Journal of Universal Language 26-2. September 2025, 109-137
DOI 10.22425/jul.2025.26.2.109
eISSN 2508-5344

Civic Education and the Use of Planned Languages on Global Campuses: A Practical Alternative for Enhancing University Students' Global Citizenship

Eunha Won
Kyungwoon University, Korea

Abstract

This study critically examines the linguistic inequalities and limitations of citizenship learning present in global citizenship education (GCED) at Korean universities and explores the applicability of extracurricular programs based on planned languages (e.g., Esperanto, Unish) as a practical alternative. In the multinational and the multilingual environment of university campuses, language

Eunha Won
Assistant Professor, Division of General Education, Kyungwoon University, Korea
Email: won@ikw.ac.kr

Received 19 May, 2025; Revised 24 June, 2025; Accepted 15 September, 2025

policies centered on English and Korean often hinder international students' learning and civic development. This paper argues that experimenting with planned languages has educational value in mitigating the inequities of linguistic power structures, while enabling experiential learning of linguistic justice, intercultural competence, and civic solidarity. Through philosophical and theoretical analysis, along with a concrete program design, this study proposes a new model in which university students in Korea can cultivate global citizenship through collaboration and critical reflection on an equal linguistic footing.

Keywords: global citizenship education (GCED), planned language, linguistic justice, multilingual campus, higher education

1. Introduction

1.1. Research Background

Higher education in the 21st century is undergoing a paradigm shift that emphasizes global connectivity and civic responsibility as its core values. In particular, universities in South Korea are adopting the recruitment of international students as a key survival strategy in response to structural challenges such as declining school-age population, the crisis facing regional universities, and reduced government funding (Kim, Yae-ji 2024; Kim, Yoon-joo 2024). Accordingly, the construction of a global campus has emerged as a central priority in university policy. At the governmental level, initiatives to attract international students have been steadily strengthened—from the launch of the *Study Korea Project* in 2004 to the *Study Korea 300K Project* in 2023—signaling a full-fledged national strategy for internationalization.

As of 2023, the number of international students in South Korea has

risen to approximately 180,000 (Kim, Yoon-joo 2024), with a significant portion enrolled in regional universities. However, the quantitative increase in enrollment has not automatically translated into qualitative improvements. Numerous domestic studies have shown that international students face serious challenges in academic persistence and adaptation due to a complex mix of factors, including limited language proficiency, academic difficulties in their majors, cultural isolation, and financial hardship (Choi, H. 2018; Lee 2022; Kim et al. 2023).

Among these, language remains the most serious barrier. This issue goes beyond mere communication difficulties and directly results in a lack of interaction and mutual understanding between international and domestic students. Most international students are required to integrate into an educational environment centered on Korean or English, but these languages are fundamentally rooted in the linguistic dominance of specific groups. This creates an asymmetrical structure that places the burden of adaptation solely on international students (van Parijs 2003, Ahn et al. 2023).

As a result, this structural asymmetry undermines the original aims of global campuses—namely, intercultural exchange, mutual understanding, and the cultivation of a shared sense of community. Even though GCED[1] is actively promoted within universities, the prevailing language policies and cultural environments remain designed primarily for domestic students, thereby marginalizing international students (Choi, S. 2018).

At its core, GCED aims to foster citizens who can recognize and practice universal human values beyond the boundaries of race,

[1] The following abbreviations are used in this paper: GCED (global citizenship education), NGOs (Non-Governmental Organizations), SDGs (Sustainable Development Goals), UEA (Universal Esperanto Association).

nationality, and language (UNESCO 2015). However, in practice, this philosophy is often reduced to English-centered instruction or numerical targets for internationalization. International students risk becoming passive "consumers" of education, while domestic students often experience global citizenship education only superficially, without meaningful international engagement.

To overcome these limitations, this study calls for a fundamental rethinking of "language" in educational contexts. In particular, planned languages, such as Esperanto, designed to be politically neutral and free from linguistic hierarchies, offer a promising alternative. They allow us to critically examine the structural inequalities of existing language policies while simultaneously enhancing both intercultural competence and civic engagement (Halperin 2012, Schor 2016). Learning a planned language is not merely about acquiring a new linguistic system but also about engaging in a philosophical reflection on such questions as "What is language?" and "For whom does language exist?"—questions that are central to the praxis of GCED.

Thus, planned languages serve not only as practical tools but also as ethical and philosophical instruments for realizing linguistic justice in education. This study focuses on the educational potential of planned languages and explores how they can be applied within the context of Korean universities, especially in regional settings, to support civic learning and inclusion.

