

Shattering Ethnocentric and Eurocentric Subjectivities in foreign language teaching: A Critical Intercultural Perspective

Adriana Carolina Torres Escobar

English, French and Spanish Professor

Education Faculty, Ph.D. program in Education, Universidad Santo Tomás, Bogotá, 110111, Colombia

Corresponding Author: adrianatorrese@ustadistancia.edu.co

Abstract

The complexity and essence of languages and cultures are unique. People live in culturally built niches based on beliefs, subjectivities, skills, and practices resulting from symbolic and material inheritances passed down from generation to generation. Throughout the qualitative, documentary, and hermeneutical research, it has been feasible to identify that postmodern society has reified human beings. People are considered a means of production and consumption. Besides, the dominant groups impose languages and cultures that they label as prestigious, ignoring that every person is unique and has ideas, values, religions, languages, and cultures. This article will describe the process of subjectivation and its relationship with 'technologies of power,' which enforce thoughts, self-concept, and behavior abstractly, subtly, and invisibly. The results depict that some authors define the English language as dominant, imperialistic, and homogeneous. The article goes further than this intellectual elaboration. It proposes that educational institutions should be sites where students actively adopt an intercultural, analytical, and critical thinking approach to learning foreign languages. That way, students learn to discover their identities, value pluralism, research the causes and consequences of domination methods, and are open to diversity without acquiring ethnocentrism or xenophobic ideologies. The article contests neutrality and dogmatism in education. It defines schools as cultural and political arenas where teachers should support students to understand reality, generate argumentative competencies and use them to make rich proposals on crucial topics for humanity, building a more democratic and proactive society. Thinking about education from a humanistic and ethical approach and holding transformative social action in classrooms respond to the chaotic and uneven prevailing world.

Keywords: culture, ethnocentrism, eurocentrism, English, identity, interculturality, postmodernity, power, subjectivity.

1. Introduction

The term postmodernity was born with Jean-François Lyotard as the skepticism of the masses towards metanarratives. Before that period, there were central principles of rational progress and universal truths. In postmodernity, facts are debatable. There are relativized values, contingent patterns of behavior, ceaseless changes, and unpredictable situations. Currently, the masses believe that there are multiple

options available to choose from in terms of families' structure, religions, lifestyles, and relationships. What really matters in the postmodern society is accomplishing a state of bliss, indulgence, and the feeling of freedom even though it is fallacious in most cases. In fact, the contemporary world is rife with surveillance, materialism, and chaotic lives.

Currently, people's competence to turn data into information has weakened. The concept of knowledge reduces to coded messages flowing within the communication system. Regarding this upshot, Soto Urrea (2009) points out that, in postmodernity, communication is perceived as something stringently physical, quantitative, and statistical and not as a process of analysis that builds organized, reflexive and structured information and knowledge. This cognition proves that the knowledge mission has shifted from the ends of human welfare to its means. It entails the pragmatics of communication through 'the agents of power' who dominate the media and spread messages loaded with ideologies that meet the elites' interests and the market. It happens in all aspects of life. For instance, according to Lyotard (1984), STEAM fields, what is taught, what is researched, and what is published, depend on governments' decisions because they are the sponsors. Thus, they decide to reject or bolster initiatives and research through normativity, media, and funds.

People live in a hectic routine, and most of them find it hard to discern the truth. Therefore, the 'technologies of power' have control of their minds, decisions, and actions. The masses are solely playing the role of consumers, and they are surrendered to the ideas that the media implants on them.

Currently, people have access to countless data and news without reaching an in-depth and holistic vision because, as Lyotard (1984) points out, 'the agents of power' have vanished epistemic coherence. Consequently, fragmentation of knowledge and abrupt changes make people not be studious and reflective. They lose meaning, are unstable, and do not use their 'technologies of the self' to build deliberate subjectivities that lead to a strong identity.

Subjectivity refers to human subjects' constitution, which results from experiences, discourses, forms of knowledge, and contexts. According to Foucault (1975), the subject has died in postmodernity and is merely a power discourse product, being socially constructed. The discourse has specific intentions and is historically situated. The process of subjectivation consists of the subjects acquiescing to the power devices that shape them as disciplinary individuals. 'Technologies of power' are used to articulate domination and discipline techniques to exert mental power over individuals to make them reproduce thoughts, ideologies, decisions, and resolutions without them even noticing that they are being fabricated externally. Subjects can escape from this domination through 'technologies of the self,' which are techniques devised to consciously form, conserve, or transform their identity according to ethical relationships. When the subjects develop and use the 'technologies of the self,' they accomplish the goal of governing themselves purposely, exploring their insights about the world and their relationships to appraise causes and outgrowths, as well as taking care of themselves and those around them (Foucault, 1982).

