Dominance of English: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Language Policy and Planning

Elham Mahjoob[1*]

[1]*Ilam University, Ilam, Iran.*

Author's contribution

The sole author designed, analyzed and interpreted and prepared the manuscript.

Original Research Article

ABSTRACT

This study is an attempt to reveal the underlying ideological loads of academic texts in the field of Language Policy and Planning (LPP) which are claimed to lack any bias in favor of the English language as a global language. It includes a purposively-sampled selection of texts from different prolific authors in the field of LPP. The strategy adopted for the organization, presentation, and analysis of the data has been implemented through the use of a conceptual framework developed by Cooper [1]. The results of a conceptual coding scheme, developed by the researcher, were computed through Chi-square. The results of the analyses suggest that the English language receives the support of the world English superpowers to promote their political goals in every corner of the world. This support has long been strengthened implicitly by the authors under the pretext of teaching English to the under-developed or developing nations to give them a key to civilization.

_____

Corresponding author: E-mail: Mahjub.e@gmail.com;

1. INTRODUCTION

Language policy and planning predate any serious efforts to systematically examine the impact within society. The western model of language planning seems to aim at the replacement of many languages by one. This model promotes a view of development that equates modernization with westernization and projects a mono-model as the only way through which planned societies can operate [2]. Thus, particular languages are given more support than others. English is one of several languages which are promoted internationally in different ways. According to Phillipson [3], English has a dominant position in science, technology, medicine, and computers; research, books, periodicals, and software; transnational business, trade, shipping, and aviation; diplomacy and international organizations; mass media, entertainment, news agencies, and journalism; youth culture and sport; education systems. This non-exhaustive list of the domains in which English has a dominant, though not of course exclusive, place is indicative of the functional load carried by English. Kaplan [4] put it as follows;

> "Language planning, in one way or another, is as old as human civilization. Every time that one polity invaded the territory of another, the language of the conqueror was imposed on the conquered. The Romans imposed their language across the civilized world as they knew it. In the 21st century, the practice of language planning has become increasingly sophisticated. English, as the result of a series of fortuitous accidents has become the international language serving many activities. At the same time, it has led to an explosion in English language teaching, an activity also not based on wise decisions or wise planning."

Throughout the promotion of the domination of English, some inequality appears which is in favor of English and which puts other languages (especially the indigenous ones) at stake. The question that can be posed in every reader's mind is whether it is fair that the U.S. and the U.K. can avoid investing substantially on foreign language education; whereas, virtually all other education systems are obliged to do so. Such inequality is largely unrecorded and unquantified, since the structural and ideological underpinnings of global linguistic hegemony tend to be regarded as legitimate, despite the massive economic and cultural advantages this gives the English speaking world.

In this study it is important to distinguish between at least two different meanings of ideology in the context of global language spread. When we talk of the ideological implications of the spread of English, there are at least two different interpretations of what may be meant by this [2]. First, ideological may be used here in a general sense to mean "political". In this fairly popular sense of the term, ideological implications refer to a critical and political analysis of the effects of the global spread of English. The second understanding of the meaning of ideological implications is a far trickier one. It implies that the spread of English has ideological effects on people, that is to say, English is the purveyor of thoughts, cultures and ideologies that affect the ways in which people think and behave.

In discursive structures, it can be gained that the polity-maker is left out in order not to mention the authors' ideological load, and thus the recipient assumes these structures as unbiased and not directional. In the present study, since the researcher is after the political aspect of LPP, these definitions and the match between them will be of interest. In fact, polity-makers and consequently policy makers and language planners believe that through the manipulation of texts and attempting to express their materials as neutral they can gain more public support. While many linguists have historically claimed a hands-off position regarding the politics of the indigenous languages they describe, an increasing number of applied linguists are examining ways in which the study of language is always a political and social act. One notable example of the link between linguistics and politics is the early descriptive work of indigenous languages by the Summer Institute of Linguistics which was funded by Christian missionary groups for proselytizing purposes [5].

At the core of politics of language lies a form of identity politics, in which language policy partisans compete to shape public perceptions about the 'we' that constitutes the relevant political community, and to embody their aims in the language policy of the state. It is also noteworthy that Honig [6] assumes that national identities are socially constructed through discourses among competing political elites. So, two core issues in political conflicts over

language policy are realized; 1) identity politics in relation to language policy and 2) the meanings and significance of equality in language policy conflict. Therefore the aim of this study is to explore why English has become the dominant international language.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The long term conjunction between English and discourses has produced a range of discursive connections between English and colonialism. English is both the language that will apparently bestow civilization, knowledge and wealth on people and at the same time is the language in which they are racially defined. It has clearly been interwoven with British colonialism throughout colonial and post-colonial history.

