1 **Beliefs of EFL learners Towards Pedagogical Values of Linguistic**

2 **Landscape in China: A Case Study Carried out in Three Schools**

3 **Abstract:** Numerous research in linguistic landscape (LL) have shown that the languages exhibited

4 on signage in city space can offer an abundant resource enabling language learning in "real-life"

5 situations. However, there are rare studies investigate the pedagogical value from the perspective

6 of the learners. Taking English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners in China as research subjects,

7 a qualitative and quantitative combined method was adopted in this study to survey three groups

8 of students' beliefs about the pedagogical value of LL (classified as senior high school students,

9 undergraduate students, and postgraduate students). The findings show that almost students

10 hold a positive attitude toward English in LL, but with the different knowledge base, learning

11 methods and ideology of "standard" English usage, the learners show different perceptions

12 towards the specific issues on to what extent the English in LL can help them to learn English.

15

16 1. Introduction

17 Over the past decade, Linguistic Landscape (LL) emerged as a dynamic and active field of

18 research. Conferences on diverse themes of LL are held annually in various places in the world;

19 edited collections reporting new research are being published; symposia on LL at major

20 sociolinguistics and applied linguistics conferences are presented regularly and courses on LL are

21 now being offered in a growing number of higher education institutions. As a burgeoning field in

22 sociolinguistics and applied linguistics, LL research is concerned with the language displayed on

23 "public roads, street names, place names, commercial shop signs, and public signs on

24 government buildings" (Landry & Bourhis, 1997). Landry and Bourhis (1997) also discuss the

25 functions of the linguistic landscape, holding that linguistic landscape has two major roles to play.

26 One is the informational function, and the other is the symbolic function. They noted the

27 information function as "the linguistic landscape serves to inform in-group and out-group

28 members of the linguistic characteristics, territorial limits, and language boundaries of the region

29 they have entered" (1997: 25). Beyond the informational function, the symbolic function is also

30 of paramount importance. It is true that the absence or presence of certain languages on public

31 signs has an effect on how people in a community feel about the languages. "Having one's own

32 language enshrined on most private and government signs should contribute to the feeling that

33 the in-group language has value and status relative to other languages within the sociolinguistic

34 setting" (Landry & Bourhis, 1997: 27). According to Gorter (2006) and Shohamy and Gorter

35 (2009), the early LL studies endeavored mostly about the publications by Landry and Bourhis

36 (1997) anchored in social psychology and serving as the fundamental definition of the field. And

37 then many developments have been taking place which at the same time yield some new

38 findings. All these research studies made a sound and solid foundation for LL field as a discipline

39 in its own right. Over the years it has reached different domains in research areas, the topics and

40 themes widely included multilingualism and translingual mixing, language policy, language

41 attitude and language ideology, minority languages and identity construction and scaled mobility

42 (Gorter, Marten & Mensel 2012; Van Mensel, Vandenbroucke, and Blackwood 2016).

43   The representative researcher who treated LL research from the perspective of multilingualism

44 is Gorter (2006). He also uses the alternative concept of what he calls multilingual cityscape,

45 which is reflective of the interest of most researchers in more than one language displayed in

46 public signs in urban areas. Cenoz and Gorter (2006) investigate the linguistic landscape of two

47 streets in two multilingual cities in Friesland (Netherlands) and the Basque Country (Spain),

48 examining the use of minority languages (Basque and Frisian), the state languages (Spanish and

49 Dutch) and English as an international language on signs. The research results show that

50 compared with other languages the majority language of Dutch and Spanish respectively in the

51 two streets is more prominently found in the multilingual signs. For the different emphasis and

52 effort towards language policy put in the two cities, the use of minority languages in the signs is

53 different from each other. In addition, the choice of English usage in the signs has both the

54 informational and symbolic functions. Backhaus, another very influential author, conducted

55 empirical research on the multilingual signs in the streets of Tokyo. In his research, special

56 attention is given to the distinction between official (top-down) and nonofficial (bottom-up)

57 multilingual signs. Besides the perspective which dealt with LL research from multilingual

58 dimension, scholars also carried out their studies from the sociolinguistic view as mentioned

59 above. For example, Huebner (2009) examined the linguistic landscape within the SPEAKING

60 model proposed by Hymes who is famous in the interactional sociolinguistic field. The mnemonic

61 SPEAKING (S = setting or scene; P = participants; E =ends or goals; A = act sequences; K = key; I =

62 instrumentalities; N = norms; G = genre) represents a sociolinguistic theory for interaction

63 between language and social life. Huebner believes there is an inextricable relationship between

64 the language means and social meaning just as he mentioned that there is "a barometer of the

65 relationship between language and society" (Huebner 2009:84). In his case study of LL change in

