflective learning, although sometimes not further specified. Reflective learning
happens in relation to the topics of migration and LL in different contexts, from the
home to the local context. In addition, project-based learning was also central, for
example in the form of jointly searching for and recording linguistic landscapes, as
well as dialogue-based learning in the form of debates or discussions. Problem-based
learning was, in turn, less salient and the 'problems' were limited to the collection
of LL at home or in the local context. Our results are summarised in Table 3.

Table 3 Overview of the main results

Focus	A. Domains	B. Competences	C. Topics	D. Approaches
Central	Cognitive (acquiring knowledge about languages and cultures)	Language-related knowledge and skills (language awareness, productive skills)	Migration and diversity	Project-learning
Average	Socio-emotional (conveying emotions, developing respect for and valorisation of diversity)	Soft skills (creativity and critical thinking)	Language attitudes and values	Reflective learning
Marginal	Behavioural (contributing to building more inclusive communities)	Attitudes and values (respect for diversity, participatory engagement)	Participation and activism	Problem-based learning

Our analysis thus shows that working with LL in the (language) classroom can very much be aligned with aims, topics and approaches of GCE, covering cognitive, socio-emotional and behavioural domains of learning. The main topics of migration and (language) diversity, attached to tackling language attitudes and fostering participation and activism are in line with what Pope Francis (2015) calls for in terms of reformulating the concept of citizenship to reduce inequalities, overcome differences and prejudice, fight for human rights and social justice. We conclude that at the basis of both language education through LL and GCE are pedagogies centred around participation, equality and social engagement. With Erling and Moore (2021), we can say that LL can be regarded as a "socially engaged pedagogical approach and field of research grounded in ideals of social justice" (p. 1).

Regarding our analytical tool, the taxonomy proved to be useful as a matrix for analysing pedagogical LL-modules from a GCE perspective. Still, further research with a larger sample should be conducted in order to better assess its potential and limitations. A follow-up study should also include the actual classroom experiences of teachers and pupils and seek out to map processes of change in the involved stakeholders over time. In the current study, we did not set out to reach all-encompassing conclusions, we merely sought to identify main trends in the ways teaching through LL converges with GCE aims, topics and approaches.

Based on these findings, we propose below eight recommendations that may inspire teachers to address GCE in a more comprehensive and meaningful way while exploring LL.

Recommendation #1: Create bridges between the classroom and the real world using LL.

Working with LL should not limit itself to photographing, identifying or counting languages. LL are a formidable opportunity to establish connections between the school curriculum and the real world. When analysing signs and artefacts that compose the LL of a specific site, teachers can make explicit links to curriculum content, drawing pupils' attention to what they already know about other languages and about the world. They can also address topics such as globalisation, migration and multilingualism, while asking questions that make pupils go beyond what they see: "Who made this sign (a shop owner, local authorities, a private citizen…)?", "Who is the intended audience of the sign?", "Why were these languages chosen (and not others)?", " How does this relate to the linguistic and cultural communities living in this area?". These strategies can help pupils better understand the world and its complexities and discover some of the roots of social (and linguistic) inequality.

Recommendation #2: Establish links with disciplines other than (foreign) languages.

GCE reaches its full potential as a whole-school approach infused in the ethos of the school community. As emphasised by Oxfam (2015), GCE can provide purpose, motivation and coherence in teaching and learning, while reinforcing key knowledge, skills and values. Hence, working with LL within a GCE perspective should not be something specific to the language classroom, but should engage teachers from all subject areas, addressing curriculum goals in a cross-disciplinary way that

makes sense to the pupils. Activities such as creating maps and itineraries of the LL, discovering people and events related to a particular street name or sign, or becoming acquainted to local or foreign artistic manifestations can easily be linked to the curriculum of Geography, History and Arts and provide pupils with more opportunities to learn how our communities and societies work.

Recommendation #3: Promote critical thinking and collaboration through problem or project-based learning.

