Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature

Vol. 17(1), Feb/Mar 2024, e1294

Learning from the streets: a state-of-the-art review about Linguistic Landscapes and Global Citizenship Education

Aprender de la calle: una revisión de literatura sobre los Paisajes Lingüísticos y la Educación para la Ciudadanía Global

Francisco Parrança da Silva
University of Aveiro

Abstract

In this article we discuss how Linguistic Landscapes (LL) as a pedagogical tool can be applied in the framework of Global Citizenship Education (GCE). We explore the pedagogical use of LL, which are the visible representation of multilingualism and diversity in public spaces, and their role for GCE practices. Research about LL has revealed their potential to support the development of students' critical awareness of diversity, empathy towards culturally and linguistically diverse others, and agency for Social Linguistic Justice. The article emphasizes the synergistic relationship between GCE and LL. Through a comprehensive state-of-the-art literature review in both fields, in this article we argue for the potential of using LL as a pedagogical tool to promote GCE. Our conclusions underscore the potential of LL as a pedagogical tool that can support students to become critically informed, empathetic, and actively engaged global citizens, thus contributing to a more sustainable world.

Keywords: Linguistic landscapes; Global citizenship education; Global citizenship; State-of-the-art review; Social and linguistic justice

Resumen

En este artículo analizamos las aplicaciones de los Paisajes Lingüísticos (PL) como herramienta pedagógica en el marco de la Educación para la Ciudadanía Global (ECG). Exploramos la utilización pedagógica de los PL y su papel en las prácticas de la ECG. La investigación sobre los PL ha revelado el potencial de estos conceptos para apoyar el desarrollo de la conciencia crítica de los estudiantes sobre la diversidad, la empatía hacia el otro lingüísticamente y culturalmente diverso, y la agencia para la justicia social lingüística. A través de una revisión exhaustiva del estado-del-arte de la literatura, este artículo trata de argumentar a favor del potencial de incorporar los PL como herramienta pedagógica en la ECG. Nuestras conclusiones subrayan el potencial de los PL como herramienta pedagógica que puede ayudar para que los estudiantes se conviertan en ciudadanos globales informados críticamente, empáticos y activamente comprometidos, contribuyendo así a un mundo más sostenible.

Palabras clave: Paisajes lingüísticos; Educación para la ciudadanía global; Ciudadanía global; Revisión de literatura del estado-del-arte; Justicia social y lingüística

ISSN: 2013-6196 | https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/jtl3.1294

INTRODUCTION

Linguistic Landscapes (LL) refer to the visible display of languages in public spaces within a particular geographic area. Usually, they include written, printed, or painted texts, such as signs, advertisements, billboards, graffiti, and shop names, that are publicly displayed and can be observed in urban or rural environments. More recently, some authors point out that LL expanded both conceptually and disciplinary "now embracing multiple sense-makers beyond written words and languages, in a more holistic, less logocentric understanding of individuals' repertoires" (Melo-Pfeifer, 2023, p. 2). As such, it is possible to argue that the exploration of LL can provide a snapshot of the languages used and their relative prominence in a particular context.

LL can vary greatly from one location to another, mirroring the specific sociolinguistic context, its cultural and linguistic diversity, and the historical and economic factors of a particular region. Thus, researchers study LL to gain insights into language policies, social (linguistic) integration and interaction, attitudes towards languages and/or linguistic diversity, and the negotiation of language identities within a given community. By examining the languages, scripts, and symbols present in the LL, researchers can gain an understanding not only of the multilingualism, language vitality, language policies, and linguistic power relations, but also of migration patterns, and cultural identities of certain community. Hence, LL provide valuable insights into the sociolinguistic dynamics of a community or region.

From Sociolinguistics to Education, LL research has its own history (Marten et al., 2012; Melo-Pfeifer, 2023). The potential value of LL in education has been noted at least since 2009, when Shohamy and Waksman proposed LL "as a powerful tool for education, meaningful language learning, [and] towards activism" (p. 326). By highlighting the presence and value of different languages and cultures within a community, educators can help students develop positive attitudes towards multilingualism (Li & Marshall, 2020) and understand the importance of respecting linguistic rights (Straszer & Kroik, 2022). LL can also serve as a springboard for discussing language policies, linguistic diversity, and the preservation of endangered languages (Melo-Pfeifer, 2023; Krompák et al., 2022).

Considering the above, LL serve as tangible representation(s) of language diversity, cultural identities, and social dynamics within communities; therefore, in the educational space, they represent meaningful connections and opportunities for intercultural understanding, empathy, and active engagement with the other and

diversity. This understanding of LL and its educational potential seems to align with the goals of Global Citizenship Education (GCE), which seeks to educate responsible and active global citizens who value and respect diversity, namely of languages, cultures, and world perspectives. Engaging with LL may empower learners to navigate linguistic diversity, promote critical intercultural dialogue, and advocate for more inclusive and just language practices and policies.

Therefore, this article aims to explore the pedagogical potential of LL as tools for GCE, in particular, regarding the education of citizens who value and respect linguistic and cultural diversity. To address this aim, we conduct a State-of-the-art comprehensive literature review (Grant & Booth, 2009) of existing research in the field, focusing on the pedagogical-didactical potential of LL for GCE. Considering the moment of LL research, this article assumes particular relevance as there is practically no research done connecting LL and GCE, as a search in major educational databases and repositories (Scopus, ERIC, Scielo, WebOfScience and Redalyc) shows at the time of this publication.

LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPES IN EDUCATION

This first part of the article focuses on the pedagogical use of Linguistic Landscapes (LL). We begin by briefly introducing the concept and the way it has been developed in Education. We then review how LL can be used in education settings and conclude by highlighting LL potential for GCE.

LL can be defined as 'The language of public road signs, advertising billboards, street names, place names, commercial shop signs, and public signs on government buildings (…) of a given territory, region, or urban agglomeration.' (Landry & Bourhis, 1997, p. 25). This is a definition of LL commonly used by researchers as it represents a relevant step for LL research developed thereafter. However, as we have briefly explained in the introduction, today's definition of LL is a more complex and broader one – not only does LL entail written or printed texts, but it also embraces images, graffiti, and sounds (Gorter, 2023; Gorter & Cenoz, 2015, 2022; Marten et al., 2012; Melo-Pfeifer, 2023). Considering the vitality of LL research in 2023, it is possible that sooner than later a more comprehensive definition of LL will be formulated. An important factor to consider is that LL research is being developed not only from a multilingual and/or sociopolitical perspective, but also from a *sensescapes* perspective (Prada, 2023).

