Negotiating Mongolian ethnic identity through the teaching of Mandarin Chinese as a second language

Abstract

Despite growing attention paid to the language ideologies of teachers as actors in bilingualism or multilingualism studies, little research has examined whether and how power dynamics between majority and minority languages play a role in the promulgation of a majority language to ethnic minority learners of that majority language. This paper explores how both linguistic and cultural knowledge of Mandarin are understood by a specific group of Mongolian teachers and trainee teachers of Mandarin in Inner Mongolia, China. Drawing on Geeraerts' (2003, 2020) two cultural models of language standardisation, we shall show that the Mongolian teachers and trainees appear to adopt both a 'rationalist' and a 'romantic' view. On the one hand, they hold a rationalist view of modern Chinese literature, perceiving it as linguistic and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1992) for Mongolian students in the Han-dominant linguistic market. At the same time, they hold a romantic view of classical Chinese literature, perceiving it as a marker of the dominant, and therefore 'ideal', Han ethnic identity. Such mixed perceptions have significant implications for understanding how teaching a majority language may be viewed by an ethnic minority group: as a communicative tool, as linguistic and cultural capital, and/or as an identity marker.

Introduction

'Our language is Mongolian, and our homeland is Mongolia forever! Our mother tongue is Mongolian, and we will die for our mother tongue!'[1] shouted students in 2020 at a protest against a new policy aimed at gradually replacing textbooks used in Mongolian-medium schools with national standard textbooks in Mandarin by the year 2022. This recent protest in Inner Mongolia can be understood within the wider context of the tensions between the Han majority ethnic group and other ethnic groups caused by a series of Chinese language policies implemented in different ethnic autonomous regions in China.[2] In multi-ethnic states like China, the stability of the country quite often depends on the system of relations woven among its different ethnic groups. This becomes more complicated when different ethnic minority groups speak different languages, leading to policies which often marginalise minority languages, as part of the way in which a state consolidates and preserves power and stability.

When it comes to bilingual and/or multilingual studies of mainland China, previous scholarship has uncovered both a collaborative and antagonistic relationship between Mandarin (the official language of China) and minority languages, as well as between Mandarin and other varieties of Chinese (such as Cantonese), and English. Grey's (2021) study of Zhuang language rights and policies, for example, has shown that despite the minority Zhuang language being ascribed low economic and mobility capital as opposed to Mandarin in the linguistic market in Guangxi, Zhuang speakers nevertheless value the Zhuang identity. Similarly, Schluessel, in a now perhaps dated study given the recent events in Xinjiang, pointed out that Uyghurs there tended to learn Mandarin if given a free choice, yet learning Mandarin may not, for them, be part of

---

[1] 'Rare rallies in China over Mongolian language curb' BBC report, September 1, 2020:
https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-china-53981100
[2] In 2004 the Xinjiang regional government promulgated a regional directive asserting that Mandarin Chinese should be used as the primary or sole language of instruction in all primary and secondary schools in Xinjiang (Schluessel, 2007: 257-258). As far as the Tibetan case is concerned, based on fieldwork notes made between 1997 and 2007, Postiglione (2008: 9) reported that bilingual education (Tibetan and Chinese) is generally available in urban areas, but after the primary school Grade 3, there is a shift toward Chinese as the medium of instruction, with only the Tibetan language and literature courses taught in the Tibetan language. The implementation of the policies was accompanied by a series of protests among Tibetans (https://nvdatabase.swarthmore.edu/content/tibetan-students-campaign-defend-tibetan-language-schools-tibet-and-china-2010) and Uighurs (https://hongkongfp.com/2019/06/18/language-attack-chinas-campaign-sever-uighur-tongue/).

acquiring a pan-Chinese identity (Schluessel, 2007). Liang (2014), too, has questioned the single linear relationship between language and identity, revealing that the Guangzhou regional identity is based on hybrid linguistic repertories (i.e. Mandarin and Cantonese). Similarly, Gao (2021) has argued that the monolingual language ideology of acquiring native-like forms of English is challenged by the multi-layered identity construction and negotiation in English language classes in China. All of these studies have foregrounded the multiplicity and fluidity of the relationship between language, culture and belonging, and revealed the need for more firmly situated analyses of language ideologies.

The power relationship between language varieties and their users continues to be a major issue in the field of teaching Mandarin as a second language. Chinese diaspora studies have revealed the internal conflict between speakers of Mandarin and other Chinese varieties within the context of teaching Mandarin among overseas Chinese communities (e.g. Li and Zhu, 2014; Zhu and Li, 2014; Huang, 2021). Zhu and Li's (2014) study, for example, looked at how ethnic Chinese learners who speak other varieties of Chinese (e.g. Cantonese speakers) reacted to the teaching of Chinese culture in Confucius Institutes and Confucius Classrooms in Britain. Zhu and Li pointed out that not only did this particular group of learners question the authenticity of the Chinese culture presented – they felt that the cultural knowledge taught by the teachers in the Confucius Institutes was different to what they had experienced in their own families and communities. They also reported feeling 'othered' by their teachers, with their learning needs being neglected as a consequence.

While such research has recognised that the representation of linguistic and cultural knowledge of Mandarin is intertwined with the tension between ideological, economic, and social-cultural forces, little research has yet explored how such power plays a role in the promulgation of Mandarin as the national language to ethnic minority learners *within* China. Grey's (2021) and Schluessel's (2007) studies come from the perspective of language rights to investigate Mandarin language education policy in general. By contrast, this present study focusses specifically on the nature and impact of language

ideologies from perspectives of Mongolian actors working in the field of teaching Mandarin directly to Mongolian learners. By 'actors', we mean the individuals who have the power to implement, interpret and resist policy initiatives (Hornberger and Johnson, 2007).

In order to address the overarching question of what linguistic and cultural knowledge is presented to Mongolian learners, and how that is interpreted, we explore the following sub-questions:

1. How is Mandarin presented in the national curriculum guidelines for ethnic minority students in Inner Mongolia?

2. How do Mongolian teaching staff and trainee teachers view the Chinese language and literature curriculum, based on their teaching and learning experience?