Technical performativity maximizes information flow and minimizes static procedures that are not economically profitable for the system. For this purpose, the 'technologies of power' appear. These are the discursive techniques and tactics that elites use to subtly rule citizens, organize their lives, and produce subjectivities and actions through discursive relationships (Foucault, 1982). Organizations, governments, corporations, and elites use language to disseminate discourses that void the relevance of everything that

does not make a profit. After several repetitions, people end up believing in the certainty of these contents. In this vein, society is prone to reproduce subjectivities that yield to hegemonic and bureaucratic impositions.

'Critical interculturality' defeats dominance, struggling against foreground subalternation models and hierarchization (Anzaldúa, 1987; Gutiérrez, 2008; Kramsch, 1993). According to Walsh (2010), there are three main definitions of interculturality. Relational interculturality is reductionist because even though it declares the prominence of the exchange among cultures, it still maintains discrimination. Functional interculturality is hegemonic because the governments plan to homogenize the population, whereby the uniformization of normativity voids inclusion. In reality, it invalidates diversity and pluralism's richness. Eventually, 'critical interculturality' is how this article defines interculturality. It is decolonial and ethical because it intends to struggle inequality through a socio-historic transformation whose purpose is to defend, dignify and preserve the diversity of identities, cultures, languages, subjectivities, social relationships, beliefs, and institutions. In this process, there are no attempts to either colonize the ideas, thoughts, and selves of the people or homogenize, judge, and despise what is different from the 'normality.' 'Critical interculturality' embraces diversity; it is not ethnocentric and does not promote the subjectivity that foreign languages contaminate nations' purity. Interculturality consists of listening to the dominant and oppressed communities and individuals from a critical outlook that explores causes, stories, current situations, and delves into conclusions, positions, and experiences. Plus, it weaves relationships between languages, cultures, history, and realities.

2. Methodology

Macdonald & Tipton (1993) state that documentary research provides depth to the data, details, interpretative variety, and contextualization to the researcher's findings. The study was qualitative, documentary, and hermeneutical. The design was non-experimental and descriptive. The researcher organized the information taking into account formal elements such as author, title, publisher, name of the document source, year of publication, description of the content, and analysis. Evaluating what Gadamer (2004) and Lincoln & Guba (1985) point out about interpretation, this research analyzed and interpreted documents to have a global and comprehensive perspective. The study conducted a thorough interrogation of the texts to unravel their arguments. The researcher inquired the texts to critically analyze subjectivities about linguistic and cultural perspectives, language, and power, taking into account her academic path and expertise in teaching foreign languages and interculturality. There was a construction of concepts inside the information, the interpretation, the context, the theory, and critical thinking. The exploration was beneficial for answering the following questions:

1. How are the subjectivities of researchers diminishing the significance of teaching foreign languages?
2. How can students learn English and other foreign languages without losing their identities?
3. How does 'critical interculturality' impact on the teaching of foreign languages?

3. Results

According to Phillipson (2012), teaching English as an international and superior language is defined as

'linguistic imperialism,' which is an expression of discrimination and narrow-mindedness. There is a unique language's preeminence over others equally important, including local, indigenous or foreign languages. The English language has gained a privileged position, which makes it especially appraised. Indeed, the domination of English in education has become a means to promote western ideologies. Unconsciously, societies adopt the subjectivity that the English language is more valuable than any other because it bestows power, status, and wealth.

Consequently, governments worldwide dispense more publicity, laws, resources, and infrastructure to promote the English language, although every country has various tongues. Envisioning favoritism towards foreign languages creates an atmosphere of inequality and social injustice, the disappearance of minority languages, and the communities to which they belong. Indeed, learning the language with the highest hierarchy has become one of the axes of education. Subconsciously, it means being part of an influential civilization. As Canagarajah (1999) and Pennycook (1998) mention, it takes a colonial character. Language is one of the most potent instruments of domination. Languages are alive, and they are used to spread cultures, lifestyles, economic and political ideologies that nonnative countries try to follow to be successful. A way in which people massify and hierarchize is through languages. In response to that, nonnative English speakers who have learned it outnumber English native speakers 3 to 1 (Crystal, 2003). The linguistic imperialism of English predominates in the postmodern era, and at an overall level, it helps to maintain prevailing power relations among speakers. Hence, globally, English is the most respected, legitimate, and influential in social, academic, political, and business spheres. Holliday (2005) has criticized the pervasive ideology that privileges English speakers and marginalizes individuals who do not have English proficiency, which deprives the significance of plurality.