Regarding this, it is clear that English Language Teaching was a crucial part of the colonial enterprise, and that English has been a major language in which colonialism has been written. This is a position that trumpets the benefits of English over other languages, suggesting that English has both intrinsic and extrinsic qualities superior to other languages. Fanon [7] studied colonialism in a cultural perspective and has come to the conclusion that "to speak means to be in a position to use certain syntax, to grasp the morphology of this or that language, but it means above all to assume a culture, to support the weight of a civilization".

Linguistic imperialism entails unequal exchange and unequal communicative rights between people or groups defined in terms of their competence in specific languages with unequal benefits as a result and in a system that legitimates and naturalizes such exploitation. Linguistic imperialism was manifestly a feature of the way the nation-states privileged one language, and often sought actively to eradicate others, forcing their speakers to shift to the dominant language. It would be noteworthy here to come to the case of Pakistan as a concrete example. As Tariq Rahman [8] pinpointed in his article "*language policy, multilingualism and language vitality in Pakistan"* Pakistan's official language is still English as it was when the British ruled the country as part of British India. In addition to this the country has five major indigenous languages. To him both globalization and continuation of global language policies by the governments of Pakistan have increased the pressure of English on all other languages. While this has also created an increased

awareness of language rights and movements to preserve languages, it has generally resulted in more people learning English. In Pakistan this means that the poor are under more pressure than before because they cannot afford expensive schools that 'sell' English at exorbitant rates. As such, linguistic globalization is anti-poor, pro-elitist and exploitative. Tariq Rahman [8] concludes what they need in Pakistan are such promotion-oriented rights for their languages. What is needed along with such rights is a good but fair system of schooling which will teach English and Urdu but equally to all children and not as it is done now—very well to the elite and very badly to all others. He strongly believes such steps might save them from the more harmful linguistic effects of unjust and anti-poor language policies.

Mukhwana [9] has taken the case of Kenyan cities into account. In his book, language planning and policy in Kenya, the author provides multiple case studies on the language attitudes of urban Kenyans in some cities. The author has provided a useful historical overview of language policy attitudes and issues in Kenya. He has also provided practical suggestions on how to improve coherency between (in his own words) bottom-up attitudes and language policy interventions. Assuming the author's conclusions on language attitudes are representative of the situation in Kenya in general, the suggestions Mukhwana makes regarding language policy and planning might be useful. Especially insightful are Mukhwana's comments on the discrepancy between the needs and preferences of the general population, on the one hand, and the policy context on the other. This observation gains further significance when one considers the fact that the focus of Kenyan language policy falls on sustainable development and national integration [9].

According to Iraki [10] "The disproportionate use of English, during and after colonization, has had some consequences on the development of Kenyan indigenous languages. Indeed, the English language has a lion's share in the school curriculum to the detriment of other languages. As a result, the scenario of the 1920s, where English was the idiom for the privileged minority, seems to persist today." In his paper, language and political economy: A historical perspective from Kenya, Iraki [10] has taken the case of Kenya into attention. To him "Kenya has 42 ethnic communities with Kiswahili emerging as the most widely accepted language for national

unity. However, the political elites continue to favor the development of English without due attention to Kiswahili and the indigenous languages. The Sheng language, spoken and popularized by the youth deserves special mention. It is argued it here that it has its place in the linguistic layout of Kenya." In his paper he reviewed the languages of Kenya and underscored their relevance in the political economy of the pre- and post-independence periods in Kenya. He further sought to lay bare the rationale behind the inordinate usage of English in Kenya by bringing in a historical perspective. In the end, he proposed a framework for the co-existence of local and foreign languages as a prelude to the development of a language policy for Kenya [10].

Baldridge [11] has explored more or less the same outcome of empirical period in India. He cited:

> "*Having attained independence from the British in 1947, Indian leaders chose Hindi as the official language of India in the hope that it would facilitate regional communication and encourage national unity. ….. And they accordingly laid out a clear timeline and plan for introducing Hindi and phasing English out. Despite this planning, Hindi and English today still share their status as official languages.*"

This situation offers an interesting case for the analysis of political and social aspects of language planning and promotion. Baldridge [11] concedes that the absence of a national language does cause some complications in India whereas at the meantime he concludes his paper as such that such a common language may never arise. To him regardless of what happens in this respect, Indian policy planners should explore the multilingual model to see how it might be best applied for India's situation. They must also uphold Nehru's promise to protect individual linguistic rights. At the very least, they must not repeat the mistakes of the past, for this will only serve to divide a nation which, while retaining its vast spectrum of languages and all of its diversity, has great potential to truly unite.