To answer these questions, we first review theories of language ideologies to conceptualise the power relationship between a standard language and other language varieties, as well as between a standard language and its users. We then briefly outline the historical development of the Chinese language and literature curriculum, first showing the shifting status of classical Chinese literature from the past to the present. This is followed by a critical discourse analysis of the recent 2006 and 2014 Chinese National Curriculum Guidelines for Teaching Mandarin to Ethnic Minority Learners to uncover how Mongolians are positioned to access the 'symbolic capital' (Bourdieu, 1992) of Mandarin, and how they are exposed to opportunities to develop competence in Mandarin. After outlining our research methods and data collection – qualitative interviews with nine Mongolian teachers (qualified and trainee) based in Hohhot, Inner Mongolia – we present and analyse the data collected. Our analysis pays particular attention to the teachers' attitudes towards classical Chinese literature, modern Chinese literature, and Mongolian culture – these were key aspects of the language and literature curriculum that emerged through the research as central to an understanding of what to teach, how to teach and why.

The results of our analysis show that the Mongolian informants in our study appear to adopt divergent views on the relative importance of teaching modern Chinese literature and classical Chinese literature, negotiating the role of Mandarin as a communicative tool, as a form of linguistic and cultural capital, and as an identity marker. Drawing on Geeraerts' (2003) two cultural models of language standardisation – rationalist and romantic – we also show that the Mongolian informants appear to adopt both rationalist and romantic views. On the one hand, they hold a rationalist view of modern Chinese literature, perceiving it as linguistic and cultural capital for Mongolian students in the Han-dominant linguistic market. At the same time, they hold a romantic view of classical Chinese literature, perceiving it as a marker of the dominant, and therefore 'ideal', Han ethnic identity. Such mixed perceptions not only have significant implications for understanding how different views on teaching a majority language are defined by an ethnic minority group but are also relevant for understanding debates in China and beyond about the relative prioritization of instrumental goals versus prestige and/or identity aspects in second language teaching.

Theories of language ideologies

Given the centrality of power relations to this study, it is helpful to begin by reviewing relevant theories of language and power in the teaching of standard language. Geeraerts (2003) identified two cultural models – a rationalist model and a 'romantic' model – to describe the emancipatory *and* hegemonic sides of developing the standard language of a nation. The rationalist approach rests on the LANGUAGE AS A TOOL metaphor (Polzenhagen and Dirven, 2008: 241), which highlights the benefits of language standardisation. A common standard language is seen to enable people to gain access to higher culture through education, which likewise leads to social emancipation (Geeraerts, 2003: 29).

Geeraerts's 'romantic' model of standardisation is grounded on the LANGUAGE AS IDENTITY MARKER metaphor (Polzenhagen and Dirven, 2008: 241). Such a perspective emphasises the identity aspects of language standardisation, often assuming that a nation state gains legitimacy from a single shared standard language. A

preference for one language or language variety over another as the national standard can act as an instrument of oppression to marginalise speakers of other languages or dialects and as a threat to local identities. Here Geeraerts (2003: 35) points out the hegemonic nature of the making of a standard language, arguing that its starting point lies in the language of specific regions, specific groups of speakers, and specific domains and functions which are economically, culturally, and/or politically dominant.

Notably, Geeraerts (2020) allows for the fact that rationalist and 'romantic' models of standardisation are not necessarily in opposition. A first type of possible synthesis takes shape in the context of nationalism. The national language plays a double role, both as an instrumental tool for mutual coordination, and at the same time, in promulgating a shared national identity to unite a community of people. In contrast, what Geeraerts calls a 'postmodern' synthesis avoids the problematic choice of a single or dominant identity (which underlies the nationalist synthesis) by accepting multiplicity as a point of convergence between the two seemingly competing models (Geeraerts, 2020: 13). This 'multiplicity' derives from the recognition of multiple identities (e.g. feeling both Breton and French, or Scottish and British, or Flemish and Belgian) in the romantic side and of multilingual linguistic repertoires (either intralinguistically, in terms of registers, e.g. dialects, colloquial registers and standard varieties; or interlinguistically, in terms of multilingualism, e.g. giving equal value to different varieties of languages) in the rationalist side (Geeraerts, 2020: 13, 14). In the particular context of teaching Mandarin to Mongolian learners, there remains an ongoing debate about the nationalist goal of promoting social cohesion at the same time as protecting the cultural and language rights of the ethnic minority group. Geeraerts (2020) therefore, provides a useful theoretical basis for us to explore how the promotion of Mandarin among Mongolian learners is negotiated by the Mongolian teachers of Mandarin, in the face of multiple linguistic repertories in Mandarin and Mongolian, and multiple and even conflicting Chinese and Mongolian identities.

Another theory of language ideology relevant to our analysis is Bourdieu's theory of legitimacy. Bourdieu (1992) focused on how social hierarchy is reproduced through

'legitimate' competence in the standard language, as a form of 'symbolic capital', i.e. social recognition, in the 'linguistic market'. Schooling enables the dominant class to legitimise the established social order by establishing distinctions (hierarchies) and legitimizing these distinctions through imposing their language as the only 'legitimate' one in the formal markets, which leads to linguistic practices of all other groups being measured against the 'legitimate' practices of those who are dominant (Bourdieu, 1992: 45). A 'legitimate' speaker, in Bourdieu's sense, is not defined solely by linguistic competence, but by the recognition that they receive from a group, which is the basis of authority. In the analysis below, we shall see how Mongolian teachers of Mandarin construct the ideology of a 'legitimate' speaker of Mandarin, a construction in which their Mongolian ethnic identity is deeply embedded.

In order to provide some background for the main discussion of the language ideologies held by Mongolian qualified teachers and trainee teachers, we first review the shifting status of classical Chinese literature in the curriculum over time. We then introduce the dual 'instrumentality' and 'humanity' foci in the recent Chinese curriculum guidelines for ethnic minority students, before outlining how the teaching of linguistic and cultural knowledge of Mandarin is presented at the policy level.

The importance of classical Chinese literature

Historically, great importance was attached to classical Chinese literature in the intellectual training and spiritual sustenance of Chinese scholar-officials, which includes certain works of the Confucian canon and certain major poets and prose writers (Hsia, 1988: 134). However, classical Chinese literature lost its primacy in the 1920s, when vernacular written Chinese replaced classical literary Chinese as the dominant language in education, journalism and creative writing (Chen, 2004: 72). The advocates of classical Chinese at that time argued for the need to study the ancient classics in order to preserve the 'national essence' (*guocui*, 国粹) and highlight China's cultural uniqueness (Hon, 2003: 258). Despite classical Chinese losing its historical dominance as the instrument of official written communication, classical Chinese literature education was still included in secondary school Chinese literature pedagogy in the

Republican period (1912–1949). It came under great attack during the Cultural Revolution (1966–1976), when it was denounced as part of a feudal culture (Hsia, 1988: 136). However, since the start of the opening and reform period (1978–), Confucian tradition has revived with governmental support, to serve the party's political needs such as 'Building a harmonious society' under Hu Jintao's leadership and promoting soft power abroad under the current president Xi Jinping's 'Chinese dream' (Zhou and Luk, 2016).

