Linguistic Landscape: Reports on immigrant language at Asian-Australian community

[1,3] Fadhlur Rahman*, [2,4] Muntasir Muntasir
[1]Master of Applied Linguistics, Monash University, Australia
[2]Master of TESOL, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand
[3]English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education,
Institut Agama Islam Negeri Lhokseumawe, Indonesia
[4]Financial Analyst, Politeknik Kutaraja, Banda Aceh, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author
Email: fadhlur.rahman@iainlhokseumawe.ac.id

Abstract
Studies in linguistic landscape (LL) have been emerged as one of the growing topics in the societal multilingualism. Linguistic landscape transpires as a significant element to study linguistic contacts in multilingual settings. Despite the fact that Australia has been acknowledged as one of the multilingual hotspots, a study in linguistic landscape received scant attention among scholars. In enhancing a broad appreciation of the linguistic diversity at the multilingual society like Australia, thus, the centrality of this article is to report significant component of rich linguistic scenes at Springvale-Greater Dandenong, Victoria. The sources of data were derived from visual data, and further will be intertwined with the consensus data. Taken together, the twofold data presented in this article have revealed that the LL studies emerge as an important element to contribute to the richness of multi-ethnic representation in multilingual societies. The result showed that English translation is mostly found in the terrestrial signage, this appearance denotes the significance of English language as an official signage or a lingua franca for the community rather than a bilingual outward appearance. Despite English language has been identified as the dominant language representation though the signage, there are a buoyance of minority languages representation in the city of Springvale's LL.

***Keywords:** immigrant language; Linguistic Landscape; Asian-Australian; Springvale-Greater Dandenong*

INTRODUCTION

Immigrant languages maintenance have been researched and investigated in a number of different perspectives by different experts in the field (Cenoz & Gorter, 2006; Rubino, 2021; Tran et al., 2021). The interest in this issue is high because its vulnerability, as represent in the Australian context, immigrant languages are overall in a vulnerable position (Liddicoat, 2020). Australia is still a strong Anglocentric country, despite its massive cultural

and linguistic diversity since the post-World War II (Forest et al., 2020; Rahman, 2020).

Scholars interested in multilingualism is fortunate enough to position themselves in a macro picture of the country's language demography. On greater context, based on the current data analysis from Census committee, the language demography of Australia is facing a significant change especially in the local community and new migration pattern post-World War II (Raymer et al., 2018; Forest et al., 2020).

The number of speakers from minority languages such as Mandarin, Arabic and Vietnamese which is a newly formed community from Middle East and Asia shows an increase (Abdelhadi, 2018; Foroutani, 2020; Tran et al., 2021; Yoshida & Nichols, 2022). This condition, on the other hand, does not true to languages like Hungarian, German, Dutch, Italian, and Greek, whose speakers are mostly in their forties and fifties (Hogan-Brun & O'Rourke, 2019). The speakers from these groups display a significant downtrend in the native language's usage (Cantone, 2020). Thus, regarding the use of mother tongue, Australian community are experiencing a shift from the European languages of the post war period to Asia and Middle East (Clyne and Kipp, 2011). The differences are taking place within the same generation and across generations (Hogan-Brun & O'Rourke, 2019).

Although its distinguished linguistic and sociocultural position in Australia, the attention given to Asian-Australian community in linguistic landscape literature is limited. Linguistic landscape is expected to provide information on the sociocultural and linguistics composition of the language groups occupying the area (Gorter et al., 2021), it is possible due to language territory is mostly linguistically different (Florey, 2018; Yao & Gruba, 2020).

In a linguistically diverse community, signs are written in various way, sometimes unilingual, bilingual and even multilingual. These written signs represent the language group occupied the area. LL can be written bilingually with dominant and less dominant language and in most cases dominant language is written prominently on the sign compared to weaker language groups (Landry & Bourhis, 1997; Malinowski, 2020).

Census data has shown factors contributing to language shift, both individual and group level. Further, literature in this paper highlighted considerable differences in the rate of shift among immigrant groups. This study then conducted an analysis for the language use in various domains displaying two and more languages, especially the LL representations at shops, restaurants, and cafes run by the generational cohort of immigrants. In a bigger scale, this research tries to advance a greater appreciation of linguistic and cultural diversity of Australian multilingual communities.