Brown (2007), Crystal (2003), Galloway & Rose (2018), Halliday (2003), Harmer (2007), Jenkins (2007), Seidlhofer (2005), Steger (2009) are authors that label English as the global language communication, the internationally most widely used language and the vehicle for information and knowledge. In this same sense, Xu (2018) characterizes it as an extensive native language and a supreme language. English is a multicultural way of thinking, doing, and being.

Nunan (2015) describes some examples of the predominance that English has taken worldwide:

1. In Latin America, some companies such as KPMG have resolved that English is the official language of communication within the corporation.
2. In Thailand, English was the language used for Chinese and Thai engineers to build a dam.
3. In the Philippines, the Pope addresses the faithful in English.
4. In southern China, a Hong Kong accounting firm conducts its audit, collecting the data in Mandarin and Cantonese, but submits the report using the English language.
5. In Brazil, a leading agricultural export company hires only English-proficient employees and trains them as accountants, rather than hiring accountants and training them in English.
6. In Korea, several top universities mandate English as the medium of instruction in technology and engineering.

The rapid expansion of teaching English to students in many countries around the world has been, at a great extension, an educational response to demands in the job market. English stands out as an essential language through worldwide state policies because it is a means of social mobility and synonymous with

earnings. This utilitarian conception that society and governments have assigned to this language is part of the neoliberal discourse of linguistic capital in the globalized economy that associates English as a device to thrive in the market, access opportunities, and banish the less competent (Canagarajah, 2017).

In Colombia, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Mexico, Panama (Cronquist & Fiszbein, 2017), China (Qi, 2016), and Japan (Liang, 2017), among other countries, English is a compulsory subject of the curriculum. Governments have used normativity to establish that schools and universities teach English as a foreign language, overlooking other foreign languages and even lowering priority to ancestral languages. These last ones should be defended and conveyed from generation to generation to preserve cultural identity and linguistic variety. In Singapore, Malaysia, and India, the governments have been remarkably emphatic on demanding students and workers a fluent English language to access the most reputable universities and the highest salary jobs. Therefore, countless citizens study English until it becomes the language in which they are most knowledgeable and more fluent, even in detriment of their native languages.

Consequently, these countries have experienced a sharp decrease in the mastery of their country's native tongues. Part of the population feels an aversion to individuals who know and use the native languages. Thus, they avoid teaching other languages than English to their children (Liang, 2017). Therefore, the transmission from one generation to the next is broken.

These factors drive an economic and political advantage to the dominant English-speaking countries. Galloway & Rose (2018) criticize the imperialism of English as a policy that benefits this language over others and represents diverse linguistic communities as inferior, mediocre, and weak. With the expansion of English-speaking nations into non-English speaking regions, people who achieve better command of the language are perceived as more competitive and have entrance to various academic and job opportunities. According to Butler et al. (2018), the English language has spread at the expense of native languages, and societies have idealized it as the language that makes business, learning, and communication possible since English skills are associated with social and economic growth and a modern self-image.

Regarding Colombia, Zwisler (2018) points out that there is an identity crisis in this country because the Ministry of Education has relegated Spanish and aboriginal languages to a position of social inferiority compared to English. Responding to globalization, the Colombian government tries to align economically with the capitalist English-speaking countries, and for this, it applies different strategies to make its citizens speak English. The government does not struggle to boost indigenous languages with the same eagerness as English learning. The cost that Colombia is paying to partake in the global market is the devaluation of ancestral linguistic identities.

The inordinate emphasis and overvaluation of English in Colombia and the world is startling, markedly considering that 2 500 languages are at risk of disappearance. Governments are not acting proactively to protect them. Unfortunately, it is a phenomenon that is on the rise. There are 7 000 languages globally, and 96% of the population speaks only 4% of them (Romaine, 2017). The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (2019) points out that 40% of languages will vanish during this century. Likewise, in Latin America and the Caribbean, one in five indigenous people has already lost the native language. Forty-four countries in the region have replaced it with Spanish and 55 with Portuguese. The disappearance of languages threatens people's sense of identity because the transmission of values, stories, rituals, beliefs, food recipes, ancient medicine, ways of expressing emotions, humor, and unique cultural

