Linguistic Landscape on Campus in Japan—
A Case Study of Signs in Kyushu University

Jing-Jing WANG

Northwest A&F University, China; Kyushu University, Japan

Abstract: This study examines multilingual university campus signs in Japan, a new attempt to expand the scope of linguistic landscape study. Based on the three dimensions put forward by Trumper-Hecht (2010) who sees linguistic landscape as a sociolinguistic-spatial phenomenon, this study brings linguistic landscape research into the context of multilingual campuses stimulated by internationalization, and intends to explore: how languages used in signs are regulated or planned in Japan, how the campus linguistic landscape is constructed and how the sign readers view the multilingual campus they are living in. The exploration of language policy concerning signs substantiates our understanding of the formation of campus linguistic landscape. The case study on the languages used in signs on Ito campus presents the features of the construction of campus linguistic landscape. On Ito campus of Kyushu University, bilingual Japanese-English signs compose the majority of campus signs, with Japanese language used as the dominant language. The questionnaire surveys students' attitudes towards a multilingual campus. The results indicate that for their academic life, students value bilingual ability a lot; in their daily life, students maintain multilingual contact to a certain degree. The important languages chosen by the students are in conformity with the language usage in reality despite a difference in order. This study is a synchronic record of the construction of the campus linguistic landscape, thus it can be used as a basis for comparative and diachronic studies in the future.

Keywords: English, campus signs, linguistic landscape, multilingualism, Japan

1. Introduction

The variety of languages and scripts displayed on signs attracts the interest of researchers all over the world. According to the French semiotician Roland Barthes (1982), Japan is an "empire of signs". Peter Backhaus (2005), saying "it is a well-known fact that public spaces in Japan, particularly in urban environments, are plastered with all sorts of written discourse…" (p.103), points out that this is not only true in a semiotic sense, but also in a material sense. Signs in urban areas have become an indispensible decoration to make the city stylish, modern and cosmopolitan. The constantly increasing signs gradually form a unique scenery in the city, and then form the "linguistic cityscape" or "linguistic landscape". It is also my personal experience that the repertoire of multilingual signs in the public sphere attracted me a lot when I came to Japan for the first time, which stimulated me to investigate linguistic landscape.

Linguistic landscape is a relatively young sociolinguistic subdiscipline. It is not difficult to find that most of these studies are done in big cities (Backhaus, 2005), or town centers (Schlick, 2003), which is a gathering place for a large number of people shopping, walking, sightseeing, eating, and so on. However, scholars should further investigate different places in order to depict a deeper and richer picture for the construction of linguistic landscape. We should not simply see what is presented in the linguistic landscape as it is. Questions like what contributes to its formation, how languages used in a certain place are regulated and how people living in it respond to a multilingual environment are also significant. Trumper-Hecht (2010) sees linguistic landscape as a sociolinguistic phenomenon, and puts forward three dimensions by developing Lefebvre's (1991) notion of "space". Therefore, this study, focusing on the multilingual community on campus, will provide a descriptive analysis of the campus linguistic landscape from three different perspectives: the actual construction of the campus signs, the rules that govern the display of signs, and native and overseas students' attitude towards the multilingual campus.

2.   Literature Review

In order to clarify the research object of this study, I will provide some basic conceptions of linguistic landscape first, including its definition and some controversies, classification and research achievements worldwide.

2.1.   What Is Linguistic Landscape?

The notion of "Linguistic Landscape" refers to linguistic objects that mark the public space (Ben-Rafael, 2009, p. 40). A commonly quoted definition of LL (Linguistic Landscape) is:

> 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 (Landry & Bourhis, 1997, p. 25).

So it refers to the languages that are visible in a specified area, more precisely, the language that can be found in cities, indoor markets, shops, schools, offices of government and big corporations, moving buses, campuses, beaches, and so on (Shohamy & Gorter, 2009). Moreover, it is also noteworthy that in Landry and Bourhis' original article, "public sign" was used as a substitute of linguistic landscape in a large part of their analysis, and in the abstract they again adopted "public sign" in comparison with "private sign" that together comprise the whole linguistic landscape, which caused misunderstanding of "public sign".

In fact, the term is extended to cover more and more places for different research purposes. Finally, the investigation on the conception of the term "linguistic landscape" turns to the discussion on what is included in the linguistic landscape and how the data are sorted. Recently, some researchers have criticized the limitations of the commonly quoted definition from Landry and Bourhis and expanded the notion of linguistic landscape by including a variety of literacy items such as icons, images, and logos,

in addition to languages displayed or inscribed in public spaces (Itagi & Singh, 2002; Backhaus, 2007; Shohamy & Gorter, 2009). Therefore, the definition of the term "linguistic landscape" becomes how the researchers define the constitution of linguistic landscape research based on data collection in their research. For this study, I concentrate on the representation of languages used on campus signs, and the graphs are not my concern.

Signs traditionally have been divided into two types, "private vs. government" (Landry & Bourhis, 1997), "top-down vs. bottom-up" (Ben-Rafael, Shohamy, Amara & Trumper-Hecht, 2006), "official vs. non-official" (Backhaus, 2006), or "private vs. public" (Shohamy, Ben-Rafeal & Barni, 2010), which share similar definition and scope: "signs issued by public authorities (like government, municipalities or public agencies), and those issued by individuals, associations or firms acting more or less autonomously in the limits of authorized regulations" (Shohamy, Ben-Rafeal & Barni, 2010). However, this seemingly resolute categorization overlooked the multi-faceted feature of the linguistic landscape. As Huebner (2009, p. 74) criticized, "the distinction between 'top-down' versus 'bottom-up' failed to capture the notion of agency and how it impacted language forms in the linguistic landscape." He explained that there was a considerable difference in a sign designed by the government and multinationals; locally owned businesses and hand-written notices; and that graffiti differs from all of them. Therefore, a further analysis on the forms of different types of signs can be explored deeper by a clearer subdivision of the linguistic landscape.

