

# An exploratory study of the idea of an Auxiliary Universal Language

by

Mojdeh Majidi, B. A.

A thesis submitted to

The Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Art

School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies

Carleton University  
Ottawa, Canada

© 2007, Mojdeh Majidi

## **Abstract**

We live in an increasingly interconnected world where the growing movements of ideas, goods, information, money and people across national boundaries and technological advancements have led to the urgent need to have a common secondary language to partake in the global community. This study intends to extend the literature on the idea of an Auxiliary Universal Language (AUL), to explore the features of an AUL, and to discuss the rationale and feasibility of language planning of an AUL. It is in addition my intention to try to find answers for how it can actually be planned through international planning.

To explore the idea of an AUL and answer the research questions I used two resources. First, after re-examining the literature and extending the literature on Language Policy and Planning I present a tentative model for language planning of an AUL. Second, to strengthen the conclusions from the first resource I conducted two sets of interviews to find out how my research participants who were thirteen graduate students in School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies at Carleton University could contribute to this exploratory study.

## **Acknowledgments**

I would like to express my gratitude to all those who gave me the possibility to complete this thesis. First, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Professor Lynne Young for supervising my study, providing constructive feedback and offering direction whenever I needed it. She encouraged me and gave me the support and confidence to accomplish my Master's degree, which seemed impossible when I first started this journey. I would also like to acknowledge the illuminating lectures of Professor Eve Haque on different issues involved in Language Policy and Planning that gave me new insights on how to address my research questions. Also I would want to thank her for agreeing to be on my thesis committee. I would also like to extend my gratitude to Professor Graham Smart who agreed to be on my thesis committee. I would also like to thank Professor Natasha Artemeva who not only broadened my view of language and language use in society, but also helped me to believe in myself and pursue my passions to do research. I am also grateful of Mr. Jaffer Sheyholislami whose questions and concerns about the subject of the thesis deepened my understanding of it. I also thank the research participants whose ideas supplement my exploratory study. I am also grateful of my father and my mother whose support and encouragement has always been there, in particular my mother who over the last ten years has always been with me in spirit. I would like to give my special thanks to my husband Ramin Malakoti whose insightful opinions about the subject of my thesis and also his support, patience, encouragement and love enabled me to complete this work.

# Table of contents

Abstract .....	ii
Acknowledgement .....	iii
Table of contents.....	iv
<b>1 INTORODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2 LITERATURE REVIEW.....</b>	<b>8</b>
2. 1 Introduction.....	8
2. 2 Reviewed resources.....	10
2. 2. 1 The literature on AUL itself.....	10
2. 2. 2 Esperanto.....	35
2. 2. 2. 1 History of Esperanto.....	35
2. 2. 2. 2 The literature on Esperanto.....	40
2. 2. 3 English.....	46
2. 2. 3. 1 Positive views.....	47
2. 2. 3. 2 Mixed views.....	53
2. 2. 3. 3 Negative views.....	60
2. 2. 4 Language Policy and Planning .....	82
<b>3 SEARCHING FOR ANSWERS.....</b>	<b>105</b>
3. 1 Introduction.....	105
3. 2 The research participants.....	108
3. 3 Re-examining the literature.....	110
3. 3. 1 Answers to the first research question.....	111
3. 3. 2 Answers to the second research question.....	125
3. 3. 2. 1 Answers from the literature on AUL.....	126
3. 3. 2. 2 Answers from the literature on English.....	130
3. 3. 2. 3 Answers from the literature on Esperanto.....	131
3. 3. 2. 4 Answers from the literature on Language Policy and Planning...134	
3. 3. 2. 4. 1 A tentative model for the language planning of an AUL...135	
1) Status planning.....	135
2) Corpus planning.....	144

3) Education planning.....	145
3. 4 Interviews.....	154
3. 4. 1 The first set of interviews.....	156
3. 4. 2 The second set of interviews (follow-up questions).....	174
<b>4 CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>187</b>
4. 1 Concluding remarks.....	187
4. 2 Limitations of the study and directions for future research.....	198
References.....	203
Appendix A: The Bahá'í perspective on an AUL.....	210
Appendix B: The first set of interviews.....	220
Appendix C: The second set of interviews (follow-up questions).....	221

# Chapter 1: Introduction

We live in an era in which societies are not any longer isolated (De Swaan, 2001). Although “intercultural contacts are as old as humanity itself”, in the last two or three decades they have extended and increased to such an extent that we cannot imagine the world without these social, economic, and political interconnections (Hofstede, 2001, p. 423). And there is an increasing need and desire to be part of this network of interconnection and to be a member of the global community whether as an individual or as a collective, although this membership has a more material and economic aspect to it than a moral or spiritual one. As Tomlinson (1999) puts it, local life is increasingly tied up with “global structures, processes and events” in order to be part of the global economy (p. 25).

In the last few decades we have witnessed the fact that the diverse range of human affairs has gained a global aspect so that different social, economic, and political issues tied to human life are not any longer individual or even national issues but global matters that need to be discussed in the global arenas. And of course technology and material advances, in particular communication technologies, have had a tremendous role in contributing and giving rise to global interconnection, and also in facilitating it in terms of providing both live and virtual communication in which geographical and political boundaries are blurred and further communication with people at the other side of the world is not any longer a dream. As Dunn (1995) puts it, “the technologies have brought once remote regions of the world into on-going daily contact, in effect dramatically contracting old conceptions of time and distance” (p. xi) so that politically defined geographical boundaries are becoming less important.

But the question is how can we actually participate in those interconnections? What can be the best means or tools to be able to go beyond our speech community and fulfill different communicative purposes both as an individual and as a collective with other individuals or collectives? The fact is that these “relations of power, trade, migration and cultural exchange” in which “all human groups on the globe engage”, or at least try to engage, are “necessarily embedded in language,” which is the most significant and frequently used means of communication among human beings (De Swaan, 2001, p. 177). But how many languages should or could we learn to fulfill our different communicative purposes? Can we learn all the world languages or at least those different languages that we need? Or should we spend an enormous amount of time and energy on transplanting information into almost 6912 languages in the world as last estimated in 2005 by Ethnologue, which is an encyclopedic reference work cataloging all of the world’s living languages? Even if we could, that would be very difficult and would imply investing a large amount of human and financial resources. Another option that has been suggested by many philosophers and linguists from the seventeenth century (e.g., Descartes 1629 and Montesquieu, 1728 as cited in Brown, 1991) to the present (e.g., Sapir, 1925; Lauwerys, 1946; Pei, 1968; Phillipson, 1992; Eco, 1995; Harrison, 2000; Meyjes, 2006) is that an Auxiliary Universal Language (AUL) could be adopted to solve the problem of language barriers, a common language that everyone in the world could learn as auxiliary or secondary to his or her mother tongue to be able to communicate with speakers of other languages. In fact, as argued in the literature, adoption of an AUL would be the solution to the problem of the language barrier facing every human being, in particular at the present time in human history.

But the question is what the features of an AUL are. Do we already have an AUL that has those features? If not, should we get one? And how can we do it? It was these concerns that initially encouraged me to dedicate my master's thesis to exploring the idea of an AUL in which I made an attempt to answer two research questions: 1) what is an AUL and what is its main purpose? 2) What is the best possible method to adopt an AUL and implement it globally?

And of course I have to mention that as a Bahá'í individual, long before doing my master's thesis on exploring the idea of an AUL I read about the idea of an AUL as emphasized in The Kitab-i Aqdas, which is the holy book in the Bahá'í Faith, and other Bahá'í writings. And in fact, it was the Bahá'í writings on the idea of an AUL that first inspired me to begin this study. I realized, however, that I needed to stand back and distance myself from the study to be sure I was being thoroughly self-reflective, I decided that it was necessary to separate the Bahá'í writings from the other research by putting the former into a separate section, Appendix A.

Since this exploratory study was a learning process, I would go through one stage and then realized the need to go to the other stage. When I first started the study, to find out what had already been said with regard to the idea of an AUL, its nature, its purpose and the plan to have one I reviewed the literature. There were four different though interconnected resources that I reviewed. They were different in the sense that each discussed and shed light on the different aspects associated with the idea of an AUL. And they were interrelated in the sense that if viewed as a whole, they could provide a holistic picture of the idea of an AUL in which different issues involved in it are more or less discussed.

The first set of resources in the literature review I focused on was on the idea of an AUL itself. Through reviewing this set of literature I intended to find out what had been already said with regard to the definition of an AUL, its functions, its purpose and also its means of adoption. As a second resource, I reviewed the literature on Esperanto because I realized that most often in the literature on AUL scholars promoted the idea that constructed languages be adopted as an AUL instead of a natural one and referred to Esperanto as the most well-known constructed language that is still live and has thousands of speakers all around the world. So, not only did I want to know more about Esperanto itself, but also I wanted to know what its status was as an AUL.

After reviewing these two sets of literature, in particular the literature on AUL I realized that in many cases scholars focused on the choice of an AUL and about whether it should be a current natural language or a constructed one, rather than providing a comprehensive discussion of the idea of an AUL itself. In addition, I found that although they talked about an AUL as something desirable and beneficial for human beings, only a few of them discussed though briefly how it could be adopted or how we could have an AUL. Therefore, as a result of the review I realized that although the idea of an AUL has long been the subject of discussion in academia, it has never been fully examined, which is another reason for my exploratory study.

In the process of reviewing the literature I also realized that another research issue that I needed to address would be whether English is an AUL or not. While I was reviewing the literature on AUL I came across many arguments that English is not suitable to become an AUL and that having it as an easy fix for the language barriers in the world would not solve the problem fundamentally. However, I found that contrary to

such arguments and oppositions English is already wide spread and is the only language known as an most international language at the present. So, I wondered if English was actually an AUL or not. Did it have the qualities and features expected of an AUL as described in the literature or not? Thus I reviewed the literature on English as an International Language (EIL) in an attempt to gain a clear picture of the status of English to be able to identify the problems associated with the current situation of English as well as a possible solution if there is any. In fact, I had the impression that discussing the idea of an AUL, in particular its international planning, would be logical, acceptable and useful if there was a problem with the current situation of English as an AUL. After reviewing the literature on English, I found that there were so many critical views about English and that the literature strongly suggested that there were many problems associated with English spread and the forces that have contributed to its dominance. However, similar to the scholars in the first set of the literature, the scholars in this field except for a few (e.g., Pennycook, 1994, 1995; Phillipson, 1992, 2001) did not provide a solution to solve the numerous problems associated with English spread although they questioned the status of English as an international language and presented a thorough description of the negative aspects associated with it.

Therefore, after reviewing the literature I realized that there is still a huge gap in the literature in terms of how the problem of language barriers can actually be removed through international planning and decision-making. I also realized that the answer to this question could actually be an answer to the increasing need to be able to communicate globally, which is now partially fulfilled by English, a language that is largely perceived as the language of modernity, social and economic development and thus prosperity

compared with native languages that are increasingly losing their functions and value in the face of English. In fact, reviewing the literature on EIL led me to the view that although English may act as an AUL, its status and means of spread are not in accordance with what the scholars describe as the features of an AUL, its uncontrolled dominance is a threat to people's linguistic rights to learn and use their native languages as well as to cultural diversity which is of great importance for sustainable social and economic development and thus advancement of human civilization.

In an attempt to investigate how an AUL could be adopted through international planning I also reviewed the literature on Language Policy and Planning (LPP). I intended to find out whether scholars in that field had ever discussed the Language Planning (LP) of an AUL. What I found were a few brief references (Haugen, 1972 and Tauli, 1974) to the LP of an AUL as a branch of LPP. However, none of them provided a thorough discussion of the issue.

Therefore, in order to explore the idea of an AUL further and answer the research questions, as the first approach I re-examined the literature itself and extended the literature on LPP. In fact, I looked at the literature to put together bits and pieces that had been presented in different fields as a way to define an AUL, identify its purpose and discuss its international explicit planning. I used LPP as a framework and presented a tentative plan for the LP of an AUL. As a second approach, to strengthen the answers provided by the literature and to get some ideas from educated fellow students involved in EIL by virtue of being students in SLALS – where language in use receives so much focus – I conducted interviews with thirteen graduate students in SLALS at Carleton University. In the first set of interviews (Appendix B), I focused on ten student

participants' views about EIL, which led to the idea of an AUL in general and asked about how an AUL could be adopted. In the follow-up questions (Appendix C) I mainly focused on the LP of an AUL that had turned out to be the main gap in the literature and interviewed three other students who had some explicit knowledge of LPP as well as social planning in general.

In Chapter 2, first I will review the literature on AUL focusing on four sets of literature: 1) the literature on AUL itself, 2) the literature on Esperanto, 3) the literature on EIL, and finally 4) the literature on LPP.

In Chapter 3, "Searching for answers", I will use two sets of resources - the literature and the interviews - to answer to the research questions. First, I will re-examine the four sets of literature and then extend the literature on LPP as a model and apply it to the language planning of an AUL and discuss different aspects associated with it. Second, I will review the interviews and analyze them to find out what the research participants contributed to the idea of an AUL.

In Chapter 4, I will briefly restate the purpose of the study, the research questions, and the two approaches adopted to explore the idea of an AUL. Then I will draw conclusions about the findings. I will end with limitations of this exploratory study and suggest some directions for future research.

## **Chapter 2: Literature review**

### **2.1 Introduction**

In my search to find what has already been done or discussed on the idea of an Auxiliary Universal Language (AUL), I learned that since the seventeenth century the idea of an international language has been the theme of discussions in many academic books and articles that I will review in the following paragraphs.

When I first started to search and study the resources on the idea of an AUL, I used different key words such as “universal language”, “global language”, international language”, “common language”, and “auxiliary universal language”. Indeed, my choices of the key words were based on the fact that I realized that there is not only one term used by scholars to define the idea of an AUL. “Global language” (Crystal, 1997), “international language” (e.g., Crystal, 1997), “an international auxiliary language” (e.g., Eco, 1995; Sapir, 1925) and “an artificial international language” (Jespersen, 1928) are some of the terms that I encountered while reviewing the literature on an AUL. What all these terms seem to share is the notion that an AUL is the language through which people from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds from all around the world can communicate and exchange ideas. It is the language that can remove one of the most problematic issues in human life, the language barrier. However, these terms differ in the sense that each refers to a different language or a different kind of language as an AUL and thus each discusses the idea of an AUL from a different perspective and sheds light on different aspects of an AUL. For example, when Crystal (1997) talks about an international language he explicitly refers to English. Sapir (1925), on the other hand,

uses the terms “an international auxiliary language” to refer to and promote constructed languages rather than a natural language to be adopted as an AUL.

Based on the different terminology that I found in the literature and what scholars have considered as an AUL, why and how such a language can be adopted and spread and what should be its main characteristics, I learned that the scholarship could be categorized into three groups. Scholars in the first group (e.g., Sapir, 1925; Jespersen, 1928; Eco, 1995; Harrison, 2001) talk about the idea of an AUL in general. They promote it as something that is theoretically desirable and thus beneficial to solve the problem of language barriers. Focusing on the choice of an AUL, the majority of them emphasizes and discusses the advantages of artificial or constructed languages compared with natural languages. In the second group the scholars (e.g. Reed, 1968; Janton, 1993, Eco, 1995, Li, 2003) specifically focus on Esperanto as the most famous constructed language invented to be used as an AUL.

The third and largest group of resources examines EIL. Contrary to Sapir’s (1925) prediction, which I will shortly review, it now is evident that English is the most widely used language in technology, science, academia, trade and even every day life all around the world and it is the only language known as an international language. Thus, in the last few decades scholars have examined aspects related to English as an international language rather than specifically the idea of an AUL itself. These scholars can be divided into three groups based on their approach towards English: positive views, negative views and mixed views. First I will review the ones who have positive or liberal views towards English such as Kachru (1992) and Canagarajah (2000); that will be followed with scholars (e.g. Crystal, 1997, 2000; Graddol 1997) who have mixed ideas towards

English. And finally, I will review the scholars such as Phillipson (1992, 2000) and Pennycook (1994, 1995) who have critical views about English.

In addition to the literature on the idea of an AUL I will also review the literature on LPP as a general framework that can be extended and used to promote and adopt an AUL. In fact, the activities involved in LPP that are mostly focused on policy formulations and implementations at the national level can be extended and used as a model to select a language to have the status of an international language that is auxiliary to the mother tongues through international decision and agreement.

## **2. 2 Reviewed resources**

### **2. 2. 1 The literature on AUL itself**

The first group of the resources that I am going to review includes the literature and the scholars who have examined the idea of an AUL in general. I should mention that the majority of the scholars, in particular those in 1920s to 1960s, have focused on artificial or constructed languages as the best possible solution for the selection of an international language and have discussed their benefits compared with natural languages.

Sapir (1925) is the first scholar whose opinions on the idea of an AUL I am going to review. As a well-known linguist he examines the idea of an AUL in his article, *The Functions of an International Auxiliary Language*. He begins his discussion of an AUL by referring to the point that there is little difference of opinion in the theoretical desirability of an international auxiliary language. However, he notes that there are different opinions in terms of the factors that should be taken into account in the solution of language barriers in the world. Considering the expected functions of an international

language he argues the point that adopting English as a quick and easy fix to facilitate the “growing need for international communication” (p. 1) does not solve the language barrier because it will be “at the expense of all other languages” and it may not be “a broad base” for “every type of expression of human being” though it can fulfill the “exigencies of trade and travel” (p. 2). Unfortunately he does not explain in detail the reasons for the inadequacy of English as a broad base. In addition, he argues that not only English but also no national language should serve such a role because “no national language really corresponds in spirit to the analytic and creative spirit of modern times” (p. 6); however, a constructed language has such a simple structure and logic that no national language even English can compete with it.

Sapir’s (1925) second argument in favor of a constructed language deals with the point that psychologically people would have the “attitude of independence toward a constructed language which all national speakers must adopt” because “it is foreign or apparently so to the traditions of all nationalities” (p. 6). And finally, he argues that constructed languages are culturally neutral.

Jespersen (1928) also like his contemporary Sapir (1925) promotes the idea of an international language. Jespersen, who was a Danish linguist and English expert, has made tremendous contributions to the development of English grammar as well as the issue of adoption of an AUL. His book *An international language*, as he puts it, is a “plea for an artificial international auxiliary language” (p. 1). Not only does Jespersen emphasize the need for an AUL as Sapir does, he also clarifies such a need by referring to many situations where people feel language barriers as a serious drawback that do not

allow them to “communicate freely with someone, ask questions, obtain or impart information, etc.” (p. 1).

Unlike Sapir (1925) Jespersen defines what he has meant by the term an artificial international auxiliary language. His definitions in brief are: “Artificial” refers to a language that is “made consciously by one man or group of men opposed to natural languages ...which have been spoken for generations and whose development has chiefly taken place without the individuals being conscious of any changes” (p. 1). “International” means that the language is meant to be used “by individuals who though belonging to different nationalities have something they wanted to communicate to one another” (p. 1). And the term “auxiliary” states that international language is “meant to be only a sort of substitute for national languages whenever these are not capable of serving as means of communication” (p. 1). Such a language, he emphasizes, “should” not “supplant the existing languages” or “infringe the sacred rights of the mother tongue”; however, it should be used “only when two or more persons ignorant of one another’s language had occasion to talk or to write to one another” (p. 1). In fact by defining an AUL Jespersen like Sapir promotes constructed or artificial languages in general.

Lauwerys (1946) like Sapir (1925) and Jespersen (1928) but about twenty years later defends the idea of adopting an auxiliary language as a “matter of real urgency” (p. 1). Lauwerys (1946) who was a Professor of Comparative Education has written many articles on issues such as international co-operation and understanding and comparative education. And his interests in international co-operation and understanding have led him to discuss the subject of an AUL in the preface of the book *On the Choice of a Common Language* by Jacob (1947). Like Sapir (1925) and Jespersen (1928), he promotes the idea

of an AUL. However, his reasons are different from those raised by Sapir and Jespersen. Contrary to the previous scholars he views an international language not as auxiliary to mother tongues but as replacing them all because in his point of view linguistic differences are “merely stultifying” and thus do not make “life richer, subtler” and “more diversified” (p. 1). In other words, he argues that linguistic diversity has no benefit for human beings because it is the result of human beings being cursed since Babel, (an argument not likely to be accepted in academia and academic discourse). Linguistic differences between groups of human beings, as he maintains, are the sources of frustration because people cannot understand each other. He also emphasizes that a common language is the instrument through which all nations can unite and remove their conflicts; an important point that scholars before him seem to have failed to discuss. Indeed, he points out that “the second half of the twentieth century will be the period of the atomic engine and of atomic bomb” (p. 1). Thus, he argues that if nations intend to survive and achieve peace, “the symbol and instrument of their union must be a common language” (p. 1). Though he does not explain sufficiently how an AUL can be a means to achieve unity, his predictions seem to suit the present time in which having a common language is more urgent as one of the means to solve world problems.

Stressing the importance of adopting an AUL in the world after the World War II Lauwerys (1946) refers to obstacles that exist in the choice of which language shall be adopted as the “World Auxiliary” language (p. 1). The first of which, as he argues, is that though English is an “obvious candidate” due to large number of speakers and simplicity, it may not maintain its value by the year 2000 but he provides no reasons for this argument (p. 2). In fact, similar to Sapir (1925) and Jespersen (1928) he argues that

English as an accessible fix would not solve the problem of language barrier. As for the second obstacle, like Sapir (1925) he points out that English or any natural language is difficult to learn compared with constructed languages. Thus, he adds to what Sapir and Jespersen have already suggested that if an “ethnic language is to be universally adopted as an auxiliary, it will have to be in simplified form” (p. 2). Explaining the advantages and disadvantages of two simplified forms of English – Pidgin English and Basic English – he argues that Basic English has not been accepted by all English-speaking countries specially England. Lauwerys (1946) does not explain the reasons for the Basic English not being accepted, but he briefly states, “a few critics seem to think that...its adoption would confer undesirable advantages upon England and the U.S.A.” (p. 2). Then he continues “for the most part...those who are interested in the promotion of an Auxiliary Language, but feel unable to support Basic [English], pin their faith to a constructed language” (p. 2). He is in fact leading the discussion in a way that supports the idea of adopting a constructed language as an AUL as the scholars before him have done.

Palmer and Litt (1947) also like the previous scholars (Sapir, 1925; Jespersen, 1928) and the former contemporary (Lauwerys, 1946) have promoted constructed languages and explained their advantages to be adopted and used as an AUL. These two scholars whose main contributions have been to English language teaching, in the preface of the book *A Planned Auxiliary Language* written by Jacob (1947) discuss ten approaches or rather ten reasons that necessitate and rationalize artificial language construction. I will briefly review these approaches.

In the first, the “universal brotherhood”, the main argument is that “the chief obstacle to universal peace, international entente and cooperation is the lack of a common

language” (p. 1). And Palmer and Litt (1947) argue without providing reasons that since most natural languages are national languages “from their very nature can no more serve as an international language” and that the international language “must be an artificial one” (p. 1).

The second approach is “the road of the delegate” (p. 2) in which they argue that the solution of letting English be the international language in international conferences will cause inequalities because an English speaker will be “forever dispensed from the task of learning foreign languages” and have “the privilege of expressing himself in his mother-tongue to the disadvantage of the others” (p. 2). Therefore, learning an artificial language will remove such inequalities and bring about justice in expression.

In the third, the “road of the language-learner”, they argue that in contrast to artificial languages, natural languages “from their very nature are exceedingly difficult to learn” due to “many unfamiliar speech sounds, irregular spelling ...” (p. 2).

Fourth is “the road of the educationist” (p. 2) according to which “knowledge of almost any foreign language reveals to us our own”. Therefore, as Palmer and Litt (1947) state, those who know only their own native language can know little of other natural languages whatever they be. And the only way to know more about natural languages is through learning artificial languages because the rationality within them can be a guide to discover the rational and irrational parts of the natural languages.

Fifth is “the road of the scientist” in which the main argument is that scientists will benefit from an artificial language within which all the vocabularies are artificially created and there is only one vocabulary for one concept (p. 3).

Sixth is the “road to the code-user” in which the main argument is that just like international commercial codes that are purely artificial it is possible to create all the words of an artificial language that can be used as an international language (p. 4).

Seventh is “the road of the etymologist” which is based on Comparative Etymology studies. Palmer and Litt (1947) argue, “at least 7000 words are more or less common in spelling and meaning to the six chief European languages” (p. 4). And also since most of them have come into these languages by “deliberate acts of creation, borrowing and adaptation”, it is possible to extend the process of borrowing to the remainder of the vocabulary and create an artificial language at the end (p. 4).

Next is the approach of “the word-coiners” which stresses the point that the way word-coiners create new words is similar to the way compilers of artificial language create new words. And also since the only difference between artificial and natural languages lies in the fact that natural languages are partly artificial and artificial languages are completely artificial so there is no priority for natural languages to become an international language.

The road of “the lexicographer” refers to the difficult duty of dictionary compilers in terms of finding synonyms and polysyns and translations in another language that can be solved by creating an artificial language in which one word represents only one meaning and only one meaning is represented by one word (p. 5).

The last approach is the road of “philosophers” whose arguments in favor of artificial languages are similar to those of lexicographers; however, their focus is on creating a “more perfect instrument of thought than are natural languages” (p. 6).

About twenty years after Palmer and Litt (1947), Pei (1968) also discusses the idea of an AUL; however, unlike Palmer and Litt rather than providing reasons for the feasibility of constructing an international language he discusses the reasons why a natural language cannot be selected as an AUL. As an Italian-born American linguist Pei knew about 35 languages, as well as the sentence structures of over 100 more languages. His interests in different languages and preserving linguistic diversity as well as his experience as a language teacher, language consultant and course designer both before and during World War II led him to become interested in the idea of an AUL. Similar to the previous scholars he emphasizes the necessity of a common means of communication for “a world that has grown very small in the course of the last fifty years” – the first half of the twentieth century (p. vii). And as he explains, such a language should be “imparted in all civilized nations from kindergarten on, on a basis of parity with national languages” (p. vii). In other words, instead of people each learning a different second language, he argues, all should learn one common language. In fact, Pei (1968) similar to the previous scholars reviewed, in particular Sapir (1925) and Jespersen (1928), points to the issue of the intentional language as being auxiliary rather than a supplement to native languages. Then he explains there are three problems for natural languages to become a universal language; the first two are new in the literature and had not been discussed by the scholars before him.

His first argument against natural languages is that natural languages are all “dialectalized”; therefore, “if a natural language is selected for international use, it must be given a standard, official form” (p. viii). Such standardization will cause the language to become differentiated from its dialects spoken by its native speakers. Second, as he

argues, there is no precise correspondence between spoken and written form in any language; therefore, ‘if a natural language is selected, it will have to be given precise phonetic correspondence between speech and writing’ (p. viii). Imposing such changes in the language will differentiate it further from the one spoken locally. The third problem, as he notes, is that natural languages are the “vehicles of national culture, points of view, and ideologies” (p. viii). Thus, no national language can be a real international language because it is not culturally neutral; an argument that scholars before him also made. By comparison, as Pei (1968) argues constructed languages do not have these problems. They are fully standardized and do not belong to a particular nation or group. Pei (1968) also raises a new point in his discussion that scholars before him did not. He notes that constructed languages may be criticized for not having “grass roots” and a “cultural background” (p. ix). His response to this common criticism is that “the true grass roots and cultural background of such constructed tongues as Esperanto lie in the fact that they are drawn from all the cultures that go into their construction” (p. ix).

Almost at the same time with Pei (1968), Foliaki (1974) also talks about the idea of an AUL in his journal article, *The search for unity: a proposal of instituting a Universal language to help unravel the world problems*. Foliaki (1974) in contrast with all the previous scholars in this area was a lawyer and Consul in Pacific legal issues who worked with the UN. His arguments and opinions to a large extent are new and unprecedented.

He begins the article by emphasizing the need for a universal language to “bridge the gap from one language group to another” (p. 1). He stresses that the idea of an AUL is not any longer a luxury and desirable issue but something that asks for urgent action.

Reflecting on the statement made by the President of the General Assembly of the UN in its twentieth anniversary, he maintains that though foreign language learning has become very common and advanced technical devices are invented for translation, none can solve the language barrier as expected. Thus, he emphasizes that a universal language should be adopted to fulfill two purposes: to “remove areas of deliberate or accidental misunderstandings” and second to “aid man in his search for the truth” (p. 13).

Then he explains the issues that necessitate the adoption of an AUL: 1) the difficult task of translation especially in government agencies and 2) the growth in international trade and thus translation. Therefore, “a single language carefully governed by a single international language academy would be “untold economy of time, effort, money and manpower” (p. 14). Though Foliaki (1974) does not explicitly refer to the international agreement for selecting the universal language, he emphasizes that it should be governed by an international committee.

As for the benefits of AUL, Foliaki (1974) argues that first of all a common language would help a tourist to make “conversations”, understand “local conditions and problems” and absorb the “native culture” at least ten times more than before (p. 14). Second, it would facilitate the work of churches so that they can reach masses of humanity and expand the religion. Third, it “would serve to clarify differences in interpretation of doctrine which would ultimately lead to confusion and religious strife” and above all it would enable mankind to find truth more readily. In other words, it would be the means through which people could seek the truth in different religious traditions that would be translated into the universal language. He also maintains that doing away with the necessity for publishing magazines in several languages and conducting

conferences in four or five different languages and helping to solve internal problems in countries with several minority languages are other benefits of a universal language. Also, in multilingual countries such as India all the people, regardless of dialect, could use the universal language among themselves without the fear that one ethnic group would obtain predominance over the others. In addition, all the ethnic groups will be able to communicate with the entire world and enrich their information and knowledge.

Foliaki (1968) also responds to the “arguments of opponents of the international language” (p. 14). He points out that an artificial language does not lead to “a loss of literary values”, but to “an enhancement of such values” because every literary book will be translated into the AUL and would “serve the entire world” (p. 14 -15). In addition, he argues that a constructed language can carry literary values because a constructed language in particular Esperanto that has evolved out of existing languages would “spring full-grown out of its parents tongues...and at once fall heir to the blended cultural values and literary devices of the most developed languages” (p. 15). In fact, through the constructed language specific cultural concepts and values are realized.

Foliaki (1974) also argues that among the “six hundred” proposals that have been “advanced for the world’s linguistic troubles” which range from the use of a given national language as it stands to the use of a constructed language, a constructed one is highly preferable since it is completely culturally neutral and void of the irregularities usually found in natural languages (p. 15).

As for the relationship between a universal language and the establishment of world peace Foliaki (1974) emphasizes that a universal language “will effectively aid world peace” “through the removal of linguistic misunderstanding and through the

creation of a healthy atmosphere wherein men regard one another as fellow human beings endowed with capacity of intelligible speech” (p. 16-17).

In addition, though Foliaki (1974) stresses that a universal language should be auxiliary and not replace national languages, he does refer to the inevitable progress of the universal language “at the expense of national languages”, a point that scholars whom I reviewed previously have not taken into account (p. 17). He adds “as time goes on, there might be less use of national language and more use of the international language” because the universal language gives the language users the means to communicate with the whole world. In answering the question of whether the universal language domination is good or bad, Foliaki (1974) maintains that as languages change, “forms of life” change too (p. 17). Therefore, some imperfections in world cultures today, might not pass on to the future generations as national languages become more and more restricted. And this is something good because a universal language will permit all the people in the world regardless of their sex, color, race, nationality or religion to exchange thoughts and learn from each other and thus put aside their imperfections. In fact, contrary to the previous scholars he explicitly emphasizes that every one should have access to the universal language.

In general, Lapenna (1982) also examines and promotes the idea of an AUL by reviewing some well-known scholars such as Descartes and Montesquieu on the idea of an international language. However, he also makes significant points in his discussion of an AUL that are not discussed by the previous scholars. He emphasizes that it does not make a difference whether a natural language or an artificial language acts as an international language because as he argues “every language is a social phenomenon” and

“the international language has the same character and is governed by the same laws as any other language” (p. 15). Therefore, he emphasizes, there is no distinction between a natural language and an artificial one because both are created up to a point by human society. He adds that there are two kinds of factors, “differentiating factors and unifying factors” that influence the evolution of language (p. 15). He clarifies what he means by these two factors: Differentiating factors can be “geographical, socioeconomic, especially caste or class divisions, professional and religious” (p. 15). In other words, these factors cause a language to change and differ from what it has already been. On the other hand, the unifying factors maintain the unity of the language and help the language to consolidate “larger numbers of people over ever larger areas” (p. 15). “Technical progress particularly in the field of transport and communications, various educational and cultural factors such as writing, printing, literature, the press, schools, libraries, theatres, etc” are some of the unifying factors (p. 15). In fact, he explains these factors to demonstrate and emphasize that it is the unifying factors that contribute to the formation of an international language. He argues that together with human society evolution, unifying factors accumulate and become increasingly important while the differentiating factors become less significant. Therefore, “in this linguistic evolutionary process as a result of the interpenetration of civilizations, modes of expression and linguistic customs have grown closer together or even become equivalent” (p. 15).

Gruber (1995), a professor of linguistics, is one of the most recent scholars who examines the idea of an AUL in his paper *A Universal Auxiliary Language: Humanity's Heritage*. He presented this paper in the seminar on “UN Restructuring: Turning Point for

All Nations” which was hosted by the Bahá’í international community in October 1995 on the occasion of the fiftieth Anniversary of the United Nations.

In his paper he discusses the compelling need at the present to adopt a Universal Auxiliary Language (UAL) as a “supplement to ethnic and national languages” (p. 1). He then explains the benefits of a UAL as follows: 1) “huge savings of administrative costs, time and effort spent in translation”; 2) being used in “areas of concern that are becoming increasingly cooperative and global today such as efforts against crime, violence”; 3) providing “cultural exchange at all levels” (p. 2) “including grassroots levels” (p. 3); 4) “empowerment of peoples speaking minority languages to contribute to world community” (p. 2); 5) facilitating and supporting the “inevitable emergence of a global community”; 6) providing “the necessary means for communication amongst nations”; 7) “encouraging the development of feelings of transnational identification and brotherhood between all its peoples”; 8) “mutual enrichment of life, culture and language itself worldwide” and finally 9) “safeguarding of world peace and the promotion of the oneness of mankind” which is the “fundamental and far-reaching” benefit of a “Universal Auxiliary Language”(p. 2). Concerning the role of a UAL in world peace Gruber notes that “a properly-agreed upon and instituted world auxiliary language” encourages and “even” engenders “a spirit of oneness” among people since they “identify themselves” with a “global community” that is viewed “as linguistically homogeneous” (p. 3).

Gruber (1995) argues that the compelling movement towards the adoption of an international language is in fact “part of a natural process” in the sense that in different stages in the history in “response to conditions of language contact” languages “serving as lingua franca” have emerged naturally and/or been adopted by national governments

(p. 3). He maintains, “as the adoption of such languages has been necessitated and accomplished in the past and currently and on national and regional scales, so we can anticipate it now on global scale” (p. 4). Such an international language he argues, “must be truly world-wide...used in all aspects of life and its adoption must be the result of conscious decision and a manifestation of justice” (p. 4). He emphasizes, “although natural processes are inevitably leading to the adoption of a universal auxiliary language today, nevertheless conscious decision and action is required” since without it “the natural forces seem to lead to abuse and injustice, so called linguistic imperialism which leads to social inequalities and loss of richness of ethnic languages and cultures” (p. 5).

He notes that linguistic diversity is the “potential for the linguistic and cultural enrichment of humanity” (p. 5) and above all it has “the potentiality to contribute to the whole of the human linguistic heritage” (p. 6). Therefore, he emphasizes that the proposal for adopting an AUL is not a threat to existing ethnic and national languages, but encourages their use because “decisive action ...determines what is to be learned and can purposely avoid linguistic imperialism and language loss” (p. 6). He explains that “the natural process involving international languages seems to entail linguistic imperialism” in which “there is a tendency for cultural dominance and benefits accrue to persons seeking the dominant language” (p. 6). In fact, in the natural spread of international languages as he states one driving force is “attainment of the benefits of dominance which the spread then reinforces” which produces “political and social inequalities” at the same time (p. 6). To avoid such inequalities a decisive action “with an aspiration for justice” is required because otherwise, the international language will lead to “disagreement and decline of the dominated languages and cultures” (p. 6).

Another point that Gruber (1995) discusses concerns the choice of an AUL. Referring to the past scholarly efforts to artificially create an AUL he notes that “natural languages come with ethnic or national association” while constructed languages are “ethnically neutral” (p. 7). However, he states that although artificial languages may be culturally neutral, they “may seem unnatural” (p. 7). And since overcoming national prejudices has always been an obstacle to adopt an AUL, international agreement on the choice of an AUL has not occurred yet. So, he argues that whenever it happens, it “would be an indication of the collective maturity of humanity” (p. 7).