66 Bloemfontein, South Africa, Plessis (2010: 74) proposes that "A change in regime can bring about

67 a change in the linguistic landscape". The LL then becomes one of the most vocal and concrete

68 indicators of consequential language regime change. Shang and Zhao (2014) provide a

69 comprehensive overview of the background, methodology, theoretical approaches, prospects

70 and challenges in linguistic landscape studies, which is a holistic picture of the area of linguistic

71 inquiries. In 2015, Shang and Zhao continued the linguistic landscape study and examined the

72 analytical dimensions and theoretical construction. Analyzing the studies conducted by foreign

73   scholars, Shang and Zhao conclude that there are at least 5 analytical dimensions: linguistic

74   landscape and language power, linguistic landscape and the implementation of language policy,

75   features of language on public signs, the international spread of English and the historical

76   dimension of linguistic landscape study.

77   Apart from the social and ethnolinguistic inquiries, there are also academic endeavors towards

78   the investigation of the influences of LL on second/foreign language learning. The pedagogical

79   perspective of LL studies is the very outcome of this endeavor. Cenoz and Gorter (2008), for

80   instance, focused on the relation between linguistic landscape and second language acquisition

81   (SLA) and the role of LL in second language acquisition. They argued that the texts on signage, as

82   an additional source of input for SLA, are always authentic and contextualized, thus can be

83   utilized to enhance learners' pragmatic competence, develop literacy skills as well as raise their

84   language awareness. As Cenoz and Gorter have noted, "linguistic landscape provides an

85   additional opportunity to experience non-linear multimodal texts in the public space" (2008: 297).

86   Moreover, for Cenoz and Gorter, the linguistic landscape also playing an important role in

87   affecting the language learning attitudes and hence conducive to the SLA process. Therefore, it

88   can be concluded that the second/foreign language learning should consider the symbolic and

89   affective factors of the linguistic landscape. Rowland (2013) has reviewed six generalized

90   pedagogical thoughts of LL which include developing students' critical literacy skills, improving

91   students' pragmatic competence, increasing the possibility of incidental language learning,

92   facilitating the acquisition of multimodal literacy skills, stimulating students' multicompetence,

93   and enhancing students' sensitivity to the connotational aspects of language. Shohamy and

94   Waksman (2009) also touched upon the pedagogical perspective of linguistic landscape studies in

95   their paper Linguistic Landscape as an Ecological Arena. They insist on the point of view that LL

96   can be used as a meaningful and powerful tool for language learning and developing language

97   awareness. When mentioned to raise language awareness, it comes to the pedagogical

98   application of language signs through LL projects. Inspired by the educational potentials of LL,

99   numerous student-led projects have been implemented in order to enhance learners' language

100   awareness and foster language skills and competencies, especially in English as a Foreign

101   Language (EFL) contexts (Dagenais, Moore, Sabatier, Lamarre & Armand 2009, Clemente,

102   Andrade, & Martins, 2012). For example, in Sayer's (2010) Mexico LL project, his EFL students

103   were acted as investigators and he intended to explore the social meanings of English on signs.

104   The final conclusion shows that the project can enable the learners to think creatively and

105   critically about language issues, which shows the advantages of LL in learning foreign language as

106   well as fostering their literacy skills. The similar research made by Rowland in 2013 also revealed

107   that the language practice to explore the LL turned out to be helpful for them to comprehend the

108   social orders underlying language choice and develop symbolic competence and literacy skills.

109   When the research focuses on the functions of LL in specific domains, like in educational

settings. The schoolscape comes into the view. Firstly, certain studies focus on either demonstrating the educational function of LL in language acquisition (Malinowski, 2015; Rowland, 2013) or examining the utility of LL in promoting awareness and teaching cultural and linguistic diversity (Hancock, 2012; Sayer, 2010). Secondly, Brown (2005, 2012) approaches schoolscapes from an anthropological and ethnographic perspective, combining interviews and observation. Thirdly, Dressler (2015), Hanauer (2010), Laihonen and Tódor (2017), Linkola (2014) and Szabó (2015) combine digital photography, field notes, interviews, questionnaires and group discussions. Fourthly, only Garvin and Eisenhower (2016) and Gorter and Cenoz (2015) represent the fairly established approach utilizing photography.

Although ample studies have proved that there is some relationship between LL and foreign language learning as well as the benefits language teaching can gain from the schoolscape, rare research has talked about the perceptions and thoughts of the foreign language learners. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct a study to investigate how foreign language learners perceive the LL, and whether they are willing to actively get involved in such immersing learning materials. The inquiry of the students' belief towards LL can help us to figure out the pedagogical function of LL more clearly, and offer some insights into the formation of language education policy.

