Volume 10 Issue 3
December 2023

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND CULTURAL STUDIES ISSN 2356-5926

Linguistic Imperialism: Means, impacts and means of resistance

Abdelalim Bouajjar
Higher Institute of Languages in Gabes,
University of Gabes, Tunisia
abdel19892010@hotmail.fr

Abstract

Linguistic imperialism, although it is at its peak in the last decades, finds its roots throughout history. As a phenomenon, it is encompassing and far-reaching in its impacts. This article, first, offers a brief historical overview of linguistic imperialism and the obsolete means by which such imperialism used to be carried out centuries ago. Then, focusing on its main topic, it provides a research review of the history of English linguistic imperialism, and its distinct means through different stages in history, and it brings to light the impacts such imperialism has on other languages and cultures. Eventually, this paper extends an account of the different means proposed by researchers to display dissent and resist this sweeping imperialistic trend.

Keywords: linguistic imperialism, linguicism, anglocentricity, neo-imperialism, globalization, racialization, resistance, decoloniality.

1. Introduction

The spread and dominance of certain languages over others are ubiquitous in human history (Phillipson, 1992; Pennycook, 1998; Spolsky, 2004). This dominance was the natural outcome of the conquests and the army invasions that certain nations and empires had made on other territories (Spolsky, 2004). Those were the Modus Operandi of linguistic imperialism centuries ago, even before the 16th century and the beginning of Europe's expansion and colonialization of the Americas, Asia and Africa. According to Spolsky (2004), several languages, like Arabic, Greek and Latin, managed to survive, even after the extinction or the fall of their empires, because they shared four characteristics: "the spread by military conquest; they became languages of administration; their rule lasted for centuries; they served as a lingua franca in multilingual areas, and knowledge of them brought material advantages to those who learned them. Generally adopted initially as additional languages, they ultimately became mother tongues" (Spolsky, 2004, p. 78). Moving to the 18th century, the Whiteman's burden of civilizing other parts of the world emerged. This civilizing mission was colonial and imperial, and the British Empire, on which the sun never sets, was the most dominant and led those efforts that marked the enrooting of the first seeds of English linguistic imperialism (Eco, 1995; Spolsky, 2004; Phillipson, 2009).

2.English linguistic imperialism

Researchers, like Eco (1995), Pennycook (1998), Phillipson (1998), and Spolsky (2004) assert that the colonial expansion of the British Empire is the precursor that marks the early beginnings of English linguistic imperialism. Eco (1995), for instance, argues that "the predominant position currently enjoyed by English is a historical contingency arising from the mercantile and colonial expansion of the British Empire, which was followed by American economic and technological hegemony" (p. 331). Within the same line, Phillipson (2012, p. 441) states that the "Anglo-American efforts to maintain global English dominance have intensified since 1945 and are central to the present-day world 'order', as the postcolonial is subsumed under the global empire, assisted by English linguistic neoimperialiasm". Being among the winning side in the Second World War and its paramount role in maintaining and promoting the spread of English language worldwide is, also, highlighted by Eco (1995). He postulates that "had Hitler won World War II and had the USA been reduced to a confederation of banana republics, we would probably today use German as a universal vehicular language" (Eco, 1995, p. 331).

After this brief historical prelude, it is fitting to understand what linguistic imperialism exactly means academically. First of all, it is noticed throughout the revised literature for this paper that the term linguistic imperialism is synonymous with English linguistic imperialism: it is coined specifically to refer to the hegemony of the English language. Phillipson (1992, p. 47) defines it as "the dominance of English which is asserted and maintained by the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between English and other languages". Those structural and cultural inequalities are among linguicisticpractices that

"ensure the continued allocation of more material resources to English than to other languages and benefit those who are proficient in English" (Phillipson, 1992, p. 47). They can be looked at as the superordinate means or mechanisms for linguistic imperialism from which multiple means unfold.