Critical thinking and collaboration are two soft skills that have been deemed essential for global citizenship and for life in the twenty-first century (Cambridge, 2020; Oxfam, 2015). Using approaches such as problem-based learning and strategies such as the issues tree, teachers can stimulate pupils' reflective thinking about real world problems that are apparent in the LL, such as discrimination, fake news or social inequality. This can also be conducted as a classroom or school project that implies active collaboration between pupils, teachers and staff. Having a 'language of the month' (see Clemente, 2017) is just one of the numerous possibilities to promote collaboration within and beyond the school walls, while building a more inclusive LL.

Recommendation #4: Provide opportunities for pupils to investigate and reflect about their own linguistic and cultural identity.

Educating 'global citizens' does not mean detaching pupils from their identitary roots. On the contrary, through exploring and reflecting about the LL present in their homes, schools or cities, pupils can not only become more aware about their linguistic and cultural background and their plurilingual repertoires, but also (re)gain a sense of self-esteem. This can contribute to a positive acceptance of diversity. As highlighted by Beacco (2004, p. 40), "if one recognizes the diversity of languages in one's own repertoire and the diversity of their functions and values, that awareness of the diversity one carries within one is such as to foster a positive perception of other people's languages."

Recommendation #5: Promote pupils' participation, engagement and decision-making.

Educating for global citizenship is about helping pupils understand that they have the power to act. While exploring LL, pupils can reflect about issues related to language (in)equity or social (in)justice. Activities such as identifying changes that need to be made in the LL in order to make it more inclusive, fair or sustainable can involve pupils in an engaged journey towards the preservation and promotion of linguistic diversity and towards collective well-being.

Recommendation #6: Involve the family and other members of the community, including local authorities.

The African proverb "It takes a village to raise a child" is a perfect motto for GCE. Apart from the teachers and staff, the family and other community members can provide pupils with meaningful and positive learning experiences while exploring LL. Inviting family members to the school to talk about their migration history or

language learning experiences, providing times and spaces for community members, such as migrants or refugees, to chat with pupils about their struggles adapting to a new linguistic and cultural reality, or bringing in local authorities to debate pupils' suggestions for a more inclusive LL can help pupils discover their individual and collective identities, make real-word connections and develop their participatory skills.

Recommendation #7: Use LL as an opportunity to address and achieve the Sustainable Development Goals.

The seventeen Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) were designed as a blueprint to achieve a better and more sustainable future, providing a sense and a direction for societal change. The achievement of these goals relies primarily on the education of global citizens, who are informed and engaged. When exploring LL, teachers can address SDGs as topics linked to poverty, well-being, climate action or responsible consumption, for example, but they can also include them as learning goals, developing activities that promote pupils' critical thinking and engagement towards reducing inequalities and making cities, institutions and societies more inclusive, peaceful, resilient and sustainable. These activities can take the form of drawings depicting pupils' ideal LL, role-play or simulations portraying migrants' experiences with a new linguistic reality, translations of information signs in the school that include the languages spoken by the school community, or letters to local authorities presenting suggestions and advice on how to change the LL to make it more inclusive.

Recommendation #8: Promote a learning environment that is democratic and dialogical, caring and supportive, stimulating and inspiring.

An important principle to keep in mind when conducting LL activities that cater for global citizenship is that the approaches and strategies used are learner-centred and dialogue-based, allowing pupils' to express their own opinion, use their linguistic repertoire, and make links to prior knowledge. Furthermore, it is important that these activities are focused on the behavioural domain, stimulating pupils' creativity and inspiring them to make a change.

References

ANGEL (Academic Network on Global Education and Learning). (2020). *Global Education Digest 2020.* Development Education Research Centre. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429463860

Andreotti, V. (2006). Soft versus critical global citizenship education. *Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review, 3*, 83–98.