Gruber (1995) also argues that whatever language being chosen as the UAL, it “will eventually become the inheritor of the linguistic riches of humanity” (p. 7). In other words, any language as he emphasizes “is the result of millennia of cultural development and is imbued with its riches” (p. 8). Therefore, the universal language even if it is a planned or constructed one in contact with diverse world languages will itself “become imbued with the potentialities of the expressive tools” of those languages similar to the way different varieties of international languages and their pidgins and creoles have naturally evolved (p. 8). However, he emphasizes that in the case of the UAL, this process should be “supported globally by conscious decision combined with continued planning and an evolutionary conception of language” (p. 8). He adds, “language planning could be a part of the ongoing use and evolution of the universal auxiliary language whose aims would include making it more learnable, expressive and reflective of the world’s linguistic inheritance” (p. 11).

In the end of the paper, referring to the benefits and compelling need to have a UAL, Gruber (1995) states that his paper “considers it timely to submit to the United Nations that it now take effective steps in this direction”; to adopt and select an UAL.

The second recent scholar Eco (1995) also in his book *The search for the perfect language* refers to the unsolved language barrier in the world. In the chapter, “The international auxiliary language”, reviewing Couturat’s and Leau’s (1903) opinions he notes that they considered the “idea of choosing a living language as an international medium as utopian” (Couturat and Leau as cited in Eco, 1995, p. 317). Also, since “returning to a dead language like Latin” (p. 317) would have some difficulties, “the obvious solution seemed to be the invention of an artificial language formed on the model of natural ones” (Couturat and Leau as cited in Eco, 1995, p. 318). In addition, as Eco (1995) quotes, “the criteria for this language should be above all simple and rational grammar” (Couturat and Leau as cited in Eco, 1995, p. 318). And finally, “an IAL project would not succeed unless an international body adopted and promoted it” (Couturat and Leau as cited in Eco, 1995, p. 318). In fact, they emphasized that “international political will” is the only way through which an AUL can be accepted and promoted all around the world (Couturat and Leau as cited in Eco, 1995, p. 318).

After reviewing Couturat’s and Leau’s arguments, Eco (1995), similar to Gruber (1995), refers to the point that if the adoption of an international language occurs, it would be “a totally unprecedented historical event” (p. 333). Unlike the scholars before him, he agrees with Couturat and Leau and proposes that the solution on how to choose an international language is through an international body such as the UN. However, his proposal unlike Couturat and Leau is based on the fact that he lives at a period of time in

history in which English has spread worldwide. In fact, unlike all the previous scholars except for Gruber (1995) he criticizes English dominance because of its being imposed by political and economic hegemony rather than being selected through global decision and agreement. (Eco is one of the many scholars whose critical views towards English will be reviewed in the section on English.)

Harrison (2001) like his contemporaries Eco (1995) and Gruber (1995) and some of the previous scholars opposes English; however, his reasons differ from those offered by Eco and Gruber. In his on-line article, *Proposed Guidelines for the Design of an Optimal International Auxiliary Language*, he argues that although English may play the role of “an auxiliary language to some extent”, like Sapir (1925) he maintains that natural languages are difficult to learn (p. 1). In fact, his ideas are similar to the scholars from the 1920s to the 1980s rather than his contemporary, Eco or Gruber. He promotes the desirability of an “interlingua” through which people who speak different languages can communicate and emphasizes a planned or a constructed language as the best candidate for an international language (p. 1). He adds, three goals should direct language construction: an “optimal” international auxiliary language should be “easy for more children and adults to learn as a second language”; it should “have the ability to handle both mundane conversation and highly technical information” and finally it should be “culturally neutral” (p. 2).

Like the scholars from the 1920s to the 1980s Harrison emphasizes the simplicity of an artificial international language that should “provide maximum ease of learning...to the largest number of people” in the world. Then he presents some guidelines concerning phonology, orthography, morphology, vocabulary and grammar that should be taken into

account in constructing an artificial language (p. 4). I do not intend to explain all these guidelines because such details are not directly related to the purpose of my study. However, I will present a few examples for clarification. For instance, in terms of phoneme selection Harrison (2001) agrees with Sapir that the International Auxiliary Language (IAL) “should only use phonemes which most people in the world already know or can easily learn to pronounce” (p. 4). Also, as for the orthography or the writing system of an IAL Harrison (2001) states that “each grapheme” that is “each letter or special combination of letters should represent only one phoneme and each phoneme should be represented by only one grapheme” (p. 6).

Harrison like Sapir refers to the cultural neutrality of constructed language; however, he provides more explanation than Sapir. He explains, since constructed languages are invented by an individual or a group of individuals, they do not belong to any nation. Therefore, if a constructed language were adopted as an IAL, every individual in the world who learns the language would have the same attitude towards the language. Then he adds, users of an IAL would not feel inferior towards the native speakers of the language because it would be a second language for all speakers and there would be no inequality in terms of level of competence in the language and also it would not belong to any specific culture and nation. Consequently, the culturally neutral language will act as a bond that links all the people around the world regardless of their nationality and ethnic group and cultural background.

Unlike Harrison (2001), Meyjes (2006) who is the last scholar I will review, presents a new perspective towards the idea of an AUL as envisioned in the Bahá'í writings. Meyjes (2006) in his chapter, “Language and world order in the Bahá'í

perspective” from the book *Explorations in the sociology of language and religion* edited by Omoniyi and Fishman (2006), discusses the perspective of the Bahá’í religion on the idea of an AUL.

As to the Bahá’í social doctrines he states that in the Bahá’í view “the divine permeates all of creation” and “divine messengers who periodically renew revelation impart divine guidance and law to humanity” (p. 27). Thus, as he maintains, the social teachings of the Bahá’í Faith are regarded as “the key to the current place in history as divine inspiration” although he acknowledges that “to see religious revelation as the foundation of societal order challenges prevailing attitudes” (p. 27). Emphasizing “the oneness of mankind” that stands at the center of the social teachings of the Bahá’í religion as well as equality and justice, he explains that world unification as foreshadowed in the Bahá’í Faith not only is not in conflict with cultural heterogeneity, but also embraces it. It is a “divinely willed order that patently promotes policies and values at once worldwide and embracing of cultural diversity” (p. 28). Therefore, the Bahá’í approach to language rights both “inter-culturally” and “intera-culturally” (p. 29), he explains, derives from the doctrine of oneness and the principle of equality in which ensuring language rights is a matter of “cultural justice” (p. 28).

As for the idea of a “Universal Auxiliary Language” (UAL) he maintains that the “Bahá’í scriptures provide guidance as to how to combine humanity’s oneness with its linguistic diversity” (p. 29). He adds, the Bahá’í writings confirm what scholars such as Sapir and Jespersen argued with regard to the benefits of learning of one common second language. He explains three facets to the Bahá’í UAL model. The first one deals with the general features of UAL the most important of which is the “universal element of the

UAL” (p. 30). So, as he explains, the “primary functional domain of UAL are international contexts, communications and institutions” (p. 30). As for the meaning of auxiliary he maintains that according to the Bahá’í scriptures a UAL should “be secondary to the native languages – not necessarily a community-internal second language (L2) in the traditional sense” (p. 30). He adds, although the Bahá’í writings “support the notion that linguistic diversity enriches differences in culture”, they make no mention of protecting linguistic diversity “devoid of ethnocultural content”, nor to resist language change or shift on cognitive principles”; therefore, as languages and cultures change a UAL would also change and perhaps evolve to a universal language (p. 35). He further explains, UAL is intended as vehicle of a worldwide “bilingualism without diglossia” (Fishman as cited in Meyjes, 2006, p. 30). Thus, as Meyjes states, it should be “taught in school curricula worldwide” rather than be naturally acquired (p. 30). In addition, Meyjes refers to Abdu’l-Bahá and Shoghi Effendi (successors of Bahá’u’lláh, the founder of the Bahá’í Faith) who have emphasized the need for simplicity and learnability of a UAL.

The second facet to the Bahá’í UAL model concerns the selection of a UAL. As he states, the “Bahá’í scriptures do not foresee a world that relies on the extra-linguistic market place to determine the lingua franca of the hour by default, as has been the case throughout history – including today with English” (p. 31). Thus, he maintains, “it is incumbent upon all nations to appoint some men of understanding and erudition” who are language planners in his view “to convene a gathering and through joint consultation choose one language from among the varied existing languages or create a new one to be taught to the children in all the schools of the world” (Bahá’u’lláh as cited in Meyjes,

2006, p. 31). Thus, selection of a UAL, he explains, will reflect “the deliberate and participatory language planning effort to regulate interethnic communication” as opposed to the way English has gained its status and dominance (p. 31).

The third facet deals with the choice of a UAL. He explains, Bahá’í writings do not promote a specific language to be chosen as a UAL but they strongly suggest that the choice should be simple, learnable and “fit for functionally unrestricted human communication at the international level” (p. 31-32). He then refers to the discussions about equality of natural languages and maintains that they need to be further assessed to aid listing of UAL contenders.

Finally, he emphasizes that the “Bahá’í-inspired vision of linguistic ecology stands in contrast to the present largely-economically driven dynamic surrounding world English” as discussed by scholars such as Pennycook and Phillipson (p. 36). In this view, he explains, international adoption of a UAL is spiritually motivated rather than materially, thus, it is “urged to shield humanity’s ethnolinguistic heritage sooner rather than later from the violence of unbridled intercultural competition, imposition and displacement” (p. 36-37).

In the following paragraphs I will provide a summary of the shared views so far reviewed in the literature.

I reviewed the literature on the idea of an AUL as a way to find out what has already been discussed in the literature about the nature of an AUL, what it is supposed to do or what its main purpose is and how it can actually be adopted. As the reader may have noticed, the common view shared by all the scholars since the 1920s to the present

is that having an AUL is so beneficial that it needs urgent attention especially at the present time.

Among the scholars reviewed some give a detailed but in some cases different explanation of the benefits of an AUL. Lauwerys (1928) Foliaki (1974), Gruber (1995), Harrison (2001) and Meyjes (2006) emphasize an AUL as a means to establish peace among different nations. Foliaki also refers to the unifying role of an AUL among different ethnic groups within a nation as well as its role in facilitating the search for truth, sharing one's cultural values with people who are from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and learning about other cultures and saving money, time and manpower spent on translation whether in trade, publishing or conferences or other situations. However, Foliaki (1974), Eco (1995), Gruber (1995) and Meyjes (2006) are the only scholars who go beyond defining an AUL and its benefits and argue for planning of an AUL at the international level. While providing a more detailed discussion of the issue than Foliaki, Gruber (1995) states that international planning of an AUL is not only urgent but also possible and that it is the time for the UN for devise a plan for planning an AUL. Eco (1995) also refers to the UN as the possible organization that can be in charge of adopting an AUL. Meyjes (2006) provides a detailed discussion of the Bahá'í perspective towards the idea of an AUL and demonstrates how the Bahá'í social and spiritual teachings about the idea of an AUL, which are the divine teachings revealed for the present time in human history, provide the divine guidance "to satisfy the planet's need for cultural justice under conditions of vibrant interethnic exchange" (p. 37).

Another common theme argued and discussed by the majority of the reviewed scholars, in particular by those in the 1920s to 1950s, except for Lapenna (1982), Gruber

(1995) and Meyjes (2006), is that constructed languages are more suitable candidates to play the role of an AUL than a natural language, in particular English. Lapenna (1982) argues that there is no difference between a natural and a constructed language to become an AUL because they both have a social nature. He explains that a constructed language like a natural language has cultural baggage because it is derived from different languages and has the potential to have functions similar to those performed by a natural language. Gruber (1995) and Meyjes (2006) also emphasize the point that the international collective decision on the choice of an AUL is more important than the choice of an AUL itself.

Although all the other scholars have more or less referred to the point that a constructed language is also derived from different languages and thus different cultures, they disregard the fact that a constructed language has cultural baggage that will be even reinforced and developed if the language is actually used and performs the functions it is supposed to. Thus, almost all argue that a constructed language is culturally neutral and thus preferable to a natural one.

In addition to this argument in defense of constructed languages, the scholars have made others. Sapir (1925) argues that a constructed language is simple, culturally neutral; thus, no one would feel independence towards it. Harrison (2001) likewise expresses similar opinions in favor of constructed languages. Lauwerys (1946) and Pei (1968) also refer to the difficult nature of any natural language and thus explain the likely obstacles to simplifying a natural language for the purpose of an AUL. Palmer and Litt (1947), who seem to deal with the issue of promoting an artificial language in more depth and detail, demonstrate the pragmatic benefits of an artificial language in academia,

conferences and scientific discourses and confine their discussion to vocabulary and vocabulary construction.

The last significant point that all scholars except Lauwerys (1946) support is that the AUL should be auxiliary or secondary to the mother tongues and Sapir (1925), Gruber (1995) and Meyjes (2006) also emphasize that mother tongues should be preserved. However, Foliaki (1974) and Meyjes (2006) note that in the long run as the cultures change, the AUL will probably change into a Universal Language and replace mother tongues.

In short, it seems that from the 1920s to the present there has been a change in the scholars' perspectives and views towards the idea of an AUL. The huge gap that the reader might have also noticed in the literature is that all the scholars except for Foliaki (1974), Eco (1995), Gruber (1995) and Meyjes (2006) make no mention of who should actually select the language and how they could reach an agreement on the choice of an AUL even if it is a constructed one, how the selected language should be taught all around the world, and how the relevant language policy can be implemented in different countries. All that scholars have focused on is that constructed languages are preferable; however, they fail to discuss how one could be adopted since they note that national prejudices and biases are the main obstacle to reaching an agreement on the choice of the language. In fact, although all the scholars either implicitly or explicitly refer to the adoption of an AUL as an urgent matter that should be considered at the international level, none discusses the ways to remove those obstacles and thus select the AUL. Only Foliaki (1974), Eco (1995), Gruber (1995) and Meyjes (2006) vaguely refer to an

international body that should be in charge of selecting an AUL and its management; however, they present no in depth discussion of the subject.

To get more insight into the idea of an AUL, in particular a constructed one which has been so promoted in the literature, in the following section I will examine the resources on the most famous constructed language, Esperanto, to find out what researchers in that field contribute to the idea of an AUL.

## **2. 2. 2 Esperanto**

As I mentioned earlier, many scholars who have examined the issue of an AUL have specifically focused on Esperanto as the “best known constructed language” developed for the purpose of an AUL (Lauwerys, 1946, p. 3). In the following paragraphs I will first provide an overview of Esperanto and the Esperanto movement and then present a chronological review of the literature on Esperanto.

### **2. 2. 2. 1 History of Esperanto**

Esperanto was constructed by Ludwik Zamenhof in 1887 when he was twenty-eight years old. As Forster (1982) and Janton (1993) explain, Zamenhof who was brought up in a Jewish family “found a need for belief in God” (Forster, 1982, p. 51) and he became concerned about social problems. He spent his youth in the multilingual town of Bialystock and “human divisions and conflicts” inspired him to create an international language “as simply a first step toward a more general goal of peace” (Janton, 1993, p. 25) and for the purpose of “mutual understanding” and reduction of tensions (Forster, 1982, p. 50). In fact, though Zamenhof had a medical degree, he realized that he was not suited for medical practice. Therefore, he focused his interest and passion on the construction of a universal language and of course his knowledge of several languages

including Russian (his mother tongue), Polish, German, French and also Latin, Hebrew, Yiddish and English helped him to achieve his goal. In 1887 he published the first textbook of Esperanto entitled *Dr. Esperanto* meaning “a hopeful man” that nowadays is known as *Unua Libro* (First Book)” (Forster, 1982, p. 54).

Like Forster (1982), Janton (1993) also highlights the significance of Zamenhof’s love for humanity and his effort to create a language for the purpose of world peace reinforcing his discussion with Zamenhof’s own statements about Esperanto. As Janton (1993) quotes, Zamenhof believed that through using an international language “we all feel ourselves members of a single nation, members of a single family” (Zamenhof as cited in Janton, 1993, p. 29). However, Zamenhof warned “this brotherly and sisterly spirit could not be fully realized unless people and social classes dealt with one another in full equality” (Zamenhof as cited in Janton, 1993, p. 29). In creating an international language Zamenhof set three goals for himself: 1) to make the language easy to learn for anyone, 2) to make it “viable by giving it a logical and simple structure” and 3) to find a way to stimulate a large number of people to learn it (Zamenhof as cited in Janton, 1993, p. 26). In Zamenhof’s point of view learning Esperanto does not need a great deal of free time and financial resources and above all its learning is not limited to “higher social classes” and “the intellect and the rich” but “all spheres of human society even the poorest and least educated of villagers” (Zamenhof as cited in Janton, 1993, p. 29). Thus it is a real international language to which everyone can access and everyone can communicate “without the required mediation of the elite and the ruling classes” (Zamenhof as cited in Janton, 1993, p. 30).

Sharing Zamenhof's beliefs Janton (1993) emphasizes that Esperanto is not just a system of classification of ideas like previous planned languages; it has irregularities found in natural languages. In other words, since Zamenhof and linguists at that time had become aware of the social aspect of language use and that "the aim of language is spoken use", they tend towards naturalism and using natural languages as a model for language construction (p. 17). Profiting from errors found in Volapuk, a constructed language invented in 1879 by Johann Martin Schleyer who was a German priest, Zamenhof created Esperanto that is a "posteriori mixed planned language" (p. 17).

The language that Zamenhof created, Janton (1993) argues, is very simple because it has only has 16 rules of grammar. For example, in "Esperanto's orthography each grapheme represents a single phoneme" (p. 43) and the accent "is fixed falling on the penultimate syllable of each word" (p. 47). Words are "independent and invariant" and "maintain the same form and remain autonomous regardless of their grammatical place in the sentence" (p. 50). "75 percent of the lexemes in Esperanto come from Romance languages primarily Latin and French, 20 percent come from Germanic languages, the rest include borrowings from Greek (mostly scientific words), Slavic languages, and in small numbers Hebrew, Arabic, Japanese, Chinese and other languages" (p. 51). "Syntactically", Esperanto belongs to the most frequent language type, namely SVO type (subject-verb-object)" (p. 73).

Esperanto started its life as a written language in contrast with natural languages that start as spoken languages and may not even have a written form (Janton, 1993). For seventeen years, as Janton (1993) explains, Esperanto functioned in "written form among widely dispersed users" and gradually "realized its latent powers ... and established itself

as a means of cultural exchange” (p. 91). Meanwhile Zamenhof translated many literary masterpieces such as Shakespeare’s Hamlet (1894), Goethe’s Iphigenia auf Tauris...and the entire Old Testament in order to enrich the lexicon of Esperanto and above all to adapt it to the “expression of thought and feeling” (p. 92). Gradually Esperanto started to be used in spoken form and for writing literature and in various sciences that enriched the vocabulary of the language with scientific terms. Today there are “over 160 specialized dictionaries in 50 or more fields” and many publications with sophisticated technical levels such as *Journal Scienca revuo*, Publications of the Institute for Pedagogical Cybernetics and a series of documents published by the Center for Research and Documentation on World Language Problems (p. 82). In addition to the publications in Esperanto, “at least 10,000 works have been translated into Esperanto” (p. 93). There also exists documentary and advertising films in Esperanto and the first fictional films in Esperanto were produced by Paramount Pictures in 1966 (p. 110). Furthermore, there are 13 radio stations in 12 countries that broadcast in Esperanto (p. 122). And over 200 magazines and journals in Esperanto are the regular means through which Esperantists exchange ideas and information (p. 120 -121).

In terms of the organizations and activities involved in the Esperanto movement, Janton (1993) also provides significant information that demonstrates Esperanto is still a living language with almost two million speakers after its invention about a century ago. In 1991 there were national Esperanto associations in 66 countries that had the role of informing and teaching the public (p. 113). There are also international associations, the largest of which is the Universal Esperanto Association (UEA), which has some 40,000 members as of 1987 (p. 113). International associations work with world organizations

like the UN and UNESCO (p. 113). UEA holds annual conferences in which it “provides non-Esperantists with an opportunity to observe firsthand the suitability of Esperanto as a means of international communication” (p. 113). Offices of UEA organize different activities “from organization of a press campaign, or public lecture series, to the inauguration of a Zamenhof Street, the performance of a play, the presentation of an exhibition or the showing of a film about a conference” (p. 119). However, as Janton (1993) points out, the Esperanto movement “does not have at its disposal the financial resources needed to launch truly effective publicity campaigns” (p. 124). And although there have always been political, social and psychological obstacles, “Esperanto is no longer a purely European initiative: active associations in Japan, Vietnam, Korea, China, Iran, Madagascar, Zaire and various parts of South America have widened the prospects for the future considerably” (p. 131). He notes that not only are Esperanto speakers slowly but steadily increasing, Esperanto is also gaining significance in educational systems. For example, in 1970 Esperanto was taught in 15 institutions of higher education and the number increased to 110 in 1985 in 22 countries (p. 124). Also the number of universities in which Esperanto is taught increased from 30 in 1970 to 125 in 1986 (p. 124).

Considering all these developments in the Esperanto movement, Janton (1993) stresses that Esperanto is “the only living planned language” that has the potential to be used as the means of communication for all human expression (p. xii) and “a solution to the problem of communication caused by multilingualism in the world” (p. xi). Because as he explains, it “does not function only at the level of instrumental communication”; “it can express everything worthy of expression provided that it creates and nurtures its own

spirit” (p. 109). In addition, he argues that the Esperanto movement is a psychological phenomenon in which speakers of different nationalities and cultures work together for the purpose of brotherhood; they learn Esperanto for the mere purpose of building bonds of fellowship with each other regardless of their culture and ethnic group.

With this overview of Esperanto and the Esperanto movement, I can now review the literature on Esperanto to find out what the scholars in this field argue about Esperanto.

### **2. 2. 2 The literature on Esperanto**

Reed (1968) talks about Esperanto as a living constructed language with many benefits. Examining the Esperanto movement, in his book *The complete grammar of English* Reed (1968) argues that Esperanto “has proved its worth by acquiring a fairly large speaking population, producing an extensive literature, both original and in translation, and gaining a considerable amount of international and even official recognition” (p. x). He explains that its grammatical structure is “simple”, “clear” and “logical” and although its vocabulary is derived from a few European languages, its vocabulary is “still international enough to appeal even to the speakers of the languages it most neglects” (p. x). He adds, the reason for such simplicity is that Esperanto is constructed “for use by persons who do not understand each other’s native tongue, or another common language” (p. xi). It is “a time-saver for people to learn it” and above all “suitable for international use” because it does not have the “sounds occurring in various languages (including English) which are difficult for people of other nationalities to pronounce” (p. xi).

Foliaki (1974) whose ideas on an international language I reviewed in the previous section, argues in support of constructed language and also discusses the positive features of Esperanto. Like his contemporary, Reed (1968), Foliaki argues that Esperanto is “probably the best known of the posteriori languages devised to solve the communication problem” though he adds the point that Esperanto is “scientifically precise and consistent” because of its having some specific features (p. 16). Similar to Reed (1968) Foliaki (1974) argues that Esperanto is a simple language but, he presents more detailed reasons for his arguments than Reed does. First, in Esperanto each letter of the alphabet corresponds to one sound and vice versa. Second, its syllabic arrangement is simple and thus it is easy to speak, read and spell. The third feature is concerned with the regularities found in Esperanto. For example, in this language “all nouns without exception end in –o, all adjectives in –a, all adverbs in –e and all infinitives in –i” (p. 16). Fourth, as a completely regular language Esperanto can be learned “by a person of moderate intelligence in just six months” (p. 16). Therefore, it is “well worth an investment of time, effort and money” (p. 16). He also argues that Esperanto is being used by “hundreds of thousands of people all over the world in a great variety of fields” as “a key to the world” and “treasure of cultural enrichment” (p. 16). In fact, like Reed (1968) he refers to the success of Esperanto in terms of its being able to fulfill different functions.

Eco (1995) also talks about Esperanto as a posteriori language that has used European languages as its model. Following Forster (1982) and Janton (1993), Eco explains that Esperanto has been developed as the result of Zamenhof’s “particular fascination with international languages” that was “mixed with a desire for peace

between peoples” (p. 325). The Esperanto movement in the first decades of its development as Eco notes, “was nearly torn apart by battles raging over proposed lexical and grammatical reforms” (p. 327). However, like Janton (1993) Eco argues that today numerous publications and translations in Esperanto and Esperanto associations testify to “the success of Zamenhof’s invention” (p.326).

Finally, Li (2003) is the most recent scholar whose ideas seem to be unique from what other scholars have reviewed have discussed. Contrary to those previous scholars, he examines the benefits of and problems associated with Esperanto compared with English that has become widespread and has many critiques. He begins his discussion by mentioning that some scholars including himself advocate Esperanto to “counter the hegemony of the phenomenal spread of English worldwide” (p. 33).

In his point of view there are some reasons why Esperanto is seen as much more suitable than English for the role of an AUL, the reasons that to a large extent are similar to those I reviewed in the first section of the literature review. First, Esperanto is no one’s mother tongue so “no one is at disadvantage vis-à-vis their interlocutors by using it as an auxiliary language” (p. 36). Second, Li argues, Zamenhof did not create Esperanto for economic purposes, but for moral and idealistic goals. It is supposed to be an auxiliary language “facilitating interethnic encounters in international settings” (p. 36). Therefore, it is not “a threat to the learner’s ethnic identities” and does not “undermine the vitality & functions of any local languages” (p. 52). Third, as Li cites, since Esperanto is “not imposed in any educational system”, it is learned on a voluntary basis and its speech community is “non-ethnic and non-territorial” (Wood as cited in Li, 2003, p. 36). Fourth, Esperanto is easy to learn because “the textual comprehension and production of

Esperanto are relatively straightforward tasks” (Li, 2003, p. 37). Like Reed (1968), Foliaki (1974) and Janton (1993) he notes that the time it takes to learn Esperanto is shorter compared with the task of learning English; thus, “the time saved could be put to meaningful use such as helping children to deepen select areas of knowledge or develop certain practical skills” (Richmond as cited in Li, 1993, p. 38). Finally, Esperanto has great “potential to contribute to international communication in translation” (p. 37).

Li (2003) also examines both the obstacles that have prevented Esperanto from becoming a world language after over 110 years of use as well as the responses to those obstacles; obstacles that do not seem to have been addressed by the scholars before him whom I reviewed earlier. The greatest one is that since Esperanto is artificially created its structure is not created out of real communicative needs. Thus, it is “unlearnable” since “it lacks what is needed for a normal acquisition of a language: embodiment in actual, accessible discourse to serve as a model for speaking and writing” (Levin as cited in Li, 2003, p. 51). The second obstacle as Li explains is that Esperanto is not sufficient enough in terms of the number of genres that can be produced through it.

In response to these obstacles Li argues that because Esperanto is easily adaptable to “local, culture-specific meaning there is practically no limit as to the kinds of genre in which one wants to communicate in Esperanto” (p. 43). However, Li (2003) referring to Large’s (1985) book, *The Artificial Language Movement*, maintains, “the pool of information written in Esperanto ...remains small and often difficult to access” (p. 44). And although Esperanto is the instrument of “communication, thought and information exchange”, “in terms of the range of communicative functions, the number of learners in the target language, as well as the amount and variety of information encoded in that

language, there is still a huge gap between Esperanto and English” (Bankle as cited in Li, 2003, p. 44 - 45).

Li also adds that since “powerful vehicles of disseminations” such as economic and military power have not been available to Esperanto as a result, Esperanto has failed to “attract people who are primarily looking for an international language” (Large, as cited in Li, 2003, p. 44). Thus, there have been no political, economic or cultural pressures on governments to promote Esperanto in contrast with English. Therefore, as Li (2003) notes, it seems that Esperanto has not been considered as useful and prestigious by those who intend to learn a second or foreign language and probably for those who have already learned English Esperanto would be an extra burden. Thus to attract more people to Esperanto Li argues, “one needs to be able to use Esperanto for a broad range of communicative functions such as being able (a) to do things in the medium of Esperanto like watching a movie, (b) to search for and read information on a topic of one’s interest and above all, (c) to use it spontaneously in natural communicative situations with fellow Esperantists, and more importantly with shopkeepers, taxi drivers and so forth for every day transactional purposes at home or overseas” (p. 50). In the end, Li (2003), referring to the arguments reviewed above, concludes that it is difficult for him to “share Phillipson’s and Skutnabb-Kangas’ optimism and to heed their advice to support a pro-Esperanto policy worldwide” (p. 57).

In summary, it seems that the kind of arguments that the advocates of Esperanto present are to a large extent similar to the ones reviewed in the last section in which the priorities of constructed languages compared with the natural languages are reviewed. Here are the arguments that the Esperantists reviewed in this section make: Esperanto, as

the only living constructed language has a simple grammatical structure, is easy to learn in a short period of time, is no one's mother tongue thus there will be no inequality and feelings of inferiority for some of its learners and it will not be a threat to the native languages. In addition, as Janton (1993) and Forster (1982) explain, Zamenhof's motif to create this language has not been for economic purposes but for providing a means through which people both rich and poor who speak different languages can learn and use, and through which they can settle their conflicts and misunderstandings and thus achieve peace and harmony both at the national and international level.

A significant point that Li (2003) discusses in response to those who oppose Esperanto as artificial and thus unlearnable is that Esperanto has the capacity that when being used, it can adapt to culture-specific meanings and thus can be learned and used as a natural language. This argument can in fact be the logical response to the dominant argument in the previous section that constructed languages are culturally neutral and thus preferable to natural languages to become adopted as the AUL. In other words, according to this argument the more a constructed language, in particular Esperanto, is used in a variety of contexts to produce a diverse range of genres, the more information and meanings will be encoded in it which are the realization of the cultures of the speakers.

Another significant point discussed in the literature by Janton, Forster, Eco and Li is that as a living constructed language Esperanto is actually performing numerous functions and is used in different contexts such as in publications, radio stations, films and plays. However, Li (2003) notes that compared with English, Esperanto still has limited functions, a limited number of learners and thus speakers, a limited quantity of

information encoded in it and above all because it has no value and benefit for the people around the world to learn it, it does not attract people. And in fact, Zamenhof's dream to stimulate people to learn Esperanto cannot be fulfilled unless people find it useful. But the question is to what extent can Esperanto national and international organizations be effective in terms of attracting people to learn Esperanto as the AUL when there is no international agreement on the choice of Esperanto as the AUL. In other words, Esperantists like most of the scholars in the previous section emphasize that constructed languages, in particular Esperanto, is created to be the international language; however, they make no reference to how this can be done nor whether there should be any kind of international planning for Esperanto to gain the status of an AUL or not, who should do that and when and how should it be taught. Therefore, it seems that lack of an international decision to adopt Esperanto as AUL as well as its internal limitations are the reasons Esperanto has not gained the status for which it was designed and created. Instead, it is English that has become the so-called international language. To get an overview of what the scholars say about English as an example of a national and natural language that seems to act as an international language we now turn to the literature on English in the following section.

### **2. 2. 3 English**

As I mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, the majority of the resources on the idea of an AUL, either books or articles in the last ten to fifteen years are about English. In fact, English due to its large number of speakers and its worldwide spread has attracted many scholars in the field of sociolinguistics and in particular, language planning and policy. And since in these resources English is talked about as an

international language in the following paragraphs I will review some of the most significant discussions around English. In reviewing the literature on English I will follow a thematic order rather than a chronological one because all the resources are recent. While reviewing the most well known scholars who have examined EIL I realized that scholars have focused on different issues ranging from English use in non-English speaking countries to English spread and dominance in the world. And that based on what they have focused on, they suggest positive, negative and even mixed views about EIL. Thus I have categorized them into three groups based on their approach to EIL. In the first group the scholars have focused on the positive features of English as an international language and how it has become localized after being used by non-native English speakers. In the second group scholars refer to both positive and negative aspects associated with EIL. Finally, the scholars in the last group are more critical about English dominance and power in the world and emphasize the negative consequences and characteristics of EIL.

### **2. 2. 3. 1 Positive views**

The first scholar I will discuss is Kachru (1992) whose research areas are sociolinguistics, world Englishes, multilingualism and language and ideology. As for the subject of an AUL he argues too briefly that since most constructed languages are driven from one or more natural languages they are not perfect proposals for a universal language. However, varieties of English all around the world have “elevated it to the status of an international or universal language” (p. 3) that is used in “geographically, linguistically and culturally diverse areas; its use cuts across political boundaries” (p. 53). In fact, the positive aspect of English, as Kachru argues, is that when it is adopted in a

region, whether for science, technology, prestige or modernization, it goes through linguistic and cultural reincarnations “caused by the new bilingual (or multilingual) settings and by the new contexts” in which English has to function (p. 6). Therefore, models for non-native speakers depend on “the context of situation” or “the historical context and the educational setting” rather than being imposed by western English speaking countries (p. 52). Consequently, the “non-native varieties” of English are “standard” as are the “native varieties” (p. 53).

Another positive aspect associated with English that Kachru discusses concerns the reasons of its spread. According to him, “the literary heritage” of English, “the status it may confer on the reader or speaker” and “the doors it opens in technology, science, trade and diplomacy” (p. 4) are the factors that have contributed to its spread rather than its “intrinsic superiority” (p. 10). In addition, he argues, whether non-native English speakers use it for a “highly restricted functional range in specific contexts” such as “those of tourism, commerce” and/or in “an extended range of uses in the sociolinguistic text of a nation”, non-native varieties with “localized characteristics” will develop (p. 55). In fact, Kachru strongly suggests that English has been beneficial for non-native speakers because they have used it not just as a means to move forwards in their lives, but also they have actually made it their own.

Strevens (1992) whose research interests are foreign language teaching and specifically English language shares Kachru’s (1992) positive ideas that English is an international language whose “localized forms” have identifiable “features of grammar, lexis, pronunciation, discourse and style” (p. 34). He also adds that although two components of English, “its grammar and vocabulary” are taught and learned without

variation” all around the world, “accents and lexico-grammars are strictly local” except for academic fields, and each English-speaking community sets its own norms and goals on how to use English and for what purposes (p. 39). Therefore, “English is not a homogenizing factor which causes cultural differences to disappear, but the use of English offers a medium to express and explain these differences” (p. 41). Indeed, EFL/ESL speakers or nonnative speakers of English use it for “their internal purposes or for dealing with other NNS [non-native speaker] populations without the presence of intervention of native speakers” (p. 41). However, contrary to Kachru (1992) Stevns (1992) emphasizes the intrinsic superiority of English as “inherently a borrowing” language that “incorporates ideas, concepts and expressions from other societies to make them part of English (p. 31). In addition, unlike Kachru, Stevns (1992) gives a more comprehensive account of English as an international language. 1) The function of English can be the medium of instruction or just used for international business, sports, travel, etc. 2) Purposes of learning English can be for “internal interaction” and/or “international interaction” (p. 42-43). Therefore, 3) at the intranational level the language interactants are both non-native speakers but at the international level interactants can be both native speakers, both non-native speakers or native and non-native speakers. 4) Student population of English is both native and non-native speakers who 5) may take courses in general English or English for specific purposes. 6) Performance targets may be “performance level of educated speaker of local variety of English” and/or “mutual intelligibility and appropriate language for situation” (p. 42-43). 7) English learners may use either an educated native English speaker or any educated English speaker, whether

local or regional, as a model to learn English. And finally 8) both the local culture of the learner or culture of specified countries may be emphasized.

Nelson (1992) also like his contemporaries, Kachru (1992) and Strevens (1992), examines the significance of the local varieties of English as positive evidence supporting the international status of English. Extending his contemporaries' discussion concerning the local varieties of English he investigates whether non-native English speakers use the communicative competence that comes with the English or the sociolinguistic knowledge of their own language and culture when they use English. He notes that "non-native Englishes exist as realities in the world" (p. 325) and the term non-native English itself demonstrates that "English is being used in response to new cultural and linguistic settings as well" (p. 329). Therefore, citing Kachru he states that there is a "parallelism between speech event and social event", so in whatever culture English is used, that specific culture determines "its applicability and its innovations at all linguistic levels" (Kachru as cited in Nelson, 1992, p. 329). Thus, "English belongs to any country which uses it" and each English user must consider it as his or her own language and adapt it variously to contexts in his or her own culture (Smith as cited in Nelson, 1992, p. 337).

Like Kachru (1992), Strevens (1992) and Nelson (1992), Canagarajah (2000) also examines the status of English; however, his positive views towards English are concerned with the role of agency in non-native speakers' English use. Canagarajah (2000) argues that although English is a medium through which western ideologies are transmitted, in different periods of history natives in periphery countries have acquired and used English "in their own terms" and resisted "the hegemonic ideologies of English" (p. 131). He emphasizes that in the "colonization" period natives were not

passive recipients of English ideologies but adopted “avoidance” strategies in which they claimed “a knowledge of the language” for “their material advancement” while distancing themselves from the texts and values that came with the language” (p. 124). In the “decolonization period” however, natives adopted “reinterpretations strategies” in which they provided “new meanings for dominant discourses to suit one’s own interests and ideologies” (p. 125). Thus, English became a “repository” of the periphery “anti-colonial thinking” (p. 126). In the post-independent period in which many nations in the periphery gained independence, English was the neutral code through which everyone could “achieve social mobility irrespective of one’s caste/regional/religious identity” (p. 126). In the present day status of English, which Canagarajah (2000) describes as “post-colonial” period, English has become “vernacularized” and natives adopt “linguistic appropriation” strategies and use English creatively to represent their own discourses (p. 128). Therefore, English is now a heteroglossic language that has become pluralized” and “mixed with other languages” (p. 130). In fact, Canagarajah’s positive arguments are in favor of English as a means for social mobility and resisting hegemonic powers.