The study of LL emerged more consistently since 2003 and has since gained momentum as a research field (Marten et al., 2012). It initially focused on the

documentation and analysis of multilingual signage in urban environments. Over time, the scope of LL research expanded to explore the sociolinguistic, cultural, and political dimensions associated with language visibility in public spaces that can be characterized as superdiverse (Blommaert, 2013). From there followed what Melo-Pfeifer (2023) called a "more multimodal approach" (p. 3) to LL, which was possibly related with the focus on "social issues along the lines of symbolic interactionism and on the way subjects live and contest their multiple identities" (p. 3). More relevant to this article, is the place LL has found in Education, with particular emphasis on Language Education (Gorter, 2018, 2023; Gorter & Cenoz, 2015, 2022; Malinowski, 2015; Melo-Pfeifer, 2023). Two important ideas can be pointed out as both cause and effect of the development of LL research: on the one hand, the acknowledgment that the conceptualization of LL understands languages has not being limited to private or interpersonal communication but also present in public spaces; on the other hand, the acknowledgment that LL, as linguistic diversity and language visibility in the public realm, can reflect the complex linguistic and cultural makeup of society (Gorter, 2018, 2023; Gorter & Cenoz, 2015, 2022; Malinowski, 2015).

LL has proven to be valuable in various research fields, but particularly in Education. In the field of Education, LL offer a visual representation of language diversity, language policies, and language ideologies within a community. They provide opportunities to analyse and understand the sociocultural and linguistic aspects of a particular context, enabling educators and researchers to address issues of language policies, multilingualism, and linguistic and cultural representations and beliefs (Li & Marshall, 2020). As mentioned before, LL refer to the visible manifestation of languages in public spaces, so they can provide insights into the presence, usage, and power dynamics of languages within a specific community or geographical area. Particularly in the educational context, research about LL can help us understand what goes on inside schools, namely regarding how languages and linguistic diversity are (re)presented and taught. From this perspective, some researchers talk about schools as a particular setting for the study of LL and therefore refer to the LL present in schools as *schoolscapes* (Gorter, 2018).

In education, LL can be explored in several ways, although they are most commonly used as pedagogical resources in language education. As a pedagogical approach, LL refer to the intentional use of language displays in public spaces for educational purposes (i.e. teaching and learning). By incorporating real-world examples of language use and linguistic diversity, learners can develop intercultural competence, language awareness, and an appreciation for cultural diversity. In a

broad sense, as a pedagogical approach, LL involves incorporating concrete meaning-making examples of language use and linguistic diversity and cultural representations into educational settings to enhance language learning, intercultural understanding, and both reflexive and critical thinking (Gorter, 2023; Gorter & Cenoz, 2015, 2022; Melo-Pfeifer, 2023).

In a more detailed description, we can say that LL as a pedagogical approach provides authentic language use and confrontation of personal cultural representations that connect students' learning to the real world. By engaging with tangible examples of language diversity in public spaces, learners can see how languages function in different contexts and gain a deeper understanding of language and diversity in action. This promotes a more inclusive and respectful approach towards linguistic and cultural diversity, as by analysing LL learners are encouraged to critically examine language choices, power dynamics, and respective social implications (Huang, 2022; Lehner, 2022; Lourenço et al., 2023). Students can reflect and discuss questions related to language visibility, representation, and the influence of language on identity and social interactions (Harris et al., 2022). This supports the development of reflexive and critical thinking skills and a deeper understanding of the complex relationship between language, culture, and society (Clemente et al., 2012, 2013; Melo-Pfeifer, 2023; Sullivan et al., 2022).

LL promotes a sense of belonging and identity by recognizing and valuing the linguistic resources and cultural diversity present in the community. Furthermore, LL foster a sense of community and civic engagement by encouraging learners to actively participate in shaping their linguistic and cultural environments (Lourenço & Melo-Pfeifer, 2022). Through LL as a pedagogical approach students can explore issues of language rights, social justice, and inclusive language practices. They can also engage in projects that involve creating their own language displays or advocating for linguistic diversity in their community (Lourenço et al., 2023). Additionally, LL can be used to examine language policy and planning in education systems, especially, in the curricula. By analysing the visibility and status of different languages in educational institutions, policymakers and educators can gain insights into language practices, inclusivity, and potential language barriers that impact students' access to education.

LL also offer opportunities to practice language and develop students' linguistic repertoires. Through analysing LL students can engage in reading, interpreting, and discussing the language displays, which improves reading comprehension, vocabulary expansion, and language production regardless of their proficiency. It

also encourages students to become more observant of language use in their everyday environment. (Gorter et al., 2021)

In conclusion, considering all the above, the pedagogical use of LL can potentially contribute to students' development as global citizens. By discovering linguistic and cultural diversity, promoting the development of intercultural competence, fostering empathy towards others, especially linguistically and culturally diverse others, and encouraging active engagement with linguistic and cultural diversity, LL appear to be a powerful educational tool to foster the values, knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for students to actively participate in an interconnected and diverse world. By embracing LL in Education, it appears that students can be better equipped to become global citizens who appreciate and respect linguistic and cultural diversity, engage in meaningful intercultural communication, and work towards a more inclusive and equitable global society.

Although we have tried to present an overall view of the development of LL as a research field, namely, in Educational Research, other publications present a more detailed account about the development of LL (viz., Melo-Pfeifer, 2023). As we finish this part about LL in Education, in the next part of this paper we will present an overview of GCE.

GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Global Citizenship Education (GCE) is an educational framework that aims to foster the knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes necessary for individuals to engage as active, responsible, and empathetic global citizens in a continuously more interconnected and interdependent world (Oxfam, 2015a, 2015b; Tarozzi & Torres, 2018; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], 2014, 2015). GCE aims to educate students that know about local and global issues while developing critical thinking, problem-solving, intercultural skills, or even translanguaging as suggested by Tierney (2018). It seeks to foster values such as empathy, respect, social responsibility, ethical decision-making, and social and linguistic justice. Moreover, GCE aims to empower individuals to act and make a positive difference in their communities, challenging injustice and contributing to a more sustainable and equitable global society (Pais & Costa, 2017; Pashby & Costa, 2021; Pashby et al., 2020; Shultz, 2007; Tarozzi & Torres, 2018; Tawil, 2013).

