universität
wien

DIPLOMARBEIT

Titel der Diplomarbeit

“Multilingualism and the Attention Paid to its Role in the Context of Development Co-operation”

Verfasser

Daniel Pateisky

angestrebter akademischer Grad

Magister (Mag.)

Wien, 2011

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt:	A 057 390
Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt:	Internationale Entwicklung
Betreuerin:	Univ.-Prof. Doz. Dr. Brigitta Busch

Acknowledgements

These are the first pages you read, the last I write. And this is where I arrive at the limits of my linguistic ability – to express all the time, effort, support and complicating circumstances that surrounded the writing of this thesis. And this is only page three.

The thankfulness I feel towards all persons who have been there with me, for me, around me, and whom I will always carry inside me, is immeasurable in its magnitude. I will not even attempt to verbalise what I feel for you. You know who you are.

It was very exciting to hear the interviewees talk about their project work, stories about the people they had collaborated with and the relationships they had established with individuals and communities in their field of work. I want to express my heartfelt thanks for the extensive information and feedback they provided me with, the time they took, as well as for the helpfulness and warmth they showed me.

My deep thanks go also to my supervisor, who – despite being involved in so many projects simultaneously – has taken the time to invest in the "project" that is me and my thesis as well. You are truly recognised, and I hope to be able to return all the favours in the future!

In addition, I want to mention how grateful I am for the insight, hour-long discussions, the tales told, scientific, and less scientific, yet truly emotional encounters that many have granted me. This is what has made all of it worthwhile, and it is what I deeply appreciate.

我非常感谢你们! Jestem wam wszystkim naprawdę wdzięczny! Merci pour les moments ! Faleminderit shumë! ¡Muchas gracias por todo! спасибо большое! Puno hvala! Asante sana! Meinen tiefsten Dank euch allen!

And to all the languages that know no direct translation for "Thank you": You understand.

Lastly, thank *you*, the reader, for taking the time to roughly browse through my work. I can only hope that it contains information you will find interesting and, even more importantly, that it will attract attention to the subject matter and possibly incite you to delve deeper into what can only be sketched in this paper.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements **3**
List of Acronyms **7**
Preface **8**

I. Aim of this Thesis **11**
I.1 Theoretical Approach **12**
I.2 Methodological Approach **13**

II. Necessary Definitions **14**
II.1 Language **14**
II.2 Saussure's Structuralist Distinctions **16**
II.3 Multilingualism **18**
II.4 Communication **20**
II.5 Symbol/Sign **21**
II.6 Meaning/Sinn **22**

III. Anthropological and Linguistic Precepts and Expectations in Development Studies/Co-operation **24**
III.1 Cultures, Language and Identity **24**
III.2 Linguistic Identity Construction **26**
III.3 (Meta-)Linguistic Awareness **27**
III.4 Speaker Communities **28**
III.5 Multilingualism as a Universal Aim **31**
III.6 *Linguae Francae* and their Dominance **32**
III.7 Linguistic Barriers & Verbal Alienation **34**

IV. Intercultural Communicative Processes **35**
IV.1 Interdisciplinary Hermeneutics **35**
IV.2 Epistemic Impacts **36**
IV.2.1 Universality & Episteme 37
IV.2.2 Particularities 39
IV.2.3 Subjectivity 39
IV.3 The "Mother-Tongue" **41**
IV.4 Translatability – Can We Assume the Possibility of Universal Translation? **43**
IV.5 Relevance of Intercultural Communication in International Relations **46**

V. Development Co-operation's (Dis-)Regard of Language **48**
V.1 (Mis-)Interpretation of a Key Concept **48**
V.2 The Development of "Development" as a Universal Aim **49**
V.3 Paradigmatic Shifts in Development Discourse? **53**

VI. Practical Implementation ... 56
VI.1 Accessibility of Information to Individuals ... 56
VI.1.1 DC Practitioners ... 56
VI.1.2 Awareness of Accessibility ... 56
VI.1.3 DC Beneficiaries in Respect to the Heterogeneity of Needs ... 57
VI.1.4 Methods Presently Implemented in Information Transfer ... 58
VI.2 Interviews Conducted ... 59
VI.2.1.1 Klaus Schuch ... 60
VI.2.1.2 Friedl Paz Grünberg ... 60
VI.2.1.3 Friedl Newald ... 61
VI.2.1.4 Gerhild Perlaki-Straub ... 62
VI.2.1.5 Stefanie Pilz ... 63
VI.2.1.6 Simron Jit Singh ... 63
VI.3 Interview Analysis – Categories of Connecting Argumentation ... 64
VI.3.1 Recognition of Different Realities and their Effects on Understandability ... 65
VI.3.2 Translatability of Terminology Used ... 69
VI.3.3 Awareness of Communication Problems – A Questioning of "Objectivity" ... 74
VI.3.4 Considerations for DC Implementation ... 80
VI.4 Shared Argumentation ... 85
VII. Conclusion ... 88
VIII. List of References ... 94
VIII.1 Print Sources (Monographs and Articles) ... 94
VIII.2 Online Sources (Papers, Articles and Documents) ... 108
IX. Appendix: Interview Questions ... 112
Kurzfassung ... 115
Abstract ... 115
Curriculum Vitae ... 117

List of Acronyms

DC	Development Co-operation[1]
DS	(The Scientific Discipline of) Development Studies
ELF	English as Lingua Franca
ETL	English as a Third Language
HDI	Human Development Index
HDR	Human Development Report
HR(s)	Human Right(s)
L1, L2, L3,…	Language 1 (also: “first language(s)”, “arterial language(s)”, “mother tongue(s)”, “native language(s)”), 2, 3,… (according to an individual’s knowledge/skill/chronological order of acquisition, self-image or ascription, etc.)
LF	Lingua Franca
LHR	Linguistic Human Right
MDGs	Millenium Development Goals
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
OL(s)	Official Language(s) (of a Nation)
SL	Source Language (of translation)
TL	Target Language (of translation)
UN	United Nations Organisation
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation

[1] Also: *development aid* – aid given by government agencies and NGOs in developing nations, to support economic, social, political, environmental progress. “Co-operation” implies that this process is taking place in partnership and co-determination on all sides of bi- or multilateral efforts.

Preface

> 'Man does not exist prior to language, either as a species or as an individual. We never encounter a state where man is separated from language, which he then elaborates in order to "express" what is happening within him: it is language which teaches the definition of man, not the contrary' (Barthes 1972, 135).

It has been my interest for a long time now, to take a closer look at the linguistic circumstances in our daily lives – from the interaction taking place in our private life, the ways in which we deal with each other professionally, connections between large-scale actors in national and global politics and the economy thereof, or the humanist approaches used in the world's fight against the troubles of today. Development co-operation, which is the pre-eminent humanist approach used today in said fight, has now been in practice for a long time. From the missions of churches, through purely financial support attempted by the economically stronger countries of the Global North, all the way to the ideological and empathic plans for the achievement of all peoples' self-sustenance, independence, the overcoming of hegemonic structures and achievement of fundamental equality on all levels of every individual's existence (cf. Rist 2002), DC has undergone a set of changes in the past decades.

The latest goals of the broader aspects of development co-operation include an additional focus on providing opportunities for participation to the ones on the "receiving end" of development – through their own comprehension of development. This is a notion that of course finds its primary expression in an increase of understanding within communicative processes[2], empowering the beneficiaries towards co-directing the ways in which DC practice is implemented. What can also be drawn from the cited example (f.n. this page), however, is the apparent marginality with which communication structures are addressed. The words quoted appear to be the only relatively clear principles put forward in this regard, and it becomes clear that the emphasis is put on clearly communicating which efforts are made towards the donors, not to the beneficiaries. Of course this is not to say that all of the aims mentioned do not complement each other to a

[2] 'In times of economic uncertainty, it is particularly important for aid to provide value for money, and to ensure that it is not misused. The development community has responded by sharpening its focus on corruption; *targeting and communicating clear development impacts*; working increasingly through developing countries' own systems to build capacity; and intensifying efforts in the poorest 30% of developing countries - a critical step toward achieving the MDGs. The report also describes how the DAC member countries intend to make their aid truly effective in the decades to come, by ensuring that climate change is addressed in each of their policy choices and by developing a broader, *more inclusive approach*' (OECD Development Co-operation Report 2010, emphases added by the author).

substantial degree. Underlying the communication of the *impact and aim* of development, as well as the advancement of a *more inclusive approach*, are all matters of exchange and communication. Yet each and every aspect of human interaction and cooperation is influenced by these dynamics, be they geared only towards development, or towards mutual understanding, cultural sensitivity, or a variety of other aspect.

While these ideas are all thought of in very idealistic terms and more often than not have seemingly comparable goals, they have come about in starkly differing contexts, and have oftentimes presupposed universality in their cause, which is not justified. But if we do not take into account the views of the ones whom this "help" is supposedly delivered to, the general discourse cannot be expanded to its full potential. Hence, communication has been crucial in the formulation of concurrent models for development goals that aim to provide equal opportunity of influence to both sides involved in this process – the ones providing assistance as well as the ones receiving it.

For the shaping of a mutual understanding, language – in all its varieties – is the first means of interaction that comes to mind. It serves as a common denominator, not only due to the fact that each human and every culture is working and developing his-/her-/itself on the foundation of ascribed meanings in an identification process through signification, as arbitrary as it might sometimes appear. But also in the purest and pragmatic sense of an everyday understanding on even the simplest levels of our being, can we take note of how our views about ourselves and others are shaped and restructured by language. Few people know of any other way than the exchange of words, syntax, translation and interpretation, that could lead to a deeper interaction and resulting understanding of each other (as subjective as such a notion might be, in every relativist sense).

> '*Die Grenzen meiner Sprache* bedeuten die Grenzen meiner Welt. […] Daß die Welt *meine* Welt ist, das zeigt sich darin, daß die Grenzen *der* Sprache (der Sprache, die allein ich verstehe) die Grenzen *meiner* Welt bedeuten' (Wittgenstein 1982, 85 - 5.6; 5.62; emphasis in the original).[3]

A conviction about the immense power that language has on individuals' thoughts and beliefs stands at the forefront of this research. I speak from many years of experience in multilingual environments, wherein I have witnessed how the use of one language or the other, their intelligibility, similarity or lack thereof, political/historical burden and other

[3] '*The limits of my language* mean the limits of my world. […] The world is my world: this is manifest in the fact that the limits of *language* (of that language which alone I understand) mean the limits of *my* world' (translation by Pears and McGuinness, in Wittgenstein 2001, 68; emphasis in the original).

influences effect the dispositions and outcomes of interaction. I am also working from a *structuralist* theoretical outset in linguistics, and from the point of view of linguistic analytical philosophy. Another factor influencing my analysis and the evaluation of the data collected additionally lies in the acceptance of some of the suspicions guiding the "linguistic relativity" hypothesis.[4]

It is for these reasons that I want to attempt to shed some light on the ways that we do – or do not – take into account the problems that multilingual development practice can pose.

4 The foundations of this concept were put forward by Edward Sapir, and later (in-)famously extended by Benjamin Lee Whorf, in the early 20th century (see Lucy 1997).

I. Aim of this Thesis

This thesis will deal with the issues regarding international co-operation's embeddedness in a multi-faceted, multi-national and therefore necessarily multilingual environment. I intend to highlight how languages in practice impact the planning and effects of said work. Hence, the guiding question for this assessment will be:

What awareness exists within development co-operation of the multilingual contexts within which its work takes place, and what arrangements are being made to tackle the potentially impeding circumstances, which may occur?

I would like to highlight the potential awareness, or lack thereof, that individual actors working in the field of DC have, with regard to the inherent importance of language in their interaction with each other and with the beneficiaries. It will therefore be necessary to examine documents concerning the pre-conditions for project application and evaluation by major international as well as national institutions (e.g. UNDP, UNESCO, OECD, ADA), which provide the set of rules by which organisations actively participate in the development field and produce policies. Criteria catalogues appear to list many fundamental ideas that should lie at the core of co-operation and guarantee adherence to its principles, yet language[5] does not seem to show up in these documents. As such, these are the additional issues and resulting secondary questions I seek to address in the course of this research:

1. Are anthropological and linguistic inquiries into the field that DC finds itself operating in[6] reflected in the current DC policy focus, and furthermore in the practical experience of interaction between development actors and beneficiaries?
2. What are parameters paid attention to in institutional (and actors‘) conception (e.g. political correctness, sustainability, equity regarding gender, religion etc.), and does language play an essential role? If not: why?
3. Do all participants have egalitarian access to sources of information, collected data, project communication and operation in terms of comprehensibility and any necessary translations? Which aspects of work and planning require the service

[5] I.e. the work in a multilingual environment and the difficulty of communicating ideas.

[6] I.e. inquiries investigated by theorists like Claude Lévi-Strauss, Clifford Geertz, Jacques Derrida and many others.

of multilingual mediators, and what are the difficulties they find themselves confronted with?

4. Of what significance is the budgeting of interpretation and translation in this context?
5. Which sort of language is being used in development co-operation's communication system? To what extent does it pose a threshold of access to meanings and goals conveyed (catch phrases and rhetoric as possible instruments of manipulation; technical terminology leading to emptiness in meaning)? What ideological concepts are being transported by this practice in interpersonal exchange?
6. Are workers in the development field aware of the power that rests within language? It would be of interest to inspect (a) whether some of them see problems in the imposition of a hegemonic language on people in segregate speech communities; (b) which language-related difficulties they find themselves confronted with; (c) how NGO workers deal with beneficiaries and access information in environments in which they cannot utilise a language they are familiar with.

I.1 Theoretical Approach

This thesis will rely first and foremost on Saussurean perspectives of structural linguistics, drawn from an assumption of reality constituted by linguistic means and oftentimes hindered in its possibilities by just these. However, I also want to refer to a few post-structuralist, post-colonial thinkers' approaches (e.g. Claude Lévi-Strauss, Jacques Derrida and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak), as well as analytical philosophers like Ludwig Wittgenstein, Richard Rorty[7] and John Searle. Post-development thought encapsulates much of this work's critical perspective on "development" and its (limited) possibilities for improving livelihood, as well as any expectations we might have of it. All linguistic theses are drawn from a wide range of persons' work in the field. Language's definition, form, function, the combination of languages, their influence on identity construction, political planning and the human rights discourse, and of course on the methods and the-

[7] E.g. biographical and demoscopic narrative, therefore also narrative theory, with regard to not only individuals but entire groups of humans.

ory of translation, its feasibility and limitations, are all aspects of theory that I want to take into account in the analysis of this diploma thesis' empirical data. It is in this research's interest to examine whether any inconsistencies appear in the comparison of the terminology ans aims prescribed by DC institutions, and how these are eventually put into action.

I.2 Methodological Approach

Grounded theory (Glaser 1978; Strauss and Corbin 1997) is going to guide me in how I refer to and implement the data collected, as well as the theories I want to rely on, and the evaluation of the impact that my empirical data shall have on its interpretation. Vice versa, the qualitative (semi-structured) expert interviews and answers collected for this thesis have influenced my tentative original view and have generated a new, differentiated approach.

> 'All research is interpretive; it is guided by the researcher's set of beliefs and feelings about the world and how it should be understood and studied' (Denzin and Lincoln 2005, 22).

Most of what scientific researchers, including myself, are collecting as empirical data is inescapably run through the mind of each single person involved, before it can be put on paper as "a conclusion to be drawn". It is therefore necessary to, at the least, retain a constant awareness of why some ideas are framed into certain, implicitly qualifying wording and put into specific contexts, and what influences, relationships and beliefs have led one to go about it in this manner.

Empirically, I am working with interviews I have conducted with experts, i.e. representatives and participants in office and fieldwork of Austrian and other NGOs. This adds an element of subjective impressions to the purely textual analysis of documents that has also been conducted, in order to gain insight into how practical aspects of work are influenced by language policies and theoretical requirements. These interviews are put to use with the intention of making more palpable just how individuals might have interpreted the language-related problems in practical DC work, and what suggestions for improvement they have come to draw from these experiences.

II. Necessary Definitions

II.1 Language

The nature of this work calls for an understanding of just what it is that we mean when we use the term "language", given that we need to rely on this term throughout the course of the following analysis. I intend to follow the definition both in respect of human language's form of realisation (acoustic, visual, spatial, written) as well as the function of language (what it intends and conveys). Means of linguistic expression in this work refer to verbal utterances in spoken, written and/or signed form.

One way of defining what language is consists in describing it in inclusive terms (i.e. sounds, words, sentences and so forth), whereas another way sets language's borders more broadly, describing it in a holistic manner as 'a system of communicating' (cf. Lier 2008). Therefore, language could be (1) the general system of speech used and created by human beings and resulting purely from their social interaction, and which is applicable within the entirety of the human race. It could also relate to the (2) communicative systems of certain groups of humans sharing either a common *natural language* (such as Arabic, Swahili, Mandarin or Xhosa) or a specific language within a larger natural framework (diplomatic language, scientific language, sign language, a constructed/planned language, etc.), necessitating a shared knowledge among speakers and recipients of all propositions uttered. Arguing against a single language's homogeneity[8] is the understanding of "heteroglossia", which finds its best explanation in the statement that '[…] at any given time, in any given place, there will be a set of conditions – social, historical, meteorological, physiological – that will ensure that a word uttered in that place and at that time will have a meaning different than it would have under any other conditions' (Bakhtin 1981, 428). This description shall spare me further elaboration on that topic. Language could just as well stand for (3) a system of coding and decoding in a wider sense, implying fundamental semiotic processes of sending and receiving which take place with every act of information transfer – involving an ongoing process of change with regard to its sounds, form and meaning.

[8] This homogeneity is implied by Saussure's structuralism as well, aiming for the construction of linguistic universals (see section III.2). These universals have been additionally elaborated on, and attempts have been made to expand them to practical human interaction, in the works of Lévi-Strauss (see ibid.).

I would like to refer, in addition, to more than just natural languages when using the term. French, Spanish and Italian, for instance, make a clear distinction in the nouns referring to language, something less apparent in German and English: fr. “langage” – “langue”; ital. “linguaggio” – “lingua”; span. “lenguaje” – “lengua/idioma”; etc. Thereby a distinction is made between what is commonly made clear in German/English through the use or no use of a definite article (*die* Sprache; *a* language) – that between language in a more general sense and its many shapes, and between specific languages and/or types of a language. Therefore, the meaning of “Sprache”, the German equivalent, needs to be made explicit by means of syntactic contextualisation and additional description (cf. Lyons 1992, 12 ff.).

To list a few exemplary definitions, I shall start with that of Bloch and Trager, who have put particular weight on the social function of language in establishing it as ‘a system of arbitrary vocal symbols by means of which a group cooperates’ (1942, 5). It is therefore primarily viewed as a tool serving human individuals as members of larger groups, a tool for exchange, serving a social function first and foremost. A more cultural studies-oriented view is provided by Robert A. Hall in his *ESSAY ON LANGUAGE* (1968, 158), in which he describes language as “an institution” for communication through as well as interaction among people, with particular focus being put on its ‘oral-auditory arbitrary symbols’ in their dual role, involving the speaker and the listener simultaneously (ibid.; cf. Lyons 1992, 14 f.), i.e. the sender and the recipient of a phonetic signal.

Edward Sapir gave a description of language as ‘a purely human and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions and desires by means of voluntarily produced symbols’ (1921, 17). Notions purported within this definition call for explanation as of themselves, since “desires”, “emotions” and “ideas” tend to be contextually interpreted in quite differing manners. Another problematic aspect of his definition lies in the implicit assumption of language being purely human[9] and non-instinctive (e.g. Chomsky’s hypothesis of an ‘I-language’ would speak for the opposite). At the same time, the far-reaching description leaves enough space for the inclusion of many languages and other communicative systems (cf. Lyons 1992, 13; Chomsky 2006), such as sign-language, body-language, etc. (see above).

A common thread shared by the definitions listed above lies in the presumption of language’s arbitrariness, of the voluntary method whereby humans have started applying

[9] Can we definitely pre-suppose that it is limited to the human species?

certain sounds and combinations thereof, as well as symbols depicting those sounds[10], to describe states of reality and and metaphysics going much further than e.g. mentioning where in space object X is to be found. We cannot use language, i.e. speak it, without using a linguistic system, *a* language. It can therefore be concluded that the one thing most scientists agree on is that language(s) appear(s) to have come about in mysterious ways, with no systematic structure quite binding everything together. I am referring to the construct of language as a whole, a human tool (exclusively?) that pervades every aspect of our existence and bears on how we relate to one another. The foundation of the discipline of philology lies in shedding light on why certain parts of speech have developed the way they did, what common ancestry these linkages might express, and why it is that patterns of phonology, syntax, semantics etc. have emerged to form what appears "normal" to us today. It is therefore rather concerned with the question of *what* has come into existence specifically, not so much with the *why* of language's use in general and – more importantly – what *can be communicated* through it and what cannot. The question regarding communicatability, in the conveyance of ideas and development goals in specific project settings, is what will be paid particular attention to in the following.

Bourdieu ascribes the power of things spoken to the institutional framework in which statements are delivered, rather than seeing it as residing within the formulation/meaning of specific words we use and the connotation we project on them (cf. Bourdieu 1990, 48 ff.). Language could therefore always be interpreted as a "political unit" (ibid.), and its formality, or informality, could very often be the result of strategic planning and manipulation, rather than natural development. It becomes apparent later in this work, that any political power carried by language(s) is implicit, and linguistic interaction is therefore not to be thought of without political connotation.

II.2 Saussure's Structuralist Distinctions

Through a self-established structuralist prism, Ferdinand de Saussure, in his influential *COURS DE LINGUISTIQUE GÉNÉRALE* (1989, 24 ff.), views *langage* in more than one way, while acknowledging the fact that it is something constituting social reality[11]. In founding structuralism, he ascribes three qualities to language: Firstly, the selection of words corresponding to meanings is *arbitrary*, and therefore can in no way be argued to be

[10] See Saussure's *First Principle of Linguistics*: 'The linguistic sign is arbitrary' (Saussure 1983, 67 f.).

[11] This position stands in opposition to that of Sigmund Freud's, and therefore later Jacques Lacan's, psychoanalytical view (cf. Laffal 1964).

"appropriate".[12] Secondly, emphasis is put on the *relationality* of words, seeing as almost no term can be used irrespective of others in the definition of its identity. This is expressed most clearly in dichotomies such as "male" – "female", "light" – "dark", "good" – "bad", etc., qualifying expressions impossible to describe in their contextual interpretation without reference to the *difference* between them[13] and their respective opposite.[14] And thirdly, since language *constitutes our world*, viz. constructs, and not just reflects it, meaning is something that we as its human speakers project into it, and that it is *not* contained[15] within its words as such (cf. Barry 2009, 40 ff.). What appears most noteworthy to me in the structuralist view of language is how it puts weight on the relation and difference among / between linguistic entitities (cf. Lyons 1992, 198 ff.), and not so much on those entities themselves, even though it might suggest more of an implicit structure than there can ultimately be discovered.

Despite successfully attempting to constitute an interpretation of language as an assembly of signs in a semiotic understanding – Saussure already speaks of "sémiologie" (Saussure 1983, 15 f.), and he ascribes to language the most important role among all systems of code developed by humankind – he was profusely regretting the superficiality, with which this particular type of code is viewed by both the general public and scientists (cf. Rorty 1991, 35–46). Language is to be viewed not only as pure nomenclature, but also in light of how it allows for cultural understanding and self-perception, its dependence on the individuals' and the masses' will, communication analysis, etc. In the end, this leads to a necessity for distinguishing language as an object of research for psychologists and linguists/semiologists in equal parts, but with very differing points of focus.

A distinction is made between (1) *langue* (language), referring to a language system and the abstract ideas expressed in linguistic terminology, yet inaccessible to a language's speakers, and (2) *parole* (speech), the palpable connection between what is described as a combination of signifier and signified – how all of it is eventually put to use (ibid.).

[12] Exceptions such as the onomatopoeic 'hiss' or 'cuckoo' are not to be found in every language or word.

[13] An idea of the world being perceived by humans in binary terms has been famously carried into another discipline, as *structural anthropology* (cf. Lévi-Strauss 1963). Such a perspective appears understandably simplistic from today's point of view. I do not want to go down that same path and construe entirely universal theories based solely on linguistic appraisals.

[14] Saussure's example of a train's identity demonstrates perfectly well this relational, differential constitution: Its engine, carriages, driver, passengers may change daily, it might not even leave at precisely the same time each day, it might even be sometimes replaced by a bus due to repair works, yet it would leave between a certain time and another with the same destination, making it appear to be the same to us (see Saussure 1983, 108 f.).

[15] This is something best demonstrated by the well-known connotative distinction between the two descriptions "terrorist" and "freedom fighter".

Noam Chomsky referred to these two concepts of language and speech as *I[nternal]-Language* and *E[xternal]-Language*, i.e. an autonomous model of language with its own (abstract) logic and a contextualised language, implemented in everyday usage, social function and human behaviour – but more on this is to follow in the sections below. He does not take the distant route through a language/world isomorphism (cf. Furmuzachi 2005, 9), but goes further with reference to universal grammar(s) and rules which could be drawn from comparative observation. However, he thoughtfully does not take the daring step towards presuming that language acquisition would therefore be a purely technical process requiring only a given amount of time (Chomsky 2006, 163). When in practice, a certain level of understanding beyond grammatical structure could never be eluded.

Another relevant factor with regard to mutability and language shift is summed up very well by Saussure: 'Whoever creates a language controls it only so long as it is not in circulation. From the moment when it fulfils its mission and becomes the property of everyone, control is lost' (Saussure 1983, 76). And herein lies one of the chief challenges for every person involved in matters of linguistic rights, linguistic equality and the formulation of commonly understood systems of signs. A language can never be expected to remain unchanged, even over the timeframe of one generation. And for this reason many people in the field of linguistics and translation will always be required for the documentation of changes taking place, and for the timely recognition of the adjustments needed.

II.3 Multilingualism

While many people in the global West have a tendency to presume that they represent the majority of the world's population if they are used to routinely speaking only one language in their daily interactions, they are much rather the exception than the norm. With an estimated 6000 languages spoken globally (cf. Crystal 2010, 42), most speakers are using at least two, if not more, languages in their daily interaction with neighbours, in their work environment, and sometimes even when talking to members of different generations within one family. Even monolingual communities can be recognised as having a variety of language forms that are made use of, if we take into account di-/polyglossia[16], local and regional dialects, relationships between speakers and a multitude of other factors that consciously or unknowingly factor into how individuals come

[16] I.e. different speech coding used depending on the environment one is communicating in.

to verbally express themselves. Just as important as this outside view on language is its function of providing a subjective constitution of identity. Language not only tells us where the person speaking might be from geographically, but can also make plain to see what her social background, possible beliefs (political, religious), level of income and education, descent, etc. might be (ibid.). It is due to this complexity that the discipline of sociolinguistics has come into existence[17], as interaction between speakers is more often than not guided by thinking in terms of *in-* and *outgroups*. This again can lead to resistance towards an acceptance of linguae francae or any outside languages of commerce, standardisation of language in the respective education system and the media, and willingness to learn additional means of communication. It has also frequently been used as a tool in political struggles for autonomy.[18]

Thus it is in almost every situation of interaction between speaker communities[19] and the individual humans in them that the use of more than one language of communication can be witnessed. I intend to use the idea of plurilingualism/multilingualism when talking about the communication between speakers of *different natural languages*, who are correspondingly unable to reach a situation of *mutual intelligibility* (Crystal 1997, 253), and would therefore have to employ a common foreign language or an interpreter.

There exist many definitions for multilingualism depending on the measurement criteria employed. These are ranging from describing the speakers as (1) (origin-oriented) developmental multilinguals, (2) orientation in competence in two or more languages, (3) (functionality-oriented) definitions of use for individuals or communities, all the way to (4) sociological/psychological demeanour the speaker is showing towards the languages used – often a matter of identification (Skutnabb-Kangas 1984, 81; see also: Jessner 2006, 10). I am approaching the topic with particular weight put on definitions (2), (3) and (4), as these are of particular importance in institutional and political environments, and in communicative settings *without* the participants' *common knowledge*.

Another important question with regard of multilingualism is whether the speakers of multiple languages are able to perceive more information communicated (explicitly or implicitly), and can therefore arrive at a different understanding (cf. Fuss, Albacete, and

---

[17] For an illuminating study of the intense linguistic social stratification in New York city alone, see (Labov 1964; Labov 1972). Also, for a sociolinguistic assessment of Greek speakers, see (Frangoudaki 1992).

[18] E.g. the Basque population in Spain; French Québec in Canada; choice of Swahili as official language when Tanzania achieved its independence; and many other examples which could be listed here (cf. Blommaert 1997; Williams 1991).

[19] For a definition of speaker communities, see section IV.4.

Monter 2003) of reality than monolinguals would. Can social realities be grasped more clearly by means of linguistic interpretation? Are hierarchical structures and customs of interaction made understandable with the help of many languages? Is *any* true understanding of a social reality ultimately possible? These questions I shall return to in the conclusion of this thesis.

II.4 Communication

As has often found mention in the publications of psychological and communication sciences (among others), practically all human interaction – negotiation of intentions, roles and positions, employment of vocalisation and other linguistic media as well as the absence of their use – can eventually lead to communication among humans.[20] What we refer to specifically as the transfer of information between a sender and a recipient, can happen by means that are intentional, and just as much through unintentional paths. This transfer is adjusted by either making apparent to outside observers what the individual(s) on the transmitting end of a communicative chain was/were unable to conceal, or (as can be observed in most instances) by the recipients endowing what is being transmitted with their own views and interpretations, as meaning is not clearly "embodied" in what might have been said (cf. Kadric, Kaindl, and Kaiser-Cooke 2010, 41 ff.; Beaugrande 1994).

The Latin term *communicare* can be translated as "sharing", "letting have a share in" or "having one join in". Hence it stands to reason, that the entities communicating allow for the sharing of their respective ideas, wishes and other notions. One of the most important aspects with regard to translational work, as can be witnessed in later chapters, lies in the distinction between two parts in language as the most commonly used communication tool: semantics and pragmatics. Semantics is concerned primarily with the immediate 'meaning' of words expressed in syntactic and grammatical structures, whereas translators find themselves dealing with pragmatic aspects of statements more than with the textbook rules and regulations of a given language (see Kadric, Kaindl, and Kaiser-Cooke 2010, 49 ff.). Who are the persons in the exchange, what circumstances come into play that led to it taking place, what might the participants be attempting to cover, to emphasise or put in an intended light, which means of communication are put to use, who are the addressees, etc. (ibid.)?