2.2. Overview of Linguistic Landscape Studies

The term "Linguistic Landscape" first appears in Landry and Bourhis' (1997) report on the perceptions of Francophone high school students of public signs in Canadian provinces. The study of the language on public signage, however, as an object of linguistic research, has a longer history. Masai (1972) focused on Tokyo and noted a presence of English in the 1970s. Tulp (1978) looked at bilingual Brussels, indicating the dominance of French. Backhaus (2005) states interest in linguistic landscape originates from the area where linguistic conflict has traditionally been relatively obvious, for example, Quebec and Belgium. Rosenbaum and colleagues (1977) investigated English and Hebrew signs in a street of Jerusalem, and indicated the public tolerance for foreign languages existing in signs. More contributions to linguistic landscape are from: Spolsky and Cooper (1983, 1991), who described the languages of the old city of Jerusalem, Calvet (1990, 1994), comparing the linguistic landscape of Paris and Dakar, and Leclerc (1989) summarizing legal provisions regarding the language of signs in a variety of places worldwide.

With the increasing interest in the public signage, there has appeared a number of articles and reports of studies scattered in various journals and collections, for example, *English Today, International Journal of Multilingualism*, and so on. Some research studies are MacGregor's (2003) survey on the language of shop signs in Tokyo; Schlick's (2002, 2003) study on the English of shop signs in Europe; Ben-Rafael et al.'s (2006) study on the patterns of LL in a variety of homogeneous and mixed Israeli cities, and Backhaus' (2006) further analysis on official and nonofficial signs based on the survey of Tokyo conducted in 2003, to name but a few.

The history of studying language use in public places in Japan can be dated from 1972. Yasuo. Masai (1972), a Japanese geographer, who was among the first to use the term linguistic landscape, investigated the language use on shop signs in the Shinjuku area, one of the centers of metropolitan Tokyo. In the late 1980s, Tokyo language was examined in a series of articles by the Japanese newspaper *Yomiuri Shimbun* (e.g., 1987a, 1987b, 1987c). Inoue (2000, 2001) focused on the issue of multilingual signs in Japan and integrated it into his theoretical framework of language and economy. Backhaus (2007) did a comparative study on signs of multilingualism in Tokyo, analyzing questions of "linguistic landscape by whom, for whom and *quo vadis*"(p. 2) . A survey of Braille signs in Yamanote Line railway stations was conducted by the Tokyo Society for the Protection of Visually Disabled Person's Lives and Rights (Toshikyo, 2000). Besides Tokyo, a few research studies have been conducted in Osaka (Miyazima, 1995; Kim, 2003) and Yamagata (Sato, 2003).

3. Theoretical Framework and Method

Trumper-Hecht developed Lefebvre's (1991) notion of "Space" and saw linguistic landscape as a sociolinguistic-spatial phenomenon. Lefebvre refers landscape to the visual aspect of space that may change in different social context accordingly with the features of that society (Trumper-Hecht, 2010). This study brings linguistic landscape research into the context of multilingual campuses stimulated by internationalization. The campus linguistic landscapes demonstrate the "social fact" through language distributions on campus. It is obvious that the globalization background facilitates the formation of the multilingual and multiethnic community on campus with its features.

Trumper-Hecht (2010) developed three dimensions of space proposed by Lefebvre in *The Production of Space* (1991, p. 237) and explicated that the "spatial practice" can be seen as the "physical" dimension that demonstrates "t he actual distribution of languages used on signs"; the "conceived space" can be seen as the "political" dimension that reflects "views and ideologies held by different policy makers whose policies mold the LL"; and the "lived space" can be seen as the "experiential" dimension that presents the attitudes of "inhabitants". I will triangulate data from each perspective for the investigation of campus linguistic landscapes and explore: first, how languages used in signs are regulated or planned in Japan; second, how the campus linguistic landscape is constructed, including the languages displayed on campus and how they are presented to readers; third, how the sign readers (students) view the multilingual campus where they are living.

4.   Analysis of the Construction of Campus Linguistic Landscape

4.1.   Political Dimension

4.1.1. Government Policies and Regulations

This study will first survey the policies or regulations that regulate the use of different languages in public places. This perspective is taken as a "conceived space" that indicates the ideologies of the

policy makers (Trumper-Hecht, 2010), which refers to "space as it is conceptualized by technocrats, planners, politicians and other policy makers (p. 237)". Backhaus (2009) indicated that at the beginning of the 1980s, the use of Japanese language in Kanji and two indigenous syllabaries showed that Japan was still a monolingual country. He cited from Leclerc (1989, pp. 240-241) and stated, at that time, few Japanese-English bilingual signs could be found in bigger train stations and subways. In later studies, Masai (1983) recorded that foreign languages were occasionally found in commercial signs, which shaped an exotic sense. Backhaus (2006) stated that the notion of taking Japan as prototype of a monolingual country had been undermined by recent publications on Japan's linguistic heterogeneity. Moreover, Backhaus (2009, p. 162) claimed that "though public awareness of the constant influx of foreign, particularly English, vocabulary has been high, to the present day no language laws exist to regulate its use on signs or in any other domains of public communication." However, the Japanese government and many organizations at different levels have been making efforts for the management of the emerging multilingual society.

As the pace of "being internationalized" is speeding up, the number of foreign residents is growing. Moreover, the number of tourists, scholars and businessmen coming to Japan is rising, thus how to adapt the linguistic landscape to the constantly increasing foreigners has become a significant issue. As Gottlieb (2012, p. 34) noted, "Japan's registered foreign population…has been steadily increasing for nearly three decades as a result of globalization-induced population flows." She also indicated that the number of registered foreign residents rose up to 2 million (including the third or fourth generations of the old comers in the Korean and Chinese Communities) by the end of 2008, the majority of whom are from China, Korea, Brazil and so on, all together 190 countries. Taking into account this situation, many efforts have been made for providing bilingual and multilingual services in Japan. For example, The Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications made a "Multicultural Coexistence Promotion Plan" in March 2006 because of the accelerated progress of globalization after the 1980s, which brought much international communication for Japanese, along with increasing foreign residents and overseas students. Therefore, providing multilingual information, media, and services for those people has become a major concern of the central government. To meet the needs, the Japan Tourism Agency of the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism also promoted a plan to improve the availability of multilingual information in 2010, aiming at helping international visitors travel in Japan. The central government has been working on guidelines, manuals, plans, and the like to encourage the implementation of "Multicultural Coexistence", but much practical work is also being done at the local level. Tokyo, as the pioneer, first saw these efforts. Since the early 1990s, the Tokyo Metropolitan Government (TMG), the local administrations, and the local government have released a variety of documents. Backhaus (2009) provided some in his comparative study on rules and regulations in the linguistic landscape of Tokyo, and this study will adopt three relative regulations from his study to analyze the rules for language usage in signs.

