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Abstract

The town of Hahndorf in South Australia was established in 1839 by German migrants. Despite the significance of Hahndorf as the oldest surviving German settlement in Australia, one of the oldest towns in South Australia, a prominent tourist location and its inclusion on state and national heritage registers, a linguistic landscaping survey of the town has not previously been conducted. This paper presents a linguistic landscaping study of Hahndorf. Eighty linguistic signs located near the main street of Hahndorf were analysed using quantitative and qualitative methods. Results indicated that English (92.5%) was the most common language choice for signs in Hahndorf, followed by German (18.75%). Chinese and Indian languages were used in a small number of signs. Signs were more likely to be monolingual (82.5%) than bilingual (17.5%). Monolingual signs predominantly used English while most bilingual signs were written in English and German. Discrepancies were found between the linguistic landscape and languages spoken at home for languages other than English. Factors such as informational versus symbolic function of languages, sign authorship, intended audience, code preference, social positioning and a diachronic perspective were considered. Multiple socio-historical (settlement history and community), socio-political (heritage listing, government regulations/laws and war-related anti-German sentiment) and socio-economic (tourism and advertising) factors were identified as having a significant impact on the linguistic landscape of Hahndorf.
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Australia is a culturally and linguistically diverse nation with a long history of immigration and more than four million Australians speaking a language other than English at home (Department of Immigration and Border Protection, 2011). The town of Hahndorf in South Australia was established in 1839 by German migrants escaping religious persecution (Young, 1985). In the nearly 200 years since its settlement, Hahndorf has undergone significant social, political, economic and linguistic changes. The primary aim of the present study is to conduct a linguistic landscape of Hahndorf. In addition, the study aims to compare the linguistic landscape with languages spoken in Hahndorf homes as well as exploring socio-historical, socio-political and socio-economic factors affecting the linguistic landscape.

The Linguistic Context: Hahndorf

The town of Hahndorf is located in the Australian state of South Australia. It is situated in the Adelaide Hills region approximately 28 kilometres south-east of the state capital of Adelaide. Hahndorf was established in 1839 by approximately 200 German Lutherans who had immigrated from Prussia and East Germany largely to escape religious persecution (Young, 1985). At that stage, Hahndorf was the second German settlement in Australia. Initially due to the remote and isolated nature of the Hahndorf settlement as well as the relatively small number of English-speaking migrants in the region, Hahndorf was predominately a German and English-speaking, bilingual agricultural community (Young, 1985). The town of Hahndorf is one of the oldest towns in South Australia (Young, 1985) and is now Australia’s oldest surviving German settlement (SA Heritage, 2012).

Hahndorf has a population of 2,547 residents (Australia Bureau of Statistics [ABS], 2011). The most common religious affiliations in Hahndorf are ‘no religion’ (26.2%) and Lutheran (14.2%), which is higher than the national rate of Lutheran religious affiliation (1.2%). In Hahndorf, 77.9% of people were born in Australia (higher than the national average of 69.8%), followed by 8.4% born in England and 1.8% born in Germany (compared to 0.5% nationally) (ABS, 2011). The most common self-identified ancestries of residents in Hahndorf are English (34.9%), Australian (24.3%) and German (11.5%). The official language of Hahndorf is English, which is also the official state and national language. Of the 2,547 residents, 91.72% speak English only at home (which suggests a high level of language homogeneity), followed by German (1.77%). A total of 14 languages are spoken in the homes of people in Hahndorf, with the seven most common (top five ranked) languages presented in Table 1 (ABS, 2011).

Table 1. Number and proportion of speakers of the top 7 languages spoken in Hahndorf

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number of Speakers</th>
<th>Proportion of Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>English Only</td>
<td>2,336</td>
<td>91.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chinese (Cantonese)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With regards to socio-economic indicators, the median household weekly income in Hahndorf ($1326) is higher than the state ($1044) and national ($1234) medians. The unemployment rate in Hahndorf (3.1%) is lower than the South Australian (5.7%) and Australian (5.6%) unemployment rates (ABS, 2011). The most common industries of employment are school education (6.1%), cafes, restaurants and takeaway food services (3.9%) and hospitals (3.6%). In 2013-2014, tourism contributed an estimated $260 million (directly and indirectly) to the Adelaide Hills regional economy (a region which includes but is not limited to Hahndorf), representing 12.4% of gross regional product (South Australian Tourism Commission [SATC], 2015).

Linguistic Landscaping Theory and Research

Linguistic landscaping involves the study of written language in the public sphere (Gorter, 2006). According to Landry and Bourhis (1997, p. 25), to whom the term ‘linguistic landscape’ has been attributed, “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”. These signs may be monolingual, bilingual or multilingual. The study of the linguistic landscape is a relatively recent and evolving field in applied linguistic research. However, a review of the research literature indicates that there have been a growing number of studies conducted on the linguistic landscape of a diverse range of towns, cities, and nations (e.g., Backhaus, 2006; Ben-Rafael, Shohamy, Hasan Amara & Trumper-Hecht, 2006; Cenoz & Gorter, 2006; Gorter, 2006; Huebner, 2006; Landry & Bourhis, 1997; Leeman & Modan, 2009; Pavlenko, 2009; Spolsky & Cooper, 1991; Torkington, 2009).