Linguistic Landscape

Language is a symbolic sign system in which traditional speech signs (morphemes, words, phrases, and so on) express meaning and utilized on public signs (Backhaus, 2007). In several ways, this representation differs from spoken language. This symbolic writing system avoids the evanescence of the spoken word by using visual rather than acoustic communication cues (Newmark, 2019). Scholars claimed that written language is eternal, but that it

is not limited to the moment of speaking and can exist independently of it (Karolak, 2020; Baranova & Fedorova, 2019). However, not all written language, such as that seen on electric appliances, clothing, and other commonplace items, can be considered public signs.

Landry and Bourhis (1997) defined Linguistic Landscape (LL) as "the language of public road signs, advertising billboards, street names, place names, commercial shop signs, and public signs on government buildings combines to form the linguistic landscape of a given territory, region, or urban agglomeration" prior to the existence of Linguistic Landscape studies. In short, LL is described as a written types of language use or viewable language signs within the public arena (Itagi and Singh, 2005). Moreover, the LL research have been thoroughly examined in recent years, expanding on Landry and Bourhis' seminal work (see Gorter, 2006; Backhaus, 2007; Lou, 2016), particularly in relation to semiotics, language of minorities, urban multilingualism, and sociolinguistic ethnography. Many researchers have conducted LL study along this path, a choice based on the written language's permanency (Adetunji, 2015).

When it comes to LL signage, it is common to think that it is merely an assemblage of government-issued official signs (Ben-Rafael et al., 2006). In reality, several unofficial LL signage have been spotted in multilingual communities. According to Siricharoen (2016), the divide among official and unofficial symbols obscures the intricacy of creating LL. As a result of social activity, LL provides greater chance to researchers to examine a complex relationship between language, place, and ethnographic depiction in metropolitan multilingualism. In a similar vein, Gorter (2018) and Jenkins & Mauranen (2019) have emphasized that LL analyses will allow conclusions to be made about the community's social layering, the relative standing of distinct societal divisions, and the prevalent cultural ideals.

All LL objects that may be counted are classed as either monolingual or multilingual signs. If a multilingual sign comprises at least one language, it is considered a sign (Backhaus, 2007). A multilingual sign, on the other hand, comprises of either one language or one language with different character representations, such as Chinese, Japanese and the Roman alphabet (Gorter, 2018; Yao & Gruba, 2020; Nambu, 2021). However, it should be remembered that the term "multilingual" will henceforth be used purely for expediency of term rather than a rigid correspondence to a range of languages (Backhaus, 2007).

LL in multilingual spaces

The use of linguistic symbolic imagery in public domain is a crucial component for shaping spaces or places because semiotic resources are deployed iteratively in a visible manner that contributes to the development of construction in specific sensory modalities and social realities (Lieberman et al., 2018). Places or spaces refers to a physical location from which one can project feelings of belonging, property ownership, and power can be filled with a variety of cultural, social, and other emotive characteristics (Blommaert et al., 2005). According to a brief sociolinguistic background described in the

preceding section, some locales have been (re)shaped multiple times over subsequent generations, resulting in several LL meanings of setting.

LL analysis is a collection of methods for deciphering how the material world is symbolically and figuratively composed through the use of visual language (Ben-Rafael et al., 2006). Quantitative and qualitative approaches are used by LL analysts, who are driven by a variety of theoretical bases (see Zimny, 2017; Mokwena, 2018). 'Symbolic messages about the relevance, strength, significance, and applicability of specific languages, as well as the insignificance of others' are indexed by the relative presence or absence (Ramadhani, 2018).

As a symbolically produced location, LL presents a variety of indexicalities, or various discursive contexts of interpretation, where it interprets interaction and connections between people and the physical setting (Curtin, 2009). As a result, the LL has practical ramifications since discourses on languages and their users are rendered concrete and visible. Such discourses also become an inextricable aspect of daily life for those dwelling in a specific region, forming a social and ethnolinguistic identity of a person, even if only subtly (Lee, 2019; Karolak, 2020; Malinowski, 2020). A systematic research and deconstruction of language and imagery use in public spaces, on the other hand, aid LL analysts to understand of the discursive structure of public spaces and, in particular, how imagery language and signage helps to establishing a comprehensive picture of social reality (Ben-Rafael et al., 2006).