1.2. Research Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to examine the philosophical and functional connections between global citizenship education and the use of planned languages, and to design an educational program model applicable to Korean universities. Moving beyond theoretical discussion, the study proposes concrete strategies for integrating such

approaches into both curricular and extracurricular activities, with the aim of enabling students to interact in a linguistically equitable environment.

This study highlights the dual role of planned languages: on the one hand, as practical solutions to address multilingual inequality in increasingly diverse campuses; and on the other, as philosophical instrument for critical refletion on linguistic power, cultural hierarchy, and the meaning of equal participation.

To this end, the study is guided by the following three research questions:

1. What are the philosophical and functional commonalities between global citizenship and planned language, and how can these dual roles—practical solutions and philosophical instrucments—form a complementary relationship?
2. Within the current realities of language policy and civic education in Korean universities, what educational and policy implications do the use of planned languages offer?
3. How can a civic education program based on planned languages be designed to reflect both their practical and philosophical functions, and what are its anticipated benefits and potential challenges?

Through theoretical exploration and program design, this study seeks to address these questions and present a viable alternative model that can supplement the structural limitations of existing approaches to civic education. As no pilot implementation data are included, the paper is explicitly positioned as a conceptual proposal, with its primary contribution lying in framing and design rather than empirical validation.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1. The Concept and Principles of Global Citizenship

Global citizenship refers to the identity and practice in which individuals adopt a sense of responsibility not only toward their local communities but also toward the lives of all humanity and global issues. This concept is closely linked to values such as human rights, equality, sustainability, and intercultural understanding, and it goes beyond mere international awareness to emphasize the capacity to act for a shared future (UNESCO 2015). In the context of education, global citizenship aims to cultivate students' abilities to critically analyze global issues, collaborate in multicultural societies, and engage in actions based on justice (Han et al. 2015, Lee et al. 2015, UNESCO MGIEP 2019).

The OECD (2018) defines global citizenship education in terms of three core competences: (i) cognitive competence (knowledge of global issues), (ii) social and emotional competence (empathy, solidarity, and intercultural understanding), and (iii) behavioral competence (critical thinking and social participation). This framework encourages an understanding of global citizenship not merely as an attitude or emotion, but as a foundation for ethically actionable behaviors.

In South Korea, global citizenship is often approached in an integrated manner alongside multicultural understanding, respect for human rights, and the SDGs. More recently, under the influence of UNESCO's Asia-Pacific initiatives, there has been increasing emphasis on the intersection of global citizenship and education, linking it to problem-solving competencies in real-world contexts such as conflict resolution in multicultural societies and responses to the climate crisis (Han et al. 2015, Kim & Park 2015, Na & Jho 2017,

UNESCO APCEIU 2022).

From this perspective, global citizenship does not seek to replace national civic identity but rather to expand it into a higher-order identity grounded in universal human values. In this process, the role of language is fundamental. Language serves as the basis for thought and world perception, and as a crucial tool for understanding, cooperation, and solidarity with others.

2.2. The Philosophy and Practice of Planned Languages

A planned language is a linguistic attempt to provide a fair and equitable communicative environment that is not subject to the interests of specific nations or ethnic groups (Janton 1993/2006, Zamenhof 1905). Historically, constructed languages such as Esperanto, Interlingua, and Unish have exemplified this idea. These languages were intentionally designed to dismantle structural inequalities among natural languages and to establish a foundation for mutual understanding (Lee 2002).

The philosophy of planned languages can be summarized in three core aspects. First is the realization of linguistic justice. This principle critiques the monopoly of certain language groups over knowledge production, politics, economics, and education, and calls for conditions that ensure equitable language use. Van Parijs (2003) conceptualized this as "fair burden sharing among language communities," highlighting the disproportionate cost placed on non-native speakers of dominant languages such as English. Recent studies in constructed languages emphasize that the introduction of planned languages can serve as an educational tool to promote equality and linguistic justice in multilingual societies (Chin 2023).

Second, planned languages aim to foster intercultural understanding and create conditions for equitable communication. In practice, the

Esperanto movement has been tested in peace and cooperation education programs run by international NGOs, human rights organizations, and educational institutions (Forster 1982, Gobbo 2017). For example, the UEA has collaborated with the United Nations and European NGOs to use Esperanto in multilingual projects for both operational and promotional purposes. Volunteer translators from the Esperanto community have contributed to translating materials for international events, campaigns, and TED-Esperanto subtitle projects, thereby demonstrating the potential for equitable communication and transnational collaboration. In educational practice, comparative studies of planned languages such as Unish and Esperanto allow for concrete exploration of linguistic and cultural neutrality (Lee 2002). In Korea, Esperanto has been introduced in alternative education settings as part of global citizenship and peace education curricula (Esperanto Professional Learning Community 2020). These efforts enable students and teachers to engage in multicultural experiences and collaborative communication, with documented cases of successful implementation. Such initiatives contribute meaningfully to reducing asymmetrical communication and expanding a shared sense of cultural community.