GCE research has taken a turn at the beginning of the 21st century. The publication of Andreotti's "Soft versus Critical Global Citizenship Education"

(2006) represented a turning point in research about GCE, especially in the global North (Pashby & Costa, 2021). Andreotti's 2006 work brought attention to this dual focus on Northern/Western values and interests being imposed indiscriminately as global and universal, which she identified as a "soft" approach to GCE. On the other hand, she proposed a critical approach to GCE as the one that "tries to promote change without telling learners what they should think or do, by creating spaces where they are safe to analyse and experiment with other forms of seeing/thinking and being/relating to one another" (Andreotti, 2006, p. 49). Later on, Schattle (2008, 2009) developed further the idea of (critical) GCE by looking at research being developed in particular English-speaking countries (USA, UK, New Zealand) by researchers and institutions/organizations like Daisaku Ikeda and the Soka University of America, the Haverford's College's Centre for Peace and Global Citizenship, or Oxfam (Schattle, 2008), and the work of Joshua Cohen (1996), Richard Falk (1994), or John Urry (2000) (Schattle, 2009). From there followed another work by Andreotti, a special issue dedicated to GCE in *Globalisation, Societies and Education* in 2011. This particular publication represented another relevant moment in GCE research as "proliferation of typologies began mapping the divergent, overlapping, and even contradictory sets of aims and approaches to GCE" (Pashby & Costa, 2021, pp. 1-2).

In 2012 the former Secretary-General of the United Nations (UN), Ban Ki-moon, launched the Global Education First Initiative (UN, 2012) in response to the need to guarantee the universal right to basic education to all. For that purpose, three major priority areas of action were defined, being "to foster global citizenship" one of those. A few years later, the publication of "Transforming Our World: The 2030 agenda for Sustainable Development" by UN (2015) revealed to be another stepping stone for GCE research, namely in response of sustainable development goal 4.7. More recently, it is relevant to note the publication of the European Declaration on Global Education to 2050 (Global Education Network Europe [GENE], 2022), also known as the Dublin Declaration.

Along this period, many different approaches to GCE were identified, analysed and typologized by researchers from different geographies (Andreotti, 2014; Goren & Yemini, 2017; Oxley & Morris, 2013; Pashby et al., 2020; Stein, 2015; Tarozzi & Torres, 2018; Veugelers, 2011; Yemini et al., 2019). More recently, GCE research has gone beyond the global North and the English language as the Multilingual Global Education Digest project shows (Academic Network on Global Education & Learning [ANGEL], 2022). Recalling Schattle's (2008) work, Pashby and colleagues emphasized that the field of GCE can be represented by

"multiple ideological constellations overlapping and even contradicting one another" (2020, p. 1). This fuzziness associated with the concept of GCE has been described long ago by Davies (2006), as he presented GCE as a metaphor, a contradiction of terms, or an oxymoron. Even so, this has not discouraged GCE research to continue developing – as of 2023 GCE research has reached fields such as the neurosciences (Carmona et al., 2022). Two particular domains where the aforementioned ambiguity can be identified are teacher training and the curriculum. Related to the first, some studies shown that the concept of GCE is indeed a fuzzy one in the perspective of teachers and educators (Andrade & Lourenço, 2019; Lourenço, 2021; Lourenço & Andrade, 2023; Rapoport, 2010; Tichnor-Wagner et al., 2016). As to the curriculum, a usual critique relates to the different approaches to GCE integration at a curricular level. In some cases, GCE is understood as a topic that can be taught in classes like History or Geography; in another situations, it is understood as a new version of the traditional citizenship education infused by a global perspective; in some other cases, GCE is added as a new subject; and to conclude, there are situations where GCE is not fully integrated at the curricular level, as it remains in realm of the extracurricular (Rapoport, 2010; Lourenço, 2018; Tarozzi & Torres, 2018).

It is possible to argue that GCE has evolved over time to address the complexities and challenges of contemporaneity. Initially, it focused on promoting awareness of global issues and encouraging action through community service and activism (volunteering). However, it has expanded to encompass a broader range of dimensions which can be extrapolated by expanding topics and themes associated with GCE. Some of GCE topics and themes are intercultural competence, language learning, human rights, sustainable development, climate changes, social justice, gender and identity, (de)colonialism, war, economy and trade, philosophy and ethics, etc. (Inguaggiato & Coelho, 2017; Pashby & Sund, 2020; Schattle, 2008, 2009; Yamashita, 2006; Yemini et al., 2019). While some of its political and social goals and principles may be subject to debate, it is important to note that several publications from supranational agencies, NGOs, and other entities within civil society have played and continue to play a significant role in advancing GCE (AIDGLOBAL, 2016; Bridge 47, 2020; Education Above All Foundation, 2012; Padilha et al., 2011; Oxfam, 2006; 2015a, 2015b, 2015c; UN, 2015; UNESCO, 2014, 2015, 2017, 2018a, 2018b, 2021, 2022; Yemini et al., 2019).

The overarching goals of GCE are to develop individuals who have a sense of belonging and responsibility to their local communities, their nations, and the world. However, upon which set of knowledge, skills, attitudes and values students

became global citizens is the key question. Following Andreottis' proposal of soft and critical GCE (2006), the path to become a global citizen can be traced from a soft approach of GCE to a critical one. From our perspective, a particular factor that can relate to the abovementioned 'path' is related to a set of methodological, epistemological, and ontological assumptions GCE shares with another educational frameworks such as Education for Sustainability, Education for Peace, Education for Social Justice, etc. At the basis of all these proposals is the necessity for change. Not only individual change, but also institutional and political, and economic and social change. Nevertheless, changing is hard and doing the necessary change (Andreotti, 2021) is even more difficult as it "involves unlearning our learned ways: of thinking and imagining; of sensing and feeling, of relating to one another, the earth, and the cosmos; of facing life, fear, pain, loss, and death […] that we learn how to face our shadows, how to compost our 'shit', and how to weather storm together." (xxi). Therefore, like it needs be a communitarian struggle for social and linguistic justice, GCE also needs to be a personal struggle for social and linguistic justice.

GCE adopts a holistic and transformative approach to learning. It goes beyond knowledge encouraging active participation, critical thinking, problem-solving, and intercomprehension (Parrança-da-Silva & Andrade, 2018), for example. Various pedagogical approaches can be employed to achieve GCE goals and/or aims, including experiential learning, inquiry-based learning, participatory and collaborative learning, reflection and action (Parrança-da-Silva & Batista, 2021; UNESCO, 2015; Yemini et al., 2019) intercomprehension, linguistic and cultural diversity, and LL (Lourenço, 2022; Lourenço et al., 2023; Parrança-da-Silva & Andrade, 2018). The aims of GCE encompass a wide range of outcomes that contribute to the education of global citizens. These include developing knowledge and understanding, furthering skills and attributes, fostering values and attitudes, and encouraging action and agency (Santamaría-Cárdaba et al., 2022; UNESCO, 2015; Yemini et al., 2019)

In one of UNESCO's early publications, it is proposed that GCE entails three specific core conceptual dimensions: cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioral (2015, p. 22). Each domain plays a crucial role in shaping the knowledge, skills, and attitudes and values of students towards global issues and their responsibilities as global citizens.