3. Means of English linguistic imperialism

Different means have been adopted throughout time for the sake of spreading English and maintaining its hegemonic status. It can be argued that the means optedfor during the colonial times are limited, simple and part of an overt de facto policy; whereas those at play throughout the last decades are more of neo-colonial nature. They are various, more subtle and underlying, yet far-reaching and consequential in their impacts.

3.1. Colonial means of linguistic imperialism

The roots of English linguistic imperialism can be traced back to the British Empire, in the early 19th century. Kopf (1969) provides a thorough account of the linguicisticand ethnocentric policies that the dignitaries of the British Empire had taken, particularly, in eastern Asian colonies. First, it is noted in his work that linguistic imperialism is in lockstep with cultural imperialism. This organic link between the two is validated by several other researchers: Phillipson (1992), Phillipson and Skutnab-Kangas (1997), Canagrajah (1999), Scollen (2004), and Phillipson (2012). They all assert that culture can not be separated from language and that when you teach a language, you teach its cultures as well; thus, linguistic imperialism by design involves cultural imperialism.

Most of the means, used by the British Empire officials to spread and perpetuate English, are radical and ethnocentric. Kopf (1969) reports that when he became president of the General Committee of Public Instruction in 1835, after easily manipulating "the well-intentionedBentinck",Macaulay proposed that "The Bentinck Government would withhold any further grant of public money from institution…conferring instruction in native languages", and he recommends"that Sanskrit Colleges be abolished" (Sharp, 1920, p. 133, as cited in Kopf, 1969, p. 248).Kopf (1969) states that this proposal was approved by Bentinck; yet public protests and petitions "saved Sanskrit College from total abolition" (p. 248). This antagonistic and hostile policy towardthe Sanskrit language reflects, according to Kopf (1969), an amplified superior ethnocentric view of English and an absolute contempt of other oriental languages. Macaulay confirms his dogmatic and ethnocentric perspective when he says that "a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia" (Sharp, 1920, p. 132, as cited in Kopf, 1969, p. 249).

Another linguicisticethnocentric policy adopted by the British Empire is the cancellation of the use of local languages in certain places. For instance, Bearce (1961) reports that the Persian language was cancelled and forbidden in Indian courts and administrations and was replaced by English. Those restrictions on the use of their original language and the cutting or

halting of funding to local schools teaching local languages were juxtaposed by further funding to the teaching of English language so as "to make natives of this country thoroughly good English speakers" (Minute of February 2, 1835, found in the GCPI MPC, as cited in Kopf, 1969, p. 250).

Those are some of the basic means by which imperial linguistic imperialism was implemented in British colonies. Those imperialistic linguicisticpractices have remained and taken more subtle forms after the waves of independence in the mid-20th century. Those waves, as Phillipson (1992, 2012) Pennycook (1998) and Spolsky (2004) affirm, did not actually or categorically mark the end of imperialism. Instead, they marked a shift from an explicit economic, cultural, and political dominance to a less explicit less direct dominance; known as neo-Imperialism or neo-colonialism (Philipson, 1992, 2009; Pennycook, 1998; Spolsky, 2004).

3.2. Neo-colonial means of linguistic imperialism

As mentioned earlier, after the waves of independence, colonial languages, in general, and English, in particular, have managed to perpetuate via different means. Again, this relentless effort to spread English, now shared by the U.S.A after the end of WW II (Phillipson, 2012), stems from an anglocentricity syndrome: the perception that the English language is the norm "by which all language activity or use should be measured" (Phillipson, 1992, p. 47). This anglocentricity "simultaneously devalues other languages, either explicitly or implicitly", and it functions hands in hand with professionalism, which means that the theories, methods and procedures in ELT aim to "disconnect culture from structure by limiting the focus in language pedagogy to technical matters" and by " the exclusion of social, economic and political matters" (Phillipson, 1992, p. 48). In other words, anglocentricity and professionalism are, resepectively,the basic rationale that motivates linguistic imperialism and the basic means through which it is achieved.