Backhaus (2007) provided a thorough examination of decades of investigation into linguistic landscapes and consequently developed a theoretical framework for linguistic landscaping studies focussing on three research questions: “(1) Linguistic landscaping by whom? (2) Linguistic landscaping for whom? (3) Linguistic landscape quo vadis?” (p. 57). This approach emphasises the producers of the signs, the audience or readers of signs and the dynamics of languages in contact. Another theoretical approach in the study of linguistic landscaping is provided by Ben-Rafael (2008, p. 48) who outlines a sociological theory for the investigation of linguistic landscapes which identifies four different orientations: the “presentation of self” perspective, “good-reasons” perspective, “collective identity perspective” and “power-relation structuration principle”. Ben-Rafael (2008) argues that the role that each of these factors plays likely varies between different linguistic contexts and that these foci of attention do not necessarily exclude each other.

The value of an emphasis on theory and methodology in linguistic landscaping research has been highlighted by multiple researchers (Backhaus, 2007; Gorter 2006; Shohamy & Gorter, 2008). Indeed, one of the criticisms of linguistic landscaping research in the past has been that it “currently has no clear orthodoxy or theoretical core” (Sebba, 2010, p. 73). As an emerging field of research, significant differences exist between studies not just in terms of the landscapes observed but also with regard to underlying theoretical perspectives, use of
terminology and the methods of data collection and data analysis (Backhaus, 2007; Pavlenko, 2009). For example, some of the key methodological issues include the representativeness and scope of the sample, units of analysis, problems related to analysis such as determining the authorship, intended audience or function of signs or categorising them as official/non-official, classification of the languages on the sign, visual hierarchy and code preference and the meaningfulness of the different quantitative and qualitative approaches (Pavlenko, 2009).

Despite these differences and debates, a number of common and significant themes in linguistic landscaping research have emerged. For example, the notions of social positioning and power are of central importance in discussions of linguistic landscapes and these themes have been emphasised in previous research and in theoretical frameworks (Ben-Rafael, 2008; Cenoz & Gorter, 2006; Landry & Bourhis, 1997; Scollon & Scollon, 2003; Torkington, 2009). Broadly speaking, social positioning refers to the position of a language (in this case) in a given society and is considered in terms of hierarchy or comparison between groups. Theorists argue that the choice of language on public signs both reflect and contribute to the social positioning and power relationships of different languages and the speakers of these languages in a given region. For example, Cenoz and Gorter (2006) posit that the relationship between the linguistic landscape and sociolinguistic context is bidirectional. That is, Cenoz and Gorter (2006, pp. 67-68) argue that the linguistic landscape reflects the power associated with different languages while at the same time it has a role in the development of the sociolinguistic context because “the language in which signs are written can certainly influence their perception of the status of the different languages and even affect their own linguistic behaviour”. As such, the linguistic landscape functions as both an information marker and a symbolic marker (Landry & Bourhis, 1997; Spolsky & Cooper, 1991). These signs may be a representation of the local, regional or national, social or governmental attitudes and policies of a community. Scollon and Scollon (2003, p. 7) argue that semiotic systems such as public signs “operate as systems of social positioning and power relationship both at the level of interpersonal relationships and at the level of struggles for hegemony among social groups in any society”. Thus, the study of linguistic landscapes can “provide a window into the power relations within the community” (Huebner, 2006, p. 32).

Another common theme in linguistic landscaping theory and research is the difference between official and non-official signs in the linguistic landscape, which have also been described using the terms ‘government’ versus ‘non-government’ and ‘top down’ versus ‘bottom up’ respectively (Backhaus, 2006; Ben-Rafael et al., 2006; Huebner, 2006; Torkington, 2009). Official signs refer to signs created by government bodies for public institutions (such as government buildings, schools and hospitals) and street signs while non-official signs include signs produced by private individuals or businesses such as retail shop signs. Backhaus (2006) investigated the linguistic landscape along a train line in Tokyo, Japan, with the sample environment including business and shopping districts, parks and roads. Of 11,834 signs identified, 2321 (19%) were categorised as multilingual and Japanese was used more frequently on official than on non-official signs. Backhaus (2006) argued that there was an important relationship between power and solidarity in the choice of language on the signs in official and non-official signs. Specifically, non-official signs written in foreign languages expressed solidarity with things non-Japanese while official signs (more
frequently written in Japanese) were identified as communicating and reinforcing pre-existing power relations. The author concluded that the “use of English on these signs can be interpreted as a symbolic expression by Japanese sign writers to join the English language community and to associate with the values that are typically attached to it” (Backhaus, 2006, p. 63). The examination of sign authorship in linguistic landscaping investigations was also a focus of the theory subsequently presented by Backhaus (2007).

In addition, socio-political and socio-economic factors affecting the linguistic landscape have been emphasised in previous research. For example, Torkington (2009) conducted a linguistic landscape of the town of Almancil in the ‘Golden Triangle’ area of Algarve, Portugal. The town has an ethnically diverse residential population and the area is known as a tourist destination. The study examined 225 signs located in the town’s main street. The results of the study indicated that Portuguese was used on 65% of signs, with 49% of signs containing Portuguese only. The most commonly used language other than Portuguese was English (49%) due in part to the high population of English-speaking residents. Italian, German and French were used on a small percentage of signs, reflecting the language of many tourists to the area. Furthermore, even though the territory contains a large number of Romanian residents, Romanian language was not used on any of signs, indicating that Romanian language “has no status in the local public social world” (Torkington, 2009, p. 132). Similar to previous studies, Torkington (2009) explored the relationship between social positioning and the linguistic landscape. Significantly, Torkington (2009) noted that factors such as national and local municipal council regulations regarding the structure of signs and choice of language used on signs had an important influence on the linguistic landscape. Highlighting the role of tourism as a key socio-economic factor influencing the linguistic landscape, Torkington (2009, p. 143) concluded that “as tourists undoubtedly contribute to the local economy” the use of English in the town “is the result of a rational choice by the producers, based on expected material benefits”.