Andreotti, V., & Souza, L. M. (2012). *Postcolonial perspectives on global citizenship education.* Routledge.

Beacco, J.-C. (2004). From linguistic diversity to plurilingual education: The guide for the development of language education policies in Europe. Report from the Conference "Languages, diversity, citizenship: Policies for plurilingualism in Europe" (pp. 35–46). Council of Europe.

Bolton, K., Botha, W., & Lee, S.-L. (2020). Linguistic landscapes and language contact. In R. Hickey (Ed.), *The Handbook of Language Contact* (pp. 281–300). Wiley-Blackwell.

Bowden, B. (2003). The perils of global citizenship. *Citizenship Studies, 7*(3), 349–362. https://doi.org/10.1080/1362102032000098913

Brinkmann, L. M., Duarte, J., & Melo-Pfeifer, S. (2022). Promoting plurilingualism through linguistic landscapes: A multi-method and multisite study in Germany and the Netherlands. *TESL Canada Journal, 38*(2), 88–112. https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v38i2.1358

Cambridge. (2020). *Cambridge Life Competencies: A framework to develop skills for life.* Cambridge University Press.

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (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. https://doi.org/10.1515/IRAL.2008.012

Clemente, M. (2017). *Paisagem linguística urbana: o caso de Aveiro e sua relevância educativa.* PhD Thesis in Education. Universidade de Aveiro. http://hdl.handle.net/10773/22801

Clemente, M., Andrade, A. I., & Martins, F. (2012). Learning to read the world, learning to look at the linguistic landscape: A primary school study. In C. Hélot, M. Barni, R. Janssens, & C. Bagna (Eds.), *Linguistic landscapes, multilingualism and social change* (pp. 267–285). Peter Lang.

Council of Europe. (2012). *Global education guidelines: A handbook for educators to understand and implement global education (updated version).* North-South Centre of the Council of Europe.

Council of Europe. (2019). *Global education guidelines: Concepts and methodologies on global education for educators and policy makers.* North-South Centre of the Council of Europe.

Dagenais, D., Moore, D., Sabatier, C., Lamarre, P., & Armand, F. (2009). Linguistic landscape and language awareness. In E. Shohamy & D. Gorter (Eds.), *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery* (pp. 253–269). Routledge.

Davies, L. (2006). Global citizenship: Abstraction or framework for action? *Educational Review, 58*(1), 5–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131910500352523

Dill, J. (2018). Global citizenship education: A critical introduction to key concepts and debates. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 66*(4), 559–560.

Erling, E. J., & Moore, E. (2021). Socially just plurilingual education in Europe: Shifting subjectivities and practices through research and action. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 18*(4), 523–533. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2021.1913171

Gorter, D. (2013). Linguistic landscapes in a multilingual world. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 33*, 190–212. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190513000020

Gorter, D. (2018a). Linguistic landscapes and trends in the study of schoolscapes. *Linguistics and Education, 44*, 80–85. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2017.10.001

Gorter, D. (2018b). Methods and techniques for linguistic landscape research: About definitions, core issues and technological innovations. In M. Pütz & N. Mundt (Eds.), *Expanding the linguistic landscape: Linguistic diversity, multimodality and the use of space as a semiotic resource* (pp. 38–57). Multilingual Matters.

Gorter, D., & Cenoz, J. (2015a). The linguistic landscapes inside multilingual schools. In B. Spolsky, M. Tannenbaum, & O. Inbar (Eds.), *Challenges for language education and policy: Making space for people* (pp. 151–169). Routledge.

Gorter, D., & Cenoz, J. (2015b). Translanguaging and linguistic landscapes. *Linguistic Landscape, 1*(1), 54–74. https://doi.org/10.1075/ll.1.1/2.04gor

Gorter, D., & Cenoz, J. (2020). Theoretical development of linguistic landscape studies. *Linguistic Landscape, 6*(1), 16–22.