2. The Study

In mainland China (or the People's Republic of China, henceforth China), the institutionalized language is Putonghua or Standard Mandarin, which has long been the predominant language variety in the society. Most LL signs in China's city space are Chinese, sometimes along with minority languages. English, as the most important foreign language in China, is also widely used in some private and official signs in cities due to its symbolic marking of cosmopolitanism, high technology, modernity, fashion, internationalism, and sophistication (Li, 2016). In some economically developed areas in China, English is quite prevalent. According to Zhao's (2012) study, the foreign language usages in the central districts of Shanghai, nearly 70% of the public and commercial signs include English which has proved that English has become a pervasive trend in the city space. Zhang and Lv (2019) also referred to that with the rapid development of the urbanization process in China, English has become easier to be seen even in medium and small-sized towns. The percentage of English is much more than that of minority languages in scenic spots in ethnic minority areas, which on the other hand reveals the fact that the Chinese national features are less underscored in reality.

Since English is that highly sought-after in China's city space, and there has been inadequate empirical research regarding the EFL learners' perceptions towards the English in LL and how they use such sources. These issues will be the focus of our study.

146

2.1 Research questions

In order to <mark>carry out</mark> a comprehensive study to explore the EFL learners' perception and practice towards English in LL. The following related questions will be addressed in the current study.

1). How do the EFL learners perceive English in LL?

2). What are the learners' attitudes towards the pedagogical values of English in LL?

3). What are the learners' attitudes towards schoolscape construction?

2.2 Research participants

The participants surveyed in this study are students in three different schools in downtown Beijing with the characteristics of international and metropolitan, and the students in this region are easy to get access to English in the city space. The total number of the participants is 205 including three groups with 100 senior high school students, 63 undergraduate students, and 42 postgraduate students. The detail information about the participants is listed in table 1. It should be noted that the senior high school students have to take the University Entrance Exam in China which includes the subject of English. Therefore, senior high school students are also worthy of consideration.

163

2.3 Methods and instruments

To address the research questions clearly, a combined research design with quantitative and qualitative methods was used in this study. Firstly, A five-point Likert scale questionnaire, ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" with assigning values from 1-5, was sent out in the classroom to elicit needed information. The questionnaire contains 2 parts, the first part gathered some basic personal details like gender, grade level, school, etc. The second part of the questionnaire composes 27 statements, which can be categorized into three basic themes: perceptions of English in LL in China's city context (Q1-Q10), attitudes towards pedagogical values of English in LL (Q11-Q20), attitudes towards the schoolscape construction (Q21-Q27). Secondly, a semi-structured interview was conducted among the students to investigate the reasons behind the choices of the questionnaire.

175

2.3 Data collection

177　　　The questionnaire was disseminated with the aid of English teachers in the classroom. In this

178　　study, 205 questionnaires were distributed. Finally, 203 valid ones were collected. The profile of

179　　the participating EFL learners is shown in Table 1. After the questionnaires were gathered, the

180　　data were extracted for data analysis. And the interview was carried out via Wechat, an instant

181　　communication tool popular in China, and the voiced message was transcribed by the researcher.

182　　**Table 1** Basic information of the participants

	Male	Female	Total
Senior high school students	63	35	98
Undergraduate students	23	40	63
Postgraduate students	6	36	42
Total	92	111	203

183

184　　**3. Results and discussion**

185　　**3.1 Students' perceptions of English in LL**

186　　　To investigate the students' perceptions towards English on signage, ten questions were

187　　designed in order to know to what extent they take notice of English in LL (Q1: I often take notice

188　　of English on signs in city space); for what purpose (Q2-Q4: I take notice of the English on signage

189　　just for fun; I take notice of the English on signage for information purpose; I take notice of the

190　　English on signage for finding errors or inappropriateness), the symbolic function of English in LL

191　　(Q5-Q6: English on signs can signify the modernization and internalization of a city; the density of

192　　English signs can show the economic conditions of a city), their evaluations on status of English

193　　and Mandarin (Q7-Q9: The fact that English is a supplementary language on signs prove its low

194　　importance in Chinese people's life; English used on public can imply that it is an important

195　　English; Hnayu Pinyin rather than English should be used in signs), and to what degree they come

196　　across "errors" or "mistranslations" of English on signage (Q10: I have come across English errors

197　　or mistranslation). The specific data were listed in Table 2.