practices also perish. Valuing and defending languages and cultures protects part of humanity's heritage, admiration for oneself and others, peaceful coexistence, collective memory, and the sense of belonging. In the specific case of Bogotá, capital of Colombia, Méndez et al. (2020) point out that the way of thinking of the bilingual subject as one who speaks English, and no other tongues, has transcended public policy campaigns. Moreover, the media's advertising has affected citizens' subjectivities, configuring the English language's supremacy as a regime of truth. On the other hand, society judges the Colombian English teachers as subjects with deficiencies and stunted effectiveness in teaching the language. These same authors illustrate that announcements build citizens' subjectivities that exacerbate English superiority and Colombian English teachers' image as inadequate personnel that cannot work efficiently and autonomously. Media discredit Colombian English teachers through negative headlines, content, and memes; sell a positive image of the native English speaking teacher while they blame Colombian English teachers because of Colombia's low English level. In contrast, Media do not evaluate the role of institutions such as the Ministry of Education, the diversity of Colombia's contexts and students, the importance of preserving other languages, the students' interests, and the scarcity of resources that are accessible in the schools to teach English.

In Colombia, several investigations affirm that organizations such as the British Council and the Cambridge University Press have furthered the teaching of English to benefit economically and attain their neoliberal goals (García et al. 2007; González 2009; Le Gal, 2018; Méndez et al. 2019). The English language teaching and learning business is an essential pillar of the British economy as it is a global product sold on the international market. The Ministry of National Education from Colombia has delegated to foreign organisms the design of curricular guidelines and materials, the administration of standardized exams to measure English, the leadership of training programs, and English immersion for students and teachers.

When considering migrants in English-speaking countries, the English language's command is an unfailingly requisite to survive, study, and work, so English superimposes on the tongues of migrant groups. The investigations of Al-Jumaily (2015); Román et al. (2019); and Velázquez (2018) agree that, in these countries, it is usual for migrant families to decide to teach English to the new generations as their mother tongue. Some immigrants get ashamed of their native languages and prefer to use English in all contexts, and children have few opportunities to learn or practice their parents' language. Besides, the population that does not speak English fluently endures negative peer pressure, social discrimination, and a decontextualized curriculum at school that does not consider the newcomers' multiple origins. Language inherently encompasses cultural elements, but parents do not transmit either of them to their children. Furthermore, many of the explicit or hidden cultural concepts embedded in English teaching materials and the media affect the children's attitudes towards their culture and identity. This generation is the result of Western civilization, which overwhelms them through language, which, according to Vygotsky (1978), is the central mediation in socio-cultural and psychological development.

How English is privileged in education systems and the discourses that justify, it needs critical scrutiny. Policies that strengthen linguistic diversity are required to counter linguistic imperialism and recognize indigenous languages. It is essential to preserve all languages because they create culture, preferences, and interpersonal relationships. For Foucault (1982), language plays a central role in the subject's decisions regarding 'technologies of power.' Bakhtin (1990) argues that language has a direct link with cultural and

social relations. From a psychoanalytic perspective, Lacan (1997) asserts that language structures a large part of subjectivity construction. In the philosophy of language, Derrida (1967) shows the transcendence of language in people's perception of meaning. In sociolinguistics, Halliday's (1978) concept of language as a social semiotic is particularly relevant for establishing a connection between socio-cultural structures and language forms.

When living with others, some people's target is to adjust to the socio-cultural context in which they move and partake in similar ideals. Therefore, they are prone to reproduce behavior patterns and repudiate those that are part of themselves but are different from the 'normality.' In these terms, the hegemonic image of the world that defines English as an outstanding language with great fame and notoriety influences how they deal with their cultural inheritance. Sometimes, if they want to be considered bilingual, appear well educated, or stand out as well-educated, they would prefer to learn English as a foreign language while discarding other tongues. This circumstance generates linguistic tension. For example, if students are bilingual and master their ancestors' languages, they may stop speaking them even in their familiar surroundings because the Western positions disregard them. Thus, the general population cannot explore other languages and cultures apart from English, even though there are more than 7000 languages worldwide (Coupé et al., 2019).

4. Discussion

In postmodernity, human beings' are treated as masses that must serve the scientific-economic progress. Mercantilism and uncaring consumerism sell deluded freedom to society. Discourses are made to dominate the masses' minds and spirits to fulfill the interests of concentrations of economic power. Eloquent speeches and alluring images intend to homogenize and make everyone think, act, and speak equivalently, to the point that learning English is also inflicted at school without offering various options. Countries have dismissed the value of the diversity of languages and cultures. They advocate that the English language is crucial because it facilitates their leadership in science, education, business, and technology. Throughout the excessive promotion of this language, inequality appears and puts other languages, plus the countries' mother tongues, at stake.