Hancock, A. (2012). Capturing the linguistic landscape of Edinburgh: A pedagogical tool to investigate student teachers' understandings of cultural and linguistic diversity. In C. Hélot, M. Barni, R. Janssens & C. Bagna (Eds.), *Linguistic Landscapes, Multilingualism and Social Change* (pp. 249–266). Peter Lang.

Hélot, C., Barni, M., Janssens, R., & Bagna, C. (Eds.). (2012). *Linguistic landscapes, multilingualism and social change.* Peter Lang.

Hernández-Martín, L., & Skrandies, P. (2020). Taking the foreign out of language teaching: Opening up the classroom to the multilingual city. In D. Malinowski, H. H. Maxim, & S. Dubreil (Eds.), *Language teaching in the linguistic landscape: Mobilizing pedagogy in public space* (pp. 293–325). Springer.

Hopkins, C. A. (2020). Foreword. In P. Bamber (Ed.), *Teacher education for sustainable development and global citizenship: Critical perspectives on values, curriculum and assessment*. Routledge.

Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 15*(9), 1277–1288. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687

International Association of Educating Cities. (2020). *Charter of educating cities*. International Association of Educating Cities.

James, C., & Garrett, P. (1992). *Language awareness in the classroom*. Longman.

Landry, R., & Bourhis, R. (1997). Linguistic landscape and ethnolinguistic vitality: An empirical study. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology., 16*(1), 23–49.

Li, J., & Marshall, S. (2018). Engaging with linguistic landscaping in Vancouver's Chinatown: A pedagogical tool for teaching and learning about multilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism.* https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1422479

Lourenço, M., & Simões, A. R. (2021). Teaching and learning for global citizenship in the EFL classroom—towards a pedagogical framework. In S. Saúde, M. A. Raposo, N. Pereira & A. I. Rodrigues (Eds.), *Teaching and Learning Practices that Promote Sustainable Development and Active Citizenship* (pp. 86–106). IGI Global.

Malinowski, D., Maxim, H., & Dubreil, S. (Eds.). (2020). *Language teaching in the linguistic landscape. Mobilizing pedagogy in public space*. Springer.

Joris, M., & Agirdag, O. (2019). In search of good citizenship education: A normative analysis of the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS). *European Journal of Education, 54*(2), 287–298.

Morin, E., & Kern, A. B. (1999). *Homeland Earth: A manifesto for the new millenium*. Hampton Press.

Nilsen, A. B., Fylkesnes, S., & Mausethagen, S. (2017). The linguistics in othering: Teacher educators' talk about cultural diversity. *Reconceptualizing Educational Research Methodology, 8*(1), 40–50.

Oxfam (2015). *Education for global citizenship: A guide for schools*. Oxfam GB.

Oxley, L., & Morris, P. (2013). Global citizenship: A typology for distinguishing its multiple conceptions. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 61*, 301–325. https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2013.798393

Pais, A., & Costa, M. (2017). An ideology critique of global citizenship education. *Critical Studies in Education, 61*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2017.1318772

Pashby, K., Costa, M., Stein, S., & Andreotti, V. (2020). A meta-review of typologies of global citizenship education. *Comparative Education., 56*, 144–164. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2020.1723352

Peck, A., & Stroud, C. (2015). Skinscapes. *Linguistic Landscape, 1*(1–2), 133–151.

Pennycook, A. (1999). Introduction: Critical approaches to TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*, 329–348.

Pope Francis. (2015). *Encyclical letter Laudato Si' of the Holy Father Francis on Care for Our Common Home*. Vatican Press.

Prada, J. (2021, 18 January). From landscapes to sensescapes: the implications of translanguaging for Linguistic Landscapes research. Communication presented at the 2nd LoCALL Training week [online]. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JW3MCZcft_4&list=PLQr6fAO8AbiaeFOI23ekVpbivB9U1kr45&index=3

Roos, J., & Nicholas, H. (2019). Using young learners' language environments for EFL learning. Ways of working with linguistic landscapes. *AILA Review, 32(1)*, 91–111.