Like the previous scholars, De Swaan (2001), the Dutch sociologist, also has positive perspectives towards English; however, his arguments concerning English, which are directed by his theories about the value of language, differ from the ones reviewed earlier. In his book *Words of the world: the global language system*, he discusses the issue of the value of language, in particular English, and explains how it influences its functions and being chosen by people. According to him each language has a communicative potential or “the Q-value” meaning that as a language’s speakers increase in number, the language’s utility increases too. Thus, not only “languages define

areas of communication” (p. 41), he argues, but also the prevalence of a language indicates the “opportunities it has to offer” (p. 33). Therefore, the motivation for learning a foreign language increases when “cultural products are unavailable in translation into one’s own, peripheral language” (p. 46) and when “people want to communicate beyond the narrow circle of their linguistic peers” (p. 52).

Further he explains how a multilingual society gradually changes into a bilingual one and finally to a monolingual society. As for the reasons, he clarifies that in “polyglossia” or when several languages coexist in one society, the language with less Q-value, “usually an indigenous language, often mother tongue”, will be abandoned, (p. 53) because “more and more people who speak the domestic language can also be reached in the foreign one” (p. 54). Once the majority of the community has become bilingual or when “diglossia” is established, the stage of “heteroglossia” sets in where “the original language no longer adds much to the Q-value of individual repertoires” and thus “it is increasingly being abandoned, as the dominant language takes over” (p. 54).

In the last chapter of his book, “Conclusions and considerations”, he considers “the present world language system” as “the latest stage in the millennial evolution of human languages” in which the connectedness between language groups is increasing (p. 176). In this stage, as he describes, most societies are increasingly entering the state of “diglossia” where English is the language of “the office during working hours” and the indigenous language is the language of home and “spontaneous informal contact” (p. 185 – 186). In short, both mother tongues and English “enable and compel people to alternate between different levels” (p. 193), although like Crystal he adds that this “division of functions is not so neat and clear” (p. 186). He then explains that diglossia is the result of

the contemporary world being transformed through the process of globalization that “proceeds in English” (p. 186). “People tend to learn the language with the greatest communication value anyway”; therefore, what “the great majority of language experts” do to “defend the peripheral languages against central...is mostly irrelevant (186). In addition, “the costs of translations and interpretations from one into all recognized languages are prohibitive”; therefore, in all multilingual constellations there is a broad agreement “against the use of a multiplicity of languages and in favor of a single vernacular language” (p. 191). At the end he emphasizes, “there is no language” other than English “that more fully reflects the variety of human experience” (p. 192). In fact, his argument in favor of English suggests that not only does he believe in the intrinsic benefits of English but also accepts English spread as completely natural and the result of people’s free choice and desire.

### **2. 2. 3. 2 Mixed views**

After reviewing scholars who have completely positive ideas about English in the following paragraphs I will review the few scholars who have mixed ideas about English.

Among these scholars Crystal (1997, 2000, 2004) is the most famous. Crystal’s examination of English as an international language goes beyond discussing its localized varieties. In fact, to examine the status of English as an international language and the reasons for its spread he extends sociolinguistics to examine how social and cultural circumstances “govern language status and change” (1997, p. vii).

As for the reason why we need a global language, he argues that we need English because it acts as a lingua franca or “common language” that has geographically spread due to political factors (1997, p. 11). Indeed, he refers to reasons that have contributed to

English becoming an international language. The first, he argues, deals with the simplicity of the language and its ease of learning. Crystal (1997) argues that intrinsic structural properties, size of the vocabulary, the language being associated with a great culture and it being a vehicle of a great literature in the past “can motivate someone to learn a language (p. 9). However, he emphasizes that none of them alone or in combination can ensure a language’s world spread” (p. 9). The case of Latin that is only “learned as a classical language by only a scholarly and religious few” and also Esperanto that has not gained global acceptance though its structure is simple are two examples Crystal presents to prove his argument.

The second and much more significant reason, Crystal explains, is the English users’ political, technological, and cultural power “on the international stage,” because as he argues, “language has no independent existence ... apart from the people who speak it” (1997, p. 7). Thus, the more English-speaking countries are becoming globally dominant the more English language is spreading and gaining value. These different forms of power that Crystal calls “external forces” on the other hand result in the non-English speaking countries giving English “a special place within their communities” (p. 4). They may make it the “official (or semi-official) language of a country to be used as a medium of communication in such domains as government, the law courts, the media and the educational system” and/or makes the language “a priority in a country’s foreign-language teaching” (2004, p. 7). He then explains how in different periods in history different forms of power have contributed to English spread. He explains colonialism was the result of political power; “Technological power was associated with the Industrial Revolution” in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries while in the nineteenth

century the economic power of the U.S. overtook Britain and in the twentieth century we are witnessing the cultural power of America influencing all aspects of our lives (p. 10).

As for the subject of an international language in general, Crystal theoretically “believes” in two principles: “the fundamental value of multilingualism” and “of a common language” (1997, p. viii). He views linguistic diversity “as an amazing world resource which presents us with different perspectives and insights” (p. viii). In addition, he notes that a “common language” provides us with “unprecedented possibilities for mutual understanding” and “fresh opportunities for international cooperation” (1997, p. viii). Thus, in his point of view, “the need for cultural and national identity” is not opposed to the need for “mutual intelligibility” through a common language (1997, p. 22). Therefore, as he maintains, the co-existence of both mother tongue and common language is “perfectly possible to develop” because the functions of these two languages “are so different that the world of linguistic diversity can in principle continue to exist in a world united by a common language” (p. 22). Unfortunately, he does not explain how that can be achieved and what should be done to that end.

But while promoting the possibility of a bilingual situation in theory, he suggests that in reality such bilingualism is not always healthy. He explains that many factors such as “growth in nation-state” and thus “recognition of official language” (p. 69), “cultural assimilation”, “demographic submersion” and “urbanization” (p. 77) as well as “the significant growths in international lingua francas” result in a stage of bilingualism in which people speak their own language and the new dominant one (p. 69). However, due to the competition between the two languages, he explains, the native or the ethnic language gradually loses its value compared with the dominant one. And in many cases

value loss is associated with the fact that people lose positive attitudes towards their own language due to their language being “marginalized” in society because of government language policies (p. 83). In other words, people view their native language as a sign of “backwardness or as a hindrance to making improvements in social standing”; negative attitudes that are “introduced by a more dominant culture” (p. 84). Thus, the ethnic language use becomes limited to “irrelevant or unimportant domains” (Fishman, as cited in Crystal, 2000, p. 83).

In his discussion of unhealthy bilingual situations that lead to language death, Crystal (2000) very rarely refers to English. He argues rather, “effects of the dominant language vary markedly in different parts of the world as do attitudes towards it”; therefore, if languages are dying there it is not through any fault of English” (p. 87). However, his argument that “no language has ever exercised so much international influence as English” and his naming of the reasons for language death give the impression that English is one of the main causes of this death all around the world though he does not seem to acknowledge it explicitly (p. 70). In fact, although he argues that English has become the “world’s lingua franca” through the process of “linguistic evolution”, he emphasizes that such status “must not be at the expense of other languages” (p. 29). Because as he emphasizes “sharing of a single language” does not bring peace, rather the choice of an international language will cause religious, nationalistic and other problems (p. 27-28). He states, even an international body as some people suggest, cannot “persuade people to voluntarily give up their language, or support another at the expense of their own” because we see that many conflicts arise when people “believe their language is being sidelined” (p. 29).

In short, Crystal's views may be literally positive and viewed as liberal by scholars such as Phillipson; however, they implicitly demonstrate his being conscious about military, political and economic powers that have been influential in English spread and dominance. In other words, he characterizes English spread as a natural process; however, his views suggest his concern for the negative consequences of the spread of English, the most important of which, is language death and abandonment of mother tongues.

Graddol's (1997) ideas about English seem to be similar to Crystal's in that they both have mixed ideas about English: they both view the worldwide spread of English as natural and beneficial though they are aware of negative aspects and consequences associated with this spread. As for the negative aspects, in his book *The Future of English*, Graddol (1997) explicitly refers to the role of Britain and the U.S. in the spread of English and that in the twentieth century the role of the U.S. has been more important than that of Britain, a fact that Crystal does not mention. In addition, Graddol (1997) refers to English as being identified with "inequality" in communication technology, because in developing countries access to Internet is costly and not always accessible (p. 39). However, he argues "languages other than English are accounting for an increasing proportion of the traffic and content of the Internet" (p. 40). Also, elsewhere Graddol and Meinhof (1999) – a Professor of German and Cultural Studies – in their discussion of the negative consequences of English, refer to the status of English in Singapore. They explain that in Singapore not only do people shift to speak Singaporean English, but also they use it both "for public communication" and "within family" which demonstrates

how English has replaced native languages in Singapore and is no longer a second language although it has become localized.

As for the positive aspects of English, like Kachru (1992), Strevens (1992) and Nelson (1992), Graddol (1997) argues that English has entered the “fabric of social life” and “reflects local culture and languages”; thus, varieties of English that have come into being differ from “the kind of English spoken in Britain or North America” (p. 2). And since English is the leading language of science and technology and embodies “the feel of hope, of material advance, of scientific and empirical procedures”, (Steiner as cited in Graddol, 1997, p. 8) “within a decade or so, the number of people who speak English as a second language will exceed the number of native speakers” (p. 2). Thus, native speakers of English would decline by 1999 and English will “increasingly act as a lingua franca between non-native speakers” (1997, p. 13). Consequently, English may influence the “balance of power” of native languages; though, “English is rarely the mere or direct cause of this language loss” (p. 39). Though Graddol seems to have a positive perspective towards English spread in future, he points out that drivers of language change “are both social and material in nature” and individuals, governments and institutions” have a significant role in the process of change (p. 17). In fact, like Crystal, Graddol believes that different social and economic factors have been influential in the rising status of English and in future similar sets of factors, the most important of which is China’s economic growth, will influence and likely threaten the power of English speaking countries and thus the English language.

Like Graddol, Spolsky (1998) also argues that “it is hard to predict the next stage” (p. 90) or the future of this world language, English, because the “major factors” involved

in its spread “come from the changing nature of the world and of its reflected language system” rather than “language policy decisions” (p. 88). In addition, he emphasizes that since English spread is not controlled and political and economic pressures reinforce its spread, it threatens to “take over important functions from other major languages and by furthering language shift” (p. 77). However, unlike Graddol he suggests that “English might simply develop into a neutral auxiliary language, more efficient and cultivated than Esperanto, but no more associated with its speakers” or that “machine translation” may remove the problem of language barrier (p. 91).

While presenting these critical views about English spread and its negative consequences, Spolsky (1998) shares De Swaan’s notion of Q-value and argues that his ideas about the natural process of English spread as the language with highest Q-value is much stronger than Phillipson’s conspiracy theory. He argues that English “now looks set to become a world language” because “the demand has continually exceeded the supply” (p. 76-77). In other words, there “has been little need to fan interest” in non-English speaking countries to learn English because the “association of English with modern technology, with economic progress and with internationalization has encouraged people all over the world to learn English” (p. 77). Therefore, questioning Phillipson’s linguistic imperialism or what he calls “conspiracy theory” (that I will review later), Spolsky emphasizes that English spread is an issue of language policy that needs to be looked at in “a much wider context” rather than in a context in which the focus is on English-speaking conspiracy, “English-teaching professionals and their elite collaborators and successors in the peripheral countries” (p. 78). In fact, as I will review in the section on LPP, Spolsky views language policy and language planning as being situated in a wide-

range of social, economic and political factors which influence not only policy formulations but also the way they are implemented and evaluated in different contexts.

In short, Spolsky views English as being associated with both positive and negative aspects. On the one hand, he argues that English spread and dominance in the world is the result of numerous social and economic factors both at the national and international levels rather than just political and economic power of English speaking countries. Therefore, he states that the process of English becoming an international language has been natural. However, on the other hand, he explicitly states that English spread at the global level has not been controlled and that at the national level, in particular in developing countries, it has been promoted and perceived as superior to native languages and thus has been conducive to their abandonment.

### **2. 2. 3. 3 Negative views**

After reviewing scholars who have positive and mixed perspectives towards EIL, in the following paragraphs I will review the scholars who have critical views towards English and thus provide some solutions as to either reduce the problems associated with English or consider the issue of the of language barrier as an urgent action.

Phillipson (1992, 1997, 2001) is one of the most well known critics of English. His research interests include language pedagogy, language policy and linguistic human rights. In his examination of the role of English in the new world like Kachru (1992), Stevans (1992) and Nelson (1992), he approves “of the principle of celebrating the multiplicity of Englishes” (2000, p 88). However, his most significant contribution to the examination of EIL is comprised of his critical views.

In his famous book *Linguistic Imperialism*, he (1992) questions the status of English as an international language and looks specifically at the “ideology transmitted with and through English” (p. 1). Contrary to Canagarajah, he ignores the role of agency in English use and argues that English as the language of “a major economic, political and military force in the contemporary world”(p. 24) has spread homogeneously worldwide due to “British colonialism, international interdependence, revolutions in technology, transport, communications and commerce” (p. 23).

Also, in the chapter, “Englishisation: one dimension of globalization” from the book *English in a changing world* edited by Graddol and Meinhof (1999), Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas (1999) examine the crucial role English has had in globalization. Similarly in the journal article, *English for globalization or for the world’s people*, Phillipson (2001) explores the role of English in the “processes of globalization” as well as the reasons for such dominance. He argues that English is “integral to the globalization processes” that characterizes the contemporary world (2001, p. 187). English not only is dominant in international politics and commerce, but also in academia and publishing. And above all, it is the “western interests” that it has served to “maintain” (2001, p. 187). Its triumph, Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas (1999) argue, is linked to the “predicted demise of, or threat towards 90 percent of the world’s languages within a century” as Krauss, (1992, 1995), Posey (1997) and the World Commission on Culture and Development (1995) have shown (p. 19).

Contrary to Strevens (1992), Phillipson (1992) argues that norms for the language flow from “core English-speaking” to “periphery English countries,” (p. 25). In fact, opposed to Strevens and Canagarajah he ignores the point that individuals in non-native

English speaking countries use their own cultural values and ideologies to process and interpret the information that comes through English and thus the world is not becoming westernized.

In addition, though he refers to tremendous increase in ESL and EFL speakers; about “300 and 100 million people respectively” (Crystal as cited in Phillipson, 1992, p. 24), he argues that English is not a real international or “universal lingua franca” as it seems (p. 188). In fact, as he states “the majority of the world’s citizens do not speak English, whether as a mother tongue or as a second or foreign language” (p. 188).

In reviewing the earlier work relevant to linguistic imperialism, Phillipson argues that earlier investigations of linguistic imperialism (e.g. Kachru, 1986) have unfortunately focused on three aspects, form, function and pervasiveness rather than on the fundamental factors that have resulted in the changes in the form, functions of the language and causes of its spread. However, he notes that the sociology of language and especially Fishman (1977), who is a pioneer in the field, offer relatively richer theories and empirical data than language spread theory because they focus on language policies and how and why they have contributed to English spread. However, Phillipson disagrees with Fishman who considers English spread as merely the result of policies rather than any imposing power.

To reinforce his opposition to English, Phillipson (1992) argues, though without any evidence, that “protesters” including “colonized people, European parliamentarians, political enemies of core-English nations, guardians of the purity of languages that English intrudes on,” have all recognized English linguistic imperialism and have “a desire to combat it” (p. 35). What he means by linguistic imperialism is that “the

dominance of English is asserted and maintained by the establishment and the continuous reconstruction of structural and cultural inequalities between English and other languages” (p. 47). In other words, developed countries maintain and reproduce their “material” and “ideological” powers (p. 47) in developing countries in the name of “development” and “modernization” which are appealing to developing countries (p. 43). English linguistic imperialism is so powerful that as Phillipson argues, it “permeates all the types of imperialism” because it is the “primary means of communication in all fields” and is the “integral part” and “primary component” of all sorts of imperialism the most important of which are cultural and social imperialism (p. 53). In other words, English is “a key medium of Centre-Periphery relations” in which western culture is imposed on developing countries (p. 56) and the “periphery remains in a dependent situation” (p. 57). As Phillipson explains, all kinds of English products such as films, videos, television serials and advertisements produced in developed or Centre countries bring about the modern world in developing societies and establish “cultural imperialism” (p. 58). Thus, as Phillipson argues, linguistic imperialism is asymmetrical in the sense that developing countries are mere consumers of western cultural products and have no role in ownership, production and distribution of cultural products and practices at the global level.

Phillipson (1992) further maintains that there are three sets of arguments that promote English. The first focuses on the “intrinsic” capacities of English, its being “rich”, “varied” and “well-adapted for change” (p. 271). The second set is based on the English resources or its “extrinsic” qualities such as English textbooks, dictionaries, rich literature and trained teachers (p. 271). And the last is associated with functions of

English and how English use makes it possible for people to have access to modernization, science and technology, to “unite within a country and across nations” and to further “international understanding” (p. 272).

In order to further back up and clarify his arguments Phillipson (1992) discusses Galtung’s three types of power, which are “innate, structural” or associated with English resources (Galtung as cited in Phillipson, 1992, p. 272). He then explains that the means used to assert these powers are respectively “persuasion”, “bargaining” and “force” or “structure” (Galtung as cited in Phillipson, 1992, p. 272). In fact, he demonstrates how these forms of power have been used to promote English language and western culture and also create a sense of “submissiveness” that is interrelated with “dependency” and finally result in “an imperialistic world order in which English is the dominant world language” (p. 272).

Phillipson’s (1992) response to the arguments on the intrinsic power of English is that any language can potentially fulfill any function, thus no language is intrinsically superior or inferior. As for the second set of arguments on English resources, he notes that these arguments glorify English resources and make “resources which other languages and multilingual countries have” as either “invisible or regarded as handicaps” (p. 279). Finally, in terms of the functional value of English, Phillipson (1992) argues that in reality what is happening is that “in some ESL contexts ...English is displacing and replacing local languages rather than functioning as an “auxiliary” or “additional” language” (p. 282). And thus he also disagrees with arguments and language policies that view “linguistic diversity as the major cause of conflict” in the world and attempts to remove it (Imhoff, as cited in Phillipson, 1992, p. 285).

Elaborating on the issue of preserving linguistic diversity he emphasizes the notion of linguistic human rights and how English is threatening minority languages and thus causing the denial of linguistic rights of minorities. In an attempt to find out to what extent dominated languages are supported at the national and international level he and Skutnabb-Kangas (1986a, 1989) analyzed a range of national constitutions and international covenants, such as declaration of International Association for Cross-cultural Communication and the 1988 submission to UNESCO by FIPLV (Federation Internationale des Professurs de Langues Vivantes). What they found indicates that only a few countries such as “Finland, India and Yugoslavia provide support for the promotion of some, but by no means all, minority languages” (p. 95). In fact, as he argues there is no sign of action on the part of these organizations to solve the problems. Therefore, though he argues that existing international declarations do not provide adequate support for dominated languages, though theoretically they promote these minority languages, he does not provide any reason for the gap and disparity between these policies and their implementation. Neither does he present any suggestion or solution to remove or at least decrease these gaps.

In addition, in the chapter, “English in the new world Order: variation on a theme of linguistic imperialism and “world” English”, from the book *Ideology, Politics and Language Policies: focus on English* edited by Ricento (2000), Phillipson (2000) refers to the link between English and “processes of global enrichment and impoverishment” that is denied by Crystal (1997) in his discussion of English (p. 90). And he explains how English is integral to the asymmetrical processes of globalization reviewed above. He

also emphasizes that “the promise of what might be achieved in and through English was as much of a hollow sham” (p. 93).

As for the solution to solve the issue of language barriers, he presents two suggestions. The first solution he maintains, is to adopt Esperanto as an international language, because he argues, Esperanto might be a more “efficient and equitable solution to some problems of international communication” than English because it may not cause the inequalities that non-native speakers of English may encounter (p. 97). However, he does not explain or provide details on how Esperanto can become an international language. His second solution concerns English if it is going to continue its role as an international language and be “a force for democracy and human rights” (p. 102). He argues that “much needs to change” both in “North” and “South” countries and in “North-South relations”; however, he does not clarify or explain what those changes can be and how they can be made (p. 102).

In short, Phillipson does not acknowledge English as an international language and presents the following critical views about it. English is not really an international language because not every one in the world has the right to learn and use it. Not only powerful western countries have imposed English on developing countries, but they have also used it as a means to maintain and even increase their dominance. Therefore, it is only the western culture that is transmitted all around the world rather than all the different cultures. As a result, it has led to homogenization or westernization of the world and the loss of linguistic and cultural diversity.

Pennycook (1994) also has critical views towards English; however, his arguments differ from those of Phillipson in significant ways. Pennycook has been an

English teacher for many years in Germany, Japan, China, Canada and Hong Kong. And his English teaching experience has lead him to conduct research on the global spread of English, colonialism and language policy, critical applied linguistics and critical approaches to TESOL.

Pennycook (1994) argues that in linguistics and applied language studies the main focus has been on “description of the different types of English produced by its spread” rather than “the causes and effects of this spread” which are “relegated to a functionalist perspective” (p. 9). Therefore, to fill the gap in literature he focuses on English spread and disagrees with the arguments that consider English spread as “natural, neutral and beneficial”, because as he emphasizes, English is not “detached from its original cultural contexts” nor is it a “neutral and transparent medium of communication” (p. 9). In addition, like Phillipson he argues that English is not beneficial for all human beings in the world because not every one has access to it and it causes issues of linguistic inequality for its non-native speakers.

Pennycook (1994) also refers to the fact that adopting English is not based on free choice, but individuals and countries choose to learn and use English due to “economic, political and ideological constraints” (p. 11). Like Phillipson (1992) he argues that English is closely linked with the dominant forms of culture in the world and is bound up with the “spread of capitalism, development aid and the dominance particularly of North American media” (p. 13). In addition, dominance of English in popular culture, academia, music, etc., he argues, not only promotes western culture and knowledge, but also like a “Trojan horse”, threatens indigenous languages all around the world (Cooke, as cited in Pennycook, 1994, p. 13).

Unlike the previous scholars reviewed he offers new insights about English. Believing in the “connections between language and its contexts”, Pennycook (1994) emphasizes that language is “an active agent” rather than “passive reflector” of “social relations” (p. 26). In fact, contrary to a structuralist approach, he maintains that language is not just a “structure”, but also a system that is a by-product of “language in use” (p. 26). Thus, following Volosinov’s (1973) views of the dialogic nature of language, he stresses that language use is “a social and cultural act” and presents his theory of the “worldliness of English” (p. 30). What he means is that “discourses of contemporary world relations have both facilitated and been facilitated by the spread and construction of English” (p. 33). That is, global and local discourses create the conditions or the contexts of engaging in the social practice of using English and at the same time, English creates the conditions of taking up a position in these discourses. In short, the worldliness of English accounts for “the material existence of English in the world, its spread around the world, its world character as a result of being so widely used in the world, and its position not only as reflective but also as constitutive of worldly affairs” (p. 36).

These arguments that seem unprecedented in their own terms seem to echo some of the issues raised by the previous scholars. On the one hand, Pennycook implicitly opposes Phillipson’s argument that puts so much emphasis on English language as distinct from its users. On the other hand, his theory of the worldliness of English reminds us of Spolsky’s (1988) argument, though not literally that “the demand has continually exceeded the supply” which is to a large extent contrary to Phillipson’s argument that only considers Western countries responsible for English spread (p. 76-77).

In elaborating his discussion on the worldliness of English and human agency in English use, he examines the relationship between English and development and modernization. He argues that after World War II the paradigm concerning development “divides the world into developed and underdeveloped nations” (p. 44). And developing countries consider that the only way for economic development and becoming modernized is to receive development aid from developed countries that, of course, is mediated through English. He then argues that though “development aid was not really aid” and that it contributed to the spread of capitalism (Gibbons as cited in Pennycook, 1994, p. 45), people in developing countries did “interpret, translate and transform their experiences of foreign culture to relate to more familiar experiences” (Boyd-Barrett as cited in Pennycook, 1994, p. 56) because culture is “an active process by which people make sense of their lives” (p. 61). Thus, focusing on the role of human agency in English use, he refers to Phillipson’s (1986; 1992) shortcoming in adhering to “a version of structural imperialism” (p. 56). In fact, he opposes Phillipson’s idea of linguistic imperialism because of its leaving “ little space for consideration of how English is used in diverse contexts or how it is appropriated and used in opposition to those that promote its spread” (p. 56). Similarly to Canagarajah and Nelson he explains how, for example in Africa, English has “helped the formation of the pan-African movement and African nationalism” (Mazrui as cited ion Pennycook, 1994, p. 260-261). Or how in colonial countries to write back and resist the colonial power people used “abrogation” strategy that is “a denial or refusal of the colonial and metropolitan categories, its standard of normative or correct usage, its claim to fixed meanings inscribed in words” and/or

“appropriation” strategy in which they have seized the language [English] and replaced it in a specific cultural location (p. 267).

Like Phillipson, Pennycook also proposes a solution to the problem of English dominance but his focus is only on problems associated with English rather than on the issue of language barriers that Phillipson refers to. He argues that we have to find ways to deal with English rather than oppose its spread. Opposing Phillipson’s solution, which seeks “a greatly diminished role for English”, he proposes “establishing critical pedagogies of English” (p. 308). Two principal aspects to his critical pedagogy are the need to ensure that students have access to those forms of language, culture and knowledge that are significant within the context and society and ways to help students to “use English in their own way, to appropriate English for their own ends” (p. 315-316). Thus, if we deal with English critically, Pennycook argues, “chances for cultural renewal and exchange around the world” will be provided (p. 325).

Like Phillipson and Pennycook, Fishman (2001) whom I will also refer to for his work in the section on LPP, as a renowned scholar in the field of language planning and policy also has critical views towards English; however, he does not seem to be as pessimistic about globalization as they are. Like Phillipson and Pennycook he accepts globalization as definitely not a “culturally neutral or impartial one”; however, he considers it as both “a constructive and a deconstructive phenomenon” (p. 6). Concerning the deconstructive nature of globalization he argues that it is the globalization of “pan-Western culture” that is “the motor of language shift” (p. 6) since English is “increasingly associated with technological modernity and power” (p. 19). In addition, in his point of view, not only does English threaten native language but also makes it impossible for

people to express their own cultural meanings via a language – English – that relates to another culture; thus, when a different language – English – comes from a “different ethnocultural point of origin”, social meanings change (p. 4).

In terms of the constructive aspects of globalization he stresses that “globalization has undoubted benefits”, and the “mainstream language yields too many advantages” for speakers of threatened languages, though he notes that the benefits are pursued at the “unjustified and un-called” expense of non-mainstream countries (p. 8).

Therefore, considering the pros and cons of globalization he argues that since “America-dominated globalization” has affected all aspects of life, saving threatened languages and cultures is in fact opposing the strongest process in the world that is “so hard” (p. 6). Therefore, saving languages threatened by English is neither “returning to the global past” when interactions between people were minimal, nor rejecting globalization as a whole, but “an internal societal re-allocation of languages to functions” (p. 7). In fact, what he proposes is another form of discussing the issue of linguistic human rights that Phillipson emphasizes in which languages especially the minorities should be given the functions they used to have. However, he does not explain how that can be achieved.

Swales (1997) also like most of the previous scholars reviewed, has critical views towards English threatening native languages; however, his focus is on the dominance of English in Academia. Swales who is known for his work on genre analysis in applied linguistics and ESL, in his article, *English as Tyrannosaurus rex*, refers to English as “a powerful carnivore gobbling up the other denizens of the academic linguistic grazing grounds” (p. 374). He confesses that after a 30-year involvement with the EAP he now

realizes how EAP programs' representation of English "as a wider window on the world" have "accrued to ESL" (p. 377). Referring to the forms of global advance of English he maintains that, no less than 31 percent of all papers published in mainstream journals in 1994 emanated from the USA (Gibbs as cited in Swales, 1997, p. 376). Therefore, he argues that the "global advance of English" has unfortunately resulted in the "loss of specialized registers in otherwise healthy languages" (p. 377). Indeed, he points out that religious and law registers have remained protected against the dominance of English. However, in "media" including "film, theatre, television, pop music, radio, print, journalism" English domination is "greater" (p. 378). In addition, he argues, there is a tremendous amount of "register loss" in the "world of scholarship" (p. 378). Consequently, he states, when native people use English rather than their own indigenous languages to produce professional and academic registers, their native culture "begins to die" (p. 379). In addition, there is "loss of professional speech differentiation for the purposes of literary characterization, for entertainment and for parody" (p. 379).

Although Swales opposes English dominance in academia, he makes an overgeneralization and limits culture to its realization in academia and ignores other domains of language use and symbols through which culture is realized and communicated.

Different from Swales, Ricento's (2002) critical views towards English are focused on the notion of preserving linguistic diversity while promoting social and cultural development. In the introduction of the book, *International journal of the sociology of language: Revisiting the mother-tongue question in language policy, planning and politics*, which he edited, Ricento (2002) emphasizes that due to the

significance of language in culture transmission and expression, “the chief conceptual and practical challenge of the contemporary world is how to promote social and economic integration of all ethnolinguistic groups while maintaining true linguistic and cultural pluralism” (2002, p. 3). Working in the field of language policy like Spolsky, his focus is on how ideologies shape language policies and thus influence language choice, language value and domains of language use. In the introduction of the book *Ideology, politics and language policies: focus on English* he (2000) elaborates on this issue and, like Spolsky and Fishman, argues that ideologies in the Periphery shape the ideologies in the Center and vice versa. In other words, as he states, there is a two-way direction between language policies and their underlying ideologies in developing and developed countries rather than a one-way direction as Phillipson argues.

In another chapter of the same book, Ricento (2000) briefly reviews both Phillipson’s (1997) and Pennycook’s (1994) critical views of English. He notes that Phillipson (1997) focuses on the structural power of English and how imperial languages, especially English, are imposed on indigenous languages around the world. However, Pennycook, Ricento notes, distinguishes between the “structural power” of English and its “discursive effects” (p. 18).

Based on Phillipson’s view, Ricento (2000) states that the cure for linguistic imperialism “involves a proactive political and moral response, especially the promotion – and acceptance – of linguistic human rights by states and international bodies as universal principles” (p. 18). Though Ricento seems to agree with Phillipson, he refers to scholars (e.g. Conrad, 1996; Davies, 1996) who have questioned Phillipson’s lack of empirical support or those (e.g. Pennycook, 1994; Canagarajah, 1999) who have

considered his model as too “deterministic and monolithic in its assumptions and conclusions’ (p. 18) and he expresses his doubt of the validity of Phillipson’s arguments.

In addition to Ricento and these scholars, participants in a graduate seminar also in a review article, *Re)experiencing hegemony: the linguistic imperialism of Robert Phillipson*, examine Phillipson’s rhetorical style in the book *Linguistic Imperialism* and argue that his “hegemonic narrative” has negatively affected the credibility of his claims (Berns, Barrett, Chan, Chikuma, Friedrich, Hadjidimos, Harney, Hislope, Johnson, Kimbali, Low, McHenry, Palalologos, Petray, Shapiro and Shook, 1998, p. 281).

The last scholar whose critical views about English I will review, is Chew (1989). Chew (1989) who is an associate professor at the National Institute of Education and president of the English Language and Literature Association of Singapore, also presents critical views about English. In her article, *Whither the International Auxiliary Language?*, she acknowledges that English “is less and less regarded as a European language and its development less and less determined by the usage of its native speakers” and that it has “over 700 million speakers ...fifty-five percent of these are non-native speakers” (p. 6). However, she presents critical views about English. She states that English spelling and pronunciation is arbitrary and its stress is unpredictable. She maintains, “especially in the Third World, English is a symbol of class superiority and discrimination” (p. 7). And above all, she stresses that the main disadvantages of English are its being associated with colonialism and “economic, technical and power imperialism” (p. 7). In another article, *Linguistic imperialism, globalism and the English language*, she (1999) also notes that ‘the phenomenal growth of English’ is not just the result of imperialism. Explaining the status of English in Singapore she demonstrates that

“globalism” and “language policy makers and language users” have had a crucial role in its growth and dominance (p. 37).

Therefore, she suggests that choosing an AUL through international decision-making will do away “with all the linguistic difficulties encountered by technicians, scientists, missionaries, immigrants, businessmen, tourists and students, and place within the reach of all, without restriction, the world’s science, political thought and channels of trade” (p. 2). In addition, it will “make the world one home and will become the strongest impulse for human advancement” (p. 3) because by learning it, people all around the world do not have to waste time and efforts to learn other languages and get involved in the “inefficiencies and insufficiencies of translations” (p. 3). She adds, if English is to be the “eventual choice as the world’s universal auxiliary language”, we must consider the issue of justice (p. 7). She explains, though English is so widespread, “still many millions” have never used it or even heard it being used. In fact, it is only the native speakers of English and those in former colonial countries who have a “clear political, economic, social and academic advantage” (p. 8). Similar to Phillipson and Graddol, she also presents two possible scenarios about the future of the language situation in the world. One is that by the time nations meet to deliberate on the choice of the AUL, “English would no longer remain as a predominantly utilitarian language of science and technology...but instead would have grown and become so widespread...that those who use it – native and non-native – [would] feel it is their own possession” (p. 8). She elaborates, “when the English language of [the] future is accepted from within rather than felt as something imposed from [the] outside”, its universal adoption will coincide with the notion of justice as emphasized in the Bahá’í writings (p. 8). As for the second

scenario, she states, if the first scenario does not happen, “Esperanto as a planned language will be the most realistic candidate for a global role” (p. 8) because “it favors no one natural language and has no association with oppression and tyranny” (p. 9).

In summary, the reviewed literature on English can be considered as the beginning step to addressing and solving the issue of the language barrier that has been emphasized especially in the first section of the literature review. In the first section some scholars refer to the possibility of English becoming a world language; however, they emphasize that it will not solve the problem of the language barrier because it will only be an easy and quick fix for immediate language problems. At present, as the literature explicitly demonstrates, English has partially become the solution for language problems. As reviewed in the section on Positive views, in response to the increasing dominance of English in academia, publishing, the media and the Internet, more and more people in non-native English speaking countries tend to learn English to be able to live a better life, educate themselves, find a better job, communicate with people all around the world who speak different languages and so on. As a result, local varieties of English have come into being which reflect the local culture rather than English or western culture. In addition, not only do these varieties have the flavor of the local cultures, but they are also the means through which resistance to the western or colonizing culture is expressed. In other words, non-native English speakers use English to resist and to express their freedom from the hegemony of the western political powers. Although these aspects are all considered as positive aspects associated with English, they are unfortunately accompanied by a larger number of negative responses or consequences as the mixed and negative views demonstrate. In fact, the critical views towards English and the negative

issues associated with it bear witness to problems for which there are only a few solutions presented in the literature.

The first and most significant problem with English dominance in the world is that according to the literature it has never been selected as the international language by all the countries around the world. In fact, the world's countries have never made a policy in which English is the international language, though as will be reviewed in the section on LPP, language policies at the national level have been influential in promoting English values and dominance together with so many other factors. Therefore, due to lack of an international decision, English spread has suffered from lack of international management and supervision. And thus, it has emerged as one of the most powerful reasons of language shift and language death. In other words, because English is often associated with economic development and is often promoted in national language policies – as I will review in detail in the section on LPP – it has gained more value and prestige than the native languages with which it is in contact. As a result, these unhealthy bilingual situations, as Crystal calls them, have led to abandonment of native languages and thus their death.

In addition to these negative aspects, colonizing countries, in particular Britain and the United States, have formulated specific policies to spread English so that they can maintain and even reinforce their cultural and political and economic hegemony all over the world, in particular in developing countries. In response, developing countries have given special value and status to English in their language policies to develop economically so that they can resist western power both through their economic development and the English language as well. And at the micro level, individuals'

choices to learn English, though they may have been intrinsically motivated, are the result of those language policies as well as world circumstances and transformations at the macro level.

In response to these problems and negative consequences attributed to English, there are only a few solutions in the literature. In other words, although the negative aspects of English spread and dominance are described and its dominance is criticized and problematized, only three scholars provide a solution. Phillipson (1992, 2000, 2001) suggests that Esperanto is better as an AUL, but he does not explain how it should be adopted. Otherwise, he adds if English is going to continue its role as an international language some changes are needed. He adds, linguistic human rights have to be respected and minority languages should be preserved. However, he does not explain what changes have to be made in order to reduce the competition between the languages, which are in contact with each other or how they can be made. Pennycook (1994, 1995) on the other hand, suggests critical pedagogy as a way to increase the role of non-native English speakers' human agency in English language use. In other words, he suggests that non-native English learners and users should be given much more freedom in English use so that they make it their own and find their voices in English. Although this suggestion is practical and useful, it does not address or solve the fundamental problems he associates with English; problems such as English threatening native languages and inequality in terms of access to English and producing discourse in English. His solution may accelerate the problem by reinforcing the discursive power of English and thus decreasing the value of the native languages because people would realize that they could easily express themselves through English and their native languages is not needed any

longer and learning it is a burden. Chew (1989,1999) is the only scholar who refers to international planning as the possible solution to adopt an AUL and preserve language rights and preserve native cultures and languages. However, she does not provide a detailed discussion of what she suggests.