Third, although planned languages have seen limited practical dissemination, they hold significant potential as experimental educational tools. Janton (1993/2016) argued that while Esperanto is neither a perfect nor a planned language, it occupies a unique position as a continuous experiment that makes a feasible ideal tangible. Rather than simply acquiring a new language, engaging with a planned language can serve as a philosophical foundation for reflecting on the nature of language, inequality, and linguistic dominance (Schor 2016, Gobbo 2017).

2.3. Shared Foundations Between Global Citizenship and Planned Languages

2.3.1. Shared Philosophical Characteristics

Global citizenship and planned languages are both grounded in the principle of human universalism, aspiring toward an inclusive ethical consciousness that transcends the boundaries of culture, race, and nation. Global citizenship is based on the idea that all human beings possess equal dignity, while planned languages share the philosophical aim of eliminating the dominance of particular ethnic languages and providing all individuals with equal opportunities for linguistic participation.

Both also pursue non-dominance and nonviolent interaction. This is especially critical in constructing conditions for equitable participation in global governance structures, where weaker nations or non-Anglophone communities are often excluded. Dill (2013) argues that citizenship education cannot be complete without problematizing the linguistic conditions that reproduce dominant-subordinate relationships, thereby underscoring the centrality of linguistic justice.

Lastly, both concepts emphasize the importance of practical ethical action. Rather than remaining abstract ideals, they must be implemented through concrete educational structures and practices. Communication exercises and collaborative projects using planned languages serve as embodied tools that translate such philosophies into lived experience.

2.3.2. Shared Functional Characteristics

Functionally, global citizenship and planned languages also play parallel roles. First, they serve as tools to facilitate communication and cooperation. In multinational and multicultural settings, the need for a shared language becomes more pronounced, and planned languages offer an experimental response to that need.

Second, they serve as a means of transcending boundaries—between nations, languages, and cultures. The linguistic and ethical practice of overcoming such boundaries is central to global citizenship education (Dower 2003: 52, Oxfam 2015). Planned languages help dismantle formal language barriers while also reducing psychological distance (Gobbo 2017: 39–40).

Third, planned languages function as educational mediators. Global citizenship education employs diverse tools to teach empathy and solidarity with others. In this context, planned languages can be utilized as a meta-educational medium that invites learners to explore the problem of "linguistic inequality" itself.

Finally, planned languages contribute to the formation of civic solidarity. Engaging in equal communication practices through a shared language can become a catalyst for the emergence of voluntary communities. In fact, various NGOs and international camps have implemented joint projects based on Esperanto that exemplify this very process.

2.3.3. A Complementary Relationship: How Planned Languages Expand Global Citizenship Education

Planned Languages can serve as both practical and philosophical tools to address some of the limitations inherent in GCED. First, as Dill (2013) points out, GCED often leans heavily toward normative

discourse, resulting in weakened practical impact. Collaborative activities using planned languages provide a concrete mechanism for transforming abstract ideals into experiential learning.

Second, van Parijs (2003) critiques the global linguistic order centered on English for placing an asymmetrical burden on non-Anglophone countries. He proposes the concept of fair burden sharing among language communities as a remedy. Rather than reinforcing English language education alone, this approach can be partially realized through experimental linguistic models that offer a level playing field—namely, the introduction of planned languages.

Third, planned languages enable experiential awareness of linguistic justice, an aspect often overlooked in GCED. According to Piron (2000), existing international languages such as English and French grant native speakers a clear linguistic advantage, while often causing psychological tension, misunderstandings, and passive participation among non-native speakers. Therefore, participation in a planned language class, such as Esperanto, allows students to set aside the privilege of their mother tongue and to collectively experience the difficulties and discomfort of navigating an unfamiliar language, thereby confronting the reality that language can function as a form of power.

Lastly, planned languages offer a linguistically neutral space that facilitates identity transformation. The process of stepping outside existing linguistic hierarchies and participating in a shared linguistic experiment aligns closely with the ideals of global citizenship. This approach proves most effective when implemented through extracurricular activities or collaborative projects.