[20] It is apparent of course that the focus in this work is put by and large on *language* in speech, writing and its other forms of expression.

It is the whole range of communicative patterns, but first and foremost the ones relevant to interlingual translation that I would like to refer to in this thesis.

II.5 Symbol/Sign

The term “symbol” is overdetermined these days, much like “culture”.[21] It is being used to refer to a great number of things, and these symbols tend to be misnamed and utilised for any set of events, objects, and qualities and their serving as “vehicles for conception”.[22] Certain words in their contextual use express some ideas that such a word by itself could never hold. ‘They are all symbols, or at least symbolic elements, because they are tangible formulations of notions, abstractions from experience fixed in perceptible forms, concrete embodiments of ideas, attitudes, judgments, longings, or beliefs’ (Geertz 1966, 7f.). Numbers, images, linguistic morphemes and scientific as well as religious terms are able to assign notions to things expressed through language, often even deciding how parts of reality are going to be perceived by humans involved in interaction[23] (cf. Fausey et al. 2010), and over which attitude will come to bear even before such encounters take place.

Even though Saussure might have thought ‘that language is nothing more than a particular case of the sign’ (Godel 1957, 44), it still holds unparalleled power in the constitution of reality[24]. For it is to language and its systems that we ascribe the ultimate power of expression, when relating to our own ideas of truth, falsehood, identity, distinction, descripition, interpretation and imagination. Hence, we would not be able to make ourselves understood if it were not for *shared* signs and symbols, of which we expect common understanding with our counterparts in communication. And it is partly because of this phenomenon that many have already dealt with the symbolic systems in our world,

---

[21] A contemporary of Saussure’s, the Polish-born linguist Jan (Niecisław Ignacy) Baudouin de Courtenay (1845-1929), who has not reached the same level of popularity, yet is considered equally influential by many, found himself midway in the nature vs. culture debate – perceiving language as an organic part of humanity as well as a cultural product.

[22] As such, a cross can become the expression of centuries of persecution and a foundation of true faith, while a slight change in its shape again, turning said cross into a swastika, can carry an entirely different connotation.

[23] All signs could also be perceived as “lies”, constantly pretending to be something they themselves are not – an idea famously coined by Umberto Eco (1994).

[24] One way of putting particular weight on its constitution of not just social but further individual reality and identity – as the chicken-and-egg-question has it, this might just as well be put into the opposite order –, is expressed in making explicitly subjective the ascription of a sign in the process of “objectivation”. On this evidence, it is primarily in the “vis-à-vis situation” (inter-personal exchange) that humans come to experience themselves as verifying their own existence and identity through vocal expression, mirroring in the other(s) and reflection emanating from this sequence (cf. P. L. Berger and Luckmann 2000, 38 ff.).

and how they influence what we perceive to be the only genuine expression possible for describing all of our existence.[25]

As mentioned by Umberto Eco in his analysis of translatory processes, there are at least three different types of semiotic transference (Eco 2006, 267 f.): “interlingual translation”, “intralingual translation” and “intersemiotic translation” (see Jakobson 2008, 28 ff.). The first is used in reference to what is commonly understood as the translation of a statement from one language into its immediate equivalent in another; an ‘interpretation of verbal signs through signs of another language’ (ibid.). The second and third are used to describe what happens when the signs previously used for description of one circumstance are put into a different *wording* (“intralingual rewording”, e.g. making use of available synonyms) or *rephrasing* a statement by non-verbal, non-linguistic semantic system (“intersemiotic translation”), such as film, images, movement, etc. It is this *transmutation* of signs[26] that is implemented in today’s development co-operation in particular[27], seeing how ideas and suggestions are being conveyed between all the DC’s stakeholders.

II.6 Meaning/Sinn

De Saussure has made less of a distinction between whether a word “has” a meaning of its own, or whether it “contains”, i.e. transports meaning. Yet in this respect, I would like to shed some light on these two disparate conceptions, which I see as follows:

Every 1) thought, turned into 2) a spoken word/sequence of words, and in its later conversion made 3) a written word/sequence of words is to be understood as *per se* conveying ideas along each step of this process of transformation. It is therefore *not* insignificant, at which of these steps we enter a communicative process, because a seamless transfer of denotation, much less connotation, cannot necessarily be taken as a given. This is one of the important assertions made in this work, as the question of all interpre-

---

[25] (among others, see Benedict 2005; Bourdieu 1990; Butler and Spivak 2007; Duranti 1997; Derrida 1998; Foucault 2007; Frege 1978; Habermas 2006; Geertz 2003; Geertz 1966; Gottdiener 1995; Hacking 2001; S. Hall 2007; Kristeva 1981; Pavlenko 2006; Quine 1975; Saussure 2003; Whorf 2008; Wierzbicka 1995; F. M. Wimmer 2004; Wittgenstein 1953)

[26] Post-structuralism goes as far as stating that a process of *de-centring* of meaning is why ‘classical thought concerning structure could say that the center is, paradoxically, *within* the structure and *outside* it’ (see Derrida 2003).

[27] I intend to make use of the word “symbol” only with reference to the *signifier* and the s*ignified*, the former being a word associated (in an ideal setting of mutual understanding) with the abstract concept of the latter. “Symbol” (and “sign”, interchangeably) is therefore to be understood as one term for the signifier, and it more often than comes into use with reference to the technical terminology prevailing globally in development co-operation today (cf. Linschinger 2009).

tation relates to how an individual along the line of an interactive process perceives her own role, how that role and the thoughts behind it are different from that of the vis-à-vis, and how much insight into the others' position and background she has, allowing for empathic understanding. The entering of communication takes place in the second of the steps mentioned above, and it is at this point that the most immediate, emotionally laden and individually tangible expression comes into existence.

Gottlob Frege has made relatively clear the distinction between a word's "Sinn" and its "Bedeutung".[28] While "Bedeutung" can plainly imply the denotation of a signifier, the specific interpretation of something expressed in the recipients' minds, "Sinn" covers a slightly wider spectrum, including sense, something's object or semantic signification. The two terms are are commonly both perceived of as homonyms related to "meaning".Frege described the general process of signification (2002, 26f.) – hereby engaging "Bedeutung" – as being "culturally specific", with this particular emphasis also expandable to different speakers and recipients, not only groups of them. The semantic "Sinn"/sense would thereby exist independently, with terms' real world importance inherent only in individual interpretations, termed "Vorstellungen" (conceptions) by Frege. John Stuart Mill referred to this distinction with the words 'denotation' (the literal/dictionary meaning of a word) and 'connotation' (connoting the qualities usually associated with these entities) (Lyons 1977, chapter 7). It is in these *conceptions* that I would like to carry my argumentation on terminology used today, since they are what is the most immediate, the perceivable and individually palpable of language, consciously accessible to humans.

[28] At the same time, we are hereby met with an exemplary problematic point in translation of abstract (philosophical) terminology between German and English, as the two expressions are well documented as being translatable (cf. Ke 1999) in many forms, e.g.: As much as his political views and affiliations are to be profoundly questioned, Heidegger's *SEIN UND ZEIT* (1927) was a landmark of theoretical shifts in continental philosophy in the early 1900s (cf. Wiredu 2010, 31). It brought into question humans' primary unreflected engagement with the world, before a conscious interaction with and through objects even becomes possible. Such an interaction would refer to language as much as other instances outside the Self. When attempting translation of the terminology first introduced in strict contextualisation, the transfer from German to English – despite the languages relative proximity in linguistic relation – already brought with it considerable challenges (cf. Ciocan 2005). It is easy to imagine how many more problems arose from attempts to transfer the text into the realities of speech communities whose cultures and linguistic structures were even further removed from that of the SL.

III. Anthropological and Linguistic Precepts and Expectations in Development Studies/Co-operation

III.1 Cultures, Language and Identity

Language has been described as a signifying practice encoding meaning into interpretable symbols and signs. These speech symbols' interpretation by the members of a society (a "culture") takes place independent of whether communicated systems appear in the form of speech or writing, as it is founded in common experience and shared notions resulting from it. The intention/representation of an act can be read similarly by all members of such a grouping, and shared "cultural meaning" is perceived in many different media (cf. S. Hall 2007). Yet Ram Adhar Mall (1998) sets right the concept of culture many seem to "intrinsically" carry within: A culture being a set of qualities contingent only to itself, unshared with others. Any sort of insularity ascribed to a given culture would thereby have the negative effect of disuniting members of differing cultural groupings, as it implies the "conspicuous" definition everyone knows, but no one is able to elaborate all that clearly when eventually asked directly.

Gottdiener (1995, 6) makes explicit one of the reasons for my prior mention of Saussurean perspectives on the 'bifacial unity of signifier and signified' and the way their relation evokes certain socialised associations: 'The system of meanings and their words, along with general rules of combination and protocols of usage, are known as language. Hence, language is a structure which codifies words and their meanings' (ibid.). How the circumstances of language and word creation as well as the social surroundings and institutional background can be intertwined was not yet clearly recognised in Saussurean theory, as Saussure was concerned rather with philological universals than stopping to reflect further on instrumental implications.

Aspects of world-view influenced by the language used have been called into question linguistically ever since Humboldt's first ventures into the terrain[29] with such ideas (perceived at the time as groundbreaking) as the Sapir-Whorf-hypothesis (e.g. see Kay and Kempton 1984). This radical idea of "linguistic relativity" is not holding well in today's scientific community – despite some of the underlying ideas being accepted as valid in

[29] See his text in Hoffmann (2010, 18–24).

social sciences[30] – as practical examples for proving such a hypothesis are much harder to be found than instances disproving the presumption (see G. Deutscher 2010, 129 ff.). However, despite our certainty of much of the seeming arbitrariness that many of these arguments were later exposed to be founded on, it is true that much of the communication between persons of differing backgrounds – with no insight into each other's – results from assumptions of commonality. The well-intended, yet ultimately detrimental, tentative approximation of mutual understanding furthermore serves as a veil covering the possible foreignness of the suppositions which were intended to be the exchange's leitmotif.[31]

In general education and language teaching in particular, a high level of awareness of "cultures" (i.e. the realities that speaker communities find themselves part of)[32] needs to be taken into account by teachers and learners alike. Emphasis on this aspect could play an equally substantial role in the language training that DC practitioners receive, if they do, before engaging in fieldwork (more on this will follow in the section on interviews conducted).

> 'Culture in language learning is not an expendable fifth skill, tacked on, so to speak, to the teaching of speaking, listening, reading, and writing. It is always in the background, right from day one, ready to unsettle the good language learners when they expect it least, making evident the limitations of their hard-won communicative competence, challenging their ability to make sense of the world around them' (Kramsch 2000, 1).

The (clinically pathologising) perspective sees in this a notably fragile feature of our selves, considering how amnesia and aphasia can lead to the "destruction" of just these parts of memory at the earliest stage, effecting a loss of words characteristic of one's own life, which are not shared with other individuals (cf. Hacking 2001, 270 ff.). Others (cf. Pavlenko 2002; Rorty 1991) have particularly stressed the function that language serves in identity construction by means of narrative construction.

---

[30] One such fundamental premise sustains the position that '[…] no two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality' (Sapir 1985, 69).

[31] As extreme examples I would like to refer to the Whorfian viewpoint that in Western European speaker communities time is perceived 'as linear sequence and vectorial motion' on divergent axes, subordinant to the grammatical structures and verbs the Western languages bestow upon their speakers. Similarly, linguistic indication of the agent's gender and its absence are sometimes viewed as inhibiting even the possibility for any calls for equality among the sexes (cf. Steiner 1998, 137).

[32] In other depictions (cf. Geertz 2003; Geertz 1977), anthropologically dealing with culture has been described as a recognition of its *semantic valence*, i.e. symbols, their interrelation, and the exclusion of certain symbols; its *historical character*, i.e. the result of an epistemological transfer along generations; its *public character*, i.e. the use of shared forms of expression; and its *orienting function*, i.e. the guidance it can deliver.

III.2 Linguistic Identity Construction

Identities have always been using language as one of their speakers' most telling signs of community. It is therefore hardly surprising that up to this day, even political conflicts are waged by means of, or at least partially justified through the argumentation of linguistic diversity.[33] Even though identity comes into existence through discursive practice, there are a multitude of other contributing factors influencing its coming into existence (cf. Mendoza-Denton 2002). Eventually what is recognised as affirmed identity by the surrounding onlookers provides the subjects or groups in question with the affirmation of existence they require. Today's society focuses strongly on a human being's individuality and consequently implies a monological acquisition of her identity, while overlooking the 'dialogical character of human existence' (Taylor and Gutmann 1994, 21). The (communitarian) conclusion drawn from this presumption would lead us to agree that only through the acquisition of a range of languages we could come to understand the identity of ourselves as well as that of others (see ibid.). Yet we could never overcome the post-structuralist 'notion of self as fluid, fragmented and multiple […], challenging the essentialist notions of self, deconstructing various ethnic, national, colonial, and gender identities, creating new discourses of hybridity and multiplicity […]' (Pavlenko 2001, 339). This serves as the antagonist in the debate on whether we will ever be able to assume the possibility of grasping *an* identity. It would indeed provide for argumentation that leads us to stop our search for a *real* identity as such and let us accept the unfathomable number of identities flowing through us in the course of a lifetime.

For one, the direct confrontation with an opposite entity, i.e. another person, leads to apprehension about oneself, with all the uniqueness and difference implied. At the same time, it is this encounter that makes visible to us the hidden similarity and common ground, which might have gone unnoticed otherwise, had we not plunged into the verbal exchange. The insight into linguistic structure and context gained from all such interaction, has been fittingly recorded by J.W. Goethe in his words:

> 'Wer fremde Sprachen nicht kennt, weiß nichts von seiner eigenen' (2006, 91).[34]

Just as it is with apprehension of linguistic systems, the recognition of the other can result in an increased closeness in human relation(s) and emotional traceability[35] among

[33] See e.g. the separatist movements in Canada's French-speaking Québec, Spain's Basque region (cf. Williams 1991) or the People's Republic of China's north-western province of Xinjiang, where before Mandarin's arrival (Turkic) Uyghur was and still remains the prevalent language.

[34] 'Whoever does not know foreign languages, knows nothing of his own' (author's translation).

individuals and groupings (Wierzbicka 1995; Wierzbicka 2003; cf. Allen 2003; Kinginger 2006; Pavlenko 2006). It is through the dialogical method[36] and constant exchange that we come to see ourselves as searching for outside acknowledgement and acceptance. What is language has been created by its speakers, what we speak has been given names and spoken by others before us. Language(s) can therefore never be understood as a factor in human existence ever prevailing without regard to the exigence of its contextualisation. We as persons are similarly integrated into all surrounding circumstances, social strata and historical narratives.[37] Hence language *per se* can never be viewed as an entity that could arise outside human interaction.

III.3 (Meta-)Linguistic Awareness

It has been attempted by linguists and educational planners to make apparent to "experts" in development aid, that they needed to at least acquire some skills of language and knowledge of the surroundings they go into when taking on field assignments (see Vermeer, Walz, and Klebes 1963). Yet we have come a long way since the 1960s, and fortunately the handling of this subject matter has (at least in theory) become more sensitive than merely quickly briefing the "development aid worker"[38] (ibid.: 15) in question before sending her out into the field.

As the terminology of this thesis is full of references to awareness and consciousness of problems (potentially or *ad hoc*) arising in the field of development co-operation, it is important to note what is meant by these expressions in a linguistic sense. Jessner (2006, 40 f.) briefly presents the descriptions and distinctions – mostly psycholinguistic ones, yet expandable to this specific field – made by Carl James (1999) in his reflections on language awareness and curricular planning. She presents the distinction within terminology as a fourfold spectrum, i.e. language awareness, linguistic awareness, metalinguistic awareness and knowledge about language. The argumentation cited goes as follows:

> 'LA [Language awareness] is broadly constituted of a mix of knowledge of language in general and in specific, command of metalanguage (standard or ad

---

[35] This deepened understanding of a people's communicative culture, consisting of an 'ensemble of texts' interpreted by scientists [i.e. "read" by outsiders, who are not the intended addressees], is what Clifford Geertz (2003, 259) has referred to as "deep play".

[36] As mentioned earlier, see (Taylor and Gutmann 1994).

[37] For views on textual analysis and (self-)investigation into how very personal lines of thought have been expressed in writing by many relevant modern theorists and can be deduced by the reader – taking into account even very ‚typical' cultural styles of thinking and text production – see (Corngold 1994).

[38] German: "Entwicklungshelfer"

> hoc), and the conversion of intuitions to insight and then beyond metacognition. There are two versions of LA. […] The first kind, LA as cognition, works from the outside in, so to speak: one first learns about language or something about a language that one did not know before. You can stop here, in which case you have done some linguistics. Or you can go on and turn this 'objective' knowledge towards your own language proficiency, making comparisons and adjustments. This is to personalise the objective knowledge gained. The second variant, LA as metacognition, works in the opposite direction: one starts with one's own intuitions and through reflection relates these to what one knows about language as an object outside of oneself. […] I shall refer to the first as *Consciousness-Raising* and to the second as *Language Awareness* proper' (ibid.: 97ff.; emphasis in the original).

The second source quoted by Jessner, which is of great relevance with respect to DC agents' routine and interaction among each other and with the beneficiaries in each respective case, is an article (Malakoff 1992) on translation ability in natural bilinguals. It argues that 'metalinguistic awareness allows the individual to step back from the comprehension or production of an utterance in order to consider the *linguistic form* and *structure* underlying the meaning of an utterance'. The individual in question is therefore prone to reach perspicuity in her understanding and interpretation of what is communicated on both sides. And this awareness would allow her knowledge about 'how to approach and solve certain types of problems which themselves demand certain cognitive and linguistic skills' (ibid.: 518). This leads back to my initial contention.

Bi- and multilingual individuals are prevalent in all of international DC's practical work, many of them being used for tasks of translation and interpretation, but rarely is their potential to recognise conscientiously what can or cannot be understood without elucidating some of the more obscure terminology harnessed. They are expected to work by means of literal translation and introduction of foreign terminology, rather than to shed light on what the other side may or may not be able to understand and, what is more, come to elaborate mutual understanding through communicative sensitivity training. This is wherein I see additional chances for improvement being passed up.

III.4 Speaker Communities

> 'Wenn ein Löwe sprechen könnte, wir könnten ihn nicht verstehen'[39] (Wittgenstein 1953, 223).

The groups of speakers using a shared code in language, i.e. a *standard language* in their respective setting (cf. Crystal 1997, 83), allow for mutual comprehensibility among speakers of a given language variety. These rules govern how primarily oral, but also

[39] 'If a lion could speak, we could not understand him' (author's translation).

written communication is verbalised and interpreted on a linguistic level of interaction.[40] But the many other aspects determining one's attribution to one community of speakers or another, stem from far more than verbal comprehension.

What Wittgenstein was accentuating in above statement (from his *Philosophical Investigations*), is that cognition and language understanding are rooted in more than linguistic norms, grammatical rules and strictly the basics of lexicography. A general social and speech community backdrop and contextualisation needs to be known in order for the communicating individuals to achieve common intelligibility. In early anthropological publications, language was described as a "psychology of the peoples" (Boas 1911, 52), and if their concepts were seen through this linguistic window. '[H]uman language, one of the most important manifestations of mental life, would seem to belong naturally to the field of ethnology' (ibid.). Sociolinguistics has concerned itself with just these correlations, how the complex relations between the social, psychological and political spectrums interact with the way persons speak – possibly even with how they think (cf. R. W. Brown and Lenneberg 1954; Labov 1964; Labov 1972; Linde and Labov 1975). Nevertheless, this correlation should not always be frivolously mistaken for direct causation. The ways in which the objects of study interact have, however, led to much thought on the political side of the spectrum, given how much influence they might have on the cohesion and sense of unity within a large group of (largely heterogeneous, when considering individuals and their particular backdrop) people. They can equally well be the bone of contention leading to eventual collapse and failure of political organisation, hence their significance can never be overlooked.

Language and corpus planning, for instance, can have the effect of ostensibly homogenising an enormous nation that contains a range of speech communities (cf. Berg 1985; M. Li 2008). Such has happened (rather successfully) in the case of standardising Mandarin in China (The People's Republic and the Republic of China, i.e. Taiwan). Here, an originally vernacular[41] type of Mandarin script (as opposed to the script known almost

[40] It is a widespread perception that language makes human interaction conceivable, that without it we might never gain insight into the thoughts and feelings of others around us and thereby go beyond the perils of viewing the world through spectacles of pure Solipsism. Wittgenstein's (1953) *private language argument* has properly shown that language in itself is proof that we do not exist in such a purported social vacuum. But disciplines such as Disability Studies have been grappling for some time now with the discourse on whether language and its production is something considered a pre-condition for granting an individual "human statuts". Humans find themselves characterised by their language(s) just as much as through their gender, faith, ideals, history or heritage.

[41] The term *vernacular* itself is difficult to digest in its etymology. Coming from the Latin 'verna, -ae', which designates a slave born in the house, its meaning extends to all things referring to the house, i.e. the things to be differentiated from the public sphere. The Greeks and Romans distinguished the city,

exclusively to scholars before then) has, since the 1910s, been introduced swiftly, with the aim of ‘developing a single […] variety of language with respect to its phonology, grammar, lexicon, writing system, etc.’ (Chen 2004, 88 f.). Written vernacular Chinese (白话 báihuà) won over the traditional written language (文言 wényán) as the basis for Modern Written Chinese, not so much for being a nationalist symbol (although it finds itself easily abused for that cause) (cf. Bourdieu 1991, 220 ff.), but for its accessibility to all potential and existing members of the speech community.[42] Despite attempts at acknowledging the value of all "minority languages" (as formerly prevalent languages are officially called in China today) and the cultures that gave birth to them, these varieties of language are attributed a lack of prestige when compared to the ‘standard’, and their speakers find themselves linguistically stigmatised.

> ‘Niepowstrzymalnej dziś tendencji do rozpadu wspólnot ortodyksyjnego typu wymykają się, jak się zdaje, jedynie tak zwane mniejszości etniczne. W ich przypadku przypisanie wspólnotowego członkostwa, warunek bezwzględny samoodtwarzania się wspólnoty, jest nadal spełniany. Przypisanie, z definicji, nie jest sprawą wyboru;’[43] (Bauman 2008, 120)

As is the case for LHRs, any stigmatisation of entire speech communities (K. Brown and Ogilvie 2009, 361 f.) – which are ethnic minorities at the same time, for the most part – needs to be countered by fighting the risk coming from disqualifying ascription from the outside. The value of the *vernacular* is mostly beset with social stigma by the hegemonic majority (cf. Platt 1977; Linnes 1998; Santa Ana and Parodi 1998), be it within one nation or worldwide (cf. Kymlicka 2001; Labov 1972; Sanders and Illich 1989). It should be understood as self-evident that only a small number of languages reach popularity for political and pragmatic reasons (e.g. languages considered *en vogue* as the "speech of the cosmopolitan", such as French until the 19th century and ETL at an early age for many today), and that the languages spoken by most in the world today are little celebrated in comparison (cf. Rorty 1991, 211–223). This is the reality we all find ourselves born into, nevertheless.

---

the outside, as the place for free men (A. Berger 2007, 113). Hence, a *vernacular* language can, despite the positive linguistic light into which it is pushed, also be interpreted as yet another expression of subjugation.

[42] This was made possible thanks also to the efforts of such scholars as Kang Youwei and Liang Qichao, whose views on translation and equity were especially advanced at the time (see Kuang 邝 1982).

[43] ‘There seems to be in the contemporary world one prominent exception to the apparently relentless process of disintegration of the orthodox type of communities: the so-called "ethnic minorities". These seem to retain in full the ascriptive character of communal membership, the condition of the community’s continuous reproduction. By definition, though, ascription is not a matter of choice’ (Bauman 2001, 89).

III.5 Multilingualism as a Universal Aim

> 'Multilingualism is a growing phenomenon and certainly not an aberration – as many, in particular monolingual speakers, may still think – but a normal necessity for the world's majority' (Jessner 2006, 1).

Most representation of identity and difference is expressed through means of language rather than political ideologies, concepts of faith or a world-view (cf. Rorty 1991, 151–162). Language and the shaping thereof also constitutes much of individual and group indentity, as witnessed in psychological and political works of the distant and recent past (Boroditsky 2011; Furmuzachi 2005; Gumperz and Roberts 1991; Labov 1964; Pavlenko 2002). Natural languages also tend to be an expression of what appears to be following in the footsteps of the nation-state today (cf. "semantic interaction" in Volosinov 1994) – increasing "regionalisms" (see Butler and Spivak 2007, 64 ff.) (without regard to political borders and/or intimate knowledge of *the Other*), which individuals find themselves associating with. An education towards the naturalisation of multilingual environments and all interaction taking place in them, can be achieved solely through the adaptation of linguistic diversity in the political agenda within nation-states – according to many pedagogical and linguistic researchers (e.g. Gorter 2006; Biseth 2009), teachers, and some politicians.

Having a common language at one's disposal helps form not only the natural vocabulary we come to use in the pursuit of a common goal, but also allows for also the perception of what might be set as such a goal. The crux of this lies in a shared interpretation[44], and thereby a shared understanding of terminology that might otherwise be misrepresented by out-group speakers, if an interpreter went only by its lexical definition. It is a goal ideally pursued, that intimate knowledge, understanding and emotional relation towards other languages, their speakers and the realities they derive from, becomes a universal norm. The "monolingual bias" of modern nations (cf. Martí et al. 2005; Kinginger 2006; Pavlenko 2009) still stands in the way of achieving the aim of the multilingual individual being regarded as the desirable, universally accepted norm. Language and rhetorical strategy, referred to as the 'invisible elements' of interpersonal and intercultural communication (Gumperz and Roberts 1991, 72), hence need to be brought into the light by researchers and officials in charge of structuring public institutional encounters. The instrumentalisation of one common language does not necessarily entail shared interpretation of the things verbally described (cf. Geertz 1977), and much less does it bestow any image of "neutrality" on the terminology in use. This results from the fact that the

[44] E.g. see Frege's term *Vorstellung* and Mill's *connotation* vs. *denotation*.

speakers more familiar with the LF are always going to have the upper hand in deciding which interpretation will be considered “correct”, and which is termed “inadequate”. Equitable use of language in development co-operation and many other fields can therefore never be guaranteed.

III.6 *Linguae Francae* and their Dominance

The implications of power often come to play a role in the creation of official norms through the formulation of language policy. Examples include what is considered to be a respective “standard”, who is given the authority in the formulation of said norms and the evaluation of which speakers are and which are not enjoying the reputation of “commanding” the language they are making use of. Official languages are ones endowed with a particular authority, as they are the result of purely political issues, far beyond merely pragmatic considerations. Some even ascribe(d) to the languages of “developed” peoples a higher degree of complexity (see McWhorter 2003, 200 ff.), a statement that in itself could already be read as an expression of cultural imperialism. The conclusions drawn could reach as far as presuming that many languages have an intrinsic inability to express certain concepts – a false assumption, of course, when reflecting the nature of all such claims having been made by outsiders.[45] Yet the conclusion can be drawn, that all individuals/groups “competent” in a respective OL can draw socio-economic and political advantages from any such knowledge (cf. Grucza 1992). If, for instance, a person is brought up with an OL being her primary language (L1), she is more likely than others to be less restricted in her education and/or career opportunities (cf. Pool 1991) by such linguistic “deficits”, or slowed down in her possibilities for interaction with a relatively wide range of others.

It is in the normalisation of multilingualism – its spread, institutionalisation, and social acceptance – that some authors’ perspectives see an increased opportunity for achieving an awareness of the contrasts and commonalities in speakers’ environments and history. ELF hence can already be conceived as a step towards the proliferation of a universal knowledge of a minimum of two languages – an absolute minimum, whih is not yet regarded as true multilingualism by many. From Bourdieu’s (see Blackledge 2010, 417) ideas comes a construction of national *habitus* through a legitimising of a ‘national cul-

[45] This account has been described (Pike 1954) as an *etic* understanding (as perceived by cultural outsiders), whereas *emic* accounts would refer to those from within a culture, furnished with subjective beliefs, opinions, etc (See the discussion of Frege’s views above). Underlying the idea of *etics* is a much-disputed (cf. Headland 1990) assumption of outside “objectivity“.

ture', with 'common principles of vision and division' as a guiding light. Blackledge again deplores the 'homogenization of all forms of communication' described by Bourdieu (ibid.; Bourdieu 1990, 16 ff.), yet sees them as one of the main catalysts for sociolinguistic developments taking place, particulary in settings where many speaker communities come together in exchange, under an influence of social hierarchies, power relations and linguistic ideology (see Bourdieu 2005; Busch 2010).[46]

At the same time, it is becoming clearer every day that many individuals, as well as groups, are presently becoming aware of the dominant position that a common language such as English is starting to take, unyielding to the structural characteristics and history of other languages or the wishes and preferences of their speakers. On this point, the poet and analyst of African identity construction Chinua Achebe takes a clear stand. He takes affront to the views purported by his contemporary Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o in the book *Decolonising the Mind* (1986), in which he accuses Achebe of being one of the 'African writers who remain accomplices of imperialism'. This accusation comes from Ngũgĩ's argumentation that African literature in a European language is practically an oxymoron. In response, Achebe states the opposite: that two or more languages could co-exist peacefully within one speaker. Not only would they *not* be exclusive of each other, but moreover they would be complementary (cf. Achebe 2006, 268). In addition, the argument goes against speech communities strictly clinging on to inherited linguistic traditions which are taken as implicitly definitive for a people (cf. Blommaert 2008; Sartre 2004, l, xlv), considering that – as Achebe demonstrates with the help of a handful of African countries that have undergone civil wars resulting from discord over which parts of the population would become dominant nationally – the introduction and reliance on imported, albeit colonial languages could be recognised in their advantages towards harmonisation. The author reasons that above all, 'these alien languages are still knocking around because they serve an actual need' (ibid.: 270), i.e. the production and sustainment of relative linguistic neutrality in highly multilingual states.