Rowland, L. (2013). The pedagogical benefits of a linguistic landscape project in Japan. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 16*(4), 494–505.

Santamaría-Cárdaba, N., & Lourenço, M. (2021). Global citizenship education in primary school: a comparative analysis of education policy documents in Portugal and Spain. *Iberoamerican Journal of Development Studies, 10*(2), 130–158. https://doi.org/10.26754/ojs_ried/ijds.585

Sayer, P. (2020). Ethnographic language learning projects through the linguistic landscape. In D. Malinowski, H. Maxim, & S. Dubrell (Eds.), *Language teaching in the linguistic landscape: Mobilizing pedagogy in the public space* (pp. 327–347). Springer.

Scarvaglieri, C., Redder, A., Pappenhagen, R., & Brehmer, B. (2013). Capturing diversity: Linguistic land- and soundscaping. In I. Gogolin & J. Duarte (Eds.), *Linguistic superdiversity in urban areas: Research approaches* (pp. 45–73). John Benjamins.

Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis*. Sage.

Shohamy, E., & Gorter, D. (2009). *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery*. Routledge.

Shohamy, E., & Waksman, S. (2009). Linguistic landscape as an ecological arena: Modalities, meanings, negotiations, education. In E. Shohamy & D. Gorter (Eds.), *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery* (pp. 313–331). Routledge.

Tjandra, C. (2021). Supporting newcomer children's language awareness, incidental language learning, and identity negotiation through the multilingual linguistic landscape: An exploratory case study. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 77*(1), 1–22.

Torres, C. A. (2018). *Theoretical and empirical foundations of critical global citizenship education*. Routledge.

UNESCO. (2014). *Global citizenship education: Preparing learners for the challenges of the twenty-first century*. UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2015). *Global citizenship education: Topics and learning objectives*. UNESCO.

UN. (2012). *Global Education First Initiative*. United Nations.

UN. (2015). *Transforming our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. United Nations.

van Mensel, L., Vandenbroucke, M., & Blackwood, R. (2017). Linguistic landscapes. In O. Garcia, N. Flores, & M. Spotti (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Society* (pp. 423–449). Oxford University Press.

Ziegler, E., Schmitz, U., & Uslucan, H.-H. (2018). Attitudes towards visual multilingualism in the linguistic landscape of the Ruhr Area. In M. Pütz & N. Mundt (Eds.), *Expanding the linguistic landscape: Linguistic diversity, multimodality and the use of space as a semiotic resource* (pp. 264–299). Multilingual Matters.

Mónica Lourenço is a Researcher at the University of Aveiro (Portugal) and national coordinator of the LoCALL project. She has a Ph.D. in Didactics and Teacher Education and experience in teacher education and supervision. Her research interests include teacher education for global citizenship, plurilingualism, and internationalization of the curriculum.

Joana Duarte Ph.D. is professor for global citizenship education and bilingual education at the University of Amsterdam and for multilingualism and literacy at the NHL Stenden University of Applied Sciences and the University of Groningen. Her research areas focus on diversity, equity and minorities in education, teacher professionalisation, educational equity and multilingual language acquisition.

Francisco P. Silva is a Ph.D. student with a research grant from the Portuguese national funding agency for science, research and technology (FCT) working at the Research Centre for Didactics and Technology in the Education of Trainers (CIDTFF), University of Aveiro. He is a member of the Laboratory of Education in Languages (LabELing), where he is developing his research on global citizenship education through intercomprehension.

Bruna Batista is a Ph.D. student at the University of Aveiro (Portugal). She has a master's degree in pre-primary and primary education and in the years 2018/2019 she was in Cape Verde in a kindergarten. Her research interests include education for sustainable development and biocultural diversity in the first years of schooling.