In short, the contemporary resources on the idea of an AUL that I have reviewed above contribute to the idea of an AUL from different perspectives. The literatures on international language and Esperanto as an example of a constructed language, in particular, provide theoretical information on the purpose, functions and benefits of an AUL; however, almost all the reviewed scholars except for Gruber (1995) and Meyjes (2006) refer to the impossibility of reaching an agreement on the choice of an AUL at the international level. Therefore, instead of providing any kind of practical solution or guidelines on how such an agreement can be achieved and how a language can be given the status of an AUL through international decision and agreement, they promote the simple and easy solution of adopting a constructed language as an AUL. And even in that case, they merely focus on the construction of an artificial language rather than discussing how it can be chosen and taught globally. Gruber (1995) maintains that not only is international planning of an AUL possible, but is also of great importance at the present time. Meyjes (2006) also argues that based on the critical views in academia against English as well as Bahá'í writings, English cannot be the desired AUL. Thus what he presents as a solution is mainly a new way of looking at or a new ideology towards the idea of an AUL that is inspired by social justice as emphasized in the Bahá'í Faith.

On the other hand, the literature on English explicitly considers English as an international language. The scholars with positive views towards English focus on the

varieties of English as evidence of its being appropriated to the local cultures and also argue how non-native English speakers use English to resist colonizing or western power. However, the critics of English and scholars with mixed views question the status of English through describing and discussing the reasons for its spread in the past and in the present and the consequences it has had. They argue that English is imposed on developing countries as the means through which developed countries foster their own culture and ideology. In addition, they emphasize that English dominance threatens native languages both functionally and psychologically. They also stress the notion of linguistic human rights in the way that non-native speakers of English cannot enjoy all linguistic human rights as much as the native speakers.

Although the scholars who examine English provide valuable information about English as an international language, their shortcomings are that they do not make any reference, except in the critical views, to the issues or the kind of theoretical considerations that have been raised and discussed by the scholars in the first section of the literature review with regard to the idea of an AUL. In addition, even though, in the critical views of English there are many arguments against English, only a few solutions are proposed to solve the problems associated with English and the removal of the language barrier in particular. In fact, only a few of them go beyond the critical evaluation of English and present a fundamental solution for the problem of the language barrier. Phillipson (1992, 2000, 2001) refers to the superiority of Esperanto compared with English but does not explain how Esperanto can be selected and taught all around the world. He also adds that if that does not occur and English continues its dominance some changes are needed. He however, gives no further explanation about those changes.

Pennycook (1994, 1995) on the other hand, suggests that critical pedagogy should be promoted and that non-native English users should appropriate English based on their own need. This is a practical solution; however, it does not solve the problems fundamentally. It does not end the unregulated spread and dominance of English and thus the inequality of expression at the global level by minority languages and cultures and those who do not have access to English. Chew (1989, 1999) also emphasizes, through briefly, the significant role of international planning in adopting an AUL and implementing it all around the world.

In conclusion, since the literature strongly suggests that English is not the suitable AUL, then the fundamental questions that remain are: how can we choose the AUL? And how can the need for a common language be addressed? What is the means or the model for the selection or status planning of an AUL as well as its teaching all around the world? And finally, what ideology should inform the planning of an AUL?

Before the section on Searching for answers, I will provide a brief review of the literature on Language Policy and Planning (LPP) to show how an AUL can actually be chosen and taught at the international level. As the literature demonstrates, communicating with people who are from different ethnic groups and nationalities and speak different languages has always been an issue in human life. And both people and governments based on their needs, available resources and other circumstances have responded differently to this problem. However, at the present time in history due to the tremendous necessity of having an AUL it seems that an international decision is imperative as some of the reviewed scholars suggest, though they do not provide an in depth discussion of it. To fill this gap and to show that the most significant issues in the

idea of an AUL are not just defining an AUL and specifying its function and purpose, but also its selection and teaching all around the world through international language planning. I will review the literature on LPP as a possible framework to address the issue of the LP of an AUL. In fact, the problem of the language barrier like any language problem can be solved within the theoretical context of LPP, which was originally developed to deliberately solve language problems in relation to form and then as the literature will demonstrate evolved and mainly focused on language problems at the national level, in particular in developing countries.

Although LPP could be possible framework through which the problem of language barriers can be solved, as the reader will notice, unfortunately no scholar provides a comprehensive discussion of using LPP for the idea of an AUL. Tauli (1974) and Haugen (1972) are the only scholars in the field of LPP that have briefly referred to the idea of an AUL. Haugen (1972) only mentions though a long time ago that the world is not yet ready for any such solution because it implies having a “world government” (p. 256). Tauli (1974) also briefly states that the adoption of an AUL can be examined within the theoretical context of LPP. As reviewing the literature on LPP will demonstrate, neither Haugen (1972) nor Tauli (1974) nor other scholars in the field of LPP provide any further information about the adoption of an AUL as a branch of LPP. However, the literature on LPP can provide some general guidelines that could be extended and applied in the LP of an AUL.

#### **2. 2. 4 Language Policy and Planning (LPP)**

As the previous resources on the idea of an AUL demonstrate, the most significant issues in solving the problems of language barriers are the selection of a

language to have the status of an AUL and teaching of the language at the global level. The selection of an AUL and the issues involved in its teaching can be considered a branch of activities conducted within the LPP theoretical framework, because as I will review in a chronological order, LPP includes any modification in language form, language function, as well as language propagation and spread. However, as the reader will notice in the literature on LPP there is no reference to using LPP as a theoretical model for the adoption of an AUL except in Tauli's (1974) and Haugen's (1972) discussions, which are insufficient. The literature on LPP and the scholars in the field mainly focus on dimensions of language planning and discuss what LPP is and what it involves. Furthermore, their discussions and investigation of LPP mostly deal with language policies at the national level, in particular in developing countries because LPP in its modern sense emerged there. Therefore, to fill this gap and to find out how LPP can be used to solve the problem of the language barriers I will review some of the most well known scholars in the field of LPP in an attempt to provide an overview of the field. This general overview will provide the basis that can be applied and extended as a framework for devising a possible solution for the problem of language barriers that will be discussed in the next chapter.

Fishman (1971), whose ideas on English I reviewed earlier, is one of the most famous scholars in the field of LPP. In this section I will provide a brief overview of his perspectives about LPP itself. Fishman's discussion of LPP is based on his studies and investigations in newly developed countries especially after World War II when solving language problems and adopting a national language was one of the major concerns of the countries at the time. In his examination of the impact of nationalism on language

planning, he refers to nationalism as “an integrative movement” that forges “wider bonds that can draw the rural, the urban and the regional into a broader unity: the nationality” (Fishman as cited in Rubin and Jernudd, 1971, p. 3). LP in his view has been considered an aspect of national modernization. In his point of view language planning is the “organized pursuit of solutions to language problems, typically at the national level” (Fishman as cited in Cooper, 1989, p. 29). In general, not only does Fishman believe that language can be planned, he also maintains that LP as “an attempt to influence usage more rapidly, more systematically and more massively” is “value-laden and value-directed” (p. 26).

In terms of the theoretical dimension of LP, Fishman (1974) states that the major dimensions of language planning are still those posited by Haugen (1966, 1969), which are policy formulation, codification, elaboration and implementation plus cultivation added by Neustupny (1970), intertransability, stressed by Ferguson (1968) and evaluation added by Rubin (1971). I will briefly review these dimensions from Fishman’s perspective.

In explaining these dimensions, Fishman (1974) argues that policy decisions have received the most attention in particular by Das Gupta (1970) and Haugen (1966) who tell us “how policies get to be formulated, how compromises are reached between opposing views and interests, in short about the formal and informal pressures and processes of arriving at policy decision” though none provides a theory on the issue (p. 18). As Fishman explains, codification and elaboration involve “technical linguistic aspects of language planning” called “corpus planning,” by Kloss (p. 19). In the cultivation as the “more advanced stage of language planning” as argued by Neustupny,

the main issue is “stylistic varieties of national standard” which have been “focused upon during previous stages of language planning” (p. 16). As for the implementation of language planning, Fishman argues, there are limited “studies of alternative implementational approaches to language planning” and “how to implement it differentially in relation to a variety of target populations and given a variety of social settings” (p. 20). Evaluation that is also of great importance deals with “various criteria of language planning success,” such as “knowledge, attitudes and use” (p. 16). In the intertransability the focus is on establishing a link between “modernization and indigenization,” in which “codification and elaboration are guided so as to attain the ease and precision assumed already to exist in one or another language of wider communication” (p. 16). In other words, intertransability involves rendering “as adequately and as effortlessly in one’s own language that which is already accurately and easily expressible in one or another crucial language of wider communication” (p. 24), which may go “beyond lexical and grammatical features alone to conversational and written styles as a whole, as well as to entire literary genres (p. 25).

In the chapter “Research outline for comparative studies of LP from the book *Can language be planned?*” edited by Rubin and Jernudd (1971), Fishman together with Das Gupta, Jernudd and Rubin (1971) provide some additional information with regard to the subdivisions of language planning. They argue that language planning has four dimensions or subdivisions: “policy formulations, codification, elaboration, and implementation” and explain what each involves (p. 293). As for policymaking, they state that it has a “consensual basis” in which the policy-making body decides on either “(1) the functional allocations of codes within a speech community or (2) the

characteristics of one or more codes within the code matrix (linguistic repertoire) of such [a] community” (p. 293). They also maintain that in policy-making, “the conflicting pressures within the language policy-making authority per se...as well as the conflicts and the resolutions of conflicts between the authority and other authorities” deserves examinations (p. 294). And it is in fact language policy decisions that determine who will benefit and who will not. They define codification as the normalization or standardization of specific language(s) through prescribing grammars, dictionaries; and elaboration, as a process dealing with “the need for intertransability with one or more functionally diversified languages by such means as the preparation of recommended (or official) word lists...” (p. 295). And implementation includes “all efforts to gain acceptance of the policies and products of language planning including grammars, spellers, word lists and school curricula” which may be extended to include evaluation (p. 299). Finally, emphasizing “intra- and inter-agency processes” they argue that “the relationship to languages of wider-communication also deserves attention in language planning” (p. 298).

Like Fishman (1971), Rubin and Jernudd (1971) also talk about LP as an element in modernization in developing countries in which language problems are recurrent, salient and significant. They emphasize that LP “cannot be seen in isolation from social planning” because language is not an “autonomous system” which is “not subject to deliberate modification by variables outside the system” as their contemporary linguists argue (p. xiv). They add, “although change of language use and linguistic rules are the objects of language planning, such change does not take place in vacuo” (p. xvi); economic, social, political and demographic and psychological variables are relevant.

However, they note that in reality “practitioners of actual language planning often attempt to solve language problems in purely linguistic terms either without considering the social environment in which a selected alternative is to be implemented or without attempting to predict outcomes” (p. xv). Thus, LP is deliberate language change in which some “planned” changes are made “in the systems of language code or speaking or both in the language code or speaking” by organizations that are established for such purposes or given a mandate to fulfill such purposes” (p. xvi). Defining LP as such, they stress that it is “focused on problem solving” and thus is “future-oriented” (p. xvi) with both “unknown” and “predictable” uncertainties (p. xvii).

Garvin (1974) another scholar in the field of LPP, like Rubin and Jernudd (1971), also refers to both linguistic and non-linguistic variables involved in LP. Concerning the relationship between these two sets of variables Garvin states, “the decision made in language planning affects linguistic variables; but they are motivated by non-linguistic variables and their successful implementation likewise depends on non-linguistic variables” (p. 69). He believes that LP has two ingredients: “choice of language and language development” (p. 75). It seems that what he means by language choice is similar to what previous scholars call policy formulation and policy making and his notions of language development echoes processes of codification and elaboration and more specifically corpus planning as have been reviewed as part of Fishman’s views. And as he explains, the basic consideration in language choice is “the purpose for which the language is intended” which “falls within the purview of function” (p. 76).

In the chapter called “A view towards the future” from the book *Can language be planned* edited by Rubin and Jernudd, Rubin (1971) while agreeing with Fishman (1971)

that LP is the current concern of new nations (p. 309), emphasizes that LP is possible because language is a resource that “can be subjected to alternative goals and strategies in order to exploit it” (p. 307). His explanation of the subdivisions of LP seems to differ from those presented by Fishman, Das Gupta, Jernudd and Rubin (1971) that I just discussed. He adds “fact-finding” as the first stage in LP and does not mention codification and elaboration (p. 307). Concerning evaluation or what he calls “feedback”, he emphasizes that though it is usually ignored by linguists, “people do evaluate their own and others’ language” and this “evaluation relates to social value and not to inherent linguistic characteristics” (p. 307). Therefore, he argues that language planners “must include such evaluations in the planning process if they propose to forecast successfully the outcomes of their efforts” (p. 307). He maintains that the motivation for LP is “a desire for ... modernization, a desire for efficiency or a desire for democratization” which is often similar to that of other kinds of planning (p. 307).

Unlike Rubin and even the scholars before her, Neustupny (1974) categorizes language planning into two general subdivisions, rather than four or five different divisions. The first is the policy approach in which as Neustupny explains, “the emphasis is on linguistic varieties and their distribution,” problems such as “selection of the national language, standardization, literacy, orthographies, problems of stratification of language” are covered (p. 39). This approach is in fact what the previous scholars call status planning or language choice. The second approach is cultivation in which “question of correctness, efficiency, linguistic level fulfilling specialized functions, problems of style” are of great interest (p. 39). He adds, although in this approach language code remains “the central focus, parole, speaking, is also considered” (p. 39).

This second approach can be considered similar to what the previous scholars called corpus planning or language development.

Karam (1974) like Garvin (1974) and Rubin and Jernudd (1971) also refers to the fact that the language problem to be solved is “directly associated with the political, economic, scientific, social, cultural and/or religious situation” (p. 108). In his discussion of the dimensions of LP like Fishman, Karam (1974) refers to Kloss’ identification of two dimensions: language corpus planning, which deals with issues such as “coining of new terms, to changes in spelling and morphology or to the adoption of a new script” and language status planning which refers to “the position of one language in relation to other languages as viewed by the national government” (p. 112). In addition, like Fishman (1971) and other scholars whom I reviewed earlier his discussion of the processes involved in LP, is based on newly emerging nations that in his point of view are “predominantly non-literate, multilingual and eager to displace their former colonial language with an indigenous language” (p. 108-109). However, unlike the previous scholars Karam provides a more detailed account of these activities. According to him planning includes “all the data collection, linguistic and sociolinguistic surveys... and preliminary and feasibility plans that are necessary for the decision-making regarding language selection and language policy,” termed as fact-finding by Rubin (1974) (p. 109). As he explains, after a plan is written, implementation starts which includes “all the activity necessary for the execution of the plan, such as the codification of the norm and the many tasks that are accompanied by the educational institutions in disseminating the codified norm” (p. 109). And unlike the previous scholars he emphasizes that it is not only educational institutions that can be involved in implementation, that implementation

is followed by evaluation, which involves “monitoring and assessing the results of both the planning and implementation activities” (p. 109). After explaining these three processes he makes his unprecedented final remark that they are cyclical because language and culture change constantly; therefore, national language planning is an ongoing activity. In fact, by emphasizing the fact that language planning is a continuous activity he suggests that one should not expect that implementing one language policy in a short period of time could solve the language problem completely without having any unexpected or negative consequences.

Tauli (1974), another scholar in the field of LPP, also talks about LP, its theory as well as adopting an AUL or what he calls an “interlanguage” as a branch of LP (p. 66). Though earlier in this section I referred to him, I will provide a more detailed review of his discussion of LPP, in particular language planning of an AUL. As for the factors that necessitate LPP he presents some ideas that have not been discussed by the previous scholars. He argues that “no language “can express everything adequately” (p. 51) and that “all languages are fatally imperfect and unsystematic with lacunae and unnecessary elements” and such imperfection becomes more recognizable, “particularly in the periods of cultural renovation that language lags behind needs, when the lack of adequate expressions for new meaning is felt” (p. 52). Therefore, to meet the needs and compensate for the imperfection “a language and its components can be evaluated, altered, corrected, regulated, improved and replaced by others and new languages and components of a language can be created as well” (p. 51) since language is not just a “social code” but a “means” (p. 49). Like some of the previous scholars reviewed (e.g. Rubin and Jernudd, 1971; Rubin, 1971; Garvin, 1974), Tauli (1974) also refers to non-

linguistic factors involved in LPP and emphasizes that the “deliberate direction of language depends on some factors” including “individual initiative, influence of leading persons, authority, prestige, imitative instinct, propaganda and last but not least power” (p. 52). In Tauli’s point of view, deliberate change in language termed LP in the literature involves “the methodical activity of regulating and improving existing languages or creating new common regional, national or international languages” (p. 56). In addition, he argues that LP is not only a “normative science”, but also it has to “point out and prove which expressions are preferable” and “to eliminate inadequacies and inconveniences in the structure and vocabulary of language and to adapt the language for new needs and to make it more efficient” (p. 57). Unlike the previous scholars he raises a significant point that from a synchronic point of view it is possible and ideal to standardize language, but from the diachronic point of view “standardization is not advisable” because language cannot be fixed forever (p. 63). Believing in efficiency as the most relevant issue in language, he argues that “man is free to alter and improve language according to his will” though he points out that authority and power are essential factors in LP (p. 61). Referring to modern nations in which diglossia is very common he argues that diglossia, in which a language or a variety of a language has more prestige in a society, the low variety or a language is not economical and it should be eliminated and the best way to do that is to have the high variety or the language with high prestige to assimilate “all efficient dialectical expressions” (p. 65).

As for the idea of an AUL or what he calls an “interlanguage” he argues the “principles, methods and tactics of interlanguage planning” can be considered as a special branch of LP (p. 66). Defining an interlanguage as “a universal language to be used as a

means of communication by individuals belonging to different language communities” who will all learn it as a “secondary language”, he argues that “the need for one interlanguage is increasing tremendously every day” and “the present international communication with its many official languages and translation procedures at international meetings is highly irrational” (p. 66). He maintains, although the “question whether one should adopt an ethnic language or a constructed interlanguage as the interlanguage has been discussed several times” and although finding a solution is urgent, the choice of an interlanguage “is not foreseeable in the near future” because reaching “an agreement between the governments or nations” and “between interlinguists” is not “in sight” (p. 66-67).

Cooper (1989) another famous scholar in LPP also examines LP as a concept with “no single universally accepted definition”; an argument that the reader might have noticed (p. 29). Reviewing different definitions of LP (e.g., Haugen, 1966; Rubin and Jernudd, 1971b; Fishman, 1974; Tauli, 1974) he defines it as follows: “language planning refers to deliberate efforts to influence the behavior of others with respect to acquisition, structure or functional allocation of their language codes” (p. 45). Through asking the question “who plans what for whom and how?” he clarifies the meaning of LP (p. 31). Regarding the individuals involved in LP like Karam (1974), he argues that LP should not be limited to authoritative institutions and exclude activities that emerge at the grass-root level. In terms of what LP does similar to most of the previous scholars, he refers to two “language planning foci distinguished by Kloss (1969), corpus planning and status planning” (p. 31), which I reviewed above. However, he also adds a third task, “acquisition planning” which is directed towards “language spread” and “increasing the

number of users” (p. 33). In general, he states that LP “is directed to the solution of language problems” though “typically carried out for the attainment of nonlinguistic ends” such as “national integration, political control” and economic development” (p. 34).

In terms of the people for whom LP is carried out, he emphasizes that individuals both at the macrolevel and microlevel can get involved in policymaking and there exists a two-way sequence from macrolevel to microlevel decision-making and vice versa. Therefore, in answer to the question of how LP should be carried out referring to Das Gupta’s and Neustupny’s definitions of LP, Cooper argues that LP should not be confined to “an activity which approaches a management ideal, whereby needs are rationally determined, goals explicitly stated, means carefully tailored to these ends, the results systematically monitored to permit the adjustment of means and ends to one another” (p. 40). In other words, he argues that language planning that occurs in the microlevel by ordinary language users may not necessarily have an explicit language policy or a planned set of goals and rules.

Due to the significance of status planning as the first phase in the language planning of an AUL I will also review Cooper’s (1989) discussion of this concept. In his point of view status planning includes “deliberate efforts to influence the allocation of functions among a community’s languages” (p. 99). To clarify what these functions are Cooper uses the list of language functions provided by Stewart (1968) in his discussion of national multilingualism. According to this list eight functions serve as targets of status planning. 1) “Official” function is associated with official language use that functions as “a legally appropriate language for all politically and culturally representative purposes

on a nation-wide basis” (p. 100). 2) “Provincial” function is served by a provincial or regional official language (p. 103). 3) “Wider-communication” function is served by “a linguistic system across language boundaries within the nation” (p. 104). Concerning this function Cooper adds, official language and even a former colonial language may also serve wider-communication function. 4) “International” function is served by “a major medium of communication which is international in scope...which links citizens of one country with citizens of another” (p. 106). Cooper also adds, “status planning of international languages of wider communication takes place in connection with determining what foreign languages will be taught in schools” (p. 106). 5) “Capital” function is served by “a linguistic system as a major medium of communication in the vicinity of the national capital” (p. 106). 6) “Group” function is allocated to “a linguistic system primarily as the normal medium of communication among the members of a single cultural or ethnic group such as a tribe, settled group of foreign immigrants, etc” (p. 107). 7) “Educational” function is associated to the language used as a medium of education which as Cooper argues is “most commonly subject to strong political pressure (p. 108). 8) “School subject” function is served by the language “commonly taught as subject in secondary and/or higher education [and even]...at the lower grades” (p. 112). Concerning teaching languages as a subject in schools, Cooper (1989) points out that when other than official and provincial languages are taught as subjects, they are taught for a number of goals but he does not explain what those goals are. He does explain that the success with which additional languages are learned as a subject depends on many factors such as “the intensity of study”, “the quality of instruction”, “the usefulness of the language outside the school” and above all “opportunity and incentive to learn” (p.

114). Therefore, he argues, “clearly the commercial importance of English has stimulated a widespread demand to learn it” (p. 114).

Like Cooper (1989), Spolsky (2004), whose ideas about English I reviewed in the previous sections, also in his book, *Language policy*, explains that LP has three foci, status planning, corpus planning as well as acquisition planning. However, unlike Cooper he emphasizes that the artificial distinction between status planning and corpus planning is not needed because these two activities are virtually inseparable. In other words, he states, “any change in the character of a language is likely to result in a change in the use environment and any change in the use environment is likely to induce a change in the character of a language” (Kaplan and Baldauf as cited in Spolsky, 2004, p. 11).

He (2004) defines LP as “the formulation and proclamation of an explicit plan or policy, usually but not necessarily written in a formal document about language use” (p. 11). Like Rubin and Jernudd (1971), Garvin (1974) and Karam (1974), he believes that “language and language policy both exist in highly complex, interacting and dynamic contexts, the modification of any part of which may have correlated effects (and causes) on any other part” (p. 6). Therefore, “a simple cause-and-effect approach using one-language related data is unlikely to produce useful accounts of language policy” (p. 7). In other words, in Spolsky’s point of view collecting and using data that is related to only one language is not sufficient for LP because so many other external variables are involved in LP. In addition, like Rubin (1971), he refers to the role of people’s beliefs and ideologies toward language, language use and language choice and how they may be parallel or not with explicit language policies. Thus, he maintains that the factors that lead to language policy can be either initiated by government and governmental

institutions or individual language users. One of the issues that he discusses concerns language contact and how it leads to planned or unplanned pressures from one language on speakers of other languages to adopt it. In other words, planned policies or unplanned forces, as he notes, cause people to shift to another language resulting in their native language becoming endangered. He also emphasizes the relationship between language and both individual and social identity. Furthermore, he argues, “language is regularly used in the exercise of political power” for example, to control its minority groups a government may ban their language (p. 58). Spolsky also discusses the issue of linguistic rights. He emphasizes that “linguistic rights are to a large extent not distinct from other human rights” and explains that there are two approaches to linguistic rights (2004, p. 119). In the first approach the focus is on preserving languages “like any other endangered species” as well as providing support to the speakers of those languages “in their efforts at reversing language shift” (1998, p. 59). In the second approach, the focus is not on “the rights of languages as an abstraction but on the rights of the speaker of the language” whether “to use it” or “maintain it by teaching it to their children” (1998, p. 59). Like Phillipson he then argues that although there are many proposals for linguistic human rights, such as the United Nations charter adopted in 1945, the 1948 The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (article 2/1) and the 1960 UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education, there is an “enormous gap” between these “idealized proposals” and “the much more pragmatic statements of rights in ratified international agreements and internal national policies” (2004, p. 130).

He (2004) explains that there are four main features to his theory of language policy. The first is “the tripartite division of language policy into language practices,

language beliefs and ideology, and the explicit policies and plans resulting from language management or planning activities that attempt to modify the practices and ideologies of a community” (p. 39). He emphasizes that these three components are so interrelated that “to study one component of language policy while ignoring the other two will provide a very incomplete and biased view (p. 39-40). Second, language policy is concerned with “named varieties of language” as well as all the individual elements at all levels that make up language” (p. 40). Third, “language policy operates within a speech community” and its domain may range from a family to a nation state or regional alliance (p. 40). Fourth, “language policy functions in a complex ecological relationship among a wide range of linguistic and non-linguistic elements, variables and factors” (p. 41).

Spolsky (1998) in his earlier book, *Sociolinguistics*, also examines the issue of “language diffusion policy or linguistic imperialism” that I reviewed above in his discussion of English spread (p. 75). He states that “political and military conquests have been major causes of language spread” but in an “unplanned” way (p. 75). However, in the case of language diffusion policy a government or other institution formulates a deliberate policy to change language acquisition and use. As he argues, such a policy can be either “internal or external”(p. 75). When a country itself decides about the national language of all its inhabitants it is a case of internal diffusion. Spolsky adds, in colonies policy is both internal and external because the colonized land is under the control of the “imperial rulers” who may want the “colonial subjects to learn their language” (p. 46).

Ricento (2000), whose ideas about English I reviewed in the previous section, also like Spolsky (1998, 2004), refers to the relationship between language policies and ideologies. However, his focus is mostly on national language policies carried out by

governments rather than individual language users. In his book, *Ideology, Politics and Language Policies: focus on English*, he (2000) discusses four themes concerning the relationship between ideologies and language policies. First, “ideologies inform policies but do not determine them” (p. 4). Second, “ideologies of language are linked to other ideologies that can influence and constrain the development of language policies” (p. 4). Third, ideologies in the Periphery shape the ideologies in the Center and vice versa. And fourth, “ideology does not always apply to the effects of dominant social groups to legitimate their power” (p. 5). In fact, these four themes as he presents them can be considered as the summary or rather as the overview of all the previous views towards the link between LPP and ideologies. In short, they demonstrate that ideologies have a tremendous role in LPP.

In the journal article, *Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policy and planning*, Ricento (2000) explains factors that have influenced LPP in three phases since the early 1960s to the present, which can be considered an historical overview of the field.

In the first phase called “decolonization, structuralism and pragmatism” (p. 2) which started in the 1960s, Ricento (2000) argues, Western sociolinguists commonly believed that “linguistic diversity presented obstacles for national development, while linguistic homogeneity was associated with modernization and Westernization” (p. 3). Therefore, “goals of language planning were often associated with a desire for unification (of a region, nation, a religious group, a political group or other kinds of groups)” (p. 4). Consequently, while viewing language as a resource “abstracted from its sociohistorical and ecological contexts”, linguists were focused more on status planning than corpus

planning in response to the new nations need and desire for unification and modernization (p. 5). In this phase, Ricento (2000) explains, scholars such as Haugen (1966), Fishman (1968), Das Gupta (1968) and Rubin and Jernudd (1971), whose main arguments I reviewed above, made efforts to develop the LP model and define LPP.

The second phase called “the failure of modernization, critical sociolinguistics and access” (p. 5) which was from the early 1970s through the late 1980s, was characterized by “a growing awareness among scholars that earlier attempts in language planning... were inadequate” (p. 6). In fact, developing nations recognized that they are “more dependent on their former colonial masters” and that using “European languages as neutral media...tended to favor the economic interests of metropolitan countries” (p.7). Therefore, scholars such as Phillipson (1992) and Pennycook (1994) began to question activities in LPP as well as views towards language and LPP and investigate the role of cultures and languages, especially English. As a result, they realized that language was no longer viewed as a discrete pregiven system, but as “located in social action” (Pennycook, as cited in Ricento, 2000, p. 6). In other words, they found that when discussing and solving language problems it is not sufficient to focus on the language itself without taking into account attitudinal, social, economic and political factors involved in it. In fact, issues such as language spread, bilingualism and multilingualism are not ideologically neutral concepts to be applied in various contexts; thus the scholars in the field of LPP shifted their focus from status planning and corpus planning to the social, political and economic aspects of language contact and language spread.

The third phase, “new world order, postmodernism and linguistic human rights”, which is from the mid-1980s to the present day, as Ricento argues, is “difficult to

characterize” because it is not completely formed yet (p. 8). However, what is clear is that languages must compete with “supranational languages such as English and French” (p. 8) that is the result of political and geographical factors the most important of which is “penetration of Western – especially North American – culture and technology in the developing world” (p. 8). As a result, language loss, language maintenance, language contact and in particular English dominance, Ricento argues, have received significant attention but from different perspectives (e.g. Phillipson, 1992; Pennycook, 1994; Canagarajah, 1999).

In short, the three phases of LPP development as Ricento describes them, suggest the fact that just as the language problems have changed across time, the research concerns and research questions in LPP have also changed and evolved. At present the field of LPP is enriched with a wide range of discussions, concerns and questions that still need to be addressed and answered. As I will discuss in detail in the next chapter, the scholars’ critical views in the third phase in particular towards English dominance as well as the unsolved problem of adopting an AUL, is the new challenge for each and every individual and above all for language planners and researchers in the field of LPP. And as I will suggest, LP of an AUL can address the current language problems and non-linguistic issues underlying them.

Like Ricento, Wright (2004) who is the last scholar whose ideas on LPP I am going to review, also refers to three phases in language policy and language planning (LPLP) research starting from the period of nationalism, after World War II and the present phase. Since her discussion of these phases is similar to that by Ricento I will not review them here. However, I will review her ideas concerning the third phase which is

characterized by globalisation and hegemony of English as well as the linguistic diversity and global international language. In fact, she raises significant points that are not discussed by the previous scholars in the field reviewed above.

In her book, *Language policy and language planning*, she (2004) points out that “globalisation” and “hegemony of English in political, economic, cultural and technological spheres” has “caused the need for a medium of communication” and “the general solution has been to use English as a lingua franca” (p. 11); therefore, “its use ...ensures its continued use” (p. 156). On the one hand, like Gruber (1995) she refers to the incompatible relationship between status planning and corpus planning of English that is due to “the unconstrained linguistic development” and impossible control of the spread of English as a lingua franca (p. 175). And she explains how scholars such as Phillipson (1992), Pennycook (1994) and Canagarajah (1999) have developed “one strand of LPLP” to respond to “this hegemony with a critique of Anglophone dominance” (p. 11). On the other hand, she refers to different varieties or “distinctive forms of English” such as Singlish [Singaporean English] and Nigerian English, to argue that English is leading increasingly towards divergence and “heteroglossia” because more and more English users in non-English speaking countries appropriate English for their use as Pennycook and Canagarajah also point out (p. 175).

To describe the functions of English as global lingua franca she explains that members of the same speech community often have one single language to fulfill both communicative and group identity purposes. However, in situations where communication with speakers of other languages is needed the situation is different. In other words, she explains, globalisation “is leading to a situation where increasing

numbers are functionally bilingual, with their language of group identity not the language that they need in most of their acts of communication” (p. 7). In fact, in situations of language contact, communicative and identity functions are not fulfilled by one single language because “economic or political pressures” and the need “to communicate or access information outside their primary language group” lead the speakers of a language to shift to another language or become bilingual (p.7). Therefore, the “desire to ally communicative competence and group identity both lies at the heart of LP and at the “heart of issues that arise when groups come into contact and linguistic accommodation is necessary” (p. 8).

As for the need for a global lingua franca, she argues that it will remove disadvantages such as tribal societies isolated by language barriers even from their near neighbours, “fear and hatred caused by the inability of human beings to understand each other” and “a brake on the transmission of ideas and technologies” (p. 5-6). She presents some alternatives to meet the need for a global lingua franca. The first is that everyone learns all other languages or that all learn one common language, which she finds both impossible and unlikely. The second option, she suggests, can be to adopt an artificial language though she states that today “artificial languages such as Esperanto are completely out of favor” (p. 173). Third, is the “machine translation” which is also “not delivering a solution” (p. 173). Rejecting these alternatives without providing sufficient reasons she argues that “English is the solution for the present and for the foreseeable future” since the “language question is at present resolving itself through the principles of lingua franca adoption” (p. 173). She accepts that oppositions to English dominance are “comprehensible” (p. 173), and that “the limits of the spread” create “a global division

between those participating in the structure, flows and networks of globalisation and those that cannot” (p.177) and thus “achieving justice at global level is proving even more problematic” than in national level” (p. 173). However, she argues that English as a possible common language is “fundamental to the healthy development of future political arrangements” because “opposition is presented in English to an English-using audience” (p. 173). She states, English “gives access to the power and prestige of a center”, “enables the flow, networks and structures of an increasingly post-national system” and “allows individuals to transcend their group membership and this is what people appear to want to do” (p. 177).

In conclusion, as the literature review suggests and as Cooper (1998) points out, it seems to be the case that there is not agreement on what LPP is and there is no single definition of LPP as well as a theory of LPP which can be attributed to the fact that the field itself is new. However, the diversity of opinions and perspectives in the field suggests how the scholars have been influenced by the language problems with which they had to deal. In fact, as the literature demonstrates, the field of LPP has developed and evolved in response to different language problems in different periods of time in history and in different countries. In addition, according to the literature, language policies have always been influenced by and also influence social, political, and economic aspects of the society or the context in which they have been made and implemented.

As for the purpose of this study, which is addressing the problem of the language barrier and adopting an AUL, the LPP literature may not present any explicit guidelines or explanation on how to adopt an AUL and solve the problems of language barrier at the

international level. In fact, as the reader might have noticed the initial concerns of LPP have been only to solve language problems of developing countries after World War II. However, the literature on LPP does provide significant information that can form the foundation based on which the LP of an AUL can be carried out because as scholars in the field claim the purpose of LPP is solving language problems.

As I will explain in detail in the next chapter, the issues that have been raised and discussed in the literature including the dimensions of LP, the agents involved in it both the policy-makers and the so-called recipients of those policies who can also be policy-makers, the interaction between LP and social, political and economic factors, the necessary cooperation between researchers who work in the field of LPP and language policy makers and above all, the role of ideologies that inform LPP and thus the purpose of LP, can all be applied to planning of an AUL in future.

To answer my research questions, in the following section first I will re-examine the literature, extend the literature on LPP and present a tentative model for the program of LP of an AUL. Second, as a supplementary source to explore the idea of an AUL I will analyze the primary data that I collected through two sets of interviews.

## **Chapter 3: Searching for Answers**

### **3. 1. Introduction**

Before explaining the approaches I have adopted to explore the idea of an AUL and to answer the research questions, I think it is better to first review these questions and explain how they evolved while reviewing the literature.

At the beginning when I started to explore the idea of an AUL I had the following research questions in mind: 1) what is an AUL and what is its main purpose? 2) What is the best possible method to adopt an AUL and implement it globally? After I reviewed the literature, I realized that these questions, in particular the first one have long been subjects of discussion in academia; however, there have not been sufficient answers, in particular to the second question. In fact, although scholars have talked about the desirability of having an AUL and the benefits it would have for mankind as a means to remove language barriers and thus bring people from all around the world closer to each other, none have provided a detailed discussion of how an AUL can actually be adopted. Their discussion of the idea of an AUL suggests that having an AUL implies international planning and decision-making; however, they provide no thorough discussion of this planning for an AUL. This strongly suggests that the research questions even the first question are still particularly relevant and justified and still need further exploration because the answers to the first one of course will have implications for the second. In addition, what I found to be significant in the literature, in particular in relation to the resources on English, is that English itself is described as an international language. However, in the process of doing this study I also realized that although English is considered by many as an international language, as suggested by the literature there are

numerous problems associated with it, which lead to my conclusion that the research questions are more justified and urgent than six or seven decades ago.

Although English is wide spread and has partially removed the problem of a language barrier for some, as the literature on AUL and English strongly suggest it is insufficient as an AUL due to the following reasons: 1) English is not an international language because not every individual in the world has access to the facilities to learn it; 2) English is mainly the means to introduce and diffuse western culture and values to the world, in particular to the developing countries, rather than introducing and communicating different cultures from all around the world as an AUL is supposed to do; 3) English spread world wide has been the result of both explicit and implicit political, military, economic and social pressures as well as national language policies rather than the result of an international collective decision; 4) viewing English as the only means of social and economic development and modernization and thus promoting it in language policies in developing countries has resulted in devaluing the significant role of native languages and cultures and traditions in the nations' development and prosperity thus, 5) in many non-native English speaking countries English is no longer an auxiliary language because it has caused language switch and abandonment of native languages in particular by younger generations. As a result of my studies then I came to understand that the answers to the research questions could be at the same time a solution for the problem of language barriers and the negative aspects associated with the current situation of English as well.