The cognitive domain involves developing knowledge and critical thinking skills. It aims to enhance students' understanding of global challenges,

interconnections, and the complexities of the world. It encompasses acquiring knowledge about global issues such as poverty, climate change, human rights, and sustainable development. It also involves developing analytical and critical thinking skills to critically evaluate information, understand multiple perspectives, and recognize the underlying causes and consequences of global problems, namely those faced by minorities and systematically 'otherized' communities. In this domain, learners are encouraged to explore diverse sources of information, engage in research, and develop a mature understanding of global issues, including non-official and non-hegemonic documentation.

The socio-emotional domain of GCE focuses on fostering attitudes, values, and predispositions that promote empathy, respect, and intercultural understanding. It involves developing a sense of global awareness, empathy, and responsibility towards others, especially the linguistically and culturally diverse others. This domain emphasizes the importance of recognizing and respecting linguistic and cultural diversity, challenging stereotypes, and promoting social justice and human rights. It also encourages the development of interpersonal skills, such as intercomprehension, and conflict resolution, to facilitate meaningful interactions and collaborations with people from different backgrounds. Additionally, this domain fosters the development of a sense of personal and collective identity as global citizens, promoting a sense of belonging and connectedness to a larger global community.

The behavioral domain of GCE focuses on inspiring individuals to take action and make positive contributions to local and global communities. It involves translating knowledge and values into tangible actions that address global challenges, namely inequalities and injustice. This domain emphasizes active citizenship, civic engagement, and responsible decision-making. It encourages individuals to participate in various forms such as community service, volunteering, activism, and advocacy for social and environmental causes. It also promotes responsible consumption, sustainable lifestyle choices, and engagement in a sustainable development praxis. In this domain, learners are encouraged to become agents of positive change by applying their knowledge, skills, and values to contribute to a more equitable, just, and sustainable world.

Together, these three domains—cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioral—can form the foundations of GCE. By fostering knowledge, empathy, and action, GCE seeks to empower individuals to become informed, compassionate, and actively engaged global citizens who contribute to a more inclusive, peaceful, and sustainable world.

To conclude, GCE corresponds to an educational framework that aims to educate global citizens, that are active, responsible, and empathetic. With particular importance for this article, GCE fosters critical thinking, problem-solving, intercultural competence, values such as empathy, respect, social responsibility, and ethical decision-making, and an active engagement towards social and linguistic justice. It explores various dimensions and themes related to global issues and challenges and uses a broad range of pedagogical approaches such as experiential and inquiry-based learning to encourage active participation and transformative learning experiences. It encompasses its cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioral dimensions, fostering the knowledge, skills, and attitudes and values needed for global citizenship. Ultimately, GCE aims to empower students to become informed, compassionate, and actively engaged global citizens, contributing to a more inclusive, peaceful, and sustainable world.

METHODOLOGY

Linguistic Landscapes (LL) and Global Citizenship Education (GCE) are extensively researched topics within the field of Education. However, there is a notable gap in the literature concerning how these two educational concepts can mutually enrich each other pedagogically and didactically. In this sense, following all stated in the previous two parts of this article, in this State-of-the-art Review (Grant & Booth, 2009, p. 101) we explore the potential of LL as a pedagogical tool for GCE.

According to Grant and Booth (2009), a State-of-the-art Literature Review (SLR) offers "considerable value for those new to an area or for those seeking to identify potential opportunities for contemporary research" (p. 101). Furthermore, such a review allows researchers to "derive a feel for the quantity and main characteristics of a topic" (p. 101) even from a single document. While our approach did not entail a systematic document search, we adopted a comprehensive methodology, which involved an exhaustive effort to gather relevant information about LL as a pedagogical tool for GCE.

Our initial step involved identifying publications explicitly linking GCE with LL. Two noteworthy documents emerged: Lourenço and Melo-Pfeifer (2022) (D1) and Lourenço et al. (2023) (D2). The former, an article published in a Portuguese academic journal (Diacrítica), was authored by researchers with a substantial body of work in LL and GCE. The latter, a book chapter published by Springer in "Linguistic Landscapes in Language and Teacher Education – Multilingual Teaching and Learning Inside and Beyond the Classroom," was co-authored by Lourenço,

Duarte, Batista, and Parrança-da-Silva. These two publications formed the foundation of our review.

As highlighted in the introduction, a search across major educational databases and repositories, using the Boolean operator "AND" to connect "global citizenship education" and "linguistic landscapes," yielded only one document (D2). This limitation prompted us to employ the snowballing technique to comprehensively gather publications meeting our review criteria.

Having established our starting point, we employed a backward snowballing technique (Wohlin, 2014), utilizing reference lists to uncover additional relevant documents. We screened these documents for key criteria, including language (Portuguese, Spanish, or English), publication year (not earlier than 2000), publication type (articles and book chapters), and open access availability. Publications that had already been examined were excluded, and the remaining papers underwent full-text review, with none being excluded at this stage. We also explored the references of these articles to identify further potential inclusions. This snowballing approach, typically associated with systematic literature reviews, proved suitable considering the limited research available in this field. After conducting these procedures, our corpus of analysis comprised a total of 18 (eighteen) publications (Banda & Jimaima, 2017; Clemente et al., 2012, 2013; Gorter & Cenoz, 2015; Hancock, 2022; Huang, 2022; Lehner, 2022; Li & Marshall, 2020; Lourenço et al., 2023; Lourenço & Melo-Pfeifer, 2022; Marten et al., 2012; Prada, 2023; Shang & Xie, 2020; Shohamy & Waksman, 2009; Solmaz, 2023; Straszer & Kroik, 2022; Sullivan et al., 2022; Tichnor-Wagner et al., 2016)

With our corpus of analysis established, we proceeded to conduct a narrative approach to qualitative data analysis (Cohen et al., 2018, p. 664). This approach typically encompasses four stages: text selection, analysis, interpretation and checking, and the final narrative. As advocated by Cohen et al. (2018, p. 665), the shaping of the final narrative can take various forms, aligning with the researcher's objectives, such as organizing it by key participants, emergent or key themes, critical events, turning points in a life history or biography. Our decision to adopt this approach stems from two key considerations: firstly, it “breaks with the strictures of coding and the risk of disembodied text that can too easily result from coding and retrieval exercises” (Cohen et al., 2018, p. 665); secondly, we truly understand narratives as “powerful, human and integrated; truly [embodying] qualitative” (p. 665) research principles.

To finalize, before presenting our results and findings, it is essential to highlight the alignment between the aims and procedures of the narrative approach to qualitative data analysis and those of a comprehensive SLR.

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

In this section, we delve into the intricate interplay between Linguistic Landscapes (LL) and Global Citizenship Education (GCE). For the purpose of this article, it is crucial to examine the specific ways in which LL serve as a pedagogical resource for educating students as global citizens. As our exploration unfolds, we uncover several crucial facets of LL that have the potential to significantly enrich students' understanding of linguistic and cultural diversity, while also motivating them to actively engage in addressing pressing global challenges. Our exploration reveals several significant aspects of LL that can enrich GCE across three core conceptual domains as presented in part 3: the cognitive domain, the socio-emotional domain, and the behavioral domain.