The commodification of language for economic and advertising purposes has also been investigated in linguistic landscaping research (Leeman & Modan, 2009; Piller, 2003). Leeman and Modan (2009) examine the linguistic landscape of Chinatown in Washington DC. In this context, the use of Chinese on public signage is described as “overwhelmingly symbolic” (Leeman & Modan, 2009, p. 352) with a connotation of “ethnic authenticity” (p. 351) and the signs are intended to be read by tourists who do not speak Chinese. Leeman and Modan (2009) discuss local council guidelines which emphasise maintaining the Chinese heritage appearance of the area and encourage the use of Chinese language on public signs (for aesthetic rather than communicative purposes). This study is particularly interesting because it examined a linguistic landscape involving a non-English minority language in a heritage-related and tourism-orientated English-speaking environment. In addition, Leeman and Modan (2009) recommended a qualitative, contextually-informed approach to linguistic landscaping to investigate sign use, function and history within a broader examination of socio-historical and socio-political factors (such as heritage, regulations and complex funding arrangements in commodified environments) which merits further investigation.
Furthermore, theoretical and research perspectives have highlighted the importance of investigating changes over time in linguistic landscapes. This is referred to as the diachronic study of linguistic landscapes and examines these contexts as dynamic rather than static. In the theory posited by Backhaus (2007, p. 59), the diachronic perspective is emphasized in the third question (“linguistic landscape quo vadis?”) which focuses on “what the signs out in the street reveal about the diachronic development of a city’s linguistic condition”. Research conducted by Pavlenko (2009) discussed the analysis of linguistic landscapes through a diachronic context in more detail. In this study, a diachronic examination of linguistic landscapes reviewed post-soviet countries specifically with regard to language shift and the derussification of these regions. Pavlenko (2009) outlined the significant social, political and linguistic changes the fourteen states have experienced since 1991 in the post-Soviet era, and examined policies affecting language shift towards local and national titular languages as seen with regard to the specific linguistic practices involved with education, commerce and the languages spoken in the regions. Within this analysis of official and non-official linguistic policies and practices, Pavlenko (2009) provided a theoretical framework outlining five forms of language-shifting-progress including language erasure, language replacement, language upgrading and downgrading, language regulation, and transgressive signage. Pavlenko (2009) also discusses the potential difference between language policies and the languages used within a particular region and observes linguistic landscaping contexts in which “the frequency of language use in public signage may not be indicative of its use in language practices” (Pavlenko, 2009, p. 267). Therefore, the diachronic study of linguistic landscapes is significant because it emphasizes changes over time and considers the cultural, social, political and economic factors affecting languages in contact.

Therefore, linguistic landscaping is an interesting and important field of applied linguistic research which has the potential to “add another view to our knowledge about societal multilingualism by focusing on language choices, hierarchies of languages, contact-phenomena, regulations, and aspects of literacy” (Gorter, 2013, p. 191). The contextual nature of this study was emphasised by Barni and Bagna (2009, p. 129) who noted that the linguistic landscape is, in addition to linguistic forces, “due above all to social and cultural dynamics, arising from contact, tension and friction between semiotic, cultural, social, economic and productive systems”. Thus, in the study of linguistic landscapes it is important to understand the extent to which the linguistic landscape accurately represents the languages spoken as well as also the social positioning of languages and the role of social, historical, political and economic factors affecting the linguistic landscape.

Aims and Significance

The main aim of the study is to examine the linguistic landscape of Hahndorf. In addition, the study aims to compare the linguistic landscape of Hahndorf with the town’s linguistic profile (languages spoken at home) and to examine some of the socio-historical, socio-political and socio-economic factors influencing the linguistic landscape of Hahndorf.

Linguistic landscaping research is an emerging field in applied linguistics which has implications for issues such as multilingualism, language shift, and language contact and...
language policy. Despite the significance of Hahndorf as the oldest surviving German settlement in Australia, one of the oldest towns in South Australia, a small town that is a prominent tourist location and its inclusion on state and national heritage registers, a review of the research indicated that a linguistic landscaping survey of Hahndorf has not previously been conducted. In addition, a review of the research literature indicated that while other countries have been the subject of multiple linguistic landscaping studies (as many as 22 in Japan), only one linguistic landscaping study from Australia appears to have been published (Fan, 2014). Furthermore, existing linguistic landscaping research has focused on larger urban areas such as more populated towns and capital cities (Backhaus, 2006; Pavlenko, 2009; Torkington, 2009). Therefore, the present study is valuable because it addresses a significant gap in the research literature both in the Australian linguistic context and in linguistic landscaping research in general.