One way to respond to the research questions, especially the first one, is through a re-examination and extension of the literature because it provides the main resource for

discussion and exploration of an AUL. In fact, since the reviewed scholars have mainly focused on features of an AUL itself and its purpose, re-examining their views could be the best possible approach to explore the nature of an AUL and provide a clear picture of what an AUL is and what it is supposed to perform. To answer the second research question I not only re-examined the literature but also extended the literature on LPP particularly to form a possible model for the LP of an AUL. The reviewed scholars have not sufficiently discussed how the planning of an AUL can be carried out; however, they have offered some clues with regard to LP at the national level that can be applied to international LP of an AUL. Thus, I extended different dimensions of LP as a possible framework through which the program for LP of an AUL can be discussed and presented a tentative model for LP of an AUL and outlined the phases and activities that might be involved in it.

To strengthen my re-examination and extension of the literature, my second approach to the research questions was through interviews. After receiving ethics approval from the Carleton University Research Ethics Committee, in order to get further perspectives on an AUL and EIL, in particular, from resources other than the ones found in the literature I conducted two set of 30-45 minute interviews that were both tape-recorded. The interview questions in both sets were semi-structured. In order to deal with the interviews I initially constrained them to ten fellow graduate students in the School of Linguistics and Applied language Studies (SLALS) in Carleton University. The participants from whom I asked the first set of questions (Appendix B) were five native speakers of English and five students for whom English is the second or foreign language. I will shortly explain the rationale for the choice of research participants.

After I did the first set of interviews which were mainly focused on the nature and purpose of an AUL and whether English is an AUL or not, I realized that I should also concentrate on the LP of an AUL which had turned out to be the main gap in the literature and the first set of interviews as well to a lesser extent. So, I audited a course at Carleton on LPP to gain basic knowledge of what LPP is, what it involves and whether scholars in the field have discussed the planning of an AUL or not. Studying about LPP and reviewing the literature on LPP gave me the insight and provided me with the possible framework to close the gap I had found. I realized that LPP could provide the framework through which the international planning of an AUL could be examined and actually carried out. Therefore, to extend the discussion on possible answers concerning the specifics of planning of an AUL, I did the follow-up interviews that were mainly focused on the program for LP of an AUL. For the follow-up questions (Appendix C) I chose three additional graduate students; two of them have academic knowledge of LPP and the last has explicit knowledge and practical experience of social planning and project management.

### **3. 2 The research participants**

As I mentioned above, the study participants included ten graduate students for the first set of interviews and three other graduate students for the follow-up questions.

The reasons I selected ten fellow graduate students for the first set of interview from among the graduate students at SLALS were that like the majority of students in SLALS these participants had been involved in learning and teaching of a second language, in particular English, and the majority of them were doing their M.A. degrees to expand their knowledge of teaching and learning of a second language, in particular

English. Therefore, their academic knowledge about language, language use, its relation to culture and society, the function of language in human life and language teaching and learning as well as the experience they gained both in academia and as second language teachers and/or learners would enrich my investigation of the idea of an AUL. Furthermore, they have had the experience of living in a multicultural country, Canada in which knowing a common language is crucial to be able to communicate with speakers of other languages and thus function in society. In fact, these students like any individual who has had such an experience would be more conscious of the tremendous role that a common language can perform in a multicultural society. The study participants had much more insightful remarks on the role of a common language than ordinary people because they had academically studied language and conducted research on a wide range of topics in applied language studies. In addition, the research participants, in particular the non-native ones, have actually experienced the need for an AUL and have learned a language as a way to go beyond the problem of language barrier and function globally. And although the native English participants might not have felt the need and the pressure to learn English to communicate with speakers of other languages, since the majority of them have experienced teaching English as a Second Language (ESL), they had ideas about why people learn English, what positive and negative issues are associated with English spread and thus whether English is qualified as an AUL or not because all of them have taught English. And finally, both native and non-native English speakers were chosen to focus on aspects of an AUL and EIL that the other might not have. In short, having the voices of graduate student participants in the study

supplemented the answers from the literature and provided fresh ideas and perspectives concerning the idea of an AUL and EIL, in particular.

With regard to the participants for the follow-up questions, since the main reason to do this second set of interviews was exploring the LP of an AUL that had turned out to be the main gap in the literature, I tried to choose participants who could help me see the question of LPP more clearly in relation to the LP of an AUL. For practical reasons I limited my choice of participants to fellow graduate students in SLALS who had some explicit knowledge of LPP. Therefore, from among the five graduate students who have taken the course on Language Spread and Contact I chose two who were still in the program and thus available to be interviewed. In fact, the main reason I interviewed these particular students was that in contrast with the first ten participants they had actually studied LPP, its dimensions as well as the activities involved in it and had also done a small-scale project in the field of LPP. Also as I mentioned above, for the follow-up questions I interviewed another graduate student in SLALS. The reason I chose her as a study participant was that her academic background in economics as well as more than 10 years of experience as Project Economist/Analyst in International Development Program Management would help provide me with new insights with regard to the program of LP of an AUL and different issues involved in it.

In the following paragraphs then I will discuss the answers to the research questions based on both the literature and the interviews.

### **3. 3 Re-examining the literature**

I should emphasize that although the two research questions, which are 1) what is an AUL and what is its main purpose? and 2) what is the best possible method to adopt

an AUL and implement it globally?, are distinct, they are interrelated because as the literature suggests, there is always a connection between choosing and using a certain language and the status of that language or the functions it is supposed to fulfill. In other words, even in everyday life situations we choose to use a specific vocabulary, grammatical structure, variety of our mother tongue or even a different language that is appropriate to a specific context. In fact, we make implicit decisions on how to use language appropriately and we even make judgments on how others use language. The same rule also applies to the LP of an AUL with the difference that the LP of an AUL is explicit and formal. In other words, having a language to perform certain functions, meet certain purposes and above all to solve certain language problems – here an AUL – implies planning and thus giving a language a certain status and certain functions and teaching it to all the people of the world. Although as I will discuss later, the LP of an AUL is an organic process which implies constant fact-finding, decision-making and planning because not only the AUL, all the other languages, cultures and social meanings are also alive and evolve and change in time. Therefore, due to the interconnection between the functions of an AUL and its status, the answers to question number one, which deals with the nature of an AUL and its purpose, has implications for the LP of an AUL that I will briefly discuss.

### **3.3.1 Answers to the first research question**

The first question again is: what is an AUL and what is its main purpose? It is mainly concerned with the nature of an AUL or rather the functions an AUL is expected to perform as well as its purpose. Based on the literature it can be said that an AUL is a language that would be used as an auxiliary means of communication among all the

people of the world who speak different languages. An AUL can be used in whatever domain in which language barriers prevent people from communicating with each other.

Although this definition and explanation of an AUL may seem naïve and simplistic, it clarifies five significant features of an AUL and thus guides its planning: 1) an AUL should be auxiliary to the mother tongues; 2) it should be used whenever two or more individuals do not share a common language to communicate with; 3) it should be universal so that each and every individual regardless of his social, economic and ethnic background would be provided with the facilities to be able to learn it and use it whenever and wherever needed; 4) as a second language it has to be easy to learn; 5) as Pei (1968), Gruber (1995) and Meyjes (2006) emphasize, the AUL should be taught in all nations from childhood and together with the mother tongue and finally 6) the main purpose of having an AUL should be to exchange ideas, remove misunderstandings and thus establish “world peace” (Foliaki, 1974, p. 16) or “universal peace” (Palmer and Litt, 1947, p. 1) among human beings.

The first characteristic then of an AUL is that it should be auxiliary or secondary to mother tongues. An interesting point that readers may have noticed in the literature on AUL is that although the scholars have talked about the co-existence of an AUL and mother tongues, they have not discussed how that bilingual situation can be developed and maintained. Neither have they explicitly stated anything about the relation between the AUL and other languages in a country; however, their discussion of an AUL has occasionally suggested that there would be no need for those other languages.

Due to the complexity of this issue, it would be difficult to predict what the governments and language planners would do and what language policies they would

formulate and what procedures they would follow to determine the status and necessity of those other languages that are allocated certain functions in society. In fact, the destiny of all the other languages except for an AUL and mother tongues would vary from country to country because countries differ in many aspects such as the number of languages functioning in each, the number of speakers of each language and the social and economic situation of the country. However, the purpose of this paper is to examine the nature and LP of an AUL so I will only focus on the relationship between an AUL and the mother tongues and discuss the secondary status of an AUL and the primary status of mother tongues.

Before discussing the relationship between an AUL and mother tongues, which is also referred to as “the native language”, “first language”, primary language” or the “L1” in the literature (Gass and Selinker, 2001, p. 5), I think it is necessary to emphasize the point that how a mother tongue is defined and the different ideologies that adhere to it has significant consequences in language policies both related to AUL and mother tongue and thus linguistic human rights of L1 speakers. It is not the purpose of this paper to present a complete definition of a mother tongue because I think similar to an AUL, it implies extensive research and exchange of expert knowledge on the part of language planners and linguists from all around the world to reach an agreement on what a mother tongue is so that they can determine and maintain the status of an AUL and mother tongues in language polices, education systems and different social domains.

Briefly, there are different definitions in the literature for mother tongue. But a mother tongue seems to be referred to generally as “the first language that a child learns” (Gass and Selinker, 2001, p. 5) and as Bernstein (1971) also emphasizes, mother tongue

is linked to social identity and socialization. However, it should be taken into account that determining a mother tongue based on such definitions would be very difficult “in cases in which children are raised in bi- or multilingual settings” and the language they speak is not the native language of their parent or of their speech community (Ricento, 2002, p. 1-2). In other words, defining a mother tongue as the first language that a child learns would not be sufficient and clear enough to distinguish the mother tongues and thus determine how they should be preserved and used in education systems and different domains in a bilingual or multilingual society and language policies as well (Gass and Selinker, 2001, p. 5). As Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) notes, “origin, identification, competence and function” are four different criteria that have each informed different definitions of mother tongue (p. 106). However, as she explains, defining a mother tongue based on just one criterion would cause some problems. Therefore, it would be a new challenge for language planners and linguists to define a mother tongue while considering these four criteria at the same time.

As for the relationship between an AUL and mother tongue and the status each one should have, according to the literature, one of the most significant characteristics of an international language is that it should be auxiliary or secondary to mother tongues and thus the mother tongue should have the primary status. Although this characteristic is desirable in theory, maintaining the status of the AUL as secondary may not be as easy in real life situations in which the AUL will be in contact with mother tongues. As the literature in LPP especially Spolsky (2004) argues, making changes in the status of a language influences the other language or languages in the linguistic ecology. And the same rule applies to an AUL. In fact, giving a language the status of an international

language and auxiliary to the mother tongues has implications for linguistic ecology and mother tongues specifically. According to the literature, adopting an auxiliary language implies creating a bilingual situation in which the mother tongue functions as the first language and the international language is auxiliary to it and is used only in contexts and domains in which a language barrier exists. Creating and maintaining a bilingual situation would imply continuous planning and implementing activities that distinguish the domains in which each language can be used. Otherwise, making decisions on the choice of an AUL and promoting it in schools without providing the circumstances in which mother tongues can maintain their functions and value will lead an AUL to dominate the mother tongues. To avoid such negative consequences, language planners should be able to predict the consequences of bilingual situation and ensure the functions of each language not just in their policies but in different domains in society; otherwise, if a person's mother tongue is used only at home and "is excluded from a wider social context, its stagnation is inevitable" (Pavlinic-Wolf, 1986, p. 178).

As Crystal argues, both an AUL and the mother tongues should have distinct functions. A mother tongue is the first language that a child is exposed to at home. It is the mother tongue through which an individual learns socio-cultural knowledge of the society and the culture in which he or she lives. And, it is through the mother tongue that an individual learns and produces the socio-cultural meanings that are acceptable in diverse domains situated within a society. In other words, a mother tongue has a significant role in the "socialization" (Bernstein as cited in Gregory and Carroll, 1978, p. 79) and the child's "cognitive development" and that there is a close link between mother tongue and one's identity and sense of belonging to a certain culture and a certain speech

community (Clyne, 1994, p. 2). It is one of the significant social symbols that embodies the history and the culture of the people who speak it. On the other hand, an AUL as the literature describes, is a means to communicate and exchange ideas, emotions, values and traditions with those who are from a different speech community and do not share a common language. It is a tool or rather a bridge between different speech communities and geographical borders. So, it can be said that an AUL can be one of the means that would give individuals a sense of belonging not to a single speech community or a nation but to the whole world because the speakers, or the users of an AUL, would be from different nations and ethnic groups who speak different languages.

As we can see from these explanations, an AUL and a mother tongue have distinct functions. However, based on the literature on LPP as well as the literature on English it can be said that in reality when two or more languages – in this case an AUL and the mother tongues – come into contact with each other their functions may not be as distinct as they are in theory. When the chosen AUL is in contact with other languages, in particular the mother tongues, if governments and education systems do not make policies and provide and support the situations in which people can continue learning and using their mother tongue in domains other than home, the mother tongues will gradually lose their functionality because people will realize that by using an AUL they can perform the functions that were once specific to mother tongues. In other words, the functions of the two languages could overlap. Thus, an AUL will not only be the language of wider communication, but could also be the means of communication within one's speech community. As the literature on EIL demonstrates, different cases of English contact with mother tongues in non-native English speaking countries are

obvious examples of how it has led to decline in use of mother tongues especially among younger generations in countries such as Singapore and India. Such cases of language shift can be considered as learning opportunities for planners of an AUL to prevent such language shift and language death in future. Based on Fishman's (2001) discussion of preserving mother tongues, however, it can be maintained that native languages that are in contact with the AUL can be preserved if they are given (back) the functions they traditionally had in different domains in society. In other words, if language planners, the governments and education systems make decisions and implement plans that guarantee the use of mother tongues in different domains in real life situations, and also provide the facilities and promote learning mother tongues, it is less likely that the mother tongues will lose their value at least in the short run. And of course, according to Haugen (1966), we should note that the success of those policies and decisions would depend on the acceptance of the community and the extent of their support in the implementation of language policies. (In the section on the application of LPP for the planning of an AUL I will provide a much more detailed explanation of people's role in planning of an AUL.)

To ensure preserving native languages until the time when desired social meanings from different cultures are encoded in the AUL, not only should mother tongues be allocated their functions and status in language policies and society, but also people should be informed of the value and the reasons why they have to preserve their mother tongues. However, I should emphasize that the success of these two actions would depend on the extent those language policies and procedures to implement them are formed based on sociolinguistic facts rather than merely political and economic considerations.

As the literature on EIL suggests, to gain national independence many developing countries such as India, Singapore and many African countries promoted the colonizing language, in particular English in their national language policies rather than choosing from among the languages within the country because it did not belong to any specific ethnic group and thus would not cause conflicts between different speech communities within the country. In addition to that and as a more prominent factor they promoted English because they viewed it as the only means to have access to modernity, technology and economic development, while mother tongues or native languages were promoted and thus perceived as a sign of poverty and underdevelopment. Thus, promoting English as a means to combat economic and social problems has been the cause of other problems the most important of which is abandoning one's native language and culture.

Although an AUL could evolve into a UL in a very long run, as Jespersen (1928) argued long ago, there have been objections in literature that an AUL will differentiate into unintelligible varieties that will hinder communication rather than facilitating it and unifying the whole world. According to the literature on EIL it can be said that the argument that the AUL will evolve into localized varieties is acceptable to some extent because English as an example of a language with a global prevalence has evolved into numerous local varieties such as Chinese English, Japanese English and Indian English that may not be fully intelligible for all English speakers. In fact, the existence of Englishes proves that the tendency towards differentiation is inevitable and will occur in any language chosen as an AUL. However, as Jespersen (1928) argues and as the above example suggests, "constant intercourse creates linguistic unity" (p. 29). In other words,

as long as there is contact between the speakers of different varieties of an AUL, one variety of the AUL will remain intelligible. In fact, it is an unavoidable fact that an AUL will change and gain the flavor of the local cultures in which it is used; however, unifying factors such as constant contact between AUL users, technologies, publications and media would help maintain the intelligibility of the AUL. In addition to non-linguistic unifying factors, explicit LP, in particular corpus planning and education planning would have a crucial role to maintain the intelligibility of an AUL. And it would be the responsibility of language planners both at the international and national level to keep the AUL as intelligible as possible through constant standardizing of the AUL in terms of pronunciation, vocabulary and grammatical structures and implement this in the education systems as well as in other domains in which the AUL is used.

The second characteristic of an AUL, as has been referred to by all the scholars in the literature, is that the AUL should be used whenever two or more individuals do not share a common language to communicate with. Thus, an AUL could serve communicative purposes in any immediate context of situation in which its users are not of the same speech community and thus face the problem of language barrier. However, like the first characteristic of the AUL – its being auxiliary – as the time passes there will be more and more people of the same speech community who will also know the AUL. Therefore, gradually, they would switch to use the AUL rather than the language of the speech community to which they belong. As I explained above, explicit planning would have a significant role in controlling the process of language shift in the short run and preventing the sudden abandonment of the mother tongues.

The third characteristic of the AUL as has been briefly discussed in the literature is that it should be universal so that each and every individual regardless of his social, economic and ethnic background should be provided with the facilities to be able to learn it and use it. In fact, giving a language a universal status so that each individual can equally have access to it is in accordance with the notion of linguistic human rights that has recently received great attention in the field of LPP. Re-examining the literature on LPP and EIL shows that the issue of linguistic human rights is of great importance, in particular in the third phase of research in the field of LPP as Ricento (2000, 2002) notes. Therefore, linguistic human rights cannot only be applied to the mother tongues, minority languages and language users' fundamental right to learn and use their mother tongues, but also to equal access to an AUL. Thus, to prevent the kind of inequalities that exist in terms of having access to English as the so-called international language, in the LP of an AUL equal access should be ensured not only in language policies but also in education systems, a point that relates to education planning of an AUL. In fact, it will depend on language policies at the national and local levels to provide the facilities so that each individual has access to the facilities to learn the AUL as a subject in school curricula.

Again, the literature on English can be a useful resource for language planners and governments to find ways to make the AUL universal and to avoid the problems associated with EIL. As the literature on English demonstrates, people's access to English has been mainly determined by social and economic pressures as well as the governments' language policies with regard to the choice of the second language being taught at schools. And even if English is taught as a subject at schools some individuals may not be able to learn it because of economic, social and political constraints.

Therefore, there is an obvious inequality in terms of access to the so-called international language, English.

The last characteristic of the AUL as suggested by its definition and emphasized by the majority of the reviewed scholars (e.g., Palmer and Litt, 1947; Foliaki, 1974; Janton, 1993; Eco, 1995; Harrison, 2001) is that it should be a means to remove the language barriers and function as one of the means to establish peace on earth. This feature that is mainly concerned with the purpose of an AUL is explained in detail in the literature. As for the purpose of removing language barriers according to the literature, an AUL would be used in different domains such as academia, trade, print, communication technology, tourism, etc. so that people who do not share a common language can communicate with each other. At a much deeper level as emphasized in the literature, the AUL will be one of the means to create peace and unity on earth. The role of an AUL in world peace can be explained from different perspectives. The first point as Eco (1995) and Gruber (1995) suggest, deals with the choice of an AUL itself. In other words, reaching an agreement on the choice of an AUL on the part of world representatives is the fundamental step towards peace because it would demonstrate human maturity to make decisions and carry out actions that benefit all mankind rather than a specific country or nation. The second aspect as explained in the literature, in particular on the section on Esperanto, is the sense of unity and fellowship that will develop among all the people of the world if they know that they all share a common language that is not imposed on them as English was. The third aspect is concerned with the use of the AUL as a most significant means of intercultural communication. In other words, living in a world which is increasingly becoming interconnected, both people and language planners

and linguists would realize that the idea of an AUL is beyond sharing the knowledge of the structure of the language so that the decision on the choice of an AUL would not be as difficult as has been argued in the literature (e.g., Sapir, 1925; Jespersen; 1928). In fact, the important point is removing the problem of language barriers so that all the people of the world could participate in the global interconnections and also develop a sense of belonging to a global speech community through using an AUL. That feeling can be built if an AUL is chosen based on close examination of the current language situation in the world as I will discuss later in this chapter.

People would realize that through using the AUL they would be able to know more about people who are from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, exchange ideas, emotions, cultural values and traditions. Thus, as has been emphasized in the literature, the AUL would become one of the most significant means through which people can avoid misunderstandings, gain a better understanding of their differences and thus be able to settle their conflicts. However, the use of an AUL will not lead to unity and peace unless it is used with an attitude of true love, respect and affection towards human beings as emphasized by Zamenhof himself. Based on the studies on intercultural communication (e.g. Bochner, 1982; Bennet, 1988; Robinson, 1988; Deen, 1997; Holliday, Hyde and Kullman, 2004) it can be said that when speakers of different language communicate through an AUL, due to lack of sufficient knowledge or understanding of cultural differences they may have “negative perceptions of other people” (Robinson, 1988, p. 85) or create stereotypes that influence their communication (e.g. Bennet, 1998; Holliday, Hyde and Kullman, 2004). However, if people try to increase their understanding of each other through the medium of an AUL and to use that

knowledge as a means to respect diversity of thought, belief, behavior, color, ethnic group and even gender, they would be more likely to settle their differences and create unity among themselves.

In addition to the above-mentioned qualities suggested by the definition of an AUL, the majority of scholars who have discussed the idea of an AUL have also referred to another significant point. They have argued that an AUL should be culturally neutral and not belong to a specific nation; thus, a natural language cannot be chosen as an AUL. This argument is not only related to the nature of an AUL that should be culturally neutral but also to the choice of an AUL or its status planning about whether a natural language or a constructed one should be chosen as an AUL. Answers to this question can also comprise part of the answer to the second research question that deals with the program of LP of an AUL, in particular the status planning of an AUL as the first phase.

It is not the purpose of this study to suggest whether a constructed language or natural one is better to be adopted as an AUL because there have been many discussions in the literature concerning this issue and above all as I will explain in response to the second research question, it all depends on the international decision to choose the AUL. However, I will refer to three significant points concerning the notion of the AUL being culturally neutral that have to be considered on the decision on the choice of an AUL.

First, focusing on the issue that an AUL should be culturally neutral indeed suggests a theory of language in which it is viewed as a structure or a communicative tool distinct from its users and the social contexts in which it is used. However, as the reviewed literature, in particular the literature on EIL and LPP suggest, language is a living system that is strongly tied to social contexts. Therefore, any language chosen as

an AUL even a constructed one will carry cultural baggage the minute it is used by individual language users and becomes one of the means through which the user's cultural meanings and behaviors are expressed and realized. In other words, although a constructed language when first created and before being used may seem culturally neutral, it will change after being used by people who are from different cultural backgrounds because like a natural language it will change and become the potential resource within which social meanings of different cultures are encoded.

Second, as Lapenna (1982) argues, even a constructed language when first created out of different natural languages is not culturally neutral because it has the cultural baggage of the languages from which it is driven; therefore, it is not void of cultural meanings. In fact, no matter whether the AUL is constructed out of different natural languages like Esperanto or is created out of rules of logic and is just a system of classification of ideas like Volapuk, its structure and vocabulary will still reflect certain culture-specific meanings.

The third point deals with the way the AUL will be selected. In the literature it is argued that adopting a natural language as an AUL will cause feelings of inferiority and oppression; however, we should take into account that such negative consequences could only occur if the natural language is imposed as an AUL through political and economic power as has been the case with English rather than true consultation on the choice of an AUL. However, as I will explain later in presenting a model for LP of an AUL, if an AUL is chosen through consultation and collective decisions and based on research, those negative consequences could be to a large extent avoided.

So far, I have re-examined the literature to answer the first question, which deals with the nature of an AUL and its purpose. However, as I mentioned at the beginning and as the answers demonstrate, the nature of an AUL is not distinct from its planning. In fact, to actually have a language with the above-discussed features would imply having an explicit program of LP. Therefore, the next set of challenges or rather questions would be how the LP of an AUL can be carried out, who can go about the LP of an AUL and what steps need to be taken in the program of LP of an AUL.

### **3. 3. 2 Answers to the second research question**

With regard to the second research question which is what is the best possible method to adopt an AUL and implement it globally, it can be said that the literature is not filled with comprehensive and detailed discussion of how the LP of such a desired AUL can be carried out as I have suggested earlier although it is rich with discussions and definitions of an AUL. A few of the reviewed scholars either implicitly or explicitly suggest that world's nations should be in charge of LP of an AUL; however, they fail to outline how they can do that. And the kind of excuse or rather the reason the scholars come up with to justify their shortcoming in answering these questions is that it would be impossible for the world's nations to reach an agreement on the choice of an AUL because they have prejudices towards their own national language and culture. Furthermore, they do not provide sufficient information as how the chosen AUL should be taught at the global level as has been long desired. However, they do give us some clues on how an AUL can be adopted and who should be in charge of that. They also refer to the kind of ideologies that could inform the LP of an AUL. In the following paragraphs, first I will re-examine different sections of the reviewed literature to explore

the clues. Then, I will discuss and expand the literature on LPP as a possible framework for the LP of an AUL and apply three different dimensions of LP as a way to discuss the program of LP of an AUL.

### **3. 3. 2. 1 Answers from The literature on AUL itself**

The most dominant point raised by the majority of the scholars in the first section concerns an important aspect of status planning of an AUL that is the choice of an AUL and whether a natural language or a constructed language is better to be chosen as an AUL. While suggesting constructed languages to be chosen as an AUL Sapir (1925) argues that a natural language will be at the expense of other languages and also not sufficient to express any type of human expression while a constructed language is simple, culturally neutral and thus all will have a feeling of independence towards it. Harrison (2001) likewise expresses similar opinions in favor of constructed languages. Lauwers (1946) and Pei (1968) also refer to the difficult nature of any natural language and thus explain the likely obstacles to simplify a natural language for the purpose of an AUL. Palmer and Litt (1947) deal with the issue of promoting an artificial language in more depth and detail. They demonstrate the pragmatic benefits of an artificial language in academia, conferences and scientific discourses and confine their discussion to vocabulary and vocabulary construction, which can be considered as part of the corpus planning of an AUL that is generally “an attempt to fix or modify the structure of a language” (Spolsky, 2004, p. 122). In short, what the first section of the literature provides us with regard to the LP of an AUL is a comprehensive discussion of the benefits of a constructed language compared with a natural one and the final conclusion that constructed languages are more suitable than natural ones. These valuable

discussions can be helpful in future when language planners and policy makers intend to decide on the choice of an AUL. In addition, the discussions in the literature concerning the construction of an AUL can be helpful if those who will be in charge of the adoption of an AUL decide on the construction of an AUL or using one that is already made. Furthermore, they can provide valuable information on how to go about constructing a language or the corpus planning of an AUL and the methods that can be used in constructing an artificial language.

Re-examining the first section of the literature also demonstrates two other references that offer clues with regard to who should be in charge of LP of an AUL. Almost all the reviewed scholars seem to be aware of the point that an AUL should be chosen by all the world countries, but they fail to discuss it because they view it impossible for different countries to reach an agreement on the choice of an AUL. Foliaki (1974), Eco (1995), Gruber (1995) and Meyjes (2006) are the only scholars who explicitly though briefly refer to the issue of who should be responsible for the LP of an AUL. Foliaki (1974) states that an international committee or international body should govern an AUL. Eco (1995) also while referring to English as the so-called international language that has suffered from lack of global decisions and agreement, states that “international political will” has a significant role on the issue of an AUL (p. 318) and points out, “an IAL [International Auxiliary Language] project would not succeed unless an international body” such as the UN “adopted and promoted it” (Couturat and Leau as cited in Eco, 1995, p. 318). Gruber (1995) also explicitly refers to the UN as the international organization that should be in charge of the program of LP of an AUL while Meyjes (2006) places the choice of an AUL on the hand of expert language planners.

Pei (1968), Gruber (1995) and Meyjes (2006) briefly refer to one aspect of the education planning of an AUL. They note that an AUL should be taught as a subject in school curricula worldwide, but makes no mention of the age at which an AUL can be taught. They argue that an AUL should be taught from childhood and together with the mother tongues. This feature not only is related to the secondary status of an AUL that I discussed above, but also suggests the age in which the AUL can be taught. Although there is not sufficient proof in the literature for this suggestion and it is not the purpose of this paper to discuss this issue, I refer to the most well-known arguments in the literature on the effect of age on second language learning that defend the idea of the younger the better to learn a second language. As Gass and Selinker (2001) explain in their book, *Second Language Acquisition, An Introductory Course*, based on the “Critical Period Hypothesis there is an age-related point beyond which it becomes difficult...to learn a second language to the degree as native speakers of that language” (p. 335). In other words, children are better language learners than adults, in particular in the mastery of the accent. The same rule can also apply to the AUL that is supposed to be the only second language that all the children of the world will learn. However, as Gass and Selinker (2001) explain, other variables, such as aptitude, motivation, personality, cognitive strategies and teaching methodologies will also influence the AUL learning that need to be considered in the planning of an AUL.

In addition to the role of age on learning an AUL, learning and being exposed to mother tongue at the same time as learning AUL at school has positive consequences of a different kind. First, being exposed to the mother tongue from childhood and also explicit learning of it at school will help the individual child to develop both the linguistic and the

socio-cultural knowledge of the culture in which he or she lives. In other words, the child while being exposed to and using the mother tongue in different contexts as well as formally learning it at school learns how to use language appropriately in the immediate contexts of culture in the society in which he or she lives. Thus he or she learns about the culture and social meanings communicated within that culture. Therefore, the mother tongue gives the child a sense of identity and belonging to a certain culture. And the AUL has the function of exchanging those culture specific meanings among the people with different socio-cultural knowledge. Indeed the mother tongue and the socio-cultural knowledge that is learned through it would form the basis according to which the information about other cultures communicated through an AUL can be processed, evaluated and finally accepted or rejected. That is, the mother tongue gives an individual child the basis to deal with new social meanings communicated and exchanged through an AUL.

Second, exchanging culture-specific meanings through an AUL will lead to the development and enrichment of an AUL itself and probably the expansion of mother tongues as well. In other words, in a long run through using an AUL by individuals from different cultural background an AUL would become the potential resource within which desired culture-specific meanings, beliefs, values and traditions would be encoded. Thus, as I explained above, in such circumstances changing an AUL into an UL would not be a disaster for human history as Crystal (2000) notes though with regard to English being the main cause of language death.

### **3. 3. 2. 2 Answers from the literature on English**

Re-examining the other section of the literature that is on EIL, demonstrates both positive and negative aspects associated with English although the negative aspects and thus the critical views towards English are much stronger and thus give rise to the need for the LP of an AUL as a possible solution. It demonstrates the fact that English being perceived as an international language has been the result of political, economic and cultural hegemony of developed countries, in particular Britain and the U.S. rather than being chosen through an international global decision and agreement. Furthermore, the critical views towards English explicitly demonstrate that English does not have the qualities or characteristics that an AUL is expected to have such as being universal and auxiliary. The literature on EIL does show however the bright side of English in that it has facilitated intercultural communication for millions of people all around the world and has evolved into localized varieties; a fact that cannot be ignored in particular in collecting and analyzing facts in order to collectively decide on the choice of an AUL.

In short, in providing an analytical description of the status of English in the world the scholars present a thick description of not just English as an international language, but also of other languages and cultures which are in contact in English and discuss the consequences and influences of such contact. They demonstrate how individual language users, native languages and cultures and national language policies have been influenced by and also influenced English language and English spread. Thus, it can be said that the literature on EIL could be considered as one of the best resources available to examine the current situation of languages in the world and to identify the problems and determine a solution to address them in which those negative aspects can

be predicted and perhaps avoided, and positive aspects can be reinforced and emphasized. In fact, I have to emphasize that exploratory studies of an AUL like this and reviewing different resources, in particular the ones on EIL, are the primary steps to identify the problems in order to present possible solutions, LP of an AUL.

### **3. 3. 2. 3 Answers from the literature on Esperanto**

Re-examining the literature on Esperanto as the most well known constructed language provides general information about corpus planning and construction of an AUL that would be useful to those who will be in charge of the planning of an AUL; it would help them decide either to use an already constructed language or create a new one as an AUL. It demonstrates the guidelines on how to create the vocabulary of a constructed language or formulate its grammatical structure so that it is as easy and as precise as possible. In addition, the literature on Esperanto movement that demonstrates how a constructed language starts its life in written form and gradually develops and expands in terms of both the number of meanings encoded in it and the number of functions it performs could be used as a learning resource for planners of an AUL on the kind of policies they can formulate. In fact, as Li (2003) emphasizes, a constructed language like Esperanto that is created from natural languages has the capacity to be used to perform different functions and adapt to culture-specific meanings as a natural language does.

Although the literature on Esperanto may provide some clues about the corpus planning of an AUL, it does not discuss what should be done before constructing the AUL. In other words, it disregards the fact that before constructing a language as an AUL and promoting it, there needs to be an international collective decision on the choice of

the constructed language to serve as an AUL. As the literature itself demonstrates, due to lack of international policy on the choice of Esperanto as an AUL, no national language policy has supported the language and the spread of Esperanto has been limited mainly to individual's passions and interest in the language as well as a few educational systems to support and teach the language.

In short, what the literature on Esperanto strongly suggests in relation to the LP of an AUL is that even a constructed language that is easy to learn in a short period of time and that is created for the purpose of establishing peace among human beings (e.g., Forster, 1982; Janton, 1993) through removing the problem of language barriers could not fulfill its purpose thoroughly, unless its creation, promotion, spread and functions are organized by explicit language planning initially at the international level and then at the national and local levels. It also demonstrates that a single individual scholar no matter how pure and humanitarian his intentions may be, as Zamenhof's were, is incapable of carrying out the LP of an AUL by himself to stimulate the people of the world to learn his constructed language on a voluntary basis. And that is why it has not been considered as useful and functional enough for all the people of the world to learn it. In addition, Li (2003) argues, if Esperanto had been provided with and supported by economic and military power as English had been, it would have gained an international status. However, the literature on English strongly demonstrates that economic and military power alone would not solve the problem fundamentally. In other words, as the literature on English clearly demonstrates, although these sorts of power may be effective in a language spread, they cause irreversible negative consequences and problems that are difficult to solve. Therefore, there needs to be international decision-making and planning

to organize and support the program of LP of an AUL even if a constructed language is decided on as an AUL.

The literature on Esperanto also demonstrates the kind of ideology that should inspire the LP of an AUL. As Zamenhof's biography demonstrates, there needs to be real love and affection for mankind for the LP of an AUL to be as fruitful as possible. In fact, those who will be in charge of LP of an AUL in future need to really care for the speakers of all languages and all speech communities no matter how small they may be and the problems they face due to language barrier rather than their own economic and political interests and Zamenhof can set a good example for this purpose.

In summary, although re-examining the literature on AUL, Esperanto and English may provide us with some clues with regard to the LP of an AUL, it does not present a complete framework through which the LP of an AUL can be explicitly discussed. Neither does it explain the phases involved in the program of LP of an AUL nor the activities involved in each phase. But as I explained in the literature review, LPP can be the possible framework through which the LP of an AUL can be examined. Unfortunately, there is not a single theory of LPP or a detailed discussion of the LP of an AUL in the literature; however, different dimensions of LP can be used as a model for the LP of an AUL. Therefore, I will re-examine the literature on LPP and use it as a model to discuss the program of LP of an AUL, the phases as well as the activities involved in it. My re-examination of LPP is of course a preliminary step in consideration of using LPP and expanding it as a model for the LP of an AUL and removal of the problem of language barriers. Future discussions and examinations of the subject and above all the actual planning of an AUL will obviously provide a much more comprehensive and

detailed picture of LPP and its application for the LP of an AUL. It is my intention only to suggest a tentative model to demonstrate the feasibility of devising a program for LP of an AUL and the kinds of issues involved in its planning.

### **3. 3. 2. 4 Answers from the literature on Language Policy and Planning**

Based on the literature on LPP although there is no single theory of LP and, as Cooper (1989) states, and that the scholars in the field have different views of what comprise LP, they all share the view that LP is a response or solution for language problems though the problems may be actually non-linguistic in nature as Fishman (1971) and Spolsky (2004) emphasize. Garvin (1974) also notes, “decisions made in language planning affect linguistic variables; but they are motivated by non-linguistic variables” (p. 69). Therefore, LP is a framework to address language or communication problems that are mainly rooted in non-linguistic problems. Although language planners deal with language problems, they should also be aware of the actual problems that have given rise to LP. Based on the literature on LPP, a language problem can be either a matter of form, function but also the spread and educating in terms of that form or function. Thus, based on the problem, the programs of LP can be corpus planning, status planning or education planning. In short, in status planning a certain language would be allocated certain functions and uses such as official functions, subject functions, national functions etc. On the other hand, in corpus planning the focus is on the language form including its grammatical structure, vocabulary, styles etc. Finally, education planning is mainly concerned with teaching and spreading a language that has previously been given certain functions or that has undergone modifications of forms.