A term that Skutnabb-Kangas [12] makes central to her view of the inequitable allocation of language rights is "linguicism". Phillipson [3] has also taken up this term and looked specifically at one form of such linguicism, namely what he calls "linguistic imperialism", and particularly

English linguistic imperialism. The main thread of Phillipson's explanation of linguistic imperialism has been reviewed as follows: "The linguistic relation between the center and periphery has been and continues to be one of dominant and dominated languages". English was originally imposed on a number of countries in the periphery and has through deliberate contrivance, successfully displaced, or replaced some of the indigenous languages of these countries.

Contrary to Phillipson's idea of linguistic imperialism [3], Aliakbari [13] has put the native speakers' hegemony in international uses of English under question. To him, advocating cultural awareness and intercultural competence urges the need for interlocutors' mutual appreciation and cooperation of cultures to strengthen international relationship. After posing ten contradictory arguments regarding the native speakers' hegemony in international uses of English, he proposes a linguistic democracy as follows:

> "*…the global attraction to learning English as an international language is not interpreted as the learners' undervaluing of their own native language or culture. Rather, it is considered a man's struggle for mutual understanding in the presence of diversity.*"[13]

English is now expanded worldwide, as a result of British Collonialism, international independence, 'revolutions' in technology, transport, communications and commerce, and because English is the language of the USA, a major economic, political, and military force in the contemporary world. It is not only Britain which has gravitated towards linguistic hegemony, but a significant portion of the entire world [3]. With its global extension throughout the world, English is no longer considered as a property belonging to its native speakers. English is no longer the language of its originators. It has become a property of the world.

2.1 Statement of the Problem and Research Question

Lots of studies have dealt with LPP in different contexts; their types and even the potential problems they may confront have also been adequately taken into account. Some scholars believe that English has gradually and naturally

changed into a global language just because it deserved it. Now the question that is posed is "Why English?", "Why not any other language?". While contrary to popular myths, English is an extremely difficult language [3].

The dominance and globalization of one language is undoubtedly at the expense of all other languages' impoverishment. The questions that can be raised here are:

- Who are the powerful advocates of English and why have they supported it to be a global language which makes the associated discourse critical?

The present study is devoted to bringing the ideological features of academic texts regarding LPP into attention. Uncovering these ideologies and associated policies helps reveal the aims these academic authors have pursued in their texts under the mask of 'academic style of writing'. However, it should be kept in mind that this would not put an end to the conflicts over LPP; whereas, it is hoped that it would broaden our view and understanding of the issue.

3. METHODS

3.1 Materials

The present study aims to explore the hidden ideological patterns of thoughts of authors in LPP in a political aspect; that is, on the basis of an impression gained through reviewing a sample of related texts, it aims to show that they are in favor of a political party or group and serve (perhaps unconsciously) their own political interests. As mentioned, the prevalence of the English language as the only language has definitely some benefits for its advocates. To demonstrate whose benefits are actually met in the globalization and dominance of English, some academic texts from different books whose authors think that they are totally neutral in asserting the points regarding the domination of English LPP in the contemporary world have been chosen.

The strategy adopted here for the selection of the type of data is one which might in a sense be characterized as expansionist. The data here are purposively-sampled.

One of the sources which has been selected is "English as a global language", a book by Crystal [14] who epitomizes the powerful and conventional in our professional world. He is an influential prolific author and on the board of the British council. In his book, English as the global language, he has paid to the why ness of the presence of English language as the global language. The book has been mainly divided into five chapters. In the first chapter, after giving a definition of a global language, he poses different questions as "what makes a language global?", "Why do we need a global language?", "What are the dangers of a global language?", "Could anything stop a global language?", and so on. Chapters two, three and four, all deal with the issue that why English language has been succeeded in becoming the global language. These chapters subsequently pay to this issue in historical context, cultural foundation, and cultural legacy.

Some texts have also been analyzed from an essay which has been written by Davis and Huebner [15]. In it now and then they have discussed the matter of the influences that politics can have on the language of a specified area and also on LPP decision making processes in each region. The book is entitled "Sociopolitical perspectives on language policy and planning in the U.S.A". It has been divided into two main sections. The first has been dedicated to several authors' papers on 'language policy/planning frameworks' and the second one is specified to papers on 'Policy and Politics'. In the first section there is an article on 'the sociopolitical dynamics of indigenous language maintenance and loss: A framework on language policy and planning' by Kathryn A. Davis. In an introduction to the article Davis has mentioned some opposing views by different linguists on the maintenance or loss of the indigenous languages. The issue of whether taking this indigenous language loss serious or not has also been discussed.