198

199

200   **Table 2** Three groups' mean score from Q1 to Q10

Question number	Senior high school students		Undergraduate students		Postgraduate students	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1	2.2	0.76	2.1	0.88	1.9	0.85
2	4.2	0.84	4.8	1.68	4.7	0.77
3	**1.8**	**0.87**	**2.5**	**0.63**	**3.8**	**0.79**
4	**4.8**	**0.78**	**3.0**	**0.71**	**2.9**	**0.67**
5	1.9	1.57	2.2	0.65	2.1	1.62
6	2.0	0.72	2.1	1.77	2.2	0.75
7	4.6	0.81	4.8	1.61	4.7	0.83
8	2.0	1.64	2.2	0.81	2.0	0.87
9	**4.3**	**0.69**	**4.1**	**0.90**	**2.7**	**0.75**
10	**3.9**	**0.79**	**2.4**	**0.86**	**1.8**	**0.66**

215   In table 2 we can see that all the students are aware of the English in LL the mean values of
216   the three groups are around 2, which claims that the students though in the different grade level
217   of English, they hold a relatively high degree of noticing the English on signs. Moreover, the data
218   of Q2 of the three groups also illustrate that they are not for the funny purpose to see the English
219   on signs (their mean values are all above 4.0). From the results of Q5 and Q6, it is known that all
220   the students accept the symbolic function of English which stands for modern, international and
221   wealthy of a city. For Q7, it is clear that most students are opposed to the statement that English
222   is unimportant in people's social life. On the contrast, they agree that English is an important
223   language (see the data of Q8).

224   The results of the data analysis show that no matter which group they are in, most students
225   acknowledge the importance of English. However, the postgraduate students support Hnayu
226   Pinyin to replace English on signs in Q9, the mean value is 2.7 (SD=0.75), which is lower than
227   senior high school students and undergraduate students with the mean value of 4.1 (SD=0.90)
228   and 4.3 (SD=0.69) respectively. According to the interviews with different students in these
229   groups, most senior high school students hold the opinion that English is a symbol of

230   internationalization which indicates the well-development of China, so they agree to keep English

231   rather Hanyu Pinyin on signs. Although some undergraduate students hold similar views with the

232   senior high school students saying that China now has developed well at home and abroad, some

233   other undergraduate students consider China's development, at present, is not in an all-rounded

234   way and it's still leaving much room to improve from various aspects. They think English as a

235   world language can attract and strengthen communication with foreigners, and affect the image

236   construction of a city or a country in the world. It is interesting that many undergraduate

237   students support to replace English on signs with Hanyu Pinyin. For them, they treat this issue

238   from the perspective of keeping and disseminating traditional Chinese culture. In their view,

239   Hnayu Pinyin as an international standard is also an essential part of Chinese culture and Chinese

240   characteristics, and to use Hanyu Pinyin in LL is conducive to building and showing the country's

241   image in the world.

242   For the data of question Q4, the mean value of senior high school students (M=4.8, SD=0.78) is

243   much higher than undergraduate students' (M=3.0, SD=0.71) and postgraduate students' (M=2.9,

244   SD=0.67), which shows that senior high school students are rare to find errors of English on signs,

245   while the undergraduate and postgraduate students are inclined to seek for faults of English in LL.

246   For such condition, on one hand, it is the different English ability within the different groups that

247   makes the students can/cannot find errors of English in LL. For example, senior high school

248   students may in the stage of learning and accumulating English knowledge. While the

249   undergraduate and postgraduate students learn English much longer and deeper than the senior

250   high school students thus they hold abundant knowledge reserves of English which contribute to

251   recognizing the impalpable incorrect usage of English in LL. The interview also reaffirms this

252   because the undergraduate and postgraduate students both mentioned the misuse of the

253   affective meaning of some English words in LL. On the other hand, it also proves the fact that the

254   level of English development in China has been improved and promoted with the increase in

255   frequent exchanges and trades between China and foreign countries. The data of Q10 shows

256   similar findings with Q4, the senior high school students are the least ones who have experienced

257   "errors" in English on signs, the postgraduate students are the most ones who frequently find

258   "errors" in English in LL, and the undergraduate students stand in the middle of the other two

259   groups.

260   Now it comes to the data of Q3, the mean value of the three groups are gradually increased,

261   that is, the tendency that the students take notice of English on signs for information is

262   decreased with the mean value of 1.8 (SD=0.87), 2.5 (SD=0.63), 3.8 (SD=0.79). Among them, the

263   postgraduate students are less likely to look for information in English in LL. Combined the

264   analysis of Q4, the postgraduate students might not trust or appreciate the English in LL for the

265   errors that occurred. And the senior high school students are most likely to read English on signs

266   for information purpose. The reason may be that they have faith in the correctness of English on

267 signage and make most of it with less fault-searching. The degree of finding information in
268 English on signs, undergraduate students is between the other two.

