Perspectives on the role of English as an International Language.

Paul Moritoshi

November 2001
Contents

Title

Contents
1 Introduction 1
2 Clarification of terms 1
3 Language in the development of society 3
   3.1 Modernisation 3
   3.2 Leisure and career opportunities 4
4 Language in the development of culture 6
   4.1 Indigenous value-systems 6
   4.2 Indigenous languages 8
   4.3 Indigenous literary arts 9
5 Language in the maintenance of society and culture 10
6 The need for appropriate and adequate language planning 12
7 Implications for ELT professionals in Japan 13
8 Conclusion 14
   Appendix 15
   References 16
1 Introduction

Historical events such as the Pilgrims’ emigration to the Americas, the wholesale transportation of British convicts to Australia and the expansion of the British empire, initiated the spread of the English language to territories which Britain claimed as its own. However, it is only relatively recently, since the 1920’s (Kachru, 1994: 137), or the end of World War II (Kaplan, 1987: 138), that the influence of English as an international language (EIL) has extended to most other parts of the world. Indeed English is now so widespread and considered so influential that the ‘BANA’ countries (Britain and the Australasian and North American nations) (Holliday, 1994: 4), which use English as their first language, are often charged with hegemony (Kaplan, 1987: 139) and ‘linguistic imperialism’ (Phillipson, 1992).

In section 2, I will provide functional definitions for some of the concepts central to this paper. Sections 3-5 then discuss the roles played by EIL and local languages in the development and maintenance of society and culture. These sections present the view that while EIL can positively develop both a society and its culture, social and cultural maintenance is best performed by the local language. Section 6 highlights the need for language planning which balances the use of EIL for development on the one hand, with the use of local languages for maintenance on the other. Finally, section 7 outlines some of the implications of these issues for English language teaching (ELT) professionals in Japan.

It is necessary to concede at this point that this paper cannot possibly cover the full range of issues pertaining to the EIL debate. The field is simply too vast. Instead, I have tried to take a balanced selection of views on issues which help to illustrate the points I wish to make in response to the question.

2 Clarification of terms

While definition of the key concepts is seen as a necessary precursor to any discussion of language, society and culture (Wardhaugh, 1998: 1), I will keep such clarifications to a necessary minimum. The definitions presented here therefore, though not necessarily conceptually water-tight, are straight-forward, clear and adequately functional for the purposes of this paper.

Wardhaugh views ‘society’ as:

......any group of people who are drawn together for a certain purpose or purposes.  

( *ibid.*).

In the context of English in an international setting, the ‘group’ might be loosely
equated to ethnic, culturally homogenous populations, possibly within, but not necessarily limited to national boundaries. Here the ‘purposes’ are taken to be social and cultural maintenance and development.

Goodenough defines ‘culture’ as:

......whatever it is one has to know or believe in order to operate in a manner acceptable to [a society’s] members, and to do so in any role that they accept for any one of themselves.


Though somewhat dated, this is in line with my own view as it emphasises culture as the knowledge-base and value-system to which members of a society must subscribe if they are to be socially accepted. These knowledge and value sets are very often expressed in a society’s language and literature.

For this reason, in addition to being 'a resource for conceptualization and communication' (Widdowson, 1987: 17), ‘language’ might also be thought of as a cultural resource, often reflecting as it does the values of the society in which it has evolved (Hyde, 1994: 300). It seems that a language develops over time specifically so that a society can adequately express the values and beliefs that it holds.

If EIL can be defined at all, it might be described as any of the Centre’s ‘received pronunciation’ (RP) varieties of English, used for international communication where the interlocutors do not have a common first language (adapted from Kennedy, 2001: 81). However, both Kaplan (1987: 145) and Wardhaugh (1998: 28) point out that these RP varieties differ between and even among themselves.

‘Development’ might be defined simply as change or evolution. The implicit assumption is that the change is intended to benefit all members of the society, though this will not always be the case. The term ‘maintenance’ indicates the continuance of the society or culture in its current state.