Canagarajah (1999) agrees with Phillipson (1992), particularly, on professionalism and ELT teaching aspect as means of implementing linguistic imperialism. First, in his seminal work *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching*, he dichotomizes communities into the center and the periphery. The center refers to the "technologically-advanced communities where English is the primary language" (Canagarajah, 1999, p.4), whereas the periphery refers to communities in which English is "of post-colonial currency", such as Bangladesh or India (p. 4). It is needless to say that the periphery is the field on which means of linguistic imperialism operate.

Before dwelling on the means of linguistic imperialism in English Language Teaching (ELT),Canagarajah (1999) reports some of the students' reactions to some of the teaching content. First, he understands how Ravi and other students feel as social and cultural differences interfere with their comprehension of one of the English texts in the class. For instance, as Canagarajah (1999) notes, Ravi's cultural background made him understand messages from his English studies that disturbed him: "he feels alienated by them" (p. 14).With such feedback on

content, Canagarajah (1999) asserts that "it would be wrong to assume that learning is always autonomous and never hindered or contaminated by contextual factors" and " that learning has far-reaching implications for students' values, identity, and community solidarity and that students will always make connections between classroom proceedings and the outside world" (p. 14).

Teachers like Mrs. K, the one teaching Ravi and his friends, are perilous to students and to students' cultural roots and values, according to Canagarajah (1999). They have a hidden agenda to disseminate western values, ideologies and ways of thinking, which would ultimately lead to reshaping the students' mentality and the community (Canagarajah, 1999). In this respect,Canagarajah(1999) agrees with Phillipson (1992) on the organic link and association between linguistic imperialism and cultural imperialism, and he concludes that "language learning can not be considered an entirely innocent activity, since it raises the possibility of ideological domination and social conflict" (p. 14). It ought to be highlighted that this pliancy of language into becoming an ideological imperialistic tool is academically studied and affirmed by several researchers, and not just Phillipson (1992) and Canagarajah (1999). Those researchers include: Kopf (1969), Bisong (1995), Eco (1995),Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas (1997), Pennycook (1998), Skutnabb-Kangas (2000), Scollen (2004), Spolsky (2004), Shohamy (2006), and Hsu (2017).

3.2.1. Pedagogy of the main stream

Within Canagarajah's (1999) framework, the first means by which linguistic imperialism takes place is the pedagogy of the mainstream. This pedagogy of ELT is based on several tenets, the most important of which is that the learning process, itsmodes, methods and techniques are universal and value-free instruments and that knowledge is "devoid of values of any moral, cultural, or ethical character" (Canagarajah, 1999, p. 16).

Canagarajah (1999) responds to this pedagogy by developing his own critical pedagogy in which he refutes all the former's assumptions. First, he argues that the established ELT methods "embody the preferred ways of learning and thinking of the dominant communities – and that this bias can create conflict for learners from other pedagogical traditions" (Canagarajah, 1999, p. 15-16). As far as knowledge being value and ideology-free, Canagarajah (1999) affirms that the "instutionalized forms of knowledge embody assumptions and perspectives of the dominant groups, which introduce other communities to the same value system in order to legitimize the dominance of the elite group" (p. 16). He further elaborates this point by arguing that instutionalized knowledge disregards the fact that local students and people "have their own philosophical traditions and competing versions of reality that favour their own interests" and that promote their own culture (Canagarajah, 1999, p. 16).

3.2.2. Exclusion of L1 in L2 teaching and the limitations in funds

Phillipson (1992), Canagarajah(1999), Stutnabb-Kangas (2000) and Hsu (2017), and several

other researchers share the consensus that the exclusion of L1, or mother tongue, while teaching English is an important tool for linguistic imperialism. This exclusion, as Canagarajah (1999) describes it, is a deliberate "center-pedagogy" dictated policy. It is an ideological power practice that, on the one hand, promotes the linguistic imperialism of English, and, on the other hand, alienates students from their mother tongue (Phillipson, 1992; Canagarajah, 1999; Stutnabb-Kangas; 2000; and Hsu (2017). Using Muhlhausler's (1996) words, the total exclusion of L1 in teaching L2 communicates that original "languages were not worthy to be vehicles for obtaining new, non-traditional information" (p. 243).