(1) *Tokyo Manual about Official Signs* (1991, p. 16)
        In order to keep up with internationalization, we make it a principle to use
        Japanese together with English
        To make place names, etc., easily understandable to small children and

> foreigners who can read Hiragana, we further make it a principle to add
> Hiragana to Japanese-English information about names.
>   (As cited in Backhaus, 2009, p. 162)

This is an early rule made for writing official signs. Some basic principles about how to use languages on signs are also proposed. The above Sign Manual approved Japanese-English bilingualism on public signs with the condition that the salience of Japanese on signs should be preserved.

> (2) *Sign System Guidebook for Public Transport Passenger Facilities* (2002, p. 16)
>   Depending on the profile of an area's visitors, it is desirable that languages
>   other than Japanese and English should be used.
>   (As cited in Backhaus, 2009, p. 164)

The Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport issued the *Sign System Guidebook for Public Transport Passenger Facilities,* which is stimulated by the promulgation of the Transport Accessibility Improvement Law in 2000. The guidebook suggested putting English into all the Japanese signs in railway stations and also provided many rules concerning Romanization principles and writing. This is also the first official approval for the adoption of non-English foreign languages on signs. It is noteworthy that such a guidebook designed by a state ministry is instructive for the metropolitan governments across the whole nation.

Tokyo Metropolitan Government issued the *Guide for Making City Writing Easy to Understand Also to Foreigners* in 2003. This guide is designed for signs targeted at pedestrians. Below are some major concerns in the guide for language use on signs:

> (3) *Guide for Making City Writing Easy to Understand Also to Foreigners* (2003)
>   a. Romanized text (English)
>   In principle, all Japanese writing is given together with Romanized text
>   (English).
>   Japanese proper nouns are given in the Roman alphabet, common nouns
>   are given in English. An interlinear order with Japanese writing above and
>   the Romanized text below is desirable so that the correspondence between
>   Japanese and the foreign language is understood.
>   b. Romanized text (English) + a number of other languages
>   In view of the number of registered foreign travelers in Tokyo, four languages
>   are used preferentially: Japanese, English, Chinese (simplified characters),
>   and Korean…
>   c. Furigana
>   Mainly thinking of foreigners who are living in Tokyo as the target group,
>   annotating Kanji with Furigana will have an effect, too.

> (Tokyo Metropolitan Government, 2003, p. 9; as cited in Backhaus, 2009, p. 165)

It is noteworthy that the adoption of Chinese and Korean are officially confirmed, given the

fact that they are the two largest linguistic minority groups of Tokyo. In addition, it recommends that these rules are applicable to official as well as private signs.

The rules on the use of foreign languages are commonly found in the manuals or guidelines at various provincial and municipal levels, for a variety of purposes, such as developing the tourism industry (Hokkaido Prefecture, Okinawa Prefecture, Aso City and Nagano City), establishing an international metropolis (Kitakyushu City) and making foreigners' life more convenient (Akita Prefecture, Fukuoka City). Those rules, taking into account the actual local situations and features, guide the formation and development of the regulations on the use of foreign languages in signs.

The Japanese Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism issued the *Guideline on Signs for Activating Tourism* in 2005, which provided principles for the making of signs at regional and municipal levels. This guideline also indicates that multilingual signs should be used when it is necessary. Before the appearance of the guideline, however, Kitakyushu City had already published its own English Sign Manual in 2004, which stipulated the use of English in many details, such as the use of hyphens, how to express macrons and some tips for translating Japanese into English. Kitakyushu issued both the English Signs Manual in 2004 and Korean Sign Manual in 2011, for the purpose of becoming an international metropolis. *The Guideline for Signs* of Nagano City provided examples of ordering six languages on a signboard, in Japanese, English, Chinese (Traditional form), Chinese (Simplified form), Korean and Portuguese.

Therefore, the role of foreign languages and their importance has been emphasized and promoted constantly. The Japanese central and local governments have been doing significant planning for multilingual services. As Gottlieb (2009) indicated that immigration had expanded significantly since the early 1980s, so besides the languages of existing ethnic Korean and Chinese communities, now there were also languages spoken by an increasingly diverse population of migrant workers. She also noted that it is local rather than national government which had taken the lead in meeting foreign residents' language needs; a much wider range of language classes (often run by volunteers through local international associations) and other multilingual services for locals was provided by local governments and civil society organizations such as NGOs or NPOs. All in all, the Japanese national government demonstrates its affirmative attitude towards the status and importance of foreign languages by providing general instructions, with whom the local governments and various organizations cooperate by contributing more concrete and practical use of foreign languages in signs and many other areas.

4.1.2.   Campus Policies and Regulations

To further investigate the rules regulating campus linguistic landscape, some background information about how signs should be made on campus will be explored. After visiting the related departments of Kyushu University, such as the International Student and Researcher Support Center of Ito Campus, and the management center of the cafeteria, it is found that there is no formal written regulation or guidebook for signs used on campus. However, there are constant efforts from the university staff and students to improve signs in terms of design, translation, and display.

Before the construction of the new Ito Campus in 2009, a special committee was founded, and the display of campus signs was one topic on their agenda. The committee decided the translation of campus signs as an official pre-plan, for example, the English nameplates of buildings. In effect, as early as 2007, the Committee for International Communication of Kyushu University had provided the English job titles for the teachers, which were put on the nameplates outside the professors' offices. Besides, there are board meetings once a month in each campus of Kyushu University, where the display and translation of signs are occasional topics along with other issues for discussion.