The setting – the City of Springvale (Greater Dandenong)

City centres are diverse landscapes made up of a variety range of sub-populations and neighbourhoods representing a diverse range of language, social, financial, and cultural origins. Because of the size and scope of urban centres like Springvale-GD, thorough coverage in a single study is unfeasible. Springvale-Greater Dandenong (GD) is a multilingual and multi-ethnic suburb of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia. It's around 23 kilometres south-east of Melbourne's CBD. According to the 2017 Victoria State Government census, the population was estimated to be around 157,000 people.

Springvale is often regarded as Victoria's most multicultural community, with a long and illustrious history of accepting newcomers. Despite the fact that the people are largely migrants, it is said that refugees have contributed significantly to the economic, social, and cultural life of the community. However, it is said that the majority of the newcomers are unfamiliar with English (both spoken and written) and Australian norms. Furthermore, a quarter of the settlers in Springvale are humanitarian migrants who might come as a result of civil war, conflict and starvation, making them particularly vulnerable.

The city council of Springvale is devoted to encouraging cultural, linguistic, and religious variety, community cohesion, and respect for all because the city has more than 60% of its people born overseas. Because of the large number of settler and asylum seeker residents in GD, the council

has prioritized their needs as top priority. According to information on the city's website, the majority of overseas-born people were from Vietnam, continued by India in second place and Sri Lanka and Cambodia sharing a roughly equal amount.

The city of Springvale-Greater Dandenong has conducted substantial community consultation in recent years, focusing and reinforcing the activity centre's position as one of Melbourne's top cultural destinations. Because Springvale is a complex, diversified community in terms of ethnicity, language, and heterogeneous settings, it offers a wide range of linguistic landscape applications. As a result, the current research attempted to provide a deeper understanding of the sociocultural and linguistic landscape inside this diverse community.

METHOD

The present study employed LL analysis (e.g. Shang & Guo, 2017; Li & Marshall, 2020) to investigate how one of the city's prominent spaces is being used to construct a symbolically contemporary sense of public setting and to continue improving the significance of linguistic landscaping. Many prominent LL analysts tend to select focal terrestrial locations within a city that provide valuable insights into the symbolic construction of a venue in a particular metropolis (Yao & Gruba, 2020; Willans et al., 2020; Nambu, 2021).

In Springvale, Greater Dandenong, visual data were taken at a prominent shopping strip circular. The data taken were selected in order to portray a representative picture of the linguistic landscape in the city centre. The majority of LL research has been carried out on foot, utilizing a still or moving photography, and with particular focus devoted to pedestrian settings like sidewalks, street signs, shop signs, tourist attractions, and city centres (Hult, 2014). From Springvale Rd (multi-cultural place mark) to the right-direction path of St. James Avenue, we used a Canon EOS 200D to record most signage in both directions of the red quarter line. The second route began at the same location (multicultural place mark) and proceeded to the left side of the map, passing through Royal Avenue. The snapshot data included numerous forms of signs, shop names, posters or bulletins in windows, and any language usage display.

The representation from the linguistic landscapes data is reflected in the analytical report, which contains information from the last census of language use in Springvale-GD. The researchers attempted to present and analyze photographic and consensus data that had been randomly collected. The researchers also wanted to see if the data could help them figure out why particular languages are over-represented or under-represented in the landscape.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A total of 178 images of linguistic landscapes were acquired as a result of the statistical calculation provided. The data were then moved to Google Drive and shared for further study. Based on the identified patterns and the language(s) presented on the signages, the data set were categorized into: (a) Signs in just one language (monolingual), (b) Signs in English and also another language, (c) Signs in two or more languages and English translation, like Chinese language, Vietnamese, Thai, Punjabi, Bahasa Melayu, and Khmer, (d) Signs in other linguistic minorities with English translation, such as Hazaraghi, Farsi, and Arabic.

Table 1. Overseas-born Residents

Countries of Origin	Population	Percentage
Vietnam	13,284	8.5%
India	12,413	8%
Cambodia	6,865	4.3%
Sri Lanka	6,366	4.2%
Afghanistan	4,804	3.0%
China	4,604	2.9%
New Zealand	2,237	1.4%

Table 2. Language Use

Countries of Origin	Population	Percentage
English	45,000	28%
Vietnamese	17,500	11%
Chinese (Cantonese & Mandarin)	11,000	6.8%
Khmer	8,000	5%
Punjabi	6,500	4%
Greek	4,000	2.5%
Other Languages	23,000	14.6%

Table 3. Linguistic Landscape

Countries of Origin	Population	Percentage
English	152	85%
Chinese	127	71%
Vietnamese	92	51%
Thai/Lao	29	16%
Khmer	23	12%
Other Languages	2,237	14%

English has the most LL representation, with 127 and 92 signs, respectively, according to the image analysis. With 127 and 92 signs, Vietnamese and Chinese (Cantonese and Mandarin) are in next position as second and third place. In terms of representation, English, Chinese, and Vietnamese have exceeded other language groupings such as Greek, Punjabi and Khmer.