Finally, a common distinction made when discussing EIL is that between the native English-speaking ‘Centre’ countries, predominantly Holliday’s (1994: 4) BANA nations, and the non-native English-speaking ‘Periphery’. I will follow this distinction rather than Kachru’s (1985: 12-15; 1992b: 232-234) differentiation between ‘Inner’, ‘Outer’ and ‘Expanding circles’, for two reasons. Firstly, that it better reflects the power relations between these two groups (Bisong, 1995: 122) and secondly, as Shaub (2000: 225) points out in the case of Egypt, Kachru’s distinction between Outer and Expanding nations is not always applicable.
3 Language in the development of society

This section discusses the uses that EIL has been put to in making new technologies available to the Periphery and the ways in which it has enhanced choice and opportunities in leisure and work.

3.1 Modernisation

One of the main roles EIL plays in social development is in modernisation. Copious literature exists pointing out that English is the language of science and technology (Strevens, 1980: 62; 1992: 31; Kachru, 1990: 7; Seaton, 1997: 381; Hyrkstedt and Kalaja, 1998: 345; Master, 1998: 716; Kennedy, 2001: 83). Indeed, Kaplan notes that 80-85% of the world’s scientific and technical information is available in English (1987: 139, citing McArthur, 1987). Two reasons for this phenomenon are that, firstly, English 'has repeatedly found itself in the right place at the right time' (Crystal, 1997: 110). In other words, it has generally been the Centre which has developed new technologies. Unsurprisingly, the associated terminology is in English. Secondly, English seems capable of supporting a very wide range of functions (Kachru, 1994: 135).

The Periphery is therefore often required to use English to obtain and use these technologies when developing or modernising their services, industries and infrastructures. Indeed, Kaplan points out that:

....where industrialization and modernization have been chosen [in the Pacific Rim]...
the relative achievement of those objectives is significantly tied to the availability of
English because, for better or for worse, English is the language of science and
technology.

(Kaplan, 1987: 144).

In other words, he views access to English as a concomitant factor for successful modernisation.

Concerns however have been expressed that the process of modernisation affords the Centre opportunities to exploit and/or control Periphery societies. In support of this view, Phillipson writes:

....the export of English to formerly colonized countries has not paved the way to
modernity and prosperity, as was foreseen by at least some planners in the post
World War II era......Far from being a neutral medium allowing for international
communication and access to the technology of developed countries, English has served the political, cultural, and economic interests of the principal colonial powers, Great Britain and the U.S., at the expense of local and national development in third world countries.


Phillipson is claiming that English failed to help former colonies (Periphery societies) share in the technological and scientific advances made by the Centre. He attempts to explain this by claiming that English provided a back-door by which Great Britain and the United States (US) could exploit their former colonies, to the detriment of their development.

Though English may be a necessary, concomitant factor in modernisation, it should not be viewed as a sufficient one. How can any language, on its own, assure a society’s development? English, or any other language, is no substitute for a viable, coherent plan for modernisation, supported by sufficient funding and appropriate and adequate political and economic policies, implemented by a competent government. It is unreasonable therefore to hold English as a language, or the Centre as its perceived ‘owners’ responsible for the failure of former colonies to develop, particularly when the prevailing social, economic and political contexts in places like India and Africa are far more influential and potentially detrimental to development. Of course the Centre gains from selling its technology to the Periphery. That is the nature of capitalism. Were the roles to be reversed, it is most likely that the Periphery would do the same.

3.2 Leisure and career opportunities

The literature also notes that the Periphery uses EIL in various domains relating to leisure and work, for example in the international news and entertainment media and in youth culture (Strevens, 1980: 62; 1992: 31; Kachru, 1994: 140), for the internet (Seaton, 1997: 381; Bowers 2001: 293) and for (particularly international) business and trade (Kaplan, 1987: 143; Hyrkstedt and Kalaja, 1998: 345; Master, 1998: 716; Bowers, 2001: 293). It could be inferred from this that proficiency in English therefore enhances one’s leisure and career choices and opportunities.