Cognitive Domain: Fostering Knowledge and Critical Thinking

Within the cognitive domain of GCE, LL play a pivotal role in enhancing students' knowledge and critical thinking skills. By immersing themselves in the linguistic displays of public spaces, students gain a profound understanding of global challenges, interconnections, and the complexities of our world. They acquire knowledge about issues such as linguistic diversity, cultural representation, and language policies (Clemente et al., 2012, 2013; Melo-Pfeifer, 2023; Sullivan et al., 2022). Additionally, LL encourage analytical and critical thinking, enabling students to evaluate information critically, recognize multiple perspectives, and comprehend the underlying causes and consequences of global problems (Clemente et al., 2012, 2013; Solmaz, 2023). This cognitive dimension helps students to develop a mature understanding of linguistic and cultural diversity, promoting a deeper sense of empathy and respect for different languages and cultures (Lourenço & Melo-Pfeifer, 2022; Lourenço & Simões, 2021; Prada, 2023).

Socio-Emotional Domain: Igniting Empathy, Respect, Intercomprehension and Intercultural Understanding

In the socio-emotional domain, LL contribute significantly to fostering attitudes, values, and predispositions that promote empathy, respect, and intercultural understanding. The tangible representation of linguistic and cultural diversity within a specific geographical area allows students to recognize the presence of different

languages and cultural symbols, thereby enhancing their global awareness (Li & Marshall, 2020). By engaging with LL, students develop empathy and a sense of responsibility towards linguistic and culturally diverse communities (Lourenço & Melo-Pfeifer, 2022). They learn to challenge stereotypes, promote social justice, and respect linguistic and cultural diversity (Solmaz, 2023). This dimension also encourages the development of interpersonal skills, including intercomprehension and conflict resolution, which facilitate meaningful interactions with people from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds (Melo-Pfeifer, 2023).

Behavioral Domain: Inspiring Active Citizenship and Social Change

In the behavioral domain, LL inspire students to become active agents of change in addressing global challenges within their communities and individual lives (Sullivan et al., 2022). Students, through their examination of the visibility and representation of different languages in public spaces, engage in critical analyses of language rights, linguistic hegemony, and social exclusion (Harris et al., 2022; Huang, 2022; Lehner, 2022; Lourenço et al., 2023). This understanding empowers them to advocate for linguistic diversity, challenge inequalities, and promote inclusive spaces that celebrate linguistic and cultural diversity (Straszer & Kroik, 2022). LL encourage students to participate in meaningful actions, such as supporting language revitalization efforts and fostering inclusive spaces that celebrate linguistic and cultural diversity (Banda & Jimaima, 2017; Lourenço & Melo-Pfeifer, 2022).

In our perspective, by organizing our findings according to these three core dimensions of GCE, we gain a comprehensive perspective on how LL can effectively contribute to the development of informed, compassionate, and actively engaged global citizens who can contribute to a more inclusive, peaceful, and sustainable world.

Conclusions and Implications for Practice and Research

In this article we explored the potential use of LL as pedagogical tools for GCE. We argue that LL, which refer to the visible display of languages in public spaces, can serve as a valuable educational tool for GCE. By analyzing the connection between LL and GCE, we tried to identify several key points of convergence. The article highlights the potential of LL in fostering empathy towards diverse languages and cultures, promoting a deeper understanding of linguistic and cultural diversity, and encouraging responsible and active agency.

Firstly, we emphasize that LL provide a tangible representation of multilingualism and diversity within a given community, unveiling the complexity of society. By observing and interpreting the languages and scripts present in public spaces, students can develop a deeper understanding and appreciation for different cultures and identities. The contact with linguistic and cultural diversity that LL provides can play a valuable role for students' interest in intercultural encounters. This aligns with the goals of GCE, which aims to cultivate intercultural competence and promote inclusion.

Furthermore, LL offer opportunities for critical reflection and analysis. Through the examination of language use and power dynamics in public spaces, students can develop a more nuanced understandings of social, political, and economic contexts. This critical lens is a crucial aspect of GCE, as it encourages students to question dominant narratives, challenge stereotypes, and promote social justice.

Globalization occurs at different paces in different locations. As the idea of GCE is strongly connected with the phenomenon of globalization, also LL are influenced by some of its effects, like migration and the movement of people across borders, or the access to goods both tangible and intangible from distant geographies. Indeed, LL reflect the global interconnectedness of societies and the impact of transnational flows of people, ideas, and languages in local communities. Exploring LL can help global citizens understand the complex dynamics of globalization and the ways in which languages and cultures interact and evolve in a globalized world.

We also highlighted the role of LL in promoting active engagement and participation in local and global issues. By investigating the linguistic choices made in public signage, advertisements, and other displays, students can become aware of the ways in which language is used to convey messages, shape attitudes, and influence behavior like consumption choices. This awareness empowers students to become active agents in shaping their linguistic and cultural environments, contributing to the core goals of GCE. It is important to note that the extent of agency may vary depending on sociocultural and political contexts. Some students in their groups or communities may have more agency in shaping the LL, while others may face constraints or limitations due to power dynamics or marginalization. Nevertheless it is precisely the production and manipulation of LL which can be seen as a form of agency that enables individuals and communities to have an active role in shaping and influencing their linguistic and cultural environments, namely for

freeing themselves from the constraints and limitations imposed by economic, political, or cultural power dynamics.

Additionally, we presented GCE as an educational framework that entails a particular set of knowledge, skills, and attitudes and values that connect with LL *praxis*. We talked about the knowledge and understanding of global issues, where LL can serve as a visible manifestation of the linguistic and cultural diversity present in a interconnected world. Then we focused on skills, highlighting how LL provide opportunities for learners to develop critical thinking, problem-solving, empathy, and intercultural communication skills. Lastly, we mentioned the importance of attitudes and values, emphasizing that LL can foster respect for linguistic and cultural diversity, promote social inclusion, and encourage a sense of global responsibility.

Teachers have a crucial role to play in operationalizing LL within the framework of GCE, enriching students' learning experiences across its three core conceptual dimensions. Within the cognitive domain, educators can engage students in LL-based activities that promote knowledge gaining and critical thinking. By exploring the linguistic diversity represented in public spaces, students can gain a deeper understanding of global challenges and develop the analytical skills needed to evaluate information critically. For example, teachers can suggest students to explore LL in various settings, including schools, homes, city centers, and familiar places they visit. They can task students with observing and documenting the diversity of languages they encounter and the locations where these languages are prominently displayed. Subsequently, engaging students in a thoughtful discussion about the significance of these languages and their placement can foster deeper insights into linguistic and cultural diversity. Knowing about the linguistic and cultural diversity that surrounds us is an essential step for us to critically think about languages and cultures.