There are unwritten rules for the making of signs, according to the staff of the International Student and Research Center. For example, signs should be written in Japanese with English; other languages should also be adopted based on the numbers of the students. The staff indicates that in the cafeteria signs in the serving areas are written on wooden signboards using Japanese, English, Chinese, and Korean. They said this was necessary to help overseas students "survive on campus". In addition, due to the implementation of the "Global 30" project supported by the Japanese government in 2009, the number of students is expected to grow dramatically. Considering this situation, the idea of forming a special student organization was proposed. As a result, the Student Committee for Internationalization was established in July 2011. Working for the globalization of the campus, it covers three main tasks: providing support for the overseas students' life; promoting the communication between Japanese students and overseas students; and the internationalization of Japanese students. In 2012, they proposed a plan to display all campus signs in both Japanese and English. The members of this committee looked for the Japanese-only signs, and reported the results to the appropriate administrators to get them revised. This activity, along with their other work, contributed to the globalization of the campus. As the efforts are from both the administration of the university and the student organization, it can be expected that more changes will follow based on the current procedures.

4.1.3. Summary of Policy Trends

The Japanese government and other organizations have made great efforts. Although there is no law that regulates whether and how foreign languages should be used in the public sphere, they have actively pushed towards internationalization and the strengthening of foreign language education, especially English. Moreover, the promotion of the use of foreign languages is implemented at various levels in Japan. Tokyo has been the pioneer, the first to make rules and put them into practice. Spolsky (2004, p. 222) noted, "…The real language policy of a community is more likely to be found in its practices than in management." Changes in language choice in the regulations over time have gradually made clear the positive acceptance of foreign languages.

A university is an aggregation of students from many different countries, and they compose a multilingual community on campus, which is not an uncommon phenomenon worldwide, as overseas study has become increasingly popular due to the impact of internationalization. In particular, the world-famous and comprehensive universities, who are accepting large numbers of foreign students and creating more "multilingual communities" on campus, are experiencing the globalizing process. Thus, Kyushu University has been working towards improving its campus signs. Staff and students

work together to globalize the campus, in which providing multilingual signs is one important project. According to data statistics of the fact book of Kyushu University in 2011, overseas students gather from 83 different countries and regions. The linguistic landscape of a campus is an important constituent part of the linguistic landscape of a city and a country, as universities are places where many international academic communications are held; where exchanges between students and scholars of different cultural backgrounds are easily made; and where local facilities and services are established to accommodate both native and foreign students' life. How the linguistic landscape is shaped indicates in what ways students from different countries interact and communicate, which also enriches the community's overall understanding towards a larger linguistic landscape.

4.2.   Physical Dimension

The present study conducted a survey to demonstrate the actual construction of the linguistic landscape of Ito campus. The survey area covers the main streets of Ito campus. All together, 251 signs were photographed. They are signs displayed on the signposts beside the crossroads, inscriptions on the buildings, plate names on the shops, library, cafeteria, gymnasium, signboards standing at the parking lots and so on. Since this survey attempts to describe how the campus linguistic landscape is shown to the public or visitors, for example, teachers and students who work or study here, or people who travel to or attend meetings at Kyushu university, samples gathered here are only the signs displayed outside the buildings, except for the inclusion of the library, cafeteria, and gymnasium, which are regarded as gathering places for the public. Moreover, only the signs in a relatively stable position are included in this study, for example, inscriptions on stone, building names on iron sign boards, guiding information hanging on the ceiling and so on, rather than temporarily plastered posters or notices and commercial advertisements on the bulletin board.

It is necessary to point out that the number of the photographs of signs does not refer to each item shown on the signboard, because some of the signs are photographed as a complete sign area (see Figure 1 & Figure 2), where several signs may appear on one signboard. All the photographs are classified according to the number of languages used. As Table 1 shows, the number of unilingual signs is much larger, all together 117 photographs, and they are counted as having Japanese, English and French. Chinese-only and Korean-only signs are not found, but they appear often on the bulletin board, which is regarded as an unstable position and excluded from this study. The languages used on these signs, the combinations and visual prominence of these languages and the translation of these signs are the main concerns of my analysis. After a close examination of these photographs, detailed discussion is given below.

Figure 1

Figure 2

Table 1. Languages on Signs on Ito Campus of Kyushu Universityt

Total	Valid Data	Groups	Languages	Number	Percentage
251	223	Unilingual 117	Japanese-only	99	44.3%
			English-only	17	7.6%
			French-only	1	0.40%
		Bilingual 104	Japanese+English	103	46.10%
			Japanese+Chinese	1	0.40%
		Multilingual 2	Chinese+Japanese+English	1	0.40%
			Japanese+English+Chinese+Korean	1	0.40%

The data were divided into three groups: unilingual, bilingual and multilingual signs. Unilingual signs were further classified into three groups: (1) Japanese (44.3%), (2) English (7.6%) and (3) French (0.4%). The bilingual signs are also sorted into two groups: (1) Japanese and English (46.1%), (2) Japanese and Chinese (0.4%). There were two multilingual signs: one is in Japanese, English and Chinese (0.4%), and the other is in Japanese, English, Chinese and Korean (0.4%), as Table 1 shows. Compared with a previous study on shop signs in Tokyo conducted by MacGregor (2003), the data from Ito campus show almost the same pattern (see Table 2); however, in MacGregor's study Danish appeared in a bilingual sign as a foreign language, rather than Chinese as on Ito campus. Besides, the larger percentage of Japanese-English bilingual signs on Ito campus also differs from the shop signs in Tokyo (46.1% vs. 24.2%).

Table 2. Languages used on Seijo shop signs (n=120)

Unilingual		Bilingual		Trilingual	
Japanese	52(43.3%)	English+Japanese	29(24.2%)	English+French +Japanese	2(1.7%)
English	31(25.8%)	French+Japanese	2(1.7%)		
French	3(2.5%)	Danish+Japanese	1(0.8%)		

(MacGregor, 2003)

4.2.1. Unilingual Signs

Among the 117 unilingual signs, the dominant language is Japanese (44.3%). English (7.6%) and French (0.4%) also show up. The Japanese-only signs can be found everywhere on campus, for instance, at the bus stop, parking lot, and on the wall of the stadium. Unlike

the shop signs, the campus signs usually are relatively long sentences, and written in the combination of kanji, hiragana, and sometimes katagana. No generalization about the preference of using different scripts can be made, so the different combinations of scripts of Japanese writing used in these signs will not be analyzed, except one sign in Roman letters, 'Ki-Re-i', which is displayed on the top of the small 'photo studio', a self-help photographing machine outside the convenience store.