Various sources support this inference. Personal experience shows that it is certainly one of the main reasons given to Japanese students of English by their teachers for studying the subject at school. Kachru (1994: 136) and Wardhaugh (1998: 356) have called English ‘the language of mobility’, implying that it gives access to avenues which might otherwise be closed. Holmes (1992: 65) has noted that English is used to enhance
job prospects and in an interview with Roger Bowers, Helena Kennedy QC talked of her experiences with the British Council:

But what was apparent in South Africa was that lots of people, anxious to make life better, didn’t want, as they saw it, to ‘waste time’ learning their own language. They were actually saying ‘I want to learn English, because English is the language that’s really going to better my life, and the life of my children.’

(Bowers, 2001: 294).

This raises the larger issue of the effects EIL has upon local languages, which I will discuss in section 4, but she makes the point that English is perceived to open doors which local languages cannot or do not. In highlighting similar sentiments among Nigerians, Bisong (1995: 124-125) points out that English is perceived to '[maximise] opportunities in a multilingual and multicultural society' (ibid.: 126). Finally, English proficiency is perceived as a highly influential factor in employment and promotion in Periphery nations as culturally diverse as China (Yong and Campbell, 1995) and Brazil (Friedrich, 2000). In fact, as of 1999, 82% of the (particularly multinational) organisations and companies which use the ‘Test of English for International Communication’ (TOEIC), either take account of TOEIC scores when reviewing job applications and promotions, or wish to do so in the future (Educational Testing Service, 2000: 5).

How does enhancing leisure and career opportunities help a society’s development? Wider leisure opportunities might generate income for, and even create new jobs in both public- and private-sector leisure-related industries. Wider career opportunities and choice can help bring about higher levels of employment. The net result is a more prosperous economy. This view is supported by Al-Haq and Smadi (1996: 313) who demonstrated that Saudi university students believe that English can enhance their nation’s economical development.

Strong critics of EIL, its spread, influences and effects, do not appear to contest that English can enhance leisure and career opportunities in Periphery societies, nor that, where such occurs, it might be beneficial to the local economy. What mainly concerns them, as touched upon above, is the potentially adverse effects that EIL might have on a society’s indigenous culture in the process.

4 Language in the development of culture
Unsurprisingly perhaps, there seems little controversy attached to the use of EIL for improving the physical services and infrastructures necessary for a large, well-equipped society, or for improving peoples’ quality of life through work and leisure. However, the debate concerning the effects that EIL and its use have had on local cultures is far more active. I shall discuss this with respect to the impact EIL has had on indigenous value-systems, languages and literary arts.

4.1 Indigenous value-systems

Several writers have noted that English, even when used in an international context, is not the value-neutral language that Wardhaugh (1987: 15) (Appendix) claims it to be (Uemichi, 1984: 6; Kaplan, 1987: 145; Brown, 1990: 13; and Phillipson, 1992, cited by Bisong, 1995: 123). My response to this is that of course English has a set of attendant values. That is its purpose as a language, as defined in section 2. However, those opposed to the spread and influence of EIL often make the generalised assumption that exposure to English results in the corruption or complete displacement of the local value-system which constitutes a major part of the indigenous culture.

Is this assumption a valid one? Kachru (1994: 147) asks whether the use of EIL for modernisation necessarily entails ‘Westernisation’? In other words, does English for social development require an acceptance of the Centre’s religious (i.e. mainly Judaeo-Christian), economic (i.e. capitalist), political (i.e. democratic?) and social values? Phillipson (1992: 166) (Appendix) would reply along the lines that Periphery societies have little choice in the matter; that those values are foisted upon them by the Centre, through English. Others dispute this: Uemichi (1984) in Japan; Adaskou et al (1990: 7) and Hyde (1994) in Morocco; Bisong (1995: 131) in Nigeria; and O’Reilly (1998: 82-83) in Bulgaria, all show that it is possible to use English without having to subscribe to its values. Al-Haq and Smadi have also demonstrated that, among Saudi Arabian university students at least, the use of English does not threaten Islamic values:

[They] agree that learning English is neither an indication of Westernization nor entails an imitation and admiration of Western cultural values.