With regard to the LP of an AUL, all three programs of planning – corpus planning, status planning or education planning – can be applied because first a language will be given the status of an AUL, then its forms should be standardized to be used in the third phase of planning which is education planning.

In the following paragraphs I will present a tentative model for the LP of an AUL and discuss the phases involved in it.

### **3. 2. 2. 4. 1 A tentative model for the language planning of an AUL**

#### **1) Status planning**

The first phase in planning of an AUL would be status planning. To go about status planning implies planning itself. In planning the main problem and thus the goal should be identified, ways and steps to achieve it should be specified and above all the individuals who would be in charge of planning of an AUL in general and its status planning, in particular should be determined. It is difficult to answer and discuss these issues in detail in this paper because it implies massive research and cooperation of language planners, linguists and even governments from all around the world. However, based on the literature I have read, I will provide some suggestions of how status planning of an AUL can be carried out. And I should emphasize that the order in which I will discuss these steps is only tentative and could change in the actual LP of an AUL.

The first step would be to determine who could go about the formal LP of an AUL. As I discussed in detail in the section on Answers from the literature, it can be said that representative language planners and linguists from all around the world could be the main planners of an AUL, in particular its status planning because they have the expert knowledge about the structure of different languages, how they work, the number of

speakers of different languages, the history of different language, the social and psychological aspects tied to each language and above all LP. However, it should be taken into account that it would be governments, education systems, language teachers and even AUL users who would be involved in implementing an AUL. Indeed, without financial resources, human resources and above all moral commitment of people at different levels implementing policies on an AUL would be impossible. Therefore, there needs to be sufficient cooperation and exchange of ideas and expert knowledge between researchers in the field of LPP, representative language planners and linguists and governments; otherwise, the outcome policies would benefit some languages and some speech communities rather than all as has often been the case, in particular in national language development in developing countries as suggested by the literature on LPP. The reasons for such problems according to the literature can be attributed to the fact that governments usually consider the political and economic factors as the main criteria to make decisions about languages and language issues, while neglecting the social and dynamic nature of languages and the way they interact with different aspects of the society, other languages and above all individual language users' attitudes towards and beliefs about language use, language choice and language function. Therefore, to avoid similar problems, expert language planners should not only be in charge of AUL planning, they should also gain perspectives and collect data from as many resources as possible so that they can make the most appropriate decision that would render the most benefits possible.

In addition, based on what a few of the reviewed scholars have suggested, the UN could be the possible organization that could have the responsibility of the

management of the planning of an AUL although none has explained why the UN could be the suitable body for such an important global endeavor. After searching the official web site of the UN it became apparent why the UN might be the most suitable international organization to plan and manage the explicit international planning of an AUL.

The UN is the largest international body in terms of representative countries. It has 192 member countries. The UN is central to global efforts to solve problems that challenge humanity. Through the UN efforts, governments have concluded many multilateral agreements that make the world a safer, healthier place with greater opportunity and justice for all of us although those agreements may not have been implemented as have been agreed upon. And the reason for such shortcomings in implementing those decisions can be partially attributed to the fact that the UN is not a world government and it does not make laws although its members agree to accept the obligations of the UN charter, an international treaty that sets out basic principles of international relations. The UN does, however, provide the means to help resolve international conflicts and formulate policies on matters affecting all human beings. And at the UN all the Member States have a voice and a vote on the process for resolving problems and formulating policies although in reality they may not have equal right to speak up and comment on the different subjects of discussion. One of the areas that the UN together with UNESCO focus on is preserving mother tongues and endangered languages as a way to implement language rights. The Proclamation of the twenty first of February as International Mother Language Day in 1999 by UNESCO can be considered one of the most significant events in human history to demonstrate the role of mother

tongues in preserving and developing human heritage. In fact, the celebration of nearly 6000 languages on this day signifies a global effort aimed at promoting linguistic diversity and multilingual education because today about half of the 6,000 or so languages spoken in the world are under threat and struggle to continue alongside the major languages of communication, in particular English. And as a way to achieve this goal UNESCO is working to promote education as a fundamental right for all while respecting and using the mother tongue at all levels of education, wherever possible, to promote through education an awareness of the positive value of cultural diversity and to make full use of culturally appropriate methods of communication and transmission of knowledge.

Reviewing all these issues about the UN, its responsibilities, the way it works and above all the programs it has devised to preserve linguistic diversity suggests that the UN could also manage the international planning of an AUL not only as one of its numerous endeavors, but also as a fundamental program to save endangered languages while planning and implementing a language that meets today's needs to communicate globally, an AUL. In other words, planning of an AUL through the UN could be the way to preserve and use mother tongues in education systems as a human heritage while at the same time choosing and implementing a language to remove the language barrier.

The second step in the status planning of an AUL would be to identify the problem or problems that have given rise to it. Although based on the reviewed literature the main purpose to have an AUL is to remove the problem of language barriers, the kind of problems that necessitate the LP of an AUL are not primarily linguistic; an AUL is aimed at removing language barriers so that people all around the world would be able to

exchange ideas and know about different views, traditions and cultures and thus live in peace. In addition, the reviewed literature on English can also set an explicit example of how on the one hand, non-linguistic issues or problems in particular, national conflicts, underdevelopment and social and economic pressures as well as the linguistic problem of not being able to communicate at the global level have been the main reasons for English spread. And on the other hand, the literature on EIL strongly suggests that English itself has become the main cause of so many non-linguistic problems the most important of which are: language death, native cultures and traditions losing their value in the face of western modernity, inequality in terms of having access to the so-called international language – English – and English being a one-way bridge for transmission of western culture and knowledge to the rest of the world rather than a two-way path. These are the problems that give rise to the LP of an AUL as a solution or as an alternative for the current situation.

In short, it can be said that according to the reviewed literature, the kind of problems that necessitate the planning of an AUL differ from the problems that necessitate the planning of, for example, an official or subject language in a nation. These problems seem to be more urgent because the negative consequences of EIL are affecting not just a single language or culture or an ethnic group, but almost all the world languages and the local cultures and minority groups and minority languages with which English is in contact. In fact, since English itself has spread worldwide, the problems associated with it have also spread globally. And the problem of language barriers and the rationale and need for removing them that have been the main reasons for proposing the idea of an AUL initially, are much more significant at the present time than maybe a

hundred years ago. We live in an era in which technological advancements and communication technologies provide us with facilities to communicate with people all around the world for a diverse range of purposes such as simple chatting or even participating in a conference call. In addition, we are witnessing major transformations in the ways different issues, problems and conflicts are dealt with. They have gained a global dimension to them so that they are not any longer considered as an individual, local or national problem but as a global issue that needs to be handled globally. Therefore, it is at this time that the presence of a common language or an AUL is most needed. An AUL would be one of the most significant means to remove misunderstandings and thus conflicts that are mainly caused by ignorance and not having sufficient knowledge about the others and above all not being able to communicate and express one's views, emotions, cultural values and traditions through a common means of communication, an AUL.

After specifying who will manage the planning of an AUL in general and its status planning, in particular, and identifying the main problem and the possible solution to address it – the international LP of an AUL – the third step would be to find a language as an AUL and allocate certain functions and certain roles to it. To do so, the first issue would be to decide on the choice of an AUL and determine whether a language from among the current natural language should be adopted as an AUL or a new language should be artificially created, a question we have visited several times in the thesis. According to the literature on LPP, fact-finding would be the most crucial step in the status planning of an AUL because it would help representative planners consult and decide on the choice of an AUL based on academic studies and sociolinguistic data rather

than their own economic and political interests as has often been the case with English though at the national level. Fact-finding would include “all the data collection, linguistic and sociolinguistic surveys” that should be carried out based on the purpose of planning (Karam, 1974, p. 109). Fact-finding would be an input into policy formulation. Of course, it should be mentioned that fact-finding has to be carried out not only before policymaking, but also before implementation of the policy and even during the implementation process (Bambgose, 1989).

With regard to the kind of data that has to be collected and the kind of studies that should be carried out an important point needs to be taken into account. As I discussed above, since the problems that give rise to the LP of AUL are both linguistic and non-linguistic, in the process of fact-finding, not only all different languages themselves, both natural and constructed, should be studied and compared and contrasted, but also the history of each language and social and emotional issues tied to each needs to be examined. In addition, since the decision is going to be international the facts should be collected from all around the world and from different representative countries. It seems to me that some of the issues that should be researched in the process of fact-finding for status planning of an AUL are: finding information about different natural languages that can be possible candidates for the status of an AUL; comparing and contrasting of natural and artificial languages in terms of simplicity and also people’s acceptance and attitudes towards them, using the literature of EIL as a way to avoid past mistakes and finally analyzing what has already been discussed and investigated about different aspects of an AUL in the literature as a way to gain different perspectives and insights with regard to different issues involved in the LP of an AUL.

After collecting data, language planners could consult and decide on the choice of an AUL, which would be the most difficult step in planning of an AUL as the reviewed scholars emphasize. Therefore, to choose the most appropriate language as an AUL, not only should the representative language planners rely on and use their expert knowledge and collected data, but also they should base their decisions on consultation and collective decision-making in which each representative freely expresses his or her ideas. If the collective decision-making results in the choice of a constructed language, the next step would be to create that language.

The reviewed literature on LPP provides very few references with regard to how decisions are made and policies are formulated in the process of LP. Haugen (1972) states that “Decision theory” as presented by social theorists is the model for decision making in LP (p. 162). However, he does not explain it in detail but does state that “decision making results in the selection from a socially defined limited number of problematical alternative projects (i.e. course of action) of one project to bring about the particular future state of affairs envisaged by the decision-makers” (Snyder as cited in Haugen, 1972, p. 162-163). In short, decision theory not only prescribes how decisions should be made by an individual but also specifies the stages involved in the process of decision-making, which are: 1) identification of the problem, 2) obtaining necessary information, 3) production of possible solutions 4) evaluation of such solutions and 5) selection of a strategy for performance (Hansson, 2005, p. 10). Since as I discussed above making decisions about different aspects of the LP of an AUL is also an international group effort, decision theory or more specifically “social decision theory” can also be applied to the LP of an AUL (Hansson, 2005, p. 79). In fact, in social decision theory the

focus is on decision-making by a group rather than an individual as has been the case with the first-developed decision theories. Therefore, this theory can be a possible tool to make decisions about different aspects of an AUL, in particular the choice of an AUL that has never been discussed because the majority of the reviewed scholars, in particular the ones in the 1920s to 1950s, has never had access to theory in the modern sense that developed in mid twenty century (Hansson, 2005, p. 6).

It is out of the scope of this study to discuss this theory in detail; however, I will discuss the significant points in this theory in relation to those that would be beneficial for the LP of an AUL, in particular in the choice of an AUL. In this theory “the presumption is that the group acts as if it were a single individual” (Hansson, 2005, p. 79). Thus, the decision-maker “can be thought of as having a unitary interest motivating its decisions” (Luce and Raiffa as cited in Hansson, 2005, p. 79). In addition, according to this theory, having different views on how the goals can be achieved is a natural feature of collective decision-making (Hansson, 2005). Fishman, Das Gupta, Jernudd and Rubin (1971) also note that there may be “conflicting pressures within the language policy-making authority” as well as “between the authority and other authorities” (p. 294). Thus, the important concern of collective decision-making should be “the aggregation of individual preferences (choices) into collective preferences (choices) and “combine them into a set of social preferences” that benefit each individual in the consulting body and those for whom the decisions are made (Hansson, 2005, p. 79). Therefore, disagreements and diversity of opinions and having different views and perspectives towards the subject under discussion should be viewed as positive signs rather than negative ones because each different opinion if being expressed based on facts

would shed light on a different aspect of the subject under study and thus would help the consulting body to decide about it with open mind (Hansson, 2005).

Although the reviewed literature does not explain in detail how policies are formulated, it does suggest that language policies have a significant role in the destiny of the language under planning as well as the other languages with which it will be in contact and also further decisions that are going to be made about that language. Therefore, the language policy associated with the AUL would be probably the most important official means in which representative language planners collectively would specify the status of the AUL and determine its domains of use as well as general issues with regard to its corpus planning and education planning. Although it should be mentioned that for corpus planning and education planning of an AUL, it would probably be necessary to formulate distinct policies that focus on the specifics; however, those policies should still be based on what has been specified in the policy about the status of the AUL because it would be probably the main referential document in which the goal of LP of an AUL would be clearly specified and its features, domains of use and functions would be explained.

## **2) Corpus planning**

After formulating the AUL policy, corpus planning needs to be carried out because it would be in corpus planning that language planners and linguists should decide on a kind of standard vocabulary, grammar and script that they are going to teach no matter whether the chosen AUL is a constructed language or a natural one. Since in the literature on LPP none of the scholars have discussed the LP of an AUL in detail, there are no discussions concerning the corpus planning of an AUL, the kind of activities

involved in it with regard to the form of an AUL. And since corpus planning implies having expert knowledge on different aspects of linguistics it is out of the scope of this study to discuss the details of corpus planning of an AUL. In addition, predicting the kind of activities involved in this phase and modifications that have to be made in the AUL would depend on the language to be chosen as an AUL. In fact, depending on the language chosen as an AUL, the kind of modifications needed to be applied to its form ranging from the vocabulary to genres would vary. And of course if a constructed language is going to act as an AUL, the corpus planning would be much more complex than if a natural language is chosen because even an already created constructed language would need to be expanded to be able to fulfill different communicative purposes and be used in different domains and contexts. Based on the literature on LPP, it can be said that modifications and standardizations of an AUL itself would not be necessarily limited to the primary stage of the corpus planning; there would probably be an ongoing need for linguists and language planners to observe the language and make necessary modifications for two important purposes: 1) to ensure that all the people around the world will learn the same AUL or that the AUL is taught based on one common ground all around the world and also 2) to ensure that the AUL is not losing its common ground through being used in different cultures and by speakers of different languages and thus to avoid unintelligibility that may occur due to the development of localized varieties of the AUL.

### **3) Education planning**

The third phase of AUL planning would be education planning in which the focus would be on the teaching of the AUL considering its status, functions as well as the

decisions made in the previous phases. An important point concerning the education planning of an AUL is that although the status planning of an AUL would be carried out at the international level and by representative language planners from all over the world, implementing or education planning would be carried out at the national level and in different countries, cities and villages. Therefore, it would be probably necessary to formulate not only an international policy with regard to education planning of an AUL, but also different national policies in which the procedure of AUL implementation is determined and specified based on the national and local resources and circumstances. It would be through those policies that language planners and authorities in education systems would decide on the ways and procedures to implement the AUL based on their national and local circumstances. So, there cannot be one procedure for all countries to follow to implement the policies concerning the education planning of an AUL.

According to the literature, here are some of the issues that should be decided upon in the education planning of an AUL: the appropriate age in which AUL education should start, the resources needed for the teaching of an AUL such as textbooks, the appropriate teaching methodology, teacher training, designing of the curriculum for the teaching of an AUL, the city or region where teaching the AUL can be started and the rate at which the AUL should be taught based on the human and financial resources. Determining these and related issues involved in education planning of an AUL would also imply massive fact-finding and decision-making.

Based on the answers to the first research question, what can be predicted with regard to the education planning of an AUL is that, all countries should include the AUL as a subject in the school curriculum and provide the facilities to teach it throughout the

country. However, it should not be forgotten that doing so implies spending huge amounts of time, energy, human and economic resources and above all enthusiasm and creativity to accelerate and improve the implementation process. In other words, it would be illogical to expect an AUL to be taught in schools all around the world in just a few years and the auxiliary language to become universal in a short period of time. In addition, since in each country different languages such as the national language and the official language are performing different functions, it would be impossible to predict what decisions policy makers would make about those other languages and how they would go about clarifying and determining the status and functions of each one of those languages. But what we can predict according to the literature is that national language policies would perhaps move towards a bilingual situation in which only the AUL and a mother tongue would function. In addition, we should take into account that moving towards bilingualism in which only the mother tongues and the AUL would be taught and used is a long-term goal because it will take time and careful planning.

The practical and useful way to measure the extent to which the education planning of an AUL and thus its status planning have been successful could be evaluation that has been discussed in the literature on LPP as the last step in any program of LP. Through evaluation language planners and authorities in education systems would be able to see the extent to which they have reached their pre-determined goal, what obstacles or problems have been in the way for education planning and what changes need to be made in the relevant policies and planning procedures to obtain the goal and achieve the purpose for which education planning had originally been considered. In short, through evaluation language planners would not only be able to assess the result of

implementation, but also to assess and monitor the results of planning. As Fishman, Das Gupta, Jernudd and Rubin (1971) maintain, evaluation can be carried out at any point in language planning especially in and after implementation.

In short, in an attempt to fill the gap in the literature with regard to how an AUL can be adopted and implemented all across the world, I have considered all three different dimensions of LP – status planning, corpus planning and education planning – and applied them to the program of LP of an AUL. I suggested that in the program of LP of an AUL all three phases are needed because first a language has to be given the status of an AUL, second its form has to be standardized and third, it has to be taught in the education systems. Of course, as I mentioned, this is a tentative program for the LP of an AUL and the order in which each phase is set could change in actual planning. In addition, as I noted, corpus planning is an ongoing process that may be carried out at any stage in the education planning of an AUL. While discussing the three phases involved in the program of LP of an AUL, I discussed the steps that have to be taken in each phase and the kind of activities involved in each. I explained that after determining the individuals who could be in charge of the LP of AUL, the first and foremost important step would be to identify the problems, clearly specify the solutions and the goals for which they are presented and collect data from as many relevant resources as possible to be able to make decisions and formulate policies that could actually be implemented.

After discussing LPP as the framework for LP of an AUL and examining specific issues in LP of an AUL which are 1) status planning, 2) corpus planning and 3) education planning, we should briefly look at more general considerations in which those three are rooted.

The first point concerns the program of LP of an AUL itself. Almost all the reviewed scholars in the field of LPP in their definition of what LP is and what comprises a program of LP emphasize that fact that LP for whatever goal it might have been devised – status planning, corpus planning and education planning – will not completely determine and control the form, function and even spread of a language because language has a social aspect to it and LP takes place in a social context in which a wide range of factors interact. The same rule would also apply to an AUL and the program devised for its LP. An AUL like any other language would not be fixed in time; it would change. And since “culture change and language change are interrelated”, an AUL would be influenced by the society and its circumstances (Nekitel, 1992, p. 57). Thus, its vocabulary, structures and the kind of genres produced in it would evolve and change. As was discussed above in response to the first research question, the kind of changes that will occur in the AUL itself will be the result of changes and modifications in the world cultures, social meanings, changing or even abandonment of some meanings and development of new ones. In addition to the changes in cultures and social meanings, language ecology will also change so that gradually and in the long run, only the AUL and the mother tongues would be probably the only languages through which communicative purposes will be achieved. Considering all these facts that are embedded in the social nature of language strongly suggest that no matter how hard language planners and linguists work to control and standardize the AUL, it would be impossible to keep the languages from those unplanned and implicit changes. However, this issue should not undermine the program of LP of an AUL because any program of LP including the LP of an AUL if devised based on facts would remove certain linguistic and

even non-linguistic problems. And as I mentioned above, LP of an AUL has to be an ongoing process in which needs and facts have to be constantly identified and addressed in the program of LP for the AUL to maintain its accessibility, intelligibility and efficiency.

Therefore, since the LP of an AUL would be an ongoing process, decision-making may occur at any point in the planning including fact-finding, policy formulation, implementation and evaluation. And in fact, any decision at any point of language planning will affect the direction of planning and the consequent activities and thus results. Therefore, for the planning of an AUL, in particular its status planning to be carried out successfully and with the least conflicts and harm for a certain country or a certain speech community, not only true consultation has a significant role, but also unity of purpose and goal in every stage of planning are very crucial. In other words, it would be impossible or very difficult to make decisions about one aspect of an AUL while the consulting members have different goals.

The second point, concerns the role of people for whom LP of an AUL would be carried out and their attitudes and responses to it though language planners, linguists and even governments would also be among those for whom an AUL would be planned and their views would influence the decisions at different stages of the LP of an AUL. As the literature on LPP theoretically raises and the literature on EIL explicitly demonstrates people at the grass root levels for whom LP is devised are implicit language planners whose beliefs and attitudes towards language affect implementation of the program of LP. Each and every AUL user would be an active language planner in occasions. Language users cannot only initiate a language planning activity such as correcting the

pronunciation of a word, but also can respond to planned language planning activities based on their ideologies and beliefs about language differently from others as Fishman (1989) and Spolsky (2004) emphasize. The same rule also applies to the LP of an AUL and its users with the significant difference that the target population for whom AUL would be planned is all the people of the world rather than a province or a nation (though it may take years to completely implement an AUL globally). The program of LP of an AUL like any program of LP would involve both planned or top-down and unplanned or a bottom-up planning. Therefore, although according to the literature the idea of having an AUL has always been viewed as being fulfilled through some sort of explicit international planning initiated by governments and language planners rather than ordinary people, the success of AUL planning would strongly depend on the extent to which people have been involved in its planning, to what extent their voices are heard in the process of planning and finally how they would respond to the decisions and policies about AUL and other languages, in particular mother tongues that they use.

In order to gain the support of the majority of the world population and for the planning of an AUL to benefit all the people rather than a certain country one of the most important issues that should be taken into account in the LP of an AUL from the beginning would be close cooperation and exchange of ideas between governments, researchers and ordinary people in order to enrich the examination of the idea of an AUL because each would shed light on aspects of an AUL that may not be noticed by the other. However, involving political leaders and researchers in different disciplines in particular applied language studies and even ordinary people in the planning of an AUL should be carried out in an organized and planned way; otherwise, conflicts and

disagreements will rise. With regard to involving people at the grass-root level in planning of an AUL probably as Haugen (1996) notes, “public opinion research” would be the best way (p. 26). And the findings from these studies could be exchanged among governments and finally consulted by the representative language planners who will be in charge of LP of an AUL. In this way, the final decision will not be the outcome of only the consulting body but of studies in which the voice of ordinary people are investigated and taken into account. And of course, the studies and research on the idea of an AUL should not be limited to language and linguistic issues. They should encompass the social, psychological and economic aspects associated with the AUL itself and its planning; otherwise, finding the truth about how to go about the planning of an AUL will not result in fruitful results that benefit all people and all speech communities.

In addition, not only should people at the grass root levels be involved in fact finding and policy formulations, they should be informed of the decisions that are made and the reasons why they have to support them. In fact, public awareness is one of the fundamental issues in LP, in particular in the case of an AUL. People should be informed of why they should learn an AUL in general and the language that is chosen as an AUL, in particular; they should also become aware of the reasons why they should preserve their native languages and what the significance of native languages and cultures is in their lives as has been already specified in the language policies.

The last point that needs to be mentioned with regard to the LP of an AUL concerns ideologies and their role in AUL planning. As Fishman argues, LP is “value-laden and value-directed” (as cited in Cooper, 1989, p. 26). In fact, any modification in the form, function or even teaching of a language whether planned or unplanned, is

influenced by some ideologies and beliefs towards language, language use, and language function and their interaction with economic, political and social issues. And as Fishman (1989) notes, the role of ideologies and attitudes towards different issues of LP are not limited to government or language planners. Even ordinary people have certain views and attitudes towards language and language use. For example, they choose to use certain words, or a certain variety of a language or a completely different language depending on the situation in which they are. And the reasons for such views and choices can be traced back to the social, cultural and even historical factors.

In the LP of an AUL like LP of any other kind, ideologies as has been suggested play a significant role. In fact, in different stages of AUL planning ranging from deciding on the choice of an AUL to implementing the AUL policies at the national and local levels and actually teaching the AUL ideologies play a significant role. As the literature strongly suggests, the issue of language barriers will not be solved, native languages will be increasingly endangered and linguistic human rights will not be observed unless representative language planners, linguists and world governments collect and make use of relevant expert knowledge and above all develop and practice humanitarian perspectives towards different aspects of the planning of an AUL. In addition, as I discussed in detail in re-examining the literature on Esperanto, viewing an AUL and its planning as a way to benefit all mankind rather than a certain country or group, preserving native languages and cultures and believing in linguistic rights should be the kind of ideologies inspiring LP of an AUL.

So far, I re-examined the literature to answer the research questions and extended the literature on LPP and applied three dimensions of LP – status planning, corpus

planning and education planning – to the program of LP of an AUL to demonstrate the feasibility of LP in devising a program for LP of an AUL; I discussed and also presented a tentative model for LP of an AUL. In the following paragraphs I will analyze the interviewees' responses with regard to the status of EIL, the feasibility of international planning of AUL and the specifics of a program for LP of an AUL. As a supplementary source in my exploration of the idea of an AUL it became apparent that the interviews reinforced the literature on EIL, provided further insights into the positive and negative aspects of EIL, extended the discussion on the idea of an AUL and presented new insights with regard to the program of LP of an AUL.

### **3. 4 Interviews**

As I mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, as the second approach in my exploratory study of an AUL, I collected primary data through conducting two sets of interviews. In the first set I asked ten student participants' views about the status of English as the most well known international language as well as the idea of having an AUL, its purpose and the possibility of international planning to adopt an AUL and teach it globally. The reason why I asked about English was to find out what they think about the positive and negative aspects associated with English and whether in their views as native and non-native speakers of English is a desired AUL or not. In fact, although English is known as an international language, I wanted to explore whether in the participants' views English is a desired AUL or whether international planning is necessary to decide on the choice of another AUL. After asking interviewees about EIL and thus identifying the problem associated with English, I focused on other research questions that were focused on defining an AUL and explaining how an AUL can be

adopted. In other words, I had begun with questions about EIL to identify whether there is any problem with the current situation where English acts as an international language. Then, I used what they said about the problems associated with English as a link to demonstrate the necessity of adopting an AUL and discuss the next research questions, which dealt with the features of an AUL and the feasibility of adopting an AUL at the international level as a possible solution, and discussing the ways to do that.

After reviewing the literature and doing the first set of interviews as well, I realized that the main gap was how to plan for an AUL in response to the problems associated with English and the urgent need to remove language barriers and facilitate communication with speakers of other languages and cultures. To find answers to this newly emerged question I conducted follow-up questions. As I mentioned earlier I chose two additional graduate students in SLALS who have explicit knowledge about LPP as well as another graduate student in SLALS who has more than ten years of experience as Project Economist/Analyst in International Development Program Management. In the follow-up questions I focused on the LP of an AUL and asked the participants how the LP of an AUL can be carried out, which dimension of LP – status planning, corpus planning and education planning – can be applied to the LP of an AUL, what activities would be involved in the program of LP of an AUL and finally what ideologies should inform the LP of an AUL so that an AUL does not have a negative influence on the status and value of mother tongues.

In the following two sub-sections I will review each participant's views separately because each had something different to contribute and as a result it was necessary to treat each one individually.

### **3. 4. 1 The first set of interviews**

First I will briefly review the ten participants' views on EIL and then will focus on the participants' responses with regard to the research questions which again are: 1) what is an AUL and what is its main purpose? 2) What can be the best possible method to go about the LP of an AUL at the international level? I will begin by analyzing the native English speakers' views and then those by the non-native participants to find out differences and similarities between these two groups in terms of the status of EIL.

The first participant, Mary, stated, "English is becoming [a universal language]". She believes that English has both positive and negative aspects. As for the positive aspect, she pointed out two issues. First, native speakers (in particular herself) can work as an ESL teacher to help the non-native English learners to learn English. Second, "because it [English] is a global language it does not matter where on the earth you are you will be able to communicate". With regard to the negative aspects, she emphasized that English is both "a huge disadvantage to other languages" and "marginalizes other people" who do not know English and thus cannot take part in the global communication and take advantage of its benefits. She added, language policies, those who make them and their intentions to be part of the global economy have had a significant role in promoting English and devaluing native languages at the same time. She maintains, "there are extra-linguistic forces that are at work for people to start learning English". People do not learn English because it is an easy language to learn but because it is linked to the economic and cultural power of western world.

While viewing an AUL as a possibility that should "allow people to use this language on the global level but still retain their native language too for use in their own

community or country”, she noted, in reality the situation is different. At present people “have to learn English in order to get ahead economically”; a situation that “has negative implications in a wide variety of ways”. Thus, she believed that definitely something should be done to preserve world’s cultures and traditions and to remove the inequality caused by either learning or not learning English. As for the question of how an ideal AUL can be adopted she stated, “the first thing is to be able to listen to some of the countries that have been misrepresented on the global level”. She emphasized that all the world’s countries rather than just Britain or the U.S. should take part in the adoption of an AUL and their views should be listened to and respected rather than being suppressed by powerful countries. But she mentioned that it is less likely that such a global decision can be made because “there are too many powers, too many other political issues that take precedence to control the language”. She stressed, people and in particular, those who have power have to recognize that native cultures and languages are being lost and become more conscious about “what is happening”. Then they can decide to adopt and “use English or whatever the majority language is” even if it is a constructed language and teach everyone that language “in such a way that it respects their culture”. Thus, as she put it, “ideally... they could still use their own first language but they could communicate using English but still representing their own cultural traditions”.

The second participant, David believed that “English is [the] most valuable [language] to most people” because it is “the principal language of international business, and academics”. Like Mary, David also stated that English people and their “money and power” have been the main cause of English spread in the colonizing period and now what we see is a reminder of that influence. So, he stressed, people have not learned

English because it is “inherently... an easy language to learn” but because they think that in order to be part of the global community “they have to “learn western culture and be able to talk about it” thus they perceive it as the only means to become engaged in the “international community” which is in his view “ is very unfortunate”. With regard to other negative aspects of English as well as its positive aspects David stated, “native speakers of English have an advantage ... because English is used all over the world” and thus it is easier for them to find jobs in which English proficiency is an asset, in particular as English teachers. Consequently, it is “definitely a disadvantage for people” for whom English is a second language or those who do not learn the language at all. As the other negative aspect, David said, “western culture is sort of spreading through English”. However, he argued, as western culture spreads, “it is actually changing so it is actually not pure western culture” because “it is going to be different in every culture”; therefore, through English “more cultures are going to blend together” which may be considered as the positive side of English.

In short, while referring to these positive and negative aspects associated with English, he argued that it would be “nice to have a balance between what is being disseminated” because at present “there is certainly much more just western culture being shared all around the world” than other cultures and traditions. Thus, adopting an AUL as a means that “might help us get to know other cultures” as he emphasized, would be the solution to remove “the discord and lack of harmony in the world” that “is mostly due to the fact that we see ourselves as different from other people and largely because we do not understand the other person”.

As for the idea of adopting an AUL he believed that a language like English has been promoted by economic powers to become widespread, but a language like Esperanto “did not work because there was no value behind it” and “nobody has any reason to actually learn it”. Thus, he doubted whether “it is possible to artificially create a language” and “enforce this new language”. However, sharing Mary’s ideas he maintained that “it is a great idea” to adopt an AUL though “it would be very difficult to make it totally represented” because the selected AUL would depend “on who” creates or selects it. So, as he emphasized, “there has to be community representatives ...from all over the world to get together and create it” and implement it in “wide-ranging countries” and most important of all to specify the reason for people to learn the language. He added, it is not necessary for an AUL to initially represent all the cultures and languages because “the language would develop to suit whatever uses it is being [put to]”.

Catherine, the third participant, also believed that English is an international language because it is the main language of “business, technology and communication” as well as academic publications. Like the previous participants she stated that “it is more who speak it [English] and who is in power”, in particular the “U.S.”, than the actual language [English] itself which has led to English spread. She explained, countries such as the U.S. control the world trade and other countries are forced to learn English to be able to partake in the global trade.

Concerning the benefits and disadvantages associated with English, like David, Catherine referred to the benefits that English has for its native speakers in terms of having more chances to find jobs and being more able “to communicate with more people”. She added, although non-native speakers of English can also communicate with

so many people all around the world, they are forced to learn English but no other language. She emphasized, an AUL should be adopted for the purpose of “effective communication among people around the world” and thus to “overcome misunderstandings” and “prejudice”. Thus, to achieve these goals, she stressed, adopting a language as an AUL should go together with informing people of the importance of the language in their life because in her view if people do not find it necessary, they will not learn it, so the adoption of an AUL will be useless. She suggested that the UN or maybe “one of the world originations” can be in charge of planning of an AUL and “come up with an idea that all countries could agree together ... to learn this language” because as she emphasized, for adoption of an AUL “a group consensus” is needed rather than economic power and money, as is the case with English. Concerning the choice of an AUL she made an unprecedented suggestion. She proposed that sign language could be adopted as an AUL because people “will be more likely to keep their own language and stop others [languages] from dying out”. In addition, as she explained, a sign language is a “neutral kind of language” and “it is not so involved with identity and culture”. Furthermore, as she stated, by learning a sign language people “can learn about people who have certain disabilities like they cannot speak”. But, she pointed out that adopting sign language as an AUL is not practical because it cannot be used in “publication and witting”.

The fourth participant, Lily also stated that the current status of English has been the result of colonialism. She stated, “it is not necessarily a bad thing that English is becoming such a global language” because “a lot of people speak it currently so that there are a lot of people who understand English” and there is “a lot of documentation about

English”. However, as a way to remove the superiority of native English speakers over the non-native speakers, she emphasized, “we do need to be ready to accept different versions of English because they still have “common grounds”. As for negative aspects associated with English she explained how due to English spread “a lot of smaller language groups have been pushed out and we are losing linguistic diversity” and that there is not “such a large representation of other language groups on the Internet to have the access”. Thus, sharing the previous participants’ views, she states that adopting an AUL is “a good idea” because it would lead not only the “governments”, but also schools and parents to promote “ [the] local language” and “giving worth to traditional or native or historical languages and giving them a place within in the society whether it be religious or cultural or business”. However, similar to the majority of the reviewed participants and scholars she maintained that it is “very difficult” especially in near future because it would cause “a lot of resistance among people who speak English as a first language”. In addition, as she stated, in the past “traditionally” it has been impossible to adopt an AUL because “there was not such worldwide communication”, “there was necessarily no global need to” and “there has not been that technological or social need to communicate with more people outside of your own country”. She emphasized, only in the last fifteen or twenty years communicating with people from other cultures and other countries “has become a major issue”; however, she thought it is not the right time yet to adopt an AUL because it would be difficult for countries to reach a consensus on the choice of an AUL.

Sara, the last native participant, also like the previous participants, believed that English is the one most “considered international language” and there “seems to be a

huge demand for other people learning English” because “they think it is going to get them a better job, a better education and it would be better for their children [because of] more job opportunities mostly”. As for the reasons of English spread, she shared the previous participants’ views that historically colonialism and thus external factors have been influential in English global spread. In addition, she believed that English has no inherent qualities compared with other languages and that also it “is a difficult language to learn”. As a second and more prominent negative aspect of English, she referred to English threatening other languages and cultures through promoting western culture because as she puts it “ideologies are going to be transferred through the language” [English] that is “inevitable”. Therefore, as she stated, it is “pretty challenging” for people to preserve their culture while at the same time meeting their desires and hopes to “have access to the kind of things that the [western] culture and language” have. Thus, like all the previous participants, she doubted whether it is possible to adopt an AUL because “English right now is very pervasive” and like Catherine she noted that people in “North America or the United States” would probably resist learning an AUL other than English. More important of all, she doubted how it would be possible to “convince them [powerful countries such as the United States and China] that ...the universal language is necessary and there is some benefit for them”. Therefore, she suggested that probably the idea of adopting an AUL would be better started “at the grass-root level” and then supported by the governments.

So far, I briefly reviewed the native participants’ views about English and the their responses to the first set of questions as well. I will now review and analyze the non-

native participants' views to find out if there are any differences between these two groups in relation to the first set of questions.

Emily believed that English is already an international language especially in academia and academic publications. She stated that English worldwide spread is not a “natural process” and there has been “some force” such as governments and education systems that have promoted English. She added, not only the government, but also “parents are very eager” to have their children learn English because English is perceived as the language through which non-native English speakers can “communicate with other people from different countries” and have higher education and have access to English journal articles while there are very few journals written in their mother tongues. However, as a negative aspect of English, she explained that non-native English speakers including herself may not be a “real bilingual” in the sense of being able to efficiently translate English terms into their mother tongues and vice versa because unfortunately they may not have sufficient knowledge of either or both languages. As another negative aspect she acknowledged that it is mainly the western culture that is introduced through English rather than other cultures. However, she maintained, it does not mean that the world is becoming western because the tool is the same but it is interpreted differently in different cultures and people adjust the culture that comes with English according to their own values. Therefore, she emphasized that English should not have such a “power” to invade other cultures. She stressed, an AUL should be just “a common tool” to help us to understand each other and “introduce ourselves”, “share our different cultures” and thus learn about each other’s culture and country. She doubted the possibility of adopting an AUL because she stated that the efforts to create a language such as Esperanto did not

work. However, she argued that English can be the common language, but “the degree of power should be limited by keeping our own language”. To achieve that goal, she explained, “we should not advocate English that much”, governments should not promote English more than native languages in the education system as they do at present and that people should “develop their own identity first” to be able to perceive those issues appropriately [cultural baggage that comes with English]. In other words, as she explained, first we need to develop a cognitive model in our first language then after we have enough “cognitive training” in our first language, we can go about learning English.

