

Exploring Moral Education Policy Documents in the Chinese College English Education Context: A Critical Discourse Analysis

Weiqing Liu*, Jeannet Stephen

Centre for the Promotion of Knowledge and Language Learning, Universiti Malaysia Sabah,
Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia

*Corresponding Author Email: liu_weiqing_du22@iluv.ums.edu.my

DOI Link: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v15-i1/27664>

Published Online: 01 March 2026

Abstract

Moral education has been a topic of extensive debate within the field of education. This study examines how China's moral education policy discourse constructs power and ideology and reshapes college English education using a critical discourse analysis (CDA) framework. The study focuses specifically on a recent nationwide educational reform, i.e., integrating moral education into college-level courses (the Chinese term *Kecheng Sizheng*). Drawing on a sample of two policy documents guiding the integration of moral education into college English teaching, the findings indicate that the policy documents function not merely as administrative guidelines but also as instruments of discursive governance. They embed ideology, discourse, and power within educational policy texts, thereby constructing ideological and moral education as a normative imperative. Through the mechanisms of recontextualization and interdiscursivity, the policies delineate the obligations of college English teachers while simultaneously regulating the interpretive space of college English educational practice. This research contributes to understanding how language planning operates through educational policy discourse, with implications for language policy scholarship in contexts where education serves state ideological projects. We argue that CDA illuminates the mechanisms through which educational policies naturalise value alignment in college English education, offering insights for future language policy research in higher education.

Keywords: Moral Education, Critical Discourse Analysis, College English Education, Kecheng Sizheng, Policy Documents, China

Introduction

As stipulated by Chinese President Xi Jinping at a national conference, "China's higher education institutions are under the leadership of the Communist Party of China (CPC), and are socialist colleges with Chinese characteristics, so higher education must be guided by Marxism, and the Party's policies in education must be fully carried out" (Xi, 2016). He further emphasised that ideological and political work must focus on students, caring for them, serving them, and helping them improve in ideological quality, political awareness, moral

characteristics and humanistic quality to enable them to develop both ability and integrity (Xi, 2016). This directive has since provided the discursive foundation for subsequent *Kecheng Sizheng* policies.

Existing scholarship has examined *Kecheng Sizheng* policies from various analytical perspectives. The evolving trends and characteristics are discussed with the NVivo tool (Liu & Li, 2023). Mandatory tools are overused, while incentive tools remain underutilised (Fan et al., 2023; Li, 2025; Zheng, 2023). Although critical discourse analysis (CDA) has been applied to China's education policies, studies have been limited to other initiatives, such as the Belt and Road Initiative (Woo, 2022; Shi, 2016; Ren, 2023). CDA's demonstrated capacity to reveal how language enacts power relations, naturalises ideologies, and shapes institutional practices (Fairclough, 1995; Rogers, 2008), but perspectives remain underrepresented in the unique socio-political context of China's moral education endeavours in college English education, with *Kecheng Sizheng* as an important case in the present.

CDA offers particular analytical leverage for examining *Kecheng Sizheng*, because it interrogates the discursive foundations of policy and practice, revealing how texts construct social realities while positioning themselves as neutral administrative instruments (Gee, 1999; Wodak, 2015). This approach is essential for understanding how educational policies embed ideological imperatives within seemingly technical governance frameworks (Ball, 1993; Vidovich, 2007). By examining linguistic features, discourse practices, and sociocultural contexts simultaneously, CDA illuminates mechanisms through which state actors naturalise values and regulate educational practice.

This study addresses three research questions: (1) How do *Kecheng Sizheng* policy documents within the college English education context construct ideological imperatives through linguistic strategies? (2) How are these policies produced, distributed, and consumed within China's educational governance system? (3) What do these discursive practices reveal about college English teachers? By answering these questions, we contribute to language policy scholarship on educational governance and demonstrate how CDA can reveal the work performed by ostensibly administrative texts.