The 17 English-only signs create an international atmosphere on Ito campus, and the majority of them are shop names and business hours of these shops, like 'UNIV. CO-OP BOOK SHOP', 'Big Orange Restaurant', 'Bread & Cafe'; and convenience stores, like 'Lawson' and 'COOP'. Aiming to either help the overseas students or show the university is internationalized, these English signs enrich the linguistic landscape of Ito Campus. The French-only sign, 'Café du DaRa', is found in the cafeteria near the engineering department. This unique sign is obvious in the cafeteria and attracts students' attention a lot. Its meaning can easily be got from the first letter of the French word, which is similar to English. All in all, the two types of signs found on campus are not as complicated in the form and meaning as the shop signs are; instead, they help construct an exotic flavor on campus.

4.2.2. Bilingual Signs

Bilingual signs are the second large category in these three groups, and Japanese-English signs (46.1%) not only dominate in these categories but also the whole sub-categories. The number of Japanese-English signs (103) is even bigger than the Japanese only signs (99). Among the 103 Japanese-English signs, all together 75 signs (72.8%) provide a relatively complete translation from Japanese to English, while 27.1% are just a partial translation. To be specific, signposts (Figure 1) beside the crossroads are examples of complete translation, and the names of buildings are all clearly translated and displayed. The notices inside the building (cafeteria, stadium, library) are rarely translated according to my observation. Moreover, the capitalized word 'P' is often found in the parking lot, and is a representative for incomplete translation, because usually next to or under the letter 'P', there are specific requirements for the status of the one who can park there, as is shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3

This survey, only one Japanese-Chinese sign (Figure 4) is found and it is a nameplate for a Chinese Restaurant. Although there is a large number of students from China on Ito Campus, fixed Chinese-only signs are not found in this survey. It is necessary to mention that

there are some temporary Chinese-only signs, and Korean-only signs, and sometimes, one sign is made into different versions, usually in Japanese, English, Chinese and Korean, for example, the posters on the bulletin board, which are regularly updated or easily taken away. However, this study focuses on more stable signs and how they are exhibited to the public, so signs on the bulletin boards are excluded.

Figure 4

4.2.3. Multilingual Signs

Multilingual signs are common in Japan, and I found two on campus; one is in Japanese, Chinese and English, the other is in Japanese, English, Chinese, and Korean; one found in a restaurant and one in the cafeteria. In the Chinese-Japanese sign (Figure 4), the Japanese Roman letter can not show that this is a Chinese Restaurant unless someone knows the Chinese characters on it, and the name 'TenTen' is just a symbol that is easy for the Japanese to remember. However, one multilingual sign found in the cafeteria displays four languages (Figure 2), and also raises a question for the position of different languages displayed on the sign board on Ito campus. This study found that in the 106 bilingual and multilingual signs, 74 of them (71.8%) display Japanese in the dominant position, either by placing Japanese on the top of the sign board with the translation under it, or by making the font and size bigger than other languages; 10 signs (9.7%) give visual prominence to English; and 22 signs (21.4%) did not show such a division.

5. Experiential Dimension

The opinions of sign readers are regarded as "A Third Dimension" (Trumper-Hecht, 2010), which derives from Lefebvre's (1991) idea of "Lived Space" — the space of inhabitants. The perceptions and preferences of "walkers" (sign readers) have been explored as an important part for understanding a whole linguistic landscape. Based on the questionnaire survey, this study will shed some light on the sign readers' interpretations towards both policy-making and the actual representation of campus linguistic landscapes.

This section, investigating the students' attitudes towards the languages used on the campus signs of Kyushu University, is comprised of three parts: students' perceptions about the use of language

on campus, students' choices and order of the languages used on the signboard of campus, and students' opinions on the importance of languages used on campus. Using convenience and purposeful sampling, this survey, comprised of 70 students (35 Japanese students and 35 overseas students) from Kyushu University, was done in December 2012. Table 3 shows the background of the 70 students: the departments they are studying in and their nationality.

Table 3. Background of the Participants from Ito Campus

Department (n=7)	Mumber (n=70)	Nationality (n=12)	Mumber	Nationality	Mumber
Engineering	27	Japanese	35	Iranian	1
Culture Studies	17	Chinese	13	Polish	1
Mathematics	14	Indonesian	7	French	1
Information Science	7	Korean	4	Indian	1
Agriculture	2	Vietnamese	4	American	1
Law	2	Malay	1		
Humanities	1	Philippines	1		

The first question of the questionnaire (see Appendix 1 and Appendix 2) asks how the students perceive the language use in campus signs. Based on the impression of the students of Ito Campus, up to 71% of the students think that Japanese-only signs are used most often (See Table 4). In actual fact, however, Japanese-English bilingual signs (46.1%) are comparable to Japanese-only signs (44.3%). The following two questions (Q2 and Q3) ask for the students' general evaluation of different languages, because this survey considers that the students closely connect their lives, either study or living, with their attitudes towards a multilingual campus. For in-class study, more students on Ito Campus hold that bilingual ability is required (57%). For daily life, 61% of the students emphasize the importance of Japanese (See Table 5 & Table 6). In addition, at least four languages are deemed to be relevant to their daily life and study. They are Japanese, English, Chinese and Korean.

Table 4. Students' Impression of the Languages Used Most Often on Campus

Japanese	English	Japanese & English
71%	1%	28%

Table 5. Students' Opinion on Important Languages for Their Study

Japanese	English	Japanese & English	Japanese & English & Chinese	Other
19%	16%	57%	6%	2%

Table 6. Students' Opinion on Important Languages for Their Daily Life

Japanese	English	Japanese & English	Japanese & English & Chinese	Other
61%	7%	24%	4%	4%

When asked about their willingness to include more exotic foreign languages on campus signs (Q4), more than one third of the students want to adopt foreign languages besides English, Chinese, and Korean on to the signboards of Ito campus, among them, 15 (21%) are native Japanese students, and 10 (14%) are overseas students. Moreover, 29% of the students choose five or six foreign languages for campus signs. Question 5 asks students how they order the languages they choose for campus signs. As I expected, the first four languages chosen by the students on both campuses are in conformity with the languages used in reality, in other words, as summarized previously, the commonly used languages are Japanese, English, Chinese, and Korean (See Table 7). Besides, Ito Campus students choose 8 more foreign languages to use. Among them, French and Spanish take the first two places.