Some texts are also elicited from a paper by Graddol [16] *English in the Future*, in which the linguistic future of the world and the presence of the English language as the only lingua franca have been taken into account which seem quite relevant to the subject of the present paper.

And the last book which was chosen as a source was written by De Swaan [17] is *Words of the World*. In the introduction to his book he pays attention to the global language system, linguistic constellation and multilingualism through which some texts have been elicited by the researcher.

To avoid redundancy just some parts of the books (that is to the extent they are revealing) will be analyzed. Furthermore, the major focus of the study has been on those features of the data that are capable of being used as evidence in the process of answering the research questions of this study through the more detailed conceptual categories. Therefore, outcomes of the analysis will be categorized based on the theoretical framework introduced by Cooper [1].

3.2 Conceptual Scheme

A descriptively adequate account of any given case of language planning ought to tell us, at a minimum, what actors attempted to influence what behaviors, of which people, for what ends, by what means, and with what results. While other investigators might add or subtract categories, a set of rubrics such as these help us to select and organize our observations from among an indefinitely large number of observations which could be made. A framework or accounting scheme helps not only the investigator but also the readers, who can use it to assess the adequacy of the description. Cooper [1] proposes a framework that constructs truth in terms of actors, people, ends, and so on.

Following Cooper, each policy should be described in terms of the following framework; what *actors* attempt to influence what *behaviors* of which *people* for what *ends* under what *conditions* by what *means* through what *decision-making process* with what *effect*? Cooper claims that these framing questions provide an "accounting" scheme that makes explicit and evaluates the central tasks of describing, predicting, explaining and theorizing in language planning since for Cooper, the validity of a description is established by cross-verification. Coding scheme development can also be considered an analogue to the qualitative process of concept formation. However though concept formation is critical to the outcome of all quantitative analysis, the process of coding scheme development is often even more in need of discussion [18]. Having an insight on Cooper's conceptual framework the researcher has come to the following scheme. The categories in the scheme are data-driven in that they have been developed out of primary reviews and a pilot study of a sample of texts. As such this scheme has to be regarded as a preliminary working one subject to modification, if necessary. The concepts in the scheme serve here to define a variety of biases toward or

against different properties associated with policies regarding decision making in LPP. The coding scheme followed is presented in Table1.

3.3 Rater

The rater is the very researcher who has meticulously gone through all procedures of the research like sampling, data collection, selection of a conceptual framework, preparing a coding scheme and data analysis. Therefore she has been quite familiar with the approach, concepts and the objectives of the present study.

3.4 Procedure

Though there may be some overlapping, the study is tended to proceed along the following steps. First, the corpus of texts to be studied here is identified. Each text is then searched through to locate the chunks of the texts relevant to the aspects of the conceptual scheme introduced and to the research questions. The selected chunks are subsequently identified as the data a) belonging to one of the categories of factors in Cooper's framework and thus to at least one of the research questions, b) reflecting at least one of the themes within the emerging conceptual scheme or being capable of lending itself to a new category of the same family of concepts. Meanwhile, to ensure the objectivity of the task, the coding scheme is applied to analyze the corpus of data. Once the chunks of data for analysis are identified they are coded and classified according to the research question which is informed by Cooper's framework.

At the next stage of the procedure, this analyst has embarked on the analysis of each set of data related to the particular research question to provide the answer to the question. It is necessary to note, however, that since CDA does not confirm the analysis of bits of data in isolation, the analyst, if necessary, has referred back to the associated co-text and occasionally even other relevant texts to do the task of analysis of those data on the basis of their linguistic context. Drawing on Cooper's framework and the research question in this study, the part on the data analysis, therefore, is divided into subsections.

Two categories of measures taken into account to control the quality of analyses, which are equated with the classical concepts of reliability and validity in of course a rough way especially in the case of the validation procedure. In a

sense, the 'reliability' of the analyses and interpretations in this study is checked through taking a specific conventional measure concerned with intra-coder reliability. At this stage, one section of the analysis has been reviewed by this analyst some time after the initial analysis.