Another means, highlighted by Canagarajah (1999), is the limitations in funding, time, and in printing materials for ELT teachers. Those disadvantageous teaching conditions make ELT teachers dependent on "western cultural agencies" that "serve as a conduit for the influence of center institutions, in particular commercial organizations involved in textbook production, and educational institutions involved in teacher training" (Canagarajah, 1999). Subsequently, the teaching methods and content, according to Canagarajah (1999), are pregnant with ideological practices about social relations and cultural values that are originally western and at conflict with the local culture of the student.

3.2.3. Anglo-American Foundations

Phillipson (1992), Pennycook (1998), and Hsu (2017) argue that organizations, or foundations, like: World Bank Company, Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, TESOL organization, Ford Foundation, British Council, and by analogy AMIDEAST, they all serve the ideology of the west; particularly, Anglo-American ideology. In other words, they are the tools for effectuating linguistic cultural imperialism (Phillipson, 1992; Pennycook, 1998; Hsu, 2017). The World Bank organization is, also, a major player in promoting the imperialistic state of English, as Phillipson (2012) argues in his recent article: English from British Empire to Corporate Empire. This bank, he asserts,has taken over "where colonial regimes left off" in spreading and sustaining the linguistic imperialism of English (p. 448).

Pennycook (1998), Kumaravadivelu (1994) and Edge (2006), on the other hand, accentuate that ELT, TEFL, and TESOL are at the core of English linguistic imperialism. Edge (2006, p. xiii), for instance, argues that teaching English in the 21st century inevitably entails "supporting the linguistic, cultural, commercial and increasingly military dominance of the USA and its allies". Hsu (2017) concords with Edge (2006) and suggests that just as teaching English "can be a mechanism of empowerment", it can, also, be "the instruction of oppressive relations of power" (p. 120).

Those are some of the main means by which English linguistic imperialism is achieved. It is self-evident that they are far-reaching and that they have critical impacts on local languages and cultures, as several researchers assert.

4. The impacts of linguistic imperialism

The impacts of linguistic imperialism, as noted throughout the reported studies, go beyond threatening the roots and values of other cultures to threatening the very existence of difference as the backbone and the distinctive mark of human societies and life from the beginning of history. Languages and dialects have, also, been jeopardized by this sweeping propagating trend of English.

4.1. Impacts on culture

There is a consensus among researchers, who investigated this issue, on the fact that linguistic imperialism is necessarily embedded with cultural imperialism. Phillipson (1992, 2012), Imam (2005), Guo and Becket (2007), Mustapha (2014),and several others assert that although linguistic imperialism is basically about the conveyance of a dominating language to other people, significant element of the dominant culture do accompany this transfer. Those cultural aspects transferred via language, according to Bisong (1995), are "the Anglo-Saxon- Judeo-Christian culture" that has been endeavouring to erase the indigenous cultures (p. 123). The same issue is raised by Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas (1997). They affirm that English through its imperial status and imperialistic endeavours have led to "cultural homogenization" or "Mc Donladization" (Phillipson&Skutnabb-Kangas, 1997). What is meant exactly by those two terms is that the spread of English does and has influenced the values, attitudes, practices, social relations, and the beliefs of non-western societies. Other researchers refer to this dissemination of English and western culture as Englishization: one of the dimensions of globalization.

> Within the same globalization line, Bourdieu (2001) claims that: globalization serves as a password or watchword, while in effect it is the legitimacy mask of a policy aiming to universalize particular interests and particular traditions of the economically and politicallydominant powers, above all the United States, and to extend to the entire world the economic and cultural model that favours these powers most, while simultaneously presenting it as a norm, a requirement, and a fatality, a universal destiny, in such a manner as to obtain adherence or at least universal resignation.(as cited in Phillipson, 2012, p. 4).