The masses look down on those who do not adhere to their lifestyles, beliefs, and expectations and mark them as backward. In 'the society of control,' individuals are always fluctuating according to the precepts of the 'technologies of power.' They reproduce patterns and do not accept heterogeneity (Soto Urrea, 2013, p. 124). Therefore, there is little admiration for indigenous people, Afro-descendants, other ethnic groups, languages, traditions, religions, and cultures, and in a demeaning manner, society deems them as periphery communities. As UNESCO (2003) states, each language possesses unique wisdom and is an essential resource for shaping identities and cultures. Indeed, the languages are the expression of who the individuals and communities are.

When educators use traditional methods of teaching foreign languages and only focus on textbook-based instruction whose emphasis is grammar, recitation, imitation, drills, and the idealization of the implications of speaking English fluently, they neglect the exploration of local and international cultures and ideologies. Owing to this situation, they keep playing a passive and sterile role to deter ethnocentric and hegemonic

forces' influences. In the 21 century, teachers' pedagogical discourses and practices should stimulate the recognition of students' own and external languages and cultures, encouraging evenhandedness and production of proposals attempting to construct democratic societies. Furthermore, teachers should introduce activities to disclose the relationships and power struggles between different economic, political, and social models. They should make students research the social relationships surrounding cultures, languages, and communities so that they realize the world's dynamics, become proactive, propose solutions and structured procedures, learn to live harmoniously, and eliminate ethnocentrism, bigotry, and discrimination.

Ethnocentrism leads individuals to be hostile and generate attitudes of fear, contempt, strangeness, hatred, and violent confrontation, either through words or actions. Fostering interculturality allows students to see the world through their own eyes and also through the eyes of others, without distorting or manipulating realities but rather judging them with reasons and arguments fairly and objectively. The English language or other languages are not perils. Indeed, linguistic and cultural diversity constitute irreplaceable wealth. When students learn new languages and cultures, they recognize the value of their identity, culture, and language and discover that they are not isolated in the world, and they are not the center. For this reason, teachers should foster activities in which students reflect on and value their origins and those of others.

Learning English is of great importance in today's globalized world. However, to go beyond the instrumentalization of language and linguistic imperialism, students must learn foreign languages through critical and non-idealizing thinking. Schools should be promoters of critical dialogue, deepening, and interpretation of realities. Horizontality and reflection on the world's facts and its current and future challenges are crucial in the classes. Learning foreign languages in this way contributes to the gain of more welcoming and positive attitudes and becomes a good platform for cultural and intercultural training.

Globalization and the learning of English is an opportunity to transcend from plurality - the recognition of diversity within society - and multiculturalism - the recognition of diversity as an essential element in society that must be respected-, to interculturality- the understanding of themselves and others in a constant ethical dialogue, interpretation, questioning, decoding, examination, interconnection, and diversity. Then, interculturality does not limit a language and culture's integrity to dances or folklore, the accentuation of stereotypes, or the attempt to change others' identities to fit in a community; indeed, it goes deeper. Interculturality exalts self-respect and deference for others. The relational and emotional component of learning is taken into account, delves into self-training and exchange of ideas as a mechanism to find differences, similarities, and complements, enriching all the subjects involved. In this order of ideas, all languages, both indigenous and foreign, are essential and have historical, social, and cultural value.

Each language's cultural aspects are critical because each society's cultural heritage relates to its language evolution. The class of foreign languages is a socio-pedagogical space. It is essential to highlight the socio-cultural aspects to bolster an intercultural dialogue that fosters a new way of looking at the world. Therefore, languages transmit personal and social actions. Consequently, it is necessary to incorporate socio-cultural factors in the language learning-teaching process.

It is of paramount importance to turn to interculturality as a means of interaction, exchange, openness, and solidarity in which values, ways of life, and symbolic representations recuperate their significance. Interculturality goes beyond the fact that several ethnic groups coexist concurrently in the same territory

but actively seek reciprocity, communication, and solidarity within different ways of understanding life, conditions, history, and social behaviors. Interculturality explores the relationships between countries, social classes, ethnic groups, and diverse contexts. Moreover, it fights against discourses and actions that spur tensions on individuals or create and intensify adverse and undemocratic relationships. Interculturality seeks to scrutinize why people stigmatize themselves and others. It also explores the consequences of constructing these subjectivities.

This research recommends that teachers expose students to social matters and address cultural and linguistic imperialism. For instance, while students are learning English, teachers can harness this language to make students explore and socialize their origins, thoughts, and personal stories. Likewise, educators should propose research tasks about the ethnic minorities of the students' country, as well as those of foreign territories.