In the socio-emotional domain, LL offer opportunities to kindle empathy, respect, intercomprehension, and intercultural understanding. Teachers can design LL-focused lessons that encourage students to connect with linguistic and culturally diverse communities. To foster socio-emotional growth in GCE, teachers can engage students in activities that promote empathy, respect, and intercultural understanding. For instance, teachers may encourage students to explore and present their home LL, providing a deeper insight into the languages and cultures that shape their identities. This collaborative effort not only highlights the rich tapestry

of languages within the school community but also empowers students to share their unique linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

Lastly, in the behavioral domain, LL can inspire active citizenship and social change. Through LL analysis in and outside the school (schoolscapes, homescapes, *sensescapes*, soundscapes), students can develop an awareness of language rights, linguistic hegemony, and social exclusion, motivating them to advocate for linguistic diversity and engage in actions that create inclusive spaces celebrating linguistic and cultural diversity. To truly foster global citizenship through LL as a pedagogical tool, teachers ought to employ active pedagogical-didactical approaches, empowering students to become active defenders of linguistic rights and cultural diversity. To achieve this, teachers can work together with students, providing them with the necessary tools and skills for them to actively advocate for a more inclusive and respectful representation of linguistic and cultural diversity within their school, neighborhood, community, and city's LL.

Although not one of the focuses of this study, considering its importance, we acknowledge the relevance of addressing potential challenges and limitations when integrating LL into GCE. While LL offer promising pedagogical opportunities, teachers and schools may encounter challenges in implementing this approach effectively. One potential obstacle is the need for teacher education and professional development to prepare teachers with the necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes and values to incorporate LL into their teaching practices. Furthermore, the success of LL integration may vary based on the sociocultural context and linguistic diversity of the learning environment. Teachers should be mindful of potential cultural sensitivities, also preventing any cultural relativism, and ensure that LL activities are inclusive and respectful of all linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

Through all of the above, we can say that LL can in fact "be linked to important wider issues such as Global Citizenship Education" (Gorter, 2023, p. xi). Yet, further research is needed, for instance a systematic literature review about this topic, which can serve greatly both LL and GCE researchers and practitioners – for example, in the development of a 'more' comprehensive understanding of both concepts. Furthermore, from our perspective, considering the momentum that both LL and GCE research are going through, empirical research about the pedagogical use of LL for GCE, in our understanding, can help develop both fields further. Based on our findings, it looks evident that LL can effectively facilitate the realization of GCE, namely as a pedagogical tool. Therefore, in alignment with

international directives and orientations, we argue that further research in teacher education encompassing both in-service and pre-service teachers, is imperative.

To conclude, we argue that GCE emphasizes the role of LL in fostering empathy towards linguistically and culturally diverse others, promoting cultural and linguistic respect, and empowering learners to engage responsibly and actively in creating a more socially inclusive linguistic and culturally diverse world.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge Professor Ana Isabel Andrade and Professor Mónica Sofia Marques Lourenço, my PhD supervisors, for all their support in all stages that led to this publication.

I would also like to acknowledge my colleagues, Bruna Batista, for her critical review of the article, and Liudmila Shafirova and Valentina Piacentini, for their critical review of the English, Spanish and Catalan abstract.

FUNDING

The work of Francisco Parrança da Silva is financially supported by National Funds through FCT - Foundation for Science and Technology, IP, under the project: SFRH/BD/149634/2019.

REFERENCES

Academic Network on Global Education & Learning (ANGEL) (2022). *Global Education Digest 2022*. DERC. https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10161623/

AID GLOBAL (2016). *Global how? Despertar para a Educação Global – Manual do Formador*. https://aidglobal.org/site/uploads/paginas/documentos/9F95CE81-ED9A0_1.pdf

Andrade, A. I. & Lourenço, M. (2019). Educação para a cidadania global e identidade profissional: um estudo de caso na formação inicial de professores. In N. Fraga (Ed.), *O Professor do Século XXI em Perspetiva Comparada: Transformações e Desafios para a Construção de Sociedades Sustentáveis* (pp. 537-555). Universidade da Madeira.

Andreotti, V. (2006). Soft Versus Critical Global Citizenship Education. *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review, 3,* 40-51. https://www.developmenteducationreview.com/issue/issue-3/soft-versus-critical-global-citizenship-education

Andreotti, V. (2014). Critical and transnational literacies in international development and global citi- zenship education. *Sisyphus - Journal of Education, 2*(3), 32-50. https://doi.org/10.25749/sis.6544

Andreotti, V. (2021). *Hospicing Modernity – Facing Humanity's Wrongs and the Implications for Social Activism*. North Atlantic Books.

Banda, F. & Jimaima, H. (2017). Linguistic landscapes and the sociolinguistics of language vitality in multilingual contexts of Zambia. *Multilingua, 36*(5), 595-625. https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2017-3047

Blommaert, J. (2013). *Ethnography, Superdiversity and Linguistic Landscapes: Chronicles of Complexity*. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783090419

Bridge 47 (2020). *Transformative Learning Journeys Venturing into the wilds of Global Citizenship Education*. Author. https://www.bridge47.org/sites/default/files/2021-01/bridge47_transformativelearningjourneys2021_1.pdf

Carmona, M., Guerra, R. & Hofhuis, J. (2022). What does it mean to be a "Citizen of the World": a Prototype Approach. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychologym 53*(6), 547-569. https://doi.org/10.1177/00220221221088332

Clemente, M., Andrade, A. I., & Martins, F. (2012). Learning to read the world, learning to look at the linguistic landscape: A study in the first years of formal education. In Ch. Hélot, M. Barni, R. Janssens & C. Bagna (Eds.), *Linguistic Landscapes, Multilingualism and Social Change* (pp. 267-285). Peter Lang.

Clemente, M., Vieira, R., Martins, F. & Andrade, A. I. (2013). Linguistic Diversity in Aveiro, Portugal: Exploring Linguistic Landscape Methodologies in the "Beira Mar" Neighborhood. *Internet Latent Corpus Journal, 3*(1), 116-133.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research Methods in Education* (8th Edition). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315456539

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

Education Above All Foundation (2012). *Education for Global Citizenship*. Author.

Global Education Network Europe (GENE) (2022). *European Declaration on Global Education to 2050*. Author. https://www.gene.eu/s/GE2050-declaration.pdf

Goren, H., & Yemini, M. (2017). Global Citizenship Education Redefined – A Systematic Review of Empirical Studies on Global Citizenship Education. *International Journal of Educational Research, 82*, 170-183. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2017.02.004

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

Gorter, D. (2023). Foreword: Linguistic Landscapes as a Useful Pedagogical Tool. In S. Melo-Pfeifer (Ed.), *Linguistic Landscapes in Language and Teacher Education – Multilingual Teaching and Learning Inside and Beyond the Classroom* (pp. v-xiii). Springer.