Hence, it can be argued that most researchers observe how English, as a dominant language, globalization, and cultural imperialism are interwoven and interrelated. English language and culture have been both the medium and the outcome of the globalizing efforts of the world.

4.2. Impacts on language and linguistic genocide

Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas (1995, 1997), Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) andPhillipson (2012) agree that English has pushed national and local languages and dialects, in post-colonial countries, to the threshold. According to them, English has been so privileged, in terms of language and educational policy, that it has rendered other languages and dialects into a

vernacular. This is what Skutnabb-Kangas(2000) calls linguistic genocide and it is the outcome of what Phillipson (1992) termed as linguicism: the "unequal division of power and resources between groups which are identified on the basis of language" (p. 47).

Assuming a more incriminating stance, Phillipson (2012) states that, as opposed to *lingua franca*, English can, also, be seen as *lingua frankensteinia*: a language that " gobbles up other languages" (p. 444). He describes the term *lingua franca* as being "pernicious", "misleading" and "false", and that it sugercoats or camouflages serious linguistically and non-linguistically imperialistic endeavours: the dominance of English as a language, culture, politics and economy. In short, for Phillipson (2012), English is "the language of the crusade of global corporatisation, marked as 'freedom' and 'democracy' " (p. 444). This lingua frankensteinia has, also, gained a foothold in Europe and has become the language of 'corporate empire' (Phillipson, 2012) and the language of scientific research (Ferguson. Perez-Llanta, &Plo, 2011).

4.3. Linguistic imperialism and racialization

According to Omi and Winant (1994), the process of racialization can be defined as a failure to recognize that the Indians, Africans and other third-worldountries have a distinct culture oftheirown, and, consequently, impose and enforce the western culture and race on them (as cited in Hsu, 2017). This is done, as multiple researchers affirm, through language as a means of establishing or reshaping culture.

Bearce (1961), Kopf (1967) and Hsu (2017) maintain that processes of racialization began to take shape in the mid-19th century with the British Empire. Hsu (2017), for instance, reports that, in 1888, Commissioner of Indian Affairs J.D.C. Atkins affirmed that "the first step to be taken toward civilization….toward teaching the Indians the mischief and folly of continuing in their barbarous practices, is to teach them the English language`` (p. 111). In other words, English is the only language of reform and enlightenment and it is the Indians' only hope of getting rid of their 'barbarity'; their original language is not doing them any good. This statement, according, to Hsu (2017), demonstrates Atkins's strong anglocentric character and his inferior view of the Indians' indigenous language, and it explicitly reveals the cogent association "between colonialism, English language teaching…and the process of racialization" (p. 111).It is important to note that the Indians, J.D.C. Atkins talks about, are the indigenous people of America, and not the people of India.

The same anglocentric and inferior perception of other people's languages is noted across the other continent, in Asia. Kolf (1967) quotes Macaulay, the president of the General Committee of Public Instructions who called for the total abolishment of Sanskrit schools, saying that " a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia" (p. 249). Boaz (1962) explains that Macaulay's racial superiority typically reflects an "ethnocentric…version of cultural evolution-that mankind had developed in a uniform series of stages from savagery to mid-Victorian England, and that all existing forms of culture were to be evaluated in terms of their similarity or dissimilarity to this highly evolved culture" (Boas, 1962,

p. 57, as cited in Kopf, 1969, p. 247). It is needless to say that the most efficient means to get a sense of likeness with this highly evolved culture is not to use your language, but rather to speak English, which is the ultimate goal of British officials: "our efforts need to be directed….to make natives of this country thoroughly good English speakers" (Macaulay, Minute of February 2, 1835, found in the GCPI MPC, as cited in Kopf, 1969, p. 250). As explained in previous sections, this had been implemented at the expense of indigenous languages and schools that had been banned and financially deprived.