269

270 **3.2 The students' attitudes towards the pedagogical value of English in LL**

271 In the second part of the questionnaire, Q11-Q20 are designed to gather the students'
272 attitudes towards the pedagogical value of English in LL including their acceptance of English on
273 signs as a learning source (Q11) and making authentic learning atmosphere (Q12), the effects of
274 English on signs of helping students learn vocabulary, improving literacy skills, promoting critical
275 thinking ability (Q13-Q15) and impact on raising the students' interests in English (Q16),
276 experiences of reviewing English knowledge when come across English on signs (Q17) and
277 experiences of using English on signs in English-learning process (Q18), supports for gathering
278 materials of English on signs by themselves for learning purpose (Q19) and supports for gathering
279 materials of English on signs by their English teachers for learning purpose (Q20). The specific
280 information of the analysis results is placed in Table 3.

281 **Table 3** Three groups' mean score from Q11 to Q20

Question number	Senior high school students		Undergraduate students		Postgraduate students	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
11	1.9	1.67	2.1	0.83	2.5	0.74
12	1.8	0.84	2.1	1.74	2.0	1.68
13	1.6	0.87	2.7	1.16	4.2	0.68
14	**3.4**	**1.68**	**2.5**	**0.81**	**3.8**	**1.59**
15	**4.1**	**1.27**	**2.6**	**0.65**	**4.0**	**0.94**
16	2.2	1.02	2.1	0.85	2.2	0.76
17	2.6	0.75	3.0	1.31	4.6	0.81
18	2.2	0.69	2.8	1.41	3.8	0.79
19	**2.1**	**0.92**	**2.6**	**1.04**	**4.7**	**0.65**
20	2.0	0.89	2.2	0.76	2.1	1.66

295   Based on the data of Q11, it is welcomed for the students' to treat English on signs as a
296   resource for English learning. Although the postgraduate students maintain a little higher mean
297   value (M=2.5, SD=0.74), they still expect to make good use of English on signs; and the interview
298   showed it is the "nonstandard" application of English in city space that causes their anxiety,
299   therefore they call for more attention being paid to improve the "standard usage and
300   dissemination of English in city space". At the same time, the students of different groups all
301   agree that English on signs creates an authentic environment for learning English. The reason
302   most frequently cited in the three groups is that the public English provides more casual and
303   usual information on practical and social English usage in real context than the classroom English
304   materials. Q13 aiming at investigating to what extent English in city space can help students to
305   learn English vocabulary, the findings show that with the grade level increases, the students can
306   get less and less assistance to learn vocabulary from English on signs. And such a situation may
307   also be related to their knowledge accumulation in different English levels. For example, the
308   English used in LL is, more often than not, common words which are not obstacles for
309   postgraduates to recognize.

310   However, as for their attitudes to the extent that English can help improve their literacy skills
311   and critical thinking ability (see the data of Q14 and Q15), there is a different story. For these two
312   aspects, it is the undergraduate students who believe they can get benefits from English in LL in
313   promoting literacy skills and critical thinking, but the senior high school students and
314   postgraduate students are both keep an opposed attitude. In the interview part, the students
315   speak out their reasons for such attitudes. The representative answers of the three groups are
316   listed below:

317   I think to improve English literacy skills needs knowledge of vocabulary, grammar and
318   text organization, and so on. In addition, the guidance and help from a professional English
319   teacher are also essential for us to advance our literacy skill. I don't think the English on
320   signs is powerful enough to get my literacy skills promoted. As for critical thinking, it seems
321   much more complicated which needs more means and contents in different fields of
322   knowledge, I cannot even connect English in city space with critical thinking together.

323   --Coming from a senior high school student

324

325   It is useful and interesting to learn the texts of public English, which has different writing
326   styles with different stories. From different vocabulary and sentences, I can feel different writing
327   purposes and emotions, and that can help me to select the appropriate word to describe something
328   or express my emotion. I can also by comparing the frequency of   occurrence between Chinese
329   and English to consider the social-historical and economical differences indifferent areas which, I
330   think, is a kind of critical thinking way. So, we can   know lots of covert information via English

331   on public signs.

332   --Coming from an undergraduate student

333

334   I don't think that English in China's city space is standard enough to be able to shoulder

335   the tasks of improving my literacy skills. On the other side, English on signs is not academic

336   enough to foster my literacy skills. As for critical thinking, I think it is a kind   of   thinking

337   model which is a long-term construction and influenced by many factors, so it is not simply

338   English on signs that can influence my thinking model.

339   --Coming from a postgraduate student

340   From Table 3 we can also see that all students agree that English on signs can help them review

341   the knowledge they have learned (see the data of Q16), the mean values are all-around 2.0. With

342   the grade level increased, their English-learning interests raised by English on the public are

343   decreased (see the data of Q17), and it is similar to their experience of using English on signs (see

344   the data of Q18). The data of Q19 show that the senior high school students and undergraduate

345   students are more likely to collect English on signs as learning materials, but the postgraduates

346   are unwilling to gathering English as learning materials. However, all of the students support the

347   teacher to use the English in city space as teaching material (see the data of Q20).