Method

The linguistic landscaping survey, conducted in May 2012, was modelled on previous language landscaping studies (e.g., Backhaus, 2006; Cenoz & Gorter, 2006; Huebner, 2006; Landry & Bourhis, 1997; Pavlenko, 2010; Torkington, 2009). The geographic areas selected were the main street of Hahndorf and several surrounding side-streets, including (but not limited to) Balhannah Road, Auricht Road, and Pine Avenue. The choice of the survey area was based on the fact that the main street of Hahndorf is the major commercial, community and tourism area of the town, including government buildings, hotels, restaurants, retail shops, businesses, monuments and parks. Precisely what constitutes a ‘linguistic sign’ or unit of analysis in linguistic landscaping is the subject of debate and may differ between studies (Pavlenko, 2009). While some previous researchers have focussed on largely fixed or permanent signs (Landry & Bourhis, 1997), Torkington (2009, p. 124) included more “mobile” signs such as flyers and tourist maps. For the purposes of this study, a sign was defined as “any piece of written text within a spatially definable frame” located in the public sphere (Backhaus, 2006, p. 55). Based on this definition as well as their inclusion in previous linguistic landscaping studies (e.g., Backhaus, 2006; Cenoz & Gorter, 2006; Landry & Bourhis, 1997; Pavlenko, 2010; Torkington, 2009), linguistic signs or ‘tokens’ of interest included advertising billboards, street names, place names, commercial shop signs, public signs on government buildings, graffiti, tombstones and tourism brochures located in the public sphere. The method of data collection involved ethnolinguistic, qualitative and quantitative processes. It involved travelling to Hahndorf, walking along the geographic region of the sample and identifying public signs that met the study criteria. Photographic records were taken along with quantitative counts of signs and brief qualitative descriptions noted (e.g., “sign above retail shop on Main Street”). The records and photographs were later analysed in more detail, categorised and stored. A total of 80 signs were analysed.

In order to analyse the distribution of languages in the linguistic landscape, signs were coded based on the language(s) present. One of the most important methodological issues in linguistic landscaping research involves the difficulty determining the language used in signs. While this may initially appear straight-forward, previous researchers have noted that “languages have no clear-cut borders” (Edelman, 2009, p. 143) and classification of
languages in the linguistic landscape can be affected by factors such as language mixing, lexical borrowing, transliteration and bivalency (Pavlenko, 2009). This methodological difficulty is not easily resolved and represents a significant potential limitation in linguistic landscaping studies. One problem identified in the present study was the classification of proper nouns by language. Edelman (2009) examined this issue in detail and outlines how proper nouns may be classified as part of a specific language of origin or as part of any language in which they appear. Edelman (2009) concluded that arguments exist in favour of both options and, as a uniform methodology for classifying proper nouns does not currently exist, researchers should describe the method used. In the present study, proper nouns were coded as part of the specific language of origin. For example, ‘Auricht Rd’ was classified as a bilingual German-English sign with ‘Auricht’ (the German-origin surname of a prominent local Hahndorf resident) coded as German. However, the proper noun ‘Hahndorf’ was not coded as either German or English in data analyses. The reason for this decision was that ‘Hahndorf’ is the name of the town and was included on most signs such that its classification as German or English would potentially skew the picture of the linguistic landscape and interesting information regarding the use and function of languages may be lost.

A qualitative analysis of three welcome signs (Figures 1, 2 and 4) was conducted to provide more detailed information about the linguistic landscape. These signs were chosen for their initial similarity (in terms of communicative message) as a launch-pad for further analysis. The analysis was framed by the three research questions outlined by Backhaus (2007), focusing on the authorship and audience of the sign and code preference for languages in contact, guided by methods of previous researchers (e.g., Huebner, 2006).

Results

Linguistic Landscape

The results of the linguistic landscaping survey indicated that English was the most common language choice for public signs in Hahndorf (see Table 2).

Table 2. Languages used in the signs of the linguistic landscape sample of Hahndorf

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of signs</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most common language other than English (see Figure 1) written on the sampled signs was German (see Figure 2). Chinese (see Figure 3) and Indian languages were also used in a very small proportion of signs.
Figure 1. A monolingual English sign marking the entrance to the town of Hahndorf.

Figure 2. A monolingual German sign welcoming people to Hahndorf.
Furthermore, the linguistic landscape provided evidence of both monolingual and bilingual signs found in the town of Hahndorf (see Table 3). Overall, signs were more likely to be monolingual (82.5%) than bilingual (17.5%). The most frequently identified monolingual signs used English while the most common instances of bilingual signs included the languages of English and German (see Figure 4). No multilingual signs with more than two languages were identified in the sample.

**Table 3. Number and proportion of monolingual and bilingual signs by language**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German-English bilingual</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German only</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese-English bilingual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian-English bilingual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of signs</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4. A bilingual English-German welcome sign**
The majority of signs in the present linguistic landscape were non-official signs. Examples of non-official signs included business names, restaurant signs and private tourism brochures, which were written in all four of the languages identified in the study (see Figures 5 and 6). Official signs were almost exclusively written in monolingual English, including the Country Fire Service sign (see Figure 7), the official Hahndorf town sign (see Figure 1), and war-related monuments. The exception to this finding regarding official signs was street signs with many street signs bilingual in German and English, using German names followed by the English word ‘road’ or ‘street’ (see Figure 8). Chinese and Indian languages were used only in non-official signs such as restaurant signs (see Figure 9) and private business tourism brochures.

*Figure 5.* A bilingual German-English sign at the Hahndorf Inn Hotel

*Figure 6.* A bilingual German-English sign at a Hahndorf coffee/lunch shop
A general pattern was also evident in the current study between historical and modern tokens. The signs in English were predominately modern such as business signs and modern official signs. In contrast, signs in German were often (but not exclusively) historical including monuments, tombstones (see Figure 10), street signs and signs on heritage-listed buildings. All the signs written in Chinese and Indian were modern signs.
Figure 10. A tombstone and historical monument written in monolingual German

Qualitative Analysis

A qualitative analysis of three welcome signs (Figures 1, 2 and 4) was conducted. Firstly, the authorship of the three signs was examined. Figure 1 is a monolingual English ‘gateway sign’ located near the entrance to the town. The author of the sign was most likely the local council (Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure [DPTI], 2013). However, the design and approval of such signs in South Australia is done in consultation with other stakeholders (including road authorities, government agencies, councils, tourist organisations and tourist operators) and there are government regulations with which signs must comply (DPTI, 2013). Hence, it is an official sign.