Considering the nature and function of English translation in most signs, this aspect can be considered in terms of its functions as official signage or a community's lingua franca rather than as a bilingual outward appearance. This information is useful from the standpoint of ethnographic representation since it indicates the under-presented and over-presented languages to others.

Figure 1. One language sign only

The reason that this is happening is that, for example, the languages commonly studied in public schools often do not represent Australia's or to the great array of opportunities for learning different languages in different states (Clyne et al., 2004a). Although school programs aimed at language maintenance are widely available in Australia, they are often unable to adequately enhance the capacity of children's linguistic skill from immigrant community to public or state school due to organizational issues. For instance, lack of recognition of immigrant students' needs and the language ecology of immigrant students (Clyne et al., 2004b; Roos & Nicholas, 2019).

A quick peek at the current Linguistic Landscape statistic reveals a striking link between the ethnographic representation of an area and the language used on store signs. Despite certain languages such as Khmer and Hazaraghi have a higher proportion of "overseas-born residents" than Chinese, they are underrepresented in the LL. Chinese have the most over-presented language signs (71%) despite ranking seventh in the proportion of "overseas-born citizens" and third in language use, indicating that Chinese signs have surpassed Vietnamese sign proportion.

The overall signage layout suggested a hierarchy of interaction among dominant and minority languages (Yi, 2019). The results also confirmed that the use of English as a Lingua Franca had created discursive channels among locals (Salih & Holi, 2018). The language environment of Springvale, Greater Dandenong, reflects ethnographic representation, according to the current report. Chinese, however, is overrepresented, while two others (Khmer and Haraghazi) are underrepresented.

Figure 2. Bilingual sign that entails English language and other language

Figure 3. The combination of three or more languages

As a crucial component of shaping public spaces or places, an analysis of the use of linguistic landscape in the public domain is essential. This is because semiotic resources are deployed iteratively in a visible manner that contributes to the development of construction in specific sensory modalities and social realities. In Springvale, where more than 60% of the population was born in another country, the city council is committed to supporting cultural, linguistic, and religious diversity, as well as community cohesiveness and respect for all persons living within the city limits.

Figure 4. Other minority languages

Springvale is an excellent example as it is situated in the heart of a variety of venues that include several markets and businesses, as well as an abundance of restaurants, and is surrounded by office and government buildings. Springvale are surrounded by a jumble of language signage in metropolitan areas. Therefore, metropolitan multilingualism's linguistic landscaping functions model is proposed. The visual data above were taken to report significant component of ethnography diversity representation of the city.

CONCLUSION

The importance of this research is high due to its susceptibility, which is exemplified in the Australian context by the fact that immigrant languages are in general in a vulnerable position. The study applies LL analysis to analyze how one of the city's significant areas is being utilized to build a symbolically modern sense of public setting and to continue increasing the relevance of linguistic landscaping. Visual data were collected using a camera at a famous retail strip loop in Springvale, Greater Dandenong. A representative image of the linguistic landscape in the city center was intended to be painted using the data collected, which was chosen with care. The vast bulk of LL study has been conducted on foot, with still and moving photographs being taken as documentation.

In today's metropolitan regions, we are surrounded by a confusion of different language signs and billboards. For example, Springvale is well-positioned in the middle of a diverse range of establishments such as various marketplaces and shops and an abundance of restaurants and is flanked by office and government buildings. Because of this, the linguistic landscaping functions model of urban multilingualism has been developed and tested.

Aspects of ethnography, diversity representation, and representation are considered when examining the LL of Greater Dandenong. The general structure of the signs implied a hierarchy of interaction between dominant and

minority language speakers. The findings also revealed that the usage of English as a Lingua Franca has resulted in the development of discursive channels among the local population.