Theoretical Framework: Critical Discourse Analysis in Language Policy Research

CDA encompasses multiple theoretical traditions unified by a commitment to revealing how discourse reproduces power asymmetries and naturalises dominant ideologies (Fairclough, 2013; Van Dijk, 2008). We employ Fairclough's (1995) three-dimensional model, which analyses texts through three interrelated levels: (1) textual analysis examining linguistic features and rhetorical strategies; (2) discourse practice analysis examining production, distribution, and consumption processes; and (3) sociocultural practice analysis situating discourse within broader ideological and political contexts.

This framework has proven productive for analysing educational policy discourse internationally. CDA can be used to analyse the talk and texts that inform and constitute the social realities and understandings of policy related to education (Lester et al., 2016). Ball (1993) demonstrated how educational reform policies in neoliberal contexts construct particular teacher and student subjectivities. Many studies used CDA to analyse education policies from perspectives such as policy mandates, policy-making meeting transcripts, policy

implementation texts and policy stakeholders (Anderson & Holloway, 2020; English, 2019; Khan & Zaki, 2022; Parker, 2019; Koyama & Chang, 2019; Wright, 2012). Vidovich (2007) used CDA to reveal how global policy discourses are recontextualised in national education systems. With its socially oriented agenda, critical discourse analysis (CDA) has been widely used in educational research to examine the discursive foundations of education policy and practice (Gee, 1999, 2008; Rogers et al., 2016).

Within Fairclough's framework, we attend particularly to: (1) lexical choices and semantic relations that construct educational priorities; (2) grammatical features including modality, nominalisation, and voice that naturalise ideological positions; (3) intertextuality showing how policy texts draw on and recontextualise prior discourses; and (4) positioning of key social actor, i.e., college English teachers. This multidimensional approach enables systematic analysis of how *Kecheng Sizheng* policies perform ideological work while presenting themselves as an administrative necessity.

Researcher Positionality

We acknowledge our positioning as researchers analysing educational policy from a Malaysian institution. The first author's background in Chinese higher education provides insider knowledge of policy contexts and linguistic nuances, while also requiring reflexive attention to how familiarity might naturalise certain discursive features. The second author's expertise in critical language policy analysis brings comparative and theoretical perspectives while necessitating careful attention to cultural-political contexts. This collaborative positionality shapes our analytical lens, enabling both contextual understanding and critical distance. We recognise that CDA itself embodies particular epistemological commitments to revealing power asymmetries, which frames our interpretation of these texts as instruments of governance rather than neutral policy instruments.

Method

Policy document analysis is adopted as the paper's primary research method, employing Fairclough's three-dimensional model of CDA as the analytical framework. Policy document analysis allows researchers to examine the textual, discursive, and sociocultural features which are embedded in official statements and directives (Bowen, 2009). Norman Fairclough's model provides a structured approach from three aspects: textual analysis on the linguistic features and rhetorical strategies of the policy documents; discourse practice analysis on the processes of policy production, distribution, and interpretation; and sociocultural practice analysis on the policies within broader ideological, political, and educational contexts (Fairclough, 1995). Combining policy document analysis with CDA, this study seeks to unravel the complex interaction among ideology, power, and discourse within *Kecheng Sizheng* policies in China's college English education, and how these values are recontextualised from national mandates to pedagogical directives.

The database consists of two official policy documents, which serve as guidance for the *Kecheng Sizheng* practice in China's college English education. Policy documents include formal directives, regulations, and guidelines issued by levels of educational administration, which establish the institutional framework for college English educational reform. The national policy document *Outlines for the Construction of Kecheng Sizheng in Higher Education Institutions* (Ministry of Education, 2020; hereafter *Outlines*) establishes the macro-

ideological framework and normative imperatives for all disciplines. In *Guidelines for College English Teaching* (2020 Edition) (National Foreign Language Teaching Advisory Board, 2020; hereafter *Guidelines*), *Kecheng Sizheng* is recontextualised into college English education standards and requirements.

Result and Discussion

Given that the primary data were originally in Chinese, the selected policy excerpts were translated into English equivalents by the researcher. To ensure that the original ideological stance and institutional tone remained transparent during the analytical process, the translations were subsequently cross-checked and validated by a professor specialising in translation studies. On this basis, the following analysis presents the findings across four themes, including policy initiative, policy content, policy implementation and social actors. The themes address “the same topic” or “about the same thing” (Lemke, 1992).