Classical Chinese literature, which mainly consists of classical literary writings and classical poetry from the 17th BC to the 19th centuries, is an important part of the Chinese literature curriculum for Han students. For example, in the compulsory exam paper for Chinese in the 2019 university entrance examination in Beijing, the score in classical Chinese literature appreciation accounts for 46 out of 150 total marks available. By contrast, in the Chinese proficiency test for ethnic minority students (the *Minzu Hanyu Kaoshi* or MHK), which is required for admission to university, classical Chinese literature is not included as part of the assessment at all.[3] However, analysis of a corpus of Chinese textbooks for Mongolian students (collected for the purposes of the larger research project, Wu, 2022) reveals that classical Chinese poetry began to be included in middle-school textbooks for Mongolian students in the 1970s. The amount of classical Chinese poetry more than doubled from around five poems per volume in the 1990s and 2000s up to around 12 poems per volume in the 2010 and 2016 middle-school textbooks. With this in mind, we were interested to understand how Mongolian informants perceived classical Chinese literature, which is widely recognised as having a higher cultural value than any communicative function.

The dynamic relationship between 'instrumentality' and 'humanity' in Chinese curriculum guidelines for teaching Mandarin to minority students
Since 1949, the Mandarin curriculum for non-Han students has been differentiated from that for their Han counterparts. According to Wu and Zhong (2017), compiling

---

[3] The equivalent proficiency test for 'foreigners' who are L2 learners of Mandarin Chinese is the *Hanyu Shuiping Kaoshi* or HSK.

Mandarin language textbooks for Mongolian learners has *always* involved the practice of lowering the level of Mandarin knowledge they are expected to learn in contrast to that expected of Han students. In practice, this means that the level of Mandarin presented in a textbook for Grade 8 Mongolian students is similar to the level studied by Grade 6 Han students (Wu and Zhong, 2017: 54).

Despite this practice, it was only in March 1999 that the national curriculum guidelines for ethnic minority learners first began to distinguish explicitly between teaching Mandarin to ethnic minority students and teaching to their Han counterparts, in terms of teaching both language and literary culture (Ministry of Education, 1999). At this point, the subject name for 'Mandarin' for minority learners was also changed from *Hanyuwen* (汉语文; lit. language and literary culture of the Han) to *Hanyu* (汉语; lit. language of the Han) (Jin, 2006: 24; Xu, 2007: 29). Through this name change, 'literary culture' (*wen*) was eliminated from the subject term. Not only did this differentiate it from the *Yuwen* (语文) studied by Han learners, it implicitly switched the focus in teaching Mandarin as the second language for minority students to 'language' (*yu*) only (Wang, 2006: 92). Communicative competence was thus given primacy, partly influenced by a world-wide trend of communicative language teaching methods developed in foreign language teaching globally since the late 1970s (Spada, 2007: 271), first in North America and Europe, and reaching China from the 1980s (Yu, 2001). A dichotomy of native and non-native speakers was reinforced, with the emphasis on the notion of second language teaching of Chinese to minority learners.

In the 2006 curriculum guidelines, Mandarin teaching is defined in terms of 'instrumentality' (*gongjuxing* 工具性) and 'humanity' (*renwenxing* 人文性). The notion of instrumentality here refers to communicative competence in Mandarin, while humanity relates to the cultural dimension of language teaching, including sociocultural knowledge of Mandarin (Ministry of Education, 2006: 13). In essence, with Mandarin positioned as a second language for ethnic minority learners, the instrumental aspect of Mandarin is emphasised over the humanistic aspect. According to the 2006 guidelines, communicative skills, especially speaking, are made the priority for minority students:

> *Hanyu* is a Chinese language course for ethnic minority students whose first language is not Chinese, and is a foundation course. As second language teaching, a Chinese language course should firstly emphasise communicative knowledge and then take care of literary knowledge. This is the basic characteristic of the Chinese language course […] The main task of Chinese teaching is to help students with acquiring Chinese knowledge and cultivating the application of language skills in real life, especially communicative competence in speaking. (Ministry of Education, 2006: 2)

The issuing of the 2006 curriculum guidelines gave rise to a new body of Chinese research literature that examined the relationship between instrumentality and humanity. It was generally acknowledged in this research that the humanistic aspect differentiates first language teaching from second language teaching. For example, Xu (2007: 28) and Jin (2006: 25) argue that appreciating literary culture and developing deeper awareness of authors' concerns and attitudes is perceived as the main task in reading literary works as part of first language education in China. By contrast, it was assumed in the 2006 curriculum guidelines that culture pedagogy for minority students in second language teaching needs to be oriented towards communication (Wang, 2013: 95). For example, Chang (2008: 116) points out that the main purpose of teaching cultural knowledge was seen as being to assist students with the acquisition of language knowledge, such as understanding words and contents of the literary works. Because of the 'communicative' focus in the 2006 curriculum guidelines, it seems that the poetic, aesthetic and critical analysis of literary works is downplayed in favour of the instrumental perspective. This implies a rationalist view of Mandarin, in Geeraerts' sense, which sees language as detachable from cultural identity.

In the 2014 curriculum guidelines for minority learners of Mandarin, however, the humanistic aspect occupies an *equal* position alongside the instrumental aspect. The dramatic increase in classical Chinese poetry in middle-school textbooks for Mongolian students by 2016, noted above, appears to chime with this strengthening of the

humanistic aspects of Chinese teaching in recent years. The humanistic aspect is specified in the guidelines in terms of culture, values, character, and identity:

> The Chinese language course is a basic and practical course of learning and applying the national commonly used language and script. It should focus on both communicative knowledge and literary knowledge. The main task of a Chinese course is to equip students with applied skills in Chinese in order to have students grasp Mandarin and standard characters to carry out basic communication. The Chinese language course should make students learn the excellent culture from ancient times to the present, improve ideological and cultural competence, gradually form good character, and build up the awareness of the motherland and interethnic unity. Integrating instrumentality with humanity in the Mandarin teaching will be beneficial for the lifelong development of the students. (Ministry of Education, 2014: 2)

Giving instrumentality and humanity equal prominence in Mandarin teaching implies an expansion from the previous rationalist view in the 2006 guideline to also encompass a 'romantic' ideology of language in Geeraerts' (2003) terms, which links Mandarin to Chinese national identity ('build up awareness of the motherland'). However, this change took place after 15 years during which the literary cultural aspect had been consistently downplayed in Mandarin teaching to minority students through their differentiation from Han students (reflected in eliminating *wen* from the subject name, as discussed above). How would the social actors involved in Mandarin teaching to Mongolian students respond to this change? In the following analysis, we focus on the teaching of Chinese literature, to consider the aspects of instrumentality and humanity as revealed within and through Mongolian teachers' attitudes towards the teaching of classical and modern Chinese literature.