The clearest remark on racialization is probably made by Lugard, the governor of Hong Kong from 1907 to 1912. Lugard, during his mandate, concluded that:

> the result of Western Education is admittedly to undermine eastern beliefs and thereby to disorganize much of social life which among eastern people is so intimately bound up to religion….students were gradually influenced by this western education, they would lose touch with their cultural and moral roots (as cited in Pennycook, 1998, p. 119).

In those words, Lugard courageously reports what he had witnessed and he unveils the real intentions and ethnocentric objectives of western education. It is simply racialization and alienation in action.

Those are some of the main impacts of English linguistic imperialism, starting from the British Empire till recent and current times. The last section of this paper offers an insight into the different means suggested by different researchers to mitigate and resist linguistic imperialism.

5. Means of resisting linguistic imperialism

Several researchers, investigating linguistic imperialism, have suggested different ways to resist it. The most comprehensive of these works is Cangarajah's (1999) *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching*. In this work, he states that "if power is always already there in communication, avenues for resistance are also there, since power can not be exercised without contestation" (p. 214). Yet, this resistance is categorically dependent on awareness of the problem and its impacts, in this context awareness of linguistic imperialism and its impacts (Canagrajah, 1999). In other words, teachers need to become aware of linguistic imperialism, at first, and, then, develop possibilities "to exert their agency for simple but significant changes" (Canagarajah, 1999, p. 213). In harmony with Canagarajah (1999),Motha (2019) accentuates the importance of awareness and stresses that we need to recognize that "that the effects of empire and racialization are woven throughout the English language, the process of teaching English, and the project of learning English" (p. 129)

Of the most practical means suggested by Canagarajah (1999) to resist the imperialism of English, there is critical pedagogy and the use of L1 in teaching English. Critical pedagogy evolves around the notion of questioning and doubting ideas, practices and beliefs that are

communicated through the input of the teaching process, and it aims rendering questioning the input a habit for students (Canagarajah, 1999). Besides, unlike the pedagogy of the main stream, in critical pedagogy learning is contextualized, personal, situated, and cultural, and knowledge is ideological and negotiated and not value or ideology-free (Canagarajah, 1999). For the use of L1 in teaching English, Canagarajah (1999) affirms that the use of L1 and the vernacular primarily functions to keep the students connected to the native language and culture; they are "imaginative and resourceful opposition strategies" to English (p. 144). With regards to its impacts on L2 acquisition, he embraces Cummins's (1991) and Auerbach's (1993) view on the matter: the use of L1 is not detrimental to L2 and it can be used as a scaffolding system to L2 acquisition (Canagarajah, 1999). This assumption is shared by several researchers: Crook (2001), Macaro (2005), Lia (2006), Littlewood and Yu (2009), Kelleher (2013), Madrinan (2014) and Bouajjar (2019).

Other means of no less importance highlighted by Canagarajah (1999)is creating contact zones for students. Those contact zones can be in the class or outside the class, a space where students can bring their various sociocultural backgrounds and opinions of issues that matter to them and voice them freely (Canagarajah, 1999). Such "an interaction in the contact zone gives birth to hybrid forms of knowledge, texts and codes which may resist homogeneity and domination" Canagrajah, 1999, p. 187).

Those safe houses or zones are similar to Reagan and Osborn's (2002) Critical Curriculum Development and its dialogical strategies. Those strategiesrevolve around accustoming students to questioning and problem posing, which "will not serve the interests of the oppressor, because it constantly strives to answer the question, Why?" (Reagan and Osborn, 2002, p.72). What Reagan and Osborn (2002) mean is that students be encouraged to think critically and ask questions like: why we study this text? Why they are asking us that question? Why are they acting like that? Why do they seem different than us? All those questions would seek "to further theaims of what might be termed *emancipatory praxis*. Arguing for a holistic modelthat incorporates and celebrates the social and cultural contexts of the schoolingprocess" (Reagan and Osborn, 2002, p.71). Shin (2006) refers to this Critical Curriculum Development and the emancipatory praxis as postcolonial pedagogy; a pedagogy that "is about questioning commonsense assumptions, privileging the situatednessof the local knowledge (and pedagogy) and understanding that one size does not fit all" (p. 162).