Schools should be open-thinking environments where students cultivate an interest in searching their roots, knowing those of others, reaching out to minorities, studying other social, sexual, and religious groups, fostering responsibility to protect languages, and improving critical thinking (Leuridan, 2019). Linguistic and cultural imperialism lacks ethical foundations in favor of democratization. That practice subjugates linguistic minorities and economically vulnerable groups. Therefore, the dominant groups reinforce cultural identities, lifestyles, and methods by undermining the languages, cultures, identities, and the dignity of the most impoverished and most dependent communities.

This research suggests that the schools' priority is to help students build their identities, recognize and value their linguistic and cultural roots without being nationalistic or negatively judge the international contexts, languages, and cultures. Schools should invite aboriginal, indigenous, afro-descendants, American, Antarctic, European, African, Oceanian, and Asian people so that the students ask questions, establish dialogues, share about their identities and learn about others, discuss rituals, gastronomy, religious ceremonies, challenges, histories, and stories. As a result of this exercise, students encounter the pleasure of making introspection and plentiful intercultural interactions and relationships. This way, they fortify concrete bases to build their identity and life project eliminating the myopic vision that considers the local and autochthonous as underdeveloped, ordinary, and worthless. Students learn not to judge themselves or others because of their language, race, customs, nationality, quirks, creeds, and phenotypic characteristics. On the contrary, they strengthen their identity, accept and appreciate themselves and their fellows as worthy individuals, and find unity in the diversity without changing themselves or compelling others to change with the meaningless purpose of following fashions or socioeconomic groups.

Education focused on humanism and the defense of human rights, according to Nussbaum (2011), makes it possible to develop the capacities to decolonize and dignify people so that they feel empowered to express, respect themselves, and preserve their identity. Schools should encourage that students recognize no language or culture inferior or superior through creative, analytical, reflective, and critical thinking. When students approach their learning of English with love, disposition, and at the same time, use critical competencies, they can open an ethical conception of the world and languages. They could feel encouraged to learn not only English and its cultures but also other languages. In this way, the idealization and apprehensions towards English would diminish. In fact, they learn to appreciate their language, seek to preserve it, and not want to get rid of it. Therefore, they would pave the way to have a decolonized mind.

Learning English should not be conceived as a disruptive and harmful element. Schools should not be restricted to teach the formal content of the language. They should teach about its history, culture, idiosyncrasies, worldview, challenges, political systems, economy, and lifestyles. As a result, students have the chance to make contrasts among their identities and those of others, their realities, and foreign ones. English has the same value as native languages and has the right not to be judged, segregated, and encumbered with contempt. No language is inherently harmful or dominant. It depends on how it is socialized, taught, and learned. The English class can become a vehicle that mobilizes insights, skills, cooperation, collective consciousness, and debates beyond the linguistic, instrumental, semantic, formal, or pragmatic language content.

If schools follow the strategies proposed in this discussion, the results are favorable because students develop cultural, cognitive, and practical tools to:

1. ascertain reasons that defend the intergenerational transmission of languages and cultures considering that their loss constitutes irreplaceable damage to human cultural diversity, essence, sense of belonging, art, dignity, spirituality, contributions, and ways of being and feeling.
2. apprehend their identities, territories, traditions, families, languages, and cultures.
3. recognize that learning the languages of their country and the variety of languages that exist in the world is worthy, and English is just one of the options they can choose to learn.
4. acknowledge that they can open up to new worlds, which does not mean that their own identity should be suppressed and annulled.
5. Be tolerant of other people, languages, and cultures. Establish interpersonal relationships appreciating diversity, strengthening their identities, and eradicating subjectivities consisting of qualifying that some languages are adverse or ideal.
6. recognize the richness of the autochthonous and foreign, so necessary to build a society that evolves in the destruction of prejudices, bias, and discrimination.
7. be analytical, investigate, identify problems, be proactive in the quest for solutions.
8. discern the mechanisms that the 'technologies of power' have used to dominate the masses.

5. Conclusion

An inherent part of human beings is the language because it is the core of culture and nurtures their essence. Weaving relationships with other people through language, culture, and identity unite them and make them more sensitive to others. All teachers, and not only English teachers, should rescue the value of the students' mother tongues and their territories of origin since every language contains subjectivities accumulated over millennia, which are part of human beings' sense. Students should maintain their ethnic identity and have convictions to explain, argue, keep social cohesion, and loyalty to their principles and communities. Schools must be influential in helping their students preserve their culture and the sense of belonging, commitment, and cooperation. One of the school's missions is to awaken students' awareness of the consequences of languages' death and the risks of manipulation, repression, and cultural oppression created by replacing their language's functions with other languages. When a language dies, so does its link to the cultural and historical past. Without connecting to their linguistic and cultural history, people succumb to

subjectivation, which is a worrying situation in the present postmodern era. It is necessary to guide the students to discover their mother tongues' beauty and the diversity of ethnic groups, know them and appreciate them. All this does not suggest a position against the teaching of English but rather highlights that every language, even when it is not the most popular in society and business, has a place of honor and is crucial because it comprises stories, songs, dances, rituals, family histories, bonds, and conventions. Those components, stored in the language, are invaluable and irretrievable sources that should not get extinct.