Examination of the data on which these conflicting arguments are founded is quite revealing. Phillipson’s (1992) data come from interviews with 8 British ELT professionals, various governmental and official reports and the published work of a handful of language scholars (Ricento, 1994: 421-2), some or all of whom are clearly
already allied to his own viewpoint. Conversely, as the above references indicate, those
who oppose Phillipson’s work generally do so based on knowledge of specific Periphery
contexts and often on data derived through empirical research at grass-roots level. At the
very least, this raises doubts as to how well Phillipson is informed of the reality on the
ground.

It is conceded that exposure to the values inherent in EIL has the potential to
modify local values, though that does not mean that they always do so, or that where they
do, that the modification is necessarily detrimental to that society or its culture. It is
entirely conceivable that the Centre’s values may even have a reinforcing effect on local
values, as in the case of other Judaeo-Christian, capitalist or democratic societies. Bisong
(1995: 131); Warschauer (2000: 515); and Kennedy (2001: 80) all point to the need to
account for the 'human agency that shapes how English is used in different circumstances'
(Warschauer, *ibid.*). In other words, people are capable of using languages eclectically
and flexibly. The same capacity for eclecticism exists with respect to value-systems,
particularly among those in minority groups, (Montgomery, 1995: 67). People living in a
foreign country and speaking the local language, often operate in this fashion. For
example, Westerners speaking Japanese can conform to Japanese sociolinguistic values
of (what seems to Westerners extreme) politeness, tolerance and patience in the company
of Japanese people, yet revert to a Western norm when talking with fellow countrymen.
Also, my own (Japanese) wife is often conspicuously ‘unJapanese’ in her behaviour
when visiting England. She is able to complain in a very forthright fashion to a
shopkeeper about a faulty product she has bought, then revert back to Japanese
sociolinguistic norms of indirectness and circuitous explanations upon meeting Japanese
friends in town. This goes beyond acculturation. It is the ability to switch back and forth
between value-systems.

Therefore, rather than viewing value-systems as absolutes, in terms of ‘one-or-
the- other’ or ‘yours-or-mine’, it might be better to think of them as an additional
‘attitudinal resource’ that can be called up when needed. In this light, the Centre’s values
are no longer automatically seen as detrimental, but as a potential enhancement, a
development, supplementing rather than supplanting indigenous values. Periphery users
of English need to be aware of the values which English holds, so that they can be used
as an additional resource, but it is not necessary to actually subscribe to those values.

4.2 Indigenous languages

When two languages come into contact, there is often a mutually beneficial
exchange at the levels of lexis, phonology, grammar and discourse (collectively: Fisiak,
1993: 96; Kachru, 1994: 139-145; and Kennedy et al, 2001: 51). There is concern however, because English almost always ‘donates’ far more than it ‘receives’.

Section 2 touched upon the preference for English over local languages in South Africa. Concern has been expressed that exposure to English can modify, marginalise or even displace local languages (Holmes, 1992: 55-70; Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas, 1997; Tully, 1997; and Wardhaugh, 1998: 348). Warschauer (2000: 516) cites Phillipson (1992) in this regard, but counters that English can then be turned against the Centre, to the Periphery’s advantage in, for example, the struggle for independence.

The general consensus among those not opposed to EIL is that Periphery societies utilise English as an addition to their local language, rather than as a substitute for it. There exists a diglossia, where societies have generally accepted bilingualism (or multilingualism) and biculturalism (or multiculturalism) (Tollefson, 1989: 24; Kachru, 1994: 145; Bisong, 1995: 123; Dushku, 1998: 377; and Wardhaugh, 1998: 356).