[46] The result of such exchange can sociolinguistically lead to one of three outcomes: interference, integration or replacement (i.e. language shift and extinction) (cf. Ghosh 1972; W. Li 1994; Thomason and Kaufman 1991). It can also result in a speaker's increased questioning of why and how new languages are being acquired. In the case of ELF, for instance, she might want to do so for the pragmatic reason of becoming part of, and co-producing, an imagined global community on the one hand, while legitimating herself (see Gu 2010, 149) in the contextual social discourses, and economic and political conditions on the other.

III.7 Linguistic Barriers & Verbal Alienation

One of the reasons for humanity's conception of language as an indispensable tool for thinking is the quasi-impossibility of formulating, much less expressing to oneself and others, any thought without making use of it. As soon as we make our thoughts intelligible to ourselves, we draw on a shared language, on shared descriptions that are put in terms long developed by others before us. Today, quite a few studies have already been conducted on the connection between language and thought, as well as vice versa, on how differences in thinking can shape the verbal expression used by individuals.[47] And despite language being something universally shared in principle, i.e. an instrument allowing us to make heard and comprehensible our emotions and thoughts, it simultaneously can, ironically, serve as something walling us in and distancing us from our vis-à-vis. As mentioned in the chapter on linguistic rights, the instrumentalistation of a *specific* form of language (what would be called the local *norm* in respective surroundings)[48] is frequently resorted to when granting someone the status of an accepted community member, sometimes even when granting the status of *being human* (e.g. see Charlton 2010; Ginsburg and Rapp 2010; Linton 2010). This concept of being an *outcast* when not abiding by linguistic rules set by one's peers, political surroundings, institutionalised norms and rationale can be a consequence of determining factors entirely outside our will and influence (e.g. physiological or pathological conditions preventing someone from speaking the way she would like to be heard, or from speaking at all), or it can be voluntarily chosen out of one's own persuasion (e.g. adaptation to a speaker community of one's individual/group choice). The struggle for disabled persons' rights is just one example of what power the language used can have: how its acceptance and normalisation within society, and necessity for linguistically mainstreaming its impact on particular kinds of phrasing[49], as well as an indispensable reflection of how it can be perceived and what emotionally connoted weight certain words carry.[50]

---

[47] For just a few examples, see (Winawer et al. 2007; Fausey et al. 2010; Boroditsky 2011; Boroditsky, Fuhrman, and McCormick 2011).

[48] Most cognitively impaired persons, as mentioned earlier, are frequently perceived as being "understood" by the persons close to them. Yet this understanding is not always founded in linguistic interaction. It can derive from shared experience and surroundings, physical contact, emotional connection and non-verbal measures of communication (cf. Knapp and Hall 2009, 409–452), as well as intuitively human-to-human empathy.

[49] Shelley Tremain (2002, 45) describes the oft-enunciated creation of "impairment" as being naturalised specifically through discursive practice, connecting the two terms of "discrimination" and "stigmatisation" in their semantic common ground. Foucault's idea of the "clinical view" finds description here as well, considering how it perfectly exemplifies how a social model of disability can be heuristically founded, and can be perceived by rules of phenomenology. The well-known quotation 'disability is something imposed on top of our impairments' (Priestley 1975, 3) serves as an essential example of how influence by means

IV. Intercultural Communicative Processes

IV.1 Interdisciplinary Hermeneutics

It is an ever-present dilemma that language and its use in science and the history of its disciplines gives 'the perpetual disruption of time the continuity of space, and it is to the degree that it analyses, articulates, and patterns representation that it has the power to link our knowledge of things together across the dimension of time. With the advent of language, the chaotic monotony of space is fragmented, while at the same time the diversity of temporal successions is unified' (Foucault 1966, 112).

Raúl Fornet-Betancourt (2005, 401), reflecting on the issue of hermeneutic translation and interculturality, proposes a '[…] desarrollo de una hermenéutica de la alteridad que parte del reconocimiento del "extraño" como intérprete y traductor de su propia identidad […]', underscoring that hermeneutic work is underpinned mainly by an interchange of interpretations. According to him the task lies in a sharing of the perceptions gathered, an exchange thereof among interpreters, since 'la comprensión profunda de lo que llamamos 'propio' o 'nuestro', es un proceso que requiere la participación interpretativa del otro' (ibid.). Accordingly, comprehension is and can only ever be a modus operandi undertaken by means of recurrent interaction and exchange. Never could it happen within the mind and understanding of only one party involved at only one point in time. Neither – and this argument relates back to what structuralist linguistics set out with: the concept of *difference* – can an (intersubjective) exchange, i.e. an exchange of any kind, be realised without ever implicitly referring to an opposition of an *I*/a *we* and an *other* (see above citation; also Münnix 2004, 215). Ergo, self-identification is processual, resulting from the light shed on alterity, where understanding is being built up from that knowledge. This thought also ties in with the fluid and shifting nature of identity, the way it varies and is reciprocally constitutive of language, inherently censoring and self-censoring an individual towards the creation of subjectivity, where postmodernist discourse (see Lyotard 1984; Pavlenko 2001; Butler 2005) regards much of what other theoretic schools have presented as almost carved into stone. Post-structuralist images of

---

of linguistic differentiation and the expression of circumstances difficult to describe can nevertheless be achieved.

[50] For much more on this topic from ethical, development- and human rights-related points of view, consult (Hacking 2001; Pogge 2003; Nussbaum 2006).

a “linguistic liquid” (Barry 2009, 64), the idea that words are unable to ever fully succeed in carrying across a “purity” of meaning[51] with, concurrently, the reduced faith one should therefore put in them, are thoughts I partially subscribe to. However, they are mostly inappropriate for the discourse covered in this work.

Language is not to be seen as merely a structure in the human brain, as simply a cognitive system through which we attempt to decipher other (syntactical, semantic, pragmatic and other) structures (cf. Chomsky 2006, 34 & 149), but something rooted much deeper in humanity’s self-perception. What has been called “the secret of the person” (Dilthey 1999, 83) serves as a constant driving force towards further investigation and attempts at understanding our vis-à-vis, and consequently also ourselves (by means of mirroring). Certainly, no part of these inquiries into the human mind can be put into action without the close collaboration of a multitude of sciences, dealing with the philosophical, historical, cognitive, social, and an immeasurable number of other fields of investigation constitutive of human co-existence.

IV.2 Epistemic Impacts

Foucault's definition[52] of *the statement* is highly relevant to the topic of science of knowledge, and to its creation. We therefore need to realise the (artificially?) constituted discourse, which is taking shape in the way that political and social realities (and academia in particular) are formed. We also need to pay attention to how the scientific community is subject to both influencing others' understanding of these conditions, and being influenced by them in turn, unless it can hold up its “shield of consciousness”. Such a shield can, of course, never seal everything off completely, as this would require an existence on the metaphysical plain alone.

---

[51] What is considered one of the founding texts in post-structuralism (Derrida 1967, 410 - translation by Alan Bass) reads:
‘Le centre n'est pas le centre. Le concept de structure centrée - bien qu'il représente la coherence elle-même, la condition de l'epistémè comme philosophie ou comme science - est contradictoirement cohérent. Et comme toujours, la cohérence dans la contradiction exprime la force d'un désir. Le concept de structure centrée est en effet le concept d'un jeu fondé, constitué depuis une immobilité fondatrice et une certitude rassurante, elle-même soustraite au jeu.’
(‘The centre is not the centre. The concept of centered structure – although it represents coherence itself, the condition of the episteme as philosophy or science – is contradictorily coherent. And, as always, coherence in contradiction expresses the force of a desire. The concept of centered structure is in fact the concept of a play based on a fundamental ground, a play which is constituted upon a fundamental immobility and a reassuring certitude, which is itself beyond the reach of the play.’)

[52] 'The statement is not just another unity – above or below – sentences and propositions; it is always invested in unities of this kind, or even of sequences of signs that do not obey their laws [...] It has the quasi-invisibility of the “there is”, which is effaced in the very thing of which one can say “there is this or that thing“' (M. Foucault in Smart 1995, 2:81).

One of the key components of the newly founded epistemic interdisciplinarity – which is in the vein of structuralism and post-structuralism, and is the realisation of an inevitable interconnectedness, resulting in not only the combination of different perspectives (cf. Nagar and Ali 2003) but their integration into one's own line of thought – appears to be an essential step towards reforming the (colonial) hegemonic structures still prevailing in today's world. This is why we cannot presume to ever find an objective, absolute knowledge (cf. Foucault 1988), nor should we strive for it. We should rather make ourselves comfortable in the social sciences' position of a Hegelian *Standpunkttheorie*. While not fully agreeing with Uma Narayan's description of the "epistemic advantage" (see Narayan 2003), whereby members of oppressed groups (such as women) possess a necessary ability to exist in more than one reality simultaneously, I would argue that the fundamental conditions for an intersubjective understanding, and the creation of new theoretical attitudes, could stem from just such a widespread array of experiences coming from the confrontation of more than one reality.

The self-correcting formulation of new questions toward our surroundings and towards others is also bound to come from such a multi-perspective approach – and in it lies one of the most important uses of language as such. The realisation of these issues, and the interwoven structures which affect all of us, could even end in people seeing through such artificially constructed, colonialist ideas auch as adherence to a nation-state, and because of this it may help prevent conflicts induced on levels of argumentation on "national communities". Reflection on the manipulative qualities implicit to language also carries the potential for the transcending of *imposed communities* (class, ethnicity, nationality, gender, religion) in the future – ideas which have been constructed with a specific goal of dominance and control in mind, thereby freeing humans to recognise *the Other* as just that: individuals. It might also play an immensely important role in dissolving the dichotomisation of scientific and popular views prevalent in present discourse, as it is those which are clearly prone to abuse.

IV.2.1 Universality & Episteme

Is development-oriented thinking (*developmentalism*) something that in itself can be considered a fixed point in a belief system, something that close to all humans involved will see as an irrevocable axiom? This *episteme* (Foucault 2007, 211 ff.) brings with it the hazard of sealing off all alternative views but the ones reconcilable with its own inherent ideals (see Davis, Keshen, and McMahan 2010). One's given set of beliefs is seen as contingent (brought about through authoritative figures such as family, school, reli-

gion, society, economy, the evidence of science and experience, political ideological beliefs, etc.) until the point of first questioning is reached, resulting from a (Socratic) dialogical process through the interaction and exchange of notions with the vis-à-vis. It is in this element of linguistic encounter-induced reflection – in precise argumentation and defence of one's epistemology – that all axiomatic principles are prone to relaxation (cf. Glover 2010), permitting a mutual approximation of beliefs. It is for this reason that language-related processes of DC actors' agency should be able to confer empathic understanding with the final beneficiaries. It is only in the immediacy of personal encounters that a connection and relationship can be achieved – the essential first step to be taken, if a real inclusion, and not only a statement on paper, is to be achieved. From this united position of reasonable, human understanding (and, ad hoc, conflict-prevention), they should attempt to falsify many of developmentalism's precepts (precepts bordering on dogma; cf. Foucault 1988) still rampant in the world today. Not just evidence from the past should be referred to as a source for defining the optimal solutions for problems of the future, given the ever-transforming circumstances occurring since the previous mid-century (cf. Popper 2000).

Otto Neurath's perspectives on semantic holism in language (Sebestik 2011) can be conferred upon the principles of developmentalist thought. In a self-contained system of argumentation and reason, whenever a statement's sentence makes an assertion that is at conflict with other assertions previously verified, either that assertion or a former one will need to be modified, in order to preserve coherence. Equally, in development discourse's argumentation, be it in favour of one school of thought or "entirely new" alternatives, all assertions need to be modified and mutually matched to guarantee a level of argumentative consolidation. Developmentalist rationale is after all limited to a given set of arguments, a scientific epistemology for the most part, and can therefore never transcend a set of individuals' beliefs that these have sprung from (cf. Quine 1975, 3 ff.). As it is with this argumentative circle, we – and consequently developmentalist ideology – have a choice as to which part of our belief system we are willing to give up when, according to our beliefs, something does not go right. True upheaval in developmentalist perspective seems likely only when resulting from a revolution in axioms colliding within it.[53]

[53] E.g. see (Pieterse 2000; Coleman 2005; Aumard and Lalande 2010).

IV.2.2 Particularities

> 'No men inhabit a "middle kindom", all are each other's guests' (Steiner 1998, 138).

The ethos of multiperspectivity as a condition for Schopenhauerian empathy needs to be introduced, without detriment to our will to understand the pragmatics of the other. Tragically, compassion and pity are separated by only a fine line. It is the latter upon which much of the call for support by development practice is (and, as many regret, needs to be) construed (cf. Münnix 2004, 212 f.). A feeling of uniformity and solidarity resulting from it might be well-intentioned, yet it still results in the appropriation of the cultural other, without the achievement of the communitarian purpose underlying the call for aid.

Science, as it is popularly understood (also by many scientist themselves), is expected to operate outside any differences disconnecting people. '[…] however, science is not above culture; it is part of culture. Science does not transcend our particularities; it discloses them' (Livingstone 2002, 10).

What science and a reflected treatment of interlingual matters, questions of translation and communication can bring to the table, is the bridging of certain misconceptions prevalent in this respect. Hermeneutically, not the *a priori* differences between parts of humanity are to be highlighted, and distancing thereby increased (see Gürses 2003, 8 ff.), but a possibility of understanding of and transmission into the unknown by means of the known, i.e. languages, needs to be brought to the forefront. In this view of *culturality*[54] as something disjoining humans more than uniting them, it is just in the recognition of all sorts of overlap between "cultures", similarities in concept relations and worldviews (cf. Mall 1998), that interdisciplinary research and communication expertise can provide for long awaited harmonisation.

IV.2.3 Subjectivity

> 'Die kulturellen Welten werden übersetzt, und indem sie sich gegenseitig übersetzen, wird Universalität erzeugt'[55] (Fornet-Betancourt 2002, 14:15).

Here – apart from reminding the reader of earlier reference to the almost unprovable, yet slightly more conceivable ideas of Frege, Pike and Harris[56] – I would like to revert once more to post-structuralist argumentation (cf. Spivak 1998). *Deconstruction*, as most clearly described by Jacques Derrida, is founded on the suggestion that 'writing no long-

[54] The alternative term *ethnicisation* in its negative homogenisation of whole groupings comes to mind.

[55] 'Cultural worlds are being translated, and by their mutual translation, universality is created.' (author's translation)

[56] (cf. Frege 1978; Frege 2002; Pike 1954; Headland 1990)

er issues from a logos' (1998, 10). This presupposition cleared the way for a wholly new perspective from which a text can be accessed[57], far closer to a de-sedimentation and careful taking apart of the written, rather than a demolition of what had been expressed in textual form: 'Deconstruction is not synonymous with "destruction". Its is in fact much closer to the original meaning of the word "analysis, which etymologically means "to undo" [...]. The deconstruction of a text does not proceed by random doubt or arbitrary subversion, but by the careful teasing out of warring forces of signification within the text' (Johnson 1980, 5).

Culture can be best interpreted in universal terminology as well, as the only factors holding this vague concept together, about which so much has been theorised already, are the ones that circumscribe it as generally as possible (for just a few examples see Adorno 2000; Malinowski 2000; Rousseau 2000; Benedict 2005). Bridging the gap between linguistic examination and the term of *culture* is what Hermanns described as "mentalities", following the lexical semantics developed in a speech community. In his opinion, "collective" thought, feeling and will can find its expression by linguistic means (see Hermanns 1994; discussed in Wiktorowicz 2008, 410 f.), as they would serve as a reflection of a community's dispositions. These again allow for insight into how a shift in speech utilisation and lexis has historically emerged, hence producing said community's present social conditions.[58]

It has been accurately observed that '[...] the resurgence and even reconstruction of subjectivities marked by multiple traditions is a distinct possibility' (Escobar 1995, 225) despite the present-day economised development- and growth-orientation. This perspective allows for at least partial optimism with regard to the rights and hopes of minorities of any kind, linguistic and otherwise, and their encounter with what is the so-called majority. It should ideally induce the analytical reading of textual materials projected onto the Other, with everyone "reading" their vis-à-vis attentively, perceiving every nuance and implication heretofore shrouded by prejudice and misunderstanding.[59]

[57] With regard to the absence of a referent/a signified, Derrida's (1998, 158) citation goes 'there is no outside-text; il n'y a pas de hors-texte'.

[58] A few examples of German vocabulary that has changed in social meaning within the 20th century, listed by Hermann are: *Weib*; *Jude*; *Zigeuner*; *Pöbel*; *Volk*.

[59] For reference to a three-step approach: from 'self-awareness', through 'cultural awareness' to 'cross-cultural awareness', see also (Krysztofowicz 2007, 235).

IV.3 The "Mother-Tongue"

While evolutionary psychologists have debated the question of language arising, as one of many aspects of evolutionary development, from intrinsically biological cognitive assets (Changeux and Ricoeur 1998; Pinker 1991; Pinker 2004; Pinker 2005; Wright 1994), most social scientists dispute such claims in favour of a hypothesis where social circumstances and upbringing, above all else, are the guiding forces in the development of human speech, beliefs, ethics and other characteristics. I also am cautiously leaning towards a *standard social science model* (Barkow and Tooby 1992) by conceding to social interaction an inherently high level of influence, hence arguing against the idea of all encompassing cultural universals and behaviours resulting from them. The ability of a child to learn a given language, without any instruction necessarily being required (cf. Pinker and Bloom 1990), may be a congenital human quality, following a process of human evolution and adaptation to social co-existence. At any rate, a form of "generative grammar" (Chomsky 1965) would provide the speaker with only a set of rules for the structure and descriptions, which a language's sentences can form. However, that the contextual implementation and social functions it can serve are learnable in evolutionary development, is to be doubted. Though a point I do agree with is how a person's perception of language as a part of the body, practically an organ in its function (Pinker and Bloom 1990), would explain the relationship an individual has with the language(s) she has been brought up in, shaped by biographically and therefore indentifying with (see below).

Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson (1989) have come forward with a fourfold definition of "mother tongue", making evident the conspicuous nature of the complexity such a concept brings with it (today more than ever) in a multilingual world. The four parts of their definition are: (1) the language(s) one learns first; (2) the language(s) one knows best; (3) the language(s) one uses most; (4) the language(s) one identifies with (Doerr 2009, 21 f.). We must first overlook the difficulty inherent in recognising how a measurability of the first two definitions can be ensured, considering that many grow up using more than one language from their earliest childhood or consider themselves equally proficient in the use of more than one, it is the last of the four points which brings with it the most extraordinary problems in terms of measurement. Competence in a language is something that can already be very hard to define, let alone practically gauge, but the multitude of factors playing into anything identity-related essentially pre-

clude the drawing of conclusions on causal correlation between one's language and identity – not to mention the conceptual fluidity inherent to identity itself.

The question of whether every peson should be granted the right to freely use the language they feel most comfortable with in as many fields of their life as possible is a point much discussed in language planning (cf. Blommaert 1996), and especially when political, regional and local entities choose OL(s). Knowledge of foreign languages, while rightfully encouraged, should come second to achieving fluency in one's L1(s), i.e. languages acquired first. The case in favour of L1-literacy has been much disputed (cf. Busch 2006; Heugh 2000; Hipfl et al. 2002), yet few arguments are made against one or more primary languages as forming the groundwork off of which the understanding – linguistic and metalinguistic – of additional languages can be fed.

> '[…] la fragilité de la voix se trouve exacerbée par l'exil […] dans une langue autre que la langue maternelle, alors que de sa survie même dépend la continuité ontologique du migrant dont la vie s'articule désormais à la rupture que constitue "expérience migratoire"' (Kral 2011, 126).[60]

The other reason, apart from providing speakers with an advantage in terms of mere language acquisition, is one more deeply rooted, and one that is to be found in the identity (construction) and self-understanding that come with receiving a language from persons close to one's heart (family, friends, etc.), which intimately connotate the speech in use with variables of emotional proximity (cf. Kristeva 1988; Allen 2003). Hereby, language becomes far more than just a tool in use. It extends to being perceived as a part of one's self, becoming an extension of the mind and an almost physical part of one's body. Body and voice (see Kral 2011, 126) can therefore never be entirely separated, considering their interrelatedness. A person who is either involuntarily snatched from or intentionally leaves her native environment (a "migrant") – the reasons for which are to be found, in nearly every case, in economic circumstances – is bound to mingle with others who are in a similar situation (at times viewed as a "traitor" by their community; see Fanon 2004, 67), and who are equally grappling with the languages of new environments, their speakers and the absence of prestige ascribed to their own language's status, as well as themselves (cf. Doerr 2009). The language carried within can be described as part of 'la mémoire culturelle et inconsciente en vous'[61] (Kristeva 1993, 118), hence part of individual narrative. An ascribed process of *being made* a "foreigner" from the outside

[60] 'The fragility of the voice finds itself exacerbated by exile […] in a language other than the mother tongue, while its very survival depends on the ontological continuity of the migrant, whose life is henceforth based on rupture, it is what constitutes the "migrant experience"' (author's translation).

[61] '[…] memory that is cultural and unconscious within you' (author's translation).

(*étrangèreté*, as Julia Kristeva refers to it) is the initial step towards all forms of stigmatisation, which takes place in a society. It is precisely this structural system which is at fault, and which needs to be countered and inverted by an institutional framework. *Strangeness* can furthermore be seen as coming from a Freudian unconscious (ibid.), traced back in individual narrative to the child's separation from its mother (cf. A. Berger 2007). Derrida (1998, 11) recognised the intimate relation of language channeling a *logos* (i.e. thought) when analysing Aristotle's *DE INTERPRETATIONE*, and writing that '[…] the voice, producer of the first symbols, has a relationship of essential and immediate proximity with the mind. It signifies "mental experiences" which themselves reflect or mirror things by natural resemblance. Between being and mind, things and feelings, there would be a relationship of translation or natural signification […]'. A person's language – as the first stage of a chain of signification – could thereby provide *transparence*, allowing for insight into her thoughts and emotions, advancing slightly towards a truth. Taking into account this correlation of semiotic sequence, translation can act as a key to further insights into hopes, presumptions and prospects that the subjects of development have, out of linguistic limitation, not come to convey.

IV.4 Translatability – Can We Assume the Possibility of Universal Translation?

> 'Die Hinausgesprochenheit der Rede ist die Sprache. Diese Wortganzheit, als ein eigenes weltliches Sein hat, wird so als innerweltlich Seiendes wie ein Zuhandes vorfindlich. […] Als existenziale Verfassung der Erschlossenheit des Daseins ist die Rede konstitutiv für dessen Existenz. Zum redenden Sprechen gehören als Möglichkeiten *Hören* und *Schweigen*. An diesen Phänomenen wird die kostitutive Funktion der Rede für die Existenzialität der Existenz erst völlig deutlich. Zunächst geht es um die Herausarbeitung der Struktur der Rede als solcher.'
> (Heidegger 1977, 2:214)
> -------------
> 'The way in which discourse[62] gets expressed is language. Language is a totality of words – a totality in which discourse has a 'worldly' Being of its own […] As an existential state in which Dasein is disclosed, discourse is constitu-

[62] In this example, the transfer of "Rede" as "discourse", and all the implications resulting from such a translation, are just one instance of deeply problematic translational work that has already been invested in the translation of this particular work of Heidegger's oeuvre. It contains a puzzling idiom, unique etymologies, constellations and Heideggerian terms (e.g. *Da-sein*, *Geworfenheit*, *Wiederholung*) that have proven to be challenging not only to German native speakers, but even more so to translators of all languages thus far. I have chosen this work (called "untranslatable" by some) as an example, as it provides evidence for what opposes any attempt at verbatim translation (see Ciocan 2005), yet has been transferred with the help of profound study and an intricate understanding of the matter at hand.

tive of Dasein's existence. *Hearing* and *keeping silent* [*Schweigen*] are possibilities belonging to discursive speech. In these phenomena the constitutive function of discourse for the existentiality of existence becomes entirely plain for the first time. But in the first instance the issue is one of working out the structure of discourse as such.'
(as translated by Macquarrie and Robinson, in Heidegger 1978, 204)

It is not in the Wittgensteinian sense that a relation between statements (*Aussagen*) and the "truth" of a proposition (*Satz*), in the sense of philosophical verification (Wittgenstein 1953, 45 ff.), is intended in the context of DC's translational processes. In such a Wittgensteinian understanding, it would be solely the translation of individual parts of a statement that we could refer to as "translation". Moreover, the daily routine of conversing, and particularly in DC field interaction, calls for attention to two or more languages' *contextual synonymy* (i.e. cognitive, not extensional) and clarification of what parts of communication are intended to be comprehensible on all sides. For it is only through an understanding of the individual interpretation, or at least the maximal convergence of two individual perspectives, that any approximation becomes possible. In the (highly theorised) idea of *total translation*, 'SL and TL texts or items are translation equivalents when they are interchangeable in a given situation' (Catford 1965, 49, in: Stolze 1994, 72 ff.). This theory of complete equivalence is of course easy to draw up in writing, but proves to be enigmatic when looking at specified examples. Yet Catford (1965, 49; 27–34) did go as far as stressing the importance of 'the greatest possible overlap of situational range', i.e. *contextual translation*. They are thus aware of the fact that the highest instance of textual translation could only be thought applied on sentence-rank[63], making apparent the limits of practicability such an approach would bring with it. Ideally, translation should take into consideration the backdrop of all participants in conversation and the respective situation at hand. Such a translation is seen by some as a means of *cultural transfer* (Vermeer and Reiß 1984; Vermeer 1990; Stolze 1994, 159 ff.). Others come to recognise through (apparently simplistic) descriptions what is a matter of devotion for many and the first step towards the construction of a theoretical framework for others, e.g.:

'For translation theory, banal messages are the breath of life.'
(Quine 1975, 69)

I do not quite agree with the assumption that translators/interpreters 'aim to be "invisible people"[64] – transferring content without drawing attention to the considerable artistic and technical skills involved in the process' (Crystal 2005, 418). According to the concept of

[63] i.e. the level of sentences

[64] For an extensive discussion of this issue, see (Valero-Garcés 2007).

Vermeer's *Skopos theory* (see Kadric, Kaindl, and Kaiser-Cooke 2010, 77 ff.), the act of translating a producer's "offer of information" is to be guided by given functional expectations as well as individual expectations on the side of the addressee (i.e. greek *skopos* – aim/goal). What happens on a textual level can be read as translation shift (see Ghadi 2010), i.e. parts of communication could be understood as interchangeable linguistic material, which in terms of language and style convey a similar attitude when implemented in a comparable situation. Eugene A. Nida (1964) payed particular attention to the distinction between *formal* and *dynamic equivalence*, i.e. equivalence in function, geared to triggering the same effects in the TL text's audience as the SL text had on its recipient(s) (see Kariminia and Heidary 2009). So the translator, for one, always needs to take into account the specific translation target group's circumstances, values, norms and requirements. At the same time, the persons translating need to be aware of the fact that their intervention through the transformation of a message from the SL to the TL is always that of a participant who influences the understanding or lack thereof resulting from said act. Since the translator is simultaneously an actor, every translational operation is an intervention in itself. By the rules of this theory, translation is cultural transfer (cf. Vermeer 1990; Stolze 1994, 159 f.), considering the inseparable interdependence of language and culture. While one can relate to the practical approach expressed in regards to translation and functionality (cf. Vermeer and Reiß 1984), a certain emotional opinion on, and relation to, what is being translated (as well as to the final aim aspired to) can never be excluded from the operation.

Others have noted, in reflection on the issues of structuralist projection and identification (see also Anzaldúa 1987), that the differential function of words would be lessened with each attempt to reach equivalence (cf. Ortigues 1962, 197; discussed in Deleuze 1992, 33). As is the case in sign language, for instance, the expressions on a signer's face can have an emotive or a linguistic function (see Corina, Bellugi, and Reilly 1999), which in turn require for a prefixed affective ability to prevent interpretive problems.

> 'Equivalence in difference is the cardinal problem of language and the pivotal concern of linguistics . . . No linguistic specimen may be interpreted by the science of language without a translation of its signs into other signs of the same system or into signs of another system. Any comparison of two languages implies an examination of their mutual translatability; the widespread practice of interlingual communication, particularly translating activities, must be kept under constant scrutiny by linguistic science' (Jakobson 1959, 233 f.).[65]

[65] See also the reference to ‚mental experience' in (Derrida 1998, 11 f.).

While I will not go as far as agreeing with Jakobson on the idea of having linguists watch over every translational act performed, his quote again makes evident the individual, internal procedures taking place in each one of us when performing semiotic transference between languages. As Spivak fittingly quotes Nietzsche, with regard to the internal chain of metaphors already in motion in the use of one language:

> 'Ein Nervenreiz zuerst übertragen in ein Bild! erste Metapher. Das Bild wieder nachgeformt in einem Laut! zweite Metapher. Und jedesmal vollständiges Überspringen der Sphäre, mitten hinein in eine ganz andere und neue' (Nietzsche 1973, 2:373).[66]

In textual translation as well as in translation of spoken interaction, the person carrying a message from one language to another is always expected to have at least a minimal level of knowledge about the circumstances, intentions and expectations of both sides communicating. Such a *knowledge base* (see Stolze 1994, 191 f.) is also to be expected of all persons involved in DC's translational interaction. It is a substantive factor in the choice of individuals as interpreters/translators that they have an angle allowing them to discern the *intended* and the *proclaimed*, while also willing to acquire all the knowledge and skills they still may be lacking.

Eventually though, no such thing as an "exact" (formal) translation appears possible in most instances. The search for the essence and limits of translation (Steiner 1998, 391 ff.) is to be loudly voiced by development actors and beneficiaries. Only if the call for true interest and a willingness to understand beyond the verbal plain is heeded, can we expect sincere exchange to ever come about in DC.

IV.5 Relevance of Intercultural Communication in International Relations

In 1934, in remarks on the idea of (psychological) *face* (面子 miànzi) in China, and how it appeared to be perceived by foreigners, the author Lu Xun famously noted:

> 'They find it extremely hard to understand, but believe that "face" is the key to the Chinese spirit and that grasping it will be like grabbing a queue twenty-four years ago – everything else will follow.' (2003, 131)

Lu Xun's statement is a reminder (cf. Anderson 2006, 69 ff.) that what is often thought to be a determining factor by outside observers can easily be overvalued in the importance it actually has to the ones observed. In the case of what is referred to as 'face',

[66] 'A nerve stimulus, first transcribed [*übertragen*] into an image [*Bild*]! First metaphor! The image again copied into a sound! Second metaphor! And each time he [the creator of language] leaps completely out of one sphere right into the midst of an entirely different one' (Spivak 1998, xii).

it is something that goes into consideration when diplomatic encounters are prepared, when business meetings take place and when personal contact is first established and upheld. But is it constituting an intense understanding of the Other in intercultural encounters between, say, a Westerner and a person from East Asia? Hardly. Yet history has shown this particular factor in interpersonal relations to be frequently overrated at the expense of other aspects, be they of linguistic, behavioural or religious nature, to name only a few.[67] At the same time, the idea of face has been consistently undervalued in the West's perception of itself.