The aspect of validation is related to representativeness (the degree to which observed data represent the normal behavior) and retrievabiltiy (the researcher's access to protocols of data so that the same responses or behaviors may be inspected). Having in mind that the data collected is both representative and retrievable for continued inspection, confirmability is concerned with the ability of the researcher to confirm findings by demonstrating the same findings through different sources [19]. Therefore to confirm the findings, the researcher has also gone through the same procedure in some subtexts of other prolific authors as Pennycook [20] who has discussed the matter of English globalization and the politics in her book English *in the world/the world in English*. Some other subtexts have also been deliberately chosen from the book *Ideology, politics and language policies* by Tomas Ricento [2], through which Ricento has tried his best to discuss the issue of English language globalization and its relevance to politics and language policy. The subtexts were treated by the same coding scheme (which is not included here), the result of which confirmed the findings of the present research and whereby the validity of the task.

To make the coding procedure clear, the researcher provides an extract from the essay by Davis and Huebner [15]. To Davis and Huebner [15], the experience of many groups with some form of military, educational, and/or missionary colonization has caused a complexity in the decision-making processes of LPP. Meanwhile, the ones involved in these processes have not been far away of such an impact:

(Subtext Davis & Huebner, 1999, p. 73-4 [a-f])

Subtext: *[a] From a socio cultural perspective, colonizers have often instituted language policies based on the view that their own language and culture were better (more modern, sophisticated, intellectual, moral) than those of indigenous groups. [b] A vivid example of this view is portrayed in the following excerpt from a report by J.D.D. Atkins, U.S. Commissioner of Indian affairs from 1885 to 1888. [c] The instruction of Indians in the vernacular (that is, in Indian language) is not only of no use to them, but is detrimental to the cause of their education and civilization and it will not be permitted in any Indian school over which the government has any control. . . . . [d] This (English) language, which is good enough for a white man and a black man, ought to be good enough for the red man. [e] It is also believed that teaching an Indian youth in his own barbarous dialect is a positive detriment to him. [f] The first step to be taken toward civilization, toward teaching the Indians the mischief and folly of continuing in their barbarous practices, is to teach them the English language. (cited in [21], p.84).*

It seems that colonizers have taken the superiority of their own language for granted [BFdel] [BFcpa]. According to Davis and Huebner, they make all their LPP decisions based on this assumption. Therefore, as can be noticed in this excerpt, they consider their language appropriate to meet any needs of any man of any race [BFdel]. To them having one language, which is English, to fulfill all the needs of different people and more importantly make them more civilized than their own language is beneficial to everyone. Since colonizers are the ones in power all through their colonies, they have imposed their very decisions on all their subjects without asking or even knowing their opinions and observing their rights [BFeil].

Table 1. Coding scheme for quantitative analysis

Concept	Code
Bias in favor of the mother-tongue speakers of the language	BFmtsl
Bias in favor of the S/F language speakers of the language	BFs/f l
Bias in favor of the governmental authorities	BFga
Bias in favor of promoting a special community's political aims	BFcpa
Bias in favor of the domination of English language	BFdel
Bias in favor of the eradication of the indigenous languages	BFeil
Bias in favor of the maintenance and revitalization of the indigenous languages	BFmril

They have made the subjects to learn English and even to teach it to their children at school through which they wanted to gain control not only on the present generation but also the future of the colonized nations [BFcpa]. Language is certainly the means by which the nations can communicate and powers can reach their goals. Putting aside the local and indigenous languages and resorting to English as the sole means of communication would not promote and transfer the cultural heritage, economical goals and political aims of the indigenous people and their governments while the colonizers' [BFeil] [Bfcpa] [BFga]. Thus taking "civilization" into account and getting sick to improve it among the indigenous people is just a claim, a pretext, or let's say a fallacious idea among the powers to promote their underlying aims [BFcpa] [Bfga]. Through quotation asserted by Diamond [21] lots of structures can be found which resulted in the exclusion of the beneficiaries. At the very beginning the nominalization "instruction" which is attributed to the Indians' vernacular language is doomed. This "instruction" has surely been due to the vernacular Indians who teach their own language. They have been considered as a minority group and all the efforts have been put into their language alteration to English which is considered "good enough" for them. How can this language be called "good" to a nation with a different past, different cultural heritage and different political goals. Haven't there been a history and a life to this nation before the existence and prevalence of the English language? Of course, there have been. So who decides that this language is "good" for them and will do any "good" to them? The use of the adverb "enough" after the adjective (i.e. good), brings up another challenge. Under what decision making processes has this decision been made? It is "good enough" for what? For whom? Surely, not good enough for the indigenous people i.e. the Indians. Since whether they want to shift to the English language they have to start from the very beginning. They have to first make the building blocks of every aspect of their lives. As mentioned by Crystal [14] the ones who own a language , here let's say English language, as their native tongue can promote their aims, of any kind, much better than the professional FL or SL learners [BFmtsl]. Knowing this it can be definitely concluded that English language owners as colonizers have even aimed at colonizing the minds of the subjugated nations and consequently gain control of every bit of

their lives: [BFeil] [BFdel], But why? To promote their own policies, to make their ambitions progress, to settle and increase their power all through their colonies [BFga] [BFcpa].