3. Applicability in Korean Universities and the Design of a Planned Language-Based Extracurricular Program

3.1. Current Realities and Limitations of Global Citizenship Education in Korean Universities

Over the past several years, Korean universities have actively expanded GCED through both general education courses and extracurricular programs under the banner of constructing global campuses. The Ministry of Education and various national higher education funding initiatives have encouraged the development of GCED courses that incorporate themes such as the SDGs, multicultural understanding, and knowledge of the United Nations and other international organizations. In response, many universities have introduced new courses aimed at promoting interaction between international students and domestic students (Han et al. 2015). However, course designs that meaningfully implement intercultural understanding and linguistic equity remain underdeveloped.

In practice, most GCED-labeled courses are conducted in English or follow a unidirectional, theory-driven model that transmits multicultural content without participatory engagement. As a result, meaningful interaction between domestic and international students is often limited or superficial. Arnold (2016) warned that the concept of global citizenship risks being reduced to marketable elements such as cultural exchange, overseas experiences, and global competencies, rather than emphasizing social justice or critical agency. Dill points out that while the ideals of global citizenship education demand both

individual ethical autonomy and communal solidarity, these are rarely translated into concrete educational practices. In particular, power asymmetries in language use and symbolic forms of exclusion can contribute to what she calls the production of "client citizenship" (Dill 2013: 137).

Such limitations are especially pronounced in regional universities in Korea, where student populations are becoming increasingly multilingual and multinational. On campuses where Korean, English, Chinese, Vietnamese, Mongolian, and other languages coexist, English-based instruction is often used as a proxy for internationalization. However, for many international students. This model creates linguistic alienation and restricts genuine participation. The resulting linguistic hierarchy undermines educational equity and access, exacerbated by Korea's exam-oriented educational culture and ethnocentric worldview, which further hinders the acceptance of linguistic and cultural diversity (Sim 2016, Choi 2023).

Considering these challenges, there is an urgent need for alternative language approaches that can dismantle existing asymmetrical linguistic structures and establish a more equitable basis for participation. Park (2012) emphasizes that GCED must move beyond knowledge acquisition to embrace the complexity and multiplicity of identities, fostering multicultural dialogue and inclusive participation through a holistic and constructivist educational approach. He especially critiques the uniformity and language-centeredness prevalent in the Korean education system and argues that genuine global citizenship requires acknowledging global diversity and designing educational environments that promote mutual respect for a wide range of identities—including linguistic ones.

3.2. The Need for Planned Languages-Based Extracurricular Experiments and Their Educational Transformative Potential

As a practical alternative to overcoming the aforementioned limitations, extracurricular activities using planned languages are drawing increasing attention. As implied by the philosophy of planned languages, these languages are free from the interests of particular nations or ethnic groups and function as tools for equalizing linguistic starting points (van Parijs 2003). Within the context of GCED in Korean universities, a planned language may be less a tool for direct communication and more an educational medium for engaging with and reflecting on linguistic justice.

Van Parijs (2003) argued that linguistic justice goes beyond fairness in language use and instead requires the fair sharing of burdens among different language communities. He emphasized that in multilingual realities, a just linguistic order should not involve a minority learning the majority's language, but rather, all participants learning a mutually new and neutral third language (p. 153). From this perspective, experimenting with planned languages in Korean universities is not merely a search for practical communication tools, but rather a meaningful attempt to experience an ethical model of linguistic justice.

Nevertheless, planned languages face clear limitations in terms of dissemination and adoption. For example, Esperanto—though theoretically robust in its grammar, logical structure, and political neutrality—ultimately failed to replace existing but imperfect linguistic systems such as English. Patterson (1999) attributes this failure to pragmatic inertia and entrenched power structures, noting that this pattern reflected a broader lesson not limited to language alone. Similar phenomena are seen in areas like information standards and data exchange protocols, where technically superior designs do

not always lead to social adoption. In domains like language, deeply embedded in historical and political contexts, ideal design alone cannot easily transform existing systems.

However, such shortcomings also highlight an important potential: planned languages need not function solely as replacement tools for existing languages but can instead serve as philosophical and educational mediators that prompt reflection on linguistic inequality and dominant power structures. This shifts the focus away from practical language acquisition and instead invites learners to recognize how language is interwoven with political and social authority. Rather than simply learning a language, students are invited to learn about language—examining structural inequities and understanding language choice as a matter of power and justice.

This approach aligns closely with the core components of intercultural competence as proposed by Byram (1997): Self-reflection, critical distance-taking, understanding of other cultures, and ethical judgment. When students from diverse linguistic backgrounds engage in experimental classes using planned languages, they collaboratively explore the conditions for linguistic equality. This provides a form a practical citizenship education that traditional language education often cannot offer. Thus, planned languages hold educational value not as ends in themselves, but as mediator languages—tools for thinking through citizenship, justice, and identity. Their impact is most potent when applied in experimental formats such as extracurricular programs or cross-cultural workshops.