A statement's formulation – be it with regard to vocabulary, syntax, grammatical relations within the phraseology used, subordination, reference, etc.[68] – can come to express certain circumstances in terms rather more fitting to the recipients' "norm", and therefore understood in its entirety more so than others would. This has been debated fiercely in the case of an Amazon language 'discovered' and put into script by Daniel Everett fairly recently.[69] The wording required could therefore be put into focus more clearly, when DC agents and researchers decide on the phrasing that will eventually have to be translatable into any language[70], and ideally self-explanatory.

---

[67] I do not intend to completely eviscerate face's value, naturally. It is a determinant that does come to subtly dictate how Neo-Confucian ideals (based on the *5 relations*, i.e. ruler to ruled, father to son, husband to wife, elder brother to younger brother, friend to friend) are expressed in daily life. This can find expression in adding authority to how one is perceived by one's vis-à-vis, and whether the environment perceives an individual as meeting the rightful role she is given within society. It goes without saying that some of these points do expand even to international relations. Not to mention that we sometimes assume the ideas of "saving face" and "losing face" to be perfectly translatable, while they happen to carry across differing connotations in different speaker communities and languages (for a few insights into the wide field of research that is facework, see e.g. Ting-Toomey and Kurogi 1998; Haugh and Hinze 2003; Vilkki 2006).

[68] For more examples on specific syntactic components potentially influencing perception and understanding, see (G. Deutscher 2010, 119 ff.).

[69] E.g. the case of the *Pirahã* language and the way it has been put under close scrutiny with regard to its speakers' ability to grasp the concepts of future, past, relation and syntactic subordination (see Everett 2005; Pinker 2008, 139).

[70] Wittgenstein advocated a radical position of mutual ontological untranslatability of naming (*Benennung*) and description (*Beschreibung*) (cf. *TRACTATUS LOGICO-PHILOSOPHICUS*: 2.12; 3.22; 3.221; 3.144) – this is an idea I do not choose to concur with.

V. Development Co-operation's (Dis-)Regard of Language

V.1 (Mis-)Interpretation of a Key Concept

Just as in legal communication, in court, in contracts and agreements, the use of language and wording needs to be understandable without reliance on shared background or knowledge. Language is therefore put into a common phraseology. But how does this common pattern of communicating come about?

Many utterances can be misconstrued on the part of a *sender* in communication. At the same time, these messages could be deciphered by a *recipient* through an inspection of the purely linguistic surface structure (cf. Chomsky 2006, 143), that does not go as far as making out the intentions underlying the "transmission".

> 'Human rights are currently being linked to North-South "aid" and the world-wide promotion of "democracy". Their observance is being required as a pre-condition for aid or investment, and for membership of the Council of Europe, where ironically a higher standard of minority protection is being required of Eastern European states than exists in many existing member states' (Skutnabb-Kangas, Phillipson, and Mart 1995, 73 f.).

The concepts carried in this quotation underlie much of today's focus and scrutiny in decision-making relevant to who will and who will not receive monetary support and other resources in the global run for "development". These commonly come to be used as an argumentation for international standards and a lever towards potential recipients (of "aid"), thus forcing a homogenisation of norms and regulations – with all the advantages and and deprivations coming from this. It is therefore of paramount importance for the initiation and monitoring of all human rights-related, and other more technical and quantitative aspects of planning and evaluation, that a system of ethics and practice is reached which would not go to the detriment of anyone involved.

> 'Or l'éthnologie – comme toute science – se produit dans l'élement du discours. Et elle est d'abord une science européenne, utilisant, fût-ce à son corps defendant, les concepts de la tradition' (Derrida 1967, 414).[71]

Lastly, this passage – by means of the anthropological example – encompasses the fundamental challenges the fields of development research and practice find themselves

[71] 'Ethnology however – like all sciences – occurs in the element of discourse. And it is primarily a European science, using, if only reluctantly, the concepts of tradition' (author's translation).

incessantly facing. For the very concept of "development" has only appeared out of discursive practice in parts of the world that were, and are not, directly subject to the efforts of development propagation. The developmental discussion and doctrine resulting from this are thus being led in unequal dissemination across the globe, with relative yet not absolute improvements in participation. And this developmental discourse still produces its own right for existence by providing the words for what it is trying to solve (e.g. Foucault 1966; Baudrillard 1975; Illich 1978; Said 1978; Escobar 1988; Sachs 1992). As a science also originating from Europe and, by proxy, North America, it finds itself in constant self-defence (see above) in the face of justifiable allegations of imperialist undertones, if not for outright hegemonic oppression of anyone diverging from its worldview (Escobar 1984).[72] Yet this position does not seem so privileged as soon as one views it in relation to other, more "universal" disciplines (e.g. the natural sciences, linguistics and, ironically, even economics). Development studies and DC itself are essentially concerned to a great extent with providing *reasons* and moreover *scientific argumentation* (cf. Foucault 1966) for why their practical skills and knowledge are indispensable to improving the lives of people in developing countries.[73]

V.2 The Development of "Development" as a Universal Aim

'Il y a des gens qui n'auraient jamais été amoureux,
S'ils n'avaient jamais entendu parler de l'amour.'[74]
(La Rochefoucauld 1967)

With the introduction of a global focus on "Third World"[75] countries since the mid-twentieth century, 'their economies, societies and cultures were offered up as new objects of knowledge that, in turn, created new possibilities of power' (Escobar 2005, 342). It has not ceased, even until today, to be a process through which large parts of the

[72] This is an issue much discussed in academia in the past twenty years, and most researchers have reached a consensus on the quasi-imperialist structure of the foundations of DC work. Yet, the practical aspects of inclusiveness in planning and implementation still do not necessarily provide for knowing, equally capacitated involvement of agents on all sides of the board. One example for good intentions and a step forward since the 1990s – a step that still has not come to fruition in practice – can be seen in the high goals set by the *PARIS DECLARATION* and *ACCRA AGENDA* (2005/2008). It aims for an increase in effectiveness by a distribution and involvement of even small actors in civil society, but nevertheless seeing NGOs as little more than "tools" in the DC process (see OECD 2005).

[73] For an extensive discussion of these allegations and the argumentation opposing them, see (Edwards 1989; Edwards 1993).

[74] 'There are people who would have never been in love, had they not ever heard love talked about' (author's translation).

[75] This is a term I believe to be highly problematic, if not outright discriminatory, but which I will nevertheless use herein for the sake of brevity and comprehension, as it is a demonstrative artefact of historical evolution in development discourse.

world's population have come to see themselves as "underdeveloped" (cf. Illich 1978; Schuurman 2000) – according to determinative factors they themselves have never chosen or would have even given any thought to begin with.

Ever since the world was linguistically divided into three, ranging from the First to the Third, ascribing a (dis-)qualifying term to parts of it has become a norm that is hard to overcome (cf. Escobar 1995, 40). What some have equated to the post-independence phases in Latin America, defined harshly by encounters of languages of the past and present (see Rojas de Ferro 1994), we can behold today in the wording used to contrast the nations and regions which have undergone "development" already – gladly reaping the fruit of this endeavour – and those which still need to take that important step, the ultimate goal justifying all means at hand.

The discourse of a political anatomy of the Third World was (and is?) the object of epistemological construction conducted in the Global North/West, '[...] the end result was the creation of a space of thought and action the expansion of which was dictated in advance by the very same rules introduced during its formative stages. The development discourse defined a perceptual field structured by grids of observation, modes of inquiry and registration of problems, and forms of intervention; in short, it brought into existence a space defined not so much by the ensemble of objects with which it dealt but by a set of relations and discursive practice that systematically produced interrelated objects, concepts, theories, strategies and the like' (Escobar 1995, 42).

The increased technocratisation of development co-operation and development discourse has been underway since its inception more than 60 years ago. This process can be structured into three stages (Escobar 1984, 387 ff.). First, *progressive incorporation of problems* led to an integration and categorisation of issues which, until that time, had not necessarily been perceived as threats to people's existence and labelling them as "abnormalities". Second came the *professionalisation of development*, allowing for an entirely new field of knowledge to arise, with all the production of "techniques" and terminology that goes with it (the origin of development studies). With the production of this knowledge, it was felt that Third World countries would surely be able to escape their predicament. Lastly, an *institutionalisation of development* started to take place and has been ongoing ever since, with the establishment of organisations ranging from the international to the local level. They have made possible the 'dispersion of centres of knowledge production' (ibid.: 388), designating behaviours and rationalities by which all parts of the system operate and influence national politics, and one another. The popular-

isation of a comprehension of the world through the development lens is making clear that development ideas are being deployed through discursive practice, in interaction between many institutions, and have reached a point where the general public sees in them a matter of course.

In this construct, development is not conceived as a cultural process (despite some insinuation that specific cultures are more prone to foster "underdevelopment"[76]), but a set of 'universally applicable technical interventions' (Escobar 1995, 44). Form this technocratic perspective comes the conclusion that culture is no more than a "residual variable" (ibid.), impossible to measure and therefore irrelevant to the hard facts necessitated for development intervention. This poses an apparent problem in many respects, among them language(s) and the influence it/they have in communicating DC practice on the one hand, and the requirements and hopes of beneficiaries on the other. Indicators should ideally be (numerically or relatively) measurable[77], in order for them to become palpable and subject to evaluation. What is being overlooked, and possibly even extinguished, in this process of quantification, makes obvious the irony of destruction 'in the name of people's interest' (ibid.). Only with economist Amartya Sen and philosopher Martha Nussbaum's fairly recent introduction of the *capabilities approach* (Nussbaum 2000, 294 ff.; Nussbaum 1999) has the ball been set rolling for new perspectives on development. Poverty is broadly defined in this concept, allied closely with the human rights approach, as an absence of a person's capabilities to realise entitlements beyond rudimentary basic needs. A dignified human life would thereby include such sine qua non as political liberties, the free choice of occupation, many economic and social rights and a variety of other HRs postulates (Nussbaum 2006, 284 ff.). Expectations are high, seeing as it also takes into account factors such as e.g. the importance of literacy and communities' particularities while not ignoring the necessity for using the traditional cultural institutions and languages which have not been imposed from the outside. Whether these prospects can change some of the critical predicaments inherent to development thought remains to be seen. An item of potential change that can in no case be omitted is the

[76] As an example, see the Confucian concept of ‚filial piety' (still defended for the most part) and its impact on women in China. They (mostly) suffer low social status, are expected to meet obedient social roles, are sold off by their families, were victim to foot-binding until the 20th century and to infanticide until the present (Moon 2003, 46). It would appear difficult to find an agreement between such practices and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, some will argue, yet this endeavour needs to be undertaken.

[77] For instance, see the World Health Organisation's (understandably quantitative, as relating to physical needs) definition of *malnutrition*, factoring in numbers on disability-adjusted life years, body-mass index (kg/m^2), birth weight and intrauterine growth retardation, among others (cf. Blössner and Onis 2005).

recognition and continued tracing of discursive production relating to development, with attention paid to each thought's and argumentation's *genealogy* as well as *critical examination* (Foucault 1974, 41 ff.) of how and why hypotheses are appropriated by developmentalism, to be then later incorporated into systems of coercion.[78]

The "language of hunger" (Escobar 1995, 102 ff.) has been established in the First World in the latter part of the 20th century, depicting the Third World in specific symbols of malnourished African children and infants from developing countries, 'waiting' to be adopted by benevolent families in the industrial nations. It is what Escobar calls an 'economy of discourse and unequal power relations' (ibid.: 103) that, by such a logic, governs present-day development co-operation in all its institutionalised and private complexity. Achieving an ever higher degree of visibility of not only the problems at hand in developing regions, but also of the victimisation and objectifying of beneficiaries is to be gradually attempted. Thereby, the actors on both ends of the DC spectrum, i.e. DC practitioners and beneficiaries, need to voice their concerns and experience gathered, as well as their views of prevailing misunderstandings. The media in donor nations, in particular, are called upon to change social attitudes (and overcome the "language of hunger") (cf. Coleman 2005, 92 ff., 119 ff., 130 ff.) by realising how linguistic attribution is performed and reproduced[79] on their part. Awareness-raising on the self-produced validity[80] that feeds development discourse, making people's invisible necessities the subject of discussion and directing the development discourse towards an inclusion of all parties involved (cf. Escobar 1984, 389; Escobar 1988; Taylor and Gutmann 1994), is what should therefore be treated as the crucial political and social scheme. These undertakings are ideally all aimed at an encompassing inclusion into discourse, as well as an overdue decolonisation of representation.[81]

---

[78] For an interesting exploration of the dicursively pseudo-empowered individual within a neo-liberal market economy, for instance, see (Girstmair 2010).

[79] For instance, see the disempowering quality connotated with the German term *Entwicklungshilfe*.

[80] The principles of discourse are to be found described, on the one hand, as Althusser's *process without a subject*, and Popper's *evolutionary* epistemological process on the other, a result of human aspirations with its own set of rules (see Hacking 1984, 166 f.). Hence, we could never assume full control over the language we put to use or estimate the inherent role that something said or written will take on once it is externalised.

[81] One attempt at including a hitherto immensely marginalised group can be witnessed in the concept of *inclusive development* (see Rousselle 2009), making disability and all affected by it the main subject of its work. A majority of disabled persons live in developing countries, and while the institutional circumstances they find themselves in can hardly be described as supportive, despite many countries official declaration, through elaborate policy papers (Aumard and Lalande 2010), of support for disability-specific development programmes.

V.3 Paradigmatic Shifts in Development Discourse?

Ever since the nineteen-eighties, a gradual change in how development discourse is conducted and argued has been occurring. It has moved away from measuring progress solely in terms of economic growth (such as the Rostovian take-off model or international dependence theories such as those of Raúl Prebisch), by means of GDP and other numeric indicators. At the same time, measurability is still seen as important, and is upheld in the UNDP's publications of composite statistics like the HDI[82] (Human Development Index). The HDI calculations take into account indicators such as GNI p.c., years of schooling and life expectancy – with the annual Human Development Report (HDR) being a document that is nevertheless considered to be important in gauging the progress of nations around the globe.

The shift in the discourse continued through Marxist models of economics, into neo-classical approaches. These neo-classical approaches, favour *free markets* and their power for inciting improvements and empowering developing nations by allowing their citizens to partake in entrepreneurial endeavours – with the hegemony described by Escobar (see above) remaining. With Amartya Sen's *DEVELOPMENT AS FREEDOM* (1999) came an approach that included arguments for the social, ecological, sustainable and other, "soft", aspects of human life, and how they, in addition to economic circumstances, influence a person's quality of life. Such a view has been accepted, to the point of becoming mainstream, in international institutions like the UN, where it is expressed to some extent in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Such a discourse is supposed to bring with it the freedom needed by developing countries' citizens, without which they would be no more than a factor in a statistical evaluation.

What has happened since the turn of the century, however, reflects a discourse which has been turning towards economic globalisation's leverage and influence (cf. Appelbaum and Robinson 2005). In so doing it is losing sight of the ideals originally put forward by *altermondialisme* (cf. Mayer and Siméant 2004; Traoré 2002; UNESCO 2011; Ziegler 2002) in many international and national fora over the years. The emergence of new non-governmental actors – categorised as philanthropic foundations, enterprises' CSR measures and global funds (Grimm et al. 2009) – together with new national actors entering the field (with China's 'economic co-operation' on the African continent being one of the most evident examples of human development's "alternatives") is changing DC's framework and dedication in a lasting manner. What happens in these cases is that

[82] See http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/hdi/; http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/

global capitalist reason encounters perspectives grounded in ethics, resulting in an investigation into human interactions. It deals with how persons in local, national and global systems can be reached and development benefits obtained, and at what price. All of this is reviving the dialogue on ethical thinking with and between non-English, non-Western language sources (see Gasper and St. Clair 2010).

Anthropological criticism (Lewis 2009) goes even further and questions development studies theorists', as well as DC practitioners', capabilities in constructing the historical realities beyond the introduction of development ideas following the Second World War. A longer frame of historical reference could thereby provide information on how non-governmental actors have worked and interacted, long before the present-day national and international contexts came into existence. This then could possibly allow for insights into different epistemologies (ibid.) and the construction of the political contexts in which development intervention occurs.

Two more recent advances in thought are also worth mentioning: The first is *Global Justice*, which focusses on matters of exploitation, distribution, power structures and a moral obligation to provide for others (cf. Miller 2010; Pogge 2003) due to historical culpability. The other is the recently introduced initiative (translated as) *Buen Vivir*, which originated in Ecuador and brings into focus ideas of harmony in social relations and the interaction between humans and the environment (Rieckmann et al. 2011), along with maximum equality of all people (see Bizerra 2009; Walsh 2010). The concept is founded in indigenous conceptions and languages, translated[83] from the (Ecuadorean) Kichwa term "sumak kawsay", that centres an ethical paradigm on a holistic understanding of nature (see Cortez and Wagner 2010). This guiding priciple has reached constitutional status in the Republic of Ecuador (as of September 2008) and has also passed, as a *sentido común* (common sentiment) in a popular referendum, into the Bolivian Constitution in January 2009 (Walsh 2010). While I consider any new approaches of 'interculturalizing' and emphasising the (collective) 'quality' of life (ibid.: 19) to be worthy of closer examination, uncertainty as to whether the inclusion of *Buen Vivir* in the World Social Forum's proposed alternatives has not been shrouded by an overly romanticised

[83] The term has been rendered into three further languages: from Kichwa to Portuguese, from Portuguese to Spanish and from Spanish to English. It is an engaging example of untranslatability, as commented on in the translator's note: 'The literal English translation is "good living," but it is important to observe that buen vivir is itself an imperfect Spanish approximation of the (indigenous Ecuadorean) Kichwa term, sumak kawsay. Meanwhile, in Bolivia, a similar concept stemming from the Aymara Indian cosmovision and language – suma qamaña – is customarily translated into Spanish as vivir bien, or "living well." The author, a Brazilian thinking and writing in Portuguese, has opted to utilize the Ecuadorean Kichwa/Spanish terms throughout her article rather than attempt a concrete Portuguese translation of the concept' (Bizerra 2009).

image of these communities remains – let alone the inability to grasp the language(s) of its origin and the resulting interpretation.

While the buzzwords and descriptions of methods and theories might have changed slightly, much of what is happening in development discourse today is still firmly rooted in the ideas of yesteryear. With an imbalance between international financial and the real economy, the calls for change and civil society's co-determination are getting louder (cf. Galtung 2011) by the day, and on a global scale. Hence, a restructuring of markets or the challenging of their present-state existence will become inevitable, since economic calamities are becoming palpable to more than the developing nations. It is only when they see themselves affected that people in the Global North recognise their participation as a conceivable necessity.

VI. Practical Implementation

As many parts of the theoretical background have been covered until now, I would like to move on to the empirical part of this work, i.e. the analysis of data gathered by reviewing set requirements and interviewing practitioners.

VI.1 Accessibility of Information to Individuals

VI.1.1 DC Practitioners

It has been shown that bi- or multilinguals are more skilled in *translinguistic competence* (see Jessner 2006, 38 ff.), providing them with better access to information – the individual beneficiary's background and emotional state, in the case of DC – and its evaluation than is accessible to monolinguals. A higher number of decoding processes are happening on a subconscious level in these individuals during the interaction with others, because of the way these individuals' experience with multiple communicative tools provides them with a wider spectrum of interpretive plains. This metalinguistic skill, in combination with an education or, leastwise, practical experience in translation, should equip actors on the side of NGOs and other DC institutions with a higher awareness and recognition of any potential misunderstandings which may arise.

VI.1.2 Awareness of Accessibility

Methods of understanding can be viewed in the Thomist sense of individuality coming to mean solely in normative terms, as "human nature" which is expressed in its difference between that of others (see Jauß 1999, 126 ff.). The metalinguistic, inclusive approach is useful in understanding the 'cognitive system, [and] certain social skills such as communicative sensitivity and metapragmatic skills' (Jessner 2006, 39 f.), as these fields are where researchers and practitioners in development studies and other disciplines[84] influence and build off of each other most clearly.

[84] Chomsky, for example, goes so far technically as stating (see 2006, 150) that even though grammar is a system of rules allowing for the generation of infinite "potential percepts" (see also Holenstein 1976), we have to take an even bigger step in order to harness the full knowledge of language (or "system of beliefs", interchangeably) which we have internalised in the course of our lives: Full abstraction is necessary due to language's non-objective existence 'apart from its mental representation' (ibid.).

Ethnomethodology in specific research settings, particularly in sociology and anthropology – disciplines traditionally requiring, at times, extensive observation of research subjects resulting in willing or involuntary interaction – has made apparent the difficult positions that observers find themselves in. For the "objective, distant observer" (see Pike's "etic" account) needs to realise first and foremost that she is involved in all communicative action taking place, influencing and taking on an ascribed or achieved role within structures established (cf. Habermas 2006, 1:179 f.), and can never elude the reflexive consciousness of all implications resulting from participation. These ramifications need to be taken into account by all development practitioners just as much as by researchers, since the 'mutual co-construction of participants' and researchers' identities has profound implications' (Mendoza-Denton 2002, 479). Linguistic studies (Ehrensberger-Dow and Perrin 2009) conducted on professional translators' awareness of how their own competence is formed in text production shows the necessity for a high level of insight for all a comprehensive understanding must first capture before any meaning can be conferred into the TL. This relates back to the afore-mentioned question about mutual identity construction, and whether any of the interacting parties in DC confront each other in knowledge of such impact their exchange is having.

VI.1.3 DC Beneficiaries in Respect to the Heterogeneity of Needs

As minorities, ethnic/linguistic, they are oftentimes not granted an entire insight into the entirety of the majority's frame of reference. They are often confronted with inaccessible terminology, constructs of thought and social realities removed from their own. At the same time, it is expected of them to adjust to their surroundings, without steps being taken in their direction from the side of their vis-à-vis.

An idea of „one state, one nation, one language" has been exported worldwide (cf. Skutnabb-Kangas, Phillipson, and Mart 1995, 74 f.) since its first incorporation in Spain in the late fifteenth century. This has at least partially led to the additional discrimination of all persons and peoples for whom speaking more than one language goes without saying, as well as precluded the acknowledgement of other languages in their legal and social capability. It is only through reconciliation of the mono- and the multilingual persons and ideas within a community that societal multiperspectivity will be allowed in all contexts and intentionally normalised over time. Bridging all the gaps created by recent

historical events[85] is an ideal set very high, yet one whose achievement should at least be attempted. Language is a perfect starting point towards an ideal of thinking in inclusive terms – outside dichotomies such as “male/female”, “coloniser/colonised”, “heterosexual/homosexual”, “underdeveloped/developed”, etc. (cf. West 1993). Only once these views are overcome can we arrive at an ethical perspective of all cultures and speakers that would permit contributions from all groups.

VI.1.4 Methods Presently Implemented in Information Transfer

In the past centuries bilinguals may have been key informants to researchers attempting to gain knowledge about other communities and their ways of living (cf. Boas 1911)[86] – still, the fact that a person (on the side of the “developing” community in most cases) speaks at least one other lingua franca in addition to her native tongue(s) does not have to lead to that individual being *nolens volens* pressured into the role of “involuntary translator”. It might be true that ethnographic – and given that it results from the interchange between strongly different speaker communities, therefore also development-specific – information gathering often needs to be performed by the DC-“aliens” who know how to go about transcription and relaying of said data, despite a lack of communicative means. This might also be an improvement over the DC equivalent of “armchair anthropology” (Duranti 1997, 54), since it provides for immediate encounters with the persons and communities involved.

The so-called *Language and Development* conferences have stressed the interconnectedness and inseparable correlation between these two fields of action and thought (Crooks and Crewes 1995; particularly Shamim 2005 therein). Much of what has been discussed in these events, which have taken place every two years since 1993 in alternating developing countries, relates to what the DC practitioners, international groupings, and institutions involved focus on in their work, with emphasis put on language teaching and acquisition. Despite this particular focus, the organisers’ approach allows for a comprehensive coverage of all related issues, providing for many contributions which deserve further proliferation and propagation in the field of development studies and beyond. For it is in the spread of linguistic knowledge and skill that a process towards empowerment and participatory strategies can be instigated. After all, if a person who knows how to

[85] The conflicts of the twentieth century have particularly scarred relations between parts of humanity – yet even these appear very distant from today’s vantage point.

[86] See earlier: chapters III.6, IV.1, IV.2, V.4 in particular.

express her thoughts and is provided with contextual knowledge, it will be very hard to suppress the desire to exhibit her own views and beliefs.

One of the most promising forms of holistic knowledge creation, co-operation and processing is presently expressed in spaces such as the *IKM Emergent Programme*[87], which is a preeminent example of the impressions the 20th century's "linguistic turn" (Rorty 1992) has left on applied transdisciplinarity. Therein, an approach of harvesting common sources of knowledge through translation and inter-cultural epistemological research is showcased – most prominently in the formation of such concepts as *traducture* (cf. Wa Goro 2007), founded in a deconstructive exchange and interplay between (fr.) *traduction* (translation) and *écriture* (writing). Gabriel Furmuzachi, in his dissertation on the topic of *LANGUAGE, IDENTITY AND MULTICULTURALISM* (2005, 70 f.), makes clear – in reference to Paul Ricoeur – that meaning emerges only in discourse, as discourse can be considered the "event of language", and as invididuals' interplay of sense and reference. In communicating with the Other, caught in its entire human complexity by Furmuzachi in the case of the metaphor (ibid.: 83 ff.), we can grasp the correlation between social, linguistic and phenomenal reality, hence the linguistic constitution of the social. This goes to prove that it is only through trans-disciplinary, and thereby trans-cultural collaboration (cf. Corngold 1994; Oseki-Dépré 1999; West 1993) that the most useful results in development planning and communication can be achieved.

VI.2 Interviews Conducted

The DC experts I interviewed[88] have been consciously chosen in light of their experience in a wide range of different levels of DC organisation and practical implementation. The transcripts of the interviews, which I refer to later on, are not to be found appended in this thesis, yet are kept on file by the author and can be accessed at any time upon enquiry. The six interviews I have conducted in early to mid-2010 – by means of the qualitative *semi-structured expert interview* method (cf. Denzin and Lincoln 2005; Sanderson 2009) – cover individuals in executive, research and fieldwork positions, who have worked in environments removed from their native language. Their experience therefore consists, among other things, of direct interaction with higher-level (i.e. institutional) as

[87] The five year research programme started in 2007, was funded by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, has been developed and is conducted under the auspices of *EADI (European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes)* in Bonn/Germany (See online documentation at IKM Emergent: http://wiki.ikmemergent.net/index.php/Main_Page [last accessed 7. November, 2011]).

[88] The experts interviewed have explicitly expressed their consent for their names to be used.

well as grassroots-level beneficiaries, having collaborated with a variety of NGOs/governments. The interviewees are (listed chronologically, in order of the respective interview date):

VI.2.1.1 Klaus Schuch

Klaus Schuch is Business Manager and Senior Researcher at the ZSI (Zentrum für soziale Innovation/Centre for Social Innovation, Vienna). He is in contact with the ZSI's clients – mostly governmental contracting parties and establishments of higher education – and takes on the role of advisory expert and evaluator of projects conducted, or which are in the planning stage. His experience in monitoring and evaluation, and particularly the close co-operation with EU-level donors and coordinators, is particularly interesting in this context, considering his constant communication with project holders and managing agencies. Schuch and his team find themselves in interaction with ministries and other high-level beneficiaries.

He conducts his work mostly in English, due to reports, evaluations and scientific coverage having to be made accessible to beneficiaries, governments and partners abroad. Only a minor part of internal ZSI work takes place in German. He mentioned regretting not having acquired Russian, as it is one of the languages of the ZSI's focus group beneficiaries today. His repertoire of languages comprises (L2) English, the language most in use in academia and international negotiations, (L3) French, which he was taught in school but has rarely had an opportunity to use, (L4) Bulgarian, due to two years he spent working in the country (but which he never learned systematically, he adds with regret). Although Bulgarian provides him with some understanding of other Slavic languages, his level of competence is not up to the task of negotiation, and even if it were, Schuch says 'I never want to negotiate in the language of my vis-à-vis! I would consider this a tactical disadvantage'.[89]

VI.2.1.2 Friedl Paz Grünberg

As an anthropologist, Friedl Grünberg was drawn into the field of development by scientific interest, a fascination and a 'love of adventure', as she puts it. She also mentions that the historical circumstances in post-war Austria made her feel an ethical obligation to engage herself in anti-racism and anti-discrimination work.[90] Hence, she has conduct-

[89] This is a recurring theme (see the discussion on ELF and Esperanto), and it calls for much more research on linguistic power relations (cf. Bourdieu 1991; M. Li 2008; Smart 1995) to be conducted.

[90] 'I wanted to know who and what a human is.'

ed project work in eastern Paraguay and southwestern Brazil since the nineteen-seventies, promoting land security for the Guaraní peoples[91]. Another area of focus was the introduction of a healthcare programme in Guaraní communities, which further developed into a system which respects Guaraní images of "soul" and including their traditional medicine. Co-operation partners on the donor side included the *Austrian Institute for International Co-operation (IIZ)*, *Österreichischer Entwicklungsdienst (ÖED)* and *Kofinanzierungsstelle für Entwicklungszusammenarbeit (KFS)*, as well as the German *MISEREOR*, *Brot für die Welt*, *Deutscher Entwicklungsdienst*, *Global 2000* and the British *Gaia Foundation*, among others. Later collaboration was conducted with *Horizont 3000*, an Austrian co-ordinator that entered the DC field in 2001[92]. In the host countries, organisations in collaboration included *Misión de Amistad* (Paraguay), *Asociación Indigensta del Paraguay*, *Centro de Trabalho Indigenista* and *Centro de Pesquiza Indigena* (Brazil), as well as *Consolidation of the Colombian Amazon*. In the countries of assignment, (L2) Guaraní, (L3) Spanish, (L5) Portuguese, and (L4) English came to be the languages most in use – with Guaraní taking on a pivotal role for her personally, considering that almost no one else "coming from the outside" had made the effort of acquiring the language. The (L6) French she learned in school has not been put to use very often, and neither has her (L7) Danish, acquired during annual stays in the country as a child. Despite learning to speak Spanish and Guaraní relatively late in her life, at the age of 27 and 28 respectively, Grünberg says she feels emotionally very close to them and regrets not having any partners in Guaraní conversation when in Austria.