Methods and data analysis

The data presented below were collected through semi-structured interviews as part of a larger project on the under-researched history of teaching Mandarin as a second

language to Mongolian learners within China since 1912 and its implications for the present day. The interviews were conducted in Hohhot between May and July 2018 with five Mongolian qualified teachers of Mandarin and four Mongolian trainee teachers studying for a MA degree in Chinese curriculum design and pedagogical theory.

The five qualified teachers selected all had at least five years' experience of teaching either primary school students (aged 6 to 12) or middle school students (aged 13 to 15). Three of the five were interviewed one-to-one. Two asked to be interviewed together. At the time, they were all working at the same Mongolian-medium school in Hohhot. The school is well-known in Inner Mongolia, with over 1600 registered Mongolian students coming from different parts of Inner Mongolia, and is accredited by the Chinese government as a "model" Mongolian school in the Inner Mongolia autonomous region. Similar to other urban Mongolian-medium schools, it offers what is known as a 'strong model' of trilingual education (Feng and Adamson, 2014: 201). That is, Mongolian is given more than equal prominence, being the medium of instruction in all classes except Mandarin and English, where Mandarin and/or English are used. The school offers Mandarin classes from the second grade of primary school, with five classes each week (40 minutes for each class).

Given the highly contentious nature of language politics in China currently, it was pleasing that so many qualified teachers at the school (relatively speaking) agreed to participate in the project. Four (out of a possible nine) middle school teachers and one (out of a possible four) primary school teachers agreed to be interviewed. To ensure no harm, the research project was rigorously reviewed through the University of Nottingham Faculty of Arts ethical approval process prior to undertaking fieldwork. However, some teachers at the school were initially reluctant to sign the informant consent form, fearing that their personal information would be made public. After the ethical approval procedure and data protection processes were explained to them in more detail, the five teachers mentioned above agreed to sign up to the study and eight

declined. Ironically, rather than reassuring study informants, the expectations of research ethics in the UK appeared to create barriers to participation in the research.

In order to maximize the number of informants, but also to allow for identification of possible differences between those entering the profession and those with more experience, we also conducted interviews with four Mongolian trainee teachers of Mandarin. All the trainees (identified with the help of a scholar working on Mandarin education to Mongolian learners from a university in Hohhot) had received Mongolian-medium education for at least twelve years from primary school to high school in different areas of Inner Mongolia. These four informants chose to be interviewed together.

Interviews were semi-structured around a number of initial questions: (a) What do you think are/were the similarities and differences when it comes to teaching ethnic minority students Chinese compared to teaching Han Chinese students? (b) What are your views on the teaching of Chinese linguistic knowledge to the students? (e.g. approach, content, changes)? (c) What are your views on the teaching of Chinese classical and modern literature to the students (e.g. approach, content, changes)? (d) What are your views on the presentation of Mongolian culture in textbooks? Once collected, thematic analysis of the interview data was undertaken to examine the language ideologies and identities of the informants, by coding and naming the themes that emerged from the interview transcripts. As Marks and Yardley (2004) have pointed out, what one chooses to code depends upon the purpose of the study. Predefined theoretical high-level categories for deductive coding, such as theories of language ideology (the 'rationalistic view' and 'romantic view'), were used for the first round of coding. Based on this, coding categories that distinguished between subcategories of language ideology in different contexts of teaching classical Chinese literature, modern Chinese literature and Mongolian culture were then inductively constructed. Three broad themes were identified, listed along with their sub-themes in Table 1 below. Theme A concerns the Mongolian actors' understanding of Mandarin as a second language. Theme B concerns their attitudes and actions regarding a perceived gap

between Mongolian and Han Chinese students' attainment of Mandarin. Theme C relates to the views of incorporating Mongolian culture into Mandarin teaching.

Theme	Theme A: Mandarin as a second language	Theme B: Gap between Mongolian & Han Chinese students' attainment	Theme C: 'Authenticity' of Mongolian culture
Sub-themes	Mandarin as a communicative tool Protection of Mongolian language and culture	Competition between Mongolian & Han Chinese in the job market Selection of teaching and learning materials by Mongolian school teachers	The close relationship between Mongolian language and culture Education experience of Mongolian teachers

Table 1. Themes and subthemes identified from the interview transcripts

The language ideologies of the Mongolian teachers and trainee teachers (all of whom have been ascribed pseudonyms, e.g. Teacher G or Trainee Teacher X, to protect their identities) will be discussed in three sub-sections. The first section explores the way in which the teaching of classical Chinese literature reveals the varying utilities ascribed to Mandarin and Mongolian in the teachers' language ideologies (theme A); the second explores the way in which the teaching of modern Chinese literature reveals a perceived gap between Mongolian and Han Chinese students' attainment of Mandarin (theme B); and the last explores the way in which the teaching of Mongolian culture reveals varying understandings of the ideological linkages made between language, culture and identity (theme C).

Classical Chinese literature: Mandarin as communicative tool, Mongolian as identity marker

While the qualified teachers we interviewed welcomed classical Chinese literature being introduced to students as an extra-curricular activity, they felt that it was unnecessary to undertake literary analysis of the kind required of Han students in mainstream language classes. Three out of the five stressed that the instrumental aspect is the focus of Chinese teaching to Mongolian students. Teacher U cited the goal of Chinese teaching in the 2006 curriculum guideline to justify her view that acquiring communicative competence in Chinese is enough for Mongolian students as a second language. She associated the learning of classical literature with the mother tongue:

> For Mongolian students, our general goal of teaching appears to be Chinese simply as our communicative tool. As long as we can speak and write it for communication purposes, this is fine. Our Mongolian language has classical literature, our Mongolian is our mother tongue; Chinese is just a communicative tool. We do not emphasise a deeper analysis of classical Chinese literature […] Because Chinese is simply a communicative tool. We also cannot really 'speak' classical Chinese in daily life.