Following iterative analysis, we identified four thematic domains spanning all three analytical dimensions: policy initiative, policy content, policy implementation, and social actor roles. These themes emerged from the data rather than being imposed a priori, though they align with conventional policy analysis categories. For each theme, we present integrated analysis across Fairclough's three dimensions, illustrated with representative extracts.

Policy Initiative: Constructing Educational Reform as an Ideological Imperative

Extract 1:

“Whom to cultivate, how to cultivate them, and for whom to cultivate them are the fundamental questions of education. The effectiveness of Lide Shuren (cultivating people with morality) serves as the ultimate criterion for evaluating all endeavours in higher education institutions. To implement the fundamental task of Lide Shuren, it is essential to integrally merge value shaping, knowledge imparting, and ability cultivation—never treating them as separate elements. The comprehensive advancement of Kecheng Sizheng aims precisely to embed value guidance within knowledge imparting and ability cultivation. This helps students develop a correct worldview, outlook on life, and values. This is not only the inherent requirement of talent development but also its essential component. This strategic move affects and even determines the issue of succession, the long-term stability of the country, and the rejuvenation and rise of the nation.” (Outlines)

At the textual analysis level, the policy documents demonstrate obvious textual features. Rhetorical parallelism is widely used, as seen in examples like “Whom to cultivate, how to cultivate them, and for whom to cultivate them” and “value shaping, knowledge imparting, and ability cultivation.” Such rhetorical devices enhance rhythm and memorability, while signalling the comprehensiveness of the educational mandate. The recurrent metaphor of “cultivate” evokes an agricultural process, implying both natural growth and guided shaping, thus underscoring the institution’s role in the educational outcomes. In the phrases “value shaping, knowledge imparting, and ability cultivation”, with value shaping at first, the lexical sequence demonstrates the priority placed on ideological orientation over other purposes, where morality cultivation is the essence of education. There are many impersonal expressions in the passage, as seen in “It is essential to integrally merge ...” and “This helps students develop...”. This construction obscures the agents behind the action, naturalising the duty and purpose of education. Overall, the textual construction is formal, abstract, and

prescriptive. It discursively constructs moral education as the ultimate criterion of China's higher education and naturalises the integration of moral-political instruction into the broader aims of cultivating talent in all disciplines.

In the aspect of discourse practice, the policy production is not neutral; it is shaped by historical continuities in Chinese educational traditions. Lide Shuren signifies the Confucian emphasis on education, reflecting traditional Chinese moral philosophy. In terms of text distribution, the documents are disseminated through multiple channels, including television, radio, print, and the internet. Media channels, as influential intermediaries, not only distribute policy documents but also actively frame them. During the process, the authority is reinforced rather than contested. When the core ideological imperatives are transmitted from national mandates to disciplinary and local requirements, during a process of discursive recontextualization, the state's strategic vision is strengthened. When it comes to higher education institutions, the abstract policy will be reproduced into concrete policies, syllabi, and curriculum design. In the classroom, college English teachers are socialised into interpreting and enacting the policy. In academic conferences and publications, scholars and teachers discuss their theoretical and practical implications. This multi-level distribution ensures that the policy message permeates across administrative, pedagogical, and scholarly spaces, reinforcing its authority through repetition and institutionalisation.

In the terms of socialcultural context, the policy text underscores China's effort to realign higher education with national strategic goals. It reflects the contemporary ideological, political, and educational landscape of China. By posing the question of "Whom to cultivate, how to cultivate them, and for whom to cultivate them", the policy stresses the political and moral orientation of education. At a sociocultural level, this national policy text positions higher education as an essential means for promoting national rejuvenation through talent cultivation. At the global level, China's higher education system faces pressures of internationalisation and competition. The initiative can be seen as a response to such pressures. By branding ideological and political education with courses, China asserts a form of cultural sovereignty in the face of Western educational models. The findings demonstrate the state's focus on strengthening ideological consensus, promoting cultural confidence, and aligning higher education with the goal of national rejuvenation.