348

349   **3.3 The learners' attitudes towards English schoolscape construction**

350   In the third part of the questionnaire, Q21-Q28 were designed to test how the students think

351   about English schoolscape construction. The related issues include the existence of English signs

352   in school (Q21: My school has English signs) and the condition of English signs in school (Q22: The

353   English landscape in my school is well constructed), the students perceptions towards the

354   function of English signs in school (Q23: English signs in school are placed in order to improve

355   students' English; Q24: English signs in school are placed in order to show its international vision),

356   their attitudes to the benefits of English signs for English-learning in school (Q25: English signs in

357   school is helpful for English-learning), who should manage and designed the English signs in

358   school (Q26: English signs inside the school should be managed by school authorities; Q27:

359   English in schools should be designed by teachers and students). The questionnaire results of this

360   part are shown in Table 4.

361   **Table 4** Three groups' mean score from Q21 to Q27

362

Question number	Senior high school students		Undergraduate students		Postgraduate students	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
21	1.7	0.88	1.6	0.94	1.6	0.83
22	3.7	0.74	3.5	1.24	3.6	0.79
23	4.2	1.35	4.0	0.89	4.1	1.75
24	2.0	1.17	2.1	0.65	1.9	1.21
25	**2.1**	**0.85**	**2.8**	**0.73**	**4.0**	**0.84**
26	4.2	0.75	4.3	0.96	4.2	0.76
27	1.8	0.81	1.8	0.64	1.7	0.82

With regard to the learners' attitudes towards the English signs in school, the students in different groups show similar attitudes in most of the issues. For instance, all of them express that there are English signs in their schools (see the data of Q21), but they are not so satisfied with their schoolscape construction (see the data of Q22) which also entails that English schoolscape construction has not been well attended to in most schools. They all hold the idea that the English signs in school are mainly to show the international vision rather than to improve the students' English (see the data of Q22 and Q23). The results also indicate that the students in different groups expect that the English signs in school should be designed by the teachers and students (see the data of Q27), opposed to the idea that English signs in school should be managed by authorities (see the data of Q26). Meanwhile, it also suggests that students are willing to take initiative and play an active role in English schoolscape construction with teachers in order to facilitate English learning. As for the benefits of learning English on English signs in school (see the data of Q25), the senior high school students deem it helpful to their English-learning process (M=2.1, SD=0.85), and the undergraduate students also keep a positive attitude towards English schoolscape for improving students' English (M=2.8, SD=0.73). However, postgraduate students refuse the opinion that English in school signs is helpful for their English study (M=4.0, SD=0.84). The reason can also be inferred from their ideology of "nonstandard" use of English.

394   4. Conclusion

395   China has the largest number of EFL learners in the world, totaling around 400 million or over

396   one-third of its population (Boldon & Graddol 2012), thus English in China has far-reaching

397   impacts and has garnered substantial scholarship. Given the longstanding conundrum of

398   separation of didactic learning and actual uses, the English in LL is supposed to provide a new

399   promising solution for the connection of classroom-based English learning to the authentic

400   learning environment in the city space as well as the school space. However, the reality is that the

401   EFL learners in different levels do not keep a similar perception towards the English in LL.

402   For the first question of this study, the learners in different groups are all aware of the English

403   in LL and they agree that the English in LL is related to the city's economic development. And the

404   undergraduate students also mentioned that English in LL can enhance the city's development,

405   therefore it is feasible and useful to keep English popular in LL rather than Hanyu Pinyin. Students

406   in senior high school also refute the idea of replacing English with Hnayu Pinyin for learning

407   English knowledge and gain information. Postgraduate students are willing to see Hanyu Pinyin in

408   LL rather than English, and they express their confidence and faith towards China's

409   well-development condition and it is time for Chinese culture to walk out. It should be noted

410   here, that the postgraduate students don't think the English on signs are "standard" enough,

411   which also influences their attitudes towards the pedagogical value in the second part of the

412   questionnaire. In spite of all the agreement on the symbolic function of internationalization and

413   modernization, the senior high school students use English on signs for information and rarely

414   find "errors" in English in LL. Conversely, the undergraduate and postgraduate students are more

415   inclined to find "inappropriateness" in English on signs.

416   The results also reveal that senior high school students, undergraduate students, and

417   postgraduate students hold different attitudes towards the pedagogical value of English in LL.