All the same challenge can be brought up for the other adjective selected purposefully for the English language in the excerpt, positive.

The passive structure "will not be permitted" (in [c]) enjoys the presence of the back grounded agent "the government". The use of the article "the" before "government" has specified this government but hasn't cleared which government. The colonized government has had the control over its schools and education and of course has been in charge of what language is instructed in schools. Therefore, it can be gained that this noun phrase "the government" refers to the new control and the power over the Indian schools and education, that is the colonizers [BFga]. They are to decide what should be taught in schools, they are to say what is good and positive to the Indians [BFcpa]. They even classify the Indians' dialect and practices as "barbarous" [BFeil]. The use of the adjective "barbarous" and nominals "mischief" and "folly" which carry only negative connotation has been deliberately chosen by the writers to disvalue and suppress the application of this indigenous language which they look down as a "dialect" [Bfeil].

The use of the non-finite clause in [e], teaching an Indian youth is his . . ." is another grammatical structure ended in the suppression of the agents. The agents have been totally excluded and the readers are wondered by whom this "teaching" has to be done. The Indians have to teach the new language to the nation or the colonizers? Colonizers, as English language speakers, can control the instruction of language much better in the way they wish and according to their own goals [Bfmtsl]. They are removed from the text here as beneficiaries while in the next non-finite clause "continuing in their barbarous practices", the agent has been back grounded which is the Indians. They are mentioned all through the passage to be condemned as supporters of a mischief, a fallacious and barbarous language.

It can be seen that in the rest of the same sentence (in [f]) by the use of the infinitival clause, "to teach them the English language", the agents have been removed again. The agents are suppressed here in order not to show

who gets benefits of all these efforts done to shift from one indigenous language to English language [BFcpa] [BFdel].

In his book, English as a global language, Crystal [14] refers to the special role of a language and asserts:

(Subtext [14], pp.2-3:[a-c])

> Subtext: *[a] A language achieves a genuinely global status when it develops a special role that is recognized in every country. [b] This might seem like stating the obvious, but it is not, for the notion of 'special role' has many facets. [c] Such a role will be most evident in countries where large numbers of the people speak the language as a mother tongue – in the case of English this would mean the USA, Canada, Britain, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and several Caribbean countries.*

Regarding the above mentioned subtext by Crystal, it can be gained that the author has aimed to imply that this is the English language which owns that special role [a] [BFdel]; however it is not clear that this "special role" has to be recognized by whom. Use of the passive voice "is recognized" in [a] makes the reader wonder who may have assigned that global status to the language; the government or the people and if people are to be considered as the real subject of this passive verb, these are the whole people living in the country or just its speakers. In [c] "speakers of the language" is pondered over [BFmtsl] to grant the language that "special role" which is needed (by the author) to achieve the global status. He has apparently bestowed that "special role" to English and in the subsequent sentences has supported his own idea by exemplifying the countries in which English is spoken as a mother-tongue [c]. In [b], he declares that this "role" has its own facets which should be attributed to the global language, which is now English [BFdel].

Ricento has also deliberately tried not only to support this spread of English language but also to call for the efforts to effectuate it. He asserts:

(Subtext [2], pp. 91-92, [a- c])

> Subtext: *[a] To effectuate the spread of English, teachers of English were needed. [b] A key policy document for the post-colonial age was written by an advisor to the*

British Council in 1941 outlining the case: "a new career service is needed to lay the foundations of a world-language and culture based on our own ..... army of linguistic missionaries . . . a central office in London, from which teachers radiate all over the world" (Routh 1941: 12-13). [c] When I graduated from an elite British university at a tender age I was commissioned into this "army i.e., into the British Council version of cultural cold war [2].

Having in mind the global prevalence of English language, Ricento called for the efforts to effectuate this spread [BFdel]. In [a], the infinitival clause has suppressed the agents. Who wanted to effectuate this language spread? No beneficiaries are mentioned even in the following clause since by the use of the passive voice "were needed" the beneficiaries are removed from the whole sentence. Going ahead through the subtext, one can come across the *British Council* who is greatly in charge of this language spread and can be accused of trying to make it more effective [BFcpa] [BFga]. Therefore it can be considered as not only the agent of the infinitival "to effectuate" but also as the beneficiaries of the passive voice "were needed" (in [a]).