Policy Content: Specifying Ideological Curricula

National Orientation

Extract 2:

"The content of the Kecheng Sizheng should closely focus on strengthening students' ideals and beliefs, with love for the CPC, the country, socialism, the people, and the collective as the main line. Centring around political identity, family and country feelings, cultural literacy, constitutional rule of law awareness and moral accomplishment, systematic education should be carried out on socialism with Chinese characteristics and the Chinese Dream, core socialist values, rule of law education, labour education, mental health education, and excellent traditional Chinese culture education.....It is necessary to integrate professional knowledge education to guide students in deeply understanding core socialist values and consciously carrying forward the excellent traditional Chinese culture, revolutionary culture, and advanced socialist culture." (Outlines)

At the textual analysis level, strong normative vocabulary dominates the passage, such as “should closely focus,” and “systematic education should be carried out”. This modality positions the policy as prescriptive and leaves little room for alternative interpretations. Phrases such as “love for the CPC, the country, socialism, the people and the collective” explicitly require political loyalty from talents. Contents including “political identity, family and country feelings, cultural literacy, constitutional rule of law awareness and moral accomplishment” combine cultural, political and moral dimensions into a unified educational purpose.

In terms of discourse practice, the passage is part of an authoritative policy discourse produced by the state and educational authorities. It is disseminated through multiple channels—policy documents, university regulations, teaching guidelines—ensuring penetration into every discipline, including college English education. Teachers and students are positioned as both recipients and reproducers of ideology. Teachers must reinterpret these directives into course content and pedagogy, while students are expected to internalise the values through participation in the curriculum and campus culture.

Socioculturally, the passage reflects China’s current sociopolitical climate, where higher education serves as an important place for strengthening identity and unity awareness. The explicit linkage of personal ideals with national ideology exemplifies education’s role in ideological reproduction. The inclusion of excellent traditional Chinese culture alongside core socialist values shows an attempt to combine cultural heritage with socialist modernity. By integrating mental health education and labour education, the policy aligns with the government’s concern for producing healthy citizens who are prepared for social contribution and national rise. In doing so, the text reflects the broader sociocultural practice of using education as a mechanism for ideological reproduction and social cohesion in contemporary China.

Disciplinary Recontextualization

Extract 3:

“College English courses should cultivate students' ability to understand and interpret Chinese culture, serving the international dissemination of Chinese culture. The core of humanism is to be people-oriented, promoting human values and emphasising the cultivation of students' comprehensive quality and well-rounded development. Socialist Core Values should be organically integrated into the teaching content of college English.... College English teaching should proactively integrate into the institutions' Kecheng Sizheng teaching system, playing a significant role in fulfilling the fundamental task of Lide Shuren in higher education institutions.” (Guidelines)

At the textual level, the policy passage employs strongly normative and prescriptive language, most notably through repeated use of the modal verb “should,” which constructs the stated objectives of college English as obligatory rather than optional. Lexical choices such as “cultivate,” “serve,” “organically integrate,” and “play a significant role” emphasise intentionality and responsibility, framing college English teaching as an active instrument for achieving broader educational and ideological goals. The phrase “organically integrated” is particularly noteworthy, as it naturalises the incorporation of ideological content into language teaching, downplaying its constructed and policy-driven nature. Grammatically, the

text frequently assigns agency to abstract entities such as “college English courses” and “college English teaching,” while teachers and students remain largely implicit. This grammatical pattern shifts responsibility from individual actors to the curriculum itself, presenting ideological integration as an inherent attribute of the course.

At the level of discursive practice, the passage demonstrates interdiscursivity. College English is discursively recontextualised from a communicative skills course into a vehicle for cultural representation and ideological guidance, particularly through the framing of English as serving the “international dissemination of Chinese culture.” This recontextualization employs the global language role of English to advance national cultural objectives. While humanism is traditionally associated with individual-centred educational values, in the policy text, it is rearticulated within a socialist ideological framework. The requirement that college English “proactively integrate into the institutions’ *Kecheng Sizheng* teaching system” reflects a top-down circulation of discourse, whereby national ideological priorities are embedded into subject-specific guidelines and subsequently transmitted to institutional and classroom levels. In this process, pedagogical discourse becomes a key site for the reproduction of policy ideology.