Table 7. Order of the First Four Languages Selected for Campus Signs

Japanese (1st Place)	English (2nd Place)	Chinese (3rd Place)	Korean (4th Place)
71%	70%	49%	39%

From Question 6 on, the participants are asked to describe their opinions more concretely, evaluating the degree of the importance of the languages used on campus signs. First, the attractive power of the foreign languages on campus is investigated; second the students' attitudes towards each foreign language; and third, their general impression of the multilingual environment. "1" represented a strong degree of attractive power, while "5" represented a weak degree of power. The result shows that the multilingual signs did attract the attention of students when they first came to campus.

Next, the students are asked to give their opinions on putting the Japanese language on the top of the signboard. The top position of the native language (See Table 8) is highly valued (Average: 1.9). Then, the participants are asked to express their feelings about the relevance to them of displaying information in foreign languages on campus. The average numbers indicate that their general attitudes are neutral, and to some extent, they accept the use of foreign languages without extreme alienation.

The attitudes of the students towards each foreign language are examined from Q10 to Q13 (See Table 8). Students unanimously emphasize the importance of English (Average: 1.7), which is regarded as a necessity for overseas students who cannot speak Japanese well at the beginning of their overseas study; and for the native Japanese students, English has been a compulsory subject which is highly valued. The role of Chinese language is regarded as relatively important on Ito Campus (Average: 2.7). Besides, the survey results show the students' lower evaluation towards Korean (Average: 3.3). I assumed that the usage of French would not be widely accepted, and indeed the students evaluate French to be less important for them, probably in terms of getting information in their daily life.

Table 8. Students' Attitudes towards the Use of Foreign Languages on Campus

Language\Group	Japanese	English	Chinese	Korean	French
Native Student	1.7	1.7	2.4	2.9	3.2
Native Student	2	1.7	3.1	3.5	3.9
Average	1.9	1.7	2.8	3.3	3.6

(1: Very important; 5: Not important at all)

The last question (Q14) attempts to get a general understanding of the students' feeling about the coexistence of the native language and foreign languages on campus. The results show that the students are quite affirmative towards multilingualism (Average: 1.7). Also, in Q15, students are invited to share their ideas and opinions about campus signs. Some express their hopes to improve the sign translation; their preferences for certain languages used on campus; and their eagerness to learn Japanese the native language of the country

6. Conclusion

I will summarize the findings, limitations and implications of this study in this section. The current research aims to investigate the languages on signs displayed on Ito campus of Kyushu University, which is a new attempt to collect data outside urban areas. Since the signs photographed were limited to the main streets of Ito campus of Kyushu University, it is difficult to draw any broad conclusions. This study, however, goes deeper into the linguistic landscape research by investigating signs from three different perspectives, a physical dimension, a political dimension and an experiential dimension, which enriches our understanding of a multilingual community.

The campus signs do not show so rich a construction of linguistic landscape as the urban area. Instead, the study presents some features of signs on campus, and at the same time it also shows that the campus has its own traits, as indicated in the large amount of bilingual Japanese-English signs. A trend towards internationalization is also shown in these signs.

Expanding the scope of linguistic landscape research, this study adopts sociolinguistic theories, which substantiate the descriptive analysis of campus signs. Going beyond that, this study meets the challenge faced by researchers who seek to collect data to analyze the opinions and thoughts of the sign readers towards the campus linguistic landscape, thus addressing a gap in the current linguistic landscape research. It brings linguistic landscape research to the context of a multilingual campus stimulated by the progress of internationalization, which differs from the concept of "tension" or "conflict" traditionally recognized in previous linguistic landscape research.

With a synchronic record of the construction of the campus linguistic landscape, this study provides a basis for further comparative and diachronic studies in the future. In addition, the interdisciplinary nature of linguistic landscape research could inspire more researchers to investigate

signs from diverse aspects.

References

Backhaus, Peter. (2005). Signs of multilingualism in Tokyo — a diachronic look at the linguistic landscape. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 2005, (175-176),* 103-121.

Backhaus, Peter. (2006). Multilingualism in Tokyo: A look into the linguistic landscape. In Durk Gorter (Ed.), Linguistic Landscape: *A New Approach to Multilingualism* (pp. 52-66). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Backhaus, Peter. (2007). *Linguistic landscapes: A comparative study of urban multilingualism in Tokyo.* Clevedon: Multilingualism Matters.

Backhaus, Peter. (2009). Rules and regulations in linguistic landscaping: A comparative perspective. In Shohamy, Elana & Gorter, Durk (Eds.), *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery* (pp. 157-172). New York and London: Routledge.

Barthes, Roland. (1982). *Empire of signs.* New York: Hill and Wang.

Ben-Rafael, Eliezer. (2009). A sociological approach to the study of linguistic landscapes. In Shohamy, Elana & Gorter, Durk (Eds.), *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery* (p. 40). New York: Routledge.

Ben-Rafael, Eliezer; Shohamy, Elana; Amara, Muhammad Hasan & Trumper-Hecht, Nira. (2006). Linguistic landscape as symbolic construction of the public space: The case of Israel. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 3*(1), 7-30.

Calvet, Louis-Jean. (1990). Des mots sur les murs: Une comparaison entre Paris et Dakar. In Robert Chaudenson (Ed.), *Des langues et des villes* (Actes de colloque international a Dakar, du 15 au 17 decembre 1990) (pp. 73-83). Paris: Agence de Cooperation Culturelle et Technique.

Calvet, Louis-Jean. (1994). *Les voix de la ville*: *Introduction à la sociolinguistique urbaine [Voices of the city: Introduction to urban sociolinguistics].* Paris: Payot et Rivages.