Teacher U mentioned the communicative aspect of Chinese four times in this short extract to emphasise its difference from Mongolian as her first language, suggesting that Chinese is merely an instrument of communication. It is notable that this teacher discussed teaching Chinese classical literature in the bilingual cultural context. Teacher U highlighted the classical Mongolian literature against the communicative function of Chinese. Appreciating classical Mongolian literature (rather than Chinese literature) seems to be perceived as a marker of Mongolian identity by Teacher U. There is a dichotomy between Mongolian as an identity marker and Chinese as a communicative tool.

Similarly, Teacher G also highlighted Chinese as a communicative tool, as opposed to a marker of identity. He wanted his students to learn Mongolian in more depth and to

develop an intrinsic attachment to the Mongolian language. He illustrated his stance using the history of the Chinese script as an example:

> Chinese script is logographic, actually it would be better to talk about its historical development, but the reason we don't teach it is because I just want my students to learn Chinese as an instrument. I want them to speak more Mongolian and understand Mongolian better, and just treat Chinese as a tool. If you love this language, you are going to be a Han.

Teacher G chose not to teach the history of Chinese script for fear of the Mongolian students developing a love of the Chinese language. In his opinion, the linguistic history of Chinese is linked intimately to the Han ethnic identity. His stance is at odds with the 2014 curriculum guidelines for minorities, in which 'equipping students with a love of the national commonly used language' and 'teaching the history of Chinese script' were added as part of the cultural pedagogy (Ministry of Education, 2014: 2, 14). Teacher G claimed allegiance to the Mongolian language through resisting teaching the history of the Chinese script, to maintain a boundary between the Han and the Mongolians.

According to Smith (2009: 118), language, along with memories, myths, values and traditions, is one of the symbolic components of the ethnic 'myth-symbol complexes' that serve to mark out and guard the boundaries of *ethnies*. Teacher U and Teacher G seem to perceive classical Chinese literature and the history of the Chinese script as a cultural tradition that demarcates Han ethnic identity, from which they, as members of the Mongolian group, want to be differentiated. From this perspective, the two Mongolian teachers tend to hold a 'romantic' view of classical Chinese literature (in Geeraerts' sense), regarding it as a marker of Han ethnic identity, from which they want to distance their learners.

Modern Chinese literature as desirable linguistic and cultural capital
When it comes to the teaching of modern Chinese literature, some of the qualified teachers interviewed considered the literary works in their middle-school textbooks to

be too 'shallow', understanding them to be texts studied by Han students at the primary school level. As Teacher M pointed out:

> Like some texts for the middle-school students are too simple. For example, 'We only have one earth' is for Grade 8 students, the contents lack difficulty and I think increasing the level of difficulty would be better. You see another text 'The story of the deer and the wolf' should be for Grade 3 students in a Han school; it is too shallow for our middle school students.

Teacher A addressed this gap by supplementing the textbook with other texts:

> Sometimes I have added other materials by myself. I selected some texts from the textbooks for Han schools and talked about them in general terms, or some classic writings. For example we have one unit with the theme of hometown, so I selected Lu Xun's 'Hometown' to teach to my students.

In such a way, Teacher A hoped to stretch the students to a higher level:

> I just want to reduce the gap with the Han students, the closer the better, because we have a big gap, our Grade 8 and 9 students only have the competence in Chinese equivalent to Grade 5 and 6 students in Han schooling. Actually, it is a shame as, at this age, students can learn things more deeply.

The trainee teachers we interviewed also appeared to have absorbed this understanding, as Trainee Teacher X reveals:

> The Chinese teaching content for Mongolian is too shallow, so that Mongolians have poor competence in listening, speaking, reading and writing, so they do not understand Han culture, which exacerbates the impression of Han people that Mongolian students have poor Chinese competence. Textbooks for Mongolian students should increase the difficulty. The difficulty level needs to be similar to that given to Han students.

This perceived gap between Mongolian and Han students' attainment causes resentment among both the Mongolian teachers and trainee teachers interviewed as part of this study. The Chinese textbooks are seen by them as disadvantaging Mongolian students, whose knowledge is compared with the Chinese knowledge learnt by the Han students. In this comparison, the Han students are positioned as the 'ideal' group, those who can legitimately claim competence in Chinese. For example, Teacher A mentioned that she made use of the Han textbooks as supplementary materials in her teaching practice. It seems that Teacher A plays an active role, i.e. is an 'actor' in the sense of Hornberger and Johnson's (2007) definition, in the selection of teaching materials rather than sticking to the government-issued textbooks. In addition, we can also understand Teacher A's teaching practice using Bourdieu's (1992) notion of habitus. The imposition of Chinese as the majority language over the Mongolian group is naturalised in her teaching practice. Such a construction of a Chinese-dominant linguistic habitus has similarly been pointed out in Bao's (2008) study of language shift in Ningcheng county, Inner Mongolia, which found that language shift from Mongolian to Mandarin takes place faster in urban areas than in rural areas.

Meanwhile, using Bourdieu's (1992: 17) notion of the 'linguistic market', we could argue that the strengthening status of the Chinese language in the Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region over the years has shaped the belief, particularly among urban Mongolians, that Chinese language and culture constitute the cultural capital needed in order to acquire symbolic capital (e.g. prestige) in the Chinese-dominant linguistic market of Inner Mongolia. Trainee Teacher X commented in her interview that she was concerned that the textbooks used in Mongolian-medium schools 'exacerbate the impression of Han people that Mongolian students have poor Chinese competence'. A lower level of competence in Chinese is clearly regarded by this trainee teacher as an unpleasant stereotype that needs to be contested. Meanwhile, the differing levels of Chinese knowledge expected of Mongolian and Han students also reinforce the hierarchical social relationships between 'native' and 'non-native' speakers (Pennycook, 1994: 175). The Han are perceived here as an homogenous linguistic

group representing the linguistic 'ideal' – they are the only ones who can demonstrate the ideal level of competence in Chinese. These factors lead the Mongolian qualified and trainee teachers to collude with the hegemony of Han native speakership by measuring the Chinese knowledge learnt by the Mongolian students against the Han students. They therefore use the scope that they have as actors in implementing government guidelines, endeavouring to teach Chinese at a higher level than is required in the government-issued textbooks, with the aim of enabling their students to reach the same or similar level as the Han group.