The last, but not least, crucial means of resisting linguistic imperialism, reported in this study, is grammar of decoloniality. Kumaravadivelu (2001, 2016) and Mignolo (2007) affirm that the grammar of decoloniality is one of the most effective means of resisting the colonial and imperial practices of English. It aims at emptying the colonial language from its hegemonic, supremacist, and racist ideologies and practices, and at metamorphosing the marginal and subaltern into a position of privilege and power (Kumaravadivelu, 2001, 2016; Mignolo, 2007). This accrues by "learning to unlearn" (Mignolo, 2007, p. 485) the colonial ideologies of hegemony and the stigmatization of the Other,and by building original, independent, and emancipatory intellectual spaces that project and promote the local sociocultural realities

(Kumaravadivelu, 2001, 2016; Mignolo, 2007). Those alternative intellectual spaces do exist and "although silenced in mainstream media,multiple fractures are creating larger spatial epistemic breaks (e.g.geopolitics of knowledge) in the overarching totality of Western global anduniversal history that from Hegel to Huntington was successful in negatingsubjectivities from non-Western, non-capitalist, non-Christian nations" (Mignolo, 2007, p. 493). Other similar means of resisting linguistic and cultural imperialism, elaborated by other researchers, include: Pennycook's (1998) postmethod pedagogies and approaches, Shin's (2006) pedagogy of engagement, and Flores and Rosa's (2015) translanguaging.

5. Conclusion

This study has mainly concentrated on how linguistic imperialism has existed and operated from the emergence and dominance of the British Empire until current times. It has reported how and why several researchers view English as subtly mischievous and deleterious to other languages and cultures; particularly, in Anglophone and third worldcountries. The imperialistic influence and power of English, however, has, also, proven to be very far-reaching and radiant to the extent that it has managed to penetrate continental Europe; an issue that is worth further examination.Be that as it may, and although the term linguistic imperialism is specifically designed for English language, other colonial languages have exerted similar practices. France, in particular, has exerted a far crueler and more overt forms of linguistic imperialism on its colonies, and still does post-colonially. This is affirmed in Spolsky's (2004) work where he states that:

> One important result differentiates French and British policies: at independence from British rule, there was commonly sufficient educationand literacy in one or more of the indigenous languages for it be a possible choice for national language, while at independence from Frenchrule, a long tradition of official and educational use of French and banning of indigenous languages made such a choice rare (p. 84).

That is why literacy meant literacy in French, not in your own indigenous language, even after the independence (Spoltsky, 2004).

It can be argued, starting from what Spoltsky (2004) asserts, that since French linguistic imperialism had had more radical and more ethnocentric means, its impacts on the local languages of its colonies were deeper, more deleterious and effacing than English linguistic imperialism. As far as this article, this remains just a claim that needs to be historically and academically examined in upcoming studies about French linguistic imperialism, its means and impacts in comparison to English. It would, also, be more revealing to examine how those two imperialistic languages struggle for maintaining their status and linguistic and cultural influence.

References

Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Re-examining English only in ESL classroom. *Tesol Quarterly*, 27 (2), 76-87.

Bearce, G. D. (1961). *British attitudes towards India, 1784- 1858*. Oxford, London: Oxford University Press.

Bisong, J. (1995). Language choice and cultural imperialism: A Nigerian perspective. *ELT Journal, 49* (2), 122-132.

Bouajjar, A. (2019). Tunisian students' attitudes towards the use of first language in teaching English as a second or foreign language. *TAYR Quarterly, 6* (4), 29-48. doi: https://doi.org/10.31561/2014tq

Canagarajah, A.S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Cook, V.J. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Journal Review*, 57 (3), 75-85.