Crystal however takes a more defensive view:

....people put two and two together and make five, of course, because the reasons why the languages are dying in Papua New Guinea have nothing to do with the role of English as a world language, all sorts of things are happening.

(Crystal, 1998: 151).

His point is that English might be present in societies where local languages are disappearing, but that other, unrelated factors are the cause. This is probably true in many cases where English, or more accurately, the Centre, has been held responsible, but the concern expressed by Phillipson and others is to some extent justified, if only because when language shift or loss occurs, it is difficult to reverse (Holmes, 1992: 74-75).

There are certainly risks associated with exposing a Periphery language to English. Those risks can however bring greater functionality through lexical, phonological, grammatical and discoursal enhancement. Where societies face the need to adapt to a changing world, their languages need to evolve with them to support that adaptation. EIL might actually be helping in that process. This highlights the importance of making language planning a coherent part of the larger vision an administration has for the society it governs. This is discussed in section 6.

4.3 Indigenous literary arts

Exposure to English has led to various developments in the Periphery’s literary arts. Firstly, to paraphrase Kachru (1994: 145), English has functioned as a model for
modifying, extending and refining genres already present in Periphery nations’ literary traditions. Secondly, it has provided fresh genres, styles and themes which have subsequently been taken up through the local language (ibid.). Finally, some Periphery writers use English in addition to, or in preference to, their own native tongue (Kachru, 1992b: 242; Lowry, 1992; Thumboo, 1992; Bisong, 1995: 128-131; Tully, 1997: 158).

On this aspect of cultural development, Phillipson (1992) questions the motivations of Periphery writers who work in English when they could channel their creativity through their own local languages. He advances three explanations. Firstly, that such writers desire to show that they can ‘[master] the Imperial culture'. Secondly, that they are attempting to 'decolonize' [Periphery] literature written in English' and thirdly, that they are unwitting victims of cultural imperialism (Phillipson, 1992, all cited Bisong, 1995: 129). Perhaps the best way to refute these claims is to let such writers defend their decisions for themselves:

If I had not written in English, I would not have written at all.

I feel that the English language will be able to carry the weight of my African experience. But it will have to be a new English, still in full communion with its ancestral home but altered to suit its new African surroundings.


How shall we describe Indian creative writing in English.......Of course, it is Indian literature, just as the work of Thoreau and Hemingway are American literature. But Indian literature comprises several literatures....and Indian writing in English is but one of the voices in which India speaks. It is a new voice, no doubt, but it is as much Indian as others.


It seems that English is the preferred medium for some simply because it facilitates the creative process (Bisong, 1995: 129). Any suggestion that Periphery writers writing in English have ulterior purposes or hidden agendas is, in Bisong’s view both 'patronising' and ill-informed (ibid.: 131). The additional literary resources made available through English can therefore be seen as complementary to the local literary traditions, rather than being at odds with them (Kachru, 1994: 145).

In summary, the main points in this section have been that:

* the value-system associated with EIL provides additional ‘attitudinal resources’.
* contact with English has led to greater functionality in Periphery languages through linguistic enrichment.
* English has provided additional literary resources.

5 Language in the maintenance of society and culture

So far, I have showed that EIL can be used to develop Periphery societies through modernisation and improved work and leisure opportunities, and to develop Periphery cultures through additional ‘attitudinal’, linguistic and literary resources. This section presents the view that, while EIL certainly has a role to play in developing the Periphery, it is the local languages that are best suited to the task of maintenance. The reason for this is quite straight-forward. The purpose of language is to reflect both the society that uses it and that society's culture. When a society and/or culture has undergone change, it's language has generally adapted in step with those changes, so that it can continue to serve that purpose.

In his article on English in India, Tully writes:
But what I do not want.....is English on top of Indian languages. I want to see the other languages flourish, and I do not believe that Indian culture and Indian civilization can survive healthily and flourish unless the original languages of the country flourish too.

(Tully, 1997: 158).