VI.2.1.3 Friedl Newald

Friedl Newald has worked for *Horizont 3000* in Uganda between 1996 and 2001, as a trainer in carpentry to small-scale workers in the country, by order of the *Uganda Small Scale Industries Association* (*USSIA*, in Kampala and regional offices). She regularly held courses for local joiners that were members of USSIA and had therefore made financial contributions allowing for them to receive additional technical skills in advanced

[91] among them: (in Paraguay:) the Paĩ-Tavyterã; the Nyandeva; (in Brazil:) Kaiowa: the Ashaninka; the Kashinawa; (in Colombia): the Makuna; the Letuana; (in Argentina:) the Tova und the Wichi

[92] *Horizont 3000* is an Austrian NGO active in the field of DC, commissioned for the most part by catholic grassroots organisations in developing countries. It specialises in deployment of 'experts' to countries of the Global South, monitoring and execution of project work. It came into existence when the organisations *Österreichischer Entwicklungsdienst* (ÖED), *Institut für Internationale Zusammenarbeit* (IIZ) and *Kofinanzierungsstelle für Entwicklungszusammenarbeit* (KFS) merged in 2001. The organisation is active in co-operation on all five continents, while staff from Austria is deployed to Kenya, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Uganda, Brazil, Ecuador, Nicaragua and Papua New Guinea. Its financing comes largely from *Katholische Jungschar Österreichs (DKA)*, *Katholische Männerbewegung Österreichs (KMBÖ)*, *Katholische Frauenbewegung Österreichs (KFBÖ)* and *Caritas Österreich* (see http://www.horizont3000.at [last accessed 12 November, 2011]).

woodwork. Organisation of said classes was conducted with local churches and the respective local government. The training itself had to be conveyed in a mixture of English and local languages, due to low levels of school education and English proficiency on the side of most participants, and no sufficient knowledge of Luganda (the local language) on the side of the foreign trainers. Friedl Newald herself had made the effort of studying some Luganda before travelling to Uganda, and this had given her the advantage of being able to communicate in the most basic everyday interaction and let her conform to local etiquette – something her vis-à-vis interpreted as a sign of amiable respect. In addition, during her work during her work she was confronted with other linguistic realities, one example being the problematic relations between speaker communities of Luganda and Lusoga. These two speaker communities were very close geographically and linguistically, since they were able to understand each other's language, both being part of the Bantu language family. She mentions that these communities ("kingdoms") were on uncordial terms with each other, yet both communities' members received the carperntry training provided by the employer. This was a circumstance that the organisation's European staff had been entirely unaware of and unprepared for when initiating the programme. Swahili[93] and English had been put to use in communication between local staff and recipients in large parts of the country. Apart from (L2) English, the working language she is most experienced with, (L3) Luganda is a language she felt gave her a feeling of warmth and proximity with partners in communication in the field, while (L4) Swahili and (L5) Arabic remained relatively academic, and hence distant since she learned them during her university studies.

VI.2.1.4 Gerhild Perlaki-Straub

Gerhild Perlaki-Straub, a qualified anthropologist with an interest in the real-life aspects rather than the museal qualities of her field of science, participated in a research project in a slum in Guadalajara (Mexico) in the late nineteen-seventies, during her time at the *Instituto Tecnológico y des Estudios Superiores de Occidente (ITESO)*. Following this formative experience, she worked many years in *Horizont 3000*'s (formerly in the IIZ's) project management division. There she was in charge of co-ordinating the mandate of member organisations of the catholic development sector, specialising in the monitoring and implementation of projects as well as in the provision of experts to developing countries. Target subjects were chiefly smallholders' and landless communities, with a focus on sustainable, ecological cultivation techniques. Her work included accounting and

[93] She mentions that it is derogatorily known in the region as "the soldier language".

reporting, staff selection, planning of seminars, authoring applications for financing as well as conveying Spanish reports and evaluations into German officialese ("Amtsdeutsch"). Despite her retirement, she says, staff of her former employing organisation still call her in for consultation on translating specialised texts from the ST Spanish. As working languages, Perlaki-Straub had to resort to her (L3) Spanish and its technical terminology, above all, as well as, of course, her (L2) English. The (L4) Portuguese and (L5) French, which she had acquired, were limited in their use to textual understanding and some passive understanding in spoken interaction.

VI.2.1.5 Stefanie Pilz

Stefanie Pilz, the youngest of the interviewees, is a qualified social worker that spent one year in a development project in Zimbabwe (2000-2001) and three years (2004-2007) as a project participant in Mozambique. Having worked in large measure with orphaned children, in co-operation with the local NGO *ANDA (Associação Nacional para o Desenvolvimento Auto-sustentado)*, she believes acquiring vital knowledge of the languages most commonly in use is indispensable when going into the field. Apart from being able to communicate in (L2) English, (L3) Portuguese, (L4) Spanish and some (L6) Turkish (acquired when working in a youth centre), she has also learned (L5) Shona – the most widely spoken Bantu language (mainly in Zimbabwe, Mozambique, South Africa, Zambia and Botswana) – which, she mentions, ended up overtaking Turkish as her L5. She refers also to the importance that is ascribed by locals to foreigners' knowledge of proper salutations, their willingness to show interest in local cultures and languages, expressing respect, and being more open and receptive to suggestions on the side of the Other. She does not forego mention of the social status of Shona, perceived along with other indigenous languages in Zimbabwe and Mozambique as a "peasant language". These languages are outshone by the prestige and potential of becoming a means to climbing the social ladder, which are qualities ascribed to former colonial languages – no matter whether English, Shona or Ndebele are OLs, as is the case in Zimbabwe. Partner organisations in her project duty included *Aids Alliance*, *Terre des hommes*, the *World Food Programme*, *Concern Worldwide*, *DED*, as well as the political party *FRELIMO* (*Frente de Libertação de Moçambique*) in the host country.

VI.2.1.6 Simron Jit Singh

A Senior Lecturer and Researcher at the Institute for Social Ecology, University of Klagenfurt (Austria) for eleven years, who specialises in social and human ecology, as well

as the metabolism of local rural systems and their long-term dynamics[94], Simron Singh is presently working extensively in scientific appraisal and analysis of developing communities. He has also conducted much fieldwork in the Central Indian Himalayas and the Nicobar Islands – home to speakers of languages in the Mon-Khmer branches of the Austroasiatic language family, many of which are considered endangered today, with precise information on them being kept away from scholars by the Indian government (see Moseley 2007, 290). He is co-ordinating many EU-funded socio-ecological research projects and is frequently in first-hand contact with beneficiary communities in India. Thus Singh usually confers with projects' final beneficiaries using Hindi or English as accepted Indian linguae francae. On the one hand, monitoring activities and results by local fieldworkers is habitually conducted using Hindi, since not all persons recruited for local NGO work are necessarily able to speak the OL English well enough to put it into writing, he says. International and national donors, on the other, require for all documentation to be translated into English in order to be considered acceptable as official reports. The interviewee also makes sure to mention on several occasions the importance he sees in cultural differences in communication (such as connotation, playing with words and indirect measures in communication), and how he has personally experienced these distinctions in perception as an Indian working in Europe. His repertoire of natural languages consists of (L1) English, (L2) Hindi, (L3) Punjabi and German, which he considers himself to be equally proficient in – with mostly passive knowledge in understanding Punjabi speech while being able to write and read better in German. Simron Singh was brought up in a Punjabi-speaking (Sikh) household in Hindi-speaking surroundings, and from the age of eight attended a British boarding school that forbade the use of 'any language apart from English', wherefore English became his 'dominant language'. It is the language he feels the closest emotional and professional relation to today, allowing him to express 'all that he wants', with his Hindi skills pared down to conversational interaction.

VI.3 Interview Analysis – Categories of Connecting Argumentation

The work I have done as a translator has been complementary to my increased interest in the subject matter of multilingualism, and it has also helped me conduct and linguistically evaluate the interviews. This task itself involved a fair amount of practical translation

[94] See N.N.: http://www.uni-klu.ac.at/socec/inhalt/861.htm (last accessed: 23. October, 2011)

work (from German to English), through which I have approximated the individuals questioned, as well as been able to think further ahead with regard to the work of linguistic anthropology, in particular. And while this might not have been with the kind of scrutiny an ethnographer would apply, this transfer, as described extensively in the theories above, still involves more than going from one language to another. Words were made to match the SL equivalents without implicitly adhering to a given theoretical perspective, yet recurring choices in wording led to an emergence of recurring themes very quickly. Therefore, I decided to give weight to some terms over others, with respect to the socio-political and cultural systems the speakers and their respective counterparts in DC practice were and are facing. The very sincere atmosphere of all interview situations has fortunately been conducive to openness and honesty on the part of the interviewees, without any pushing or directing into specific directions of thought. What has emerged from this process was a surprising level of vertical argumentative coherence between the interviewees' statements, something which has allowed for the identification of the following units of measurement and meaning.

VI.3.1 Recognition of Different Realities and their Effects on Understandability

Apart from universal agreement among all persons interviewed on the fact that multilingualism is essential in the operation of DC, there was also universal accord on the belief that not nearly enough attention is being shed on the necessities resulting from such an environment.

It is clear that contracts, agreements, project proposals, LogFrames[95] and the like need to be formulated in an agreed legal language for specific contexts. Firstly, the advantage of technical translation being conducted can find its expression in the facilitation of the review and discussion of project means and goals. Secondly, the effect that any in-depth translation can have on both mutual group understanding and rapprochement of interests is every bit as important as the rational technical understanding garnered, but tends to be overlooked and come second.

Simron Singh puts it in very poignant terms when he describes a "typical" instance of evaluation work:

[95] I.e. "logical framework": 'Management tool used to improve the design of interventions, most often at the project level. It involves identifying strategic elements (inputs, outputs, outcomes, impact) and their causal relationships, indicators, and the assumptions or risks that may influence success and failure. It thus facilitates planning, execution and evaluation of a development intervention' (OECD/DAC Development Evaluation Network 2010, 27).

> 'There is a translation of cultures going on. [...] so, when a donor asks a question, the translator does not translate exactly the question, but translates what this question would mean in the context the farmer is in. And when the farmer gives an answer, the same way around, translation is given back into the Western cultural context. [...] so you would always hear "Well, the farmer is saying this, but what he really means to say is this." [...] this is distorting the picture [...]' (interviewee's emphasis).

So, while a transference of the purely pragmatic questioning and answers is taking place, the person conducting the translation, i.e. somebody familiar with the target group's environment and habits of speech (see above), will not feel she needs to imperatively stick to the phrasing provided. Moreover, this person is going to take into account all manner of interpretation available in order to have an honest exchange with their counterpart, or she will "shape" and "colour" the answers provided, since '[t]he donor, of course, does not want to go into detail'. What he means by this is that it would not be in the donors' interest if their projects' evaluation ended up portraying them as even partially unsuccessful ventures. They owe it to all their contributors to guarantee progress in the field that is expected to become "developed". In the same manner, it is the implementing agencies (i.e. mainly international and national NGOs) who have to promise success to the donor(s) whenever applying for the "privilege" of carrying out a project. It would therefore be detrimental to any implementing organisation's financing, and hence preservation, to show anything other than the accomplishment of what they were expected to do. Points of critical evaluation and exposure of minor shortcomings need to be carefully incorporated (if the practising individuals deem them important) but weighed against a superior number of positive results.

The afore-mentioned raising of individuals' sensitivity through their interaction with partners and beneficiaries is acknowledged by all sides among the interviewees.

In terms of an interrelatedness of culture and language, Friedl Grünberg notes that the most formative experience she had was when she first realised that many terms in German and English had an entirely different connotation in Paraguay. The Guaraní Amazonian Indians she worked with had no concept of "private property", for instance, as everything in those communities belongs to everyone. This idea, along with many other concepts, therefore had to be introduced and adapted to the residents' world-view – an effort that calls for time and a true interest in rapprochement with the opposing sides. Yet, semantic explications are very uncommon in DC today, she regrets, since the stress on time efficiency does not allow for any slowing down in order to make sure that seemingly identical terms are semantically indistinguishable as well. Similarly, Perlaki-Straub

talks about the gravity that should be ascribed to language as a means to achieving an understanding of social relations, systems of values and mythology, i.e. the groundwork of reasoning within a speaker community:

> 'The structure of a society is reflected in its language' (Perlaki-Straub).

There is agreement among the fieldworkers on interaction with final beneficiaries and local co-workers as being emotionally formative, with the strongest impressions being left by the "little", the "interpersonal" encounters. These firsthand encounters leave much more of an impression on the individual than any encompassing concepts or political circumstances ever could. And it is the individuals, after all, who make project work materialise and thus perceivable to the beneficiaries.

To practise development work on a daily basis is something altogether different from what the institutional framework makes it appear – as made clear in practitioners' journals and witness accounts (e.g. L. Frank 1997). Devout DC practitioners[96], find themselves conducting actions and engaging in encounters with people from different cultures that stray quite far from what the seemingly simple, inclusive and overreaching concept would lead them to expect.

Simron Singh proves the hypothesised attribution of linguistic influence when stating that 'language is power', and that 'multilingualism is not only language', but 'a culture of communication'. What really counts, Singh emphasises, are 'personal relationships', in order to minimise the potential for misunderstandings.

If the field staff are extraordinarily diligent, they will go to the grass-roots level in order to investigate people's awareness of and satisfaction with the results, according to Gerhild Perlaki-Straub. But that, she makes clear, is not a legally set necessary condition. Pilz has encountered situations, in which the LF texts were providing instructions, which were yet constantly being misunderstood by the locals. A *loss* of the originally intended message through translation is one of the biggest risks, and hence translation should be conducted in a very diligent manner. She also encountered situations which were very abstruse, in which the project sponsors required for European NGO staff and local volunteers to work out in detail a LogFrame *together with* the beneficiary families. She recalls it being a disastrous enterprise, with both sides jointly discussing and attempting to translate issues such as "sustainability", "measurable results" and "remote goals" for an entire day. Eventually, the staff sat down and put the answers down on

[96] I.e. motivated persons, who are absolutely convinced of the good their actions will bring to the beneficiaries.

paper by themselves, resorting to the technical terminology that ‘all workers in DC are familiar with’, Pilz adds.

When donors go to visit “their” target countries and communities – Simron Singh criticises here with reference to the introduction of the concept of “gender” – they ‘try to put together a few women [...] and photograph them. Then [...] there is a meeting’, and all of a sudden it is declared that ‘the women are “enlightened”’. Some “stronger” women are allowed to speak, photographs are taken, and ‘“suddenly there has been a gender change", now "women are empowered"’, he cynically observes. The practical achievement of female empowerment is far from realised, much less has the rich spectrum of “gender” terminology been adequately transposed and interpreted to fit the cultural context of the target group. The needs of the donors might have been fulfilled, but the lacking end result is just one example of the terminological problem within cultural contexts.

> ‘When identifying the (type and scope of the) intervention to be evaluated […], participatory methods might be of particular use; aspects that might be “hidden” behind official language and political jargon (in documents) can be revealed by narrative analyses and by consulting stakeholders. More generally, the process of participation in some cases can enhance stakeholder ownership, the level of understanding of a problem among stakeholders, and utilization of impact evaluation results.’ (Leeuw and Vaessen 2009, 32)

‘The more socially excluded a [speaker] group is, the more difficult it becomes to ‘get them on board “the boat of mutual understanding”’, says Schuch in flowery terms. The conclusion he and Pilz draw from this is that communities that are already marginalised for reasons irrespective of their language (be it for illiteracy, geographic isolation, etc. – things which only add to their continued exclusion), need to be made subject to measures of inclusion on a broader, socio-political scale. This, as it is now, entails specific sensibilities, which need to be called for in the strategies of evaluation put into practice.[97] However the goal of leastwise rudimentary understanding is achieved – a goal more often than not the rule, it would appear – the DC workers need to be prepared to confront unexpected conversational barriers, and bring with them a few ideas and techniques (see this page’s fn.) for when such cases as these pop up.

As has been taken into account by all interviewees when reporting their experiences, communication is coined not only through context, but also through pretexts[98] (see Busch 2010, 26 f.). When DC participants enter the space of interaction, they do so coming out of a given background, a discursive and social sphere that will never allow for a

[97] Such strategies could include cognitive interviewing and questioning via photographs, drawing pictures or even common drawing on boards with the final beneficiaries themselves.

[98] I.e. individual demeanour, stereotypes, cultural schemata, etc.

human to partake in any sort of interaction in what some may term “a position of neutrality”. As much as this imagined position should provide an ideal which individuals can aspire after, it should never be expected to become a realistically achievable precondition between conversational partners.

A “streamlining” of the working processes and employment practices can be traced back to the costs of having a European outside his office, so the argument goes. Paying external staff a running per diem and covering lodging and travelling expenses has little appeal when compared to commissioning the inexpensive labour of quasi-qualified locals, the cynics argue. In the same way, donors cannot afford that their staff spend months learning the languages locally spoken, and thus stay in the country for an additionally extended period of time, getting to know their subjects of work ‘like anthropologists’ (Simron Singh). Much more likely, the DC evaluators will ‘have to monitor 10 projects in 5 days’, and be exposed to the constant pressure of time and money from above. Their accountability is strongly oriented towards the donors and other money sources, long before they can take the time to reflect on how to balance this pressure with the requirements of their target groups and the factual results of project work – results often at odds with the aims formulated in writing (be that in proposals or final reports). Singh exposes these dynamics by stating that ‘a system of *leaving information out* is in practice’ (interviewee’s emphasis). It is evident, at this point in the investigation, that what needs to be pursued is an intelligibility of terminology, a moving away from submission to time constraints, and a resulting accountability to beneficiaries as partners, who are thereby emancipated and not kept in the dark anymore.

VI.3.2 Translatability of Terminology Used

If the words in use are to be understood in all environments, irrespective of the languages spoken, they need to implicitly reflect the social and other norms in the respective field, and they need to be self-explanatory. An empathic means of communication would therefore call for at least beasic understanding of local languages by the DC actors involved.

Pilz, along with others, criticises that practical experience in the target country, with the target communities and their language(s) is not a sine qua non for persons applying for positions in NGO fieldwork. Simron Singh adds to this that there ‘might be some special cases, but without English [or without a LF] you can’t be in development co-operation’. As Schuch points out, the Western and local workers’ use of a “language of compro-

mise" ('Kompromisssprache', i.e. LF) has quite a few advantages when used in negotiations. For one, none of the participants would be "unfairly" (Schuch) favoured in an exchange conducted in English, unless, of course, one of the parties interacting was a native speaker of said language. Another benefit from the use of an LF would also show in the way that no one side would be able to bamboozle the other due to a higher understanding of the language at hand, something which is particularly important in legal agreements. On the downside however, the English used (in the case of the ZSI's target countries) is often reduced to a very functionality-oriented, technical language, which can serve as a favourable vantage point for experts included in technical interaction, he argues. The negotiation language is cut up and bereft of the beauty some might associate with it. Yet eventually, Schuch's main argument goes:

> '*Negotiating* is *not* something I want to do in the language of my vis-à-vis. I'd consider this a tactical disadvantage. I mean, it's [like] shooting oneself in the foot' (interviewee's emphasis).[99]

Grünberg, the interviewee with extensive experience gathered in the Amazon, commented that one of the gravest problems she encountered in her work was getting NGOs and other organising institutions to even take note that there *were* problems of understanding getting in the way of project preparation and revision. Since most documentation is *a priori* and *ex post* drawn up in the local LF and in the foreign institution's working language, the inclusion and adaptation is considered most of the time to be the locals' task, says another interviewee. Newald mentions cases from her experience in Uganda, when the participants' knowledge of English was insufficient, yet the project's documentation and training was conducted, and any diplomas issued in that language. One of the pragmatic reasons for that, she says, lay also in the stigma that the local Luganda finds itself afflicted with, making documents in that language less valuable, when compared to English.

Schuch talks positively of a mutual give-and-take, a "culture of elaborating consent" ('Kultur des Einverständnis-Erarbeitens'), as he calls it. So, while the work of language translation as such might not come to be worked out in as much detail as is required at first to the extent necessitated, the two (or more) sides in a project would confront the issues and gradually move towards one another, in hope of reaching that consensus. I would make an educated guess that this ad hoc method of communicative operation between speaker communities may be an option as long as the topics in question are not

[99] '*Verhandeln* möchte ich *nicht* in der Sprache meines Gegenübers. Das halte ich für einen taktischen Nachteil. Ich meine: da schießt man sich ins Knie.'

too convoluted. However, the legally binding nature of many documents in such work, and requisite information they contain frequently, calls for the utmost precision in phrasing and understanding. Hence, Schuch states, the translation of written materials into local (official) language(s) would depend, more often than not, on the weightiness of the respective document. The more important (i.e. tied to higher-level institutions or to be inspected by government officials) a document is, the greater the likelihood that it will be translated.

As for intercultural exchange through linguistic interaction, it is indispensable that the cultural background of the community in question is understood before, or shortly after, going into the field. Such a necessary approach would not be achievable without resort to the use of many languages, something all interviewees (unknowingly) agree upon. In the case of Mozambique, similarly with the case of English in Eastern Europe, India and Uganda, the major part of the interaction was expected by the external NGO (*Horizont 3000*) to take place with the help of Portuguese. Despite this, Pilz estimates that some 20 percent of communication during her project activities would have been impossible without recourse to some Shona skills, or the help of colleagues who knew the common language. The dialogues in Shona were the ones most personal and intimate, providing for insight into the children's (she worked at an orphanage, among other places), as well as elderly and less educated people's lives. These groups would have remained unapproachable without the use of Shona. As the social worker observed in this context, much of what the beneficiaries talked about would have been lost in translation, if attempting to directly transfer to the LF.

Any kind of professional translation work, *if* required and afforded by the organisations conducting DC projects, has been confirmed by all interviewees to make up a disproportionately large part of the budget – "if" being the crucial word in this sentence.

Surprisingly, large organisations like the World Bank, with a clear hierarchy in working languages (i.e. English, Spanish, French), have reached a point where, upon revision of former MOs since 2004 (see World Bank 2010), an option of an application being made in one additional national/commercial language has been made optional: '[…] the RFP [Standard Request for Proposals] may also be issued in the language of the Client's country (or the language used nation-wide in the Client's country for commercial transactions […]' (ibid.: 24 , point 3.1). I would of course not go as far as seeing in this detail a milestone in regard to the inclusion of non-European languages in diplomatic and donor-recipient exchange. In such a process, the consultants applying for, and the organisa-

tions requesting, grants and project financing will nevertheless be expected to make use of one of the dominant languages listed above when dealing with the WB's assignments. In addition, the above-named request gives no more than a 20% weight to the "experience in region and language" as eligibility criteria, considering it separated from "general qualifications" and "adequacy for the assignment" (ibid.: 27, point 5.2b).

In regard to this dominance of some languages over others, I want to quote one interviewee who said that command of a language could frequently be a monopolising factor in the information transfer between beneficiaries and donors.[100] What Schuch refers to above, are the barriers often arising between the parties conversing, even before any substantial knowledge of intentions and procedures has been transferred. On the one hand, DC diction – peppered with technical phrasing that presupposes all participants' understanding – cannot always be directly assigned equal expressions in the TL, thus the SL party will at times have to narrow down what it is they want to convey. In addition, much of what should be communicated by beneficiaries through evaluation techniques and grasped on the donor's side, in order to accomplish the effects intended, is lost altogether – owing to DC actors' disregard of recipients' communicative strata.

With unmitigated precision, Perlaki-Straub acknowledges that 'interpreters are doing more than just conveying wording one-for-one' – they are also deciphering underlying symbolic arrangements and are therefore "cultural interpreters" (cf. the translator's role decribed in Vermeer and Reiß 1984; also Vermeer 1990). Hence, translating/interpreting individuals are also to be recognised as cultural mediators. Examples mentioned include project reports from Brazil, Argentina and Mozambique being sent to Austria in the respective LF of the target country, with only a German abstract added (a requirement of the Austrian Development Agency, according to the interviewees' experience). It is therefore self-evident that much of what has been communicated between the speakers in the original assessment procedures is bound to be lost in this multi-step chain of translation and interpretation.

Singh throws in that, having worked primarily in the Indian DC context, he and others in the region could expect at least the respective head of a local organisation to speak English and hence be able to communicate with non-Indian partners as well. Resulting from this circumstance, translation was taking place mainly *within* NGOs, as many of their fieldworkers were the ones most likely not to have the technical English proficiency expected. This internal translation is what often has external DC actors puzzled as to how

[100] '[…] die Sprachkenntnis […] sehr oft einen monopolisierenden Faktor darstellt'.

some terminology can be processed with only a high level of approximation. In the following point of analysis, I want to return to his idea of "cultural translation".

Pilz says that she found interpretation by locals necessary first and foremost in her interaction with children and the elderly. When donors came in to check on the progress of projects, they would sometimes hire professional interpreters, which again were either lolcals or expats working for them. This statement ties in again with Schuch's aforementioned proposition of professional translation's institutional-level-dependence. Singh explains that donors want to talk (with the help of interpreters, that is) to the beneficiaries themselves, 'e.g. a woman milking a cow, a farmer on his tractor, a child that should be in school', in order to at least have the impression of truly being in the picture about progress in the field. This is when their reliance on local NGO workers, or other multilingual locals hired ad hoc, becomes apparent.

Friedl Grünberg even mentions that she cannot recall any qualified interpreters being consulted in project work she partook in. At the same time, the potential complications seem evident to her: 'If one wants to understand people's thoughts, one needs to speak their language – not just formally […], but really understand *their* language, to approach it'.[101]

Civil society actors have long understood the important role their ability to communicate directly with local speakers grants them. An exemplary case is that dealing with the Republic of Congo's HIV/AIDS programmes:

> 'Anonymous testing within existing health facilities was identified as a way to increase the numbers of people presenting themselves for testing as it reduced visibility and thus fear of ostracism, while peer education and counselling were developed to establish broad outreach in prevention and support between people of the same background, speaking the same language, living similar experiences' (Wood and Lavergne 2008, 2).

Individuals' proximity and expression thereof by means of language, among other factors, is what can award DC organisations and transnational institutions access to the populations they are desperately attempting to reach. This raises the likelihood of beneficiaries' co-operation and their understanding of what a degree of self-responsibility in the proceedings would entail.

In relation to the role of field staffers (i.e. the ones employed ad hoc in developing countries, and the experts in the evolving development sector in these countries), Simron

[101] 'Will man die Gedanken der Menschen verstehen, muss man ihre Sprache sprechen - nicht nur formal […], sondern wirklich *ihre* Sprache verstehen, sich ihr annähern'. (Grünberg; interviewee's emphasis)

Singh talks of the local staff members in developing nations as being ‘usually not idealists’. By and large, he explains, the personnel working with DC expats from the Global North are not doing it in order to follow higher aims, but see it simply as a job. Development Co-operation, in all countries involved, hence globally, can be considered ‘a niche, it's a business’ he concludes.

Much of what we know as “development activity” has turned into a sort of business, dominated by “experts” and “agencies”, having “recipients” as its clientele (see McNeill and St. Clair 2009). From a critical perspective, it seems that they use an arcane language, stripped of any tangible, emotional, and genuinely human content (cf. Gasper 2007). Such expression runs the risk of feeling rigid and cold in its implicit legalism, something which excludes the poor.

Any interlingual rendition of such language(s) carries with it the inherent danger of reproducing equally obscuring patterns of terminology, entailing the same levels of unintelligibility, leaving comprehension exclusively to insiders. From this fact becomes apparent the problem that even professional translators and interpreters in DC are facing. They as individuals run the risk of either becoming an accessory to purporting opinions and structures in the discursive field, finding themselves as *in between*, co-producing ideologies (cf. Pöchhacker 2006) that are consistenly excluding many persons whom the results achieved directly concern. Or, if they are honestly looking to find means to reach *translates*[102] which reflect real-life conditions[103], and which are linguistically tangible to the group of persons concerned, the translators’/interpreters’ services simply might not be put to use by high- and mid-level principals in the first place, possibly not even by lower-level agents, considering all of the actors’ compulsory subordination to the established normative systems (cf. Bielsa 2010; Kalina 2002). And insubordination, after all, is ordinarily the first step towards unemployment in this branch of knowledge and practice, as much as in any other sector of a market economy, the rules of which (e.g. “effectiveness” and “efficiency”) increasingly dictate DC’s modus operandi.

VI.3.3 Awareness of Communication Problems – A Questioning of “Objectivity”

> ‘If the accounts are correct, and if the procedures have been documented well – as long as there is paper to prove that this has been done – the matter is closed‘ (Simron Singh).

[102] I.e. the functional product of a translation (see Vermeer and Reiß 1984).

[103] See citations of Grünberg’s examples of women’s rights in Guaraní communities, as well as Singh’s idea of an Indian peasant’s possible thoughts about how he got his new cow.

It used to be a commonplace procedure for European expats to conduct an assessment of needs and evaluation in the field, says Gerhild Perlaki-Straub, but now a transfer of these actions to local staff members or partner NGOs has taken effect. The final translation of project reports and the “wrapping” of information for submission to donors still has to be conducted by Austrian/European staff members, due to their knowledge of precise requirements, terminology and expectations. Besides, ‘all professions confront the problem of technical terminology’, according to Klaus Schuch, and this has led to DC use of many “empty phrases”. The explicit request for their translation into every national language (Albanian and Serbian, in the case of ZSI’s projects in Kosovo) provides little more understanding, but rather a reproduction of insignificant platitudes. The expert refers to countries that have “oriented themselves” in a development assistance environment to the degree of having established institutional norms and regulations for meeting donors’ translational needs. What he describes as ‘meeting the donors half-way’ on an institutional level and in interpersonal translation is a view that provokes sympathy for the recipients situation, as it makes them appear to be caught in a vicious circle – having come full circle from desperate need to creating demand for what the DC donors have grown accustomed to provide. As is apparent, more research into this aspect of “mutual reliance” is called for.