From a sociocultural perspective, this policy discourse must be situated within the broader context of strengthened ideological governance in Chinese higher education in the New Era. The passage reflects the state’s strategic effort to ensure that English education contributes to the fundamental task of Lide Shuren. By redefining college English teaching as a carrier of cultural confidence, moral education, and socialist values, the policy aligns language education with national development and ideological reproduction. English, a language historically associated with Western modernity and globalisation, is re-signified as a means to enhance China’s cultural soft power and international discourse capacity. Overall, the policy exemplifies how macro-level ideology is embedded naturally into the everyday practices of English education in higher education.

Policy Implementation: Operationalising Ideological Integration

Extract 4:

“In the selection of teaching materials, Socialist Core Values and excellent traditional Chinese culture should be consciously integrated, so as to guide students in establishing a correct worldview, outlook on life, and values. The selection of teaching materials should be grounded in China while oriented toward the world, broaden horizons, draw on the strengths of diverse traditions, and make use of the advantages of college English courses to timely reflect the latest developments in global science and technology and absorb outstanding achievements of human civilization, thereby providing strong support for cultivating talents with forward-looking thinking and an international perspective.” (Guidelines)

At the textual level, the passage employs strong deontic modality, particularly through the repeated use of “should,” constructing expectations regarding teaching materials and teachers as normative obligations. Ideologically salient lexical items such as “socialist core values,” “excellent traditional Chinese culture,” “correct worldview, outlook on life, and values,” function as condensed ideological signifiers. The material selection discourse combines moral–political vocabulary with terms associated with globalisation and modernisation, such as “international perspective,” “global science and technology,” and

“human civilisation,” producing a hybrid evaluative framework. Grammatically, abstract entities “teaching materials” are foregrounded as responsible agents, while institutional constraints and contextual challenges are backgrounded, presenting ideological integration as self-evident.

From the perspective of discursive practice, the extract exhibits clear interdiscursivity. Teaching materials are recontextualised from neutral instructional resources into carriers of moral guidance, national culture, and global vision. The discourse of “grounded in China while oriented toward the world” reconciles nationalism with globalisation.

At the sociocultural level, these policy statements reflect the broader context of ideological guidance in Chinese higher education under the framework of Lide Shuren. The integration of socialist values and traditional culture into college English education materials illustrates how curriculum content supports moral cultivation and cultural confidence. Within the context of college English, a discipline traditionally associated with Western knowledge and global communication, these discourses re-signify English education as a strategic site for ideological reproduction, cultural transmission, and national development.

Taken together, the policy text constructs college English as a value-oriented and ideologically embedded component of higher education rather than a purely skills-based language course. College English is redefined as a strategic site for integrating Socialist Core Values, cultivating cultural confidence, and serving the international dissemination of Chinese culture under the overarching goal of Lide Shuren. In terms of teaching content, textbooks and learning materials are explicitly positioned as carriers of moral guidance, traditional Chinese culture, and global knowledge, reconciling national ideological orientation with international vision and scientific advancement.

The theme of implementation highlighted the tensions between central mandates and local institutional practices. While the documents articulate implementation strategies, the discourse often glosses over practical challenges, including teachers’ professional competence, pedagogical autonomy, and students’ reception. Implementation is thus discursively framed as a matter of compliance and responsibility, yet it implicitly relies on the interpretive agency of institutions and educators to translate policy imperatives into classroom realities.

Social Actors: Positioning College English Teachers in Ideological Education

Social actors are individuals or collectives that participate in social practices and are represented in texts. Critical discourse analysis highlights how texts construct social actors—individuals and institutions—and how these constructions reflect power relations, responsibilities, and ideological priorities (Van Leeuwen, 2008; Fairclough, 1995; Wodak, 2015). In the context of *Kecheng Sizheng*, we will examine how the social actor, college English teachers, are discursively represented.