Gottlieb, Nanatte. (2009). *Migration and language policy in Japan today.* The Tokyo Foundation. Retrieved January 20, 2013, from http://www.tokyofoundation.org/en/additional_info/migration-and-language-policy-in-japan-today

Gottlieb, Nanette. (2012). *Language policy in Japan: The challenge of change.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Huebner, Thom. (2009). A framework for the linguistic analysis of linguistic landscape. In Shohamy, Elana & Gorter, Durk (Eds.), *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery* (pp. 70-87). New York: Routledge.

Inoue, Fumio. (2000). *Nihongo no Nedan [The price of Japanese]*. Tokyo: Taishuukan.

Inoue, Fumio. (2001). *NihongowaIkinokorerunoka [Will Japanese survive?].* Tokyo: PHP Shinsho.

Itagi, N. H. & Singh, Shailendra Kurnar. (2002). Introduction. In N.H. Itagi & S.K. Singh (Eds.), *Linguistic landscaping in India with particular reference to the new states: Proceedings of a seminar* (pp. 9-12). Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages and

Mahatma Gandhi International Hindi University.

Japan Tourism Agency of Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism. (2010). Multilingual Information on Public Transport and Other Locations. Retrieved from http://www.mlit.go.jp/kankocho/en/shisaku/kokusai/koukyou.html

Japanese Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism. (2005). Guideline on Signs for Activating Tourism. Retrieved December 14, 2012 from http://www.mlit.go.jp/common/000058923.pdf

Kim, Miseon. (2003). Gengokeikankaramitanihon no taminzokuka [Japan's growing ethnic heterogeneity as seen from the linguistic landscape]. In H. Shooji (Ed.), *Kokusai Imin no JizonSenryaku to ToransunashonaruNettowaaku no Bunka JinruigakutekiKenkyuu [Cultural-ethnological research about international immigrants' strategies of independent existence and transnational networks]* (175–190). Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.

Kitakyushu English Sign Manual. Retrieved December 14, 2012 from http://www.city.kitakyushu.lg.jp/files/000087509.pdf

Kitakyushu Korean Sign Manual. Retrieved December 14, 2012 fromhttp://www.city.kitakyushu.lg.jp/files/000087496.pdf

Landry, Rodrigue & Bourhis, Richard Y. (1997) Linguistic landscape and ethnolinguistic vitality. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 16*(1), 23-49.

Leclerc, Jacques. (1989). *La guerre des langues dans l'affichage [The war of languages in signage].* Montreal: VLB Editeur.

Lefebvre, Henri. (1991). *The production of space.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Masai, Yasuo. (1972). *Tokyo no Seikatsu Chizu [Living map of Tokyo].* Tokyo: JijiTsushinsha.

Masai, Yasuo. (1983). S*hinjuku no kissaten mei: gengo keikan no bunka chiri [Café names in Shinjuku: The cultural geography of the linguistic landscape],* Tsukuba Daigaku Chiiki Kenkyu, 1, 49-61.

MacGregor, Laura. (2003). The language of shop signs in Tokyo. English Today, 19(1), 18-23.

Miyazima, Tatuo. (1995). *Tagengoshakai e no taioo —Osaka 1994 nen [Adapting to a multilingual society — Osaka 1994].* Handai Nihongo Kenkyuu 7, 1–21.

 Nagano public sign guideline. Retrieved December 14, 2012 from https://www.city.nagano.nagano.jp/uploaded/attachment/48010.pdf#search='外国人来訪者等への配慮+長野'

Rosenbaum, Yehudit; Nadel, Elizabeth; Cooper, Robert L. & Fishman, Joshua A. (1977). English on KerenKayemet Street. In: Fishman, J. A.; Cooper, R.L. & Conrad, A. W. (Eds.) *The spread of English, Rowley* (pp. 179-196). MA: Newbury House,.

Shohamy, Elana; Ben-Rafael, Eliezer & Barni, Monica. (2010). Introduction: An approach to an 'ordered disorder'. In E. Shohamy, E. Ben-Rafael, &M. Barni (Eds.), Linguistic landscape in the city (pp. xi-xxviii). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Shohamy, Elana & Gorter, Durk. (2009). *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery.* New York: Routledge.

Sato, Keiko. (2003). Kanban no moji [The letters of signs].*Yamagatahogen* 35, 1-21.

Schlick, Maria. (2002). The English of shop signs in Europe. *English Today*, 70 (18), 3-7

Schlick, Maria. (2003). The English of shop signs in Europe. *English Today, 73*(19), 3-17

Spolsky, Bernard & Robert L. Cooper. (1983). *The languages of Jerusalem; Arab-Jewish relations in the Old City (Research report to the Ford Foundation).* Bar-Ilan: Bar-Ilan

University.

Spolsky, Bernard & Robert L. Cooper. (1991). *The languages of Jerusalem*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Toshikyo (2000).*Tokyo ShiryokuShoogaisha no Seikatsu to Kenri* o Mamoru Kai [Tokyo Society for the Protection of Visually Disabled Persons' Lives and Rights]. Yamanotesenkaidantesuritenjihyoojitenkenchoosahookoku [Report on a survey of Braille signs at the handrails of the stairs in Yamanote Line stations], Unpublished document.

Trumper-Hecht, Nira. (2010). Linguistic landscape in mixed cities in Israel from the perspective of 'walkers': The case of Arabic. In Elana Shohamy, Eliezer Ben-Rafael, & Monica Barni (Eds.), *Linguistic landscape in the city,* (pp. 219-234). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Tulp, Stella M. (1978). Reklame en tweetaligheid. Een onderzoek naar de geografische verspreiding van franstalige en nederlandstalige affiches in Brussel [Advertising and bilingualism: A survey of the geographic distribution of French and Dutch posters in Brussels].*Taal en Sociale Integratie 1*, 261-288.

Yomiuri Shimbun (1987a). *Afureru katakana [Katakana overflowing]* Column on Tokyo Language 24, 6 October 1987, 23.

Yomiuri Shimbun (1987b). *Katakana wakakkoo ii?* [Is Katakana cool?] Column on Tokyo Language 26, 9 October 1987, 23.