The extended version of reports are penned in the LF in use locally, but there needs to be at least a short report for the principal offices in the OL of the home country – ADA (Austrian Development Agency) requires that all reports be delivered back to Austria in German. Pilz has devised a counter-measure of sorts, as she wanted to make sure her colleagues in the field were able to understand the reports as well. Hence, she penned them in Portuguese, leaving the abstract and translation mainly to the home office colleagues.

Another relevant aspect influencing the need for translation in these procedures, according to Singh, is for

> ‘[...] organisations in the West [to] usually commission an evaluator from the recipient country – [...] e.g. ADA would commission an expert Indian – [...] who are trained, know the [local] language, know how to write a report [...] how the format needs to be, how the language needs to be [for the donors], the terminology has to be expressed, how the LogFrame needs to be worked out, how the indicators need to be specified [...]’.

This is a fitting explanation of why the technical terminology, and all the assessment that goes with it, can be consistently perpetuated, even if the agents involved are not shipped into the developing countries from the outside. A growing professional group *within*

developing countries has come into existence, conducting evaluation *for* donors. It is in most instances more affordable for donors to commission these experts than to dispatch specialists from the donor countries. Since donors are 'not interested in any negative evaluation' (Singh), they want to hear that things are going well, and critical analysis is not in the interest of local experts and NGOs. It is for this reason, the interviewee adds, that 'they have an interest to ignore and to highlight certain things', or else they may risk losing the next contract. This vicious cycle of misinformation and a decreased interest in communicating all things experienced causes for the same problems to recur incessantly.

Consequently, learning the languages of the locals that NGOs interact with in projects should become a must, not an option. Yet, as long as the time frames for projects remain as tight as they are these days (and possibly allow for even shorter terms for implementation in the future), it will not be possible for any additional efforts to be made. 'Most people need a pragmatic "reason" in order to recognise complementary language acquisition as being worth the effort' (Newald).

The necessity of review in written translation, with the translator ideally being able to confer with the original's author to avoid any misunderstandings, is clear. This, however, is practically never the case, the interviewees agree. In face-to-face interviews for evluation, Schuch adds, an elementariness in the wording used needs to be assured. In cognitive interviews, one should always make sure to ask, whether everything has been clearly understood, and any new terminology needs to first be properly introduced, e.g. by writing down essential terms in big letters, asking every (literate) person attending, if they've understood, having them express concepts in their own words. Altogether, validity of evaluation needs to be assured beyond contextuality of a given evaluation setting, i.e. the interviewers present and the language(s) used.

Grünberg, speaking from personal experience (as the Guaraní are mostly monolingual communities), states that she had to learn the local language for any true communication, without reliance on translating proxies, to take place. 'Purely "intellectual"' acquisition of a language, as a consequence, is not sufficient – at least one local variety of the common language spoken locally should be trained to the staff and willingly learned by them. Another expert recommends that the translation of final documents should pass through a phased process, involving persons speaking the local, national language(s) as well as the OL or LF of the donor country, then peer-reviewing and cross-checking the SL original and TL texts. All NGOs and donors should make sure to finance any practice-oriented language education the DC workers are going to require in the field in or-

der to be able to interact directly with the beneficiaries concerned. Apart from this, communication is also ‘a matter of rhythm’ (Singh), i.e. steps should be taken to empathise with the local communities and adapt to their communication customs.[104]

With regard to the choice of technical wording, Singh complains that ‘They can't just drop terminology and leave it there’. Alleviating this problem that all actors, including the DC workers, face are training sessions, he adds. They serve the purpose of explaining the latest “catchphrases”, models, indicators, provide manuals and so forth. At the same time, their focus on the transfer of all concepts portrayed into the linguistic realities of target communities leaves a lot to be desired, if it is not entirely obscured. Perlaki-Straub’s objections once again make clear, that only through knowledge of communities’ and individuals’ thoughts and wants, geared towards their own definitions of progress – usually immediately tangible results – can any success be granted. ‘Our’ definitions of “progress”, “development”, etc. do not matter to most beneficiaries. Following these statements, *legal minima* of conceptual linguistic transmission between DC principals, agents and beneficiaries are the least of the requirements that should hereby be voiced (above all, see UNESCO 1996, Art. 7; 8; 17).

Interdisciplinarity in development studies stems partially from an agreement on humanist/humanitarian ethics, which is shared by many fields and scholars within these fields. It is difficult to argue against, considering that international HRs are founded within these ethics (cf. Edwards 1993, 89; Nussbaum 2006, 274). From this comes the implicit understanding, throughout humanity, that all (humanitarian) aims that substantiate the practice of DC do not require additional justification. It is “for the good of the people”, after all. A silent, unspoken understanding and consensus between all humans is implied. Where such a consensus emerges is not clarified though; and when speaking of successful deployment of development practice with the achievement of the aims that were set, unanimity can be witnessed in the statement ‘that there is no one, single or universally-agreed way of doing this successfully’ (Edwards 1993, 90). Every so often the circumstances (wars would be the most ubiquitous example) do not allow us to presuppose full agreement on all sides over who is deserving of humanity and brotherly love, and of seeing ‘the worth of the human person’ (United Nations General Assembly 1948, Preamble). In these cases we cannot unquestioningly speak of all humanity as a family. This set of problems obviously extends beyond the context of warring nations. It pervades all social structures and arises wherever disagreements between humans imply an exchange

[104] To me, it seems that only in this manner reliable information can be gained in evaluation and project planning.

on an ethical level. Thus, it would border on naïveté to assume that development and all political implications its ideals determine, could *not* just as well be exploited in the installation and perpetuation of hierarchies and general power relations. Here lies development's inherent irony – all the ideals of economic growth and the political freedoms that allegedly go hand-in-hand with it as time goes by, are no match for hard realities such as environmental deterioration, a limit in resources or the Malthusian exponential function on global demography.[105]

When researchers in development and ethics talk of moral universalism and global economic justice (see Pogge 2003, 91–117), they search for all-embracing assertions for all members of the human race, despite being acutely aware, in most cases, that such propositions would be hard to articulate in equal wording, in every language, even if all of them were discovered. So, while many believe that we as humans share certain fundamental *values* that are fixed points anchoring our social realities, and which keep us grounded, directing the ways in which we interact (cf. Searle 1995), this is little more than an *a priori* statement providing only a level of comfort. What we *can* take as a matter of fact is only what immediate circumstances and practical interaction with others show, and even these conclusions should not necessarily lead us to blind extrapolation.

An example from DC work is provided by Friedl Grünberg when she says that many legal and ethical terms are not necessarily to be found across the globe. In the Guaraní language, for instance, the concepts of "gender" and "women's rights" is not directly translatable, as women enjoy a considerably higher position within the social hierarchy than they do (or have done until recently) in the West. The Guaraní language knows no gender, and therefore gender discrimination by means of phrasing is impossible, she underlines. Singh validates the (dis-)connection which beneficiaries often show towards the metaphysical implications that DC agencies see in their practical work. He says that an Indian farmer would most likely think, 'I got something which I didn't even ask for. So why should I worry about what I should have gotten? God has given me this cow. And I should thank God.' As a consequence, it becomes apparent that this perception does not lead to an apprehension by the final beneficiary of all the international and

---

[105] I concur with the view taken by Jan Nederveen Pieterse (2000, 188), who, after an extensive inspection and comparison of present-day positions on development finds that even *post-development* and *alternatives to development* are flawed premises, since, while providing welcome critique of popular academic notions, they are built upon and continuously replicate the 'rhetoric of developmentalism'. As many critical voices in development studies have come to realise, it is hard to argue against something while being tied to the use of a language that will not let one suggest variant preferences without the use of the very same expressions (and therefore intrinsic ideas) that one would like to forego.

global systems working in the background, that provide him with what he is receiving at a given moment. He translates the proceedings into the terms his mind is most accustomed to, a view of the world he is familiar with.

A common theme in the interviewees' comments about the workings of development co-operation is a focus on functionality, in respect of which all action or inaction can be justified. While goal-oriented work – driven by economic circumstances as well as the relationship of dependence between implementing organisations and their donors – is understandably limited in its freedom to meet all theoretical expectations of language-awareness, these conditions do also serve as a convenient excuse. Under the guise of financial constrictions it is relatively easy to argue against such propositions as the execution of competent translation processes, intercultural interpretation training, re-translation of outcomes into the target group's language, etc.

According to the persons interviewed, the structure of projects and the communication patterns that come with it is provided by the respective donor organisation. How the evaluation and documentation thereof is to be conducted goes by a set of explicit rules, which explain what should be put to paper, and how results are to be coded in a terminology that is comprehensible to all persons on the receiving end of the documents provided (not the development aid, that is). What the constituents expect of their fieldwork staff is for the documentation to be encoded in the standardised terminology of the time – an issue which is equally contextual, considering the previously cited statement on practitioners having to stay up-to-date in an ever-changing environment. 'These terms are integral *only for the administrative office*' (interviewee's emphasis), Perlaki-Straub points out. She goes as far as asserting that when certain key terminology is included, the documentation delivered will certainly pass. If some of the essential catchphrases are missing, however, the documents in question are fated to be rejected by institutional-level offices.

Following from the interviewees' explications, it is clear that increasingly the technocracy has started changing the ways in which all DC is operating, particularly when compared to the workings of DC only twenty or thirty years ago. 'The people in the recipient countries have not changed much, and DC is not adapting to their rhythm of living and communicating, as its speed is increasing by the day' (Grünberg). Since the nineteen-seventies, a shift from by and large practically experienced workers labouring in development projects in the field, towards a bulk of the practitioners coming from a theoretical background can be observed, states Grünberg.

VI.3.4 Considerations for DC Implementation

The most prominent factor limiting the use of professionals in translation and interpretation – making it outright impossible at times – are the tight budget constraints, something which all interviewees were in accord with. It is for this reason that ad hoc intermediaries are found on the spot, and given the relatively high amount of (above average by local standards) remuneration, as well as the time constraints on the implementing organisation's side, this instant solution is perceived as being sufficient by most. It becomes more problematic, Schuch states, when the local authorities or agencies responsible for the project become involved in translation practice at the same time. Since they are to be not only actors, but also the "subject of investigation" or evaluation, the possibility that they could govern the formulation and, implicitly, the qualitative assessment of critical data must be consciously delimited.

Throughout my research on the implementation of the requirements of DC organisations thus far, I have not come across any unequivocal mention of linguistic criteria as being vital to the eligibility of project proposals. Neither do requirements of local language (not LF) proficiency, that project staff from outside the developing country in question would have to bring to the table when going into the field, appear particularly accentuated. Eligibility criteria in regards to NGOs' choice of staff for projects to be implemented refer, in most cases, to target country LF only as an asset. Rarely is it considered a necessary requirement. Pilz states, 'I have not seen it put into writing anywhere, whether one needs to learn the language [i.e. non-LF local language]'. This might indeed be considered exemplary for NGOs' handling of the linguistic subject matter, since it paints a picture of the issue being considered relatively insignificant. One would be jumping to conclusions, however, when suggesting that these organisations' conduct was due to negligence, or even ignorance. What is more, this proves again the precariousness in which the office and field staff, plus the host country evaluators, are constantly operating. They are unable to afford to centre their relevant terms of engagement with an inclusion of language in the advantages in effectiveness such a focus might provide.

Some good things can fortunately be said about the bigger actors in international DC, who can act as principals or agents with respect to individual situations – a role recently ascribed to civil society actors as well (cf. OECD 2005; OECD 2009). At this point, I would like to cite the OECD DAC's document *Evaluating Development Co-operation: Key Norms and Standards* (2010, 20), which states as one of the rules that '[e]valuators are mindful of gender roles, ethnicity, ability, age, sexual orientation, *lan-*

guage and other differences when designing and carrying out the evaluation' (emphasis added by the author). Underlying the dissemination of the reporting and feedback from the field is a set of rules, according to this explication, which all DAC members should follow. And, even though language is listed as only one point in a list of many criteria, following the Declaration of Human Rights (1948)[106], the document does go as far as prescribing the following: 'Evaluation reporting should be clear, as free as possible of technical language' (OECD and Lithman 2010, 10, Paragraph 39). This recommendation would therefore constitute a definite understanding for all parties involved, that all terminological exclusion of non-insider speakers, as mentioned heretofore, should be brought to everyone's attention and issues, hopefully, resolved. This problem of marginal comprehensibility has driven organisations like *Pact*[107] to recognise the necessity for the production of 'a number of plain-language, user-friendly resources' (Wood and Lavergne 2008, 23), in order to truly reach their beneficiaries. Participatory communication methods have also been elaborated by other big actors (Berlage and Stokke 1992; Development Assistance Committee 1991; Development Co-operation Directorate (DCD-DAC); OECD/DAC Development Evaluation Network 1999; OECD/DAC Development Evaluation Network 1999; OECD/DAC Development Evaluation Network 2010; Tufte and Mefalopulos 2009; UN General Assembly and Committee on Information Thirtieth Session 2nd & 3rd Meetings (AM & PM) 2008; World Bank Projects and Operations), yet, in most instances, their guidelines remain theoretical recommendations only.

In my opinion, however, this process does not leave any space for nuance or potential ambiguities, seeing as an import of western DC terminology is taking place. The language is merely stripped down to its basic structure and left as a tool, with each of the parties using pre-set phraseology and wording. As much as I can see the value to be found in a functional means of communication, I believe that the centering of speech and writing on strictly technical terms does away with much of what subtleties and emotion a linguistic repertoire has to offer.

---

[106] One way of stating the *linguistic human right* is in relation to the '*mother tongue(s)*', freedom of identification with it/them and making use of its/their spoken and written form(s) (cf. Skutnabb-Kangas, Phillipson, and Mart 1995, 71). The groups most often deprived of having education, political administration of justice or administration provided in their mother tongue(s) are mostly *minorities* (*indigenous minorities*, *migrant minorities*, *refugee minorities* – see Bauman in section IV.4), who have come to bear the burden of nation states being partially defined by a shared, "unifying" language and discrimination against all of its "outsiders" (cf. A. Wimmer 2005, 107 ff.). It is in schools where a process of forced assimilation ("forced inclusion") of these "outsider communities" takes place, and where the dominant language is used to enforce the dominant culture and its views on children of ethnolinguistic minorities (cf. Skutnabb-Kangas, Phillipson, and Mart 1995, 71).

[107] See: http://www.pactworld.org/

Even language proficiency is of little use once a seemingly endless list of acronyms is introduced. 'At some point I have grown tired of memorising all the acronyms'[108], a visibly disappointed Grünberg says. It is still the DC donors and their staff members' duty to have an overview of the most important parts of terminology, translating and explicating their meaning as best as possible, lest the final beneficiaries be expected to acquire knowledge in a LF. Participatory measures should be considered a given in this day and age, particularly after having experienced the negative consequences all non-integrating MOs have effectuated.[109]

Another point of agreement among all interviewees is reflected in their recognition of language's strategic importance in the development sector, relating not solely to translation but to management and co-ordination of knowledge gathered in the DC process. The proper handling of information should consequently include speakers of all natural languages that are part of the interaction process, so as to facilitate effective project and programme results. It could therefore be considered a prerequisite that all donor organisations as well as governmental actors jointly request legal pressure to be put on all implementing and evaluating parties who are in constant interaction with each other, and with the beneficiaries. Only with the help of such guidelines, which would of course need to be monitored externally, in addition to project monitoring, could appropriate mutual support among multilingual agents be secured.

The likelihood that any well-trained interpretation/translation workers are involved depends in large part on what stage of the project cycle is concerned and where that cycle is conducted. Klaus Schuch observes a linear levelling of this practice: from using mostly local language(s) at the "bottom" (i.e. the final beneficiaries), through English as LF, all the way to the language of the donor's or head NGO's country, respectively. As soon as governmental actors are involved, he comments, the probability of professional translation work being brought in appears to rise exponentially.

One advantage of staff usually consisting of locals from the target country as well as experts from the outside is that it ensures, to a certain extent, local input on the institutional level. Translation of all vital aspects of communication, not only into the common LF but also into the local languages, is however not considered corequisite, despite the

---

[108] 'Irgendwann bin ich müde geworden, mir die ganzen Abkürzungen zu merken' (Grünberg).

[109] The effects of inclusive methodology are by no means less problematic. From them stems a multitude of additional complications, which need to be taken into account and countered by all DC parties (cf. Rebien 1996; Tufte and Mefalopulos 2009).

argument one might make for such a habitual procedure being conducive to project effectiveness.

Eventually, though, the distance between DC practitioners and the quasi-instrumental approach to multilinguals in the field needs to be surmounted at an institutional level. It would for one call for better educational opportunities for individuals in developing countries, granting the people affected by development intervention full participation in decision-making. Also, all practitioners coming from Western countries should be afforded extensive linguistic training *before* going into the field, as long as budgetary constraints do not preclude institutions from implementing such methods.

One aspect of high awareness which Schuch has drawn from his DC work by now is that language is something which brings with it power – it can decide over exclusion or inclusion of individuals and communities. Often, he explains, particularly women and the elderly (due to their relatively high level of illiteracy and monolingualism), find themselves relegated to the lower edges of even their native communities – a point Newald and Singh concur with, referring to the cases of Uganda and India. On this point, Perlaki-Straub alludes to the difficulties encountered when different ethnicities are expected to co-operate, even if they have no *common ground* linguistically. According to her, 'it is difficult to expect of a European to learn five Amazon Indian languages.' Grünberg counters this statement by saying that only by such language acquisition (she does not mention a number) can one truly empathise with the target group. To provide an example of an inverse linguistic claim to power, she tells of the Guaraní demarcating themselves through the means of 'their own, secret language' – separating themselves from the LF-speaking majority.

The power aspect of language becomes less and less predominating the higher one climbs up the levels of hierarchical institutional strata, Schuch qualifies the above statement, with a smirk on his face. At certain levels within the governmental stakeholder and international donor organisations, language becomes only one of many influential factors, and the uneven distribution of linguistic assets almost ceases.

Information exchange is constrained in part not only by the hurdles that language poses, but also by the local law that leaves many choices to the small-scale actors and does not call for complete transparency on all sides. Transparency is expected of the beneficiar-

ies, necessitating translation processes and inquiries in the first place, while the donors can keep all their data confidential if they like, Simron Singh regrets.[110]

Extended discussion among all parties is still necessary if DC actors want to be able to vouch for their inclusion of everyone's perspective in their operation, and in how they approach the target groups and select which "projects" (i.e. communities with specific challenges and needs) they will support. The elaboration of policies and programmes to be implemented, with reference to open interaction, interviewing, translation and interpretation procedure, should come about in ways similar to the afore-mentioned interdisciplinary research. New knowledge can be generated only if all sources of information – hence all speakers – can make themselves heard, and their rights and epistemology respected as being equally relevant. Indigenous, endogenous fields of knowledge can be accessed only by means of encompassing translation work, led by individuals who are familiar with the speaker communities concerned, and who are willing to metalinguistically and culturally approach the persons on both ends of the chain of communication.

This is a statement all the experts interviewed agree with. Yet, on a pragmatic level, Schuch points out that budgeting is where the implementation of said measures gets problematic. The relatively high salary a local interpretation/translation professional receives by the target country's standards is not much at all compared to what Austrian interpreters and translators get. Yet, in view of mostly meagre project financing, even this expense is rarely afforded, and is avoided by employing, formally or informally, non-professionals on the spot, with little awareness of the wide range of misunderstandings and their effects on project results, which this hazards. As long as evaluation, most importantly, is dependent on language, then all of the thought that needs to be invested into how it is handled cannot be done without.

In regard to practically relevant universality, I want to refer to Schuch's statement that all validity needs to be secured beyond contextuality.[111] In order for such conditions to be met, evaluators are bound to take into consideration in their enterprise not only all of the documentation provided, but also the conditions and context surrounding its materialisation. This would include experts' surveys as well as direct consultation of the target groups, with the help of (ideally certified) interpreters familiar with the setting at hand.

---

[110] As a consequence, the claim can be made that a fully open exchange can take place only if beneficiaries' concessions are evidently reciprocated by donors and agencies in equal terms, thus eliciting the trust necessary on all sides.

[111] 'Die Aussagekraft über Kontextualität hinaus muss gesichert sein' (Schuch).

A context-aware investigation needs to include such questions as 'What do you yourselves see as a success or failure?', as one of the interviewed professional makes clear.

In additional, Singh states that '[…] it is taken for granted that the recipient organisations know how to deal with the beneficiaries [...], but the emphasis is less on whether the people [i.e. the beneficiaries] have *really* understood what they are doing' (interviewee's emphasis). In his opinion, in most cases the mediated values and knowledge take second place to providing accounts and documentation.

A disadvantage of seeing the linkage between languages in use and the cultures they spring from (and furthermore the way their speakers think) comes from realising the extremely relativist opinions one might deduct from such a position. An increasingly nuanced level of analysis of this relationship is therefore required in scholarly and field practice. 'This sophistication includes increasing openness to universals among those influenced by a tradition of "axiomatic relativism", balanced by a healthy critical attention to the cultural foundations of linguistics itself' (Hill and Mannheim 1992, 399). All accumulation of knowledge that results from direct participation in DC operations, i.e. planning, interaction with donors and beneficiaries, as well as translation in them, should be systematised in order to elaborate new, more inclusive approaches.

VI.4 Shared Argumentation

Much of what my interviewees reported about the role NGOs, governing institutions and local forces played in their DC experience, and how these entities interact, has validated many of my initial hypothesis' assumptions, with a few points of information that were truly unexpected. One point of interest relates specifically to the heterogeneity of individuals, and making apparent the ones who cannot be reached as easily, even by means of local language use.[112] This is often overlooked in the ways evaluation is conducted in project work.

A lot of what is conferred between individuals is coded in metalinguistic indicators, such as body language, what is left unsaid (cf. Searle 1975; Searle 1983), or the choice of one expression over another. The social conditions and norms of beneficiaries and their communities play an essential role as well. The obvious conclusion to be drawn from

[112] Such as women and children, who are statistically more likely tob e monolingual and less educated. See above.

this is that all messages need to be cognitively filtered by each participant and the staff members evaluating. These persons clearly have a better chance of recognising the unspoken, and the interpretative scheme to be applied, once they have gained some experience with the communities and cultures in question. Face-to-face evaluation should, for this reason (among many), never be left to inexperienced outsiders who have only a formal relation to the beneficiaries, for such people might disregard many of the facts.

As for the realities that DC actors find themselves confronted with in their field experience, they bring with them an interaction that can hardly be compared to other types of exchange that persons are commonly accustomed to. Not only the immediate encounter with persons from crucially different backgrounds needs to be recognised, but linguistic understanding – tied closely to the introduction of new terminology – poses an additional, considerable challenge to most. When we access such scenarios with the expectation of maintaining an outsider's "objectivity", we do not take into account that any views previously constituted lose their significance once entering new territory. While human universals (such as the accepted HRs aspired to) are something that is necessitated as an overarching guideline, the fact of the matter appears to be, that new realities are created with every new interaction that takes place. It is these realities – instigated by development intervention in the first place – that all DC practice needs to constantly adjust to and approach from new angles with respect to each individual circumstance.

The common statements on technocratised DC institutions and practice express the presumed reason for why language and translation/interpretation is seen in the relative austerity that actors find themselves working in. Another crucial factor hindering a non-secretive attitude of ready accessibility in DC, without concealment of the actions and purposes of all parties involved, is "aetiologically diagnosed" by Friedl Grünberg:

> '[…] part of the advance in [DC's] technocratisation came with an unwillingness to deal with one's own helplessness' (Friedl Grünberg).[113]

Following the changes in the global economy that have been occurring increasingly rapidly since the Second World War, development practice has started shifting its focus and moving towards a re-orientation under the auspices of the market economy. This has resulted in DC turning into simply one "business" among many, with its practitioners having to yield in their former idealism to the terms newly introduced. The above-mentioned "helplessness" of DC actors becomes increasingly evident when these actors find themselves going against the "windmills" of technocratic economic structures,

[113] '[…] ein Teil des Technokratisierungsschubs [der EZA] kam mit dem Unwillen zum Umgehen mit der eigenen Hilflosigkeit.'

which are prevalent across the globe. Viewed from a slightly sanguine perspective, a possibility of radical change due to rising popular discontent with the entirety of these structures *in developed countries* might cause for an altering of events in the near future.

The introduction of DC implementation with increased attention directed to the words in use and their self-explanatory, evident understandability calls for an expanded multi-perspectivity, by means of including many different disciplines and native speakers. Only through such methods could a balance between the ones disadvantaged in terms of language-proficiency and their counterparts be achieved. An increase in empathic measures of communication is to be accomplished on the one hand, and development co-operation urgently needs to make clear the implications of the wording in use, ideally with reference to its origins (if not outright etymology), providing the recipients with better traceability and opportunity for a critical perspective, on the other.

VII. Conclusion

One of the citations that I consider to be put in the most simple, yet astoundingly apt, and almost lyrical wording, which encompasses all points of discussion hitherto mentioned, goes as follows:

> 'Semantics is about the relation of words to thoughts, but it is also about the relation of words to other human concerns. Semantics is about […] the way that speakers commit themselves to a shared understanding of the truth, and the way their thoughts are anchored to things and situations in the world. It is about the relation of words to a community […]. It is about the relation of words to emotions: the way in which words don't just point to things but are saturated with feelings, which can endow the words with a sense of magic, taboo, and sin. […] people use language not just to transfer ideas from head to head but to negotiate the kind of relationship they wish to have with their conversational partner' (Pinker 2008, 3).

In an ideal world (i.e. a hypothetical one) the use of multiple languages in international and intercultural communication could result in what can be referred to as a *merging of horizons* (see Preisendanz 2007), that is, the arrival of new approaches in knowledge production, the proliferation thereof as well as a fundamental re-thinking of transdisciplinarity (Ricoeur 1969) – taking into account the interpretations of our environment provided by individuals who had until recently not had a means of making their voices heard outside their individual language communities.[114] While there is practically no likelihood of us ever creating the conditions for completely non-violent, non-hierarchical communication or the full carrying-over of "meaning" between human beings, I believe the power of languages and their interaction should never be underestimated. There might appear to be too high a risk of falling into overly relativistic Nietzschean *perspectivism* (cf. Hingst 1998), but so far I am holding on to my conviction that one of the key concepts for achieving human understanding lies in the constant exchange (to the extent possible) of just these seemingly unrelated perceptions among *individuals*. Still, the implications of people's structural integration into what surrounds them, and therefore already has become part of their Self, allow for us to perceive these circumstances as 'rationally justified within the limits of their own knowledge, understanding, or access to the relevant information sources.' (Norris 2006, 65) A certain level of *Erkenntnis* (Pop-

[114] This view presumes that the question "Can the subaltern speak?" (cf. Spivak 1988) is to be answered with a clear "Yes", as long as an awareness of the problem is upheld. They may not yet have reached a level of audibility that could be compared to that of the respective Hegemon – if only one exists –, but new means of communicability are being constantly put forward.

per 2000, 43 ff.) is to be reached on a subjective level however, and this is what creates the conditions for an exchange enabling the transportation of any meaning.

Accordingly, the first suggestion I want to make for further scientific investigation to be conducted, is to enquire how different means of communication create differently perceived realities. Can certain linguistic and metalinguistic exchange lead to more convincing conferment of concepts (in DC as well as other fields)?

We can attempt, theoretically, to grasp the importance of an individual's linguistic repertoire, a repertoire she has acquired within a biographically given socio-political setting, which is, therefore, never independent of circumstances. This repertoire is subject to constant change *outside the mind* – from the impact of institutionals and power relations to emotion (cf. Busch 2010) – yet everyone perceives their speech to be "their own" or "their group's", long before they cognitively embed themselves into superstructures such as a nation, or even a "world community". Even the speech of only one person can be 'filled by many different *voices* or linguistically constructed personae' (Duranti 1997, 75), contributing even more to the already multi-layered image an individual has of herself, and all the more to the indistinct conception of their vis-à-vis that others around her are carrying (cf. Bakhtin 1981, on the imbroglio that heteroglossia can cause). It is not hard to grasp, therefore, what the influences of such complexities on the interaction between DC workers – be they the most knowledgeable participants/informants/evaluators/researchers/local fieldworkers – and their counterparts on the "receiving end" of development aid is. Translating all words uttered with respect to cultural idiosyncrasies is what makes knowledge of ethnographic and translational methodology, as well as intercultural theoretical thinking-ahead and repeated re-interpretation a necessity.

Translation and interpretation are always a part of discourse, and all individuals involved in the processes of restating from one language into another should feel ethically obliged to at least sustain an awareness of what knowledge, methods and ideologies they are knowingly imparting to the receiving side(s). The role of an interpreter *per definitionem*, a definition relating to the word's Latin etymology of "inter-partes", has been concisely brought to the fore by Pöchhacker (2006, 193): '[…] the term essentially designates the human mediator positioned between two parties or values, and it seems easy to extend the latter term, i.e. values, to mean value systems, or belief systems, if not "ideologies" in modern academic usage'. Thus, I see all of the systems and actors of translation as preordained to bear the heavy burden of "complicity", to use a particularly weighty term, in constructing and sustaining a norm of vocabulary, grammar, and reasoning – and

therefore the potential fallacies that come with it. While perfect impartiality on the side of the person(s) interpreting/translating might be a beautiful goal in theory, most will admittedly feel stronger sympathy to either one party's position or the other's. As humans – and persons with intricate knowledge of the subject matter of interaction at hand, which I would rightfully presume to be the ideal in professional DC interpretation and translation – most actors are likely in constant internal conflict when encountering a situation where they strongly disagree with the wording and ideas conferred. This leaves them with only two options: to either refuse any more translation work or to deliberately continue in their action and therefore necessarily accept the fact that they are no longer unknowing, "neutral" participants, but have become culpable *intermédiares*.

From this chain of thought, I want to introduce what calls for further investigation: Can linguists and development researchers – in collaboration with fieldworkers, institutions and beneficiaries – develop translations of terminology, which would not necessitate workshops and trainings in order to be roughly understandable? This question entails investigation into universals in semantics, and how some concepts could find not literal translation, but respective equivalents in target speaker communities.