To sum up, all of the informants in this study position themselves and their students as being in a single linguistic market with their Han counterparts, who are perceived to hold the 'legitimate' competence in Chinese. While resisting the teaching of classical Chinese at the same level as for students' Han counterparts, they are keen to teach modern Chinese literary canons. The Mongolians here endeavour to equip themselves and their students with the linguistic and cultural capital that Han Chinese have in the Han-dominant linguistic market.

Presenting Mongolian culture in textbooks: can Mandarin convey Mongolian culture?

While our analysis reveals that modern Chinese literature is perceived by both the Mongolian qualified and trainee teachers as desirable linguistic and cultural capital, there are some differences. All nine Mongolian informants supported the inclusion of Mongolian culture in the Chinese textbooks, but their views differed regarding both the proportion and the way of presenting Mongolian culture. Discussion with the trainee teachers reveals the strong influence of mainstream government ethnic policy, as the passage below shows:

Researcher W: So you think, Chinese textbooks should include more Mongolian culture?

Trainee teacher L: Mainly Han culture [I think]

Trainee teacher H: [en]

Trainee teacher X: [No, they should] be in equal proportion. It is not like when you have Chinese class, you should forget Mongolian culture, the boundary should not be too clear, otherwise, I think it will cause some political problems.

Trainee Teacher L and Trainee Teacher H thought teaching Han culture should be the main concern. For them, Chinese cultural knowledge is representative of the Han culture. Before Trainee Teacher L finished her sentence, however, Trainee Teacher X chipped in to express her disagreement. The wording of Trainee Teacher X's expression of her view about the presentation of cultural knowledge seems almost to quote the government ethnic policy. She called for an equal proportion of Mongolian and Han cultures in the Chinese textbooks, which could be interpreted as following the political principle of interethnic equality. She further argued against drawing too firm a boundary between Mongolian culture and Han culture, seeming to suggest that they are both an integral part of the Chinese culture.

On the other hand, two of the qualified teachers expressed their concern that the way that Mongolian culture is presented in Chinese language classes may not be appropriate. Teacher G, for example, attached great importance to the role of the Mongolian language in transmitting the authentic Mongolian culture, as this section of the interview shows:

Researcher W: How would you teach the content of Mongolian culture?

Teacher G: I teach it, and Mongolian culture is also included in textbooks.

Researcher W: Will you find some supplementary sources?

Teacher G: This depends on teachers. Because many teachers do not really understand Mongolian culture…like Teacher Z and Teacher E, for example.

Researcher W: Is Teacher Z Han?

Teacher G: Yes, there's really no need for her to teach Mongolian culture.

Researcher W: Did Teacher E receive Chinese-medium education?

Teacher G: Yes, but she is a Mongolian and can speak Mongolian. But, how can I put this, as a person who is not familiar with the ethnic culture, has not learned its language and script, she can only talk about it generally and is not able to understand the culture deeply. If you want to help students to understand our culture our ethnicity, you must use Mongolian.

In Teacher G's thinking, competence in Mongolian is bound up with Mongolian culture, indicating the 'romantic' view of Mongolian, in Geeraerts' (2003) terms. An ethnic boundary between Han and Mongolians is revealed when Teacher G excludes the Teacher Z, who is Han, from teaching Mongolian culture to students. For him, only the Mongolians who have received education using Mongolian as the medium of instruction are qualified to claim ownership of Mongolian culture. Stressing the relationship between the level of Mongolian literacy and Mongolian culture, Teacher G expressed his strong personal attachment to the Mongolian language. He expresses the view that a 'legitimate' member of the Mongolian group needs not only to be able speak Mongolian but also to know its written language and script through education. His strict requirement of Mongolian proficiency as the gatekeeper of authentic Mongolian culture indicates that for him, language is the distinctive marker of ethnic identity to differentiate Mongolians from the Han majority.

Regarding the portrayal of Mongolian culture in the textbooks, Teacher A voiced a criticism that the contents are too general and used a lesson about Mongolian traditional clothes as an example, as can be seen in this section of our conversation:

Teacher A: In the past in a textbook there was a text entitled 'Mongolian traditional clothing'. Because our Mongolians live in eight Leagues, Mongolians in different counties have different styles of clothing.[4] The text simply talks about our clothing, like headwear, then, erm, then simply

---

[4] Leagues are the prefectures of Inner Mongolia. The name comes from a Mongolian administrative unit used during the Qing dynasty.

introduces what they are, but does not distinguish that Mongolians in different regions dress differently, the text does not specify this … we have to do a lot of work to supplement it.

Researcher W: So, do you think more details should be added into the textbooks?

Teacher A: I don't think so, because Mongolian language classes will cover something about ethnic culture.

This homogenised representation of Mongolian traditional clothing without specifying the regional variances embedded within it is criticised by Teacher A. Such a practice of cultural homogenization could usefully be understand as an instance of Gal and Irvine's (1995) notion of *erasure*, an essentializing process in which the ideology of imagining the 'other' social group as homogenous renders some persons or activities invisible. Here the narration of Mongolian traditional clothing is presented as an indifferentiated whole, an erasure of the heterogeneity within the Mongolian group. Interestingly, however Teacher A rejected the idea of adding more Mongolian cultural details, despite pointing out the issue of homogenization. She suggested that promulgating Mongolian culture is the main task of Mongolian language classes, echoing Teacher G's linking of Mongolian culture to the Mongolian language.

From the point of view of some Mongolians, therefore, the inclusion of Mongolian culture in the Chinese textbooks appears to reinforce the view that Mongolian culture is part of Chinese culture, while the Mongolian teachers do not expect it to play a role in the construction of Mongolian ethnic identity. Indeed Teachers G and A cited in the examples here, go further and argue that Chinese language materials cannot and should not be expected to be the disseminators of authentic Mongolian culture, because Mongolian culture is so closely tied up with the Mongolian language.

Conclusion and implications

The aim of this study was to explore how a non-Han group – in this case, Mongolian qualified teachers and trainee teachers – negotiate their ethnic identity within the

teaching of Mandarin in China. In particular, it sought to understand how they define the Mandarin language and cultural knowledge in classes teaching Mandarin as a second language. The findings reveal that the Mongolian teachers and trainee teachers appear to display a range of attitudes towards the teaching of classical and modern Chinese literature, negotiating the role of Mandarin as a communicative tool, as a form of linguistic and cultural capital, and as an identity marker.