Some individuals perceive foreign people and languages as invaders that strive to dominate them, nullify their culture, and violate their moral values. Nonetheless, it is not feasible for the population to reduce their vision and keenness solely to their ethnicity and culture within this global and plural world. Ethnocentrism is harmful because it represents people who do not belong to their ethnic groups and country as 'others,' 'odds,' 'dubious,' 'strangers,' 'subversives.' Schools should not elevate ethnocentrism because it prompts students to exclusively value their achievements and particularities but exclusively loathe virtue in people of different cultures and nations. Students should not fall into violent nationalism, classism, or racism, since this process consists of marginalizing, excluding, and discriminating those who do not share their linguistic, cultural, religious, and phenotypic characteristics.

As it was possible to deduce in the research results, societies' use of the English language on profuse occasions has been instrumental. The English language is not imperialistic and colonial by itself. Admittedly, no language has an intrinsically nefarious nature. Teachers should support critical reflection and make students question various beliefs and values. That way, students nurture their cognition and intercultural sensitivity. They become the agents of their lives and political actors capable of making personal and social changes through praxis, that is to say, the combination between theory and informed decisions that transcend to reality. This mechanism is meaningful for students because they learn to maintain and enrich their identity in a reflective practice that explores the world. They learn from others, inquire, and socialize their subjectivities without acculturating or making that their identity or that of others perish. Teachers should use the English language as an opportunity of addressing social problems, delve into them, discuss them, and allow students to know the realities and make decisions. In this way, students do not take a stigmatizing ideological stance but instead decide to learn English or other languages with self-awareness and critical thinking.

6. References

- Al-Jumaily, S. (2015). Parents' First Language is Their Children's Second Language. Language Loss: Arabic is a Case. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijelt.v2n2p19>
- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands. The New Mestiza*. Spinsters Aunt Lute.
- Bakhtin, M. (1990). *Art and answerability: Early philosophical essays*. University of Texas Press.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Addison Wesley Longman.
- Butler, Y. G., Sayer, P., & Huang, B. (2018). Introduction: Social class/socioeconomic status and young learners of English as a global language. *System*, 73, 1-3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.02.007>

- Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Canagarajah, S. A. (2017). *The Routledge handbook of migration and language*. Routledge.
- Coupé, C., Mi Oh, Y., Dediu, D., & Pellegrino, F. (2019). Different languages, similar encoding efficiency: Comparable information rates across the human communicative niche. *Science Advances*, 5(9), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aaw2594>
- Cronquist, K., & Fiszbein, A. (2017). *El aprendizaje del inglés en América Latina. El diálogo. Liderazgo para las Américas. [Learning English in Latin America. The dialogue. Leadership for the Americas]*. <https://www.thedialogue.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/El-aprendizaje-del-ingles-en-Am%C3%A9rica-Latina-1.pdf>
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language (2ª. ed.)*. Cambridge University Press.
- Derrida, J. (1967). *De la grammatologie. [Of grammatology]*. Minuit.
- Foucault, M. (1975). *Surveiller et Punir: Naissance de la prison. [Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison]*. Gallimard.
- Foucault, M. (1982). *La hermenéutica del sujeto. [The hermeneutics of the subject]*. Fondo de cultura Económica.
- Gadamer, H.-G. (2004). *Truth and Method* (J. Weinsheimer & D.G. Marshall, Transl., 2ª. ed.). Continuum.
- Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2018). Incorporating Global Englishes into the ELT classroom. *ELT Journal*, 72(1), 3-14. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccx010>
- García, R., Alvarez, V., López, A., Patiño, B., & Saldarriaga, R. (2007). *Legado de una Amistad. [Legacy of a Friendship]*. Centro Colombo Americano.
- González, A. (2009). On alternative and additional certifications in English language teaching. The case of Colombian EFL teachers' professional development. *Íkala, Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura*, 14 (22), 183-209. http://www.scielo.org.co/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0123-34322009000200008&lng=en&tlng=en
- Gutiérrez, K. (2008). Developing a Socio-critical Literacy in the Third Space. In *Reading Research Quarterly*, 43(2), 148-164. <https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.43.2>
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic. The social interpretation of language and meaning*. Hodder Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (2003). *Written Language, Standard Language, Global Language. World Englishes*, 22(4), 405-418. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470757598.ch20>
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching (4ª. ed.)*. Pearson Education.
- Holliday, A. (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford University Press.
- Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and Culture in Second Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Lacan, J. (1997). *The Language of the Self: The Function of Language in Psychoanalysis (A. Wilden, Transl.)*. The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Le Gal, D. (2018). English Language Teaching in Colombia: A Necessary Paradigm Shift. *Matices en Lenguas Extranjeras*, (12), 154-187. <https://doi.org/10.15446/male.n12.73267>
- Leuridan, J. (2019). *El sentido de las dimensiones éticas de la vida*. Universidad de San Martín de Porres.