418   First, they all admit English on signs is an authentic resource for English learning and support the

419   teachers to collect English on signs as a type of English teaching material. But the three groups

420   are not in line with issues that English on signs can improve vocabulary, English literacy, and

421   critical thinking. Generally speaking, the research shows that the extent of promotion on such

422   abilities is related to the students' knowledge background, English learning methods and

423   perceptions of English on signs. The postgraduate students' "standard" ideology towards English

424   make them feel negative on pedagogical values of English in China's city space, though they deem

425   the English in LL precious and meaningful for English learning.

426   Although the students of senior high school, undergraduate students and postgraduate

427   students share similar attitudes in most issues, for the advantages of helping students improve

428   English, the postgraduate students still have a negative evaluation of the "correctness" of English

429   in school; the senior high school students insist that English in school is helpful for improving

430   their English, and the undergraduate students are with a neutral attitude.

431   All in all, the findings in this study show that the EFL learners in different levels all admit that
432   the English in LL has played an important role in its symbolic function which is emblematic of
433   internationalization, modernization, and well economic development. They also agree that
434   English in LL is a valuable resource for English learning, and they hope the English schoolscape
435   construction can be improved. The extent to the utilization of English in LL is determined by
436   multiple factors, for example, the learners' English knowledge base, English learning methods
437   and ideology of "standard" English. For the senior students, they are the most ones who are very
438   interested and efficient in learning English in LL. Because the postgraduate students keep a strict
439   standard requirement of English application in LL, they are more likely to seek "errors" or
440   "inappropriateness" rather than absorb some knowledge or skills from English in LL. The
441   undergraduate students are in the middle position. On one side, they use English in LL to learn
442   new vocabulary, improve English literacy and enlighten their critical thinking ability. On the other
443   side, they are also able to realize the "inappropriateness" of English in LL. However, they hold a
444   different ideology towards "standard" English, that is, they are more likely to treat such
445   "inappropriateness" as a kind of Chinese way of expression or "Chinglish" of which they are in
446   favor.

447   According to the findings, some suggestions can be proposed for English education planning.
448   Firstly, since the importance of English in LL are approved by all the students, it is feasible for the
449   English teacher to use the English in city space as a resource for English teaching. Secondly, the
450   contents and quantity of such resource should be carefully selected and controlled based on the
451   different learners with different English levels. Last but not least, the English schoolscape is
452   supposed to be constructed well with the efforts of professional English teachers.

453

454

455   **References**

456   1．Landry, R. & R. Bourhis. 1997. Linguistic Landscape and ethnolinguistic vitality: An empirical
457   study [J]. Journal of Language and Social Psychology 16: 23-49.

458   2．Gorter, D. 2006. Further possibilities for linguistic landscape research [J]. International Journal
459   of Multilingualism 81-89.

460   3．Shohamy, E., & Gorter, D. (Eds.). 2009. Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery. New York,
461   NY: Routledge.

462   4．Gorter, D., Marten, H. F., & Mensel, V. (Eds.) 2012. Minority languages in the linguistic
463   landscape. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

464　5．Van Mensel, L., Vandenbroucke, M., & Blackwood, R. 2016. Linguistic landscapes. In O. Garcia,
465　N. Flores, & M. Spotti (Eds.), Oxford handbook of language and society (pp. 423–449). Oxford:
466　Oxford University Press.

467　6．Gorter, D. 2006. Introduction: The study of the linguistic landscape as a new approach to
468　multilingualism [J]. International Journal of Multilingualism Vol.3, No. 1: 1-6.

469　7．Cenoz, J. & Gorter, D. 2006. Linguistic landscape and minority languages [J].International
470　Journal of Multilingualism 3: 67-80.

471　8．Huebner, T. 2009. A framework for the linguistic analysis of linguistic landscapes [A]. In E.
472　Shohamy & D. Gorter (eds.). Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery (pp. 70-87) [C]. London:
473　Routledge.

474　9．Plessis, T. D. 2010. Bloemfontein / Mangaung, ‗city on the move'. Language management and
475　transformation of a non-representative linguistic landscape [A]. In E. Shohamy, E. Ben-Rafael & M.
476　Barni (eds). Linguistic Landscape in the City (pp. 74-95) [C]. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

477　10．Shang, G. W. & Zhao, S. H. 2014. Perspectives, theory, and methodology in linguistic
478　landscape research [J]. Foreign Language Teaching and Research 2: 214-223.

479　11．Shang, G. W. & Zhao, S. H. 2015. Analytical dimensions and theoretical construction in
480　Linguistic landscape [J]. Journal of Foreign Languages 6: 81-89.

481　12．Cenoz, J. & Gorter, D. 2008. The linguistic landscape as an additional source of input in
482　second language acquisition [J]. International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching
483　46 (3): 267-287.