Rather than positioning Mandarin as a second language, some Mongolian actors appear to pine for the Han native-speakership model, positioning the Han as the ideal group with the 'legitimate' competence in Mandarin regarding the teaching of modern Chinese literature. As for the teaching of classical Chinese literature, some Mongolian actors view it as a marker of Han ethnic identity and reject to teach classical Chinese literature at the same level as the Han Chinese counterparts do. They stressed the instrumental aspect of Chinese to distinguish themselves from their Han counterparts and claimed allegiance to the Mongolian language through calling for learning Mongolian culture at a deeper level by studying classical Mongolian texts.

At the policy level, we found a growing nationalistic focus in the government-issued curriculum guidelines. The Chinese government seems to intend to strengthen the combination of the rationalist and romantic dimensions of Mandarin, making the 'people' and 'state' coincide. This trend can be viewed in the broad context of the patriotic education campaign launched since the 1990s (Zhao, 1998), with the major foci of cultivating Chinese young people's identity consciousness in their relationship to the state and society, and the more recent reform in the Mongolian-medium schools (Uda District People's Government, 2020). However, from the perspectives of the Mongolian actors of this study, the rationalistic and romantic dimensions of Mandarin teaching tend to be viewed from a 'postmodern perspective', i.e. allowing for a heterogeneity of identities and multiplicity of language choices, with the emphasis on the functional differentiation between Mongolian and Mandarin (Geeraerts, 2020: 14). These actors linked Mongolian language closely with the Mongolian culture and identity, while regarding Mandarin as a communicative tool and 'linguistic and cultural

capital' (Bourdieu, 1992). This distinction is similar to that found by Baioud (2021) in her analysis of Mongolian wedding speeches, which she found dictated a strict boundary between Mongolian and Mandarin, in a way that presented the Mongolian wedding speech genre as intact and authoritative.

Our study has implications for the debate over the relative importance of language education on instrumental/utilitarian grounds vs education for access to a wider/elite culture not just in China but also beyond, for example in the field of modern foreign language teaching in the UK context – where presenting a language as more useful or necessary, but without recreating the prestige of language study, does not necessarily result in greater appetite for language learning (McLelland, 2017: 219). The study has implications for identity aspects in second language teaching. While Gao's (2020) study explored how Chinese learners of English negotiated linguistic ideology and successfully constructed multifaceted identities in English classes in which native oriental culture and philosophical values are deeply embedded, this study has shown how the identity dilemma in bilingual or multilingual education is perceived as a *risk* by the Mongolian actors. This study has also demonstrated the hegemony of Mandarin in the linguistic market in Hohhot, as elsewhere in China, where Mandarin tends to be associated with high economic value. This chimes both with Grey's (2021) study of the Zhuang group in Guangxi province within China, as well as with Huang's (2021) investigation of shifting power relations among different Chinese varieties in the Chinese diasporic context.

This study also significantly enriches the discussion of how Chinese might be presented to its ethnic minority learners. The adoption of national standard textbooks for the Chinese language subject in the recent policy in 2020 implies that the PRC government intends to promote equal access to Chinese as linguistic and cultural capital for both Han and non-Han students, thus addressing a concern raised by the Mongolian teachers and trainee teachers in this study (Uda District People's Government, 2020). However, what the policy seems to neglect is the belief that Mongolian language is a marker of Mongolian identity, a belief widely shared among the Mongolian informants in this

study Further research will be needed to understand both how rural Mongolians (as opposed to these urban informants) and how other ethnic minority groups negotiate their ethnic identity in defining the linguistic and cultural knowledge and values of Mandarin. Such research has the potential to reveal commonalities and differences in how the role of language is constructed in the field of teaching Mandarin as the majority language. Last but not the least, the power dynamics between Mongolian and Han in the field of teaching Chinese to ethnic minority students are also relevant for ethnic minority language studies, contributing to our understanding of how the relationship between language and identity is constructed in different kinds of contexts.

Word count: 7716

Profile

Jiaye Wu is a lecturer in the School of Applied Linguistics at Zhejiang International Studies University. [ORCID 0000-0003-4564-2464]

Nicola McLelland is Professor of German and History of Linguistics at the University of Nottingham. [ORCID 0000-0002-6499-9453]

Sarah Dauncey is Professor of Chinese Society and Disability in the School of Sociology and Social Policy at the University of Nottingham. [ORCID 0000-0002-9457-8430]

References

Bao, Y. Z. (2008) 'A Study of Language Contact and Shift in Harqin of Ningcheng County, Inner Mongolia.' *Chinese Education and Society* 41 (6): 71-93.

Baioud, G. (2021) 'Transforming Mongolian Wedding Speech Genres in Bilingual Bicultural Urban Inner Mongolia.' *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 0 (0): 1-19.

Bourdieu, P. (1992) *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge and Malden: Polity Press.

Chang, Z. D. (2008) '民族汉语教学中的文化教学 [Culture Pedagogy in the Chinese Teaching to Ethnic Minority Learners].' In B.H. Wang and S.Y. Wang. (Eds.) 民族中小学汉语教学论稿 *[An Essay Collection of Chinese Pedagogical Theories to the Ethnic Minority Primary and Secondary Schools]*. Beijing: People's Education Press, 104-122.

Chen, P. (2004) *Modern Chinese History and Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid and Cape Town: Cambridge University Press.

Feng, A. W. and Adamson, B. (Eds.) (2014) *Trilingualism in Education in China: Models and Challenges*. Dordrecht, Holland: Springer.

Gal, S. and Irvine, J. T. (1995) 'The Boundaries of Languages and Disciplines: How Ideologies Construct Difference.' *Social Research* 62 (4): 967- 1001.

Gao, F. (2021) 'Negotiation of native linguistic ideology and cultural identities in English learning: a cultural perspective.' *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 42 (6): 551-564.

Geeraerts, D. (2003) 'Cultural Models of Linguistic Standardization.' In R. Dirven., R. Frank., M. Putz (Eds.) *Cognitive Models in Language and Thought. Ideology, Metaphors and Meanings.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 25-68.

Geeraerts. D. (2020) '"Romantic and rationalist models of linguistic diversity.' *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 17 (3): 2-19.