AUTHOR STATEMENT

Fadhlur Rahman: conceptualization, introduction, methodology, data collection and management, results and discussion, conclusion, and reference. **Muntasir Muntasir**: abstract, methodology, data analysis, editing, and refining the overall manuscript.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

Abdelhadi, M. (2018). Arabic language maintenance in multicultural countries and in the regional city of Toowoomba, Australia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Contemporary Education and Communication Technology, 4*(2). https://doi.org/10.25275/apjcectv4i2edu5

Adetunji, A. (2015). English in a Nigerian linguistic landscape. *World Englishes, 34*(4), 654-668. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12158

Backhaus, P. (Ed.). (2007). *Linguistic landscapes: A comparative study of urban multilingualism in Tokyo* (Vol. 136). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853599484

Baranova, V., & Fedorova, K. (2019). 'Invisible minorities' and 'hidden diversity' in Saint-Petersburg's linguistic landscape. *Language & Communication, 68*, 17-27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2018.10.013

Ben-Rafael, E., Shohamy, E., Amara, M.H. and Trumper-Hecth, N. (2006). Linguistic landscape as symbolic construction of the public sphere: The case of Israel. In Gorter, D., (ed.) *Linguistic Landscape: A New Approach to Multilingualism* (p.7-27). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710608668383

Blommaert, J., Collins, J., & Slembrouck, S. (2005). Spaces of multilingualism. *Language & Communication, 25*(3), 197-216. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2005.05.002

Cantone, K. F. (2020). Immigrant minority language maintenance in Europe: Focusing on language education policy and teacher-training. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 14*(2), 100-113. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2020.1715541

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2006). Linguistic landscape and minority languages. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 3*(1), 67-80. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710608668386

Clyne, M., & Kipp, S. (2011). *Pluricentric languages in an immigrant context: Spanish, Arabic and Chinese* (Vol. 82). Walter de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110805444

Clyne, M., Fernandez, S., & Grey, F. (2004a). Languages taken at school and languages spoken in the community–a comparative perspective. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, *27*(2), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1075/aral.27.2.01cly

Clyne, M., Hunt, C. R., & Isaakidis, T. (2004b). Learning a community language as a third language. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *1*(1), 33-52. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710408668177

Curtin, M. L. (2009). Languages on display: Indexical signs, identities and the linguistic landscape of Taipei. In E. Shohamy & D. Gorter (Eds.), *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery* (pp. 221–237). Routledge.

Florey, M. (2018). Transforming the landscape of language revitalization work in Australia: The Documenting and Revitalising Indigenous Languages training model. *Insights from practices in Community-Based Research: From theory to practice around the globe*, 314-338. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110527018

Foroutani, Y. (2020). Ethnic or religious identities?: Multicultural analysis in Australia from socio-demographic perspective. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies*, *7*(1), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.29333/ejecs/280

Forrest, J., Benson, P., & Siciliano, F. (2020). Linguistic Shift and Heritage Language Retention in Australia. *Handbook of the Changing World Language Map*, 1069-1086. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02438-3_37

Gorter, D. (2006). Introduction: The study of linguistic landscape as a new approach to multilingualism. *International Journal of Multilingualism*. 3(1), 1-6. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710608668382

Gorter, D. (2018). Methods and techniques for linguistic landscape research: About definitions, core issues and technological innovations. *Expanding the linguistic landscape: Multilingualism, language policy and the use of space as a semiotic resource*, 38-57. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788922166-005

Gorter, D., Cenoz, J., & der Worp, K. V. (2021). The linguistic landscape as a resource for language learning and raising language awareness. *Journal of Spanish Language Teaching*, 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1080/23247797.2021.2014029

Hogan-Brun, G., & O'Rourke, B. (Eds.). (2019). *The Palgrave handbook of minority languages and communities*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2019.1632511

Itagi, N., H. and Singh, S., K (eds). (2005). Linguistic Landscaping in India with Particular Reference to the New States. *Journal of Language problems and Language Planning,* 29(2), 199-201. https://doi.org/10.1075/lplp.29.2.11gor

Jenkins, J., & Mauranen, A. (2019). *Linguistic diversity on the EMI campus* (p. 226). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429020865

Karolak, M. (2020). Linguistic landscape in a city of migrants: A study of Souk Naif area in Dubai. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 1-25. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2020.1781132