Extract 5:

“Enhancing teachers’ awareness and capacity for integrated ideological and political education in the curriculum is essential. Teachers are the key to comprehensively advancing the construction of ideological and political education in the curriculum.... It is essential to

fully leverage the primary role of teachers, effectively enhancing their enthusiasm and initiative in participating in the construction of ideological and political education in the curriculum.” (Outlines)

Extract 6:

“College English teachers should continuously engage in learning and take the initiative to improve themselves, striving to become 'Four-Have' good teachers of the New Era—teachers who have firm ideals and beliefs, noble moral sentiments, solid professional knowledge, and a benevolent heart.” (Guidelines)

At the textual level, the extracts are characterised by strong deontic modality and evaluative language, constructing teachers’ roles as normative obligations. Recurrent expressions such as “is essential,” “must,” and “are the key” foreground necessity and authority. Teachers are explicitly nominated and activated as central agents, while abstract qualities—such as “awareness,” “capacity,” “enthusiasm,” and “initiative”—are emphasised, framing ideological competence as an internal professional attribute. The moralised lexicon of the “Four Have” good teachers shifts the focus from pedagogical skills to ethical self-cultivation. Grammatically, teachers are both agents of action and objects of expectation, revealing a dual positioning that combines responsibility with obligation.

From the perspective of discursive practice, the extracts illustrate a clear process of discursive circulation and recontextualization across policy levels. The national-level discourse *Outlines* frames teachers’ primary role of *Kecheng Sizheng*, establishing ideological legitimacy and professional obligation. This discourse is further specified at the disciplinary level in *Guidelines*, where general ideological expectations are translated into subject-specific norms for college English teachers through the “Four Have” framework.

At the sociocultural level, the construction of teachers in these policy texts reflects broader trends in the governance of higher education in contemporary China, where ideological alignment and moral responsibility are integral to teacher professionalism. Teachers are positioned as both transmitters and embodiments of ideological values, particularly within *Kecheng Sizheng*. This reflects the state’s broader effort to ensure ideological consistency and moral authority within higher education through the strategic positioning of teachers as key social actors.

The findings regarding the “activation” and “instrumental agency” of teachers in *Kecheng Sizheng* reflect a broader international trend identified in critical policy studies. Similar to the “fantasies of empowerment” described by Wright (2012) in Western contexts, the policy discourse in China positions teachers as central actors while simultaneously constraining their autonomy through what Power (1997) calls the “audit society.” The pervasive use of deontic modality and evaluative vocabulary creates a monitored space where teachers must perform “enthusiasm” within a rigid ideological framework. This suggests that modern educational governance relies on the discursive regulation of professional identity to ensure policy compliance. (Fairclough, 1995; Van Leeuwen, 2008; Wodak, 2015).

Synthesis: Mechanisms of Discursive Governance

This study has undertaken a critical discourse analysis of the *Kecheng Sizheng* policy directive in the Chinese college English education landscape, with a particular focus on how language, discourse, and ideology interplay and shape the trajectory of college English education. By integrating insights from international critical policy analysis (Anderson & Holloway, 2018), this study moves beyond a descriptive account of *Kecheng Sizheng* and uncovers both the underlying rationalities of state discourse and the mechanisms by which such discourse is recontextualised into college English education practices.

Across these four themes, *Kecheng Sizheng* policy documents demonstrate how educational governance operates through discourse. Naturalisation through grammatical erasure. By employing nominalisation, passive constructions, and impersonal modality, policies present ideological requirements as self-evident educational goods rather than contested political projects. "Value shaping" appears as a natural educational outcome, obscuring questions about which values and whose interests they serve. College English teachers are discursively positioned as implementing agents whose professional autonomy is circumscribed by the mandate of ideological compliance. These mechanisms illuminate how language policy operates through discursive construction of educational purposes, pedagogical practices, and subject positions that naturalise state ideology as educational necessity.