Grey, A. (2021) *Language Rights in a Changing China a National Overview and Zhuang Case Study*. Boston, Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Hsia, C.T. (1988) 'Classical Chinese Literature: Its Reception Today as a Product of Traditional Culture.' *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* 10 (1/2): 133-152.

Hon, T. K. (2003) 'National Essence, National Learning, and Culture: Historical Writings in *Guocui Xuebao*, *Xueheng* and *Guoxue Jikan.' Historiography East & West* 1 (2): 242-286.

Hornberger, N. H. and Johnson, D. C. (2007) 'Slicing the Onion Ethnographically: Layers and Spaces in Multilingual Language Education Policy and Practice.' *TESOL QUARTERLY* 41 (3): 509-532.

Huang, J. (2021) 'A shifting standard: a stratified ideological ecology in a Birmingham Chinese complementary school.' *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 42 (2): 165-177.

Jin, H. (2006) '少数民族汉语教学与语文教学之比较 [Comparing teaching Chinese to ethnic minority learners with the Han Chinese students].'中国民族教育 *[Ethnic Education of China]* 5: 24-26.

Li, W. and Zhu, H. (2014) 'Language and literacy teaching, learning and socialization in the Chinese complementary school classroom.' In X.L. Curdt-Christiansen and A. Hancock (Eds.) *Learning Chinese in Diasporic Communities: Many pathways to being Chinese*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 117-135.

Liang, S. H. (2014) *Language Attitudes and Identities in Multilingual China*. Switzerland: Springer.

Marks, D.F. and Yardley, L. (2004) Research Methods for Clinical and Health Psychology. SAGE Publications.

McLelland, N. (2017) Teaching and learning foreign languages: A history of language education, assessment and policy in Britain. Abingdon: Taylor & Francis Group.

Ministry of Education of People's Republic of China. (1999) *Mandarin Chinese language curriculum guideline for full time ethnic minority primary and secondary schools (on trial)* [Minzu Zhongxiaoxue Hanyu Kecheng Biaozhun Shixing Caoan 民族中小学汉语课程标准试行草案]. Beijing: People's Education Publishing House.

Ministry of Education of People's Republic of China. (2006) *Mandarin Chinese language curriculum guideline for full time ethnic minority primary and secondary schools (on trial)* [Minzu Zhongxiaoxue Hanyu Kecheng Biaozhun Shixing Caoan 民族中小学汉语课程标准][Online]. Available at <https://wenku.baidu.com/view/2092cedf33126edb6f1aff00bed5b9f3f8 0f72d6.html> [15 March 2022]

Ministry of Education of People's Republic of China. (2014) *Mandarin Chinese language curriculum guideline for full time ethnic minority primary and secondary schools (Compulsory education)* [Minzu Zhongxiaoxue Hanyu Kecheng Biaozhun 民族中小学汉语课程标准（义务教育）]. Beijing: People's Education Publishing House.

Pennycook, A. (1994) *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*. London: Longman.

Polzenhagen, F and Dirven, R. (2008) 'Rationalist and Romantic Models in Globalisation.' In G. Kristiansen and R. Driven (Eds.) *Cognitive Sociolinguistics: Language Variation, Cultural Models, Social Systems*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 237-300.

Postiglione, G. A. (2008) 'Making Tibetans in China: the Educational Challenges of Harmonious Multiculturalism.' *Educational Review* 60 (1): 1-20.

Schluessel, E. T. (2007) '"Bilingual" Education and Discontent in Xinjiang.' *Central Asian Survey* 26 (2): 251-277.

Smith, A. D. (2009) *Ethno-symbolism and Nationalism a Cultural Approach*. London and New York: Routledge.

Spada, N. (2007) 'Communicative Language Teaching: Current Status and Future Prospects.' In J. Cummins and C. Davison (Eds.) *International Handbook of English Language Teaching Part I*. New York: Springer, 271-288.

Uda District People's Government. (2020) 全区民族语言授课学校小学一年级和初中一年级使用国家统编《语文》教材实施方案政策解读 [An interpretation of the policy of using national standard Chinese language textbooks in the district's ethnic

minority schools among the first and seventh grade students]. Available at: https://web.archive.org/web/20200904063237/http://www.wuda.gov.cn/qnyw/32938.j html [Accessed 27 May 2022].

Wang, B. H. (2006) '从"汉语文"到"汉语"，汉语教学理念的更新与发展——浅谈少数民族汉语课程改革 [Renovation and development of Chinese teaching ideas – A discussion on the reform of Chinese teaching of ethnic minorities].' 民族教育研究 *[Journal of research on education for ethnic minorities]* 17 (6): 90-93.

Wang, Y. (2013) '少数民族汉语教学学科性质特点：对比与解读 [Characteristics of teaching Mandarin Chinese to ethnic minority students: comparison and discussion].' 民族论坛 *[Minzu Tribune]* 10: 94-96.

Wu, Y. M. and Zhong, D. D. (2017) 蒙古族中小学汉语教科书 60 年变迁及启示 [Shifts in Chinese textbooks for Mongolian-medium primary and secondary schools over sixty years and its implications] 民族教育研究 *[Journal of Research on Education for Ethnic Minorities] 28(3): 50-55.*

Wu, J. Y. (2022) *Representing language, culture and citizenship to minoritized ethnic groups: the teaching of Mandarin Chinese to Mongolian learners as a second language in China since 1912*. University of Nottingham: PhD Thesis.

Xu, X.W. (2007) '体现第二语言教学特点培养学生汉语基本素养——解读汉语课程的性质和基本理念 [Embodying the characteristic of second language teaching and cultivating students with the basic skills of Mandarin —— interpreting the principles and basic concepts of Mandarin curriculum].' 双语教学 *[Bilingual language teaching]* 9: 28-30.

Yu, L. M. (2001) 'Communicative Language Teaching China: Progress and Resistance.' *TESOL Quarterly 35* (1): 194-198.

Zhao, S. S. (1998) 'A State-Led Nationalism: The Patriotic Education campaign in Post-Tiananmen China.' *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 31 (3): 287-301.

Zhou, Y. and Luk, S. (2016) 'Establishing Confucius institutes: a tool for promoting China's soft power?' *Journal of contemporary China* 26 (100): 628-642.

Zhu, H and Li, W. (2014) 'Geopolitics and the Changing Hierarchies of the Chinese Languages: Implications for Policy and Practice of Chinese Language Teaching in Britain.' *The Modern Language Journal* 98 (1): 326-339.