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

Lee, J. S. (2019). Multilingual advertising in the linguistic landscape of Seoul. *World Englishes, 38*(3), 500-518. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12427

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

Liddicoat, A. J. (2020). 17 Language policy and planning for language maintenance: The macro and meso levels. *Handbook of home language maintenance and development: Social and affective factors, 18,* 337. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501510175

Lieberman, A. M., Borovsky, A., & Mayberry, R. I. (2018). Prediction in a visual language: real-time sentence processing in American Sign Language across development. *Language, cognition and neuroscience, 33*(4), 387-401. https://doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2017.1411961

Lou, J.J. (2016). *The Linguistic Landscape of Chinatown: A sociolinguistic Ethnography.* Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783095636

Malinowski, D. (2020). Linguistic landscape: The semiotics of the public of public signage?. *Linguistic Landscape, 6*(1), 23-28. https://doi.org/10.1075/ll.00021.mal

Mokwena, P. L. (2018). *A social semiotic analysis of the linguistic landscape of two rural district municipalities in the Northern Cape, South Africa* [Doctoral dissertation, University of the Western Cape]. Western Cape. http://hdl.handle.net/11394/6050

Nambu, S. (2021). Linguistic landscape of immigrants in Japan: a case study of Japanese Brazilian communities. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development,* 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2021.2006200

Newmark, K. (2019). *Beyond symbolism.* Cornell University Press. https://doi.org/10.7591/9781501738869

Rahman, F. (2020). Bilingual Education vs English-only Approach at Australia's Northern Territory Schools. *REiLA: Journal of Research and Innovation in Language, 2*(1), 1-7. https://doi.org/10.31849/reila.v2i1.3854

Ramadhani, A. R. (2018). Lingua Franca in The Linguistic Landscape of Gresik Kota Baru (Gkb). *Etnolingual, 2*(2). https://doi.org/10.20437/etno.v2i2.10569

Raymer, J., Shi, Y., Guan, Q., Baffour, B., & Wilson, T. (2018). The sources and diversity of immigrant population change in Australia, 1981–2011. *Demography, 55*(5), 1777-1802. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-018-0704-5

Roos, J., & Nicholas, H. (2019). Using young learners' language environments for EFL learning: Ways of working with linguistic landscapes. *AILA Review, 32*(1), 91-111. https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.00022.roo

Rubino, A. (2010). Multilingualism in Australia: Reflections on current and future research trends. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 33*(2), 17-1. https://doi.org/10.2104/aral1017

Rubino, A. (2021). Language competence, choice, and attitudes amongst Italo-Australian youth. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 42*(3), 275-290. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2019.1688337

Salih, A. A., & Holi, H. I. (2018). English Language and the Changing Linguistic Landscape: New Trends in ELT Classrooms. *Arab World English Journal*, *9*(1). https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol9no1.7

Shang, G., & Guo, L. (2017). Linguistic landscape in Singapore: What shop names reveal about Singapore's multilingualism. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *14*(2), 183-201. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2016.1218497

Siricharoen, A. (2016). Multilingualism in the linguistic landscape of the Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand. *Manusya: Journal of Humanities*, *19*(3), 12-25. https://doi.org/10.1163/26659077-01903002

Tran, V. H., McLeod, S., Verdon, S., & Wang, C. (2021). Vietnamese-Australian parents: Factors associated with language use and attitudes towards home language maintenance. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2021.1904963

Willans, F., Gure, J., & Koro, S. (2020). Signs of multilingualism in the urban linguistic landscapes of Fiji and Vanuatu: reflections of national identity. *Social Identities*, 1-24. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504630.2020.1772742

Yao, X., & Gruba, P. (2020). A layered investigation of Chinese in the linguistic landscape: A case study of Box Hill, Melbourne. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, *43*(3), 302-336. https://doi.org/10.1075/aral.18049.yao

Yi, L. (2019). Issues and methodologies in ecological linguistic landscaping. In *1st Asia International Symposium on Arts, Literature, Language and Culture (AISALLC 2019)*.

Yoshida, R., & Nichols, S. (2022). The multiple resources of refugee students: A language portrait inquiry. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2022.2026359

Zimny, D. (2017). *Language and Place-making: Public Signage in the Linguistic Landscape of Windhoek's Central Business District* [Doctoral dissertation, Stellenbosch University]. Stellenbosch. http://hdl.handle.net/10019.1/102911

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.