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters LTD.

Eco, U. (1995). *The search for the perfect language*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Edge, J. (2006). (Re)locating TESOL in an age of empire. New York, NY: Palgrave and Macmillan.

Ferguson, G., Perez-Llantada, C. &Plo, R. (2011). English as an international language of scientific publication: A study of attitudes. *World Englishes, 30* (1), pp. 41–59. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-971X.2010.01656.x

Flores, N,. & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review, 85* (2), 149-171.

Guo, Y. & Becket, G.H. (2007). The hegemony of English as a global language: Reclaiming local knowledge and culture in China. *Convergence, XL* (1-2), 117-131.

Hsu, F. (2017). Resisting the coloniality of English: A research review of strategies. *The CATESOL Journal, 29* (1), 111-132.

Imam, S.R. (2005). English as a global language and the question of nation building in Bangladesh. *Comparative Education, 41*, 471-486.

Kelleher, M. (2013). Overcoming the first language taboo to enhance learning a foreign language. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 93, 2037-2042.

Kopf, D. (1969). *British orientalism and the Bengal renaissance: The dynamics of Indian modernization 1773-1835*. Calcutta, India: FORMA K. L. MUPHOPADHYAY

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1994). The postmethod condition: (E)merging strategies for second/foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 28* (1), 27-48.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). Towards a postmethod pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly, 35* (4), 537-560

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2016). The decolonial option in English teaching: Can the Subaltern act? TESOL Quarterly, 50 (1), 66-85.

Liao, P.S. (2006). EFL learners` belief about strategy use of translation in English learning. *RELCJ*, 37 (2), 191-215. Retrieved from: http://journals.sageup.com/doi/abs/10.1177/00336882060674228

Littlewood, W, & Yu, B. (2009). First language and target language in the foreign language classroom. *Language Teaching*, 44 (1), 64-77. doi: 10.1017/S0261444809990310

Macaro, E. (1997). *Target Language, Collaborative Learning and Autonomy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Madrinan, M. S. (2014). The use of first language in the second-language classroom : A support for second language acquistion. *Gist Education and Learning Research Journal,* 9, 50-66.

Mignolo, W. D. (2007). DELINKING: The rhetoric of modernity, the logic of coloniality and the grammar of de-coloniality. *Cultural studies, 21* (2-3), 449-514.

Motha, S. (2014). *Race, empire, and English language teaching: Creating responsible and ethical anti-racist practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Muhlhausler, P. (1995). *Linguistic ecology: Language change and linguistic imperialism in the pacific region*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Mustapha, A. S. (2014). Linguistic hegemony of the English language in Nigeria. *Ikala, Revista de Lenguja y Cultura, 19* (1), 83-97.

Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourse of colonialism*. London, England: Routledge.

Phillipson, R. &Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1995). Linguistic rights and wrongs. *Applied Linguistics*, Volume, 16 (4), 483-504.

Phillipson, R. &Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1997). Linguistic human rights and English in Europe. *World Englishes*, 16 (1), 27-43.

Phillipson, R. &Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1999). Englishization: one dimension of globalization. In D. Graddol& U. Meinhof (Eds), *English in a changing world* (pp. 19-36). AILA Review, 13

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. London, England: Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, R. (2012). English: From British empire to corporate empire. *Sociolinguistic Studies, 5* (3), 441-464. doi: 10.1558/sols.v5i3.441

Reagan, T. G. & Osborn, T. A. (2002). *The foreign language educator in society: Toward a critical pedagogy.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.

Scollen, R. (2004). Teaching language and culture as hegemonic practice. *Modern Language Journal, 88*, 271-274.

Shin, H. (2006). Rethinking TESOL from SOL's perspective: Indigenous epistemology and decolonizing praxis in TESOL. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 3* (2-3), 147-167.

Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education – Or worldwide diversity and human rights.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.