Figure 2 is a monolingual German sign located on Pine Avenue on a fence which appears to be part of a retail bakery called ‘The German Cake Shop’. This shop was reportedly established in the 1970s but the date of the sign is unclear. The wooden and ‘antique’ appearance is consistent with the shop’s interior design. Hence, there is evidence to suggest that this is a non-official sign which may have been authored by the bakery’s owners. However, such public signs in Hahndorf must comply with official design guidelines outlined in local council regulations (Mount Barker District Council [MBDC], 2013), which makes a clear distinction between official and non-official authorship difficult.

Figure 4 is a bilingual English-German sign seen in the entrance of the Hahndorf Academy located at 68 Main Street. Since 1839, the heritage-listed building has been sold 18 times and has served numerous purposes including educational institutions, Lutheran seminary, hospital and nursing home, council offices, military headquarters, retail shops, recreation centre and private housing (Butler, n.d.; Hahndorf Academy, 2015). At present, the Hahndorf Academy is owned by the District Council of Mount Barker and contains an art gallery, German migration museum, retail outlet and tourism information centre (Hahndorf Academy, 2015). However, it is run by the ‘Hahndorf Academy Foundation’ which receives funding from both private and government sources at local, state and national levels. It is unclear precisely who produced the sign or when it was designed. It has a modern appearance but may pre-date
1998 when the building last changed ownership. On the basis of this evidence, the sign may be best described as an official sign. However, this example further highlights the complexities of determining authorship and categorising signs into smaller units (such as official/nonofficial) for analysis.

Despite the differences in the authorship of these three signs, the intended audience of each of the signs is largely tourists. Gateway signs such as in Figure 1 are described as “a necessary part of tourism guidance” and are designed to welcome tourists to the region (DPTI, 2013, p. 11). As a sign positioned outside a retail store selling German cakes, the intended audience of Figure 2 is also likely to be tourists, with the goal of having these tourists buy the traditional German product inside the store. The intended reader of Figure 4 is also tourists, although the goal is more likely to sell the heritage of Hahndorf as an image rather than a specific physical product and to encourage readers to visit other local destinations where they may spend money. The use of German in Figures 2 and 4 appears to be more symbolic than informational in function.

Only one of the three welcome signs contained more than one language. Figure 4 is a bilingual sign which is written in English and German. The type of font, size of font and amount of information is identical in the two languages in the sign. However, English is positioned first on the left side while German is on the right in a left-to-right reading script as is the case for both English and German. These characteristics of code preference provide evidence to indicate that English is the predominant language in the sign.

**Discussion**

The results of the present study indicated that English (Australia’s official language) was the most common language in the linguistic landscape of Hahndorf, followed by German. Signs were more likely to be monolingual than bilingual. Monolingual signs predominantly used English while most bilingual signs used English and German. Differences were noted between modern versus historical and official versus non-official signs, although significant problems with the classification of such signs were identified.

**Comparison of the Linguistic Landscape and Languages Spoken at Home**

English was the most common language spoken in Hahndorf (see Table 1) and is the most common language present in the linguistic landscape (see Table 2). In addition, the proportion of English language signs (92.5%) and English-only speakers (91.72%) was nearly identical. With the exception of English, however, the results of the present study suggest a significant discrepancy between the linguistic landscape of Hahndorf and the languages spoken at home. German is the second most common language spoken in homes in Hahndorf and the second most common language present in the linguistic landscape. However, the proportion of German signs (18.75%) was markedly higher than the proportion of German speakers (1.77%). In contrast, languages such as Italian, French, Dutch and Serbian were in the top ranking languages spoken in Hahndorf (albeit with extremely low numbers of speakers) and yet no examples of these languages were seen in the sampled
public signs. Chinese and Indian languages also have stark differences in number of speakers and use in the linguistic landscape in which both languages are present (although in extremely small numbers). Chinese (Cantonese) is the equal fifth most commonly spoken language in Hahndorf but third most common language in public signs, while no residents reported speaking Indian languages at home. The use of Chinese in the linguistic landscape (5%) was much higher than the (virtually negligible) proportion of speakers (0.27%).

Therefore, the results of the present study provide evidence of a context in which the use of language in public space does not accurately reflect the pattern of languages spoken by residents in the town. This finding appears to conflict with the ethnolinguistic vitality perspective of Landry and Bourhis (1997, p. 27) in which the linguistic landscape was generally considered to be a marker or “concrete manifestation” of spoken languages in the community. However, the discrepancy between the linguistic landscape and languages spoken in Hahndorf homes is consistent with the findings of a number of more recent linguistic landscaping studies (Cenoz & Gorter, 2006; Coupland, 2010; Pavlenko, 2009; Torkington, 2009). This result may reflect differences in the linguistic context studied (including a non-English minority language with a very low proportion of speakers in an English-speaking environment) as well as the unique socio-historic, socio-political and socio-economic factors involved over nearly 200 years since Hahndorf’s settlement.