Conclusion

This study has analysed China's policy documents of moral education endeavour, *Kecheng Sizheng*, within the college English context, through Fairclough's three-dimensional CDA framework. It reveals how language constructs ideological imperatives within Chinese higher education governance. Our analysis demonstrates that these policies function as instruments of discursive governance, embedding ideology and power within ostensibly administrative texts. Through strategic linguistic choices, grammatical structures, and rhetorical strategies, the policies naturalise political objectives as educational necessities and mandate educational actors to uphold ideological compliance. Understanding these different governance modalities requires attention to how policy discourse constructs educational purposes, legitimate knowledge, and subject positions. We demonstrate how CDA illuminates mechanisms through which states govern education through discourse. By naturalising ideological requirements as self-evident educational goods, policies secure compliance while maintaining the appearance of professional autonomy. We show how policy discourse recontextualises global educational discourses, redirecting them toward state-defined ideological objectives. We reveal how educational policies construct subject positions. Teachers are simultaneously empowered as "key" actors and constrained by evaluation mechanisms.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

Due to the limited resources, the study was constrained to policy document analysis and did not cover stakeholders' attitudes and classroom practices. Methodologically, future investigations could benefit from triangulation by combining policy analysis, teacher and student perspectives, and classroom observations (Bowen, 2009). This would connect macro-level policy discourse with meso- and micro-level practices, offering a more comprehensive picture of how ideological education is enacted in higher education. It is advisable to investigate the perceptions and practices of college English teachers. Teachers serve as the

mediators between national policy and classroom instruction, yet their interpretations and strategies may or may not diverge from policy prescriptions (Brain et al., 2006). Surveys can provide insights into this, and interviews could capture instructors' nuanced views. Such work would illuminate how teachers negotiate the integration of ideological content with English language teaching, highlighting both opportunities and challenges in implementation. Students' perspectives also merit closer attention. As the ultimate recipients of *Kecheng Sizheng*, students' attitudes toward its presence in English courses are crucial for evaluating its effectiveness. Research has shown that students' perceptions can strongly influence their engagement and learning outcomes (Lamb, 2017). Research could examine how students perceive the blending of ideological education with language learning, how it shapes their cultural identity and motivation, and whether they find it empowering or constraining.

In sum, this thesis demonstrates how China's moral education endeavour, *Kecheng Sizheng*, is discursively constructed within the college English context at the policy level. Future research should explore its lived dimensions within universities. By examining teachers' and students' perceptions and practices through interviews, surveys, and classroom-based studies, scholars can extend the analysis from official texts to educational realities. Such research would deepen our understanding of the dynamics between language, ideology, and education, and contribute to broader debates in applied linguistics and language policy.

References

- Anderson, K. T., & Holloway, J. (2018). Discourse analysis as theory, method, and epistemology in studies of education policy. *Journal of Education Policy*, 33(2), 188–214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2018.1552992>
- Bacchi, C. (2000). Policy as discourse: What's the problem represented to be? *Magill's Choice*, 1(1), 45–57.
- Ball, S. J. (1993). What is policy? Texts, trajectories and toolboxes. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 13(2), 10-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0159630930130203>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Brain, K., Reid, I., & Comerford Boyes, L. (2006). Teachers as mediators between educational policy and practice. *Educational Studies*, 32(4), 411–423. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055690600850396>
- English, R. (2019). First they came for the unschoolers: A Faircloughian critical discourse analysis of Queensland home education policies. *Journal of Unschooling and Alternative Learning*, 13(26), 14-47.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2009). A dialectical-relational approach to critical discourse analysis in social research. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 162–186). Sage.
- Fan, Q. Z., Huang, Y., & Jiang, K. (2023). Content characteristics, tool preferences, and optimisation suggestions for curriculum ideological and political education policies. *Chongqing Higher Education Research*, 11(4), 79–89. <https://link.oversea.cnki.net/doi/10.15998/j.cnki.issn1673-8012.2023.04.007>

