
This book contains data gathered from two Confucius Institutes in the UK and explains their situation in terms of Language Management Theory (LMT) as a means of stressing the crucial role of the participating “agents” in the practice and process of language planning at various levels.

The first chapter, as an introduction to the research, offers basic information on the concepts and aims of the Confucius Institute and its rapid development in the context of globalized societies. As the theoretical framework of the study, the concept of Language Management is briefly introduced and research questions at three different levels are mentioned: (1) “how the Chinese government language policies have evolved with regard to the teaching of Chinese language as a foreign language overseas along with the initiative of Confucius Institute,” (2) “how China’s central language policies concerning the learning and teaching of Chinese have been interpreted and incorporated into the policy statement, if any, by the partner institutions,” and (3) “what the actual learning and teaching practices are like in the classrooms of Confucius Institutes with regard to the Chinese language policy” (p. 16).

The second chapter provides deeper information on the Confucius Institute by comparing it with other similar Language Promotion Organizations such as the British Council, the Alliance Française, and the Goethe-Institut in terms of their concepts, aims, historical perspectives, funding, and partnerships. Furthermore, the author describes their limitations, such as a bigger focus on culture than on language, Euro-centric perspectives, and some funding issues (p. 44–45).

The third chapter provides an overview of studies of Confucius Institutes conducted in China and abroad. The main topics of the studies include sustainable development, the role of Confucius Institutes in building soft power, the teaching methods of Confucius Institutes, and features and trends in research on Confucius Institutes. Furthermore, the author provides a deeper account of language policy and planning theory in accordance with its periodical development and introduces the concept of language management from the perspective of Bernard Spolsky. The author differentiates his concept of language management from the perspective of Neustupný, Jernudd, and Nekvapil by arguing that “it (Language Management Theory from Neustupný, Jernudd, Nekvapil, and his followers) lacks adequate attention to the fact that no individuals live or make choices in isolation, but rather in various social domains relevant to their lives, some concurrently and some successively” (p. 59). The author justifies the concept of language management from Spolsky by describing how “in Spolsky’s view, language policy is all about choices, and a theory of language policy is to account for the choices made by individual speakers based on rule-governed patterns recognised by the speech community of which they are members. He believes that some of these choices are the result of language management, or conscious and express efforts by language managers to control the choices as all individuals live in a social space as exemplified in a network analysis” (p. 59). However, this argument can be criticized because LMT also accords considerable attention to various social domains. According to LMT, an individual essentially maintains a norm (i.e., linguistic, communicative, or sociocultural) by noting a deviation from it in his/her own or his/her interlocutor’s utterance. He may evaluate the deviation positively or negatively. If the noted deviation is evaluated negatively — that is, the individual considers it an
inadequacy — he may plan an adjustment and implement it. The process can cease at any stage. The crucial thing is then how the norm is maintained, how some deviations are noted, how they are evaluated, how an adjustment is planned, and what factor initiates its implementation. One set of answers to these questions can be found in the norms of social domains. Note that LMT focused on many such domains, such as the economic domain (multinational companies), the education domain, minority groups in matrix society, etc. (see, Nekvapil, J. & Sherman, T., 2018 and Sherman, T. & Homoláč, J., 2019). Furthermore, Sloboda (2010) criticizes Spolsky’s perspective by arguing that “the definition of language management presented in the book excludes language-targeted activities done by people without authority.” If the author had applied LMT in her research, she would have achieved a deeper understanding and interpretation of data from the micro-level of the research in chapter 6.

The fourth chapter explores Chinese language management at the institutional level. Three institutional stakeholders (Confucius Institute Headquarters, Chinese partner universities, and UK host universities) are introduced and their relationships in financial, human resources, and policy-making issues are accounted for. Since each institution has its own focus, aim, and purpose in establishing the Confucius Institute, this chapter shows how the headquarters attempt to integrate their language policy and disciplines into Chinese partner universities and eventually into local universities (in this study, UK host universities).

The fifth chapter provides more detailed accounts of the problems of the three institutional stakeholders. Different educational environments affect the method of teaching and learning Chinese. They lead to differences in the language policies of the institutions and demand a high degree of localization of teacher education, training, and preparation of adequate teaching materials for the needs of local students. However, on account of the absence or relatively short term of Chinese directors in UK host universities and the part-time contracts of the UK directors, there is no plan to address these issues.

The sixth chapter gives data gathered from the questionnaire survey and interviews. Teachers and students are the main subjects of the field study. The author considers teachers a main operational agent of language policy and analyses their behavior toward students (e.g., making a hierarchical relationship between a teacher and students) and language policy (e.g., limited focus on literacy). With respect to the analysis of the behavior of teachers, it would have been more fruitful if the author had used the framework of LMT from Neustupný, Jernudd, and Nekvapil mentioned above. In accordance with Nekvapil & T. Sherman (2014:7), the theory offers a framework for a deeper understanding of various problems in relation to language, paying attention not only to the linguistic but also to the economic, cultural, political, and sociological components affecting language problems in society.

The final chapter summaries nine findings from the research with the statement that “[t]he research was designed to examine how the institutional Chinese language was managed in the implementation process in the local British Confucius Institutes, and seek answers at three levels” (p. 169). The author diagnoses the process of language management at three different levels and argues that an “urgent need and ample room for improved synergy for the Chinese language courses to be organically integrated with other activities of the Confucius Institutes and equally between Confucius Institutes” (p. 175).

The chapters in this book shed light on the complex process of language management at Confucius Institutes at the micro- and macro-levels. However, the conceptualization of language management as a result of language
policy and planning theory fails to give insight into the interconnection and mutual relationships between institutions and individual language users. Specifically, in chapters 4, 5, and 6, the author gathers various data from three different levels and tries to account for the language management process. However, each account is just listed separately and there is no more in-depth explanation of the consequences of each management process. In addition to this, the author did not focus on how language management on the micro-level affects macro-level language policy. According to LMT, simple (micro-level) and organized (macro-level) management are intertwined and in a complementary relationship. This different theoretical conception facilitates a more profound understanding of the complex process of enacting language policy and its motivation.

Still, this book is rich in examples and the extensive analysis of language management at three institutional levels invites us to understand the whole working process of language management in practice. It will be of interest to students and scholars engaging in language policy and planning.

Minyoung Park, Charles University.
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