3.3. Designing an Extracurricular Program: Planned Languages as Experiments in Linguistic Equity

Based on the preceding discussion, an extracurricular activity centered on planned languages can be structured around four key

educational principles. First, it aims to equalize linguistic starting points by having both domestic and international students learn the same new language, thereby dismantling hierarchical language structures. Second, it seeks to raise awareness of linguistic justice by encouraging students to continuously reflect on the question, "Why are we using a new, unfamiliar language instead of English or Korean?" Third, it facilitates experiential boundary-crossing and collaboration through joint tasks and role-playing, fostering civic attitudes that transcend cultural and linguistic divides. Fourth, it provides a space for practicing intercultural coexistence, where the focus of communication shifts from linguistic fluency to the will to learn and the attitude of attentive listening.

Grounded in this philosophy, the following 15-week extracurricular program—titled "Fair Language Lab"—is proposed in Table 1. Looking more closely at each phase of the proposed *Fair Language Lab*, the structure is as follows:

In Phase 1, students critically examine the hierarchical nature of language and issues of inequality in global education. Through surveys and case studies, they come to recognize the asymmetric power structures embedded in language. This leads into the conceptual and philosophical foundations of planned languages, including discussions on linguistic justice and the ethical imperatives of non-dominant communication.

In phase 2, students are introduced to simple sentences in constructed languages such as Esperanto and apply them in practical communication activities. The emphasis here is not on fluency or linguistic function, but rather on experiencing linguistic equity by stepping outside the norms of dominant language systems.

Phase 3 involves collaborative, multicultural group activities mediated by a planned language or co-created linguistic system.

Table 1. Example Program Design – “Fair Language Lab”

Phase	Weeks	Core Content	Educational Objective
Phase 1: Awareness & Theoretical Foundations	Weeks 1–5	Explore language hierarchies, concepts of linguistic justice, and the philosophical basis of planned languages	Critical reflection on language inequality and alternative linguistic frameworks
Phase 2: Introduction & Application of Planned Languages	Weeks 6–8	Learn basic planned language structures (e.g., Esperanto) and apply them to communication exercises	Experiential engagement with a “non-dominant linguistic environment”
Phase 3: Intercultural Collaboration	Weeks 9–13	Engage in practical team activities using planned languages—e.g., mock UN, negotiation simulations, co-creating a new language	Cultivate intercultural understanding and community-based cooperation
Phase 4: Reflection & Institutional Expansion	Weeks 14–15	Analyze learning outcomes, reflect on individual transformations, provide program feedback and proposals	Assess the learner’s shift in awareness and explore possibilities for program institutionalization

Activities may include mock UN conferences, negotiation role-plays, or creating an original language collaboratively. These are designed to help students practice the connection between language, citizenship, and cooperation, echoing the intercultural communication competencies emphasized by Byram (1997).

In Phase 4, students reflect on linguistic experiments and citizenship education they experienced throughout the semester. They analyze how their perceptions of language, power, and civic engagement have changed, and offer feedback on how the program could be improved or expanded. This phase opens discussion on the institutional feasibility and broader applicability of such experimental educational models.

This four-phase program design does not treat planned languages as mere communication tools, but instead as pedagogical instruments for interrogating linguistic inequality and simulating conditions of equitable communication. By embedding the philosophical framework of linguistic justice into educational practice, the program aims not simply to enhance multilingual competence but to foster civic sensitivity and intercultural ethical responsibility.

3.4. Expected Outcomes and Implementation Conditions

Unlike credit-bearing regular courses, this type of experimental program operates outside the framework of achievement-oriented assessment. As such, it provides an open and flexible structure in which students from diverse majors and linguistic backgrounds can participate more freely and voluntarily. As an expanded model of GCED in practice, the program holds particular significance in offering participants the opportunity to experience and reflect upon linguistic hierarchies and inequalities.

Several conditions must be met to ensure the stable operation of such a program. First, administrative flexibility must be secured. To

this end, collaboration with offices such as the extracurricular education center or the general education center should be arranged in advance. It is especially important to institutionalize flexibility that allows the program to be scheduled and operated outside of regular class hours.

Second, the placement of student assistants and multilingual supporters is necessary. Given that students from various linguistic backgrounds are expected to participate, these assistants play a critical role in reducing language barriers and facilitating smooth group activities.