Though he states clearly that he is in favour of English for all the benefits it can bring (ibid.), he strongly believes that India and its cultures will thrive only if Indian languages reassert themselves.

The renowned African writer Chinua Achebe has expressed his hope that those writing in the local languages will continue to do so, so that the 'ethnic literature will flourish side-by-side with the national ones' (1975, cited by Bisong, 1995: 129). More generally, Strevens (1980: 62) says that local languages can perform the same functions at the intranational level or among native-speakers, that EIL does in the international context, (for example in science and mass media). Further, that in many (though not all) cases, they can do so just as 'adequately and even elegantly' as EIL (ibid.: 73). Where this is the case, given that local languages are already optimally attuned to the local culture and the society’s linguistic needs, clearly it is the local language that it best suited to the maintenance of that society and its culture.

To close this section, it is interesting to note Master’s (1998: 723) observation that Cantonese is actually displacing English in Hong Kong. To explain this, he cites Fishman:

..when non-English-speaking countries that currently rely on English for modernization ......become strong enough to continue that progress in their own vernacular languages, for example, by inventing new technology, English will be displaced, as will all those in the population who identify with it, and power will shift to those who know (and identify with) the vernacular.


He sees English as a transient medium through which a society can import new technologies, then, when it has taken what it wants, the indigenous language is allowed to reassert itself. This leaves the society in a technologically stronger position than before, but able to maintain its culture through its own language. In Hong Kong’s case this might be an oddity caused by the rapid and substantial shift in political systems that occurred
with its return to China. However, if other societies follow this example, the implication for EIL is that its long-term future as the dominant language in some countries is far from assured.

### 6 The need for appropriate and adequate language planning

This paper has advocated a position which requires a balance to be struck between the utilisation of EIL for the development of Periphery societies and their cultures, and the use of local languages for their maintenance. It is essentially the same juggling of national concerns which Kennedy (2001: 95) outlines with respect to Malaysia. However, the optimal balance for any given context is highly unlikely to arise, or to be maintained, merely by chance. It must be deliberately planned and actively implemented. It would be the role of language planners to formulate appropriate and adequate plans, that is to say ones which account for both present and future local problems, needs, available resources, etc. To avoid the kind of problems outlined by Bisong (1995: 124), this work is perhaps better performed by native language planners who have knowledge of the prevailing local conditions.

Planning with a view to establishing this EIL/local language equilibrium would, perhaps to a large extent, negate the potentially adverse effects of EIL and the Centre upon Periphery languages, cultures and, therefore, societies. Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas (1996) write at great length about the need for language planning to counter these negative tendencies, while Kaplan (1987: 143) succinctly describes the whole process as 'damage control'. That is perhaps a fair label. It is significant that much of the work being done in language planning in recent years seems to relate to the preservation of indigenous languages, rather than the promotion of English. Perhaps the former has become necessary because the Centre has already fulfilled the latter task more than adequately.

Of course having a plan does not equate to its successful implementation. It does not necessarily even equate to the intention to successfully implement it. Some individuals or groups within the society will be unwilling (either overtly or covertly) to do so, while others will, for whatever reason, be unable to. However, it seems fair to say that a plan which is both appropriate and adequate, is likely to be generally well received by a society's native members. To maintain widespread support however, it would require frequent review, since many of the social variables on which its formulation is based, are themselves dynamic (Kennedy, 2001: 94-95).

### 7 Implications for ELT professionals in Japan
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What implications do the issues raised in this paper have for ELT professionals in the Japanese context?