Carole also like all the previous participants acknowledged English as an international language because it is “used in international conferences, in business, in publications [and] academic publications”. She explained, people learn English and not any other language to become a member of “the successful group”, to be able “to communicate to other nations”, “to have a better position”, and “to have better understanding of the conflicts between cultures”. Thus, she noted, English brings “people together closer since understanding take place through communication”. As a result, each individual becomes “a multicultural person” who combines “things from different cultures” and learns from them.

As for the negative aspects associated with English similar to the previous participants, Carole stated that English dominance is associated with “economic power or military power” of English speaking nations rather than the English language itself because they use their language as a tool to “work their power”. As a result, she acknowledged that English is “invading other nations through culture, through movies, through jeans and stuff” rather than in a direct way; however, she stated, it is not

something bad because other nations want to belong to those powerful nations. And thus like Emily, Carole strongly believed there is no need to go about adopting an AUL. As she explained, “it is like a market if you substitute English with any other language it is not going to work”.

The third non-native participant, Mark stated that he cannot “think of any other language other than English being the international language” because it has the largest number of non-native speakers and it is “the only language or the one language that we [Indians] needed to communicate with the people coming from different parts of the world” or “if we are going outside in a different country”. In addition, as he explained, in most of the academic institutions [in India] the medium of instruction is English and it “is one of the requirements of finding jobs” [in India]; therefore, “you have to have it”. Unlike Lily, Mark argues that although “most probably ninety nine percent of the information they are getting from the web is coming from the English-speaking countries”, it is still “acceptable”; otherwise, people would not bother getting that information.

Concerning the factors that have been conducive to English spread he referred to his home country India. He stated, since India was a British colony, English “came in so naturally” that people did not have any idea it was becoming such an important language though he noted that at that time it was “definitely” not something natural and “there was maybe some sort of resistance and difficulty in getting used to language”. However, he added, gradually “when people started to use the language in everyday life probably ... it became more and more natural and more usual than something abnormal”. Although he acknowledged English imperialism as being tied with some negative issues, he noted that

the English language itself is not bad because any language would still be considered as having imperialistic power if it had spread and gained power the way English has. Thus, similar to most of the participants, he doubted the idea of adopting an AUL at the international level.

Pamela, the fourth non-native participant also like the previous participants believed that English is “becoming a universal language”. As she explained, English is so predominant in the Internet, academic publications that people have “no choice” other than learning English to be able to use these resources and also “to have [a] voice in the world”. However, unlike all the previous participants, she emphasized that English has some qualities that have contributed to its becoming an international language: it has the “unique” characteristic of organizing “our minds, our thoughts”; it “has a history” and “many books are written in English; books that are not only about English culture, but about other cultures”. In addition, since other countries want to have access to technological developments and advancements that mainly occur in English-speaking countries, she stated, “they have to learn” English which is something natural in her view. Similarly to Mark and Emily she believed that English is the quick solution to the problem of global communication because it brings people closer to each other, helps them understand each other better and remove “some of the misunderstandings” which are the main purpose of an AUL. She doubts international planning of an AUL at present. However, she stated that in the future if an organization selects an AUL other than English that would be a good idea. She explained, probably if the UN assigns “a committee” with “some linguistic professionals, representatives from all countries” to get together and discuss this issue, it will work. However, she added, adopting an AUL by

just “one country” will not work because “the voices of other countries” should be heard and considered in making decision about adopting an AUL.

The last non-native participant, Lucy also stated that English is an international language because “more people can speak English compared to other languages” and it makes it possible for people to “communicate with people from different countries”. Focusing on the popularity of English in her own country, China, she explained that “more and more people want to learn or know more things about China and more and more Chinese want to know more things about the whole world. So, the most important tool maybe is the language” [English]. Like Emily, another non-native participant, she stated that “parents... want their child to have better job in the future or [a] better life in the future”, so they “want their child to learn it [English]” while “at the same [time] they are neglecting the importance of their native language”. Moreover, as she maintained, English and English cultures have led to the abandonment of “many traditional things” and them being replaced by “new western style” in particular among the young generations. Thus, she emphasized that no matter what language is going to be adopted as an AUL, mother tongues should maintain their values and functions because an AUL would be just a tool “to communicate and to exchange your ideas and to know each other”.

In summary, reviewing and analyzing the interviewees’ responses to the first set of interviews, in particular the current status of English demonstrates that although the interviewees may not be considered as fully-fledged professional researchers and may not have conducted research on the status of EIL, they provide a rich discussion and description of EIL based on what they have experienced and observed as English teachers

and/or learners and what they have learned in their academic studies about language. While referring to positive aspects of EIL, they strongly suggest that there are many problems associated with English that need to be addressed as we have seen.

As the reader may have also noticed, interestingly, the native participants have more critical views about English than the non-native ones although both groups argue that English is the most prevalent language in academia, trade and the Internet and thus is considered an international language. All the native-participants mention that they are all benefiting from being a native English speaker; however, they emphasize the negative aspects associated with English spread. These are the negative aspects they refer to: English has been the cause of inequality in the world and marginalizing people rather than uniting them; English culture and language have penetrated or rather invaded the world's cultures without having any real justification; English threatens minority languages; English language has been promoted and thus perceived as the only way to modernity while native languages have been perceived as the cause of misery and poverty and finally economic, military and political powers have been and still are the main factors contributing to English spread and increasing the pressure to learn and use English.

On the other hand, the non-native participants have specific positive attitudes towards English. They emphasize that English for them as non-native English speakers has allowed them to pursue their higher education and find higher positions in the job market, to communicate with people who speak different languages and learn about other cultures and also the benefits it has had for their native countries to develop and get involved in the global economy. The non-native participants do refer to a few negative

aspects associated with English; however, their critical views about English are not as strong as those argued by the native participants and the reviewed scholars as well. For example, Emily doubts that English is a threat to native languages and she states that it should be just “a common tool”. Although she seems to be aware of the reality about English threatening other languages she ignores it. Carole also argues that English should be “only a second language” and not be imposed “on people as a national language or official language” though governments unfortunately do so. Mark opposes the way English has historically become the international language, in particular in the colonialism period. And finally Lucy stresses the idea that English has led to the abandonment of traditional styles and behaviors and caused Chinese people to “pay more attention to English” than to “Chinese Mandarin” or whatever their mother tongue is.

I will now summarize the interviewees’ responses to my two research questions. In response to the first research question which is what is an AUL and what is its main purpose?, all the participants more or less explain that an AUL is a common tool that will facilitate communication between people who speak different languages and thus using an AUL can help remove misunderstandings, expand one’s knowledge and understanding of different cultures and develop respect and tolerance towards diversity of thoughts, attitudes, ethnic groups, and cultural practices and beliefs. As I reviewed above, the participants’ views are to a large extent similar to what has been discussed as the purpose of an AUL by the reviewed scholars, in particular the ones who discuss the idea of an AUL itself and Esperanto. However, a significant point about the interviewees’ ideas is that they, in particular the non-native ones, have actually experienced using a common language – here English – to communicate with people who are from different cultures,

different nations and different speech communities. Therefore, they define an AUL based on real life experience while the reviewed scholars especially those in the 1920s-1950s might not have had that actual experience of choosing and using a language as an international language although their discussions are based on studies and facts about languages such as French and Latin that used to be considered as world languages. In other words, the scholars' discussion of the idea of an AUL and its purpose, in particular the scholars in the 1920s –1950s, may have been based on theoretical considerations rather than actual experience and examination of a live language acting as an AUL. The study participants on the other hand, have experienced learning, using and even teaching a language – English – to actually fulfill what has been theoretically described as the purpose of an AUL.

Another significant point suggested by participants is that as I discussed earlier in this chapter, an AUL is supposed to remove both linguistic and non-linguistic problems. In other words, although the study participants refer to the point that an AUL should be initially adopted to remove the problem of language barriers equally for every individual in the world, it is non-linguistic problems that they emphasize as the main purposes of an AUL: better understanding of each other, settling conflicts and removing misunderstandings. In fact, as the interviews suggest, there is nothing wrong with English itself being an AUL. The problems associated with the current situation of English are rooted in the way it has spread, the factors that have contributed to its spread and popularity, its being perceived as the only tool to modernity and material prosperity, lack of equality in terms of access to this so-called international language for every world citizen and thus its being the means of disseminating western culture rather than all the

world cultures. Indeed, these are the reasons that give rise to the need for international planning of an AUL.

With regard to the second research question, which is how an AUL can be adopted, similar to the reviewed scholars, the participants view the idea of adopting an AUL as urgent and beneficial but very difficult and probably impossible, in particular at the present time. As the reader may have also noticed, the participants have skeptical views about the possibility of international planning of an AUL and they mainly focus on the possibility of such an action rather than how to do it actually. They have different perspectives towards the international planning of an AUL. Some of them wonder how it would be possible to formally and explicitly adopt an AUL. Since their main focus is on English as an international language, they think that a language should become an AUL in the seemingly natural process as English has done rather than through explicit international planning. In fact, although most of them acknowledge political, economic and military powers that have promoted English spread, they view it as normal and natural because it has happened over a long period of time. Therefore, they cannot imagine a language becoming an AUL through explicit international planning. These may be why they argue that the international planning of an AUL may only be possible in the far future.

The other group of participants argues that at present adopting an AUL is not practical and useful because English is fulfilling what is expected of an AUL, therefore, adopting another language as an AUL would be a burden for people to start over and learn another language. Thus, they offer no further explanation of how an AUL can be adopted. Although what they argue is understandable, they ignore the obvious fact that

the burden they are talking about would be for English speakers who are much smaller in number compared with the number of people in the world who do not speak English. In addition, they seem to disregard the point that it would be more difficult to adopt an AUL in future when English has probably more power than present. Thus, they do not consider the fact that the longer it takes to go about the explicit international planning of an AUL, the more languages will die and the more native cultures and traditions would be endangered due to the hegemony of western culture through English due to contact with English and thus its uncontrolled dominance and spread.

The third group of participants argues that adopting an AUL at the present time is a good idea; however, making the decision on the choice of an AUL would be very complex and difficult. The first obstacle they argue is that it would be difficult to listen to the voices of all world's nations. In other words, what these participants suggest is that just having representatives from all nations is not sufficient; their ideas and perspectives towards the idea of an AUL should be actually taken into account in the LP of an AUL so that the decisions benefit them all. The second obstacle which is in fact related to the first is that powerful countries such as the U.S. or Britain would probably disregard what other nations would suggest and argue with regard to the choice of an AUL and thus would dominate the process of LP of an AUL and make decisions that would only benefit themselves rather than the whole world. And in fact, it would be very difficult for native English speakers to give up the benefits English has had for them and start learning a second language.

An interesting point that almost all of the participants emphasize is that ordinary people should be informed about the language chosen as an AUL and the reason for

which they have to learn this AUL as well as the functions they can perform with it; otherwise, the choice of an AUL would be useless. As I mentioned earlier in using LPP as a model for planning an AUL, ordinary people not only should be informed of the final decisions of policy makers, but also they should be involved in making decisions; their voices should be heard, examined and taken into account in the research studies that would be conducted in different stages of the planning of an AUL.

The last significant point suggested by one of the interviewees is a bottom-up rather than a top-down process for adopting an AUL because as she explains it would be less likely for the world governments to go about adopting an AUL. Therefore, people at the grass-root levels if they become concerned about their native languages and native cultures could initiate the movement for the LP of an AUL and demand the governments and/or international organizations to do something about adopting an AUL. Although this is an interesting suggestion, it is not practical and sufficient in real world situations. As the literature on EIL demonstrates, people in non-native English speaking countries unfortunately perceive their welfare, progress and development in following western culture and thus learning English as a means to have access to modernity and technology; thus they are becoming more and more motivated to learn English. And even if people become conscious of what is happening to their cultures and languages, it would be difficult or less likely for them to oppose English spread and the hegemony of western culture while governments and those in the position of power promote English. Therefore, a modified version of this suggestion would be that the public should become sensitive and concerned about their languages and cultures as well as realize the value and significance of their own traditions, values and beliefs; also governments and those

who are in power should reach that level of consciousness and help create awareness in the public and create policies and devise procedures that help preserve mother tongues. In fact, according to the literature on LPP, as many developing nations promoted the idea of one nation, one language as a way to gain national identity and national unity, they collectively and in a global effort could also promote the idea of an AUL as a way to create one global speech community in which a common second language namely an AUL would create the feeling of belonging to a global community. And at the same time in their policies and programs to preserve and promote mother tongues in particular as the means of instruction in education systems, they could inform people and involve them in decisions and activities concerning an AUL and the mother tongues as well.

We can now move on to the second set of interviews concerning specifically the LP of an AUL. Since none of the previous ten students had had any explicit knowledge about LPP and did not explicitly help address the issue of LP of an AUL, I interviewed two other fellow students who had taken a graduate course on LPP and were familiar with dimensions of and activities involved in LPP and thus could enrich my investigation of LP of an AUL, and another graduate student who had more than ten years of experience in social policy and project management at the international level.

### **3. 4. 2 The second set of interviews (follow-up questions)**

As I mentioned earlier, in the second set of interviews I only focused on the LP of an AUL to provide a much more detailed response to the second research question which was what is the best method to adopt an AUL and implement it globally? I inquired about the participants' views with regard to the phases and activities involved in the LP of an AUL as well as the people who could potentially be in charge of the LP of an AUL. In

terms of the language planning of an AUL Betty stated that all three aspects of LPP could be applied to the LP of an AUL. As she explained, status planning is needed because we need to “give the language some sort of status so that it can be recognized or more easily accepted”. Corpus planning, she stated, is also necessary because it would ensure that every body learn the same language in terms of vocabulary and grammar the language is to be universal. And finally, education planning would ensure that everyone can access that language. She added, international bodies, in particular the UN rather than a single country such as “the U.S. or Canada or Britain” should be in charge of the international planning of an AUL because as she stresses, in that case “it would not be seen as any one country that is making their voice heard and the others are left out”.

Concerning the steps that should be taken for the language planning of an AUL Betty emphasized that the people who are going to do the planning of an AUL first have to conduct “thorough...research into” it. And if AUL planners are going to choose a language “that already exists” rather than making up one, Betty explained, they should not only know about the language itself, but also its “history”, “how it came about, the people who use this language” and above all “what political, social, economic and things that is around that language”. She added, these collected non-linguistic facts would help the AUL planners “make sure that they are choosing the most appropriate language and not just going with maybe the most dominant one of the most dominant society”. However, she mentioned, in reality that would be difficult because “we are dealing with human beings” who want their own language to become the AUL. Therefore, she suggested, “maybe they do need to make up a new language” because then “the decision could be more neutral”.

After deciding on the choice of an AUL, Betty pointed out, the next step would be policy formulation in which the selected language would be officially introduced as an AUL. Then, education planning is next in Betty's point of view because as she put it, it deals with how the AUL is "going to roll out to everybody so that every body has access to this language". She added, for the AUL to be secondary to mother tongues so that it does not replace them, not only "language policies", but also "teachers" should "be extra careful to not to give this language any more importance than the mother tongues of these people who are learning the language so that they know although they are learning this language it is for this purpose but their mother tongue is still quite important and has its own functions in society". She explained, planners of an AUL have to make sure that people who are learning this language "understand the purpose of the language": that is to be able to "communicate with every body globally" rather than gaining "any political power or economic power or anything like that"; otherwise, the AUL will replace mother tongues like the way it is "happening with English". She added, the AUL should not be seen "as the only route to get to perhaps economic betterment or something like that" but as a way to communicate globally.

Suzy, the second participant who took a graduate course on LPP like Betty thought that status planning, corpus planning and education planning could all be applied to the planning of an AUL. However, she emphasized that "status planning and acquisition planning would be the most important first steps to take". She explained, through status planning "people know what this language would be used for" and in what situations. She stated, education planning is also necessary because it deals with "how people are going to learn this language". However, differently from Betty she argued that

“corpus planning would come last” in terms of importance because it “will be ongoing, it will be changing as the language develops, as the AUL is used more”.

With regard to the issue of who can be in charge of the planning of an AUL and making decisions about it, Suzy stated that “if that decision is going to be universal”, “linguists and language planners from all countries” should “get together” although she mentioned that unfortunately it is the politicians and those in the position of power who often make these decisions that are not often beneficial for all people and speech communities. She emphasized, they “have to do research” in order to “see what this language is going to be based on like what kind of grammar it is going to use what it is going to adopt from current existing languages” and “then put those together and form a language that ... would be useable for [the] general population of all existing countries”. In other words, she suggested that an AUL should be constructed based on the current natural languages, rather than being chosen from among them because she thinks that if a natural language is going to be chosen, it will have the same status as English.

In terms of the education planning of an AUL as secondary to mother tongues, like Betty she emphasized that the AUL should be given a secondary status in language policies “in a way that people know it is secondary”. She explained that the main subjects should be taught in the mother tongues and the AUL should be taught as a second language and as a subject “for a certain number of hours per week in school” or even in community for adults who are not attending school any longer. And then after teaching AUL at the basic level, she explained, for those who want to “have a better grasp of the language” for example, to “get a job” some advanced level courses should be offered.

With regard to planning of an AUL and the kind of steps that should be followed to plan an AUL, like Betty Suzy stated that “definitely fact finding” is a crucial step because language planners would need to know how different languages function and how they work because “languages are more advanced and [have] more complicated grammars than some like pidgins”. Using the collected facts, language planners can find out “which one [language] “is more learnable” and “probably much easier for masses” to be chosen as the AUL because as she explained, learnability should be considered as the key criteria for the choice of an AUL and as “the main purpose of research”. In addition to doing research on different languages themselves, she emphasized, as part of the fact-finding process non-linguistic factors should also be examined. In other words, she stated that initially language planners should focus on linguistic factors to see practically which language is more learnable to be adopted as an AUL and then examine the AUL candidate to see if it really works or not and how would people react to it emotionally.

After doing research and selecting the most learnable language as an AUL as Suzy noted, policy or policies should be formulated in order to specify the status of the language. Next, Suzy added, is implementing the formulated policy all around the world because as she explained AUL is “for use”, so it should be taught in schools.

As for the kind of beliefs and attitudes that should inspire planners of an AUL so that their efforts render the best results for speakers of different languages and for all countries Suzy emphasized that planners of an AUL should not just look at how an AUL would “scientifically work”; they should consider the purpose of having an AUL and the benefits it would have for people. She stressed, they should want to “bridge countries” and facilitate communication among all the people of the world. Therefore, they should

not look at the AUL as the dominant language and thus give it a dominant status in society. Therefore, to maintain the secondary status of the AUL in society and the primary status of mother tongues on the other hand, Suzy explained, the government bodies should make “the same information ... that is available in AUL available in the primary languages” so that people do not just focus on learning this language as is the case with English and forget all about the functions of their own languages. To do so, Suzy emphasized, the AUL should be given “more of a status of communication for specific purposes”. In addition, she stressed that facilities should be provided for people to use their mother tongues for all social activities “on [a] daily basis”, for example, in “in schools for [the] purpose of education, in government office” and “on the radio” because “it is the language of comfort” and the language “that bonds people” while the AUL should be just used for “international relations or for business purposes to exchange information or transactions with other countries”.

Grace, the last interviewee for the follow-up questions whose background knowledge is social planning and economics, viewed planning of an AUL as different from the previous two. In fact, although she also acknowledged three dimensions of planning of an AUL – status, corpus and education planning – and the activities involved in each one, she provided a more general discussion of planning and argues that it is only after defining the problem clearly that planners of the AUL can go about formulating a new policy and presenting different alternatives or solutions of how to go about that problem and do the status, corpus or education planning. In fact, viewing the international planning of an AUL as a big project she explained that within this project, some smaller or rather more specific projects are involved that imply separate planning.

In her view, for planning any project, in particular an AUL, first of all certain factors involved need to be examined. These factors as she explained include: the “land” or the “place”, “how wide that distribution of that language is going to be”, the human resources” to implement this project, “the financial back up for it” and “the technology” that may be needed for implementation. Therefore, the first issue would be the scope of this project. Since the scope is international, she emphasized, different countries, the individuals who are involved in their education systems, those who are in charge of the countries’ language policies as well as the people who are actually speaking languages should be involved in the planning of an AUL. Thus, for fact-finding as the initial stage for the LP of an AUL, she explained that a diverse range of information should be collected about “what is there” about the “language itself” and about “different regions and different countries and how people would view and react towards the AUL, the available human and financial resources and facilities for education planning of the AUL as well as the possible risks that introducing the AUL might have.

In response to the question of how language planners can go about the corpus planning of an AUL, while focusing on status planning rather than corpus planning Grace emphasized that since AUL is going to be secondary or auxiliary to the mother tongues and that everyone would have the right to learn and use his or her mother tongue, “there should not be too much of a problem” and that “people will accept” it [the AUL] if the UN for example, informs people of the purpose of an AUL that it would help world in terms of peace and global communication.

As for the education planning of an AUL, she stated that it involves implementation that as she put it, is “getting to what your initial intention was”. She

stressed that to be able to implement a policy an “implementation schedule” is needed so that human resources involved in implementation would know how to go about it, the steps they should take and the financial resources they need. With regard to the education planning of an AUL she stated that the schedule will include the details of the implementation planning of the AUL and it can address issues such as: how to “start the education” of an AUL, how to advertise it, “the rate at which you are going to have people come on board into this language”, the regions you are going to start from”, at which level (basic schools or universities) an AUL is going to be taught, “what percentage of people you want to begin with this AUL and at what time?”. And then for the purpose of evaluation, which would be literally the last stage in any phase of planning, Grace explained, the benchmarks that have been initially set have to be revisited to find out the performance achievement.

In response to the last question in the interview, which dealt with the kind of ideologies that should inform the planning of an AUL and at the same times the mother tongues with which it will be in contact, Grace stated, an AUL should be viewed as secondary, but the education systems should ensure that AUL learners gain sufficient proficiency in the language. She added, to ensure the secondary status of the AUL local languages should not be put in the background so that they would have “a better chance of surviving”. Further more, she maintained, the mother tongues should be integrated “into local cultures” and be used on a daily basis.

At the end of the interview, Grace made two interesting suggestions with regard to the planning of an AUL. She stated, “if it [the LP of an AUL] is a global thing, it will take a long time, it is not an overnight thing”. Therefore, she suggested that rather than

planning of an AUL at the international level, it can be planned at the regional or continental level. As an example, she referred to Swahili and explained how it was initially created through combining Bantu and Arabic and gradually spread in eastern Africa and become the official language in that region. Therefore, she proposed that probably, EU and other regional bodies in Africa and Australia can start adopting a common language for a region and then gradually the regional languages would evolve into one AUL. In addition, as another alternative to accelerate the implementation of an AUL, she suggested that education planning of the AUL should start at the basic schools and with the young age individuals who would be more open to the whole idea of having an AUL than the “older group” who maybe more conservative to change.

Reviewing these three participants’ views concerning the planning of an AUL not only sheds light on how LPP as a model can be used for the planning of an AUL, but also suggests the kind of questions or concerns that language planners would need to address in the planning of the AUL.

With regard to using LPP as framework and applying different dimensions of LP to the LP of an AUL the reviewed interviews demonstrate that in the participants’ point of view planning of an AUL involves all three forms of planning, status planning, corpus planning and education planning. In particular, Betty and Suzy explain that these three dimensions are all necessary because each would address a specific aspect related to the AUL. Status planning is necessary because it gives a certain language the status to function as an AUL. Education planning is also mandatory because its goal would be to spread the language all around the world so that every one would learn it.

Concerning corpus planning and its application in AUL planning both Betty and Suzy agree that it is needed because every one should learn the same AUL; however, Suzy emphasizes that AUL corpus planning would be an ongoing process because an AUL itself would change and evolve the more it is used so there would be a constant need to make some modification in it in terms of vocabulary and grammar.

Grace also emphasizes that planning of an AUL includes status planning, corpus planning and education planning but contrary to Betty and Suzy she emphasizes that to go about each one of these dimensions further planning is necessary. In other words, no matter whether it is status planning, corpus planning or education planning, the scope of the planning should be determined, the goal should be specified, verifiable objectives should be set, relevant research should be conducted, data should be collected, human and financial resources should be taken into account and also the relevant policies and activities of past should be considered.

With regard to the issue of who can be in charge of the planning of an AUL Betty notes not surprisingly that the people who will be in charge of AUL planning will have a determining role in the choice of an AUL. Therefore, she, similar to Suzy, stresses that representative language planners and linguists from different countries and different languages should be in charge of the planning of an AUL rather than a single powerful country such as the U.S. or Britain or politicians. Grace also points out that since the scope of planning of an AUL is international, linguists and language planners and those who are in the education system of different countries should get together and collectively decide on different issues involved in the program for the LP of an AUL.

In addition, all three participants emphasized that definitely fact-finding is the first and foremost important activity in the planning of an AUL. As they explain, language planners and linguists in charge should do massive research not only about different languages, but also about their history and the social and economic issues tied to each language so that as Suzy argues, they can choose the most appropriate and learnable language and not just the language that belongs to a dominant society or country. However, since making such a decision would be difficult Betty suggests that a constructed language maybe better be chosen as an AUL. Suzy also thinks that a constructed language is preferable; however, her discussion or reasoning differs from Betty's. She explains that finding facts about other languages and how they work should be pursued for the purpose of finding common areas in different languages and thus using them and putting them together to create a new language as an AUL which does not belong to any specific country.

After choosing the AUL, Betty and Suzy explain, an international status should be given to the language through a policy and then that policy should be implemented for the purpose of education planning. They emphasize that having a policy with regard to the status of an AUL is very important because it would determine and specify the status, the functions and the boundary of uses of the AUL and would demonstrate when or for what purpose people should use it. Not only such a policy would determine the status of an AUL, but also as they note, it would specify the role and function of other languages, in particular mother tongues so that people know why and when to use them.

With regard to policy formulation Grace makes a crucial point. She stresses that before formulating any policy, the language problem with regard to the current situation should be identified and then alternatives to solve it should be specified in the policy.

Finally, with regard to the education planning of an AUL so that it maintains its status as auxiliary or secondary and the mother tongues maintain their functions, all three participants emphasize that in the language policies the AUL should be given a secondary status rather than a primary one. In addition, they explain that in the education system the AUL should be taught as a subject rather than the means of education. Finally, they stress that the mother tongues should be actually integrated in real life situations so that people can use them on a daily basis and as Suzy suggested, the information available in AUL should also be available in the mother tongue so that people can function with their mother tongues and not only focus on learning and using the AUL. And as Suzy and Grace note, the implementation of an AUL should begin at the basic school and at a young age because children would accept the language more readily and the implementation process would be accelerated.

To summarize, in this chapter I have used two approaches to explore the idea of an AUL and its adoption. First, I re-examined the literature to find out what an AUL is and how an AUL can be adopted through explicit international planning. As I discussed, although the literature is rich with regard to the nature of an AUL and the purposes for which it has to be adopted, there are few references of how it can actually be adopted. Therefore, in an attempt to fill this gap and find out how the LP of an AUL could be actually carried out I used the literature on LPP and applied three dimensions of LP as a

model to present a tentative plan for the LP of an AUL that could solve certain linguistic and non-linguistic problems and fulfill certain purposes.

In addition to re-examining the literature and expanding LPP to be considered as a framework for the LP of an AUL, as a supplementary source to explore the idea of an AUL I collected primary data through two set of interviews which were aimed at strengthening and supplementing the answers gained from the literature and above all addressing the gap in the literature which concerns how we can actually plan to have an AUL.

In the following chapter first I will briefly restate the purpose of the study, research questions and the approaches adopted to explore the idea of an AUL. Then after presenting the concluding remarks, I will explain the limitations of this exploratory study and suggest some directions for future research.

## **Chapter 4: Conclusion**

### **4. 1 Concluding remarks**

The research in this thesis was initially inspired by the Bahá'í writings on the idea of an AUL and motivated by the urgent need at this time in human history to communicate with people from all around the world and be part of the global community that is becoming increasingly interconnected. We live in an era in which intercultural communication specifically with people who are from different ethnic groups, different countries and above all who speak different languages is one of its significant features. There seems to be a global network of social, economic, political and even moral interconnections in the world in which not only individuals but also international and/or transnational organizations face the need to participate in order to achieve their goals and fulfill different purposes. And of course numerous developments in communication technologies have not only facilitated communication but also made it possible for people to go beyond time and special boundaries and communicate with people from all around the world. But the question is how can we actually participate in this network of interconnections? What can be the best means or tools to be able to go beyond our speech community and fulfill different communicative purposes both as an individual and as a collective? The answer would be language or more specifically a common language with which all the human beings can communicate. Although human history demonstrates that learning different languages and translations have been alternatives to remove language barriers using these two options imply spending a large amount of time and financial and human resources which not every one can afford. Thus, as has been suggested by many philosophers and linguists since the seventeenth century (e.g., Descartes, 1629;

Montesquieu, 1728 as cited in Brown, 1991) till the present (e.g., Eco, 1995; Gruber, 1995; Harrison, 2000; Meyjes, 2006), having an AUL can solve the problem of language barriers. Thus, two research questions need to be addressed: 1) what is an AUL and what is its main purpose? 2) What is the best possible method to adopt an AUL and implement it globally?

It was these questions that motivated me to do an exploratory study on the idea of an AUL. After reviewing the literature I realized that these questions were still relevant and even more urgent and logical than before because the present world circumstances strongly require the existence of an AUL. In order to find out what has already been said or discussed with regard to the idea of an AUL, its nature, its purpose and the way to have one I reviewed four different sets of literature. The reason to choose and review different resources came out of reviewing the literature itself. In fact, after I reviewed the literature on AUL itself, I realized that in many cases the scholars have referred to constructed languages, in particular Esperanto as well as the possibility of English becoming an international language. Therefore, I decided to review the literature on Esperanto as a way to see what scholars in that field contributed to the idea of an AUL. And of course I found it necessary to review the literature on English because I realized that contrary to the scholars' in the 1920s - 1940s predictions that English would not be a suitable candidate to be an AUL, English has actually become the most prevalent language in the world in the last four to five decades. So, I found it strongly relevant to review the literature on English to see if it qualifies as an AUL and that whether it has the features an AUL is supposed to have as described in the literature. In addition to these three resources I also reviewed the literature on LPP because I realized that the reviewed

scholars either implicitly or explicitly suggested that international planning would be the possible way to adopt an AUL. Thus, I reviewed the literature on LPP to find out whether the scholars in the field talked about the LP of an AUL and its specifics.

In short, although the four reviewed resources were different in terms of what they focused on as the main research subject, they were all interrelated and shed light on different issues related to the idea of an AUL including its features, its purpose, its necessity, a planning program for it and even the kind of vision that should inform its planning.

In summary then the reviewed resources on AUL in its general sense and Esperanto as an example of a constructed language created to act as an AUL, in particular, provided significant points about the purpose, the function and the benefits of an AUL; however, almost all except for Gruber (1995) and Meyjes (2006) referred to the fact that in the past it seemed to have been impossible to reach an agreement on the choice of an AUL at the international level. Therefore, the scholars constrained their discussion to promoting a constructed language, in particular Esperanto, to be adopted as an AUL. And of course the scholars' failure can be attributed to three facts. First, in six or seven decades ago when most of the scholars in the first section talked about an AUL, LPP in its modern sense had not been developed and LP was confined to matters of language form that were often addressed by individual grammarians. Therefore, the scholars had no framework within which they could discuss how an AUL could actually be planned. In addition, as I emphasized in the previous chapter, decision theory in its modern sense had not been developed either, so the majority of the scholars argued that differences of opinion on the part of world governments on the choice of an AUL would

make it impossible to plan for an AUL. And finally, the need for an AUL in the 1920s-1950s was not as urgent as it is at present in which increasing interconnections between speakers of different languages require a common means of communication for all.

On the other hand, the literature on English explicitly demonstrated that the idea of English as an international language had been one of the most controversial subjects of discussion in the last two or three decades and scholars have presented positive, negative and mixed views about it. The scholars with positive views towards English focused on the varieties of English as evidence of its being appropriated to the local cultures and also argued how non-native English speakers used English to resist colonizing or western power and that now they had made it their own. However, the critics of English and scholars with mixed views questioned the status of English through describing and discussing the reasons for its spread in the past and in the present and the consequences it has had for world languages and cultures. They argued that English had been imposed on developing countries as the means for developed countries to foster and diffuse their own culture and ideology. In addition, they emphasized that English as the most dominant language in the world had been the biggest threat to native languages and native cultures as well because it had been always perceived as the symbol of modernity and a bridge to have access to western material advancements while native languages and native cultures were perceived as causes of underdevelopment and poverty. And as the literature demonstrated national language policies and promotion of English as an official language in many multilingual and multiethnic developing countries had a great influence in creating those wrong perceptions. And in many developing countries, in particular in Africa, English had had such a prominent status that for many people education simply

meant the ability to speak and write in English rather than in their own native language (Mazrui as cited Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 1995). In fact, English had gained the primary status rather than the auxiliary or secondary status and education through it separated people from their history and values specifically in Africa (Thiong'o, 1992). The last and most important negative associated with English as an international language as strongly suggested by the literature though explicitly mentioned only by very few scholars was that it had never been selected as an AUL by the world countries. Thus, its spread and implementation in education systems and school curricula meant that learning it had mainly depended on economic and political factors both inside and outside developing countries; it did not promote justice and equality in terms of having access to learning English as an AUL at all.

In short, although the scholars who had examined English provided a detailed description of English status at present and raised numerous arguments against it, only a few of them provided solutions to solve the problems associated with English and remove the language barriers in particular. However, their solutions did not address the problems fundamentally (e.g. Phillipson and Pennycook) and even if they did (e.g. Meyjes and Gruber), they were not comprehensive enough. While promoting linguistic rights Phillipson (2000) argued that Esperanto would be much more suitable than English to become an AUL but he did not explain how Esperanto could gain that status and actually become an AUL. Pennycook (1994) suggested that critical pedagogy should be promoted and that non-native English users should appropriate English based on their own need. Though being practical and useful, his suggestion did not address the numerous problems associated with English fundamentally. On the other hand, Meyjes (2006) and Gruber

(1995) did suggest international planning of an AUL and provided the rationale for that; however, they did not present a through discussion of how actually that could be carried out.

To learn more about planning of an AUL, I reviewed the literature on LPP to explore whether the scholars in that field had ever discussed the international planning of an AUL. Unfortunately I realized that none of the scholars except Haugen (1972) and Tauli (1974), referred to the LP of an AUL and that their discussion was very brief, in particular Haugen's. Thus, the question still remained about how an AUL could be internationally planned.

After reviewing the literature about an AUL, I realized that not only the number of studies specifically on the idea of an AUL was limited but also most of them were outdated. In fact, although at the present time the need for an AUL is much more urgent than six or seven decades ago, there are few scholars in applied language studies who have examined this issue. And even those few have not provided a thorough discussion of the subject, in particular in terms of how an AUL could actually be adopted and taught and used all around the world. Therefore, I realized that my exploratory study of an AUL might not only extend the studies conducted on the idea of an AUL, but also might contribute to the field by discussing both the features of an AUL and the feasibility of its international planning. In addition, my discussion of how an AUL could be actually planned would extend and contribute to the studies conducted in the field of LPP, which have been mainly focused on LP at the national and local level rather than the international level.

Thus, to fill the gap and to find answers to the research questions I made use of two resources: the literature itself and some interviews conducted for the purpose of the study. I re-examined the literature to put together bits and pieces that had been presented in different fields as a way to define an AUL, identify its purpose and discuss its international explicit planning. In addition, I used LPP as a framework, extended it and presented a tentative plan for the LP of an AUL to demonstrate the feasibility of the LP of an AUL and outline the phases and activities that could be involved in it.

As a second resource to explore the idea of an AUL through some primary data I conducted interviews with thirteen graduate students in the SLALS at Carleton University. In the first set of interviews, I inquired about the student participants' views about English as an international language and then led the interview to the idea of an AUL in general and asked about how an AUL could be adopted. In the follow-up questions I mainly focused on the LP of an AUL that had turned out to be the main gap in the literature as well as in the first set of interviews. I interviewed three other students who have had some explicit knowledge of LPP as well as social planning in general.

Re-examining the literature and the first set of interviews demonstrated that the scholars and the students had similar opinions on what an AUL is and what its main purpose is: an AUL is a language that people would learn as secondary to their mother tongues to be able to communicate with people who speak different languages in order to fulfill different individual or collective purposes that involved inter-cultural communication. These would help expand one's knowledge of the people of the world, different cultures, traditions, beliefs and life styles and thus remove misunderstandings and settle conflicts. The interviewees' responses in particular the ones in the follow-up

questions strongly suggested that making explicit decisions about languages, in particular the LP of an AUL, is situated in a context in which different social, economic, political and even emotional factors are operating; thus, in the LP of an AUL all these factors should be taken into account.

None of the previous studies on AUL had discussed in detail the relationship between an AUL and mother tongues; they had only emphasized that an AUL should be secondary to mother tongues. However, in this study in addition to discussing the features of an AUL, I did discuss the relationship between an AUL and mother tongues and also stressed issues involved in different definitions of a mother tongue to demonstrate how informative and influential they could be in future language policies about an AUL and mother tongues at the same time. And the interviews strongly suggested the primary status of mother tongues and stressed that for mother tongues to maintain their status and functions, not only in future language policies about an AUL, but also in different social domains within the society their functions had to be preserved.