According to all the above mentioned subtexts, the advocators of the prevalence and the spread of English language have resorted to any kinds of pretexts to urge other language speakers to believe in English language supremacy, quit their own languages, which are called "barbarous dialects", and resort to English language in every aspect of their lives. The advocators and supporters of this global language who have long helped its prevalence and maintenance have been the British and American authorities. They have established various types of organizations which are claimed to exist to fulfill some specific needs of different nations, while they have established them not only to promote their language all through the nations but also to promote their aims in those nations through their linguistic subjugation.

4. DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

The present study is an attempt to critically probe some scholarly, claimed neutral, texts to come to the underlying ideological loads of the authors through the texts. It has widely been held that the scientific texts are all void of ideological views of the authors while it is in fact hard to conceive of a scholar who is strictly

neutral. A scholar interested in LPP should definitely own some certain personal views on it which cannot be disguised in his/her excerpts by any means. The point to be discussed here is about the globalization and prevalence of the English language and the support that it receives from different prolific authors who have persuaded, directly or indirectly, its use to promote the goals and wishes of mother-tongue speakers of the language, since the relationship between LPP and the prevalence of English language is triggered and supported by dominant and powerful nations. It has also been taken into attention especially in Colonialism and Imperialism. To do so, the researcher has extracted some texts from different books of different known authors in the field of LPP and attempted to analyze them through a coding scheme which was developed according to a conceptual framework by Cooper [1].

The research question to be dealt with here is "Who are the powerful advocates of the English language and why have they supported it to change into a global language which makes the associated discourse critical?".

Through the coding scheme that was prepared by the researcher during data analysis, all the subtexts were coded and the following results were gained (see Table 2).

The task now is to compare the observed frequencies with expected frequencies, the frequencies that we would expect simply by chance if the 'independent variable' had no relationship to the distribution. If the area of research was not important in the coding process, then the chances would be 1/7 for each concept. Since there are 194 coded items (E = 194) in all, the frequencies expected by chance for each would be 27.8. To see if the differences between the observed frequencies and the expected frequencies are large enough to say that they are truly different, the Chi-square test (X^2) is used. As in any other statistical tests, we have to first state a null hypothesis which is "there is no support implied by LPP authors in their texts in support of the domination of English language and the eradication of indigenous languages." The X^2 test gives us a way of testing whether the difference between the observed and expected frequencies is large enough to allow us to reject the null hypothesis. We can compute the X^2 value as follows (see Table 3).

The value of X^2 critical with 6 d.f is 12.59 for the 0.05 level. Since the difference is significant the null hypothesis is rejected and we can feel confident that the data support the claim that there is an implied support by the LPP authors in favor of the domination of English language and the eradication of the indigenous languages in favor of political achievements of the powerful L1 speakers of the English language.

The result gained through statistical computation represents the willingness of English superpowers in promoting their goals via planning the language in accordance with their wishes. To ensure the reliability of the research, the researcher not only resorted to the results of the coding scheme and the statistical computations, but also, some time after analyzing the subtexts, chose some of the subtexts randomly and analyzed them again. It is noteworthy that through this intra-rater evaluation the same results were gained as well.

Table 2. Observed frequencies for each coding concept

CODES	BFmtsl	BFs/fl	BFga	BFcpa	BFdel	BFeil	BFmril
FREQUENCY	19	1	36	43	66	28	1

Table 3. Statistics for the computation of X^2

	Observed f	Expected f	O-E	(O-E)²	(O-E)²/E
BFmtsl	19	27.8	-8.8	77.44	0.39
BFS/FI	1	27.8	-26.8	718.24	3.70
BFga	36	27.8	8.2	67.24	0.34
BFcpa	43	27.8	15.2	231.04	1.19
BFdel	66	27.8	38.2	1459.24	7.52
BFeil	28	27.8	0.2	.04	0.0002
BFmril	1	27.8	-26.8	718.24	3.70
∑ 16.8402					
$X^2 = \sum (O - E)^2 / E = 16.8402$					