I concur with Simron Singh's call to involve more anthropologists in DC's programme elaboration, as they are more 'used to discuss social issues and "meaning"', while 'development experts are versed more in the "technical capabilities"'. Researchers of all disciplines should be engaged as immediate participants, as Friedl Grünberg and Gerhild Perlaki-Straub concur.[115] Not only the languages, but the 'cultures have to be understood' (Singh), in order for any further insights to be advanced. Only if all factors are taken into account through a disciplinary amalgam of cultural studies, anthropology, linguistics, development research, psychology, neurosciences, and all other disciplines who are willing to contribute, will any further progress be made. New manners of communication with an increased focus on translation need to be devised. This is a critical endeavour that cannot be conducive to intercultural and interdisciplinary collaboration unless the multiplicity of languages, cultures, and problems at hand are analysed by an equal number of individuals, who deliberate on these issues out of an equal number of backgrounds and contexts, and who then put the interpretation of the world into an equal number of perspectives, who enunciate their views in an equal number of adequate terms, and who then share these results with the highest number of other individuals involved.

[115] Whether this agreement is slightly biased due to the fact that they themselves are both anthropologists, is rather insignificant to the point made here.

Furthermore, the “universal” aims underlying international development endeavours, as exemplified by the MDGs of 2000, appear to me to be tangible mainly through their practical implementation in given settings. At the same time, the meta-structure theoretically holding up and justifying any of these actions seems removed from the everyday realities that persons are facing. So, without jumping to conclusions, I recognise a similarity between talking about “development” and talking about “politics”: Oliver Marchart (2007, 61–78) demonstrates, by comparing critical thinkers’ debates on the *identity-constituting difference* of the expressions “la politique” (politics) and “le politique” (the political), how the theoretical distancing from *praxis* and the physical manifestation thereof are two ends of the political spectrum. Likewise, I would like to endorse the claim that “development” as such principally finds itself constituted in a spatially and temporarily limited scope. We could draw a comparison between this constitutive dichotomy and the "DC concept” as a continuous activity vs. any “DC realisation” as a discrete event, fitting it into human cognition of time and space. Once put into DC practice, we cannot see the continuous leading thought that all of it is founded on. Rather, the conclusion from this analogy would be that development only exists in an ever-recurring reconstitution in the practical field, and this should be made clear in how information is transferred: How do we define (and translate) “development”, and what is considered “developmental”, i.e. conversion and linguistic communication in practical terms, from DC practitioners to beneficiaries, and vice versa.

What can be drawn from these explications is my third proposed research desideratum: A systematic analysis of how DC actors and their vis-à-vis on the receiving end view and name the ends of development practice to be conducted. Are there apparent overlaps in interpretation due to the respective vocabulary in use to be recognised? Have any of the aims come into existence independent of the international discourse? Are particular unusual perspectives to be encountered in certain speech communities? Etc.

Having conducted a fair amount of research and dealt intimately with the questions posed, as well as with the thoughts emerging from this process, I have come to the conclusion that I consider myself, to an enormous degree, to be delineated and ceaselessly modified by means of language. If an incapability to linguistically express one’s thoughts occurs – be that only in an inability to recall certain words on occasion – the habituation of relying on language to give voice to our minds, a practice we take for granted, reaches its peak of manifest obviousness. As I perceive the means of expression that many speakers make of their language, it incites a will to hone my own skills in

communicating my beliefs and opinions in ways which make them intelligible and warm to others, on a semantic as well as an emotional level. It is my opinion that the least a linguistic manifestation of thought should achieve, is to convey an impression, crossing inter-lingual borders by *empathic translation* and making tangible to the ones receiving the message, of what the originator's circumstances were. It is through language that humans are able to accept the otherness of surrounding individuals as being non-threatening, and it is here that a mutual interest and respectfulness is elicited. Language acquisition and use are therefore key to the acceptance of individuals' needs, motivation, values and immediate feelings, with everyone's identity construed (or destroyed) in an ongoing dialogical process.

The last point worthy of discussion, that I want to propsose with regard to multilingualism, is whether the speakers of multiple languages are able to perceive more information communicated (explicitly or implicitly), and can therefore arrive at a different understanding (cf. Fuss, Albacete, and Monter 2003) of a state of affairs than monolinguals would. Can social realities be grasped more clearly by means of linguistic interpretation? Are hierarchical structures and customs of interaction made understandable with the help of many languages? Is *any* true understanding of a social reality ultimately possible, and how could such understanding be made measruable? These are all questions relating back to the much-discussed issue of awareness and interaction, which I have not sufficiently discussed as of now and believe to be of interest for further investigation in the future.

VIII. List of References

VIII.1 Print Sources (Monographs and Articles)

Achebe, Chinua. 2006. The Politics of Language. In *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, ed. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. 2nd ed. London & New York: Routledge.

Adorno, Theodor W. 2000. Résumé über Kulturindustrie. In *Kulturphilosophie*, ed. Franz-Peter Burkard, 167-176. Alber-Texte Philosophie 10. Freiburg [et al.]: Alber.

Allen, James Smith. 2003. "Review: Navigating the Social Sciences: A Theory for the Meta-History of Emotion." *History and Theory Vol. 42* 1: 82-93.

Anderson, Benedict Richard O'Gorman. 2006. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Anzaldúa, Gloria. 1987. *La Frontera/Borderlands: The New Mestiza*. 1st ed. San Francisco: Spinsters / Aunt Lute.

Appelbaum, Richard P., and William I. Robinson. 2005. *Critical Globalization Studies*. London: Routledge.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Barkow, Jerome H., and John Tooby, eds. 1992. *The Adapted Mind: Evolutionary Psychology and the Generation of Culture*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Barry, Peter. 2009. *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory, Third Edition*. 3rd ed. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Barthes, Roland. 1972. To Write: An Intransitive Verb? In *The Languages of Criticism and the Sciences of Man: The Structuralist Controversy*, ed. Richard Macksey and Eugenio Donato, 134-144. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Baudrillard, Jean. 1975. *The Mirror of Production*. Trans. M. Poster. St. Louis, MO: Telos Press.

Bauman, Zygmunt. 2008. *Wspólnota: W poszukiwaniu bezpieczeństwa w niepewnym świecie*. Trans. Janusz Margański. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.

Bauman, Zygmunt. 2001. *Community: Seeking Safety in an Insecure World*. Cambridge: Wiley-Blackwell.

Beaugrande, Robert De. 1994. Cognition, Communication, Translation, Instruction: The Geopolitics of Discourse. In *Language, discourse, and translation in the West and Middle East*, ed. Abdulla Shunnaq and Mohamed Helmy Heliel, 1-22. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Benedict, Ruth. 2005. *Patterns of Culture*. Boston & New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Berg, Marinus van den. 1985. Language Planning and Language Use in Taiwan: A Study of Language Choice Behavior in Public Settings. A Contribution to the Sociology of Language. Ph.D. Diss., Leiden: Leiden University.

Berger, Anne. 2007. The Popularity of Language: Rousseau and the Mother-Tongue. In *The politics of deconstruction : Jacques Derrida and the other of philosophy*, ed. Martin McQuillan, 98-115. London: Pluto Press.

Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann. 2000. *Die gesellschaftliche Konstruktion der Wirklichkeit - Eine Theorie der Wissenssoziologie*. Trans. Plessner, Monika. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch.

Berlage, L., and Olav Stokke. 1992. *Evaluating Development Assistance: Approaches and Methods*. Ed. European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes. London: Routledge.

Bielsa, Esperança. 2010. "Cosmopolitanism, Translation and the Experience of the Foreign." *Across Languages and Cultures* 11 (2): 161-174.

Biseth, Heidi. 2009. "Multilingualism and Education for Democracy." *International Review of Education / Internationale Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft/Revue Internationale de l'Education* 55 (1) (January 1): 5-20.

Blackledge, Adrian. 2010. The Discursive Construction of National Identity in Multilingual Britain. In *Bilingualism and Multilingualism - Sociolinguistic and Interactional Perspectives*, ed. Wei Li. Vol. 3. London & New York: Routledge.

Bloch, Bernard, and George L. Trager. 1942. *Outline of Linguistic Analysis*. Special publications of the Linguistic Society of America. Baltimore: Linguistic Soc. of America.

Blommaert, Jan. 2008. *Grassroots Literacy: Writing, Identity and Voice in Central Africa*. London: Routledge.

Blommaert, Jan. 1997. The impact of State Ideology on Language: Ujamaa and Swahili Literature in Tanzania. In *Human contact Through Language and Linguistics*, ed. Birgit Smieja and Meike Tasch, 253-270. Frankfurt a.M. & New York: Peter Lang.

Blommaert, Jan. 1996. "Language Planning as a Discourse on Language and Society: The Linguistic Ideology of a Scholarly Tradition." *Language Problems & Language Planning* 20 (3): 199-224.

Blössner, Monika, and Mercedes de Onis. 2005. *Malnutrition: Quantifying the Health Impact at National and Local Levels*. WHO Environmental Burden of Disease Series 12. Geneva: World Health Organization.

Boas, Franz. 1911. Introduction. In *Handbook of American Indian languages, Part I (ed. by Franz Boas) (Bureau of American Ethnology)*, 40:1-83. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution.

Boroditsky, Lera. 2011. "How Language Shapes Thought." *Scientific American* 304 (2): 62–65.

Boroditsky, Lera, Orly Fuhrman, and Kelly McCormick. 2011. "Do English and Mandarin Speakers Think about Time Differently?" *Cognition* 118 (January): 123-129.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990. *Was heißt sprechen? - Zur Ökonomie des sprachlichen Tausches*. Ed. John B. Thompson. Trans. Hella Beister. 2nd ed. Vienna: Braumüller.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 2005. *Die verborgenen Mechanismen der Macht*. Ed. Margareta Steinrücke. Reprint of 1992 Ed. Schriften zu Politik & Kultur 1. Hamburg: VSA.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Ed. John B. Thompson. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Brown, Keith, and Sarah Ogilvie, eds. 2009. *Concise Encyclopedia of Languages of the World*. 1st ed. Oxford [et al.]: Elsevier.

Brown, Roger W., and Eric H. Lenneberg. 1954. "A Study in Language and Cognition." *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 49: 454-462.

Busch, Brigitta. 2010. "... und Ihre Sprache? Über die Schwierigkeiten, eine scheinbar einfache Frage zu beantworten." Ed. Martina Rienzner and Gabriele Slezak. *Stichproben, Wiener Zeitschrift für kritische Afrikastudien* 19/2010, 10. Jg. (Sprache und Translation in der Rechtspraxis): 9-33.

Busch, Brigitta. 2006. "Language Biographies – Approaches to Multilingualism in Education and Linguistic Research." Ed. Aziza Jardine and Angelika Tjoutuku. *PRAESA Occasional Papers* 24: 5–17.

Butler, Judith. 2005. *Giving an Account of Oneself*. 1st ed. New York: Fordham University Press.

Butler, Judith, and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. 2007. *Sprache, Politik, Zugehörigkeit*. 1st ed. Zurich & Berlin: Diaphanes.

Catford, John C. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics*. Language and Language Learning 8. New York: Oxford University Press.

Changeux, Jean-Pierre, and Paul Ricoeur. 1998. *Ce qui nous fait penser: la nature et la règle*. Paris: Odile Jacob.

Charlton, James. 2010. The Dimensions of Disability Oppression. In *The Disability Studies Reader*, ed. Leonard J. Davis, 157-159. 3rd ed. New York & London: Routledge.

Chen, Ping. 2004. *Modern Chinese: History and Sociolinguistics*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2006. *Language and Mind*. 3rd ed. Cambridge [et al.]: Cambridge University Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Vol. 119. Cambridge, MA: MIT press.

Ciocan, Cristian, ed. 2005. *Translating Heidegger's "Sein und Zeit"*. Vol. V. Studia Phaenomenologica. Bucharest: Humanitas.

Coleman, Hywel, ed. 2005. Language and Development: Africa and Beyond. In Addis Ababa: British Council, October 26.

Corina, David P., Ursula Bellugi, and Judy Reilly. 1999. "Neuropsychological Studies of Linguistic and Affective Facial Expressions in Deaf Signers." *Language and Speech* 42 (Pt 2-3): 307-331.

Corngold, Stanley. 1994. *The Fate of the Self: German Writers and French Theory*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Cortez, David, and Heike Wagner. 2010. Zur Genealogie des indigenen "guten Lebens" ("sumak kawsay") in Ecuador. In *Lateinamerikas Demokratien im Umbruch*, ed. Leo Gabriel and Herbert Berger, 167-200. Vienna: Mandelbaum.

Crystal, David. 2010. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. 3rd ed. Cambridge [et al.]: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, David. 2005. *How Language Works*. London: Penguin Books.

Crystal, David. 1997. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. 4th ed. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Davis, Nany Ann, Richard Keshen, and Jeff McMahan, eds. 2010. *Ethics and Humanity: Themes from the Philosophy of Jonathan Glover*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Deleuze, Gilles. 1992. *Woran erkennt man den Strukturalismus?* Berlin: Merve.

Denzin, Norman K., and Yvonna S. Lincoln. 2005. *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*. New York: SAGE.

Derrida, Jacques. 1998. *Of Grammatology*. Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore & London: JHU Press.

Deutscher, Guy. 2010. *Through the Language Glass: Why the World Looks Different in Other Languages*. 1st ed. New York: Metropolitan Books/Henry Holt and Co.

Dilthey, Wilhelm. 1999. Das Verstehen anderer Personen und ihrer Lebensäußerungen. In *Philosophische Hermeneutik*, ed. Hans-Ulrich Lessing. Alber-Texte Philosophie 7. Freiburg [et al.]: Alber.

Doerr, Neriko Musha. 2009. Investigating "Native Speaker Effects": Toward a new Model of Analyzing "Native Speaker" Ideologies. In *The Native Speaker Concept: Ethnographic Investigations of Native Speaker Effects*, ed. Neriko Musha Doerr, 15-46. Language, Power and Social Process 26. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Duranti, Alessandro. 1997. *Linguistic Anthropology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Eco, Umberto. 2006. *Quasi dasselbe mit anderen Worten - Über das Übersetzen*. Trans. Burkhart Kroeber. Munich & Vienna: Carl Hanser.

Eco, Umberto. 1994. *Einführung in die Semiotik*. Trans. Jürgen Trabant. Uni-Taschenbücher. Munich: Fink.

Edwards, Michael. 1993. How Relevant is Development Studies? In *Beyond the impasse: New directions in development theory*, ed. Frans J. Schuurman, 77–92. London: Zed Books.

Edwards, Michael. 1989. "The Irrelevance of Development Studies." *Third World Quarterly* 11 (1): 116–135.

Ehrensberger-Dow, Maureen, and Daniel Perrin. 2009. "Capturing Translation Processes to Access Metalinguistic Awareness." *Across Languages and Cultures* 10 (2): 275-288.

Escobar, Arturo. 2005. Introduction. In *The Anthropology of Development and Globalization: From Classical Political Economy to Contemporary Neoliberalism*, ed. Marc Edelman and Angelique Haugerud, 337-351. Blackwell Anthologies in Social and Cultural Anthropology 5. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Escobar, Arturo. 1995. *Encountering Development - The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton studies in culture, power, history. Princeton, NJ [et al.]: Princeton Univ. Press.

Escobar, Arturo. 1988. "Power and Visibility: Development and the Invention and Management of the Third World." *Cultural Anthropology* 3 (4): 428–443.

Escobar, Arturo. 1984. "Discourse and Power in Development: Michel Foucault and the Relevance of his Work to the Third World." *Alternatives* 10 (3): 377–400.

Everett, Daniel L. 2005. "Cultural Constraints on Grammar and Cognition in Pirahã: Another Look at the Design Features of Human Language." *Current Anthropology* 46 (4): 621-646.

Fanon, Frantz. 2004. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press.

Fausey, Caitlin M., Bria L. Long, Aya Inamori, and Lera Boroditsky. 2010. "Constructing Agency: The Role of Language." *Frontiers in Cultural Psychology* 1: 162.

Fornet-Betancourt, Raúl. 2005. Filosofía intercultural. In *Pensamiento crítico latinoamericano*, ed. Ricardo Salas Astraín, 5:401. 1st ed. Santiago de Chile: USACH.

Fornet-Betancourt, Raúl. 2002. *Zur interkulturellen Transformation der Philosophie in Lateinamerika*. Vol. 14. Denktraditionen im Dialog: Studien zur Befreiung und Interkulturalität. Frankfurt a.M.: iko.

Foucault, Michel. 2007. *Archaeology of Knowledge*. Routledge.

Foucault, Michel. 1988. Technologies of the Self. In *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*, ed. L.H. Martin, H. Gutman, and P.H. Hutton. Cambridge, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1974. *Die Ordnung des Diskurses: Inauguralvorlesung am Collège de France, 2. Dezember 1970*. Ed. Wolf Lepenies and Henning Ritter. Trans. Walter Seitter. Hanser Anthropologie. Munich: Carl Hanser.

Foucault, Michel. 1966. *Les mots et les choses: une archéologie des sciences humaines*. Paris: Gallimard.

Frangoudaki, Anna. 1992. "Diglossia and the Present Language Situation in Greece: A Sociological Approach to the Interpretation of Siglossia and Some Hypotheses on Today's Linguistic Reality." *Language in Society* 21 (03): 365–381.

Frank, Leonard. 1997. The Development Game. In *The Post-Development Reader*, ed. Majid Rahnema and Victoria Bawtree. London [et al.]: Zed Books.

Frege, Gottlob. 2002. *Funktion, Begriff, Bedeutung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Frege, Gottlob. 1978. *Schriften zur Logik und Sprachphilosophie (aus dem Nachlaß)*. Ed. Gottfried Gabriel. Philosophische Bibliothek ; 277. Hamburg: Meiner.

Furmuzachi, Gabriel. 2005. Language, Identity and Multiculturalism. Diss., Vienna: University of Vienna.

Galtung, Johan. 2011. "'IME', Index für Menschliche Entwicklung - Schuldenkrise in der EU (derStandard.at › Meinung)." *der Standard*, October 19, sec. Meinung. http://derstandard.at/1318726232587/IME-Index-fuer-Menschliche-Entwicklung (last accessed October 20, 2011).

Gasper, Des. 2007. Human Rights, Human Needs, Human Development, Human Security. In , 9-43. Oslo: Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, January.

Gasper, Des, and Asuncion Lera St. Clair, eds. 2010. *Development Ethics*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Geertz, Clifford. 1966. Religion as a Cultural System. In *Anthropological Approaches to the Study of Religion*, by Michael Banton, 1-46. London: Tavistock.

Geertz, Clifford. 1977. *The Interpretation Of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

Geertz, Clifford. 2003. *Dichte Beschreibung: Beiträge zum Verstehen kultureller Systeme*. Ed. Sven Papke and Georg W. Oesterdieckhoff. Trans. Brigitte Luchesi. 1st ed. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

Ghosh, Samir K., ed. 1972. *Man, Language and Society: Contributions to the Sociology of Language*. Den Haag & Paris: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ginsburg, Faye, and Rayna Rapp. 2010. Enabling Disability: Rewriting Kinship, Reimagining Citizenship. In *The Disability Studies Reader*, ed. Leonard J. Davis, 237-253. 3rd ed. New York & London: Routledge.

Girstmair, Stefanie. 2010. „The Entrepreneurial Poor“: Das Subjekt im Anti-Aid-Entwicklungsdiskurs. Diplomarbeit, Vienna: University of Vienna.

Glaser, Barney G. 1978. *Theoretical Sensitivity: Advances in the Methodology of Grounded Theory*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glover, Jonathan. 2010. "Responses: A Summing Up." *Ethics and Humanity* 1 (9): 237-290.

Godel, Robert. 1957. *Les sources manuscrites du Cours de linguistique générale de F. de Saussure.* Geneva: E. Droz.

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. 2006. *Maximen und Reflexionen*. Ed. Helmut Koopmann. Kleine Bibliothek der Weltweisheiten. Munich: DTV/C.H. Beck.

Gorter, Durk. 2006. *Linguistic Landscape: A New Approach to Multilingualism*. Amsterdam: Multilingual Matters.

Gottdiener, Mark. 1995. *Postmodern Semiotics - Material Culture and the Forms of Postmodern Life*. Oxford [et al.]: Blackwell.

Grucza, Franciszek. 1992. Język, kultura – kompetencja kulturowa. In *13th Symposium of the Institute of Applied Linguistics, Warsaw University 1987*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Gu, Michelle Mingyue. 2010. "Identities Constructed in Difference: English Language Learners in China." *Journal of Pragmatics* 42 (1) (January): 139-152.

Gumperz, John, and Celia Roberts. 1991. Understanding in Intercultural Encounters. In *The Pragmatics of Intercultural and International Communication: Selected Papers of the International Pragmatics Conference, Antwerp, August 17-22, 1987 (volume III), and the Ghent Symposium on Intercultural Communication*, ed. Jan Blommaert, 3:51-90. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Gürses, Hakan. 2003. Funktionen der Kultur. Zur Kritik des Kulturbegriffs. In *Grenzen des Kulturkonzepts. Meta-Genealogien*, ed. Stefan Nowotny and Michael Staudigl, 13–35. Vienna: Turia + Kant.

Habermas, Jürgen. 2006. *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns Bd.1: Handlungsrationalität und gesellschaftliche Rationalisierung*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Suhrkamp-Taschenbuch Wissenschaft. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

Hacking, Ian. 2001. *Multiple Persönlichkeit - Zur Geschichte der Seele in der Moderne*. Trans. Max Looser. Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer.

Hacking, Ian. 1984. *Die Bedeutung der Sprache für die Philosophie*. Trans. Uta Müller. Philosophie: Analyse und Grundlegung 10. Königstein: Hain.

Hall, Robert A. 1968. *An essay on language*. 6th ed. Philadelphia: Chilton Books.

Hall, Stuart. 2007. *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London [et al.]: SAGE.

Haugh, Michael, and Carl Hinze. 2003. "A Metalinguistic Approach to Deconstructing the Concepts of 'Face' and 'Politeness' in Chinese, English and Japanese." *Journal of Pragmatics* 35 (10-11): 1581–1611.

Headland, Thomas N. 1990. Chapter 1. Introduction - A Dialogue Between Kenneth Pike and Marvin Harris on Emics and Etics. In *Emics and Etics: The Insider/Outsider Debate*, ed. Thomas N. Headland, Kenneth L. Pike, and Marvin Harris. New York: SAGE.

Heidegger, Martin. 1978. *Being and Time*. Trans. John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. London: Wiley-Blackwell.

Heidegger, Martin. 1977. *Sein und Zeit*. Ed. Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann. Vol. 2. Veröffentliche Schriften 1914-1970 I. Abteilung. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann.

Hermanns, Fritz. 1994. Linguistische Anthropologie. Skizze eines Gegenstandsbereichs linguistischer Mentalitätsgeschichte. In *Begriffsgeschichte und Diskursgeschichte: Methodenfragen und Forschungsergebnisse der historischen Semantik*, ed. Dietrich Busse, Fritz Hermanns, and Wolfgang Teubert, 29-59. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Heugh, Kathleen. 2000. *The case against bilingual and multilingual education in South Africa*. PRAESA Occasional Publications 6. PRAESA.

Hill, Jane H., and Bruce Mannheim. 1992. "Language and World View." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21: 381–406.

Hingst, Kai-Michael. 1998. *Perspektivismus und Pragmatismus - ein Vergleich auf der Grundlage der Wahrheitsbegriffe und der Religionsphilosophien von Nietzsche und James*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.

Hipfl, Brigitte, Anita Bister, Petra Strohmaier, and Brigitta Busch. 2002. Shifting Borders: Spatial Constructions of Identity in an Austrian/Slovenian Border Region. In *Living (with) Borders. Identity Discourses on East–West Borders in Europe*, ed. Ulrike H. Meinhof, 53–74. Aldershot-Burlington: Asgate.

Holenstein, Elmar. 1976. *Linguistik, Semiotik, Hermeneutik - Plädoyers für eine strukturale Phänomenologie*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Humboldt, Wilhelm von. 2010. Einleitung in das gesamte Sprachstudium. In *Sprachwissenschaft - Ein Reader*, ed. Ludger Hoffmann, 18-24. 3rd ed. De Gruyter Studium. Berlin & New York: De Gruyter.

Illich, Ivan. 1978. *Toward a History of Needs*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Jakobson, Roman. 1959. On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. In *On translation*, ed. Reuben A. Brower, 232-239. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jakobson, Roman. 2008. *Semiotik: ausgewählte Texte 1919 - 1982*. Ed. Elmar Holenstein. Orig.-Ausg. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

James, Carl. 1999. "Language Awareness: Implications for the Language Curriculum." *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 12 (1): 94-115.

Jauß, Hans Robert. 1999. *Probleme des Verstehens - Ausgewählte Aufsätze*. Universal-Bibliothek ; 9764. Stuttgart: Reclam.

Jessner, Ulrike. 2006. *Linguistic Awareness in Multilinguals - English as a Third Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Johnson, Barbara. 1980. *The Critical Difference*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kadric, Mira, Klaus Kaindl, and Michèle Kaiser-Cooke. 2010. *Translatorische Methodik*. 4th ed. Vienna: Facultas University Press.

Kalina, Sylvia. 2002. "Interpreters as Professionals." *Across Languages and Cultures* 3 (2) (December 1): 169-187.

Kay, Paul, and Wilett Kempton. 1984. "What is the Sapir–Whorf Hypothesis?" *American Anthropologist* 86 (1) (March): 65–79.

Ke, Ping. 1999. "Transatability vs. Untranslatability: A Sociosemiotic Perspective." *Babel* 45 (4): 289-300.

Kinginger, Celeste. 2006. Alice Doesn't Live Here Anymore: Foreign Language Learning andIdentity Reconstruction. In *Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts*, ed. Aneta Pavlenko and Adrian Blackledge, 219-242. Bilingual Education and Bilingualism 45. Clevedon (et al.): Multilingual Matters.

Knapp, Mark L., and Judith A. Hall. 2009. *Nonberbal Communication in Human Interaction*. 7th ed. Boston, MA: Wadsworth/Cengage Learning.

Kral, Françoise. 2011. "Du silence du polyglotte au bégaiement de la langue." *Tropismes* 17 (0): 126–137.

Kramsch, Claire. 2000. *Context and Culture in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kristeva, Julia. 1993. Étrangeté, etrangèreté. In *Penser la rencontre de deux mondes: les défis de la" découverte" de l'Amérique*, ed. Alfredo Gomez-Muller, 107-135. 1st ed. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

Kristeva, Julia. 1988. Le Silence des Polyglottes. In *Étrangers à nous-mêmes*. Paris: Fayard.

Kristeva, Julia. 1981. *Le langage, cet inconnu: Une initiation à la linguistique*. Paris: du Seuil.

Krysztofowicz, Sylwia. 2007. "Grundprinzipien für den Umgang mit Vorurteilen und Stereotypen im interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht mitFortgeschrittenen." *Kwartalnik Neofilologiczny* LIV (3): 232-241.

Kuang 邝, Bailin 柏林. 1982. *康有为的哲学思想 Kang Youwei de zhexue sixiang (The Philosophical Thought of Kang Youwei)*. Chongqing: 中国社会科学出版社 (Zhongguo Shehui Kexue Chubanshe).

Kymlicka, Will. 2001. *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism, and Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Labov, William. 1972. "Some Principles of Linguistic Methodology." *Language in Society* 1 (1) (April 1): 97-120.

Labov, William. 1964. "Phonological Correlates of Social Stratification." *American Anthropologist* 66 (6). New Series: 164-176.

Laffal, Julius. 1964. “Freud’s Theory of Language.” *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 33: 157–175.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1963. *Structural Anthropology*. Trans. Claire Jacobson and Brooke Grundfest Schoepf. New York: Basic Books.

Lewis, David. 2009. “International Development and the ‘Perpetual Present’: Anthropological Approaches to the Re-historicization of Policy.” *European Journal of Development Research* (February 21).

Li, Wei. 1994. *Three Generations, Two Languages, One Family: Language Choice and Language Shift in a Chinese Community in Britain*. Vol. 104. Clevedon [et al.]: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Lier, Leo van. 2008. The Ecology of Language Learning and Sociocultural Theory. In *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, ed. Nancy H. Hornberger, 2949-2961. Boston, MA: Springer.

Linde, Charlotte, and William Labov. 1975. “Spatial Networks as a Site for the Study of Language and Thought.” *Language* 51 (4): 924-939.

Linnes, Kathleen. 1998. “Middle-Class AAVE Versus Middle-Class Bilingualism: Contrasting Speech Communities.” *American Speech* 73 (4): 339–367.

Linschinger, Gisela Sophia. 2009. Interkulturelle Kommunikationstrainings in der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit und linguistische Alternativen. Diplomarbeit, Vienna: University of Vienna.

Linton, Simi. 2010. Reassigning Meaning. In *The Disability Studies Reader*, ed. Leonard J. Davis, 223-236. 3rd ed. New York & London: Routledge.

Livingstone, David N. 2002. *Science, Space and Hermeneutics - Hettner-Lecture 2001*. Ed. Hans Gebhardt and Peter Meusburger. 1st ed. Hettner-Lectures 5. Heidelberg: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Lu, Xun. 2003. On “Face.” In *Selected Works*, trans. Xianyi Yang and Gladys Yang, 4:131-134. 3rd ed. Beijing: Foreign Language Press.

Lucy, John A. 1997. “Linguistic Relativity.” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26: 291–312.

Lyons, John. 1992. *Die Sprache*. Ed. Heinz-Peter Menz and Ingrid von Rosenberg. Trans. Christoph Gutknecht. C.H. Beck Studium. Munich: C.H. Beck.

Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics. Vol. 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyotard, Jean-François. 1984. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Trans. Geoffrey Bennington and Brian Massumi. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Malakoff, Marguerite E. 1992. Translation Ability: A Natural Bilingual and Metalinguistic Skill. In *Cognitive Processing in Bilinguals*, ed. Richard J. Harris, 83:515–529. Advances in Psychology. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Malinowski, Bronislaw. 2000. Die Funktionaltheorie. In *Kulturphilosophie*, ed. Franz-Peter Burkard, 119-134. Alber-Texte Philosophie 10. Freiburg [et al.]: Alber.

Mall, Ram Adhar. 1998. “Das Konzept einer interkulturellen Philosophie.” *polylog. Zeitschrift für interkulturelles Philosophieren* 1: 54-69.

Marchart, Oliver. 2007. *Post-foundational Political Thought: Political Difference in Nancy, Lefort, Badiou and Laclau*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Martí, Fèlix, Paul Ortega, Itzlar Idiazabal, Andoni Barreña, Patxi Juaristi, Carme Juny, Belen Uranga, and Estibaliz Amorrortu. 2005. *Words and Worlds - World Languages Review*. UNESCO Etxea. Bilingual Education and Bilingualism 52. Clevedon [et al.]: Multilingual Matters.