Third, collaboration with external organizations is recommended. Partnering with local multicultural family support centers, civic organizations, or international exchange associations can enable the program's final presentations or project outcomes to be shared with the public. This, in turn, enhances students' sense of civic participation and action-oriented awareness.

Fourth, the program should operate on a small group basis. Since language practice and civic discussion are core components of the activities, a learning environment that supports active interaction and idea exchange among participants is essential.

When these conditions are met, the program can effectively embody Dill's (2013) assertion that ethical citizenship education is only possible through practice. In other words, rather than limiting itself to abstract theoretical discourse, the program becomes a space for learners to directly experience and interrogate the relationship between language and power. This has the potential to significantly reorient the discourse on global citizenship education in South Korea.

3.5. Summary

Global citizenship education in Korean universities has yet to fully

realize its core values of linguistic justice and linguistic equality. As a practical alternative to address this gap, extracurricular activities based on planned languages offer a promising experimental space. The proposed program operationalizes van Parijs's (2003) argument for the fair distribution of linguistic burdens and aligns with Dill's (2013) practice-centered model of GCED. Korean university campuses —where students from diverse linguistic backgrounds, including Chinese, Vietnamese, Mongolian, and Uzbeks, come together— represent both the context that most urgently needs and is most conducive to this kind of fair language experimentation.

4. Discussion: Linguistic Transformation in Global Citizenship Education and the Reconfiguration of Korean Higher Education

This study has highlighted the need for a pedagogical transformation of GCED through the lens of language, in order to realize its core values—human universalism, intercultural coexistence, and non-dominance—within educational practice. It critically examined how linguistic imbalances on multilingual and multicultural university campuses in South Korea act as major barriers to citizenship learning, and proposed extracurricular programs using planned languages (e.g., Esperanto, Unish) as an alternative model.

Dill (2013) stresses that GCED must go beyond the transmission of global issues; it should offer students a space for ethical citizenship in practice. Yet, in the Korean context, GCED remains closely tied to "internationalization" understood primarily through English-medium

instruction. This creates a structural advantage for students who are already proficient in English, while placing linguistic and emotional burdens on international students who are not. Such a structure runs counter to the foundational goal of GCED—nurturing civic agency and ethical engagement.

In this context, the concept of linguistic justice, as proposed by van Parijs (2003), offers critical insights. He defines linguistic justice not simply as the fair use of multiple languages, but as the equitable distribution of linguistic burdens across all members of society. From this perspective, the unilateral dominance of a particular language (e.g., English) reproduces unequal power relations and undermines the ethical foundations of citizenship that GCED seeks to cultivate. A truly just implementation of GCED must confront, rather than evade, the question: Whose language becomes the standard?

Extracurricular programs based on planned languages provide a practical educational model for addressing such questions. By placing all participants at the same linguistic starting point, the program creates a collaborative learning environment free from hierarchical language dynamics. More importantly, it fosters critical awareness of linguistic inequality and encourages philosophical reflection on language and citizenship. In this sense, the program is not merely about acquiring a new language, but about using language as a vehicle for civic ethics and educational transformation. The concept of intercultural competence from Byram (1997) offers a key theoretical framework for such practice, as it promotes not only openness to other cultures but also critical reflection on the power dynamics embedded in language itself.

This approach is far from utopian idealism. Rather, it is in the multilingual and multicultural regional campuses of South Korea that such experiments are most necessary and viable. Students arrive from

diverse linguistic backgrounds and already experience discomfort with the dominant language norms. Yet, current educational structures continue to rely on a narrow set of standards —primarily Korean or English—rather than embracing this diversity. As a result, many international students experience marginalization, while domestic students come to associate "international competence" narrowly with English proficiency.

In such a context, programs based on planned languages are not simply attempts to teach a new language, but opportunities to realize civic ethics through language practice. This resonates with Dill's (2013) assertion that ethical citizenship is only possible through practice and demonstrates that education can indeed serve as a tool for social justice.

In sum, if Korean higher education is to truly realize the goals of global citizenship education, it must move beyond viewing language as a mere instrument. Language is not only a means of communication, but also a core medium through which civic values are practiced, power and inequality are reflected upon, and community is formed. The future of GCED lies not merely in deciding what to teach, but in fundamentally rethinking how we speak.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study has explored how the use of planned languages can help address key challenges in GCED in Korean universities—namely, linguistic hierarchy, unequal participation, and a lack of practical engagement. While existing GCED practices often remain confined to theoretical instruction focused on global agendas, English-centered internationalization, and the development of passive forms of

citizenship, this paper has proposed a shift toward participatory citizenship education grounded in the principle of linguistic justice.