Socio-Historical and Socio-Political Factors

There are several important socio-historical and socio-political factors which may influence the findings of the linguistic landscape of Hahndorf. Firstly, the use of German in the linguistic landscape is strongly related to the history of the Hahndorf settlement. In 1839, Hahndorf was settled by German Lutherans who had immigrated from Prussia and East Germany (Young, 1985). At this time, Hahndorf was only the second German settlement in Australia but soon other nearby towns such as Lobethal (founded in 1842) were also established by German migrants (Young, 1985). Located nearly 30 kilometres from Adelaide, Hahndorf was initially a remote and isolated town (Young, 1985). As a result, Hahndorf was predominately a German and English-speaking, bilingual community with only a relatively small number of English-speaking people in the region (Young, 1985). Therefore, in the early years of Hahndorf’s settlement, the use of German on public signs would likely have had an informational function. This remains evident today on historic signs in the linguistic landscape such as on tombstones (see Figure 10). Thus, consistent with Landry and Bourhis (1997), the presence of German in the linguistic landscape would have been an accurate marker of the language spoken by residents in the early period of the Hahndorf’s settlement.

Despite the nearly 200 years since the town’s settlement, the German historical background of Hahndorf remains one of the most significant factors affecting the use of German in the linguistic landscape today. It should be noted that given the length of time since the town’s settlement, census data (including ancestry, place of birth and language spoken at home) and the three generation model of language assimilation in which the ability to speak a heritage language is generally argued to disappear by the third generation (Fishman, Nahiry, Hoffman & Hayden, 1966; Veltman, 1983), the use of German in the linguistic landscape is
unlikely to be attributable to heritage language maintenance and the language is likely to have a more symbolic than informational function. However, there is a visible sense of community, pride and collective identity in Hahndorf around the German heritage of the town and the status of being the oldest surviving German Settlement in Australia as well as an interest in the German language itself. This is observable in a diverse range of settings such as education, sport, culture and food. In terms of education, all three educational institutions in Hahndorf acknowledge and proclaim pride in the German heritage of the town and both primary schools provide German language instruction as part of the curriculum. For example, the principal of the Hahndorf Primary School writes that “our 132 year old school promotes the special heritage of Hahndorf” and that the school has “specialist teachers and facilitators for German” (Hahndorf Primary School and Preschool, 2016). In fact, Hahndorf Primary School is one of less than 60 public schools (out of over 500 in total) in the state of South Australia which teach German (Department for Education and Child Development, 2014). Similarly, St Michael’s Lutheran School outlines its history as the “oldest continuing Lutheran School in Australia” first established in 1839 by German settlers and is “proud of our humble beginnings and German heritage” (St Michael’s Lutheran School, 2016). St Michael’s Lutheran School (2016a) teaches historical, cultural and religious aspects as part of its German language instruction, such as teaching the Lord’s Prayer in German, a focus on the German history of Hahndorf and collaborating with students from a nearby high school to increase German language communication skills. With regards to sport, the Hahndorf Rifle Club was established in 1864 and is the only club in the Southern Hemisphere to have the traditional German ring-target style of shooting in an annual Koenigschiessen (Kingshoot) (Hahndorf Rifle Club, 2016). In addition, Hahndorf has an art gallery and German migration museum (the Hahndorf Academy) as well as festivals and markets such as Musikfest, Christkindlmarkt and previously Schützenfest (now held in Adelaide). Furthermore, many local food manufacturers emphasise their German heritage and style (e.g., Beerenberg Farm and Max Noske and Son Country Meat). Therefore, one of the most important factors affecting the use of German in Hahndorf is the town’s German historical background. In conjunction with the findings of the linguistic landscape survey, these examples related to socio-historical factors also provide initial support for the notion that German has relatively high social positioning in Hahndorf.

Secondly, there are strong socio-political factors which have a role in the salience of English and German in Hahndorf’s linguistic landscape. For example, there are regulations aiming to maintain the German heritage of the town at local, state and national government levels. The town of Hahndorf and dozens of the individual buildings and structures of the town are heritage listed at state (SA State Heritage Trust) and national (National Trust of Australia) levels which includes regulations for the preservation of the German character of the town (SA Heritage, 2012). There are also local community groups which monitor and seek to maintain the German heritage of the town, such as the Hahndorf Community Association and the Hahndorf Business and Tourism Association. Mount Barker District Council (2013) has a development plan for the town with strict regulations regarding the landscape of Hahndorf including the design of buildings and public signs. This plan directs “the conservation and reinforcement of the historic heritage of Hahndorf” with the objective of maintaining “a township in which development that is compatible with the East German heritage is
encouraged” (MBDC 2013, p. 264). Therefore, policies exist at multiple levels of community and government which may have a role in the linguistic landscape of Hahndorf especially with regard to German. However, it must be noted that while public signs have received much attention with the aim of keeping them consistent with the town’s heritage (MBDC, 2013), such council regulations do not explicitly mention the use of German language on signs. This is a distinct contrast to the studies by Torkington (2009) and Leeman and Modan (2009) in which policies affecting these contexts explicitly mention the use of language in public signs. In the case of Hahndorf, whilst there are no explicit policies regarding languages on signs, the use of German on 18.75% of signs may indicate an implicit desire to maintain the linguistic heritage of Hahndorf among regulatory bodies given that public signs are approved by the local council.