Mayer, Nonna, and Johanna Siméant. 2004. “L’espace de l’altermondialisme.” *Revue française de science politique* 54 (3/2004): 373-378.

McNeill, Desmond, and Asuncion Lera St. Clair. 2009. *Global Poverty, Ethics and Human Rights: The Role of Multilateral Organisations*. Rethinking Globalizations 19. New York: Routledge.

McWhorter, John. 2003. *The Power of Babel: A Natural History of Language*. 1st ed. New York: Perennial.

Mendoza-Denton, Norma. 2002. Language and Identity. In *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, ed. J.K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill, and Natalie Schilling-Estes, 475–499. Oxford: Blackwell.

Miller, Richard W. 2010. *Globalizing Justice: The Ethics of Poverty and Power*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Moon, JungYul. 2003. “A Study of Dagongmei: A Feminist Understanding of Gender Politics in China under Reform.” *Asian Journal of Women’s Studies* 9 (4): 38–68.

Moseley, Christopher, ed. 2007. *Encyclopedia of the World’s Endangered Languages*. London & New York: Routledge.

Münnix, Gabriele. 2004. *Zum Ethos der Pluralität : Postmoderne und Multiperspektivität als Programm*. Münster: LIT.

Nagar, Richa, and Farah Ali. 2003. “Collaboration Across Borders: Moving Beyond Positionality.” *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 24 (3): 356–372.

Narayan, Uma. 2003. The Project of Feminist Epistemology: Perspectives from a Non-Western Feminist. In *Feminist Theory Reader: Local and Global Perspectives*, ed. Carole Ruth McCann and Seung-Kyung Kim, 308-317. London & New York: Routledge.

Nida, Eugene A. 1964. *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Nietzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm. 1973. *Über Wahrheit und Lüge im außermoralischen Sinne*. Ed. Giorgio Colli and Mazzino Montinari. Vol. 2. 15 vols. Gesammelte Werke III. Berlin & New York: De Gruyter.

Norris, Christopher. 2006. *On Truth and Meaning: Language, Logic and the Grounds of Belief*. London: Continuum.

Nussbaum, Martha Craven. 2006. *Frontiers of Justice: Disability, Nationality, Species Membership*. Cambridge, MA [et al.]: Belknap Press.

Nussbaum, Martha Craven. 2000. *Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Nussbaum, Martha Craven. 1999. *Gerechtigkeit oder Das gute Leben*. Ed. Herlinde Pauer-Studer. Edition Suhrkamp, Vol. 739 : Gender Studies. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Ortigues, Edmond. 1962. *Le Discours et le Symbole*. Paris: Aubier.

Oseki-Dépré, Inês. 1999. *Théories et pratiques de la traduction littéraire*. Paris: Armand Colin.

Pavlenko, Aneta, ed. 2009. *The Bilingual Mental Lexicon: Interdisciplinary Approaches*. Clevedon [et al.]: Multilingual Matters.

Pavlenko, Aneta. 2006. *Emotional Experience, Expression and Representation*. Bilingual Education and Bilingualism. Clevedon [et al.]: Multilingual Matters.

Pavlenko, Aneta. 2002. "Narrative Study: Whose Story is it, Anyway?" *TESOL Quarterly* 36 (2) (July 1): 213-218.

Pavlenko, Aneta. 2001. "'In the World of the Tradition, I was Unimagined': Negotiation of Identities in Cross-cultural Autobiographies." *International Journal of Bilingualism* 5 (3): 317-344.

Pieterse, Jan Nederveen. 2000. "After Post-Development." *Third World Quarterly* 21 (2): 175–191.

Pike, Kenneth L. 1954. *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior*. Dallas, TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Pinker, Steven. 2008. *The Stuff of Thought: Language as a Window into Human Nature*. London: Penguin Books.

Pinker, Steven. 2005. "So How Does the Mind Work?" *Mind and Language* 20 (February): 1-24.

Pinker, Steven. 2004. "Clarifying the Logical Problem of Language Acquisition." *Journal of Child Language* 31 (4): 949–953.

Pinker, Steven. 1991. "Rules of Language." *Science* 253: 530-535.

Pinker, Steven, and Paul Bloom. 1990. "Natural Selection and Natural Language." *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 13 (4): 707–784.

Platt, John T. 1977. "A Model for Polyglossia and Multilingualism (with Special Reference to Singapore and Malaysia)." *Language in Society* 6 (3): 361-378.

Pöchhacker, Franz. 2006. "Interpreters and Ideology: From 'Between' to 'Within'." *Across Languages and Cultures* 7 (2) (December 1): 191-207.

Pogge, Thomas W. 2003. *World Poverty and Human Rights: Cosmopolitan Responsibilities and Reforms*. 1st ed. Cambridge, MA [et al.]: Polity Press.

Pool, Jonathan. 1991. "The Official Language Problem." *The American Political Science Review* 85 (2): 495-514.

Popper, Karl R. 2000. *Lesebuch: Ausgewählte Texte zur Erkenntnistheorie, Philosophie der Naturwissenschaften, Metaphysik, Sozialphilosophie*. Ed. David Miller. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: UTB.

Preisendanz, Karin, ed. 2007. *Expanding and Merging Horizons – Contributions to South Asian and Cross-Cultural Studies in Commemoration of Wilhelm Halbfass*. Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 53. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press.

Quine, Willard Van Orman. 1975. *Word and Object*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Rebien, Claus C. 1996. "Participatory Evaluation of Development Assistance: Dealing with Power and Facilitative Learning." *Evaluation* 2 (2) (April 1): 151-171.

Ricoeur, Paul. 1969. *Le conflit des interprétations: Essais d'herméneutique*. Paris: du Seuil.

Rieckmann, Marco, Maik Adomßent, Werner Härdtle, and Patricia Aguirre. 2011. Sustainable Development and Conservation of Biodiversity Hotspots in Latin Amer-

ica: The Case of Ecuador. In *Biodiversity Hotspots*, ed. Jan Christian Habel and Frank E. Zachos, 435-452. Berlin & Heidelberg: Springer.

Rist, Gilbert. 2002. *The History of Development: From Western Origins to Global Faith*. 2nd ed. New York: Zed Books.

La Rochefoucauld, Comte François de. 1967 (1665). *Maximes*. Ed. Jacques Truchet. Paris: Garnier frères.

Rojas de Ferro, María Cristina. 1994. A Political Economy of Violence. Ph.D. diss., Ottawa: Carleton University.

Rorty, Richard M. 1991. *Objectivity, Relativism, and Truth - Philosophical Papers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rorty, Richard M., ed. 1992. *The Linguistic Turn: Essays in Philosophical Method*. 2nd ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. 2000. Abhandlung über den Ursprung und die Grundlagen der Ungleichheit unter den Menschen. In *Kulturphilosophie*, ed. Franz-Peter Burkard, 25-46. Alber-Texte Philosophie 10. Freiburg [et al.]: Alber.

Sachs, Wolfgang, ed. 1992. *The Development Dictionary. A Guide to Knowledge as Power*. London: Zed Books.

Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Sanders, Barry, and Ivan Illich. 1989. *ABC: Alphabetization of the Popular Mind*. London: Vintage.

Sanderson, Hannah. 2009. “International Development Studies: Theories and Methods in Research and Practice.” *Development in Practice* 19 (7): 952–954.

Santa Ana, Oto, and Claudia Parodi. 1998. “Modeling the Speech Community: Configurations and Variable Types in the Mexican Spanish Setting.” *Language in Society* 27: 23–52.

Sapir, Edward. 1985. *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir in Language, Culture and Personality*. Ed. David Goodman Mandelbaum. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Sapir, Edward. 1921. *Language. An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. New York: Harcourt.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. 2004. Preface. In *The Wretched of the Earth*, by Frantz Fanon, xliii-lxii. New York: Grove Press.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. 2003. *Wissenschaft der Sprache - neue Texte aus dem Nachlaß*. Ed. Ludwig Jäger and Elisabeth Birk. Suhrkamp Taschenbuch Wissenschaft. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1989 (1916). *Cours de linguistique générale*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz Verlag.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1983 (1916). *Course in General Linguistics*. Ed. Albert Riedlinger. Chicago, IL: Open Court Publishing.

Schuurman, Frans J. 2000. “Paradigms Lost, Paradigms Regained? Development Studies in the Twenty-first Century.” *Third World Quarterly* 21 (1): 7–20.

Searle, John R. 1995. *The Construction of Social Reality*. New York: Allen Lane.

Searle, John R. 1983. *Intentionality - An Essay in the Philosophy of Mind*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, John R. 1975. “Indirect Speech Acts.” *Syntax and Semantics* 3: 59–82.

Sebestik, Jan. 2011. Otto Neurath’s Epistemology and Its Paradoxes. In *Otto Neurath and the Unity of Science*, ed. John Symons, Olga Pombo, and Juan Manuel Torres, 41-57. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

Sen, Amartya K. 1999. *Development as Freedom*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Shamim, Fauzia. 2005. English as the Language for Development in Pakistan: Issues, Challenges and Possible Solutions. In *Keynote Presented to the 7th Conference on Language & Development, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia (Oct. 27-28, 2005)*. Addis Ababa.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove, Robert Phillipson, and Rannut Mart, eds. 1995. *Linguistic Human Rights - Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin & New York: De Gruyter.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove, and Robert Phillipson. 1989. “Mother Tongue”: The Theoretical and Sociopolitical Construction of a Concept. In *Status and Function of Languages and Language Varieties*, ed. Ulrich Ammon, 450–477. Berlin & New York: De Gruyter.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove. 1984. *Bilingualism or not*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Smart, Barry. 1995. *Michel Foucault - Critical Assessments II: Rationality, Power and Subjectivity*. Vol. 2. London: Routledge.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1998. Translator’s Preface. In *Of Grammatology*, by Jacques Derrida, ix-lxxxix. Baltimore & London: JHU Press.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1988. Can the Subaltern Speak? In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, ed. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, 271–313. London: Macmillan.

Steiner, George. 1998. *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stolze, Radegundis. 1994. *Übersetzungstheorien: eine Einführung*. Tübingen: G. Narr.

Strauss, Anselm L., and Juliet M. Corbin, eds. 1997. *Grounded Theory in Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Taylor, Charles, and Amy Gutmann. 1994. *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Thomason, Sarah Grey, and Terrence Kaufman. 1991. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Ting-Toomey, Stella, and Atsuko Kurogi. 1998. “Facework Competence in Intercultural Conflict: An Updated Face-Negotiation Theory.” *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 22 (2): 187–225.

Traoré, Aminata Dramane. 2002. *Le viol de l’imaginaire*. Paris: Fayard.

Tremain, Shelley. 2002. On the Subject of Impairment. In *Disability/Postmodernity: Embodying Disability Theory*, ed. Mairian Corker and Tom Shakespeare, 32-47. London: Continuum.

Valero-Garcés, Carmen. 2007. “Challenges in Multilingual Societies. The Myth of the Invisible Interpreter and Translator.” *Across Languages and Cultures* 8 (1) (June 1): 81-101.

Vermeer, Hans J., ed. 1990. *Kulturspezifik des translatorischen Handelns: Vorträge anlässlich der GAL-Tagung 1989*. th - translatorisches handeln 3. Heidelberg: University of Heidelberg.

Vermeer, Hans J., and Katharina Reiß. 1984. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*. 2nd ed. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Vermeer, Hans J., Heinz Walz, and Heinrich Klebes. 1963. *Sprache und Entwicklungshilfe. Bedeutung und Möglichkeit der Vermittlung von Sprachkenntnissen und Auslandskunde an deutsche Fachleute im Rahmen der Entwicklungshilfe für Afrika und Asien*. Munich: J. Groos.

Vilkki, Liisa. 2006. "Politeness, Face and Facework: Current Issues." *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 19: 322–332.

Volosinov, Valentin N. 1994. Language and Ideology. In *Language and literacy in social practice: a reader*, ed. Janet Maybin, 44-57. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Wa Goro, Wangui. 2007. Problematizing the Gaze through Traducture. Does it Matter if You're Black or White? In *White Matters*, ed. Susan Petrilli. Rome: Meltemi Editore srl.

Walsh, Catherine. 2010. "Development as Buen Vivir: Institutional Arrangements and (De)Colonial Entanglements." *Development* 53 (1): 15-21.

West, Cornel. 1993. The New Cultural Politics of Difference. In *The Cultural Studies Reader*, ed. Simon During, 203-217. London & New York: Routledge.

Whorf, Benjamin Lee. 2008. *Sprache, Denken, Wirklichkeit*. Ed. Peter Krausser. 25th ed. Hamburg: Rowohlt.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 2003. "Emotion and Culture: Arguing with Martha Nussbaum." *Ethos* 31 (4): 577-600.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1995. "The Relevance of Language to the Study of Emotions." *Psychological Inquiry* 6 (3) (January 1): 248-252.

Wiktorowicz, Józef. 2008. Sprachgeschichte als Gesellschaftsgeschichte. In *Kultury i języki poznawać - uczyć się - nauczać : księga jubileuszowa z okazji 65. urodzin Profesor Elżbiety Zawadzkiej-Bartnik = Kulturen und Sprachen: verstehen - lernen - lehren*, ed. Anna Jaroszewska and Marta Torenc, 407-412. Warsaw: Uniwersytet Warszawski - Instytut Germanistyki.

Williams, Colin H., ed. 1991. *Linguistic Minorities, Society, and Territory*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Wimmer, Andreas. 2005. *Kultur als Prozess: zur Dynamik des Aushandelns von Bedeutungen*. 1st ed. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Wimmer, Franz Martin. 2004. *Interkulturelle Philosophie*. Vienna: UTB.

Winawer, Jonathan, Nathan Witthoft, Michael C. Frank, Lisa Wu, Alex R. Wade, and Lera Boroditsky. 2007. "Russian Blues Reveal Effects of Language on Color Discrimination." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 104 (19): 7780 -7785.

Wiredu, Kwasi. 2010. "Kwasi Wiredu im Gespräch: Über afrikanische Philosophie, interkulturelles Übersetzen und Aufgaben der (interkulturellen) Philosophie." Ed. Brigitta Saal. Trans. Stefan Skupien. *polylog - Zeitschrift für interkulturelles Philosophieren* 24: 29-36.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 2001 (1922). *Tractatus logico-philosophicus*. Trans. David F. Pears and Brian McGuinness. London & New York: Routledge.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1982 (1922). *Tractatus logico-philosophicus - Logisch-philosophische Abhandlung*. 16th ed. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1953. *Philosophische Untersuchungen*. Trans. Gertrude E. M. Anscombe. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wright, Robert. 1994. *The Moral Animal: The New Science of Evolutionary Psychology.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Ziegler, Jean. 2002. *Les nouveaux maîtres du monde*. Paris: Fayard.

VIII.2 Online Sources (Papers, Articles and Documents)

Aumard, Celine, and Romain Lalande. 2010. Make Development Inclusive - Policy Papers on Disability in Development. *Make Development Inclusive*._http://www.make-development-inclusive.org/countrypolicy.php?spk=en (last accessed September 23, 2011).

Bizerra, Cecilia. 2009. "Sumak Kawsay/Buen Vivir - The Indigenous Decolonial Concept." Trans. Blanca Diego and Christopher Reid. *Monthly Review*._http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2009/bizerra181209.html (last accessed December 18, 2010).

Crooks, Tony, and Geoffrey Crewes, eds. 1995. Language and Development. In Denpasar, Bali: Indonesia Australia Language Foundation._http://langdevconferences.org/node/4 (last accessed July 17, 2011).

Derrida, Jacques. 2003. Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences. In *Writing and Difference*, trans. Alan Bass, 278-294. London: Routledge._http://hydra.humanities.uci.edu/derrida/sign-play.html (last accessed September 27, 2011).

Derrida, Jacques. 1967. *L'écriture et la différence*. Tel Quel. Paris: Édition du Seuil._http://www.jacquesderrida.com.ar/frances/ (last accessed September 27, 2011).

Development Assistance Committee. 1991. *Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance*. Paris: OECD._http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/31/12/2755284.pdf (last accessed November 4, 2011).

Development Co-operation Directorate (DCD-DAC). DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance._http://www.oecd.org/document/22/0,2340,en_2649_34435_2086550_1_1_1_1,00.html (last accessed November 9, 2011).

Fuss, Daniel, Gema M. Garcia Albacete, and Miriyam Rodriguez Monter. 2003. Language, Values and European Identity - Results from A Cross-cultural Youth Project. Vienna: University of Edinburgh [et al.]._http://www.sociology.ed.ac.uk/youth/docs/Paper_InterKnow_Fuss_Garcia_Monter.pdf (last accessed November 1, 2011).

Galtung, Johan. 2011. "'IME', Index für Menschliche Entwicklung - Schuldenkrise in der EU (derStandard.at › Meinung)." *der Standard*, October 19, sec. Mein-

ung._http://derstandard.at/1318726232587/IME-Index-fuer-Menschliche-Entwicklung (last accessed October 20, 2011).

Ghadi, Alireza Sadeghi. 2010. Shift In Translation Or Translation Shift. *articlesbase.com*. April 8._http://alirezasadeghighadi.articlesbase.com/non-fiction-articles/shift-in-translation-or-translation-shift-2116778.html (last accessed November 27, 2011).

Grimm, Sven, John Humphrey, Erik Lundsgaarde, and Sarah-Lea John de Sousa. 2009. "European Development Cooperation to 2020: Challenges by New Actors in International Development." *Bonn: European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes (EDC 2020 Working Paper 4)*. FP7 - Seventh Framework Programme._http://www.die-gdi.de/CMS-Homepage/openwebcms3.nsf/(ynDK_contentByKey)/ANES-7S7HX2/$FILE/EDC2020_WP4_Webversion.pdf (last accessed October 21 , 2011).

Kariminia, Amin, and Javad Heidary. 2009. Equivalence in Translation. *articlesbase.com*. May 18._http://javadheidary.articlesbase.com/languages-articles/equivalence-in-translation-922552.html (last accessed September 6, 2011).

Leeuw, Frans, and Jos Vaessen. 2009. *Impact Evaluations and Development: Nonie Guidance on Impact Evaluation*. Washington, DC: NONIE Network of Networks for Impact Evaluation._www.worldbank.org/ieg/nonie/ (last accessed October 12, 2011).

Li, Mingjiang. 2008. "Soft Power in Chinese Discourse: Popularity and Prospect." *RSIS Working Papers* 165 (08)._http://www.rsis.edu.sg/publications/WorkingPapers/WP165.pdf (last accessed September 2, 2011).

OECD. 2005. Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action. OECD._http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/11/41/34428351.pdf (last accessed November 5, 2011).

OECD. 2009. *Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness: Findings, Recommendations and Good Practice*. Washington, DC: OECD Publishing.

OECD, and Eckhard Deutscher. 2010. *Development Co-operation Report 2010 - Summary in English*. Paris: OECD._http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/32/24/45051632.pdf (last accessed September 19, 2011).

OECD, and R.M.E. Lithman. 2010. Evaluating Development Co-operation: Summary of Key Norms and Standards. OECD DAC Network on Development Evaluation._http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/12/56/41612905.pdf (last accessed September 7, 2011).

OECD/DAC Development Evaluation Network. 1999. Guidance for Evaluating Humanitarian Assistance in Complex Emergencies. Ed. Niels Dabelstein. OECD._http://www.oecd.org/LongAbstract/0,3425,en_2649_34435_2667287_1_1_1_1,00.html (last accessed September 19, 2011).

OECD. 2010. Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management. Ed. Niels Dabelstein. OECD._http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/29/21/2754804.pdf (last accessed September 19, 2011).

Priestley, Mark. 1975. UPIAS - Fundamental Principles of Disability. The Disability Alliance, London._http://www.leeds.ac.uk/disability-studies/archiveuk/UPIAS/fundamental%20principles.pdf (last accessed June 27, 2011).

Rousselle, Vanessa. 2009. Make Development Inclusive - PCM Guideline. *Make Development Inclusive*._http://www.inclusive-development.org/cbmtools/index.htm (last accessed October 15, 2011).

Tufte, Thomas, and Paolo Mefalopulos. 2009. *Participatory Communication: A Practical Guide*. World Bank Working Papers 170. Washington, DC: World Bank._http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTDEVCOMMENG/Resources/Participatorycommunication.pdf (last accessed June 8, 2011).

UN General Assembly, and Committee on Information Thirtieth Session 2nd & 3rd Meetings (AM & PM). 2008. Importance of Multilingualism, Rationalizing United Nations Information Centres, Closing Digital Divide among Issues as Information Committee Debate Continues (PI/1828). UN, April 29._www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2008/pi1828.doc.htm (last accessed June 20, 2011).

UNESCO. 1996. Universal Declaration of Linguistic Rights._http://www.unesco.org/most/lnngo11.htm (last accessed June 10, 2011).

UNESCO. 2011. Management of Social Transformations (MOST) Programme. *MOST Programme*._http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/social-transformations/most-programme/ (last accessed July 18, 2011).

United Nations General Assembly. 1948. Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). UN._http://www.hrcr.org/docs/universal_decl.html (last accessed May 24, 2011).

World Bank. 2010. RFP - Standard Request for Proposals - Selection of Consultants. World Bank._http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/PROJECTS/PROCUREMENT/0,,contentMDK:21996667~menuPK:84284~pagePK:84269~piPK:60001558~theSitePK:84266~isCURL:Y,00.html (last accessed September 15, 2011).

World Bank Projects and Operations. How the Project Cycle Works. *worldbank.org*._http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/PROJECTS/0,,contentMDK:20120731~menuPK:41390~pagePK:41367~piPK:51533~theSitePK:40941,00.html (last accessed September 4, 2011).

Wood, Jacqueline, and Réal Lavergne, eds. 2008. Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness. An Exploration of Experience and Good Practice. In Accra: Advisory Group on Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness. http://siteresources.worldbank.org/ACCRAEXT/Resources/4700790-1208545462880/Exploration-of-Experience-and-Good-Practice_(Accra-version).pdf (last accessed September 2, 2011).

IX. Appendix: Interview Questions

1. Which role do languages other than German play in your daily work?
2. What exactly is your position, who do/did you work for, and what is your personal relation to development co-operation?
3. Which institutions/governments/beneficiaries have you come directly or indirectly in contact with? Who are the partners and 'target groups'?
4. What do you believe multilingualism means in view of development co- operation, i.e. what realities do you think monolingual actors in DC would find themselves confronted with? What role do you think it should play in DC's quality criteria?
5. Have you ever faced language-related difficulties in your DC work, and if so, in which cases (necessity of translation; use of common lingua franca; communication via letters, e-mail, telephone, etc.)?
6. Who was acting as interpreters/translators, and who took the role of intermediary in the communication processes, in project conception, implementation and evaluation (locals/final beneficiaries; members of national/local NGOs; external institutions; people with/without specific qualification as translators/ interpreters)? Which types of projects do you believe would necessitate a higher awareness of communication methods?
7. Do you feel that language plays a part in culture and how it operates? How would that have an effect in DC?
8. Have you ever encountered situations in which – from you personal point of view - translation into local languages was or would have been necessary/ would have helped exchange between partners and beneficiaries?
9. Have you worked with monolinguals/a monolingual in the DC process, and what were respective differences you noticed in the interaction with her/him/them?
10. Are there any language-related documents that one could refer to, when it comes to rules of procedure of the DC work you've experienced? Did

you ever experience difficulties in the understandability of a legal language or specific terminology *(with respect to quality criteria)*?

11. Which languages come to be used in the formulation of contracts and agreements, and which factors/criteria does one go by in their selection? Who is deciding these choices, and why?

12. As far as you know, do any of these documents include apparent reference to issues such as translation, use of multiple languages, linguistic diversity or "cultural compatibility" *(with respect to quality criteria)*?

13. Who is questioned when it comes to project evaluation (e.g. members of NGOs; cognitive impression of "beneficiaries")?

14. Could you try to outline how a potential language policy aiming at a highest degree of inclusiveness – while not constraining language diversity – should be structured?

15. What do you think is the state of people's awareness of communication processes and potential thresholds therein (e.g. fundraising and reports)?

16. How do you feel people's image of languages' role is impacted by their experience in this field of work? Have you come away with the impression that beneficiaries' images are likewise influenced by their experience in this context?

17. Could you please briefly sketch your personal linguistic biography?

18. What is your subjective relationship towards each of "your" languages, and have you ever experienced any uncertainty in the use of any of them, be it in your private or your professional life (L1, L2, L3,...)?

Kurzfassung

Als wissenschaftlichen Gegenstand behandelt diese Arbeit Mehrsprachigkeit, die in der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit zum Einsatz kommt. Als mehrsprachiges Feld ist die EZA auf die Kommunikation zwischen AkteurInnen verschiedenartiger soziopolitischer, ökonomischer und kultureller Milieus angewiesen. Diskutiert werden hier Fragen des Einsatzes lokaler Sprachen in der praktischen EZA-Arbeit, der Gewichtung von Übersetzungstätigkeiten und des Bewusstseins, das EZA-AkteurInnen gegenüber ihrer mehrsprachigen Tätigkeit und dem darin Kommunizierbaren entwickeln. Theoretische Aspekte der Linguistik und Philosophie werden den praktischen Daten aus Interviews mit EZA-ArbeiterInnen und schriftlichen Vorgaben gegenübergestellt. Daraus resultierend treten weitere Problemfelder zutage, welche wiederum Licht auf sprachbezogene Herausforderungen in der Projektplanung und –evaluierung werfen. Es wird besonderes Augenmerk auf die Konstruktion von Realitäten durch Sprache(n) und ihren Einsatz gelegt. Eine Erkundung dessen, ob die Entwicklungszusammenarbeit in internationalen Netzwerken etwas zur Überbrückung der sprachlichen Hindernisse beitragen, Kommunikationsprozesse empathischer gestalten und entsprechend bessere Voraussetzungen für inklusive Teilnahme aller EmpfängerInnen schaffen kann, erfolgt ebenso in dieser Diplomarbeit.

Schlagwörter: Sprache, Mehrsprachigkeit, Entwicklungszusammenarbeit, Übersetzung, Dolmetsch, Strukturalismus, Identität, Kommunikation, Lingua Franca, Sprachbewusstsein, Hermeneutik, Übersetzbarkeit, Auswahlkriterien, Vorgaben, Evaluierung

Abstract

As a scientific subject, this work deals with multilingualism used in development co-operation. As a multilingual field, development co-operation relies on the communication between actors from varied socio-political, economic and cultural settings. Discussed herein are questions regarding the use of local languages in practical development co-operation work, the weighting translation activities are assigned, and the awareness that development actors evolve of their multilingual actions and of what is communicable within these. Theoretical aspects of linguistics and philosophy are contrasted with data collected in interviews conducted with development workers, as well as with requirements in writing. As a result, additional problem areas become evident, which in turn throw light on language-related challenges in project planning and evaluation. Particular emphasis is put on the construction of realities through language(s) and their use. An exploration of whether development co-operation is able to contribute in international networks to the bridging of linguistic obstacles, whether communication processes could be designed more empathetically, and accordingly deliver better conditions for inclusive participation of all beneficiaries, is also carried out in this thesis.

Keywords: language, multilingualism, development co-operation, translation, interpretation, structuralism, identity, communication, lingua franca, linguistic awareness, hermeneutics, translatability, eligibility criteria, guidelines, evaluation

Curriculum Vitae

Personal Information

Name	**Daniel Nikolaus Pateisky**
Date/Place of Birth	16.04.1982, Vienna
Nationality	Austrian/Polish
Address	Speckbachergasse 23/9, A-1160 Wien, Austria
Mobile	+43/ (0)676/ 5421200
E-mail	daniel.pateisky@gmx.at

1. Education

07/2007 – 05/2008	**University of Qiqihaer, PR China** Enrolment & Language Courses in Mandarin Chinese
11/2005	**Theatre of the Oppressed, Vienna/Calcutta, India** Course on the putting into action of political *Forum Theatre*
07/2005 – 08/2005	**Shaoxing University, PR China** Summer School on Mandarin Language, Chinese Economics/ History/Culture/Art
10/2004 –	**University of Vienna** BA-Programme in Sinology
10/2007 – 12/2011	**University of Vienna, Austria** Mag. Diploma-Programme in Development Studies
10/2003 – 07/2004	**Department of Applied Mathematics**, **University of Vienna** Courses on the *Philosophy of Mind*
10/2001 – 06/2004	**Medical University of Vienna** Dr. Programme in Human Medicine
06/2000	**Highschool-Graduation from Piaristengymnasium**
1992 – 2000	**Piaristengymnasium** Jodok-Fink-Platz 2, 1080 Vienna Highschool

2. Work Experience

since 05/2010	**Municipal Libraries of Vienna (Büchereien Wien, MA13)**
	Assistant Librarian
since 02/2010	**MS Young Connection**
	Head of Support Group (voluntary work in non-profit civil society organisation)
since 2008	**University of Vienna**
	Private language-tutor for school/university-students & adults
since 2006	**United Nations Offices Vienna (UNOV)** Conference Management: Assistant, Usher
08/2007 – 05/2008	**University of Qiqihaer, China**
	English language teacher
2006/2007	**Institute of Development Studies Vienna**
	Tutor in Seminar on „The History of North-South-Relations" (particular focus on South-Asia)
2006/2007	**University of Vienna**
	Tutor for freshmen in Development Studies
10/2005 – 02/2007	**Theatre Group *keine_Uni Forumtheater*, University of Vienna**
	Head, Coordinator & Actor
10/2005 – 10/2006	**Theatre of the Oppressed, Vienna (TdUW)**
	Actor

3. Publication

Tong Xin (2009): *Die arbeitsrechtliche Situation marginalisierter Arbeiterinnen und die Herausbildung eines Rechtsbewusstseins*. Original published in: *社会性别 (Shehui xingbie – Gender Studies)* Nr. 2, 2004, pp. 151-163. (Translation from Chinese, with Chiang, Karina; Du, Zhangping; Du, Zhanglin; Fuchs, Daniel; Gruber, Christine; Lee, Ting; Lipinsky, Astrid; Nejedla, Helena; Schneidewind, Julia; Suhendra, Chia- Hua; Wan, Waikei; Wascher, Elke), Vienna: University of Vienna.