- Gabriel, R., & Lester, J. N. (2013). Sentinels of Trust: the discursive construction of Value-added Measurement in policy conversations. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 20(9). Retrieved from: <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/1165>
- Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. Routledge.
- Gee, J. P. (2008). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (3rd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203944806>
- Gee, J. P. (2011). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Khan, M. A., & Zaki, S. (2022). Corpus Assisted Critical Discourse Analysis of Pakistan's Language Education Policy Documents: What are the Existing Language Ideologies? *Sage Open*, 12(3), 21582440221121805. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221121805>
- Koyama, J., & Chang, E. (2019). Schools as refuge? The politics and policy of educating refugees in Arizona. *Educational Policy*, 33(1), 136-157. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904818807319>
- Lamb, M. (2017). The motivational dimension of language teaching. *Language Teaching*, 50(3), 301–346. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000088>
- Lemke, J. L. (1992). Intertextuality and educational research. *Linguistics and Education*, 4, 257–267. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0898-5898\(92\)90003-F](https://doi.org/10.1016/0898-5898(92)90003-F)
- Lester, J. N., Lochmiller, C. R., & Gabriel, R. (2016). Locating and applying critical discourse analysis within education policy. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 24, 102. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.24.2768>
- Li, Y. (2025). Relevance, balance and adaptation: Research on the optimisation of curriculum ideological and political education in colleges and universities from the perspective of policy tools. *Journal of Kunming University of Science and Technology (Social Sciences)*, 25(3), 132–142. <https://link.oversea.cnki.net/doi/10.16112/j.cnki.53-1160/c.2025.03.153>
- Liu, P., & Li, X. Y. (2023). Subject trend, transmutation characteristics and prospect of curriculum ideology and politics: An NVivo analysis based on policy texts. *Journal of Shijiazhuang University*, 25(5), 22–28. <https://link.oversea.cnki.net/doi/10.13573/j.cnki.sjzxyxb.2023.05.009>
- Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China. (2020). *Outlines for the Construction of Kecheng Sizheng in Higher Education Institutions*. http://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A08/s7056/202006/t20200603_462437.html
- Parker, L. (2019). Deconstructing growing success: A critical discourse analysis of Ontario's assessment policy. *Critical Education*, 10(14). <https://doi.org/10.14288/ce.v10i14.186326>
- Power, M. (1997). *The audit society: Rituals of verification*. Oxford University Press.
- Ren, S. (2023). Neoliberalization of higher education in China: A critical discourse analytical approach. *Language & Communication*, 90, 41-51.
- Rogers, R. (2008). Critical discourse analysis in education. In M. Martin-Jones, A. M. de Mejía, & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopaedia of language and education* (2nd ed., Vol. 3, pp. 53–68). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_61
- Shi, J. (2016). *English language education policy in China: A CDA and ethnographic study* (Doctoral dissertation, Newcastle University).
- Spring, J. (2015). *Globalisation of education: An introduction*. Routledge.

- Taylor, S. (2004). Researching educational policy and change in 'new times': Using critical discourse analysis. *Journal of Education Policy*, 19(4), 433–451. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0268093042000227483>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and power*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and practice: New tools for critical discourse analysis*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195323306.001.0001>
- Vidovich, L. (2007). Removing policy from its pedestal: Some theoretical framings and practical possibilities. *Educational Review*, 59(3), 285–298. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131910701427231>
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Methods of critical discourse studies* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Wright, A. (2012). Fantasies of empowerment: Mapping neoliberal discourse in the Coalition government's schools policy. *Journal of Education Policy*, 27(3), 279–294. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2011.607516>
- Woo, E. (2022). Narrating the Belt and Road Education Policy: A Critical Policy Discourse Analysis. *Higher Education Policy*, 1. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41307-022-00279-9>
- Xi, J. P. (2016). President Xi calls for strengthened ideological work in colleges. *People's Daily*, 1. <https://en.people.cn/n3/2016/1208/c90000-9152526.html>
- Zheng, H. Y. (2023). Enactment defects and its improvement strategies of policy tool use in college curriculum ideological and political education. *Heilongjiang Researches on Higher Education*, 8, 141–147. <https://link.oversea.cnki.net/doi/10.19903/j.cnki.cn23-1074/g.2023.08.017>