5. CONCLUSION

The relevant analysis demonstrated the presence of world English superpowers as the most powerful advocators of the language. These powers which are mainly Britain and the U.S.A have deliberately penetrated the nations under the mask of linguistic hegemony. They have made English the "international language" to pursue their goals of all types specifically political ones. We can begin with the process of decolonizing our minds by critically evaluating our concepts. What does "English as a world language" refer to? Only a tiny fraction of the population of most countries in the world, including those often described as "English-speaking" countries in Africa and Asia, actually speaks English meaning that terms like "English as a world language" grossly misinterpret the reality of communication experience of most of the world's population. More seriously, such terms as "global English", "Anglophone Africa", or reference to English as a "universal" lingua franca conceal the fact that the use of English serves the interests of some much better than those of others. Its use includes some and excludes others. Language "spread" is another apparently innocuous term that refers to seemingly agentless process, as though it is not people and particular interests that account for the expansion of a language. And what is "international" communication? The label "international language" was applied to planned languages like Esperanto long before English, Russian and other dominant languages were referred to as "international". Probably Dasgupta [22-23] suggests that communication between people of different nationalities would be more appropriately designated as "inter-local" since the language they use permits communication between people from different local cultures, and is in this sense inter-cultural. In much person-to-person communication, one's national or international identity is not in focus, unlike many other aspects of one's identity. Nations do not speak to nations, except in the slogans of missionary societies, bodies that had great difficulty in distinguishing between preaching the word of God and promoting the political and economic interests of their countries of origin. This was as true of missionaries 200 years ago as it is today.

There are thus many terms in the sociology of language that are grounded in implicit, covert value judgments. We need to be constantly vigilant in reflecting on the ideological load of our concepts, and how they relate to, and probably serve to underpin and legitimate a hierarchal linguistic order.

The expansion of English in recent decades has occurred simultaneously with widening gap between haves and have-nots, and with a consolidation of wealth and power globally in fewer hands. It has not suggested a direct casual link between English and processes of the global enrichment and impoverishment, but that the two are not connected, which is basically Crystal's position [14], which seems to me to be irresponsible.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Author has declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Cooper R. Language planning and social change. New York: Cambridge University Press; 1989.
2. Ricento T. Ideology, politics, and language policies-focus on English. Amsterdam: John Benjamins; 2000.
3. Phillipson R. Linguistic imperialism. Oxford: Oxford University Press;1992.
4. Kaplan RB. Language planning. University of Southern California, USA; 2013.
5. Bolinger D. Aspects of language. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich; 1975.
6. Honig B. Democracy and the foreigner. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press; 2001.
7. Fanon F. Black skin, white masks. New York: Grove Press; 1967.
8. Rahman, T. Language policy, multilingualism and language vitality in Pakistan. Published online; 2006.
9. Mukhwana A. Language planning and policy in Kenya- a case study of Kenyan cities. Saabrucken, Germany: VDM Verlag Dr. Muller. 2010;204. ISBN-978-3-639-30498-5 (paperback).
10. Iraki FK. Language and political economy: A historical perspective from Kenya. United States International University, Kenya; 2010.
11. Baldridge J. Reconciling linguistic diversity: The history and the future of language policy in India. University of Toledo Honors Thesis; 1996.

12. Skutnubb-Kangas T. Multilingualism and the education of minority children. In Skutnubb-Kangas, T, Cummins (eds.). 1988;9-44. First published in Phillipson & Skutnubb-Kangas. 1986b;42-72.
13. Aliakbari M. Linguistic imperialism, linguistic democracy and english language teaching. The International Conference on Information Technology and Universities in Asia. Chulalongkon University Press, Bangkok, Thailand; 2003.
14. Crystal D. English as a global language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1997.
15. Davis KA, Huebner T. Sociopolitical perspectives on language policy and planning in the U.S.A. Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data. 1999;16.
16. Graddol D. The Future of Englishes. In. Burns A, Coffin C (eds.). In analysing english in a global context. USA, Canada: Routledge. 2001;26-37.
17. De Swaan A. Words of the world: The global language system. Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA: Polity; 2001.
18. Samaie MA. Critical discourse analysis of Gardner's theory of attitudes and motivation. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Shiraz University; 2006.
19. Selinger HW, Shohamy E. Second language research method. Oxford University Press; 1989.
20. Pennycook A. English in the world/the world in English. In J. Tollefson (ed.). Power and inequality in language education. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1995;34-58.
21. Diamond J. Speaking with a single tongue. Discover Magazine February;1993.
22. Das Gupta J. Toward a dialogue between the sociolinguistic sciences and Esperanto culture. In H. Tonkin (ed.), Esperanto, Interlinguistics, and planned language. Lanham: University Press of America. 1997;139-170.
23. Das Gupta J. Culture, sharing and language. In R. Phillipson (ed.). Rights to language: Equity, power and education, Mahwa. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. 2000;49-51.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
http://sciencedomain.org/review-history/10195