Gorter, D. & Cenoz, J. (2015). 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 Publishers.

Gorter, D., & Cenoz, J. (2022). Linguistic landscapes in educational contexts: an afterword. In E. Krompák, V. Fernández-Mallat & S. Meyer (Eds.), *Linguistic Landscape and Educational Spaces* (pp. 277-290). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788923873-015

Gorter, D., Cenoz, J., & Van der Worp, K. (2021). The linguistic landscape as a resource for language learning and raising language awareness. *Journal of Spanish Language Teaching*, *8*(2), 161-181. https://doi.org/10.1080/23247797.2021.2014029

Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: An analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health Information & Libraries Journal, 26*(2), 91-108. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-1842.2009.00848.x

Hancock, A. (2022). Chinese students' engagement with linguistic landscapes during a summer school in Scotland. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 25*(10), 3568-3579. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2022.2066970

Harris, L., Cunninghan, U., King, J. & Stirling, D. (2022). Landscape Design for Language Revitalisation: Linguistic Landscape in and beyond a Māori Immersion Early Childhood Centre. In E. Krompák, V. Fernández-Mallat & S. Meyer (Eds.), *Linguistic Landscapes and Educational Spaces* (pp. 55-76). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788923873-005

Huang, C. (2022). Displaying Care: The Neoliberal Semiotic Landscape of Psychilogical Health Service Posters on a University Campus in Hong Kong. In E. Krompák, V. Fernández-Mallat & S. Meyer (Eds.), *Linguistic Landscapes and Educational Spaces* (pp. 104-126). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788923873-007

Inguaggiato, C. & Coelho, LS. (2017). Políticas de implementação da educação para a cidadania global no ensino básico: Análise comparativa realizada no âmbito do projeto Global Schools. *Sinergias, 5,* 55-73.

Krompák, E., Fernández-Mallat, V., & Meyer, S. (Eds.) (2022). *Linguistic landscape and educational spaces*. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788923873

Landry, R. & Bourhis, R. Y. (1997). Linguistic Landscape and Ethnolinguistic Vitality: an Empirical Study. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 16(*1), 23-49. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X970161002

Lehner, S. (2022). Linguistic Landscapes and Constructions of Space in a Learning Club for Young Refugees in Vienna. In E. Krompák, V. Fernández-Mallat & S. Meyer (Eds.), *Linguistic Landscapes and Educational Spaces* (31-54). Multilingual Matters.

Li, J. & Marshall, S. (2020). Engaging with linguistic landscaping in Vancouver's Chinatown: a pedagogical tool for teaching and learning about multilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *23*(8), 925-941. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1422479

Lourenço, M. (2018). Cidadania global e integração curricular: desafios e oportunidades nas vozes de formadores de professores [Global citizenship and curriculum integration: challenges and opportunities in the voices of teacher educators]. *Indagatio Didactica, 10*(1), 9-27. https://doi.org/10.34624/id.v10i1.11361

Lourenço, M. (2021). From Caterpillars to Butterflies: Exploring Pre-service Teachers' Transformations while navigating Global Citizenship Education. *Frontiers in Education, 6*, 1-17. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.651250

Lourenço, M. (2022). *Educação para a cidadania global em contexto português: possibilidades de integração curricular*. UA Editora. https://doi.org/10.48528/bjah-5j02

Lourenço, M. & Andrade, A. I. (2023). Educating for Sustainability and Global Citizenship in Uncertain Times. A case study with in-service teachers in Portugal. In J. Madalinska-Michalak (Ed.), *Quality in Teaching and Teacher Education – International Perspectives from a Changing World* (pp. 180-202). Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004536609_010

Lourenço, M., Duarte, J., Parrança-da-Silva, F. & Batista, B. (2023). Is there a place for Global Citizenship Education in the exploration of Linguistic Landscapes? An analysis of educational practices in five European countries. In S. Melo-Pfeifer (Ed.), *Linguistic Landscapes in Language and Teacher Education – Multilingual Teaching and Learning Inside and Beyond the Classroom* (pp. 93-121). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-22867-4_6

Lourenço, M., & Melo-Pfeifer, S. (2022). A paisagem linguística: uma ferramenta pedagógica no âmbito de uma educação plurilingue e para a cidadania global. *Diacrítica – Revista do Centro de Estudos Humanísticos, 36*(2), 209-231. https://doi.org/10.21814/diacritica.4815

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. 1-21). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-4402-0.ch005

Malinowski, D. (2015). Opening spaces of learning in the linguistic landscape. *Linguistic Landscape, 1*(1-2), 95-113. https://doi.org/10.1075/ll.1.1-2.06mal

Marten, H.F., Van Mensel, L. & Gorter, D. (2012). Studying Minority Languages in the Linguistic Landscape. In D. Gorter, H.F. Marten & L. Van Mensel (Eds.), *Minority Languages in the Linguistic Landscape* (pp. 1-15). Palgrave-MacMillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230360235_1

Melo-Pfeifer, S. (Ed.) (2023). *Linguistic Landscapes in Language and Teacher Education – Multilingual Teaching and Learning Inside and Beyond the Classroom*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-22867-4_1

Oxfam (2006). *Global Citizenship Guides – Teaching Controversial Issues*. Oxfam GB.

Oxfam (2015a). *Global citizenship in the classroom – A guide for teachers*. Oxfam GB.

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

Oxfam (2015c). *English and global citizenship: A guide to help teach English through a global citizenship lens*. Oxfam GB.

Oxley, L. & Morris, P. (2013). Global Citizenship: A Typology for Distinguishing Its Multiple Conceptions. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 61*(3), 301-325. https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2013.798393

Padilha, P. R., Favarão, M. J., Morris, E. & Marine, L. (2011). *Educação para a Cidadania Planetária: Currículo intertransdisciplinar em Osaco*. Editora e Livraria Instituto Paulo Freire.