- Liang, M. (2017). Why Japan needs English, *Cogent Social Sciences*. *Morita, Cogent Social Sciences*, 3(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2017.1399783>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage.
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: The Postmodern Condition: A report on Knowledge* (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Transl., 1ST ed.). University Of Minnesota Press.
- Macdonald, K., & Tipton, T. (1993). Using documents. In Gilbert, N. (Ed.) *Researching Social Life*, 187-200. Sage Publications.
- Méndez, P., Garzón, E., & Noriega-Borja, R. (2019). English Teachers' Subjectivities: Contesting and Resisting Must-Be Discourses. *English Language Teaching*, 12 (3), 65-76. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n3p65>
- Méndez, P., Garzón, E., Noriega-Borja, R., Rodríguez, F., & Osorio, G. (2020). 'English Teacher', *subjetividad y enseñanza del inglés en Bogotá*. Editorial Universidad Distrital.
- Nunan, D. (2015). *Standard English, English standards: Whose standards are they in English Language education?* In L. T. Wong y A. Dubey-Jhaveri. *English Language Education In A Global World*. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.4479.1129>
- Nussbaum, M.C. (2011). *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourses of colonialism*. Routledge.
- Phillipson, R. (2012). *Imperialism and colonialism*. In B. Spolsky (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy* (pp. 203–235). Cambridge University Press.
- Qi, G.Y. (2016). The importance of English in primary school education in China: perceptions of students. *Multiling*, 6 (1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13616-016-0026-0>
- Romaine, S. (2017). *Language Endangerment and Language Death. The Future of Language Diversity*. The Routledge Handbook of Ecolinguistics.
- Román, D., Pastor, A., & Basaraba, D. (2019). Internal linguistic discrimination: A survey of bilingual teachers' language attitudes toward their heritage students' Spanish. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 42(1), 6-30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2018.1563006>
- Seidlhofer, B. (2005). Key concepts in ELT: English as a Lingua Franca. *ELT Journal*, 59(4), 339-341. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci064>
- Soto Urrea, W. H. (2009). *Instancias y estancias de la pedagogía. La pedagogía en movimiento*. [Instances and stays of pedagogy. Pedagogy in motion]. Universidad de San Buenaventura.
- Soto Urrea, W. H. (2013). *Cibernética y pedagogía: una mirada desde la física y la matemática hacia la pedagogía del algoritmo*. [Cybernetics and pedagogy: a look from physics and mathematics towards the pedagogy of algorithm]. Universidad de San Buenaventura.
- Steger, M. (2009). *Globalization. A very short introduction (2^a ed.)*. Oxford University Press.
- The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. (2019). *Many indigenous languages are in danger of extinction*. <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/Indigenoulanguages.aspx>

UNESCO. (2003). *Language Vitality and Endangerment. Presented at the International Expert Meeting on UNESCO Programme Safeguarding of Endangered Languages*. Paris: UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000183699>

Velázquez, I. (2018). *Household perspectives on minority language maintenance and loss: language in the small spaces*. Multilingual Matters.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Harvard University Press.

Walsh, C. (2010). Interculturalidad crítica y educación intercultural. [Critical interculturality and intercultural education]. In J. Viaña, L. Tapia., & C. Walsh. *Construyendo interculturalidad crítica* (pp. 75-96). Instituto Internacional de Integración del Convenio Andrés Bello III-CAB.

Xu, Z. (2018). Exploring English as an International Language- Curriculum, Materials and Pedagogical Strategies. *RELC Journal*, 49(1), 102–118. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217753848>

Zwisler, J. J. (2018). Language Policy and the Construction of National Identity in Colombia. *Encuentros*, 16(1), 133-146. <https://doi.org/10.15665/.v16i01.700>

Copyright Disclaimer

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).