The key conclusions are as follows:

First, global citizenship and planned languages share a deep philosophical connection rooted in an ethical imagination of a universal human community. Both emphasize respect, equality, and shared civic values that transcend national, linguistic, and cultural boundaries.

Second, planned languages carry a dual role: they can function practically as alternative communication tools that mitigate multilingual inequality on campus, while also serving philosophically as instruments for critical reflection on the entanglement of language, power, and identity. These two functions are not contradictory but complementary—the practical use of a planned language provides experiential ground for reflection, while its philosophical framing deepens the meaning of such practice.

Third, within the context of Korean higher education, such programs may be more effective when implemented not as formal curricular offerings, but as extracurricular experiments or collaborative pilot projects. University campuses in Korea already provide a multilingual environment, making them ideal spaces for such pedagogical experimentation.

On this basis, the following practical recommendations are proposed:

- First, extracurricular programs based on planned languages should be expanded to offer a fair linguistic starting point, allowing both international and domestic students to participate voluntarily and equitably in civic education activities. In this sense, the planned language is simultaneously a practice-based

experiment in equality and a reflective exercise in uncovering hidden linguistic hierarchies.

- Second, the concept of linguistic justice should be explicitly integrated into the content of GCED curricula. Rather than limiting discussions to global issues and cultural comparisons, courses should also address language ideologies, linguistic power dynamics, and the structures of inequality embedded in language systems. This approach encourages students to move beyond the assumption that "the international language equals English" and to engage more critically with the social implications of language choice.
- Third, multinational campuses must be reimagined not as passive multicultural spaces, but as active, practice-based cultural-linguistic communities. GCED should evolve into a training ground where students learn the languages of others and develop the skills to engage in intercultural negotiation and cooperation. Course structures and instructional methods must be reoriented toward collaborative, practice-based engagement.
- Lastly, for sustainable practice, it is necessary to establish long-term collaborations with multicultural centers, NGOs, and local civic organizations. To strengthen impact, GCED initiatives should also extend into the wider community through presentations, field activities, and civic campaigns.

Future research should include in-depth interviews with students from diverse linguistic backgrounds, case studies on program implementation, and empirical investigations of the cognitive and psychological effects of planned language learning on civic development. Particularly important are the integration of formal and informal educational settings and the design of reciprocal learning

models that accommodate students with varying levels of language proficiency.

Ultimately, GCED is not merely about the transmission of knowledge but about realizing social ethics and justice through education. Yet, any form of citizenship education that lacks linguistic equality is akin to a tower built on an unstable foundation. By foregrounding the dual role of planned languages—at once practical and philosophical—this study suggests that unfamiliar linguistic tools can both equalize participation in practice and foster deeper ethical reflection. In this way, they open possibilities for a more just, critical, and practice-oriented form of global citizenship education. At the same time, it must be underscored that the present study is conceptual in scope. Its contribution lies in proposing a framework and directions for practice, which future empirical studies should test and refine.

References

Ahn, H. et al. 2023. Effect of Developing and Implementing a Learning Support Program for International Students on Their Achievement and University Life Adjustment. *The Korean Journal of Educational Methodology Studies* 35.2, 379–398. DOI: 10.17927/tkjems.2023.35.2.379

Arnold, E. 2016. Cultivating Global Citizens: Global Citizenship Education in a Moment of Neoliberal Globalization. Master's Thesis, Simon Fraser University.

Byram, M. 1997. *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Chin, S. 2023. Linguistic Diversity and Justice: The Role of Artificial Languages in Multilingual Societies. *Journal of Universal*

Language 24.2, 71–89. DOI: 10.22425/jul.2023.24.2.71

Choi, H. 2018. A Study on the Adaptation of Foreign Students to Korean Universities. *Studies in Humanities and Social Sciences* 61, 71–94. DOI: 10.17939/hushss.2018..61.004

Choi, S. 2018. A Study on Global Citizenship Education for Foreign Students' Glocal Citizen Competence Development. *Korean Journal of General Education* 12.4, 139–159.

Choi, S. 2023. Language Education for Sustainable Living: Toward Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. *Journal of Korean Language Education* 52, 429–468. DOI: 10.17313/jkorle.2023..52.429

Dill, J. 2013. *The Longings and Limits of Global Citizenship Education: The Moral Pedagogy of Schooling in a Cosmopolitan Age*. New York: Routledge.

Dower, N. 2003. *An Introduction to Global Citizenship*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Esperanto Professional Learning Community (2020). *Presentation at the 2020 Alternative Education Festival* [Online video]. Available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4Dkvj6ng2mY&t=7s>.