Pais, A., & Costa, M. (2017). An Ideology Critique of Global Citizenship Education. *Critical Studies in Education, 61*(1), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2017.1318772

Parrança-da-Silva, F. & Andrade, A. I. (2018). Educação para a cidadania global e intercompreensão: reflexões em torno de um projeto desenvolvido no 1º ciclo do ensino básico. *Indagatio DIdactica, 10*(1), 83-97. http://hdl.handle.net/10773/26789

Parrança-da-Silva, F. & Batista, B. (2021). Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship: A Portrait of Educational Practices (2010-2020). In S. Saúde, M. A. Raposo, N. Pereira & A. I. Rodrigues (Eds.), *Teaching and Learning Practices That Promote Sustainable Development and Active Citizenship* (pp. 67-85). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-4402-0.ch004

Pashby, K. & Costa, M. (2021). Interfaces of critical global citizenship education in research about secondary schools in 'global North' contexts. *Globalisation, Societies and Education,19*(4), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2021.1904213

Pashby, K., M. da Costa, S. Stein, & Andreotti, V. (2020). A Meta-Review of Typologies of Global Citizenship Education. *Comparative Education, 56*(2), 144-164. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2020.1723352

Pashby, K., & L. Sund. (2020). Decolonial Options and Challenges for Ethical Global Issues Pedagogy in Northern Europe Secondary Classrooms. *Nordic Journal of Comparative and International Education, 4*(1), 66-83. https://doi.org/10.7577/njcie.3554

Prada, J. (2023). Sensescapes and What it Means for Language Education. In S. Melo-Pfeifer (Ed.), *Linguistic Landscapes in Language and Teacher Education – Multilingual Teaching and Learning Inside and Beyond the Classroom* (pp. 243-258). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-22867-4_13

Rapoport, A. (2010). We cannot teach what we don't know: Indiana teachers talk about global citizenship education. *Education Citizenship and Social Justice, 5*(3), 179-190. https://doi.org/10.1177/1746197910382256

Santamaría-Cárdaba, N., Franco, A., Lourenço, M. & Vieira, R. (2022). Educación para la Ciudadanía Global Crítica al acabar la educación obligatoria en España y Portugal: Una revisión integrativa de la literatura. *REIDOCREA, 11*, 120-134. https://doi.org/10.30827/Digibug.72543

Schattle, H. (2008). Education for Global Citizenship: Illustrations of Ideological Pluralism and Adaptation. *Journal of Political Ideologies, 13*(1), 73-94. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569310701822263

Schattle, H. (2009). Global citizenship in theory and practice. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad: Higher education and the quest for global citizenship* (pp. 3-20). Routledge.

Shang, G., & Xie, F. (2020). Is "poor" English in linguistic landscape useful for EFL teaching and learning? Perspectives of EFL teachers in China. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 30*(1), 35-49. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12258

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. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203930960

Shultz, L. (2007). Educating for Global Citizenship: Conflicting Agendas and Understandings. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 53*(3), 248-258.

Solmaz, O. (2023). Linguistic landscapes tasks in Global Englishes teacher education. *ELT Journal*, *77*(4), 416-425. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccad027

Stein, S. (2015). Mapping Global Citizenship. *Journal of College and Character, 16*(4), 242-252. https://doi.org/10.1080/2194587X.2015.1091361

Straszer, B. & Kroik, D. (2022). Promoting Indigenous Language Rights in Saami Educational Spaces: Findings from a Preschool in Southern Saepmie. In E. Krompák, V. Fernández-Mallat & S. Meyer (Eds.), *Linguistic Landscapes and Educational Spaces* (pp. 127-146). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788923873-008

Sullivan, K. P. H., Waldmann, C. & Wiklund, M. (2022). Using Participatory Linguistic Landscapes as Pedagogy for Democracy: a Didactic Study in a Primary School Classromm. In E. Krompák, V. Fernández-Mallat & S. Meyer (Eds.), *Linguistic Landscapes and Educational Spaces* (pp. 193-213). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788923873-011

Tarozzi, M. & Torres, C. A. (2018). *Global citizenship Education and the Crises of Multiculturalism*. Bloomsbury.

Tawil, S. (2013). Education for 'global citizenship': A framework for discussion. *Education Research and Foresight Working Papers, 7*, 1-8.

Tichnor-Wagner, A., Parkhouse, H., Glazier, J. & Cain, J. M. (2016). Expanding approaches to teaching for diversity and justice in K-12 education: fostering global citizenship across the content areas. *Educ. Policy Anal. Arch. 24*, 1-31. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.24.2138

Tierney, R. J., (2018). Toward a Model of Global Meaning Making. *Journal of Literacy Research, 50*(4), 397-422. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X18803134

United Nations (UN) (2012). *Global Education First Initiative*. Author. https://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/pdf/The%20Global%20Education%20First%20Initiative.pdf

United Nations (UN) (2015). *Transforming our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. Author. https://sdgs.un.org/publications/transforming-our-world-2030-agenda-sustainable-development-17981

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (2014). *Global Citizenship Education: Preparing Learners for the Challenges of the Twenty-First Century*. Author. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000227729

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (2015). *Global Citizenship Education Topics and Learning Objectives*. Author. https://doi.org/10.54675/DRHC3544

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (2017). *The ABCs of global citizenship Education*. Author. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000248232.locale=en

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (2018a). *Global citizenship education: taking it local*. Author. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000265456.locale=en

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (2018b). *Preparing teachers for global citizenship education: a template*. Author. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000265452.locale=en

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (2021). *Global citizenship education: a policymaking awareness and advocacy handbook*. Author. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000377929.locale=en

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (2022). *Global citizenship education: advocacy, practice and awareness handbook for teachers*. Author. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000384105.locale=en

Veugelers, W. (2011). The moral and the political in global citizenship: Appreciating differences in education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 9*(3-4), 473-485. http://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2011.605329

Wohlin, C. (2014). Guidelines for Snowballing in Systematic Literature Studies and a Replication in Software Engineering. *EASE '14: Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Evaluation and Assessment in Software Engineering, 38*, 1-11. http://doi.org/10.1145/2601248.2601268

Yamashita, H. (2006). Global citizenship education and war: The needs of teachers and learners. *Educational Review, 58*(1), 27-39. http://doi.org/10.1080/00131910500352531

Yemini, M., Tibbitts, F. & Goren, H. (2019). Trends and caveats: Review of literature on global citizenship Education in teacher training. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 77*, 77-89. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.09.014

———— & ————

FRANCISCO PARRANÇA DA SILVA

University of Aveiro, Research Centre on Didactics and Technology in the Education of Trainers. PhD candidate in Education - Teaching Methodology and Curriculum Development at the Department of Education and Psychology, University of Aveiro, Portugal. Bachelor's degree in Basic Education and master's degree in Teacher Education - Pre-school education and 1st cycle of basic schooling.

parranca.silva@ua.pt
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1053-2273

———— & ————

Parrança-da-Silva, F. (2024). Learning from the streets: a state-of-the-art review about Linguistic Landscapes and Global Citizenship Education. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, *17*(1), e1294. https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/jtl3.1294

———— & ————

Rebut / Recibido / Received / Reçu: 17-10-2023
Acceptat / Aceptado / Accepted / Accepté: 23-01-2024

https://revistes.uab.cat/jtl3/