Despite borrowing many words from English (McArthur, 1987, cited by Kaplan, 1987: 139), and even some grammars (Kachru, 1994: 143), there seems no realistic chance of English making serious inroads into the Japanese language. The biggest issue here therefore seems to be that of cultural, rather than linguistic imperialism, i.e. imposing the Centre’s values upon Japanese citizens. To safeguard against such charges, ELT professionals in Japan may need to review both the materials they use and the ways in which they are deployed. Materials which rely heavily upon Centre-based contexts, characters and cultural values and assumptions minimise their relevance to students and are likely to be poorly received (Adaskou et al, 1990: 7-8; Prodromou, 1992: 47-48). Activities which require students to perform in ways contrary to their cultural norms also seem inappropriate. For example, Japanese are generally very uncomfortable with any activity requiring them to draw attention to themselves, as it goes very much against their cultural values to do so. Uemichi’s admonition reinforces this point:

.....foreign teachers of English......should pay more heed to the realities of Japanese society and the opinions of Japanese teachers and students.

(Uemichi, 1984: 5-6).

That is not to say that teaching the Centre’s culture is taboo. Cultural knowledge is generally accepted as an important part of increasing overall communicative competence, but if foreign ELT professionals here are to maintain credibility among their colleagues and students, it needs to be done in a way which is sensitive to, and respectful of Japanese culture, just as Adaskou et al (1990) and Hyde (1994) demonstrated in the case of Morocco.

Finally, in common with other Periphery nations such as Malaysia (Kennedy, 2001: 95), what occurs in the classroom often bears little resemblance to the official language plan. There is in Japan the unstated, but socially accepted supposition that the sole purpose of formal English education is to prepare students for higher education entrance exams. That these (language knowledge) tests serve only to nullify the (language use) plans outlined by central and local government is a major source of conflict between Japanese and foreign ELT teachers here. How one resolves this conflict is a matter of personal preference, but a successful outcome is likely to require the cultural sensitivity outlined above.
8 Conclusion

This paper has suggested a division of labour in the roles played by EIL and Periphery languages in the development and maintenance of society and culture. EIL seems best suited to social development because it facilitates modernisation and enhances leisure and career opportunities and choice. It also appears able to develop Periphery cultures by supplying additional ‘attitudinal’, linguistic and literary resources. Conversely, social and cultural maintenance are probably best performed by the local language, because the indigenous code is already finely attuned to the society and its culture.

The need for adequate and appropriate language planning has also been highlighted. Without it, the tendency of EIL and the Centre to modify or displace local languages and cultures would go largely unchecked. Finally, some implications for ELT professionals in my local context have been highlighted. These go some way to applying the occasionally abstract and remote concepts of society and culture to the practical problems encountered in the classroom.

The world is indeed getting smaller and in response to that, more societies are tending towards bilingualism and biculturalism. ELT professionals, particularly those from the Centre need to be cognisant of the fact though that knowledge of additional languages and cultures does not equate to a preparedness to abandon one's own. Further, that where those in the profession are not sensitive to societies’ indigenous cultures and languages, they risk eliciting negative reactions.
Appendix

Quotations used in the original task question.

#1 since no cultural requirements are tied to the learning of English, you can learn it and use it without having to subscribe to another set of values [...] 

Languages in Competition: Dominance, diversity and decline. Blackwell

#2 English is the least localized of all the language in the world today. Spoken almost everywhere in the world to some degree, and tied to no particular social, political, economic or religious system, or to a specific racial or cultural group, English belongs to everyone or to no one, or at least it is quite often regarded as having this property. 

Languages in Competition: Dominance, diversity and decline. Blackwell

#3 What is at stake when English spreads is not merely the substitution or displacement of one language by another but the imposition of new ‘mental structures’ through English. This is in fact an intrinsic part of ‘modernization’ and ‘nation-building’, a logical consequence of ELT. Yet the implications of this have scarcely penetrated into ELT research or teaching methodology. Cross-cultural studies have never formed part of the core of ELT as an academic discipline, nor even any principled consideration of what educational implications might follow from an awareness of this aspect of English linguistic imperialism. 

Linguistic imperialism. OUP

#4 there have been comments made about other structural aspects too, such as the absence in English grammar of a system of coding social class differences, which make the language appear more democratic to those who speak a language (e.g. Javanese) that does express an intricate system of class relationships. 

David Crystal (1997). 
English as a Global Language. CUP
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