As for the need and feasibility of international planning of an AUL, re-examining the literature on EIL and the first set of interviews did suggest that there are so many problems in relation to the current situation of English as well as so many other languages in the world. Languages in contact with English, which is the most powerful language in the world are often minority languages because they or rather their speakers are deprived of their necessary rights to learn and perform in those languages due to numerous factors including socioeconomic or sociopolitical ones or even migration. Thus, these problems necessitated the need to devise a plan that could remove the urgent need of the people of the world to communicate with speakers of different languages and

cultures and the current problems with English at the same time. And as has been suggested both implicitly and explicitly international LP of an AUL would be the possible solution to address those problems. However, the interviews demonstrated that the students doubted the feasibility of international planning of an AUL, in particular at the present time as did the majority of the scholars reviewed in the first section of the literature review.

To demonstrate the feasibility of LP of an AUL I proposed a tentative model for the program of LP of an AUL and discussed different phases and activities involved in it. I suggested that and outlined how the program of LP of an AUL has three phases: status planning, corpus planning and education planning. I emphasized that fact-finding and decision-making are two important components of the LP of an AUL at all points and at any level in the process because for results to be beneficial for all the people of the world and speakers of all languages collective decision-making based on facts and research should form the basis. In fact, the solution to any problems at any point in the process of LP, in particular the choice of an AUL, should come out of the facts rather than being imposed on them; otherwise, the results would not be as have been specified in the language policies and the procedure to implement the language policies would not be supported by people as has been planned or the results may be counter-productive. Extending Haugen's argument, I emphasized that social decision theory could also be used in decision-making at any point in the process of the LP of an AUL, in particular in the choice of an AUL that has been viewed as impossible by the majority of the scholars reviewed in the first section.

The follow-up interviews confirmed what I had proposed in a model for the program of the LP of an AUL, emphasized the significance of identifying the rationale for international planning of an AUL and the fact-based criteria on the choice of an AUL and stressed that fact that the rationale and criteria for the LP of an AUL and the choice of an AUL should be shared with people at the grass root levels. In addition, while discussing the phases and activities involved in the program for LP of an AUL, the follow-up questions strongly suggested that there is a close link between the way a language – here an AUL – is defined and viewed and its LP. In fact, the reviewed scholars had only discussed the features of an AUL in theory and had made very few references to how these features could actually inform the LP of an AUL and what implications they might have for language policies that would be formulated about an AUL. However, the follow-up interviews as well as the tentative model strongly demonstrated the implications each feature of an AUL would have for its LP. In other words, they demonstrated the fact that the way and AUL is defined and viewed would inform the LP of an AUL and also the decisions made in the process of the LP of an AUL would influence the features and functions of an AUL as well as other languages, in particular mother tongues.

As I discussed and the follow-up interviews also strongly emphasized, fact-finding is the main resource to inform and guide decisions made in the process of the LP of an AUL, in particular those in relation to the choice of an AUL. One obvious and undeniable fact that has been strongly suggested in the literature on EIL, in particular the positive views, and stressed by the interviewees in both set of interviews was that there were already so many English speakers in the world and that it has become localized, so

it may be the language chosen at some future time as an AUL. I do not intend to suggest that English will be so chosen, but I do think that such a prediction is not far from reality because according to Ethnologue as estimated in 1999, English has 309,352,280 speakers spread all around the world and a large amount of human and financial resources had been already spent on its teaching and learning.

However, I do want to emphasize that such a prediction should not undermine the idea of international planning of an AUL and cause language planners and linguists to give up the idea of international planning of an AUL because international planning of an AUL is more than just selecting an AUL. Explicit international planning would be a global humanitarian effort to remove current linguistic and non-linguistic problems and make decisions, formulate policies and devise plans of action to avoid those problems as much as possible. Thus, the political, economic and even cultural power supporting the AUL and its planning would be global rather than being confined to a few countries. Such a global effort on the part of language planners, linguists, researchers in relevant disciplines, education systems and above all world governments would ensure that a language secondary to mother tongues would be implemented in schools all around the world so that every one has the equal right to learn and use the language and the opportunity of being an active agent in the global community rather than a passive recipient. So, speakers of different languages who are from different countries and ethnic groups would feel unified rather than marginalized in the global community. In fact, sharing a common language that is chosen by representatives from all the world's countries, through collective decision-making and based on facts would create a sense of belonging to a global speech community. People would realize that learning an AUL for

wider communication is not just for certain individuals or certain groups of people in society and that every one would have the right to learn this language regardless of his social, economic, ethnic or religious background. In that case, the chosen AUL would not necessarily be the language to resist those who imposed the language – as English was – but a means equally available to all to participate in intercultural communication.

In addition, as opposed to the current relationship between English and local languages and cultures, international planning of an AUL and giving the primary status to mother tongues in language policies, education systems and above all in domains other than home would ensure people's "necessary rights" to learn and use their mother tongues and a common second language (Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson, 1995, p. 102). In fact, according to the answers reached in the previous chapter the ideology behind the international planning of an AUL differs from the one that influenced English spread. An AUL should not be viewed as superior to mother tongues or native languages, but as secondary to them. Thus, there need not be a contradiction between local knowledge, local traditions and local languages and being part of the global community through the medium of an AUL since achieving sustainable development is likely to be impossible unless it is founded on native cultures, traditions and mother tongues and this is something to promote without a doubt.

## **4. 2 Limitations of the study and directions for future research**

This exploratory study of an AUL was a preliminary step to examine the nature of an AUL and its international LP as well. I extended the literature on AUL and argued the feasibility of the LP of an AUL through proposing a model of how an AUL can be actually planned, who could possibly be in charge of such a big international project, who

would be the players in that project at different levels and how they could implement it though collective effort. However, what I proposed were only some general guidelines and a tentative model to show how the idea of an AUL that has been long desired could be realized. The tentative model that I presented lacked specifics about each phase in the project that were very difficult to predict and explain in detail. As an exploratory study at the master's level my approaches to answering the research questions were confined to the literature itself and some primary data collected through interviews with some fellow graduate students at SLALS. Thus, I did not delve in depth into of many issues involved in the idea of an AUL including a sufficient definition of mother tongue as the language whose primary status should be specified and emphasized in language policies formulated about an AUL. Neither did I discuss the relationship between an AUL and languages other than mother tongues with which it would be in contact, which one of those languages should be necessary to be maintained and preserved, and what status they might be given in language policies and different domains as well.

In fact, the limitations of this study were embedded in the subject of the study itself. As I emphasized and discussed several times in the paper and the interviews also confirmed the scope of international planning of an AUL is global; therefore, it would be out of the scope of this single exploratory study to provide a comprehensive discussion of the different issues involved in this global project. And since language and LP are closely tied to social, psychological, economic and even political issues, devising a program for the international LP of an AUL and doing research about it should not be confined to applied language studies. It would be an interdisciplinary project to which different relevant disciplines need to contribute. Thus, actual planning to have an AUL would

imply extensive research, not only in the field of applied language studies but also in other relevant fields, the most important of which is international affairs which has become of great importance in recent decades.

Collecting data about different languages, their structures, number of speakers, and the social, political, religious and attitudinal issues tied to them and analyzing the collected data and most important of all conducting an analysis of people's actual communicative or rather linguistic needs would be directions for future research. These studies would be a prerequisite to devising a plan for the LP of an AUL because they would help to closely determine the factors and problems that give rise to the LP of an AUL and thus specify the ultimate goal for international planning of an AUL and mother tongues as well; two languages whose contact and influence on each other would not be avoided but rather managed. In addition, a sufficient definition of mother tongue that suits current world conditions would be another issue that needs to be addressed in future studies because in multilingual and multicultural settings not only is it difficult to determine one's mother tongue, but also to attribute one's identity to just one language, namely the mother tongue. Defining one's mother tongue, its functions and status would be of great importance not only in international planning of an AUL and policies formulated about it, but also in national language policies on preserving mother tongues and providing education in native languages.

In addition, since the international program for planning of an AUL is a kind of international project with three sub-projects or phases, scholars and practitioners in the field of international affairs could also contribute to it and complement the research conducted in applied language studies. Scholars and practitioners in international affairs

could help specify what an international language policy should include, how it should be formulated and how it could actually be implemented and what procedures need to be followed and most important of all, how such an international project could be planned and managed. In fact, researchers and practitioners who have carried out research on different international projects could make useful contributions in relation to different issues involved in international planning of an AUL because linguists and language planners' efforts in the field of LP have been confined to LPP at the national level rather than the international one. In addition, they could also help examine the economic and even the political issues involved in the LP of an AUL, in particular the financial and human resources needed to plan and implement an AUL and most important of all, the benefits it would have for countries and the risks and consequences as well.

The above-mentioned directions for future research are more likely to happen in the next few decades rather than in a few years since based on the answers to the research questions discussed in the previous chapter, not only would the LP of an AUL be a long process, but it would take time for international organizations, in particular the UN and world governments, to take the first steps for the LP of an AUL. Thus, as for directions for research in near future, I think that not only should English teachers encourage ESL students to make the language their own as Pennycook argues, but also language teachers need to do research and find ways to foster positive beliefs and attitudes towards native languages and native cultures among young generations and their parents as well, in particular those in developing countries. In addition, they would probably need to search to find ways on how to limit the status of English as secondary and above all create circumstances for equal access to English learning.

In summary, having an AUL through international planning will be a global humanitarian effort on the part of the world's countries to address people's necessary linguistic needs that are learning and using mother tongues and having a common secondary language to be able to function both locally and globally. This globally supported project would help world's countries build their nations on the foundation of local languages and local knowledge rather than merely on the language(s) of the economically powerful countries in the world and the knowledge and information communicated through it.

## References

Bamgbose, A. (1989) Issues for a model of Language Planning. *Language problems and language planning*, 13(1), 24 – 34.

Bennet, M. J. (Ed.). (1998). *Basic concepts of intercultural communication: selected readings*. US: Intercultural press.

Berns, M., Barrette, J., Chan, C., Chikuma, Y., Fredrich, P., Hadjidimos, O., Hislop, K., Johnson, D., Kimball, S., Low, Y., McHenry, T., Palaidlogos, V., Petray, M., Shapiro, R. & Shook, R. (1998). Review Essay: (Re)experiencing hegemony: the linguistic imperialism of Robert Phillipson. *International journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(2), 271-282.

Bernstein, B. (1971). *Class, Codes and Control. Vol.1*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bochner, S. (Ed.). (1982). *Cultures in contact: studies in cross-cultural understanding*. Great Britain: Pergamon Press.

Brow, D. E. (1991). *Human Universals*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Canagarajah, S. (2000). Negotiating ideologies through English: strategies from the Periphery. In Ricento (Ed.), *Ideology, Politics and Language Policies: focus on English*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, p. 121- 132.

Chew, P. G. L. (1999). Linguistic imperialism, globalism and the English language. In Graddol & Meinhof (Eds). *English in a changing world*. United Kingdom: AILA, p. 37-48.

Chew, P. G. L. (1989). Whither the international auxiliary language? *The Journal of Bahá'í Studies*. 2(2), 1 – 11.

Clyne, M. (1994). *Intercultural communication at work: Cultural values in discourse*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.

Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (2004). *The language revolution*. United Kingdom: Polity Press

Crystal, D. (2000). *Language death*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Deen, J. (1997). *Dealing with problems in intercultural communication: a study of negotiation of meaning in native-non-native speaker interaction*. The Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.

De Swaan, A. (2001). *Words of the world: the global language system*. UK: Polity Press.

Dunn, S. H. (Ed.). (1995). *Globalization, communications and Caribbean identity*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Eco, O. (1995). *The search for the perfect language*. UK: Blackwell Publishers.

Fishman, J. A. (Ed.). (2001). *Can threatened languages be saved?* Great Britain: Multilingual Matters LTD.

Fishman, J. A. (Ed.). (1974). *Advances in language planning*. Netherlands/The Hague: Mouton Publishers.

Fishman, J. (1971). The impact of nationalism on language planning: Some comparisons between early twentieth century Europe and more recent years in south and Southeast Asia. In Rubin and Jernudd (Eds.) *Can language be planned?* U.S.A.: The University Press of Hawaii, p. 3 - 20.

Fishman, J. Das Gupta, J. Jernudd, B. H. and Rubin, J. (1971). Research outline for comparative studies of language planning. In Rubin and Jernudd (Eds.). *Can language be planned?* U.S.A.: The University Press of Hawaii, p. 293 - 306.

Foliaki, L. (1974). The search for unity: a proposal of instituting a universal language to help unravel the world problems. *T.E. S. L. reporter*, 7(4), 12 – 18.

Forster, G. P. (1982). *The Esperanto movement*. The Hague/Paris/New York: Mouton Publishers.

Garvin, P. L. (1974). Some comments on language planning. In Fishman (Ed.). *Advances in language planning*. Netherlands/ The Hague: Mouton Publishers, p. 69 - 78.

Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (Eds.). (2001). *Second Language Acquisition: An Introductory course*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Graddol, D. & Meinhof, U. H. (Eds.). (1999). *English in a changing world*. UK: AILA.

Graddol, D. (1997). *The future of English?* United Kingdom: Glenton Press.

Gregory, M & Carroll, S. (1978). *Language and situation: language varieties and their social contexts*. Great Britain: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Gruber, J. S. (1995). An international seminar on United Nations Restructuring: Turning Point For All Nations. A Universal Auxiliary Language: Humanity's Heritage. Hifa: Bahá'í World Centre.

Hansson, S. O. (1994) Decision theory: a brief introduction. Retrieved Jan. 10, 2007, from, <http://www.infra.kth.se/~soh/decisiontheory.pdf>

Harrison, R. K. (2001). *Proposed guidelines for the design of an optimal international auxiliary language*. Retrieved Oct 4, 2005, from, <http://www.geocities.com/Athens/Forum/5037/optimal.html>

Haugen, E. (1972). *The ecology of language*. Essays by Einar Haugen. Stanford University Press: Stanford, California.

Haugen, E. (1966). *Language conflict and language planning: the case of modern Norwegian*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*. USA: Sage Publications.

Holliday, A., Hyde, M. & Kullman, J. (2004). *Inter-cultural communication: an advanced resource book*. London and New York: Routledge.

Janton, P. (1993). *Esperanto: Language, literature and community*. Tonkin, H., Edwards, J. and Johnson-Weiner, K., Trans. Tonkin, H. (Ed.). United States: State University of New York Press.

Jespersen, O. (1928). *An international language*. Retrieved Dec 10, 2005, from, <http://www.geocities.com/Athens/Forum/5037/AIL.html>

Jespersen, O. (n.d.). *An international language*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, INC Publishers

Kachru, B. B. (Ed.). (1992). *The other tongue: English across cultures*. United States of America: University of Illinois Press.

Karam, F. X. (1974). Towards a definition of language planning In Fishman, J. A. (Ed.). *Advances in language planning*. Netherlands/The Hague: Mouton Publishers, p. 103 - 124

Lapenna, I. (1982). Basic facts about international language. In Rudiger and Eichholz, V. S. (Comp.). *Esperanto: In the modern world*. London: Esperanto Press, p. 13 - 22.

Lauwerys, J. A. (1947). Preface. In Jacob. (Ed.). On the choice of a common language. Retrieved Dec 5, 2005, from, <http://www.geocities.com/athens/forum/5037/OCpref.html>

Li, D. C. S. (2003). Between English and Esperanto: what does it take to be a world language? *International journal of sociology of language*, 164, 33 - 63.

Meyjes, G. (2006). Language and world order in Bahá'í perspective: a new paradigm revealed. In Omoniyi & Fishman. (Eds.). *Explorations in the sociology of language and religion*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, p. 26-42.

Nekitel, O. (1992). Culture change, language change: the case of Abu'Arapesh, Sandaun Province, Papua New Guinea. In Dutton, (Ed.). *Culture change, language change: Case studies from Melanesia*. Australia: A. N. U. Printing Service, p. 49-59.

Nelson, C. L. (1992). My language, your culture: whose communicative competence. In Kachru. (Ed.). *The other tongue: English across cultures*. United States of America: University of Illinois Press, p. 327-340.

Neustupny, J. V. (1974). Basic types of treatment of language problems. In Fishman. (Ed.). *Advances in language planning*. Netherlands/The Hague: Mouton Publishers, p. 37 - 48.

Pavlinic-Wolf, A. (1986). The definitions of a mother tongue and some related questions. *Grazer Linguistic Studies*, 27, 167-183.

Pei, I. K. (1968). Forward. In Reed. (Ed.). *Esperanto: A complete grammar*. Metuchen, N. J.: The Scarecrow Press, p. vii - x.

Palmer, H. E. & Litt, D. (1947). The approaches to artificial language. In Jacob. (Ed.). A planned auxiliary language. Retrieved Dec 25, 2005, from, <http://www.geocities.com/Athens/forum/5037/PALpref.html>

Pennycook, A. (1995). English in the world/ The world in English. In Tollefson. (Ed.). *Power and Inequality in Language Education*. UK: Cambridge University Press, p. 34 - 58.

Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. London and New York: Longman.

Phillipson, R. (2001). English for globalization or for the world's people? *International review of education*. 47, 3 - 4.

Phillipson, R. (2000). English in the new world Order: variation on a theme of linguistic imperialism and "world" English. In Ricento, (Ed.). *Ideology, Politics and*

*Language Policies: focus on English*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, p. 87-103.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, R. & Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1995). Linguistic human rights, past and present. In Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson (Eds.). *Linguistic human rights: overcoming linguistic discrimination*. Berlin/New York: Mouton Publishers, p. 71 - 110.

Ricento, T. (2002). Introduction. Revisiting the mother-tongue question in language policy, planning and politics. *International journal of the sociology of language* 154, 1-9.

Ricento, T. (2000). *Ideology, Politics and Language Policies: focus on English*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Robinson, G. L. N. (1988). *Crosscultural understanding*. Greta Britain: Prentice Hall.

Sapir, E. (1925). *The function of an international auxiliary language*. Retrieved Dec 10, 2005, from, <http://www.geocities.com/Athens/Forum/5037/sapir.html>

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education or worldwide diversity and human rights*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Phillipson, R. (1999). Englishisation: one dimension of globalization. In Graddol & Meinhof, (Eds). *English in a changing world*. UK: AILA, p. 19 – 37.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Phillipson, R. (Eds.). (1995). *Linguistic human rights: overcoming linguistic discrimination*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Spolsky, B. (1998). *Sociolinguistics*. United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Stevens, P. (1992). English as an international language: directions in the 1990s In Kachru. (Ed.). *The other tongue: English across cultures*. University of Illinois Press: United States of America, p. 27 - 48.

Swales, J. (1997). English as Tyrannosaurs Rex. *World Englishes*, 16(3), 373-382.

Swales, J. (1988). Discourses communities, genres and English as an international language. *World Englishes*, 7(2), 211-220.

Tauli, V. (1974). The theory of language planning. In Fishman, (Ed.). *Advances in language planning*. Netherlands/The Hague: Mouton Publishers, p. 49 - 69.

Thiong'o, N. W. (1993). Imperialism of Language, a language for the world? In *Thiong'o, Moving the center*. London: James Currey, p. 30-41.

Tomlinson, J. (1999). Globalised culture: The triumph of the west? In Skelton, T. & Allen, T. (Eds.). *Culture and global change*. London and New York: Routledge, p. 22-30.

Wright, S. (2004). *Language policy and language planning*. Great Britain: Palgrave Macmillan.

## **Bahá'í References**

Abdu'l-Bahá, (1969). *Paris Talks*. Wilmette: Bahá'í Publishing Trust.

Abdu'l-Bahá, (1982). MacNutt, H. (Comp.). The promulgation of Universal Peace: Talks delivered by Abdu'l-Bahá during His visit to the United States and Canada in 1912. Wilmette: Bahá'í Publishing Trust.

Abdu'l-Bahá, (1984). Barney, L. C. (Comp. & Trans.). *Some Answered Questions*. Wilmette: Bahá'í Publishing Trust.

Bahá'u'lláh, (1976). Shoghi Effendi, (Trans.). *Gleanings from the Writings of Bahá'u'lláh*. Wilmette: Bahá'í Publishing Trust.

Bahá'u'lláh, (1988). Shoghi Effendi (Trans.). *Epistle to the Son of Wolf*. Wilmette: Bahá'í Publishing Trust.

Bahá'u'lláh, (1978). Taherzadeh with the assistance of a Committee at the Bahá'í World Centre, (Trans.). Research Department of the Universal House of Justice (Comp.). *Tablets of Bahá'u'lláh revealed after the Kitab-i-Aqdas*. Wilmette: Bahá'í Publishing Trust.

Bahá'u'lláh, (1992). *Kitab-i- Aqdas: The Most Holy Book*. Hifa: Bahá'í World Centre.

Beckford, J. (2000). Religious movements and globalization. In Cohen, R. & Rai, S. M. (Eds.). *Global social movements*. London, New Brunswick, NJ: Athlone Press, p. 165-219.

Research department of the Universal House of Justice, (Comp.), (n.d.). *Consultation: compilation: extracts from the writings of Bahá'u'lláh, Abdu'l-Bahá, Shoghi Effendi and The Universal House of Justice*. Wilmette: Bahá'í Publishing Trust.

Research department of the Universal House of Justice, (Comp.). (n.d.). *Universal Auxiliary Language. Selected extracts from letters written by or on behalf of the Universal House of Justice*. Haifa: Bahá'í World Centre.

Research department of the Universal House of Justice, (Comp.). (n.d.). *Extracts on the principle of an International Auxiliary Language*. Haifa: Bahá'í World Centre.

Research department of the Universal House of Justice, (Comp.). (n.d.). *Extracts from a research memorandum dated 7 July 1994*. Haifa: Bahá'í World Center.

Research department of the Universal House of Justice. (Comp.). (2003). *The Bahá'í World 2001-2002*. Haifa: Bahá'í World Centre.

Shoghi Effendi. (1980). *The promised Day is Come*. Wilmette: Bahá'í Publishing Trust.

Warburg, M. (2005) Introduction. In Warburg, Huithamur, & Warmind, (Eds.). *Bahá'í and globalisation*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, p. 7-17.

## Appendix A

As Fishman (2006) argues in his newly co-edited book, *Explorations in the sociology of language and religion*, throughout history there has always been a link or interface between language and religion such as the link between the spread of religion and the spread of language. In the Introduction to the book, while referring to chapter written by Mayjes (2006) that I reviewed above, Fishman states, such discussions will contribute to “sociology of language and religion” as a newly born discipline because they shed light on the effect of religion – here Bahá’í Faith – on language, in particular, AUL (p. 3).

Before reviewing the Bahá’í perspective towards the idea of an AUL I will briefly explain the Bahá’í Faith for the reader(s) who may not be familiar with it, because an overview of the Bahá’í Faith will provide the context within which the idea of an AUL is presented and thus makes it much more meaningful.

The Bahá’í Faith is a world religion based on the teachings of Bahá’u’lláh. “The Bahá’í Faith upholds the unity of God, recognizes the unity of His Prophets, and inculcates the principle of the oneness and wholeness of the entire human race” (Shoghi Effendi, p. xii). “It proclaims the necessity and the inevitability of the unification of mankind” which is translated in the spiritual and social teachings and principles as revealed in sacred writings, one of which is adopting an AUL (Shoghi Effendi, p. xii). Bahá’u’lláh (1817-1892) is the Founder of the Bahá’í Faith and His writings offer spiritual guidance as well as directives for both individual and social conduct. The Bahá’í teachings are both for individual spiritual development as well as the betterment of the society and the world at large. Bahá’u’lláh states man is “a mine rich in gems of

inestimable value” and the purpose of life and society is to generate processes, which serve to release those “gems” of human potential (Bahá’u’lláh, p. 260). Therefore, the principles of the Bahá’í Faith such as the universal education, equality of men and women, the removal of all prejudices, a spiritual solution to economic problems, adoption of an AUL and above all world peace which is the main purpose of the Faith are not any longer beautiful dreams but things that can happen if each and every individual member of the society regardless of his ethnicity, skin color, religion, language or gender strives to realize his potentialities to be able to carry forward “an ever-advancing civilization” for which he has been created through cultivating those gems he has been bestowed with (Bahá’u’lláh, p. 214-215).

After Bahá’u’lláh who created the administrative order of the Bahá’í Faith Abdu’l-Bahá and Shoghi Effendi were His successors. After these two figures, The Universal House of Justice which was instituted by Bahá’u’lláh himself acts as the supreme legislative organ of the Bahá’í Faith and has the same authority for Bahá’ís as do the sacred texts themselves with the only difference that the House of Justice has the right to repeal and alter any of its enactments as the Bahá’í community evolves and new conditions emerge, whereas the laws enshrined in the Bahá’í texts will remain unchanged. In fact, The Universal House of Justice as a corporate body and not the individual members is “under the protection and the unerring guidance of God” and thus an instrument for divine guidance (Abdu’l-Bahá, 1985, p. 172). The administration of the Bahá’í Faith on the national and local levels is presently carried out by national and local Spiritual Assemblies. The significant point concerning the operation of these assemblies and the Universal House of Justice is that they function in accordance with consultative

principles and collective decision-making that are founded on spiritual principles in order to ensure that power is used as an instrument of justice, and that governance serves humanity's true needs and that each and every individual Bahá'í can have a voice in the decisions that are made and activities that are carried out in and outside the Bahá'í community.

Having provided an overview of the Bahá'í Faith I will briefly review the Bahá'í writings on the idea of an AUL.

The first and fundamental sacred resource in the Bahá'í Faith in which the idea of an AUL is stated is *The Kitab-i-Aqdas* that is The Most Holy Book in the Bahá'í Faith translated into English in 1992. In this book Bahá'u'lláh states, “O members of parliaments throughout the world” select a “single language for the use of all on earth, and adopt...likewise a common script” (p. 193). He continues, “this will be the cause of unity... and the greatest instrument for promoting harmony and civilization” (p. 193).

In Tablet of Maqsud (The Goal/The Desired One) revealed after *The Kitab-i-Aqdas* and translated into English in 1988, Bahá'u'lláh also states that an AUL is one of things that is “conducive to unity and concord and will cause the whole earth to be regarded as one country” (p. 165). Then he adds, “it is incumbent upon all nations to appoint some men of understanding and erudition to convene a gathering and through joint consultation choose one language from among the varied existing languages, or create a new one, to be taught to the children in all the schools of the world” (p. 165-166). In another tablet named Tablet of Ishraqat (Splendours), Bahá'u'lláh (1988) also emphasizes that “the greatest means for the promotion of that unity is for the peoples of the world to understand one another's writing and speech” (p. 98-99).

In another tablet, Epistle to The Son of the Wolf which is translated into English by Shoghi Effendi Bahá'u'lláh (1892) says to Kamal Pasha – the king of Constantinople - that he and “other officials of the Government” should “convene a gathering and choose one of the divers languages, and likewise one of the existing scripts, or else to create a new language and a new script to be taught children in schools throughout the world” (p. 138). Therefore, people of the world would acquire “only two languages”, “their own native tongue” and “the language in which all the peoples of the world would converse” (p. 138). Thus, “people would be relieved and freed from the necessity of acquiring and teaching different languages” (p. 138).

Abdu'l-Bahá (1844-1921), the eldest surviving son of Bahá'u'lláh and His designated successor also emphasize the idea of an AUL. In his three-year travels from 1912-1915 in Europe and America in which He established the Faith of Bahá'u'lláh, He conducted numerous talks and sent messages to many people in which he emphasizes the idea of an AUL as one of the means to establish peace on earth. His talks were translated and compiled in 1982 in two books *Promulgation of the Universal Peace* and *The Paris talks*. He talked about the idea of an AUL and its significance in world unity on several occasions: A message to Esperantists in Washington D. C.; Baptist Temple in Pennsylvania; All Souls Unitarian Church in New York and Church of the Messiah in Montreal.

Shoghi Effendi also in some letters written on His behalf to individual believers talked about the idea of an AUL. During the time He was the Guardian of the faith, many individuals wrote to him and inquired about Esperanto and whether it was or it would become the AUL or not. In response to these questions like Abdu'l-Bahá, Shoghi Effendi

appreciates Zamenhof's efforts and Esperantists' activities and also encourages the believers in the Bahá'í Faith to learn Esperanto and translate the Bahá'í writing to Esperanto for the purpose of the spread of the Cause. However, he repeatedly emphasizes that such appreciation does not mean that Esperanto will necessarily become an AUL because as Bahá'u'lláh explicitly said in *The Most Holy Book*, it is an international committee with representatives from all nations that has the responsibility of selecting an AUL rather than a single individual or organization. He states that "the interest which the Bahá'ís have and should have" in Esperanto" is essentially because of the vital significance of the idea it represents rather than the belief in its inherent worth as a suitable and adequate international medium of expression" (1937). He maintains, whatever language the governments of the world agree on "we would heartily support it because we desire to see this step in the unification of the human race take place as soon as possible" (1944).

After Shoghi Effendi, *The Universal House of Justice*, which is the supreme legislative organ of the Bahá'í administrative order, also in some letters written by or on its behalf refers to the idea of an AUL. The Universal House of Justice encourages learning Esperanto and to "appreciate it as a vital contribution to the development of the idea of an international auxiliary language" (p. 1993). However, Universal House of Justice emphasizes, "the Bahá'í Faith is not supporting or advocating the selection of any particular language" (p. 1997).

Concerning English, the Universal House of Justice states, "although no doubt that the English language is widely accepted as an international means of communication particularly in business and trade, science and technology as well as in international

affairs, it has not been adopted by the world as the international language” (Universal Auxiliary Language, Selected Extracts from Letters Written by and on Behalf of the Universal House of Justice). Thus, “there is no doubt that current and future events will certainly compel the governments of the world to adopt an international language” (1999) and as the Universal House of Justice remarked earlier in 1964 “the choice will undoubtedly depend on many factors when the times comes for it to be made”.

In short, it can be said that the Bahá’í writings on the idea of an AUL especially the ones revealed by the founder of the faith have particular features. The first is that in the history of the world religions it is the only religion in which the idea of an AUL is clearly proposed in the sacred writings, which comes at a time when the current world situation in which individuals, ethnic groups and countries are increasingly interconnecting and are becoming more or less aware of how mankind are all the members of a single family. The second significant point concerns the novelty of such a proposal at the time (about a hundred and fifty years ago) when world integration and interconnections began its momentum. In other words, at present, due to migration, tourism, communication technologies and even wars and natural disasters, talking about the idea of an AUL may not be as new and unprecedented as it was a hundred and fifty years ago when Bahá’u’lláh proposed to the world representatives to decide on the choice of an AUL. The last significance point deals with the new perspective that Bahá’í Faith presents on the nature of language and the idea of an AUL, its purpose as well as the benefits, when it should be taught, its relationship with other native languages and above all the procedures and conditions for its adoption with an aspiration for justice and unity.

According to the Bahá'í writings, mother tongues are the potential resources within which valuable beliefs, values and traditions are embedded; thus, they have to be preserved to enrich the advancement of human civilization. In addition, not only linguistic diversity should be reserved, but also all other forms of diversity be it ethnic, color, thought, gender and culture should be protected since they are the precious heritage of human civilization without which social and economic development would be impossible or unsustainable. Therefore, not only is the adoption of an AUL a great step towards unity in diversity, but also the AUL itself would be the means through which people all around the world can communicate, express themselves and thus remove their conflicts and finally form a unified world. Since the Bahá'í Faith is one of the few religions that “express so clearly in their doctrine the view that the world should be unified” (Warburg, 2005, p. 9) and that it foreshadows globalization “with its emphasis on the interdependence of people and the need for international institutions of peace, justice and good governance” (Beckford, 2000, p. 175), it can be said that the principle of adopting an AUL is one of the many principles revealed in the Bahá'í sacred writings that foreshadows a unified world with its emphasis on the interdependence of all the people.

There is not much detail in the Bahá'í writings about the specifics of planning of an AUL. However, there are general guidelines on how it can be carried out. First, the individuals who would be in charge of the LP of an AUL should be representatives from all the nations across the globe and have expert knowledge. Second, the main criteria to be used in the choice of an AUL should be simplicity and learnability. Third, the choice of an AUL should be carried out through consultation and collective decision-making. Since decision-making is of great importance at any point in the process of planning an

AUL, I will briefly discuss the moral and spiritual principles provided in the Bahá'í Faith with regard to consultation.

According to the Bahá'í writings, consultation is a method of non-adversarial decision-making that is used to build consensus in a manner that unites various constituencies instead of dividing them. According to this definition, none of the representative members should advertise and promote their views and opinions. In addition, as Bahá'í writings strongly emphasize, consultation not only does not negate diversity of opinion, but also encourages it and acts to control the struggle for power that is otherwise so common in decision-making (a point that is also stressed in the social decision theory). In addition, the Bahá'í writings do provide the means on how to deal with diversity of opinions in order to achieve the goal of consultation, which is finding truth. The prime requisites for those who take counsel together as emphasized in the Bahá'í writings are purity of motive, radiance of spirit, detachment from all else save God, humility and lowliness amongst, patience and long-suffering in difficulties. Consultation should be carried out based on four principles: 1) Information should be gathered from the widest possible range of sources including both expert advice and knowledge as well as views of the individuals at the grass root levels from diverse backgrounds. 2) During consultation, participants must make every effort to be as frank and candid as possible, while maintaining a courteous interest in the views of others. 3) Personal attacks, blanket ultimatums and prejudicial statements are to be avoided. 4) When an idea is put forth it becomes at once the property of the group. Therefore, opinions have to be expressed out of a sincere desire to serve and benefit all rather than emanate from a desire for personal interest. 5) When a decision is made after taking a

majority vote, it is incumbent on the entire group to act on it with unity - regardless of how many supported the vote. And even if the decision is a wrong one, it will become evident only when the decision-making group and the community at large support it and take action to implement it. (Research Department of the Universal House of Justice, 1990, p. 93-110).

According to these principles it can be said that the main purpose of consultation is investigation of truth or finding a solution or an answer to a problem; a solution that would benefit all rather than a certain individual, group or country. Therefore, for the consultation to render the best result possible, the first and foremost condition is absolute love and harmony amongst the members of the assembly. In addition, the members should approach their responsibility with purity of motive, love for humanity, humility, patience, open-mindedness, sense of justice and duty, entire devotion to the welfare and interests of humanity so that they can win not only the confidence and the genuine support and respect of those whom they should serve, but also their esteem and real affection.

In short, the principles of consultation as explained in Bahá'í writings suggest that true consultation is spiritual conference in the attitude and atmosphere of love rather than mere exchange of expert knowledge to fulfill the personal interests of a specific person, group or even a country. In fact, these principles suggest a new approach for carrying out consultations that differ from the traditional approaches towards consultation in which diversity of opinions and thoughts are considered problematic and also usually one consulting member promotes his or her views and imposes or encourages other members to support him or her. In this new approach to consultation spirituality and morality form

the foundations of consultation based on which opinions should be expressed, discussed and decisions made. Thus, making an attempt to follow these principles as well as the rules prescribed in the social decision theory in the process of LP of an AUL might result in decisions that benefit all world citizens.

To summarize, in the Bahá'í inspired vision global integration or what is known as globalization should be spiritually rather than materially motivated, thus as Meyjes (2006) notes, it calls for “a deliberate, organic and ideologically coherent” process (p. 36). And the role of an AUL in that process is to allow “unfettered, organic and participatory cultural exchange and change” and “shield the primacy of native linguistic traditions from undue pressures” (p. 37).

## **Appendix B**

1. As a native speaker of English/ an ESL speaker what is your opinion about English that seems to function as an international language?
2. Do you think it has the qualities of an international language? Why? What are those qualities?
3. Do you think that it has any benefits? If yes, what are they? If not, why?
4. Do you think that it has any disadvantages? If yes, what are they? If not, why?
5. Do you think that English language which is widely used in communication technologies, media, Internet, etc. promotes western culture and leads the world culture to become homogenous? Why? How?
6. Based on what you said do you think human beings need an international language other than English? (one that every one could have the right to learn as secondary to his mother tongue) Why?
7. What are the features of an AUL? And what is the main purpose of having an AUL?
8. What do you think is the best possible way to adopt such an AUL? How? Who could do that?
9. If English is not qualified as an AUL, then what do you think about the choice of an AUL? What is your opinion about these two options? Why?
  1. Selecting one of the current languages as the AUL or 2. Constructing an artificial one?  
(Do you think there are any other options to do that?)

## **Appendix C**

- 1.** Which dimensions of language planning (status planning, corpus planning, education planning) can be applied to LP of an AUL? Why? How?
- 2.** Who should devise the program for LP of an AUL? Why?
- 3.** Should language planners and linguists only focus on linguistic issues? Why? What other (non-linguistic) issues should they take into account in planning of an AUL?
- 4.** What activities (e.g. fact-finding, decision-making, policy formulation, etc.) could be involved in the LP of an AUL? Why? Can you explain?
- 5.** What ideologies should inform the LP of the AUL so that we avoid the kind of problems that we face at present with regards to English and create equal rights for people all over the world to learn the AUL as a subject at schools and also learn and use their native languages?
- 6.** How can planning of an AUL help recognize the significance and value of their own native languages?