484　13．Rowland, L. 2013. The pedagogical benefits of a linguistic landscape project in Japan.
485　International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 16(4): 494–505.

486　14．Shohamy, E., & Waksman, S. 2009. Linguistic landscape as an ecological arena: Modalities,
487　meanings, negotiations, education. In E. Shohamy, & D. Gorter (Eds.), Linguistic landscape:
488　Expanding the scenery (pp. 313–331). New York: Routledge.

489　15．Dagenais, D., Moore, D., Sabatier, C., Lamarre, P., & Armand, F. 2009. Linguistic landscape
490　and language awareness. In E. Shohamy, & D. Gorter (Eds.), Linguistic landscape: Expanding the
491　scenery (pp. 253–269). New York, NY: Routledge.

492　16．Clemente, M., Andrade, A. I., & Martins, F. 2012. Learning to read the world, learning to look
493　at the linguistic landscape: a primary school study. In C. Hélot, M. Barni, R. Janssens, & C. Bagna
494　(Eds.), Linguistic landscapes, multilingualism and social change (pp. 267–285). Frankfurt: Peter
495　Lang.

496   17．Laihonen, P., & Tódor, E. 2017. The changing schoolscape in a Szekler village in Romania:
497   Signs of diversity in regularization. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism,
498   20(3), 362–379.

499   18．Linkola, I. 2014. (The linguistic landscape of a Sámi school –An ethnographic study of Sami
500   language in a secondary school) Saamelaisen koulun kielimaisema–Etnografinen tutkimus
501   saamen kielestä toisen asteen oppilaitoksessa.Koutokeino, Finland: Sámi University College.

502   19．Szabó, T. P. 2015. The management of diversity in schoolscapes: An analysis of Hungarian
503   practices. Apples –Journal of Applied Language Studies, 9(1), 23–51.

504   20．Garvin, R. T., & Eisenhower, K. 2016. A comparative study of linguistic landscapes in middle
505   schools in Korea and Texas: Contrasting signs of learning and identity construction. In R. J.
506   Blackwood, E. Lanza, & H. Woldemariam (Eds.), Negotiating and contesting identities in linguistic
507   landscapes (pp. 215–232). London, United Kingdom: Bloomsbury Publishing.

508   21．Sayer, P. 2010. Using the linguistic landscape as a pedagogical resource. ELT Journal, 64(2),
509   143–154.

510   22．Hancock, A. 2012. Capturing the linguistic landscape of Edinburgh: A pedagogical tool to
511   investigate student teachers' understandings of cultural and linguistic diversity. In C. Hélot, M.
512   Barni, R. Janssens, & C. Bagna (Eds.), Linguistic landscapes, multilingualism and social change (pp.
513   249–266). Frankfurt, Germany: Peter Lang.

514   23．Malinowski, D. 2015. Opening spaces of learning in the linguistic landscape. Linguistic
515   Landscape, 1(1/2), 95–113.

516   24．Dressler, R. 2015. Signgeist: Promoting bilingualism through the linguistic landscape of
517   school signage. International Journal of Multilingualism, 12(1), 128–145.

518   25．Hanauer, D. I. 2010. Laboratory identity: A linguistic landscape analysis of personalized space
519   within a microbiology laboratory. Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 7(2–3), 152–172.

520   26．Brown, K. D. 2005. Estonian schoolscapes and the marginalization of regional identity in
521   education. European Education, 37(3), 78–89.

522   27．Brown, K. D. 2012. The linguistic landscape of educational spaces: Language revitalization
523   and schools in southeastern Estonia. In D. Gorter, H. F. Marten, & L. van Mensel (Eds.), Minority
524   languages in the linguistic landscape (pp. 281–298). Basingstoke, United Kingdom: Palgrave
525   Macmillan.

526   28．Gorter, D., & Cenoz, J. 2015. Translanguaging and linguistic landscapes. Linguistic
527   Landscape, 1(1/2), 54–74.

528   29．Boldon, K., & Graddol, D. 2012. English in China today. English Today, 28(3), 3–9.

529   30．Li, S. 2016. English, advertising and positioning: The impact of English on Chinese people's
530   daily lives. Journal of World Languages, 2(2–3), 77–93.

531   31．Zhao, R. H., 2012. Shanghaishi gonggong Changsuo Waiwen Shiyong Qingkuaing Diaoyan
532   Baogao [technical report on the survey of the foreign language uses in Shanghai's public signs].
533   Shanghai: Research Center for Foreign Language Strategies, Shanghai Foreign Studies University.

534   32．Zhang, H. J., & Lv, M. J. 2019. Research on medium and small-sized towns' linguistic
535   landscape: from the perspective of language planning [J]. Social Science Front 6: 1-5.

536