Forster, P. 1982. *The Esperanto Movement*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Gobbo, F. 2017. Beyond the Nation-State?: The Ideology of the Esperanto Movement Between Neutralism and Multilingualism. *Multilingual and Social Inclusion* 5.4, 38–47. DOI: 10.17645/si.v5i4.1140

Halperin, L. 2012. Modern Hebrew, Esperanto, and the Quest for a Universal Language. *Jewish Social Studies* 19.1, 1–33. DOI: 10.2979/jewisocistud.19.1.1

Han, K. et al. 2015. *Strategies for Promoting Global Citizenship Education in the Era of SDGs*. Seoul: UNESCO Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding.

Janton, P. 1993/2006. *Esperanto: Language, Literature, and Community*.

Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Kim, N. & C. Park. 2015. Cosmopolitanism and Global Citizenship in the Age of Globalization: Which Cosmopolitanism and Global Citizenship Should We Follow? *Journal of Ethics* 1.105, 1–34. DOI: 10.15801/je.1.105.201512.1

Kim, S. et al. 2023. Qualitative Literature Analysis on Study on Adjustment to College Life of Foreign International Students. *The Journal of Learner-Centered Curriculum and Instruction* 23.13, 591–608. DOI: 10.22251/jlcci.2023.23.13.591

Kim, Yae-ji. 2024. A Study on the Current Status and Perceptions of International Students Using Big Data Analysis. *Journal of Industrial Innovation* 40.1, 338–351. DOI: 10.22793/indinn.2024.40.1.029

Kim, Yoon-joo. 2024. A Study on the Korean Government's Foreign Student Attraction Policy and Korean Language Education Policy. *Hansung Language and Literature* 52, 1–33. DOI: 10.23114/hsemh.2024.52..1

Lee, D. 2002. A Comparison of Unish Grammar with Esperanto. *Journal of Universal Language* 3.2, 57–83. DOI: 10.22425/jul.2002.3.2.57

Lee, S. et al. 2015. *The Current Status and Practical Tasks of Global Citizenship Education*. KEDI Research Report RR 2015-25. Korean Educational Development Institute.

Lee, Y. 2022. Returning Foreign Students Who Dropped Out: A Case Study on Studying in Korea. *Global Studies Education* 14.4, 141–168. DOI: 10.19037/agse.14.4.06

Na, J. & D. Jho. 2017. Analyzing the Characteristics of Global Citizenship Education Reflected on Educational Materials Published by Major GCED Agencies in South Korea. *The Journal of Learner-Centered Curriculum and Instruction* 17.24, 907–933.

DOI: 10.22251/jlcci.2017.17.24.907

OECD. 2018. *Preparing Our Youth for an Inclusive and Sustainable World: The OECD PISA Global Competence Framework*. Paris: ODEC Publishing.

Oxfam. 2015. *Education for Global Citizenship: A Guide for Schools.* Oxford: Oxfam GB.

van Parijs, P. 2003. Linguistic Justice. In W. Kymlicka & A. Patten (eds.), *Language Rights and Political Theory* 153–168. Oxford: OUP.

Park, S. 2021. Approaches to Citizenship Education in the Global Era. *Proceedings of the 2012 Summer Conference of the Korean Association for the Social Studies Education* 43–52. Chuncheon: The Korean Association for the Social Studies Education.

Patterson, R. & S. Huff. 1999. The Decline and Fall of Esperanto: Lessons for Standards Committees. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 6.6, 444–446. DOI: 10.1136/jamia.1999.0060444

Piron, C. 2000. *Linguistic Communication: A Comparative Field Study. Esperanto Document 46A*. Rotterdam: Universal Esperanto Association.

Schor, E. 2016. *Bridge of Words: Esperanto and the Dream of a Universal Language.* New York: Metropolitan Books.

Sim, H. 2016. Global Citizenship Education in South Korea Through Civil Society Organizations: Its Status and Limitations. *Asian Journal of Education* 17.2, 107–129.

UNESCO. 2015. *Global Citizenship Education: Topics and Learning Objectives*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing. DOI: 10.54675/DRHC3544

UNESCO APCEIU. 2022. *GCED Curriculum Development and Implementation in Higher Education*. Seoul: UNESCO Asia-Pacific Center of Education for International Understanding.

UNESCO MGIEP. 2019. *Transforming Education for Humanity.* New Delhi: UNESCO MGIEP.
Zamenhof, L. 1905. *Fundamento de Esperanto*. Paris: Hachette.