Yomiuri Shimbun (1987c). *Chokusetsuhyoogensakerukufuu* [Devices to avoid direct expressions] Column on Tokyo Language 35, 6 November, 23.

Author Note

Jing-Jing Wang was a PhD student in Kyushu University of Japan when she contributed the article to this journal. This paper is based on her dissertation *Linguistic Landscapes of Multilingual Campuses in China and Japan: From the Perspective of Language Policy, Construction of Signs and Students' Attitude*s. She got her PhD degree in September, 2013. Now she works as a lecturer at the Foreign Language Department of Northwest A&F University in China. Her major research interests are sociolinguistics, intercultural communication and translation.

Appendix 1. Questionnaire A

Questionnaire Survey (Native Students on Ito Campus)

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this survey about students' attitudes towards the campus signs. The questionnaire is part of my PhD Research on the Linguistic landscape of China and Japan. Your answers will remain confidential.

_____

Section A: General Questions
Gender: ☐ Male   ☐ Female   Department: _____

Nationality: _____   Mother Language: _____

How many foreign languages can you read? _____ ;

They are: _____

Section B: Students' Attitudes

1. Which language(s) do you think is used most often on the signboards of Ito Campus?
    ☐ Japanese   ☐ English   ☐ Japanese & English   ☐ Others _____

2. What language(s) do you think are important for the students' study on Ito Campus?
    ☐Japanese   ☐English   ☐Chinese   ☐Korean   ☐Spanish   ☐French

    ☐Malay   ☐Indonesian ☐ German   ☐Hindi   ☐ others _____

3 . What language(s) are important for the students' daily life on Ito Campus?

    ☐Japanese   ☐English   ☐Chinese   ☐Korean   ☐Spanish   ☐French

    ☐Malay   ☐Indonesian ☐ German   ☐Hindi   ☐ others _____

4. Do you want to add another foreign language (besides English, Chinese and Korean) into the signboard on Ito Campus?

    ☐ Yes, I do.   I want to add _____   ☐ No, I don't.

5. If you get a chance to choose and order the languages used on the signboards of Ito Campus, you will arrange them as:

    1. _____ 2._____ 3._____ 4._____
    5._____ 6._____

Please circle the number you want to choose. For example: **1**   **2**

6. Did the multilingual signboardsattract your attention when you first came to ItoCampus?
    Very much ◀━━━━ 1   2   3   4   5 ━━━ Not at all

7.How important is it to put Japanese on the top of the signboard?

Very important   ◄   1   2   3   4   5   Not important at all

8. Do you think you are relevant to the information in theEnglish-only signs?

Very much   ◄   1   2   3   4   5   Not at all

9. Do you think you are alienated (separated) from the English-only signs on Ito Campus?

Very much ◄ 1   2   3   4   5   Not at all

10. What is your opinion on using English on the signs of Ito Campus?

 Very important   ◄   1   2   3   4   5   Not important at all

11. What is your opinion on using Chinese on the signs of Ito Campus?

Very important   ◄   1   2   3   4   5   Not important at all

12. What is your opinion on using Korean on the signs of Ito Campus?

Very important   ◄   1   2   3   4   5   Not important at all

13. What is your opinion on using French on the signs of Ito Campus?

Very important ◄ 1   2   3   4   5   Not important at all

14. What's your general feeling about the multilingual signs displayed on Ito Campus?

Very good   ◄   1   2   3   4   5   Very bad

15. Are there any additional opinions or thoughts you want to share?

Appendix 2. Questionnaire B

Questionnaire Survey (Overseas Students on Ito Campus)
Thank you for agreeing to take part in this survey about students' attitudes towards the campus signs. The questionnaire is part of my PhD Research on the Linguistic landscape of China and Japan. Your answers will remain confidential.
_____
Section A: General Questions

Gender:☐Male   ☐Female   Department: _____

Nationality: _____   Mother Language: _____

How many foreign languages can you read? _____;

They are: _____

Section B: Students' Attitudes

1. Which language(s) do you think is used most often on the signboards of Ito Campus?

    ☐ Japanese   ☐ English   ☐ Japanese & English   ☐ Others _____

2. What language(s) do you think are important for the students' study on Ito Campus?

    ☐Japanese   ☐English   ☐Chinese   ☐Korean   ☐Spanish   ☐French

    ☐Malay   ☐Indonesian ☐ German   ☐Hindi   ☐ others _____

3. What language(s) are important for the students' daily life on Ito Campus?

    ☐Japanese   ☐English   ☐Chinese   ☐Korean   ☐Spanish   ☐French

    ☐Malay   ☐Indonesian ☐ German   ☐Hindi   ☐ others _____

4. Do you want to add another foreign language (besides English, Chinese and Korean) into the signboard on Ito Campus?

    ☐ Yes, I do.   I want to add _____   ☐ No, I don't.

5. If you get a chance to choose and order the languages used on the signboards of Ito Campus, you will arrange them as:

    1. _____ 2._____ 3._____ 4._____
    5._____ 6._____

Please circle the number you want to choose. For example: **1**   **2**

6. Did the multilingual signboardsattract your attention when you first came to Ito Campus?
    Very much   1   2   3   4   5   Not at all

7. How important is it to put Japanese on the top of the signboard?
    Very important   1   2   3   4   5   Not important at all

8. Do you think you are relevant to the information in the Japanese-only signs?
   Very much   1   2   3   4   5   Not at all

9. Do you think you are alienated (separated) from the Japanese-only signs on Ito Campus?
   Very much   1   2   3   4   5   Not at all

10. What is your opinion on using English on the signs of Ito Campus?
    Very important   1   2   3   4   5   Not important at all

11. What is your opinion on using Chinese on the signs of Ito Campus?
    Very important   1   2   3   4   5   Not important at all

12. What is your opinion on using Korean on the signs of Ito Campus?
    Very important   1   2   3   4   5   Not important at all

13. What is your opinion on using French on the signs of Ito Campus?
    Very important   1   2   3   4   5   Not important at all

14. What's your general feeling about the multilingual signs displayed on Ito Campus?
    Very good   1   2   3   4   5   Very bad

15. Are there any additional opinions or thoughts you want to share?