Given the socio-historical factors acting to increase the social positioning of German in Hahndorf, it is rather surprising that the proportion of German signs in the linguistic landscape was not higher. Important socio-political (and socio-historical) factors which may have influenced the linguistic landscape of Hahndorf include Australian law and public perception. As a result of anti-German sentiment in Australia during the First World War in particular, there was a strongly negative attitude towards the German language and German names were anglicised (Harmstorf, 2012). The Nomenclature Act of 1917 mandated that “enemy place names” of German origin be changed to names of British or indigenous origin (Parliament of South Australia, 1916). In accordance with this act, the name of Hahndorf was changed to Ambleside in 1918 (ABS, 1926). As part of this sentiment towards Germany and German people in Australia, individuals anglicised their surnames, business names were changed, schools were closed (including the Lutheran school in Hahndorf) and “German was virtually forbidden” at an institutional level (Harmstorf, 2012). Therefore, a dramatic change in the social positioning of German in the early twentieth century meant that many of the original German signs were removed and the linguistic landscape of the town of Hahndorf was changed. Although the Nomenclature Act of 1935 revoked the previous name change and the town’s name was reverted back to Hahndorf (“Righting a wrong”, 1935), it is likely that this period of anti-German sentiment and laws specifically banning the use of German language had a significant and enduring influence on the linguistic landscape of Hahndorf.

Given these socio-historical and socio-political factors discussed and the resultant changes in the linguistic landscape of Hahndorf over time, a diachronic analysis seems particularly relevant in the current study. Pavlenko (2009) provides a theoretical framework of diachronic analysis outlining five forms of language-shift-in-progress. In the present study, no clear evidence of language regulation or transgressive signage was observed in the linguistic landscape of Hahndorf. The linguistic landscaping survey and a review of historical photographs provided limited evidence to indicate that language erasure and language replacement may have occurred, although the extent to which this occurred and the impact on the linguistic landscape is unclear. In the absence of previous linguistic landscaping surveys of a region or clear historical photographs showing signs at different time periods, it is difficult to provide evidence of these forms of language-shift-in-progress. This represents an important methodological limitation of the diachronic perspective which restricts the analyses
and useful conclusions that can be drawn based on this theory. Further research focusing on documenting and evaluating changes to the linguistic landscape would be valuable.

Socio-Economic Factors

In addition to socio-historical and socio-political factors, socio-economic factors such as tourism and advertising may have a crucial role in the linguistic landscape of Hahndorf. Following the construction of the nearby highway in the 1970s, Hahndorf experienced a tourism boom (Department for Environment and Heritage, 2008). Hahndorf is now a popular tourist destination which is marketed as the oldest surviving German settlement in Australia, with tourism materials heavily emphasising the German heritage, original ‘Fachwerk’ buildings, authentic German food and village atmosphere (e.g., Hahndorf Business and Tourism Association, 2010; Tourism Australia, 2016). For example, Tourism Australia (2016) promotes Hahndorf as a “little slice of Germany” in which “you half expect to spot men in lederhosen yodelling” and visitors eat “sausage, sauerkraut and apple strudel with a stein of German beer” before leaving with “a hamper of gourmet German goodies and an urge to yodel”. Tourism is a major source of income for the Adelaide Hills region, contributing an estimated $260 million annually (SATC, 2015). The Government of South Australia promotes Hahndorf as “one of Adelaide’s premier tourist destinations” (SA Heritage, 2012, p. 2) and funding is provided to the town by organisations such as the South Australian Tourism Commission on the basis of this tourism (MBDC, 2010). As such, many of the socio-political issues related to council regulations arguably have a background in tourism concerns for economic reasons, which is noted by the local government as a “need to preserve the historic elements of the township that form the basis of the area’s attraction as a tourist destination” (MBDC, 2013, p. 265). Therefore, as a tourist destination whose appeal centres on the German heritage of the town, a major contributing factor to the use of German in the linguistic landscape of Hahndorf is its value for tourism. Thus, the economic value of tourism and the use of German language as a symbolic marker in this context provide support for the argument that German seems to have high social positioning in Hahndorf.

Approximately 112,000 people visit the Adelaide Hills region every year (SATC, 2012). The overwhelming majority of these visitors (106,000) are domestic visitors from Australia (SATC, 2012) and would likely speak English. Previous research regarding language contact in advertising has emphasised the symbolic value of language (Piller, 2003). In this perspective, the audience identifies the language, recalls the group stereotype and transfers the stereotype to the product (Kelly-Holmes, 2000; Piller, 2003). For example, the use of German in advertising has been associated with stereotypes of precision, reliability and superior technology (Kelly-Holmes, 2000). However, while the results suggest that the use of German has an important symbolic function in the linguistic landscape of Hahndorf, the use of German in this unique context appears to have connotations of being authentic, traditional, historical and enduring. This is more consistent with Leeman and Modan (2009, p. 351) in which Chinese language was associated with “ethnic authenticity”. Furthermore, as argued by Leeman and Modan (2009), government and private businesses in Hahndorf may use
symbols of German heritage and culture (including language, architecture and food) to turn Hahndorf into a commodity. By leveraging and enhancing the existing German history of the town, a unique and distinctive identity can be commodified to attract visitors for economic gain. For example, the use of German language in signs for food-orientated businesses such as Hahndorf Inn Hotel (see Figure 5) and Hahndorf Kaffeehaus & Fine Foods (see Figure 6) may be based on its symbolic function with connotations of traditional German ethnicity as a distinctive selling point to be marketed and consumed. Thus, German becomes commodified in Hahndorf as a useful tool for its symbolic value.

The economic importance of tourism is also a crucial factor in the presence (or absence) of languages other than English and German in the linguistic landscape of Hahndorf. Approximately 6,000 international tourists visit the Adelaide Hills region each year (SATC, 2012). State-based tourism data indicates that tourists from China stayed more nights in South Australia and spent more money ($126,000,000) than any other nationality (SATC, 2014). In 2012-2013, visitors from China spent 1,850,000 nights in South Australia compared to 619,000 nights for visitors from India, 133,000 nights for visitors from Italy and 204,000 nights for tourists from France (SATC, 2014). Given the economic importance of tourism for the town, local councils and businesses might consider it more pertinent and more financially profitable to include public signs written in Chinese to attract and communicate with these international tourists rather than signs written in other languages. Media reports provide evidence to support this argument. Specifically, the owner of the Hahndorf Inn implemented a strategic plan in 2007 to target the Chinese tourist market (Yow, 2015). This plan explicitly included a focus on the use of Chinese language in written materials such as the creation of pub menus in Chinese. The strategy resulted a five-fold increase in the number of yearly visitors to the business with 35% of visitors to the business being Chinese, up from 8% before the strategy was developed (Yow, 2015). Thus, there is preliminary evidence to suggest that Chinese has marginally higher social positioning (albeit low overall) than some other languages in the linguistic landscape of Hahndorf due to its socio-economic value for tourism. However, it is worth noting that the use of Chinese in some signs (such as bilingual restaurant signs) is likely to have symbolic value related to advertising which appeals to local residents and other tourists, not just informational value for those who speak Chinese.

Similarly, although a large number of tourists to the region originate from India, it is likely that the single sign using an Indian language (a restaurant sign) is symbolic in function and related more to its economic value for advertising (targeting readers interested in eating Indian food) than tourism. In addition, the absence of other languages such as Italian, French, Dutch and Serbian in the linguistic landscape is similar to the findings of the study by Torkington (2009) in which the Romanian language (labelled an ‘out-group’) had no linguistic capital and was not present in the linguistic landscape. Hence, in the current study, other languages spoken in Hahndorf homes such as Italian, French, Dutch and Serbian may be perceived as having no value for tourism in terms of the German heritage of the town or in terms of communicating with tourists from these countries and no value for businesses from an advertising point of view. Tourism and advertising are, therefore, important socio-economic factors affecting the linguistic landscape of Hahndorf.
Limitations of the Current Study

Several limitations exist in the current study which may affect interpretation of the results. Firstly, the problem of representativeness and scope of a sample is a common area of debate in linguistic landscaping research. The present study involved a small number of signs but its quantitative analysis was complemented by a qualitative analysis and an emphasis was placed on examining socio-historical, socio-political and socio-economic factors following recommendations of previous researchers (Leeman and Modan, 2009; Pavlenko, 2009). Secondly, quantitative analyses of signs based on categories such as official/non-official and modern/historical were not conducted in the present study. This decision was made due to major difficulties associated with determining authorship (as described in the qualitative analyses conducted) which is complicated by factors such as joint funding partnerships and regulatory frameworks particularly in a heritage and tourism-related area such as Hahndorf. Such quantitative analyses have recently been the subject of criticism due to the complexity involved in these classifications (Coupland, 2010; Leeman & Modan, 2009; Pavlenko, 2009). Thirdly, factors affecting the use of English in the linguistic landscape are largely ignored in the discussion in favour of a focus on other languages. The reasons for this decision include English being the official language in this context, the concordance between English language use among residents and the presence of English in the linguistic landscape, the predominance of English for informational functions in the linguistic landscape and limitations of scope. It was felt that concentrating on languages other than English would provide more interesting insights and greater contribution of knowledge to the field.

Conclusion

In conclusion, a linguistic landscaping analysis of the South Australian town of Hahndorf identified the use of monolingual and bilingual public signs in English, German, Chinese and Indian languages. The results of the study indicated that English followed by German were the most highly visible languages in the linguistic landscape of Hahndorf. Discrepancies were identified between the linguistic landscape and languages spoken at home for languages other than English. This is consistent with what previous researchers have referred to as an aspirational ideology of bilingualism (Coupland, 2010; Pavlenko, 2009).

Analysis of the social positioning of languages was based on a combination of explorations of the presence of languages in the linguistic landscape, the linguistic profile of the town and evidence provided by socio-historical, socio-political and socio-economic factors affecting the linguistic landscape of Hahndorf. These findings provide preliminary evidence to support the argument that English and (to a lesser extent) German may have high social positioning in Hahndorf while the social positioning of Chinese and Indian is low overall but comparatively higher than that of other languages spoken in local homes such as Italian, French, Dutch and Serbian which are invisible in the public sphere in Hahndorf.

In addition, the findings of the study support the role of socio-economic factors such as tourism and advertising in shaping the linguistic landscape. However, it would be remiss to conclude that the linguistic landscape of Hahndorf, and in particular the use of German in this...
context, is purely a function of socio-economic factors as ‘just a tourist town’. Rather, the linguistic landscape of Hahndorf has been shaped over nearly two centuries by significant socio-historical and socio-political forces. There is a strong sense of community around the town’s German heritage and language (evident in areas not directly related to tourism such as education) which has survived the passage of time despite intense challenges such as deep anti-German sentiment and laws targeting German language and education. This German heritage existed long before Hahndorf experienced its tourism boom (roughly 130 years after the town’s settlement) and long before the current increase in international tourists.

For these reasons, the qualitative, contextually-informed approach advocated by Leeman and Modan (2009) and the diachronic perspective of Pavlenko (2009), both of which emphasise socio-historical, socio-political and socio-economic factors, were identified as particularly relevant in the current study in addition to the framework outlined by Backhaus (2007). The current study provided the first linguistic landscaping analysis of Hahndorf and addressed important gaps in linguistic landscaping research. Future research documenting changes over time to further develop and test the diachronic perspective would be particularly interesting and informative.
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